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This dissertation seeks to discover and analyze the divergent ways that higher education has been legitimated by American discourse in the twentieth century. Institutions of higher learning have been able to survive and flourish because they have been seen as essential to the health of a democracy, of a free-market economy, and of religious institutions. However, the explanations for such legitimacy have been diverse and varied.

Bormann’s fantasy theme analysis can account for the values and beliefs that form the institutional environments shaping and legitimating organizations such as colleges and universities. Fantasy themes expressed in popular discourse are expressions of the shared social reality of those who enact organizations. My dissertation study explores the ways that rhetorical visions of higher education have changed or persisted in the twentieth century, and it also considers whether positive public sentiments toward colleges and universities have been enhanced or undermined by these shared fantasies. Texts for analysis included the addresses, essays, and books of significant figures from a variety of areas including education, government, and business.
The results reveal tension between individualistic and communal fantasy themes. One also recognizes competition for control of education, and such competition impinges on the independence of the academy. A college degree has been presented as useful for equipping individuals to be self-sufficient, financially prosperous, virtuous citizens. Conversely, colleges have also been valued for encouraging students to become servant leaders in a democracy, productive members of the business community, and benevolent members of a spiritual community. In recent discourse, however, the individualistic fantasy has dominated, and higher education has surrendered independence and power to government and industry. These findings are significant because educational rhetoric helps us to understand current beliefs and practices in higher education by tracing the historical development of these attitudes. The results also clarify the relationship between rhetoric and the environments within which organizations exist.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Higher education has played an important role in American culture and in public discourse. Politicians often propose expanded access to higher education for more Americans as a solution to many problems, including economic inequality or a lack of responsible citizenship (Clinton 259). Spokespersons outside of the government also make these connections. For example, in 1954 the CEO of Standard Oil claimed to be speaking to educators on behalf of American business, "Education has been a vital factor in making the American dream come true . . . the mind must be trained to choose wisely and well, the spirit must be molded to act nobly and in the common good" (R. Wilson 213). Likewise, speakers in America's earliest days addressed the value of higher education, and many patriots believed that the young democracy would not survive without an educated citizenry (Roche 164). However, there have been divergent conceptions of higher education. Higher education has been presented as a means of building community consensus and responsible citizens. Others have depicted it as a means of equipping individuals for success and providing opportunities for more students.

In this study, I argue that in the twentieth century, education reformers and reactionaries alike have resorted
to what Ernest Bormann would call conflicting rhetorical visions to describe higher education as a way of preparing individuals for life in government, business, and religion, and as a means of improving the community through contributions to government, business, and religion. Throughout the twentieth century, rhetorical visions have legitimated higher education as a democratic institution by emphasizing the opportunities a college degree provides for individuals from all social classes. Those in business, in particular, have emphasized the economic benefits of higher education. For example, Allen Crow, who was president of the Detroit Economic Club in 1944, said that “Higher education . . . must include among its primary functions, the instruction of folks in how to acquire what they need and what they want, by taking care of themselves” (379). This emphasis on individualism often comes at the expense of communal perspectives. In contrast, other rhetorical visions emphasize a communal perspective and the duty that college graduates have to the community. In a baccalaureate address given in 1949, Princeton President, Harold Dodds, urged his graduates to “use your minds . . . not for your own pleasure and profit alone but as effective participants in a democratic society” (“The Cultivation” 555). This statement is typical of ceremonial speeches
given to inspire graduates to understand their new responsibilities in life.

My primary contention is that the two rhetorical visions that have connected higher education and democracy have existed side by side and have led to very divergent conceptions of the purposes of college schooling. The development of these conflicting visions has also led to different purposes and ideal-types for colleges and universities. Often an individualistic rhetorical vision is emphasized at the expense of communal visions. I argue that balance must be maintained between both of these competing perspectives. Even the rhetoric of educators has frequently catered to the demands of individualistic American culture. Administrators or professors do this to gain legitimacy for their institutions, but, in the process, they have neglected the communal purposes of higher education. To support this argument, I trace the historical development of the opposing rhetorical visions and consider the implications these constructions have on the ways that people enact or give meaning to the college and university experience. In the remainder of this section, I briefly sketch the ways that colleges and universities have evolved as important institutions in this country.
The American system of higher education has undergone much change and tumult since its inception. The history of institutions of higher education as organizations and the environments in which these organizations operate has changed dramatically over the years. Colleges and universities have been the battleground for heated debates, the proving ground for great Americans, and the catalyst for changes in our culture. The current model of higher education is very different from the institutional model that educated our founders, but it is no less influential. Throughout its rich and diverse history, American higher education has been the focus of much attention. Influential speeches, books, and essays are replete with discussions of the aims of higher education. Leaders in education, business, government, and religion have suggested that these institutions are central to the American experience. In 1947, president of the University of Chicago, Robert Hutchins, who became a significant voice in American culture, illustrated: "It is often said that American education is the American substitute for a national religion" ("Where" 591). Hutchins, like most of his contemporaries, agreed that higher education could bring about social change.
The nine colonial colleges that existed at the time of the American revolution were not seminaries, but all were established and operated, at least in part, by religious groups. These schools were Christian residential colleges in the British tradition, and they played an important role in preparing students for the revolution and the emerging democracy. Faculties were very small, and the curriculum was based solely on the classics.

After the revolution, the nation expanded west, where many denominational schools appeared. These schools often failed. During this time, however, pressure mounted to expand curricula to include more practical studies. This pressure led to the modern university, which appeared after the Civil War. These organizations existed not only for the dissemination of knowledge but also the discovery of it. Schools like Harvard and Cornell began to offer electives in response to pressures for practical education. These organizations followed the German model by replacing generalists with specialized researchers. Also, the domination of schools with religious affiliations led educational leaders to call for public universities. The Morrill Acts of 1862 were a critical development for public higher education, and they provided federal land and money for universities to pursue agricultural and mechanical
research. These schools were seen as assets to the community because they advanced knowledge and trained citizens in important areas, such as agriculture.

Between the World Wars, American higher education continued to evolve. Schools were called upon by the government and economists to contribute to defense technology and to help alleviate the depression, and, in doing so, these organizations continued to be prized for their practical contributions. This was illustrated in a speech called "Industry and You" given by a DuPont executive who argued that the war revealed a lack of skilled researchers. Colleges could address that weakness by supplying researchers with "industry, dependability, persistence, initiative, and ingenuity" (Tyler 399). After World War II, the GI Bill gave unprecedented numbers of Americans the chance to go to college. Higher education became a means of giving equal opportunities to everyone and became a tool to enrich our society. As educator Brand Blanshard explains, "Today it is widely believed that if anyone is to cope adequately with our complex age he needs a college education. And if it would promote both his own good and that of society to have it, does not society owe it to him and he have a right to it?" (31). Later, student unrest on campuses in the 1960's reflected and in some
sense promoted the radicalism and relativism that continue to be influential up through the present day. Also prevalent is the pragmatism and consumerism that led to a view of colleges as trade or professional schools. Robert and Jon Solomon, both university professors, observed this attitude: “social mobility in the United States is very largely determined by education. Education is the gateway to the professions and, these days, to managerial jobs in business and other organizations” (61).

The changes to higher education, especially in the twentieth century, have transformed the form and function of these schools, which have developed an increasingly close relationship with organizations in the private sector. Traditionally, sharp boundaries existed between educational organizations and corporate organizations, but the changes described above have led to a close interrelationship between business and education. In addition, higher education has remained an important part of a democratic state. However, the British model of higher education that was critical to our founders in preparing students to be citizens in our democracy has been widely criticized by postmodernists for being too elitist and promoting an illiberal curriculum (Lucas 272).
Obviously, this breakdown in consensus has also limited emphasis on character education and Church influence.

In response to these challenges and rapid growth, colleges and universities have become complex bureaucracies. Institutions have been divided into departments and offer very diverse fields of study. Costs have risen, and large, sophisticated budgets have led to demands for efficiency. Also, large-scale research projects require more administrators. Finally, professors have to divide their work time between teaching, research, and administrative and other professional responsibilities.

Contemporary colleges and universities continue to be strong in this country, and they are valued for their contributions to the American economy and culture. American business often sees schools as useful personnel and training facilities. A CEO of Chrysler recently provided evidence of this attitude when he told a convention of educators that colleges are his most important supplier: "you supply us with brainpower, just as surely as USX supplies us with steel and Goodyear supplies us with tires" (Lutz 650). Colleges have developed from the residential schools that sought to bring up moral, Christian leaders to serve the community, to the modern,
government-dependent research universities which train
students in practical career-based curricula.

This broad history serves as a backdrop against which
the rhetoric that lends legitimacy to higher education can
be read. A more detailed history of American higher
education will be given later. Although many modern
attitudes toward higher education can be traced to earlier
periods, it was not until events of the early twentieth
century that the modern conception of higher education
emerged. Therefore, my study will be limited to rhetorical
treatments of higher education in the twentieth century.
As educational institutions have changed, so have
rhetorical constructions of higher education, implying a
connection between rhetoric about higher education and the
organizations' forms and functions. In the next section, I
further explore organizational rhetoric.

The relationship between democracy and higher
education is a rich, historical link that has created an
environment that depicts a college education as a critical
foundation for freedom and happiness in our country. For
this relationship to continue, our institutions must
maintain a sense of community that permits collective
action, while allowing a variety of individuals and
perspectives to participate in this consensus-building
process. The rhetorical vision of higher education as a democratic institution that builds consensus and responsible citizens must be balanced with the vision of higher education as an institution that provides individuals with opportunities and skills to succeed. An inability to reconcile these visions has led to a breakdown in consensus and conflicting ideal-types for colleges and universities.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Rhetoric shapes an organization’s environment. While organizations can attempt to control their environments, there are other powerful voices that are beyond their influence. The research questions that will guide this study seek to connect the rhetorically constructed organizational environment with institutions of higher education. My research questions will be:

(Q1) How have rhetorical visions of higher education, found in American discourse, changed in the era since the early twentieth century, and what visions have persisted?

(Q2) In what ways has the legitimation of colleges and universities been enhanced or undermined by discourses in their institutional environments?

In answering these questions, I argue that: 1) Rhetorical visions are an influential and necessary element
in the process of institutional legitimation; and 2) using fantasy theme analysis as a methodology for unearthing the cultural influences that legitimate higher education reveals that two rhetorical visions connecting higher education with other social institutions have not been balanced in contemporary rhetoric, leading to conflicting ideal-.types and undermining legitimacy.

RHETORIC AND ORGANIZATIONS

In this section, I show that institutional environments are reflected and shaped by the rhetoric that appears in the organizations' environments, and as a result, examination of that discourse can yield insights to the attitudes and values that impact colleges and universities. As Cheney writes, "Scholarship and rhetorical criticism have not come to terms with the corporate rhetor or audience. In organizational studies, the trend toward institutional analysis has addressed this deficit" (Organizational Society 163). Supported by institutional analysis, my study seeks to examine rhetorical visions of educational organizations in light of their consequences for the corporate audience, that is, the way that rhetoric about organizations might influence the organizations and their communication practices. The first part of this section defines organizations and defines
rhetoric. Then, I illustrate ways that rhetoric plays a key role in enacting organizations and their environments.

Weber defines an organization as "a system of continuous purposive activity of a specific kind," and he further defines a corporate organization as "an associative social relationship characterized by an administrative staff devoted to such continuous purposive activity" (15). As purposive, coordinated social relations, organizations are shaped by rhetoric. Organizations exist in environments from which they must acquire resources for survival (Aldrich 63). Resources or inputs can include material resources or intangible resources like good will or customer loyalty. Although there are very real, material conditions in an organization's environment, rhetoric plays an important role in shaping the way organizations see themselves and their environments. Weick explains:

people invent rather than discover part of what they think they see. It certainly is the case that organizations bump into things and that their bruises testify to a certain tangibility in their environment, even if that tangibility can be punctuated in numerous ways. The enactment perspective doesn't deny that. But it also does not accept the idea that organizations are most usefully viewed as reactive sensors of those things that happen outside. (166)

Rhetoric has been defined in various ways. Aristotle defines rhetoric as "an ability, in each [particular] case,
to see the available means of persuasion" (36). Burke calls rhetoric "the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols" (A Rhetoric 43). For Bryant, rhetoric serves "the function of adjusting ideas to people and of people to ideas" (413). Hart defines rhetoric more narrowly as "the art of using language to help people narrow their choices among specifiable, if not specified, policy options" (4). He later adds, "Communication is an attempt to build community by exchanging symbols" (53). Each of these definitions is concerned with rhetoric as a form of symbolic inducement or persuasion. Thus, rhetoric is a valuable resource for organizations because, as Cheney writes, the purpose of organizational rhetoric is to manage multiple identities, both individual and collective (Organizational Society 2). Organizations shape and are shaped by their environments, and the rhetoric of organizations is a form of symbolic inducement to influence environments. For example, an organization's rhetoric can persuade the public to respond to that organization in a certain way. At the same time, rhetors not affiliated with an organization profoundly shape those same publics and have very real effects on organizations. Organizations use rhetoric for image-making, identity maintenance, political
influence in the public, and for recruiting, mobilizing, retaining, and motivating employees.

Several scholars have argued that rhetorical theory and criticism should be better utilized in the analysis of messages that shape organizations. As Stohl and Redding conclude, “Systematic, sustained programs of rhetorical criticism, whether carried out in terms of the traditional or the new rhetoric, should long ago have been turned on organizational discourse” (494). In addition, Putnam and Cheney cite the rhetorical perspective as one of four emerging approaches to organizational communication. They comment, “communication scholars are applying classical and modern rhetorical theory to the study of complex organizations” (Putnam and Cheney 145).

Ideas from many fields and disciplines are used in the study of organizational rhetoric, and while the communication field has taken much from mature academic domains like sociology, social psychology, economics, and management, Tompkins asserts that what is now referred to as organizational theory, management, and administration is simply an extension of classical rhetorical theory (77). The modern organization is an increasingly significant sphere for the production and consumption of rhetoric. Having established that rhetoric is critical to
organizations and organizations are important rhetors, I will next discuss the relationship between rhetoric and organizational environments. Then, I explore arguments that suggest that sentiments in the environment carry over into educational organizations when students, administrators or professors, who have acquired culturally accepted values toward higher education, enter schools.

Tompkins connects rhetoric with organizational theory by showing that rhetoric was used as management, decision making, and public relations theory in ancient Rome, and he further advances this connection by citing Kenneth Burke's realistic function of rhetoric (78). Burke asserts that rhetoric is “rooted in an essential function of language itself . . . the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols” (A Rhetoric 43). The term “cooperation” exposes the connection between rhetoric and organization and allows one to see texts not usually considered as rhetoric as instruments to build the identification and cooperation that create organizations (Tompkins 78).

Most rhetorical analysis has focused on the discourses used by organizations to control the socialization process and to inculcate premises in newcomers (Cheney, “Identification” 143). Perhaps even more influential,
however, are the premises and values held before members enter the organization. These premises deserve more attention than they have been given by rhetorical scholars. Rhetorical analysis can reveal the organizational values that pervade our culture and influence large numbers of people in many organizations.

Another important way that organizations impact public discourse is by shaping the way that individuals perceive messages. A listener's perception of a message is shaped by his/her sense of self or identity, and membership in an organization shapes one's identity. "The individual's identity," Burke writes, "is formed by reference to his membership in a group . . . we are mainly offered identification by membership in a financial corporation, or identification by membership in a political corporation" ("Twelve Propositions" 306-307). Therefore, audiences' receptions of rhetorical messages are shaped by their membership in organizations. As Crable observes, "Any 'one' audience member may have several or many organizational identifications which . . . all help define that individual" (118).

Sproule is another organizational communication scholar who has advocated the application of rhetorical theory to organizational texts. He distinguishes between
the rhetoric of the public and private spheres (259). The public sphere, as ideally enacted in ancient Greek and early American culture, in which a democracy was controlled by public opinion and open discussion, permitted people to present their arguments (Sproule 259). The private sphere exists in bureaucracies, in which an expert at the top of the hierarchy delivers downward commands through official channels to implement the decisions of the leaders who guide the bureaucracy (Sproule 260). Weick has acknowledged, however, that small publics invariably exist within larger privately controlled space, and an organization is constantly changing and being enacted in the minds of participants (qtd. in Sproule 261). Thus, Sproule concludes that organizations should recognize this strong influence and employ a more democratic model, like that of the public sphere, to allow for the function of rhetoric and public opinion in the organization (262).

Cheney and Vibbert conclude that organizations have increasingly been concerned with the ways that values, issues, images, and identities are perceived in internal and external environments (Cheney and Vibbert 177). Mobil Oil's "epideictic advocacy" is one example of attempts to shape perceptions that can later lead to actions. This epideictic discourse attempted to make explicit and
implicit identification with the public as well as to establish shared scapegoats (Crable and Vibbert "Mobil" 380). Crable and Vibbert cite Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's claim that the purpose of epideictic rhetoric "is to increase the intensity of adherence to values held in common by the audience and speaker," which is important because it "strengthens the disposition toward action" (qtd. in Crable and Vibbert, "Mobil" 383). This type of rhetoric builds premises for later persuasion, or from a Toulminian perspective, serves to establish warrants for later claims (Crable and Vibbert, "Mobil" 383).

The theories cited in this section all connect rhetoric with organizational environments. These environments shape and are shaped by organizations and their rhetoric. The rhetorical perspective outlined above can be very useful for determining the ways that we enact and value organizations. Scott explains:

As students of organizations, our task becomes not simply to explain why one hospital is more effective than another, or why some schools exhibit more conflict than others, but to explain why some organizations are constituted as hospitals and others as schools. Where do these organizational templates come from, and how are they reproduced and transformed. (Scott, Institutions 44)

Using this and related literature, I will show that institutional environments upon which colleges and universities depend for resources are largely constructed
by shared fantasies. Rhetorical analysis of this sort would be invaluable for schools to truly understand and respond to their environments because environments lend significance to higher education and establish its place and image in American culture. For example, in the case of higher education, students seek a degree because it is legitimated by society. Rhetoric plays a role in convincing us that a degree is important and that colleges provide the optimal educational opportunities. However, despite consensus that the degree is valuable, conflicting rhetorical visions have undermined consensus on the exact purpose and value of the degree. The next section presents justification for my study.

JUSTIFICATION OF STUDY

The environments upon which organizations depend for resources, including legitimacy, are strongly influenced by other institutions. Higher education has acquired its meaning and legitimacy in relation to other social institutions. My study seeks to consider ways that discourses lending legitimacy to higher education express the value of colleges in terms of their contribution to three pervasive social institutions: government, industry and free enterprise, and the Christian church. My findings will explore the influence of these institutions on
assumptions about higher education, as scholars of organizational rhetoric recommend that "the shaping of public discourse and public values by dominant institutions" should be examined (Cheney and McMillan 109).

My investigation of twentieth century educational rhetoric is significant because it will (1) help to understand our current attitudes and beliefs about higher education by tracing the historical development of these attitudes; (2) demonstrate the significance of rhetorical analysis for public relations practitioners and administrators in organizations to understand the environment that influences their organization; and (3) shed light on the relationship between rhetoric and institutional theory.

Rhetoric's importance in developing current attitudes and beliefs about higher education provides the first justification for this study. According to institutional theory, for any organization to be legitimated, its structures and practices must be seen as consistent with the values esteemed by the society within which the organization exists (Scott, Institutions 41). Organizational structures and actions, whether rational or not, are often constructed symbolically to show that the organization meets the demands of its institutional
environment. Scott summarizes the environment's influence on organizations: "Cultural controls can substitute for structural controls. When beliefs are widely shared in categories and procedures taken for granted, it is less essential that they be formally encoded into the organizational structure" ("Unpacking" 181). Speakers can influence and reaffirm the values held by the audience. For example, shared fantasies in the environment are important because they strengthen disposition toward action. Argumentation paves the way for or brings about action. Thus, rhetoric shapes values in America to which higher education must conform if it is to be evaluated positively.

Rhetorically constructed opinions about higher education legitimate colleges and universities and also establish expectations and criteria for evaluating those institutions. An organization's methods of guaranteeing legitimacy are used later as criteria to judge the organization (Francesconi 50). For instance, when our culture is persuaded to believe that higher education exists primarily to provide students with access to higher paying jobs, colleges will be evaluated based on their ability to produce well-paid graduates.
The rhetoric addressing the value and purpose of higher education also has implications for deciding whom colleges and universities were created to serve. The groups that are associated with higher education gain a great deal of power. As Weber observes:

bureaucracy is among those social structures which are the hardest to destroy. Bureaucracy is the means of carrying 'community action' over into rationally ordered 'societal action.' Therefore, as an instrument for 'societalizing' relations of power, bureaucracy has been and is a power instrument of the first order - for the one who controls the bureaucratic apparatus. (75)

Weick adds, “People in different positions have differential access to power, which means they have differential success in imposing their enactments on other people both inside and outside the organization” (168). Certain groups or organizations are empowered/disempowered through our conceptions of higher education. For example, my findings suggest that an individualistic, business-oriented vision of higher education can provide more financial resources and prestige for academic fields that are seen as assessable and relevant to career preparation.

For various reasons, our culture values a college degree. Educational bureaucracies use standardized curriculum and teachers to produce standardized graduates, who are given places in the economic and social stratification system on the basis of educational
background (Meyer and Rowan, "The Structure" 72). Through changing times and various anti-intellectual attacks, the legitimation of the degree has been constant and has ensured the survival of higher education. Rhetoric can establish this legitimacy, just as rhetoric can undermine it. This process of legitimation has occurred over time, as multiple layers of meaning have accumulated. These multiple meanings can be unearthed by looking at the discourses that have addressed the significance of education in our society.

The second justification for my study considers the practical importance of rhetorical analysis for PR practitioners and other organizational participants. Public relations professionals and other corporate communicators have emphasized the formation of messages. However, my study shows that rhetorical criticism provides educational advocates with vital information. The role of the PR practitioner has been conceived of as a boundary spanner, who both talks and listens. For an organization's messages to be formed effectively, the rhetor should understand the rhetorical situation to which he/she is responding. Crable and Vibbert illustrate this point: "assessing public reaction is essential to a well-formulated and research-based approach to public relations.
problems. Just as the organization must appraise itself, it must also gauge environmental reactions" (*Public Relations* 370). Analysis of public discourse about an organization provides an accurate characterization of the organization's rhetorical situation.

Organizational theorists have recognized the need to understand the environment. As Scott puts it, "new institutional views emphasize the extent to which the persistence of cultures, structures, and activities relies on active monitoring of the social-cultural environment and the importance of continuing connections to the world outside the organization" (*Institutions* 79). Finally, Cheney and Vibbert argue that communication activities represent the organization to the public and the public to the organization, simultaneously. Public relations practitioners are communicators and boundary spanners who make symbolic connections between organizations and their environments (Cheney and Vibbert 177-178).

Higher education has been highly valued as a vital part of American culture throughout U.S. history. Colleges and universities are legitimate social institutions, meaning our culture accepts and is committed to the value of these organizations. However, as legitimated institutions, colleges and universities are seen as
existing for different purposes and are valued for different reasons. Institutions are legitimated by their environments. Scott and Meyer explain that institutional environments are:

those (environments) characterized by the elaboration of rules and requirements to which individual organizations must conform if they are to receive support and legitimacy. The requirements may stem from regulatory agencies authorized by the nation-state, from professional or trade associations, from generalized belief systems that define how specific types of organizations are to conduct themselves, and similar sources. (Scott and Meyer 123)

The ability to recognize these requirements through rhetorical criticism can help leaders of organizations make their organizations conform to these requirements, and this critical ability can help PR practitioners understand the audience and rhetorical situation for which messages are created. The same can be said for the value of rhetorical criticism for communicators at a variety of other legitimated organizations.

The third justification is based on my study's ability to link public discourse with institutional theory by looking at the formation of attitudes and beliefs that compose institutional environments. In part, rhetorical criticism can answer the call by organizational scholars for "serious critical histories of educational systems, in order to gain perspective on the reshaping of school and
university, and to challenge the rhetoric of reform" (Tribe 141). Such histories can be achieved using rhetorical analysis. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, for example, propose that longitudinal analysis of discourse can help us better understand our own situation by providing insights to the past (20). My research suggests that rhetoric plays a critical role in shaping institutional environments over time, and the shared fantasies found in rhetoric will reveal beliefs in the environment that legitimate organizational practices and structures.

Institutional theory should inform analysis of discourse about higher education because shared rhetorical visions legitimate schools. Institutional theory has become a popular approach in the study of organizations. An institution is defined as "a social pattern that reveals a particular reproduction process. When departures from the pattern are counteracted in a regulated fashion, by repetitively activated, socially constructed controls . . . we refer to a pattern as institutionalized" (Jepperson 145). Institutionalism is juxtaposed against the traditional rational actor models of organizations. The institutional approach is concerned with embedded, taken for granted assumptions and "emphasizes the ways in which
action is structured and order made possible by shared systems of rules" (DiMaggio and Powell 11).

Traditionally, the formal organization consisted of a rational pursuit of goals, and informal social relations provided just a counterpoint to formal structure. However, neo-institutionalists believe that many of the actions of individuals in organizations are driven by beliefs and values that are separate from technical requirements. Legitimacy relies on an organization's ability to identify itself with cultural symbols of power (Galaskiewicz 296). According to Scott, such symbols shape organizations, which "acquire certain structural features not by rational decision or design but because they are taken for granted as 'the way things are done.'" ("Unpacking" 179). In time, these taken for granted structures perpetuate themselves. Scott explains:

As organizations become infused with value, they are no longer regarded as expendable tools; they develop a concern for self-maintenance. By taking on a distinctive set of values, the organization acquires a character structure, an identity. Maintaining the organization is no longer simply an instrumental matter of survival but becomes a struggle to preserve a set of unique values. (Institutions 19)

As a result, organizations incorporate the practices and procedures defined by prevailing concepts of organizational work and institutionalized practices in society. Organizations that can do this increase their legitimacy
and their survival prospects, independent of the efficacy of the acquired practices and procedures (Scott, Institutions 41).

The "shared systems" that legitimate institutions are culturally constructed and shaped by rhetoric. In fact, the sharing of values, attitudes, and beliefs emphasized by institutional theorists resembles the chaining out of fantasies. Bormann explains that fantasy themes sustain in people a "sense of community, to impel them strongly to action . . . and to provide them with a social reality filled with heroes, villains, emotions, and attitudes" ("Fantasy and Vision" 212-213).

Organizations attempt symbolically to conform to the beliefs valued by society. Institutionalized values are "rationalized and impersonal prescriptions that identify various social purposes as technical ones and specify in a rule like way the appropriate means to pursue these technical purposes" (Scott, Institutions 44). Rational bureaucracy, for example, tends to be a socially legitimated myth that is preserved long after it is the most rational or efficient way to structure an organization. Traditionally, coordination and control of activities in the organization have been the focus of organizational theory. Resources, however, are often
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attracted not because an organization is efficient, but because it is seen as efficient and, as a result, attracts resources (Friedland and Alford 243).

Some types of organizations are more sensitive to environmental influences than others. Colleges and universities are loosely coupled organizations that are affected by institutionalized, vertical environments (Scott and Meyer 123; Brint and Karabel 350). While tightly coupled or technical organizations develop unique and influential cultures of their own, professionalization carries more influence in a loosely coupled system. For example, physicians are more influenced by norms and values of the medical profession than by the organizational culture of the hospital where they work. Likewise, educators are profoundly influenced by the culture of their profession. Colleges' and universities' survival depends on the culturally accepted belief that a degree is important and that students benefit, in some way, from going to college. The influences of this legitimation process are, perhaps, more important to higher education's survival than the culture of individual schools or those schools' ability to operate efficiently or rationally.

When organizations such as colleges and universities and their structures become institutionalized, people
depend on them and preserve them. Perrow argues that some organizations "take on a distinctive character; they become prized in and of themselves, not merely for the goods or services they grind out. People build their lives around them, identify with them, become dependent on them" (167).

Various forms of public discourse can have an effect on the form and function of organizations. This occurs by influencing the participants who are responsible for enacting the organization. The way that insiders see their organization shapes the way they respond to issues faced by their organization (Dutton and Dukerich 517). More research should examine the meaning systems that define the collective goals or values of organizational fields because these goals or values define consensus and boundaries for action within organizations (Scott, "Organization" 168). Fantasy theme analysis can be an effective way of understanding such meaning systems. "When a speaker selects and slants the interpretation of people's actions he or she begins to shape and organize experiences," explains Bormann ("Fantasy Theme" 368). Based on this conclusion, if there is a cultural belief that higher education offers a service to society, people will identify with colleges and universities and be committed to and disciplined by that mission. These justifications suggest
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that rhetoric is pervasive and it is powerful in legitimating organizations, especially educational organizations. The next section presents literature relevant to these issues.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To understand the assumptions that guide my study of the role of rhetoric in influencing and legitimating higher education in America, it is necessary to review literature that has examined group fantasies and symbolic convergence, the relationship between rhetoric and the legitimation process, and the relationship between rhetoric and higher education.

Fantasy Themes and Symbolic Convergence

The messages that establish, reinforce, or challenge institutional legitimacy can be examined using Ernest Bormann's fantasy theme analysis. Fantasy theme analysis is "a form of rhetorical criticism that highlights the way groups construct shared symbolic realities" (Putnam and Cheney 146). This analysis illuminates how listeners make sense of their experiences and "provides an explanation that accounts for consciousness creating, raising, and maintaining communication" (Bormann, "Symbolic and Culture" 101).
Fantasy themes, when shared by audiences, lead to what Bormann calls symbolic convergence, which is defined as "the way two or more private symbolic worlds incline toward each other, come more closely together, or even overlap during certain processes of communication" ("Symbolic and Culture" 102). Such convergence can be equated with the belief structures that, according to organizational theorists, legitimate institutions. Symbolic convergence examines how fantasy themes construct shared symbolic worlds, which include things like values, beliefs, ideals, and norms (Bormann, "Symbolic and Culture" 106). The value of fantasy theme analysis is its ability to "account for the development, evolution, and decay of dramas that catch up groups of people and change their behavior" (Bormann, "Fantasy and Vision" 213). These dramas are closely tied to the social realities and motives that direct the behavior of members of organizations. Therefore, fantasy theme analysis can reveal the relationship between rhetorical messages and institutions.

Bormann provides specific vocabulary to guide fantasy theme analysis. He begins with the concept of a fantasy. A fantasy is "the creative and imaginative interpretation of events that fulfills a psychological or rhetorical need" (Force 8). Bormann observes that fantasies are "chained
out” or are elaborated and repeated by audiences (“Eagleton” 143).

The content of the dramatizing message which sparks a fantasy chain is called a fantasy theme. Bormann defines a fantasy theme as “a dramatizing message in which characters enact an incident or series of incidents in a setting other than the here and now of the people involved in the communication episode ("Applications" 52). According to Hart, fantasy themes are “mythic shorthand, the stories told by subgroups in society. If myths are the prized tales of humankind in general, fantasy themes are the local variations wrought on these themes” (251).

Repeated fantasy themes build a fantasy type. A fantasy type is “a recurring script in the culture of a group . . . They will be essentially the same narrative frame but with different characters and slightly different incidents” (Bormann, “Symbolic and Culture” 110). For example, one case study shows how “the rhetorical portrayal of a time of troubles may build a sense of national unity during a time of war,” which was accomplished using the Jerehmiad narrative frame as a fantasy type that has been applied in a number of exigencies in American history (“Fetching” 130).
When a number of members within a communication subsystem share several fantasies and fantasy types, they share a *rhetorical vision*. A rhetorical vision is "a unified putting-together of the various shared scripts that gives the participants a broader view of things" (Force 8). When people come to share a group of fantasies and fantasy types, they may assemble them into a coherent rhetorical vision of their social reality (Bormann, "Fantasy Theme" 368). Rhetorical visions suggest which characters are heroes and villains, which plots should be followed and in which setting, and a correct way of acting (Cragan and Shields 41). For example, the rhetorical vision labeled "new politics" was used in the 1972 presidential campaign by political unknowns to stress the moral superiority of the heroes (the people) engaged in a liberation movement (Bormann, "Eagleton" 143).

Taken together, all of these communicative units form a *saga*. An *organizational saga* is a "detailed narrative of the achievement and events in the life of a person, a group, or a community" ("Symbolic and Culture" 115). Bormann uses the concept of organizational saga to include the shared fantasies, the rhetorical visions, and the narratives of achievements, events, goals, and ideal
states" of an organization's members ("Symbolic and Culture" 115).

Although my dissertation does not examine the saga of a particular university, it considers the development of rhetorical visions of higher education, in general, which can influence the sagas of particular schools. For example, Clark, from whom Bormann adopted the "saga" concept, examined the image or reputation of three distinctive private colleges. According to Clark, an organizational saga "refers to a unified set of publicly expressed beliefs about the formal groups that (a) is rooted in history, (b) claims unique accomplishment, and (c) is held with sentiment by the group" (179). Many advantages accrue from possessing a distinctive organizational saga at a college. It is a valuable resource that gives a school a competitive edge in recruiting and maintaining personnel. "Enduring loyalty follows from a collective belief of participants that their organization is distinctive. Such a belief comes from a credible story of uncommon effort, achievement, and form" (Clark 183).

Symbolic convergence theory provides some understanding of the legitimation of certain behaviors and structures in educational organizations. An inability to
reconcile contrasting rhetorical visions of higher education can undermine consensus among students, faculty, or administrators on the saga or purpose of a college or of an academic program. While some may be committed to a vision that values collectivism, others may be committed to a vision of higher education that provides individual gains. To function, a rhetorical vision must be shared, and it is possible for only a portion of the members to share a rhetorical vision, but when large communities in an organization are committed to opposing fantasies or sagas, one can expect much turmoil and deliberation over the organization's missions, goals, policies, and other related issues. As Bormann puts it, "Once a rhetorical community ... emerges with a coherent rhetorical vision, the rhetorical problem of holding the group together becomes important" ("Fantasy Theme" 370).

Rhetorical Analysis in the Study of Institutions

A few studies in speech communication have been concerned with the institutionalization of specific organizations or of fields of organizations and the connection between society and those organizations. Cheney and McMillan have made this connection, "the student of organizational life may seek to comprehend and criticize the society at large, generalizing across organizations and
organizational types" (102). They further suggest that rhetorical scholars "scrutinize the range of messages that constitute contemporary organizations: organizations may be seen as fields of institutionalized discourse that legitimate and express particular goals, values, issues, images, and identities" (103). However, there has not been an effort to connect symbolic convergence with legitimation. Previous studies recognize that socially constructed values exist and that an organization's values must be congruent with them. Most of this research, however, focuses on efforts to show congruence with these values (Dionisopoulos and Crable 134; Hearit 1; Seeger 147; Watkins-Allen and Caillouet 48). There have not been any efforts to look at the rhetorical development of organizational value-systems or to emphasize the need for corporate rhetors to be alert rhetorical critics. A rich understanding of the social value systems in the environment, as my study seeks to discover, is necessary in creating effective, responsible messages.

The research that has dealt with institutionalization and rhetoric has focused on two areas. First, it has focused on organizations' use of rhetoric to establish and maintain legitimacy. Second, research has examined the
role of rhetoric in establishing legitimacy by connecting an organization with other institutions.

Organizations often use rhetoric to secure resources such as legitimacy. Legitimacy is defined as "the rhetorically constructed and publicly recognized congruence between the values of a corporation and those of a larger social system within which it operates" (Hearit 2). Francesconi calls legitimacy the right to exercise authority, and he argues that legitimacy is supported by the on-going process of reason-giving (49). In sum, institutional rhetors who fail to justify their decisions might encourage more distrust because institutions lose legitimacy if they cannot meet the criteria set by the larger culture (Francesconi 58).

As shown above, a connection has been established between rhetorically constructed values in society and organizational structures and practices. There is a precedent for using rhetorical criticism to investigate organizational legitimacy, and attention should be given to messages that contribute to the rhetorical process of symbolic convergence in those environments.

In addition to exploring the role of rhetoric in institutionalization, rhetorical scholars have considered the ways that the most powerful organizations can influence
other institutions in the environment. Similarly, my study shows that higher education gains legitimacy through its ability to serve other interests. For example, ingratiation strategies are generally directed at the most powerful institutions in the environment (Watkins-Allen and Caillouet 48). Because they focus on ways that organizations use rhetoric to shape environments and on ways that institutions impinge on one another, these findings are consistent with the goal of my study to examine the relationship between schools and other institutions in the environment.

Social legitimacy is often supported or threatened by other institutions. For example, Hearit observes that several institutions criticized Exxon during its legitimacy crisis (4). Smith also analyzes institutional discourse, examining the impact various institutions have on one another. Smith examines the Democratic and Republican parties as institutions that create rhetoric that is critical in defining government and democracy in America (19). Finally, NASA is another organization that relies on its legitimacy from the public and the government because its funding depends on their support (Seeger 147).

To conclude, studies have been conducted to investigate the connection between organizational rhetoric
and institutionalization and between organizational rhetoric and legitimacy acquired from relationships with other institutions. However, more work is needed to examine the role of shared group fantasies in constructing values, beliefs, and attitudes to which colleges must conform to be legitimated.

**Rhetorical Analysis in the Study of Higher Education**

Scholars in speech communication have also connected rhetoric and colleges and universities. For example, McMillan and Cheney propose that rhetoric is a powerful force in shaping our institutions because “we tend to become what we say we are” (2). Organizations reflect socially constructed reality, and they are “dramatic enactments of the rationalized myths pervading modern societies” (Meyer and Rowan, “Institutionalized” 47). Although there have been efforts to conduct case studies looking at the connection between rhetoric and particular institutions, there has been no historical analysis of the legitimation of American higher education or of the construction over time of the institutional environments within which colleges and universities exist. Also, there have been no efforts to look at the connection between higher education and democracy, nor have rhetorical critics explored the contrasts between individualism and
collectivism in rhetorical visions of higher education. First, I present studies that have considered implications of rhetoric found in the environment on higher education. Then, I discuss case studies of educational organizations that have used rhetoric to influence their environments.

Research suggests that rhetoric does impinge on higher education. For example, McMillan and Cheney consider the implications of the “student as consumer” metaphor (13). Bello also considers the implications of public discourse for higher education. He looks at the political correctness debate and finds that reality is screened through the terms used in public discourse, and different constituencies use language that reflects a highly selective view of reality (Bello 244).

Davis connects college and culture by arguing that the ethos of higher education is very responsive to the interests and beliefs of the community (488). According to Davis, the ethos of higher education cannot be separated from the shared traditions of the culture (488). The research presented above provides excellent examples of rhetorical constructions that impinge on colleges and universities.

The following are case studies of schools that have attempted to use rhetoric to influence their environments.
Windt's conception of "administrative rhetoric" emerges from his analysis of the California - Berkeley administration's response to student protest. Windt observes that administrators saw the sit-in as a crisis of their authority, and for students this was a crisis of legitimacy because the administration was acting unconstitutionally (Windt 247). College officials responded with what Windt describes as administrative rhetoric by claiming that the college's role in society is to stay neutral and educate students (Windt 248).

Stuart looks at self presentations of small universities. The schools had trouble presenting the nature and values of liberal education and establishing the uniqueness of the institution (4210). Colleges and universities also use rhetoric to reconcile contradictory perspectives. One source of contradictory perspectives is the relation between higher education and democracy and the purpose of higher education (Gallagher 1). According to Gallagher, schools use rhetoric to deal with conflicts over the goals and purposes of higher education (Gallagher 10). Nelson recognizes that college presidents are important rhetors who shape society's perceptions of education, and he argues that presidents are especially influential in matters involving morality and character (1048).
To summarize, studies on the rhetoric of higher education show that rhetoric about higher education impinges on colleges, and they suggest that communicators in colleges and universities must understand their environment to be successful in creating messages. In the next chapter, I describe a method for examining the role of rhetoric in legitimating higher education in twentieth century America.
CHAPTER 2
METHOD

In this chapter, I propose that fantasy theme analysis be applied to institutional theory as it accounts for the influence of rhetoric on colleges and universities. First, I discuss steps that will guide my method for identifying and analyzing the rhetorical visions that legitimate higher education. Then I present theories of rhetorical analysis and organizational rhetoric that further elaborate a methodology for exploring the institutional environments of colleges and universities.

FANTASY THEME ANALYSIS

Fantasy theme analysis will effectively address the research questions presented earlier. I will identify the fantasies that appear in selected twentieth century speeches, essays, and books addressing the legitimacy of higher education. "The fossilized remains of shared group fantasies," according to Bormann, "can be found in texts of the oral and written messages that created them in the form of fantasy themes and fantasy types" ("Symbolic and Culture" 107). Thus, this study will be sensitive to conceptions, both factual and fictional, that present an idealized picture of higher education. After identifying the recurring fantasy themes and types in this rhetoric, I will assemble them into a coherent rhetorical vision and
probe the presuppositions underlying that vision. Hart, for example, advises the critic to "isolate the stories told most often in a given body of rhetoric and then to ask what 'lessons' they appear to be teaching" (254).

In examining the development over time of rhetorical visions of higher education, I am most concerned with the consequences of this rhetoric for educational organizations. Specifically, certain practices and structures in colleges can be institutionalized or challenged by the ideas represented in fantasy themes. My consideration of these consequences will be guided by the question, "according to popular fantasies, what are the purposes of higher education?" For higher education to thrive, audiences must believe that colleges and universities offer some benefit. Therefore, I will analyze rhetorical visions to determine what types of benefits we assume students receive, as individuals, from a college education, what benefits higher education gives to society, and how these assumptions have changed over time. Such purposes are important because they provide criteria by which our society, both inside and outside colleges, use to determine how effective our institutions are and what changes need to be made (Meyer, Scott, and Deal 49).
RHETORICAL CRITICISM AND ORGANIZATIONAL RHETORIC

Although organizational rhetoric is pervasive, scholarship and rhetorical criticism have not come to terms with the corporate audience, but in organizational studies the trend toward institutional analysis has addressed this deficit (Cheney, Organizational Society 163). In this section, I present my rationale for a longitudinal analysis of rhetoric from a variety of sources.

First, it is important to note that this analysis does not attempt to distinguish between internal and external rhetoric. Cheney and Vibbert note that "A strict division between 'inside' and 'outside' can prevent lay persons or researchers from appreciating the necessary connections between internal and external discourse" (179). Therefore, I am concerned with any discourses that reflect beliefs about the relationship between higher education and other influential institutions. These discourses might be directed to members of the higher education community or to outsiders. Weick, for instance, notices that "boundaries between organizations and environment are never quite as clear cut or stable as many organizational theorists think. These boundaries shift, disappear, and are arbitrarily drawn" (132). It is important to recognize that rhetoric normally thought to be targeted to a specific public, such
as house organs, newsletters, or external persuasive campaigns, influence multiple environments (Cheney and Vibbert 181). In light of the blurred lines between insiders and outsiders, I will consider rhetoric from a variety of sources in the environments within which colleges exist. Both the messages created by an organization and messages from other influential speakers work to legitimate higher education in America.

Along with examining rhetoric from a variety of sources, I will examine rhetoric from a variety of eras in the twentieth century. Organizational scholars have called for more analysis of the history and sources of institutional patterns (Powell 188; Scott, Institutions 135). Rhetoric can contain valuable insights to popular beliefs, which legitimate institutions over time. Wrage explains that “A speech is an agency of its time, one whose surviving record provides a repository of themes and their elaborations from which we may gain insight into the life of an era” (455).

Weick further connects Wrage's approach with organizational analysis. In organizations, “sense-making is commonly retrospective. Sense is made of previous actions, things that have already occurred” (Weick 133). In different eras, these sense-making activities can be
very different, and fantasy theme analysis can show these contrasts or illustrate how competing rhetorical visions develop through time.

Corporate rhetors must be familiar with the fantasies shared by contemporary audiences and understand how these beliefs and values developed and evolved over time. Fantasy theme analysis, applied to historical texts that reflect the development of these ideas, can be invaluable for understanding and addressing the tensions between community and individualism confronted by members of an organization. However, this study's contribution to organizational rhetoric is the argument that more attention should be paid to rhetorical visions providing beliefs that are very influential on the form and function of colleges.

APPLICATION

An analysis of the role of rhetoric in legitimating higher education should consider the rhetoric of powerful organizations that influence educational organizations. This study will show that government, business, and religion have been among the institutions with the most influence on higher education. Previous studies have also identified government, business, and religion as critical to the legitimation process (Brint and Karabel 347; Crable and Vibbert, Public Relations 74). Friedland and Alford
illustrate that “The central institutions of the contemporary capitalist West - capitalist market, bureaucratic state, democracy, nuclear family, and Christian religion - shape individual preferences and organizational interests” (232).

All three contexts discussed above are interdependent, as shown in this analysis of higher education. Higher education exists among other legitimated institutions in America. Higher education's relationship to those institutions provides colleges and universities with much of their legitimacy. As Cheney observes, “much of contemporary rhetorical practice is organizational, within complex organizational settings” (Organizational Society 2). The influence of external organizations has also reached daily life in colleges in the form of military and corporate support, textbook publishers, and mass media (Schiller 20).

This study will examine a convenience sample of twentieth century discourses that have been recorded in published collections of speeches, in popular books, and in essays. The selected texts are representative of popular ideas and assumptions on higher education in this century. The discourses that were selected deal with the relationship between education and other institutions such
as government, business, and religion. Often the texts available for this convenience sample are those that have been published and recorded, and, as a result, represent mostly mainstream ideas as expressed by significant personalities. The artifacts that have been selected for this study are effective in documenting the popularity of individualistic and communal educational fantasies in the public sphere. This is because those texts demonstrate the persistence of these rhetorical visions throughout the century, despite changing political and economic contexts. The following chapters will present analysis of twentieth century rhetoric that has legitimated higher education.

Chapter three will summarize the history of American higher education to provide context for this study. This historical account will focus on the ways that colleges and universities evolved as organizations. Chapter four will present analysis of rhetoric that has legitimated higher education by connecting colleges and universities with institutionalized government. In particular, I explore the relationship between higher education and democracy. Chapter five will discuss rhetoric that has connected higher education with private enterprise, and I will explore the different contributions to the private sector that have been valued. In chapter six, I look at the
changing relationship between higher education and religion, examining changing conceptions of the role higher education has been thought to play in the moral or spiritual development of students. Finally, chapter seven presents conclusions and considers the implications of these themes.
CHAPTER 3
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

To provide context for my analysis, this chapter briefly sketches the development of American colleges and universities, as it has been recorded by historians of higher education. Such historical context is essential to understanding the consequences of fantasy themes found in rhetoric, from various historical periods, about higher education. I discuss the transformation of the original model of American colleges, shaped in the image of British residential colleges, into the large and diverse contemporary, bureaucratized organizations that now pervade higher education.

A BRIEF CHRONOLOGY OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

American colleges and universities have changed dramatically over time. This section shows that early colleges were non-political residential colleges that focused on the classics. Following the revolution, more colleges appeared, and electives, research, and practical education gained importance. During the first and second World Wars, schools were called upon to contribute information to government and industry. Finally, after World War II, access to higher education has been expanded and schools have become large and bureaucratic.
At the time of the American Revolution, there were nine colleges in the colonies. They were not seminaries, but religious groups and clergy played a major role in establishing and operating the colleges (Roche 3). The colonial colleges were Christian residential institutions that followed the British model at Oxford and Cambridge (Lucas 111). Europe's earliest universities were created to train clergy. Teaching was done through lectures, complemented by students' private study, and there was little contact between professors and students. The curriculum of colonial colleges was still rooted in classics and religion, but there was a growing interest in modern authors and subjects like political history, law, the philosophy of government, and natural philosophy (Roche 10). The students translated the classics to English, read and wrote Latin prose and poetry, and studied the new and old testament. Oral rhetoric was also highly valued. Students participated in weekly declamations and public disputations (Westmeyer 9). Teaching was the responsibility of the college president, a few faculty, and several tutors.

The colonial colleges saw themselves as apolitical. However, these schools did play a role in the revolution. Historian John Roche writes that:
the truly remarkable success of the patriot cause in finding and recruiting men of knowledge, balance, foresight, and breadth of vision to lead the fight for independence and the work of creating a new nation, was due in very large measure to the available pool of American college alumni. (Roche 2)

Early in the revolution, students participated in the cause by debating on campus and by orally presenting commencement theses on the subject. Later, students contributed to the revolution by participating in various militia groups.

Despite these activities, the colonial colleges worked to isolate themselves from the conflict. Based on the West European tradition that discouraged universities from being political, early American universities aspired to be detached, non-utilitarian, quiet colleges (Douglas 12). In the wake of a conflict at Harvard, the president and faculty asked for “harmony, mutual affection, and confidence . . . that peace and happiness may be preserved within the walls of the College whatever convulsions may unhappily distract the State abroad” (qtd. in Roche 61). As war broke out, however, the schools were severely disrupted, and enrollments, libraries, campuses, and scientific instruments suffered, but were quickly restored after the war.

As the nation moved westward during the antebellum years, there was an explosion of new colleges, many of which were denominational schools. In the years 1776-1861,
800 new institutions opened their doors; however, financial hardships made survival difficult. By 1800, only 180 of these “cow colleges” remained (Westmeyer 29). These institutions were “small, mostly denominational, narrow in curriculum, and they had low standards” (Westmeyer 29).

During this time, pressure was mounting to expand curricula to accommodate more practical fields of study. In the years following the civil war, there was tumult and reform in higher education curriculum. The old residential college was transformed into the modern university. New technology that benefited business, industry, and agriculture and the concept of the German research university were the primary catalysts. According to Henry Philip Tappan, an early president at the University of Michigan, the modern university should be a gathering of books, scientific apparatus, and learned men for the purpose of determining and dispensing of knowledge (Westmeyer 32). Likewise, Thomas Jefferson's ideal university both diffused and advanced knowledge (Westmeyer 27). Also related to this change, pressure mounted to adopt elective systems that provided a more practical curriculum. The presidents of Harvard and Cornell, Charles Eliot and Andrew White respectively, took leadership roles in this reform. And industrialists like Carnegie attacked
classical learning: "the college student has been learning a little about the barbarous and petty squabbles of a far-distant past, or trying to master languages which are dead" (qtd. in Lucas 145). Under the elective system, students were allowed to take courses that best suited their needs. When Cornell opened in 1868, it claimed to offer instruction to any person in any subject, and Harvard adopted the elective system in 1869. This change required specialized researchers, usually Ph.D.'s educated in Germany, to replace generalists on teaching staffs.

In response to the proliferation of denominational schools, public universities became independent of sectarianism and were overseen by a diverse group of trustees. A major change came when Lincoln approved the Morrill Acts in 1862, which provided federal lands and monies for universities to pursue agricultural and mechanical research. The land-grant colleges provided technical education in the nation's major business: agriculture. Other graduate research institutions like Johns Hopkins and the University of Chicago advanced study beyond existing undergraduate programs and provided opportunities for faculty research. For the most part, midwestern schools led the move to the German model, while "the older universities on the East coast were still
institutions aiming to transform youths of upper and middle-class origin into Christian gentlemen and leaders of society" (Shils 1260). The development in the 1890’s of comprehensive graduate schools thoroughly fractured the vision of the traditional residential university. This vision has never regained its prominence.

The seminar was another key change brought about by graduate study. The seminar allowed professors to build research teams, and it provided students with supervision and patronage from professors. According to Tribe, this separated average, uninterested students from those students who embraced the research ethos. He writes, "In the humanities and the natural sciences the development of the seminar and the research laboratory was perceived internationally to be the chief merit of the German university" (146). Although American colleges before the Civil War focused on classics and mathematics and had almost no research function, post-bellum colleges were given a pivotal role in the development and modernization of the United States (Tribe 147).

During World War I, academics and scientists worked closely with the government to contribute new technology to the national defense. In this era, higher education continued to expand and, following the German university
system, emphasized research over professional preparation. In the years between World War I and World War II, higher education experienced many changes. During the depression, university economists were called upon to help solve the nation's problems, and during World War II scientists again cooperated with the government on defense projects.

Writing about the crises of the 1930's, Walter Lippman observed that, "there is an insistent presumption that prolonged study should have produced immediate practical wisdom, that from the professors should issue knowledge of how to decide the current controversies" (97). New forms of financial support for higher education emerged in this era, such as research grants from private foundations, including the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations and corporate labs like GE and Bell. As a result, university presidents yielded much power to these sources of financing. In the years leading up to and during the Second World War, nearly all research was dedicated to the war effort, further directing higher education toward practical ends. In this era, "esteem was replaced by expectations of practical benefits" (Shils 1266).

One of the most influential events in the history of American higher education came during World War II, when the G.I. Bill provided the opportunity for college
education to an unprecedented number of Americans. In the years 1950-1960, the US population grew 8%, while the number of students enrolled in colleges grew 40% (Westmeyer 142). In the fifties and sixties the number of researchers doubled and the number of graduate students tripled (Blackman and Segal 940). Community colleges also made higher education available to more citizens. As a college degree became the norm, many new students demanded relevant coursework and career counseling and placement. However, the expanded access that has occurred throughout this century has raised many questions as to the selectivity of universities and the intellectual value of new courses. Hutchins illustrates this point, claiming that "the notion that any American, merely because he is one, has the privilege of proceeding to the highest university degree must be abandoned" ("Where" 593).

Also during this era, schools had grown dependent on federal and state support for land and money and on business and industry for financial contributions. As the government and private business began to fund higher education more extensively, they also began to exert more control over colleges and universities. Kerr, for example, observes that less than one tenth of one percent of American institutions are federal institutions (military
academies), yet the federal government exercises a great deal of control through the land grants of the 1860's, the use of the schools for research in World War II, and the GI bill following the war (27).

After the Second World War, higher education was recognized as an important part of American culture. Shils observes that during this era, universities "seemed to be the institutional instruments for enriching societies, for preventing and curing their diseases, for feeding them better, and for elevating them in the opinion of the world" (1267). Higher education was also at the center of public and political life because it was seen as an instrument to fulfill the ideal of social equality and social mobility (Shils 1267). A college degree, made possible by the GI Bill, was an opportunity for anyone, even those from the most humble beginnings, to be successful.

The student unrest on college campuses in the late 1960's was an additional catalyst for change. Students and some professors protested the Vietnam War, civil rights, and student rights issues on American campuses. Shils notes that relativism and radicalism became prevalent on campuses (1274). Most of the issues that compose the crisis of higher education, as discussed below, have their roots in this era.
CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

As demonstrated above, in the last century, higher education has been transformed by increased specialization, emphasis on practical curriculum, increased government funding, and expanded access to higher education for American citizens. Along with these influences, however, additional forces have changed the shape of American colleges and universities.

Private Funding

The development of an increasingly close relationship between higher education and the private sector has been among the most significant developments for higher education in the last century. Traditionally, sharp boundaries separated higher education from society, and the purpose of higher education was widely accepted. Institutions trained distinctive young men and prepared them for traditional professions. In this century, however, commerce and industry have contributed to and exerted influence on higher education, and curricula have been modified to train students for more practical professions. For example, schools of agriculture and business proliferated in this century. As Mace writes, "there is a considerable amount of evidence that students' decisions to enter higher education are influenced by
perceived future economic benefits” (897). This perspective is also illustrated by the popular metaphor that conceives of a college education as an investment in the future and the social demand model that claims higher education should be available to all who can benefit and wish to go (Mace 897).

The 1980's was a time of great growth and expansion for both business and higher education, but suspicions grew when the lines between business and education were blurred (Williams 863). Corporations stand to gain a great deal from their involvement in higher education. Corporations can access the information yielded by the high-tech research conducted at universities. Also, colleges represent a supply of well-trained, qualified personnel. Of equal importance is the prestige that corporations gain from a partnership with higher education. Businesses are legitimated by the credibility gained by using expert researchers employed in academia as consultants. Other intangible benefits come from improved reputations and positive relations that stem from generous sponsorship of educational endeavors (Williams 864).

Likewise, higher education benefits from this partnership. Colleges get money from businesses, which helps them be less dependent on government. This
relationship keeps students and faculty in contact with real world problems, and it provides employment opportunities for graduates (Williams 864). Organizations that work closely with advanced technology, in particular, benefit from close contact with higher education. Despite these gains, there are also very serious dangers associated with the relationship between education and the private sector. The first and most obvious is the bias that market forces can exert on the agenda of researchers. Many fear that businesses or government will distort research agendas in exchange for funding. In deciding what research gets funding, businesses can distribute money unevenly between departments and universities. Ancient languages or other subjects that are not of interest to corporations, for example, do not get financing. Others have feared that disputes will arise over who deserves ownership of ideas produced at universities but funded by industry (Blackman and Segal 942). Williams observes that business and education differ in fundamental ways. For example, business is concerned with pragmatism and problem-solving. Universities are concerned with discovering truths and general theories. Businesses seek secrecy in order to maintain exclusive control of information. Education
strives to disseminate its research findings (Williams 869).

The Politicized University

The differences discussed above raise questions about the purpose of higher education. Such questioning of purpose has been labeled the “crisis” in higher education. Many have wondered if education’s primary role continues to be teaching or the discovery of knowledge for industry. Critics have also questioned for whom knowledge should be produced and what type of knowledge should be produced. “The democratization of the university helped dismantle its structure and caused it to lose its focus,” writes Bloom (Closing 65). In addition, a traditional college education was designed to build character and inculcate values in students. However, critics have also questioned the type of character or values that should be promoted on campus. It has been argued that the consensus that once undergirded higher education has broken down, which has led to both positive and negative implications. The breakdown of consensus has led to a diminished ability for culture to function collectively, and also allowed the emergence of specialized communities that can now participate in public discourse (Clark and Halloran 6).
One manifestation of the conflict in higher education and democracy has been in the battle for the curriculum. The British model of higher education has been widely criticized for being too elitist and promoting an illiberal curriculum. Some educators have sought to expose the hegemony of community, while bringing to light perspectives and voices that are concealed by "consensus." In the New York Review of Books in 1990, the philosopher John Searle characterized the PC movement and their "desire to expose the facade of objectivity and critical detachment claimed by traditional bourgeois thought, and a programmatic disdain for all standards of judgement . . . except their own ideologically-driven imperatives" (qtd. in Lucas 272). Others have contended that the political correctness movement paralyzes cooperative action, and they have further argued that denouncing Western culture politicizes the university (Lucas 274). Moreover, Bellah argues that specialization and professionalization in universities have led to "the impoverishment of the public sphere" (qtd. in Lucas 283). Under such fragmented conditions, scholarship becomes highly specialized and narrow in focus. As Lucas remarks, "The new experts . . . exchanged general citizenship in society for membership within a smaller, more specialized community of experts" (283). Finally,
problems in the universities, including the “publish or perish” mentality, the lack of emphasis on teaching, oversized schools, and an alleged loss of community result in institutions that might attend to the technical and commercial needs of society but not the needs of human beings and “not the fundamental civic needs of the republic” (Lucas 288). Douglas succinctly puts it this way: “American universities built on the Germanic model are too often judged on their output of research” (197).

With a breakdown of consensus on which values colleges should promote, there has been less emphasis on character education and less church influence (Shils 1260). In addition, many observers have been critical that the vast amounts of money provided by government and industry have influenced what aspects of society get studied. While this is not the first time professors have been politically active, there has been concern that many professors have lost the ability to separate their political beliefs from their teaching and research. For some, the classroom and laboratory have become a forum to advance a political agenda. For example, Professor Roger Kimball fears that politics has interfered with scholarship: “the teaching of the humanities in our colleges and universities has been
appropriated by special interests and corrupted by politics” (3).

Educational Bureaucracies

The growth of higher education has influenced the form and function of colleges and universities as organizations. In response to all of these conditions, colleges have become very bureaucratic organizations. The result, according to Tribe, has been the modern university, a new bureaucratic structure characterized by division of labor and the symbiotic relationship between teaching and research (143).

Schools were divided into divisions and departments, and institutions formed departments to study fields that used to be amateur disciplines, such as folklore, anthropology, and archaeology. Colleges offered electives and emphasized research that produced new knowledge, with a few elite universities attempting to bring this knowledge to the masses and not just to the experts. Also, advanced students were inculcated with ethical research values (Shils 1264). Classes became larger and more crowded and universities multiplied in size. An additional response to this new demand was the opening of regional campuses and community colleges. Costs also increased and caused budget constraints. Because of budget constraints, economic
principles have often been used to examine higher education. For example, demands for efficiency have been important concerns. More than ever, colleges are striving to maximize their outputs while minimizing their costs (Mace 896). Professors became busy as their time was divided between teaching, research, and administrative duties. Also, large scale research projects call for many participants and administrators. Professors, therefore, found themselves in a new position as bureaucrats in large organizations.

The Strength of Higher Education

A strong system of higher education, it is assumed, supports a strong economy. This is achieved by training students, and, therefore, creating human capital. The economy also benefits by the new knowledge created by colleges and universities (Woohdall 890). Since the 1960's, economists have linked investments in education to economic growth, which has caused Americans to assume that all college programs should have vocational relevance and cost effectiveness. Woodhall illustrates: "The belief that economic development requires a shift towards science and technology, both in university teaching and research, is widespread" (894).
Higher education continues to be strong in this country. The number of Americans with a college education has increased steadily in the last half of this century. In the 1950's 6% of Americans had four or more years of college. In the 1970's 10% had four or more years, and by the late 1980's 20% of Americans had four or more years of college (Teichler 980). Although the number of college graduates who work in professional, managerial, or technical jobs has declined since the 1970's, the belief remains that college is an important part of career preparation and a valuable character-developing experience. Further, higher education is still a symbol of status, and some professions are only open to college graduates (Teichler 975-992).

This discussion has documented the transformation of American colleges and Universities into complex organizations, as recorded by historians of higher education. These changes in higher education are germane to the study of the legitimation of contemporary colleges and universities and to understanding the consequences of fantasy themes found in rhetoric about higher education. In the chapters that follow, I closely examine rhetorical texts that have appeared in the last 100 years, which
connect higher education to government, to business, and to religion.
In the twentieth century, higher education has been legitimated as an institution that serves democratic government. It has been argued that without higher education, democracy could not exist. However, as with higher education’s relationship to business and religion, democratic government has led to contrasting fantasy types in higher education. Education has encouraged individualistic and communal values simultaneously, and in doing so, has created a dialectical tension that has deeply impacted and continues to impact higher education in America. My findings show that higher education has been presented in twentieth century rhetoric as a servant to individuals rather than to the democratic community. These competing fantasies can be found in the rhetoric of educational advocates and opponents in a variety of contexts throughout the century. The discourse presented in the following chapters is typical of the educators, politicians, and business leaders who faced the educational conditions discussed in chapter three. In particular, I compare and contrast contemporary texts with texts that are representative of attitudes that appeared before World War II. Despite some differences, many visions of higher education that were communicated in response to the economic and political conditions that preceded the war are remarkably similar to the current themes that influence
education. Essentially, rhetorical visions of higher education have served to shape conditions surrounding schools. Regardless of the varied economic contexts that have existed, individual and communal values consistently underlie most fantasies of higher education in this century. However, recent texts seem to place less emphasis on the communal purposes of higher education. I argue that it would be valuable for contemporary spokespersons for education to explore the fantasy themes that were privileged before the war.

The next three chapters show that contrasting fantasies have led to a lack of understanding of higher education’s purpose, contradicting ideal-type colleges, and a lack of appreciation for academia. In addition, higher education’s connection to individuals and to the business, democratic, and religious communities has subordinated education to other powerful social institutions.

In this chapter, I first present the strong connections that twentieth century Americans have made between higher education and government. Then, I examine the fantasy type that privileges the community and the fantasy type that privileges the individual. Finally, I consider the ways that persuaders have dealt with the dialectic tensions created by these fantasies and the consequences of such tensions.
LINKING HIGHER EDUCATION WITH THE GOVERNMENT

During this century, higher education has continued to be closely connected with democratic government. As discussed in the previous chapter, it has long been assumed that democracy cannot exist without an educated citizenry, and the American system of higher education is essential in providing the necessary education. During the 1930’s and 1940’s, educators were engaged in a debate between the virtues of traditionalism and progressivism in American schools. Both groups agreed that higher education was a means of social improvement in a democracy, although they also agreed that there was confusion on the purpose of higher education. Traditionalists, led by Robert Hutchins, viewed colleges as places to retreat from society and exercise the intellect. Progressives, often represented by John Dewey, favored an experiential education that encouraged immersion in society. Several influential educators emerged in this era. One such educator was Princeton president, Harold W. Dodds, who provides evidence of the belief that democracy relies on education, and he presents an idea agreed upon by both traditionalists and progressives. In 1939, he contended that his institution should “rededicate itself to its historic mission of educating young men for participation in the ceaseless task of making democracy work” (Dodds, “Making” 32). Dodds’ remarks are representative of statements that have been
made frequently about the role of colleges in preparing citizens for democracy.

An additional link to democracy occurs when free inquiry in colleges and universities is described as an important element of a free society. For example, the link between higher education and democracy has been forged by invoking the heroes of America’s struggle for liberty against the fascists of the World War II era. Dodds addressed Princeton alumni in 1937 and connected free government with academic freedom. He cautioned those who advocate dogmatic education to “consider what is being done in Russia and Germany. There youth are being compelled to concentrate on a regimented education, which drills them to repeat dogma but punishes them if they show signs of thinking for themselves” (“Education” 105).

It has also been suggested that democracy is an ideology and a way of life. The academic community perpetuates this ideology and prepares students to adopt a democratic way of life. The pragmatist John Dewey represents progressivism and advocates the value of learning through participation in the community. In 1916, Dewey published Democracy and Education, an influential book that introduced his ideas on intellectual development through experience and cooperation. In that book, he suggested that the purpose of education is not the transmission of knowledge but the integration of the
student into the democratic community and the perpetuation of that community. He wrote, "a community or social group sustains itself through continuous self-renewal, and . . . this renewal takes place by means of the educational growth of the immature members of the group" (Dewey, Democracy 12).

Today, colleges have become large, bureaucratic organizations that often resemble businesses. Many schools have been criticized for neglecting teaching in favor of research and becoming overly politicized. However, despite changing conditions, there is evidence that the themes identified above continue to exist. In a speech in 1990 at the University of Chicago, Willard Butcher, Chair of the Chase Manhattan Corporation, suggested that advocates still believe higher education is necessary for a healthy democracy: "If our two-century experiment in democracy is to remain viable, our educational institutions must continue to play a key role in the process" (Butcher 625). In 1987, University of Chicago philosophy professor, Allan Bloom, reinvigorated the debate on what educated Americans should know with his book, The Closing of the American Mind. In this book, he contends that many social and political problems of the present age can be attributed to a failure of universities to promote important works in literature and philosophy, which would help students to understand themselves and their world. Bloom, like
Hutchins, favors traditionalism and reliance on the authority of “great ideas.” Bloom also agrees that open inquiry is necessary in a free society: “the free university exists in liberal democracy, and liberal democracies exist only where there are free universities” (Bloom, Closing 259). The third relationship between education and democracy conceives of democracy as a way of life that must be learned. This idea also persists. Bloom observes that “democratic education, whether it admits it or not, wants and needs to produce men and women who have the tastes, knowledge, and character supportive of a democratic regime” (Bloom, Closing 26).

In sum, the connection between democratic government and higher education is strong and varied, and it persists in the contemporary era. College, it is assumed, prepares students for citizenship and for a democratic life-style, and open inquiry is necessary in a free society. The close link to democracy is one major strength of higher education. As long as democracy survives and is linked to higher education, our colleges and universities will be accepted as important institutions in our culture. This institutionalization is one factor that has contributed to the longevity and strength of American schools. Education has been so closely allied with democracy that higher education has been treated by many spokespersons as a god-term. President Bill Clinton often identifies with large
constituencies by expressing concern for educating all deserving citizens. In his 1998 “State of the Union,” he shows confidence in education as a god-term that can provide social improvement:

Last year, from this podium, I said that education has to be our highest priority. I laid out a 10-point plan to move us forward and urged all of us to let politics stop at the school house door. Since then, this Congress, across party lines, and the American people have responded. (259)

Like any god-term, higher education for democracy is vague and ambiguous, and it is accepted by diverse constituencies. In elaborating the relationship between higher education and democracy, contrasting fantasy themes have emerged, and these differing perspectives can be divisive. Next, I show areas of divergence that appear in rhetorical texts linking democracy and higher education, and I argue that a balance should be maintained between the individual and community in higher education.

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT AND THE INDIVIDUAL IN HIGHER EDUCATION

At the root of the division between fantasy themes that connect higher education and democracy is emphasis on the individual or on the community. In this section, I present fantasy themes that privilege an individualistic perspective of a college education. Individualistic approaches to education are not unique to the present era. Individualism is promoted in discourse from a variety of twentieth century contexts. Higher education is thought to
equip individuals to resist those who could take advantage of them and to provide equal opportunity to all citizens in a democracy.

**Independent Citizens**

One recurring fantasy theme suggests that higher education serves the individual in democracy by emphasizing a transformation of individual character rather than skill-related training. For example, an individual educated on how to think, reason, and analyze can protect him/herself from an imposing or non-democratic government or from other citizens in a democracy. Thus, a citizen is protected from totalitarianism when he has the ability to think. As a result, colleges and their curricula would focus more on training a student to think and analyze effectively than on equipping students with the ability to perform specific tasks. In 1936, president Glenn Frank of the University of Wisconsin opened his presidency with a speech to faculty and students, and in that speech, Frank took steps to influence the audience’s view of education. During this era of political tumult and change, Frank illustrated the need to be analytical, “it is not the business of a university to teach its students what to think but to teach them how to think, and then to trust them to decide what to think as year by year they face the changing facts of a changing world” (Frank, “Welcome” 197).
Frank confronted a changing world that was troubled by the rise of fascism. Like many educators of that time, he believed that knowing how to think would protect citizens from totalitarian threats. Frank believed that an independent citizen can protect him/herself, and various educators have worked to specify the characteristics of an effective thinker. One characteristic is the ability to have insight through analysis and criticism. Critical abilities are central to the individual who is well-trained for democracy. In the same era, Hutchins, who preferred exercising the intellect over experience, justified the relevance of intellectual training as a necessary defense against fascism. For Hutchins, "democracy rests on the assumption that the citizens will be intelligent," and critical abilities help "to resist the demagogue and the propagandist" (Hutchins, "University" 711).

The ability to be insightful also helps students to think for themselves. Twentieth century educators have asserted that informed citizens are able to develop their own unique perspectives and avoid thinking like the masses. For Hutchins, the ability to think freely allowed citizens to make more valuable contributions than the ability to meet society’s practical needs. "The purpose of education," Hutchins argued in 1939, is to teach students to think independently: "Democratic government rests on the notion that the citizens will think for themselves. It is
of the highest importance that there should be some places where they can learn to do it” (“What” 54).

To contemporary advocates, the ability to think independently equips a citizen to protect him/herself from an overbearing government. Bloom, for example, cautions that people not properly educated lack these critical abilities: “Lack of education simply results in students’ seeking for enlightenment wherever it is readily available, without being able to distinguish between the sublime and trash, insight and propaganda” (Bloom, Closing 64). As a university professor, Bloom is expressing concern for a lack of insight in students. According to recent spokespersons, however, education emphasizing the independence of the individual also should ensure that one opinion or perspective can not dominate the thinking of others. As a result, individualistic education promotes differing points of view. Roger Kimball cites a statement made recently by a contemporary scholar of literary studies, Robert Scholes: “I am opposed to the establishment of a canon in humanistic studies because I believe such a move to be fundamentally undemocratic: a usurpation of curricular power by the federal government” (qtd. in Kimball 5). It is essential, then, for individuals to think and act independently. However, it is also essential in a democracy for citizens to think and act cooperatively. Later, I show that those who have felt that education must
deal with shared truths and values have shown a need to balance individual and collective fantasies.

**Opportunity for All**

A second individualistic fantasy type complements higher education’s ability to teach an individual to think for him/herself in a democracy. Higher education is also democratic because it is available to all qualified citizens. The chance for a college education has been described by many as a democratic equalizer that erases lines of social class and privilege. Politicians such as Bill Clinton have used this fantasy to appeal to voters, speaking of college as an opportunity that all citizens are entitled to:

> I have something to say to every family listening to us tonight: Your children can go on to college. If you know a child from a poor family, tell her not to give up — she can go on to college. If you know a young couple struggling with bills, worried they won’t be able to send their children to college, tell them not to give up — their children can go on to college. If you know somebody who’s caught in a dead-end job and afraid he can’t afford the classes necessary to get better jobs for the rest of his life, tell him not to give up — he can go on to college. Because of the things that have been done, we can make college as universal in the 21st century as high school is today. (Clinton 259)

Along with politicians, business leaders have identified with America’s universal access to higher education. Spokespersons have argued that an educated and skilled citizenry provides workers and consumers for business. From this perspective, equality of opportunity is seen in economic terms. Unlike Hutchins, who emphasizes the right
to think freely, representatives of business consistently emphasize the right to make a living. To make education relevant to their objectives, business leaders seem to employ fantasies framed in economic terms. From such a perspective, higher education is made to look attractive by presenting it as a tool for financial prosperity and an advantage in business. One representative of business, Robert Wilson, chair of Standard Oil in 1953, added, “One of the noteworthy things about higher education in America is that there is so much of it . . . Nowhere else has it been possible to offer the advantages of higher education to so many” (213).

Thus, higher education has been legitimated as a democratic institution because it provides opportunities for all. It is argued that we have diminished class distinctions by providing educational opportunities to anyone who wants to go to college. Such access is thought to provide equal economic opportunities. However, apart from economics, access to college has been presented as a right that should be granted to every citizen. Such rights are a necessary component of freedom in a democracy. Homer Rainey, who directed the American Youth Commission in 1939, dealt with a question that was raised often as college enrollments grew in the twentieth century. Rainey, an advocate of public education, believed that it was not possible for “too many” Americans to attend college.
Rainey spoke for those who defended the opportunity for students to achieve class mobility through education, and he was an opponent of elitism. He argued that in a democracy every capable student must be admitted to college and Americans should “recognize that such training may have values for our democracy wholly apart from its contribution to the enhancement of one's earning power and economic status” (“Too Many” 462). Essentially, the chance to attend college has been discussed as a democratic right. In the same speech, Rainey further explored this issue by asking whether or not the wrong people are attending college. He argued, “there are still more youth out of college who ought to have the privilege of going than are now in college. These youth are denied the opportunity of higher education primarily because of lack of economic resources” (“Too Many” 461).

Others have expressed concern that this fantasy theme of universal access and equal opportunity is misleading. Although this fantasy is our ideal, we must cautiously recognize that universal access has not been entirely achieved. As more access to higher education has been provided after World War II, some educators have warned that equality of opportunity still has not been fully achieved. Spokespersons at public institutions contend that their schools have been more accessible, but elite institutions have changed little. As the president of a
public university, James Rosser of UCLA, recently observed, "we all know that a student's future may depend as much on where as on whether the student attends at all. The painful fact is that most low-income and minority students attend two-year and non-selective four-year colleges" (368). Interestingly, those involved in public education have often addressed expanded access, while those in well-known private institutions seem to speak more frequently about training the best students for leadership.

The fantasies promoting individualistic thinking and reason reveal a strong faith that a logical/rational citizenry is most desirable in a democracy. Further, it is the role of the university to inculcate in students the ability to think critically and rationally. Thus, the university and any of its activities that promote criticism and logic are legitimated through their tie to democracy. As a result, many of the liberal arts and sciences, whether useful in careers or not, are justified as instrumental to constructing a strong democracy because they teach students "how to think." Any attacks on these institutionalized beliefs will be met with great resistance. Similarly, any actions by a school that is labeled as elitist or as interfering with an individual's democratic right to higher education are met with great hostility. This cultural attitude was a topic addressed by Allan Bloom, who has been accused of elitism because he advocates the traditional
authority of the Western tradition, rather than equality among ideas. According to Bloom:

The charge of elitism reflects the moral temper of our regime, as the charge of atheism would have done in an earlier age. You couldn't get much of a response in a university today by saying that Allan Bloom doesn't believe in God. But you can get a lot of people worked up by saying that Allan Bloom doesn't believe in equality. (Bloom, "Western"

DEVELOPMENT AND THE COMMUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The fantasy theme explored above focuses on individual benefits of higher education in a democracy. Others have placed greater focus on the community in linking democratic government and higher education. To many, the good of all of society is promoted by an educated citizenry. Students learn to "understand that the good life can be led only in a political society, and that such a society is an organization designed to promote the common good" (Hutchins, "University" 711). Hutchins made this statement in an essay published in 1938, in which he argued that the virtues acquired through education prevent the economic and social injustices of fascism, while a breakdown in these virtues led to the outbreak of totalitarianism in Europe. Contemporary Americans have been more skeptical since prejudice and poverty continue to exist despite the efforts of colleges and universities. This belief is represented by James Rosser of UCLA, who, in 1981, said many people once assumed that education "would produce a more enlightened electorate which, in turn, would lead to the
selection of better qualified public officials. We had no
doubt that education would overcome intolerance and
overcome the social ills," but he goes on to argue that
these ideas have only led to unmet expectations (368). In
sum, the argument that higher education can magically
transform society has received criticism, especially since
expanded access has not solved the problems it was expected
to. Educators have been required to provide an explanation
for the communal benefits provided by colleges and
universities. The explanation that has been consistently
given depicts higher education as a means of encouraging
students to appreciate the community and put service to
others before self-gain.

The Servant-Leader

The communal fantasy of higher education and democracy
is based on a clearly articulated model of leadership. This
idea of higher education for leaders is in direct conflict
with the idea of democratic education for all individuals.
College graduates are seen as a select minority of people
who must fill a leadership role for the greater community.
Princeton President, Harold Dodds, told his graduates in
1949 that they belonged to an elite group of educated
leaders. Students at Princeton, like those at other elite
private institutions in that era were seen as the nation’s
finest leaders. He said, “you are under, and will be under
all the days of your life, the heavy responsibility of
being qualified for membership in that creative minority which . . . decides the great issues of life” (“The Cultivation” 555). Others argue that members of this elite minority cannot honorably escape the role as leaders. It would be seen as disgraceful if an educated person shirked his/her responsibility to lead. Dodds, for example, told his students that he was concerned that educated citizens are often “guilty of the sins of civic indolence, private self-interest and slavery to party spirit. These add up to gross neglect of civic duty” (Dodds, “The Cultivation” 555).

Leadership is often defined in different ways. For most people who address the role of higher education in preparing students to lead, there is an emphasis on service. Those who serve others are those who lead best. For many, higher education improves the community by providing it with servant-leaders. Another representative statement was made by Charles Seymour in 1941, who was president of Yale, another elite private university:

Any attempt to define exactly the nature and scope of American university ideals is a sure device for throwing a faculty meeting into confusion. But it is equally certain that whatever may be the comprehensive definition of those ideals, underlying them as a fundamental basis stands the principle of service to the nation. (Seymour, “University” 311)

In the same speech, Seymour defines the qualities needed by an effective servant-leader as “the positive qualities
which first made democracy: intelligence, courage, self-sacrifice, the sense of responsibility" ("University" 312).

Hutchins and others who have labeled college as preparation for leadership have said that competition and academic excellence, rather than wealth, should be the criteria for selecting students. Thus, true education for leadership requires competition and total immersion in the collegiate community. Unlike progressives such as Dewey, Hutchins preferred academic isolation. He defended this idea to an audience of business executives in 1947.

Hutchins said:

If we had in this country real intellectual competition in our universities, it would at once become apparent that it is not possible for a boy to work eight hours a day in a factory, as I did, and get an education at the same time. Under those circumstances it must be clear that I did not get an education; I simply graduated from college, which is quite a different thing. (Hutchins, "Where" 593)

Some advocates, including James Conant, Harvard president in the 1930’s, have argued that there are too many rather than too few students in college. College prepares leaders, but only if it is reserved for the best. Leadership, by definition, can include only the few. Like Hutchins and other traditionalists, Conant hopes to educate only a select group of serious scholars as preparation for leadership. Conant explained in 1938, “the country at large would benefit by an elimination of at least a quarter of those now enrolled in advanced university work and the substitution of others of more talent in their place”
(Conant 420). In this common scenario, higher education would become a meritocracy reserved for the best and brightest rather than the wealthiest. In this way, higher education could best serve society by providing leadership abilities only to the most deserving candidates. It is interesting to note again that a representative of Harvard emphasizes training the best students, while public institutions address the need to educate as many students as possible.

Speakers further argued that higher education should equip graduates with an appreciation and trust for the masses. This populist sentiment is best expressed by William Jennings Bryan, who frequently defended the dignity of common people. In the early twentieth century, Bryan often spoke on college campuses and on the Chautauqua circuit. William Jennings Bryan’s speeches offer a lucid outline of the responsibilities of cooperation and appreciation for others that college graduates should develop. In one such speech, he urges educators to:

> Have faith in mankind. The great fault of our scholarship is that it is not sufficiently sympathetic. It holds itself aloof from the struggling masses. It is too often cold and cynical. It is better to trust your fellow men and be occasionally deceived than to be distrustful and live alone. (“Faith” 332)

He adds that democracy is best “not because it is perfect, but because it can be made as perfect as the people deserve to have. It is a people’s government, and it reflects the
virtue and intelligence of the people" ("Faith" 333). At a Nebraska State University commencement, he tried to inspire each graduate to serve others. Bryan suggests that collegiates should acquire knowledge that can be used to fulfill one's very important duties of citizenship ("Man" 297). He closes by telling graduates that they cannot shirk the duties of citizenship, and they "must help to make the government good or share the blame for permitting evils that might be corrected," he adds, "Your labors are not ended, but begun" ("Man" 311-312).

In the early part of this century, it was also argued that democratic leadership, as promoted by higher education, should include patriotism and a desire to serve the state. Thus, in crises like the depression and the threat of fascism, education was called upon to protect America. It was claimed that national crises and threats to democracy are best met by an educated citizenry. Christian Gauss, who was serving as a Dean at Princeton in 1935, represented the belief that servant-leaders were needed to deal with the depression:

"You live in a troubled time, in a distracted America, and your responsibility is not to the past, but above all to your country and its future. The function of the scholar is to think longer and less selfishly than others... if democracy is to endure the scholar must lead." (53)

Flaws in the community are often blamed for hardships and higher education is presented as a panacea for those flaws. In 1941, Yale president, Charles Seymour blamed the rise of
fascism in Germany after World War I on a morally weak community. He illustrated, “the failure has been primarily moral, resulting from unwillingness to face difficulty, from a lack of courage, and from a shirking of responsibility” (“University” 312).

Finally, higher education is essential to a thinking leadership that does not simply act on its passions. Emotional thinking is dangerous and leaves the people vulnerable to opportunistic totalitarians. In the years before World War II, Hitler’s success was attributed by some to a lack of passion brought on by intellectualism in Germany (Wrage and Baskerville 214). However, Hutchins answered this argument in 1939 by claiming it was too much emotion and a lack of intellectualism that permitted Hitler’s rise to power:

Democracy can survive economic collapse, external pressure, and the pretty pictures painted by the dictators only if the citizens understand the nature and purpose of the state. It will not suffice to have them get emotional about it all, or react habitually to such habitual stimuli as the flag, the national anthem, or the Fourth of July. (“Democracy” 587)

The arguments presented above reflect an attitude that colleges and universities play a pivotal role in shaping the loyalties of the people. Scholars were called upon to be servant-leaders who could help the nation deal with the depression and totalitarianism. Democracy demands a culture that understands and appreciates the government and does not fall prey to those who would usurp power. This
fantasy proposes that higher education provides the community with a love of the nation balanced by sound judgement.

In contemporary statements by leading educators such as Harvard President, Derek Bok, and History professor, Ralph Ketcham, as well as statements from earlier in the century, one can see an articulation of the value of the servant leader. It is believed that a college education can and should teach the best students to put other people in the community ahead of themselves. In the language of recent educational advocates, it becomes apparent that servant-leaders are still necessary, and the desire and ability to serve others can be nurtured in college. In an essay published in 1992, a history professor at Syracuse University, Ralph Ketcham defended civic education as a way of training students to participate in democracy. His remarks are representative of those who advocate servant-leadership, "Human beings do have the capacity to rise above the narrow and self-serving states of mind, and this capacity can be nourished" (12). To encourage service to others, Derek Bok argued at Harvard’s 1992 commencement exercises that we must teach students to “deepen their concern for those who need help, to build within them a strong sense of ethical responsibility, to help them acknowledge that exceptional talent carries with it exceptional responsibility for the welfare of others” (Bok,
"Social" 114). Bok proposes that this community-oriented perspective will help solve the problems that have undermined public faith in the academy.

**The Watchdog**

An additional communitarian function of higher education in a democracy is the role of the independent watchdog. President of the University of Wisconsin, Glenn Frank, talked about this function of colleges in the 1930’s, when fascist regimes caused Americans to fear that governments can manipulate citizens in the absence of institutions that keep government in check. In a speech to a trade group of newspaper publishers, Frank argued that education provides a democracy with corrective criticism: "To Jefferson the freedom of scholars to examine and the freedom of journalists to express were liberties without which neither the political nor the economic liberty of the people could conceivably be secure" ("Critical" 199). This section shows that numerous thinkers have argued that academics should use their insight and influence to keep other powerful groups in check.

Part of higher education's watchdog role has also been to exist as an independent community of thinkers left to contemplate freely. In a 1935 speech over the NBC radio network, Hutchins also addressed the fears brought on by Hitler. He frequently advocated theoretical training and a separation of the academy from every day affairs. This
separation would prevent colleges from becoming a tool of a political party or a propaganda agency ("What" 52). In that speech, Hutchins defined a university as "a community of scholars" ("What" 51). Thus, the university serves as a watchdog, rather than a servant to the government.

Hutchins made this argument at a time in which prejudices and fears threatened researchers ("What" 52). For him, the key to fighting controversial ideas, such as socialism, is to discuss rather than ignore them: "the American people must decide whether they will . . . tolerate the search for truth. If they will, the universities will endure and give light and leading to the nation" ("What" 56). In response to the same conditions, Glenn Frank also emphasized the value of a system of higher education that could inquire freely and the need for the results of such inquiry to be used to inform other institutions, such as government. "Great universities," he claims, "can prosecute and publish fearlessly objective researches into the living issues of state and nation" (Frank, "Critical" 202). In these arguments, we see the value of keeping colleges and universities independent of government. Schools should not blindly serve government, and their research should not be subject to the rule of the government.

The Miniature Community

A final communitarian view of higher education embraces the value of schools as small communities, within
which students learn to function in larger communities (Dewey, "School" 32). When he was president of Princeton, Woodrow Wilson emphasized the need for a campus to be a community of scholars who motivate one another. As an administrator, Wilson worked to shape the environment within his school, and he tried to convince students to embrace the academic community. The enthusiasm of some people in the community will spread and motivate others in the community to study and learn. Wilson said, "A college body represents a passion . . . a passion not so much individual as social, a passion for the things which live, for the things which enlighten, for the things which bind men together in unselfish companies" (W. Wilson 203).

Living in this community provides the student with practical lessons in how to serve his fellow citizens and, more importantly, how to selflessly serve an institution larger than oneself. Woodrow Wilson elaborated:

A college is a brotherhood in which every man is expected to do for the sake of the college the thing which alone can make the college a distinguished and abiding force in the history of men . . . men shall be ashamed to look their fellows in the face if it is known that they have great faculties and do not use them for the glory of their alma mater, when it is known that they avoid those nights of self-denial which are necessary for intellectual mastery, deny themselves pleasure, deny themselves leisure, deny themselves every natural indulgence in order that in future years it may be said that that place served the country by increasing its power and enlightenment. (204)

The social legitimation of this need to live in a communal environment to truly absorb the lessons of a
college education would cause nontraditional forms of education that do not involve the student in the community to be met with great resistance. This approach toward education might account for the objections raised by many against distance learning and other non-traditional programs. One remark by Wilson strongly shows the need for students to immerse themselves in an academic community and his desire for Princeton students to participate in this community:

Until we live together in a common community and expose each other to the general infection, there will be no infection . . . we ought to teach and ask ourselves how we ought to live in college communities, in order that the fire and infection may spread . . . The teacher must live with the pupil and the pupil with the teacher, and then there will begin to be a renaissance, a new American college, and not until then. (W. Wilson 205-207)

Such a communal arrangement supports the other missions of the university education. For example, students become better critics of public opinions that are widely accepted in the campus community. Other educators further justified the communitarianism of the British residential model for its contribution to students’ understanding of public opinion and social criticism. One such educator was Yale president, Charles Seymour, who explained in 1939 that students trained in a university can appreciate the power of public opinion. Students can observe the ways public opinion is formed and the evil ends and the noble ends that are served by public opinion. More
importantly, the student acquires "habits of intelligent
criticism, which, if he maintain them throughout life, will
enable him to appraise the validity of prevailing opinion
according to rational standards" ("Power" 604).

The miniature community was recently articulated by
philosophy professor, Robert Solomon, and professor of
classics, Jon Solomon, in a book that examines the current
state of higher education. They explain, "The university
should be a model for democracy as well as a training
ground for democracy" (89). This statement provides
evidence that, to some, participation in the academic
community continues to be vital.

Having described the details of the individualistic
and communal fantasies linking higher education and
democratic government, the next section examines the
consequences of these tensions. I show that both of these
visions must be maintained to preserve a healthy dialectic.
Contemporary discourse shows fear that the individualistic
vision has come to dominate the link between higher
education and democracy.

DIALECTIC TENSIONS: LEGITIMACY, HIGHER EDUCATION, AND THE
GOVERNMENT

In this section, I argue that tensions between
divergent fantasies support a dialectic that is necessary
and healthy for American higher education. However, when
one view comes to dominate the other, there is an imbalance
in our colleges and universities that will threaten both
higher education and the democratic government that legitimates it. American rhetoric has failed to provide one coherent vision of higher education that accommodates both visions.

Currently, the individualistic perspective dominates the communal perspective. This fantasy appears to be attractive because it claims to offer tangible, measurable benefits to students. The form of the individualistic fantasies enhances their appeal. These fantasies emphasize materialistic benefits while downplaying cooperation and service in the community. Individuals who are concerned with self-gain and independence would quickly identify with the form and content of the individualistic view of higher education. Bloom, who is opposed to the dominance of the individual perspective, observes that students primarily embrace individualism in their college lives (Bloom, Closing 91). Most people, he claims, come to college for self-gain and self-improvement. Similarly, a dean at St. John’s University gives more evidence that students of today are less interested in using their education to serve and strengthen their communities. In a 1987 commencement address, Spaeth illustrates, “Students . . . understand a college education as an individualistic endeavor. They determine for themselves what they ‘want to get out of’ their college experience” (Spaeth 24).
Consensus-Building

One issue that becomes a consequence of misplaced emphasis on individualism in democracy is the role of colleges in building versus undermining consensus on civic values and virtues. The previous section showed that colleges can serve the community by providing servant-leaders, acting as a watchdog, encouraging trust in the masses, and providing a community within which students learn to interact. From a communal perspective, colleges discover and disseminate truths that are shared by all members of the community. The sharing of this knowledge unites people into communities, and democratic government cannot exist without this agreement. Educated citizens must arrive at this agreement of their own free will. Unlike the totalitarian regimes of his day, Assistant Secretary of State, A.A. Berle, told educators in 1940: "democracy of necessity assumes that there will be a body of agreement on spiritual, social, and aesthetic values not imposed from above, but based on free choice" (Berle 150).

Colleges have been granted a role in building and reinforcing shared beliefs on democracy. "The emphasis," said Dewey, "must be put upon whatever binds people together in cooperative human pursuits and results, apart from geographical limitations (Democracy 114). Dewey’s statement is representative of other progressives who
favored education of the whole student through practical experiences.

College must also help us balance the desire to do for ourselves with the responsibility to do for others. According to the individualistic fantasy, students learn in college to think for themselves. Quite to the contrary, the communal fantasy requires colleges to teach students to selflessly serve others. At the opening of the 1940 school year, Harold Dodds worried that there has been so much “talk about 'my' rights and 'your' duties that correlative duties and rights have been left to shift for themselves” (Dodds, “The Objective” 27). With the threat of war, Dodds was concerned that a lack of unity and consensus would weaken the nation. Again, he claimed higher education should seek to articulate a vision in which the very appealing individualistic vision does not dominate the vision of the servant-leader. In an academic essay on the relation between democracy and higher education, Brand Blanshard provides a rare example of rhetoric that recognizes both perspectives: “if anyone is to cope adequately with our complex age he needs a college education. And if it would promote both his own good and that of society to have it, does not society owe it to him and he have a right to it?” (31).

As discussed earlier in this chapter, a college education can help individuals to defend themselves in a
democracy and equip them to be independent. Colleges uncover individual truths that undermine accepted beliefs. These accepted beliefs wrongly perpetuate negative values and should be exposed by academia. This is one of higher education’s most important functions. But a college’s ability to explore individual perspectives and criticize flaws in our shared beliefs should be balanced with the ability to build consensus. Many educators have been concerned that this individualistic role has come at the expense of efforts to build consensus. Blanshard adds, “It is significant that in the atmosphere of today dissent as such, regardless of what is dissented from, should seem admirable” (45). At the same time, diversity and tolerance are also necessary for the health of a democracy. In 1990, Willard Butcher, chair of Chase Manhattan, supported the humanities and criticized the emphasis on personal gain that prevails in the business world. Butcher claims to represent other business leaders in noting, “But for citizens of a pluralistic democracy exposure to the great diversity of human cultures and achievements provides more than personal fulfillment - it is a precondition for good citizenship” (Butcher 624). This view dominates contemporary higher education, and the American university's unity of purpose has “all but disappeared” (Bok “Social” 109).
This issue can be linked to conditions in contemporary universities. As schools have become more bureaucratic and academicians have become highly specialized, colleges have lost their communal characteristics. While some institutions remain small enough in size to accommodate a true academic community, larger universities often tend to become compartmentalized. If an individualistic fantasy is dominant, the communitarian fantasy is overshadowed. Organizational participants often structure their organizations based on the ideals promoted in fantasy themes, and a weakened collective fantasy will not provide the motivation for educators to restore a sense of community in their institutions. According to Robert Spaeth, Dean of Arts and Sciences at St. John's University, "I believe that reform of undergraduate liberal education must arise from the determination of a college faculty to be a community and to come to a consensus on the values of that intellectual community" (25). Yet, without agreement within the academy, there cannot be instruction that encourages agreement among students.

These changes have deeply affected the scholars who make up American universities. Professors often identify with their academic community and the loss of such community is troubling to them. Derek Bok observes that professors are often motivated by meaningful work which arouses the interest and enthusiasm of colleagues, and he
warns that universities should guard against faculty losing its "sense of responsibility for the welfare of the institution and the education of its students" ("Cost"167). In sum, a loss of community could undermine the motivation and sense of purpose shared by scholars, leading to an ineffectual university.

Although popular discourse does reflect the dominance of the individualistic fantasy, the fact that the lack of consensus is often addressed as a problem shows that the communal fantasy has not entirely disappeared. Recognizing the desire for more community in higher education, schools that can address this need to build consensus will appear very unique and will certainly meet the demands of their environment. This might be accomplished through interdisciplinary curricula and through increased dialogue between academic departments. Those schools that make a claim on what is the ideal citizen for democracy and overtly work to turn students into that citizen will meet the demands of advocates, such as John Howard, of the Rockford Institute, for whom "the very thought of identifying certain traits of character as desirable in all college graduates and seeking educational means to strengthen those ideals of human behavior is now anathema within the reigning academic orthodoxy" (316).

Higher education's lack of effort to build consensus has also led to the accusation that schools only destroy
and do not create anything useful for the nation. This was a concern before World War II, when critics claimed that overly critical academics weakened the nation by undermining unity. Dodds remarked:

We have listened too attentively to those who would tear down, forgetful of how difficult is the more difficult and less dramatic work of building up... world conditions have suddenly arisen which require that we put the pieces together again in an old fashioned pattern, and unite to restore faith in those institutions which alone make self-criticism and freedom possible. (Dodds, “The Objective” 27)

This issue can be tied to conditions in colleges and universities. Administrators should support scholars and departments that both dismantle institutions through informed criticism and build-up healthy social structures by promoting appreciation for consensus.

Again, democracy is served by both the individual and communal perspectives described in the first part of this chapter. Colleges must be intent on achieving both ends: building consensus on positive values while criticizing and exposing values that oppress individuals. The tension in higher education between contributing new knowledge and criticizing the accepted truths in a culture is one manifestation of the dialectic between the individual and community in higher education. The need to maintain and balance this dialectic should be better reflected in rhetoric on higher education. Neither perspective should be allowed to dominate thinking on this issue. In 1987, Robert Spaeth expressed concern that these visions should
be balanced. He did so in a convocation address in which he attempts to warn graduates about individualistic culture:

individualism is so rampant in American higher education today that it goes unnamed and often unnoticed. It is, I believe, our way of life . . . it has produced the very failures that critics are constantly bringing to our attention. Individualism has infected both student bodies and faculties, and the two groups encourage it in one another. Students by and large come to college today to major in a field that will lead to a career — their own career — by means of which they hope to become successful and at least materially comfortable. (Spaeth 24)

Universal vs. Limited Access

Another significant manifestation of dialectical tensions in colleges and universities is the contrast between higher education for training the elite to lead and higher education for equipping every individual to function. This opposition can be seen in contrasting admissions policies. Some schools desire to maintain selective admissions standards and limit their enrollment. Other schools attempt to enroll more students by expanding access. These opposing fantasies were outlined in the first part of this chapter. For some, democratic education, by definition, must be available to all who desire it. Many contemporary administrators struggle with the balance between unlimited access and elitism. President Patrick Ellis of Catholic University recently said, for example, "Everyone loves to teach brilliant students but that is not necessarily what education, and
democracy, is all about” (Ellis 629). In an essay that attempts to mediate opposing positions on admissions standards, Blanshard notes that the universal access fantasy has been dominant: “the trend against reserving higher education for those of hereditary or social or financial position is strong and growing stronger” (Blanshard 36). On the other hand, many have argued that higher education, if it is to perform the function of providing our democracy with leadership, should accept only the best students. In the 1930’s and 1940’s, traditionalists like Hutchins and educators at private institutions defended this fantasy as equally democratic. For example, Dodds claimed that he was not “guilty of treason to my democratic faith. Any workable democratic system must respect the function of leadership. Of course it must be leadership earned by ability, not conferred by circumstance of wealth or birth” (Dodds, “The Cultivation” 556).

Contemporary critics of the fantasy theme of American higher education for all who desire it have been concerned that there is a compromise in quality when education becomes universal. They worry that schools’ standards and instruction will be lowered to the level of the average student, rather than raised to the level of the best students. Blanshard’s 1976 essay contends that “a university that enrolls the masses will accept mass
standards, and if it does that it will no longer be an institution of higher learning” (Blanshard 37). The result is seen as neglect for the needs of our brightest students. Blanshard further explains, “we tend to forget the even stronger rights of the naturally advantaged. It is to the potential leaders of the next generation that in reality we owe the most” (Blanshard 38).

Critics have argued that reserving higher education only for the best students is an elitist fantasy. When colleges appear to isolate themselves from mainstream America, their legitimacy will be undermined. Therefore, to maintain legitimacy, schools in late twentieth century have taken strides to open their doors to unprecedented numbers of students.

Attempts to Balance Contradictory Fantasies

Early in this century, there were efforts to present one coherent vision of higher education that existed to serve the community but appreciated the individualistic fantasies that are also very appealing. Dewey reconciles the demands of the community and individual by hoping to supply students with rationality to direct them to act as responsible individuals and benevolent members of the community. Dewey’s discourse is representative of other progressives who reacted against conservative traditions in academia. Progressives favored the application of knowledge to experience, and, to them, the academy should
not exist in isolation. For Dewey, "it is not enough for a
man to be good; he must be good for something. The
something for which a man must be good is capacity to live
as a social member so that what he gets from living with
others balances with what he contributes" (Dewey, Democracy
417). In a speech in 1899 at University Elementary, a
school for teaching and research in education, Dewey
expanded on this vision: "what the best and wisest parent
wants for his own child, that must the community want for
all of its children. Any other ideal for our schools is
narrow and unlovely" (Dewey, "School" 19). Robert Wilson
of the Standard Oil Company also reconciled the individual
and community in the early 1950's. "Education," he argued,"has been a vital factor in making the American dream come
ture . . . the choice of his own destiny rests with each
individual, the mind must be trained to choose wisely and
well, the spirit must be molded to act nobly and in the
common good" (213). Wilson was the Chair of Standard Oil,
and he was addressing educators in this speech. He
represented a typical position in business. To Wilson,
colleges supplied labor, and business is concerned with the
character developed in those workers supplied by
educational institutions. Despite early attempts to
recognize the coexistence of the individualistic and
communal fantasies, there was not one well-developed,
widely accepted vision of higher education’s purpose that
accommodated both. In recent rhetoric about education, this lack of one coherent vision continues to be apparent.

Although patrons of higher education have advocated one fantasy or the other, they have not worked to put together one coherent vision that emphasizes the need to preserve and balance both fantasies. It is clear that these dialectical tensions are both required to keep one another in check. Those who address the issue of democracy and higher education would be wise to consider the need to provide educators and supporters of education with a framework for assimilating these diverse visions.

In sum, this vision would recognize that graduates must experience self-improvement during their college years. Such growth can be a benefit to individuals, but such growth, by definition, also builds consensus and instructs individuals to serve the community. This growth can be seen through the training of the mind, character, and soul. Hutchins effectively captured this notion in a speech given at a University of Chicago Commencement in 1939, and he provides a model for contemporary advocates who wish to articulate a vision for individualism and community in higher education. In addition, if we accept the assumption that educators are to teach individualistic students to better appreciate a communal perspective, arguments by Hutchins and others can be useful teaching
tools for promoting this fantasy theme on campus.

According to Hutchins, education:

exists also to provide the highest goods themselves. It exists to foster moral, intellectual, and spiritual growth. Its results should be a sound character, a disciplined mind, and an elevated spirit. It is in these terms that higher education must be judged. Our people may properly complain at the triviality, futility, and confusion of most programs now masquerading as higher education . . . the test of true education is not whether the graduates are millionaires or ditch diggers. Even if they were all ditch diggers they would still be the educated citizens that democracy demands if they had a sound character, a disciplined mind, and an elevated spirit. These things true education can give. On these things democracy depends. ("Democracy" 588)
CHAPTER 5
THE FREE MARKET AND HIGHER EDUCATION

This chapter examines the connection that twentieth century educators have made between higher education and private enterprise. This fantasy type conceives of higher education as a partner in business and has flourished in educational rhetoric throughout the century. The tensions between the individual and the community that emerge from democratic education are similar to the tensions found in this chapter. First, I show that private business and higher education have been closely linked. Next, I present the individualistic and communal fantasies that connect colleges to business. Finally, I discuss the implications of these tensions, arguing that education has been legitimated and shaped by private enterprise and economic interests for a long time.

The dominance of the individualistic fantasy connecting education and free enterprise constructs opposing ideal-types for colleges and universities and leads to anti-intellectual sentiments. The result has been criticism and an ambiguous purpose for higher education. This is because critics use only individualistic criteria to evaluate schools, which are communal in many ways. An understanding of these arguments can be valuable for discouraging students, educators, legislators, or others in the public from seeing only an individualistic vision of higher education. American free-enterprise has long
embraced individualism, which has conflicted with higher education’s communal nature. Defenders of the academy must be prepared to address this issue.

**LINKING EDUCATION AND BUSINESS**

Throughout the century, a college degree has been seen as a means of providing class mobility. That is, a student from any class can achieve prosperity through education. Therefore, higher education has endeared itself to Americans as a way of erasing class distinctions. The close tie between education and business and career training is reflected in the discourse that characterizes a variety of twentieth century contexts. In 1916, Dewey, who urged educators to give practical preparation for life wrote, “A society which is mobile . . . must see to it that its members are educated to personal initiative and adaptability” (Dewey, *Democracy* 103).

Contemporary educators have recognized that students primarily go to college to improve their professional opportunities. In 1993, Robert Solomon and Jon Solomon observed that “social mobility in the United States is very largely determined by education. Education is the gateway to the professions and, these days, to managerial jobs in business and other organizations” (61). This attitude among students is not new. Hutchins provides evidence that Americans saw college as career preparation even in the first half of the twentieth century. Hutchins recognized
the prevalence of the belief among Americans that a college degree would lead to more earning power. "We are likely to think," he reported in 1938, "that a university's first duty is to build up the physique and the economic prospects of its students" ("University" 711). At the same time, many educators like Hutchins and others have acknowledged that this is the overwhelmingly popular perspective on education, but they have questioned its validity. As a larger percentage of Americans have the opportunity to go to college, a degree has almost become the norm. As a result, higher education has become less of a means of elevating oneself, socially or professionally, above others. Rhetoric about higher education does indicate, however, that a degree continues to hold esteem in our culture and it helps to legitimate individuals, providing access to many professions that remain closed to those without some sort of college degree. This perception of esteem is critical to the survival and institutionalization of American higher education.

Higher education has also been connected to private enterprise through a college's ability to provide for the needs of businesses. Americans believe that schools train and socialize graduates to function effectively in for-profit organizations, and they also provide useful information to businesses through research. Dewey suggests that the industrial revolution has deeply impacted
education ("School" 20). For example, as division of labor and bureaucracy came to characterize industrial organizations, colleges began to organize themselves similarly. Also, as free enterprise becomes pervasive in our culture, schools have been adapted to serve the needs of industry.

In sum, the close bond between higher education and business has long persisted and continues to be strong. Next, I show the individualistic fantasies that reside in the rhetoric that unites higher education and free enterprise.

**EDUCATION, BUSINESS, AND THE INDIVIDUAL**

In this section, I first demonstrate that a degree is seen as a means of advancing professionally. It also is seen as a way of making people more effective in their careers. In addition, a degree is thought to teach graduates to find more meaning in their professional vocations. Finally, the ability of higher education to prepare students for careers has been questioned by some as impractical, while others have defended both specialized and liberal arts curricula as useful in one’s career.

First and foremost, education has been viewed as a means to an end. Throughout this century, our culture has accepted the argument that a college degree is training for desirable employment. Allen Crow of the Detroit Economic Club put it simply in 1944, "Higher education . . . must
include among its primary functions, the instruction of folks in how to acquire what they need and what they want, by taking care of themselves" (379). Crow, like most business leaders, represented Dewey's progressive approach. Beyond the simple link to financial prosperity, there are other dimensions to the relationship between college and business.

Character-Building for Business

Along with learning specific skills that can apply to the workplace, higher education has been seen as training for students to think and see the world in a way that will make them more effective in their careers. First, rationality is encouraged in students for their careers. In a speech given at Virginia Military Institute in 1938, Chaplin Tyler, an executive at E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, explored the opportunities industry offers for graduates. Tyler observed that an overall “working philosophy” is far more important than any specific course of study. Such a philosophy includes logic, “unswerving faith in cold facts,” and, lastly, a sense of responsibility (401). Employers have long recognized that good employees have strong character, and Tyler provides evidence of this attitude among those in business. Throughout this century, it seems that the most important character trait learned in college is the ability to be rational and logical. Many, like Hutchins, have argued
that developing the intellect is education’s only concern and graduates must learn to be directed by their minds and not just their emotions: “if we can teach our students to lead the life of reason we shall do all that can be expected of us . . . The task of education is to make rational animals more perfectly rational” (Hutchins, “Education” 500).

Several other positive character traits have been said to be promoted during the college years. For Hutchins, higher education supplies the student with stability, which helps a graduate survive when “the tumult of adult life beats upon them” (Hutchins, “Education” 499). In 1947, Hutchins also explored character-building in students by emphasizing the value of general theoretical training, rather than preparing for specific tasks. Unlike progressives, such as Dewey and many employers, Hutchins favored theory over practice, and he used a speech to businesss executives to persuade them to appreciate his point of view:

The best practical education is the most theoretical one. This is, probably the first time in human history in which change on every front is so rapid that what one generation has learned of practical affairs, in politics, business, and technology, is of little use to the next . . . It is principles—everlasting principles—which are of practical value today; not data, not methods, not facts, not helpful hints, but principles are what the rising generation requires if it is to find its way through the mazes of tomorrow. No man among us can tell what tomorrow will be like; all we know with certainty is that it will be different from today. (Hutchins, “Where” 593)
Both progressives and traditionalists agreed that higher education should not only help students become people who are more functional in their occupations, but character education should provide a meaningful existence in one’s vocation. According to Dewey in 1909, an education helps one to avoid being enslaved by his/her occupation, and colleges should train the whole person. He said,

> The world in which most of us live is a world in which everyone has a calling and occupation, something to do. Some are managers and others are subordinates. But the great thing for one as for the other is that each shall have had the education which enables him to see within his daily work all there is in it of large and human significance. How many of the employed are today mere appendages to the machines which they operate! (Dewey, “School” 38)

Many educators of the 1930’s claimed education could provide students with a meaningful existence. President Harold Dodds of Princeton, for example, contends that introspection, learned in college, is crucial in living a meaningful and balanced life. College provides a valuable opportunity “for implanting within one, resources and interests which make one’s whole life agreeable and pleasing to one’s self, which alone sustains that needful inward peace and harmonious adjustment to the world outside” (Dodds, “The Art” 136). Dodds added, “The great lesson of a liberal education is that there are no short cuts to culture, and a college career should be an open door to rich life experiences rather than a tool to
material advancement or business success" (Dodds, "The Art" 137). Finally, Hutchins agrees that higher education can help graduates to avoid the superficiality and commercialism of free-market culture:

> We can at least provide ourselves, in the time that is left to us, with some suitable alternative to liquor, the movies and - if I may say so in Detroit - running around the country in second hand cars, and catching glimpses of the countryside between the billboards. (Hutchins, "Where" 594)

The attitudes identified, such as rationality, stability, individualism, and satisfaction are typical in the type of character that colleges try to build. Thus, educators can defend academic or non-academic programs that can be linked to these traits. However, as I show below, some have challenged higher education's ability to develop these traits in students.

**A Pragmatic Approach**

Unlike Hutchins and others who advocate the ability to think theoretically, many business professionals have contended that a more desirable trait for business is pragmatism. According to this individualistic vision, pragmatism is best learned outside of the college. The value of higher education for business has often been challenged by those who argue that college is not practical and teaches less than "real-world" experience. In a 1937 speech to a convention of college deans, Robert H. Jackson asked why we value a college education. Jackson was a corporate attorney who had no college education, but he
later became chief prosecutor of Nazi war criminals at the Nuremberg trials. Jackson valued the formative years a young person usually spends in college and wondered whether those years are best spent in college. He spoke from personal experience and claimed he learned much when he was "tossed into the strife to sink or swim," while students learn less because they are "removed from the struggle of life" (58). He admits he missed much in not attending college, but he wonders if his son will miss just as much because he does attend college. He remarked, "The world has an overabundance of those who paddle pretty well in still water. The world cries for men who can navigate 'white water.' I see plenty of it ahead for individuals and for society" (59). Jackson also argued that men who learned by experience had the benefit of learning to be pragmatists. A man of experience "instinctively appraised theories by experience and events, while the college-educated man very often judges facts and events by his theories" (61). Such pragmatism can be gained in college, but often it is not. He argues that such pragmatism is essential to have courage to face a changing world (61).

One way to answer these objections and preserve the legitimation of higher education is by making the claim that colleges provide transformation and growth, which is not related to specific job skills, but is achieved through liberal learning. A few contemporary scholars, including
Allan Bloom, have countered criticism with the argument that individual preparation can be achieved through liberal education. Many advocates hope to justify their academic fields are relevant. Bloom, for example, argues that students who truly get a liberal education do not have a fixed career goal, while students who have a fixed goal go through school blindly, taking only the required courses and an occasional elective. However, a true education "requires that the student's whole life be radically changed by it, that what he learns may affect his action, his tastes, his choices, that no previous attachment be immune to examination and hence re-evaluation" (Bloom, Closing 370).

There have been many other attempts to legitimate education and the liberal arts, in particular, not as a merely intellectual pursuit, but as a valuable pragmatic resource for professionals. These rhetorical efforts reflect the attempts of supporters of the liberal arts to justify their fields by showing how their disciplines meet the demands of the environment. Employers often tell educators that they prefer liberally educated, well-rounded graduates to narrowly educated employees. Contemporary business people posit the liberal arts as excellent preparation for leadership. For example, Judd Alexander, Vice President of the James River Corporation, told educators at the convention of the Association of American
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Colleges that many major businesses make a mistake by not recruiting at liberal arts colleges. As a result, parents and students reject the liberal arts. However, their problem may come later when they try to get out of the trap of a career path that has become too narrow . . . One of the reasons that liberal arts graduates develop into fine business leaders is that early on in their careers they are not limited to a specialty or pre-committed to a course of work. (Alexander 316-317)

It has been popular to conceive of the link between higher education and business in a very individualistic way. I have presented the arguments of those who believe that college provides knowledge and transforms the character of individuals so that they may succeed professionally. This learning is often thought to be provided through a liberal arts curriculum, but others have questioned the usefulness of education for job-training. The individualistic perspective assumes that education leads to professional success. However, most fantasy themes posit that this success is achieved through character transformation and not through the acquisition of practical facts. This vision depicts the university as unique and unlike other forms of job-related training.

Defenders of higher education, in my judgement, would be wise to continue to use this unique vision. I will develop this claim further in my final chapter. Next, I argue that higher education has also been connected to business from a communitarian perspective.
In the twentieth century, community-oriented fantasy themes showing ways that higher education is related to American commerce and industry have also been advanced. Some business professionals believe that businesses can add much to America's well-being and have claimed that education can convince students to serve others through their professional activities. The claim has also been made that university research benefits business and the community. Finally, colleges are thought to provide employers with an effective work force.

Business Makes America Better

Several Americans have accepted the premise that businesses can play a role in improving society. Early in the twentieth century, populist sentiments valued the nobility of work. Simply learning to work diligently and be productive can benefit others. In a commencement address in 1905, William Jennings Bryan called for moral development and a sense of responsibility to the greater society to accompany mental training, “It is worthier by far to add something to the world’s store of wealth than to spend the money that others have earned” (“Man” 298). He adds, “An education is incomplete which does not place a noble purpose behind mental training and make the hands willing to work” (“Man” 299).
Currently, college is thought to equip business leaders with a desire to serve others, and businesses are to provide leadership for the nation and the world. The discourse of many professionals reflects the call for benevolent leadership from commerce and industry. One representative remark is provided by the Rockford Institute's John Howard. He emphasizes the role of higher education in training students for servant-leadership: “although you make a living by what you get, you make a life by what you give. It seems to me that on the agenda for our colleges should be a plan to enlist the students as dedicated partisans of abiding, ennobling obligations” (Howard 317). This servant leadership is seen by many as the only effective and worthwhile model for those who wish to lead others. Self-serving individualism, on the other hand, will not create success. Willard Butcher, Chair of the Chase Manhattan Bank and advocate of applying the humanities in business, recently told an audience at the University of Chicago, “A total commitment to personal gain – ‘meism’ – at the expense of society’s overall well-being, even if it gets you to the top, will ensure you are not a leader – in the business community or indeed the broader nation” (Butcher 623). The liberal arts have been further legitimated by professionals as necessary for leadership. The liberal arts allow students to understand their community and culture. In the future, business leaders
"will have to be well-rounded people who know how to understand politics and how to be effective in political debates; and who know about moral and cultural realities, care about them, and are effective in nourishing them," according to Exxon President, Randall Meyer in 1987 (122).

**Supplying Resources**

Along with providing competent leaders, higher education is credited with supplying the business community with information and knowledge through research (Tyler 399). Dewey favored experimentation and a constant search for new knowledge rather than relying on the authority of traditional ideas (Wrage and Baskerville 209). This new information could improve society. Dewey observed that scientific technology supported social progress when the researcher shared findings with the community. For Dewey, when discovery is shared and given "a wider reference the results of the experience of any individual are put at the disposal of all men. Thus ultimately and philosophically science is the organ of general social progress" (Dewey, Democracy 270).

Contemporary educators have also proposed that private enterprise thrives on the contributions of higher education:

> Corporations get more benefit from the university today than any other segment of our society . . . The university provides research results as well as research faculty and facilities that are worth billions to the corporations that utilize them, often at remarkably little cost to themselves. (Solomon and Solomon 292)
Of equal importance to its research contribution is higher education's ability to supply American business with a trained workforce. For example, deficiencies in American workers are blamed on colleges and universities for substandard education. University of Colorado President, Judith Albino, an advocate of modifying higher education to meet the demands of the business world, observed in 1992 that employers have sent the message "that our students need to be better trained in terms of work skills, work ethics, and the ability to think creatively . . . . the anticipated role of higher education in solving larger problems in the community seems to be expanding" (372).

However, educators avoid placing too much emphasis on skill related training. Higher education, as shown repeatedly by discourses cited in this study, is often seen as a transformation of the individual and community and not simply as job training. Education's role as a supplier is not the primary purpose of schools. Solomon and Solomon recognize that today, many Americans do emphasize students' acquisition of marketable skills. In their effort to expose weaknesses in contemporary pedagogy, they write:

Because the university mission has become so business oriented, the university views the students as part of its business, the purpose of which is to supply the corporation as well as the state and federal governments with a commodity - trained employees. Education, accordingly, becomes training. It is the process of providing skilled, disciplined, narrowly knowledgeable technicians, managers, and professionals. The real virtues of a university
education - the time to explore one’s talents and possibilities, to cultivate a rich and creative mind, to learn those things that one could not learn before and may never have time to learn again - these are sacrificed, sometimes totally, in the name of career preparation and training. (Solomon and Solomon 16)

Business has been closely connected with higher education through communitarian fantasy themes. It is often argued that colleges supply businesses with information, employee training, and competent leaders. However, this tension has given rise to disputes regarding the mission and ideal-type of a college. Supporters and critics of higher education have questioned the goals of education. These socially legitimated goals are of extreme importance because they direct the actions of individuals within schools and provide criteria that are later used to evaluate schools.

STRIKING A BALANCE: DIALECTICAL TENSIONS IN EDUCATING FOR BUSINESS

As shown above, higher education and business have been closely connected. According to many business leaders, the community can be served by higher education's contributions to the economy. At the same time, individual students can be trained for a life in commerce and industry. Differing perspectives emanate out of the tension between individual and community in joining education and business. Negative American attitudes toward higher education often privilege an individualistic fantasy, although higher education is a communal endeavor.
in many ways. As a result, higher education is often legitimated primarily for its contributions to the individual, and colleges are sharply criticized when they do not appear to serve the needs of individuals. Those embracing communal fantasies, on the other hand, have advocated different curricula and ideal-types for colleges. A lack of agreement has resulted from a failure to reconcile diverse fantasy themes when linking higher education to free enterprise. In this section, I assemble the ideal types that correspond with the individual and community fantasies. I also argue that tension between these fantasies and the dominance of the individualistic fantasy has led to confusion and criticism regarding professors, curriculum, and the purpose of education in American culture.

Conflicting Ideal-Types

Discussions of business and higher education have led many commentators to question the model for a quality educational institution. The existence of differing ideal-types can cause conflict in schools as people attempt to enact both ideal-types. For some, the ideal university is a community of the very best intellectuals, a place where the brightest Americans can develop and be challenged. In Hutchins’ 1935 radio speech, he defended his view of education by arguing, “The greatest university is that in which the largest proportion of . . . scholars are the most
competent in their chosen fields" ("What" 51). As the president of a university that was capable of recruiting such scholars, Hutchins had the luxury of describing the ideal institution in this way. Administrators at schools that could not attract well-known faculties might not agree with Hutchins' ideal-type.

Academicians have also treasured the freedom to think and study as they wish in the university. Scholars, from this point of view, are less concerned with the immediate pragmatism of their thinking. From this perspective, higher education should distance itself from the pragmatism of the business world. For instance, in 1938 Hutchins said that colleges should not be concerned with training students for vocations that are not intellectual: "a profession that has no intellectual content is not a profession with which a university can concern itself, no matter how important it may seem, or how prosperous and influential its members may be" (Hutchins, "University" 711).

To others, the college is less a community of thinkers than a training ground for people to prepare for their careers. According to this view, a college's primary focus must be on serving the needs of undergraduates. Undergraduates are seen as customers of a business, and schools should be responsive to their desires. The problem addressed by contemporary critics like Solomon and Solomon
"is not that the university has failed but that in its spectacular success, it has lost sight of its mission. Its mission is to educate the 'undergraduates’" (Solomon and Solomon 3). This view might be especially attractive to public institutions that are driven to attract growing enrollments.

Different ideal-types that serve different needs have resulted from competing rhetorical visions. Some schools, some disciplines, and some academic programs have developed to serve one fantasy or the other. For example, one aspect of the communal fantasy was the construction of a small collegiate community, within which students learn to function within groups. The American liberal arts college articulates this vision and claims to distinguish itself from more bureaucratic universities because it offers this unique experience to students. On the other hand, the individualistic fantasy envisions higher education as available to all citizens and a means of transcending class and developing each individual's intellect.

Most non-traditional programs offer an individualistic educational experience. These programs provide convenient options such as night classes and express terms for working professionals. As a result, these programs are available to virtually anyone, but they do not require students to immerse themselves in the collegiate community, as a program at a liberal arts college might do. This variety
is one of the strengths that make the American higher educational system one of the world's best. Prominent supporter of the business model for universities and president of a public university, Judith Albino, illustrates, "American higher education is truly a wonder of diverse types of colleges and universities serving vastly different needs" (372). Some advocates of higher education have expressed a preference for one model or the other, but both models remain strong.

Ideal-types can be constructed to use these competing fantasies to understand the relationship between the rhetoric studied above and the form and function of colleges. Ideal-type analysis uses an extreme case to compare organizational patterns in different settings. A distinctive ideal-type can be assembled from the communal fantasy. The ideal-type might look like this: 1) The institution is small in size. 2) It is a residential college that seeks to involve students in a close-knit campus community. 3) The mission of this college is to prepare its students for responsible participation in the community. This mission includes preparing an educated citizenry, constructing a consensual image of citizenship, and nurturing the moral character of students. 4) The curriculum at these colleges is based on intellectual value. 5) Teaching at this ideal-type is done by professors who are committed to instructing students.
through close interpersonal contact. 6) The student body is composed of an academically elite group of students who will provide leadership for the community.

The second fantasy promotes an antithetical ideal-type. In this fantasy, higher education is connected with business because colleges and universities are accessible to all individuals who desire to improve their earning power and they empower individuals to be independent. The second ideal-type might be constituted in this way: 1) The institution is large enough in size to provide diverse perspectives and a variety of specialized fields of study. 2) It is accessible to accommodate commuters and other students who need to work or maintain other off-campus commitments. 3) The mission of the college is to distribute and discover knowledge. This mission influences both graduate and undergraduate instruction. 4) The curriculum at these colleges is based on utilitarian, practical subject-matter that can be applied to the students' chosen professions. 5) Teaching is done by professors and graduate students who offer useful knowledge to students. 6) The college's constituency is composed of students from all socio-economic backgrounds. It strives to include opportunities for a large proportion of the nation's people, regardless of economic class.

In light of this diversity, it might be possible that contemporary American rhetoric about education does not
accommodate the variety of educational experiences encountered by students. For example, the education of a commuter student, a dorm student, a fraternity member, and a nontraditional student are very different. However, we would say that each of these students has a college education. Perhaps contemporary educators should seek to find more precise ways of specifying the type of college education that a student has pursued.

The remainder of this chapter shows that individualistic, free-market culture most values ideal-type institutions that empower individuals to succeed independently. This preference has caused much criticism for American colleges and universities.

**Negative Perceptions of Intellectuals**

Anti-intellectualism and criticism of an overly liberal academy that is isolated from the business world have been common in discussions of higher education. Perceptions that higher education is ineffectual include the popular belief that intellectuals or professors are very impractical people who do not understand the issues that are important to the general public. Texts produced earlier in this century show that such attitudes have long persisted among various constituencies. Especially those critics who are in business and industry criticize college instructors because they do not have actual experience in business or industry and students learn how to dissect and
define subjects, rather than apply useful techniques (Crow 378).

In contemporary times, professors have been attacked for a lack of objectivity and for advancing political positions in their teaching and research. This fantasy theme can be connected to current conditions in universities. In particular, negative perceptions of intellectuals can be linked to the recent trend documented in chapter three showing that universities have become highly political. According to Roger Kimball, author of *Tenured Radicals*:

> It would not be at all difficult to find influential professors whose scholarly work and pedagogical aims are blatantly political. Nor would it be difficult to produce countless examples of well-regarded work in the humanities that is needlessly obscure, hopelessly trivial, or frankly at odds with the traditional purposes of humanistic study. (143)

Leaders in business have been especially critical of the type of teaching that occurs in a politicized university, especially in light of the fact that such teaching often attacks business practices. Chairman Robert Lutz of Chrysler complained recently that because of political and financial agendas, trendy theories, and attempts to quantify the unquantifiable, “I am not at all happy about what is happening in most institutions of higher learning today in America. To put it bluntly, I think that too many smart kids are getting a dumb education” (650).
There has also been doubt as to whether voters in this country want to spend tax money on humanities programs which have been devoted to promoting radical political agendas. Likewise, Kimball argues that student bodies are more conservative than in the past, and many students resist the “exhortations of a markedly more radical faculty” (Kimball 184).

Various other texts reflect negative beliefs that American intellectuals are out of touch with the practical concerns of the free market. Images in popular culture have shown that the American intellectual often is not respected or taken seriously. Solomon and Solomon wrote in 1995 about this image: “From movies like The Nutty Professor to the latest novel by David Lodge, the professor is portrayed as an ethereal fool, pampered by a security taken for granted, bitter about wealth and rewards withheld” (Solomon and Solomon 4). President Bok of Harvard observes a need to reclaim the trust of the public, which has recently embraced the attacks on higher education. Bok explains, “universities are deeply irritating to many groups – as they always have been. And yet the point remains: we are being criticized now as we were not 10, 20, 30 years ago” (Bok, “Reclaiming” 5).

Theory vs. Action

The communitarian fantasy conceives of a college as a community of thinkers, while the individualistic fantasy
conceives of a college as a place to prepare students to be practitioners in a chosen field. These fantasies reveal important contrasts of which educators and business professionals who address the bond between business and higher education must be aware. The “community of thinkers” fantasy values its distance from the constraints of the business world. On the other hand, the “training of individual practitioners” view values immersion in the ideas and experience of the business world.

A distinction between action and thought is related to this divergence. Those advocates who favor a fantasy that views education as career training argue that the most useful lessons come from and prepare one for practical experiences. In contrast, the “community of thinkers” fantasy privileges theoretical, abstract thinking that is judged on its intellectual merits rather than on its pragmatism.

A variety of texts have illustrated the argument that only experience can provide valuable life-lessons. John Dewey, a major figure in twentieth century philosophical pragmatism, contended that “no training of sense-organs in school, introduced for the sake of training, can begin to compete with the alertness and fullness of sense-life that comes through daily intimacy and interest in familiar occupations” (Dewey, “School” 25). Dewey elaborates, the only training that becomes intuition, is that got through life itself . . . But the school has been so
set apart, so isolated from the ordinary conditions and motives of life that the place where children are sent for discipline is the one place in the world where it is most difficult to get experience. (Dewey, "School" 31)

In response to these issues, some persuaders have attempted to clarify the roles of theoretical and experiential education. Hutchins, as mentioned earlier, is representative of the view of education which is concerned only with intellectual pursuits. He admits that experience can teach valuable lessons. In 1938 he asked, "Are we compelled to assume that our students can learn nothing from life or that they have led no life before coming to us and lead none after they come" (Hutchins, "Education" 500). However, the best training for the workplace occurs on the job: "As our experience in war time shows, the place to train hands for industry is in industry" (Hutchins, "Where" 593). Since training for the marketplace comes from experience, according to this fantasy, the university should be concerned only with intellectual matters. For Hutchins, the measure of a course should be "not whether it is amusing or informational or seems to contribute to financial success . . . The real test of instruction or research is whether it has high intellectual content and demands intellectual effort" ("University" 710). Others supported Hutchins in criticizing education that only provides students with skills. Abraham Flexner, for example, was the Director of the Institute for Advanced
Study and a leading innovator of teaching and education in the medical field in the first half of the twentieth century. Flexner published an essay in *Atlantic Monthly* in 1932, in which he argued, “practical training - that is, the ability to do different things without profoundly understanding the processes therein involved - does not belong to a university” (Flexner 87).

Many contemporary pedagogists disagree with this theoretical approach to education, arguing that schools can be more prosperous if they offer any type of training desired by students. Solomon and Solomon, whose primary focus is on relocating the role of teaching in the university, write:

The exclusion of certain skills and subjects from the university curriculum ought to be determined by time and space limitations only, not by class or tradition. Much of the career training that is now farmed out to “colleges” should be included at the university - along with a healthy dose of the liberal arts. Why should so many working-class students be abandoned to fly-by-night operations that neither train nor educate? Future plumbers and air-conditioning specialists have just as much to gain from college as do potential lawyers and engineers. (Solomon and Solomon 97)

The divergence between theory and action also has the potential to impact colleges and universities. The emphasis on practical skills, which is rooted in a view of education as a means of equipping individuals for career success, creates attitudes and beliefs that will impact the curriculum. In such an environment, educational exercises and courses that are seen as practical and relevant to a
student’s future profession will be valued. In other words, classes must teach students how to do something useful for a career. A communication class, for example, might only become valuable to individualistic students when they are convinced that it will help them to prepare for vocational activities like interviewing for a job or giving professional presentations. From this perspective, theoretical learning and critical thought are only valuable if they can be linked to a specific job-related skill.

Just thinking more effectively will not be valued in a culture that accepts only the individualistic fantasy. One other visible outcome of this fantasy will be on the popularity of assessment in higher education (Bok, “Cost” 169). Because the dominant individualistic fantasy privileges experience over intellect, any type of educational endeavor will be judged on its ability to meet measurable, behavioral objectives. As I discuss in my final chapter, many important educational objectives are not easily quantifiable. Next, I consider further implications individualism has on the curriculum.

Confused Curriculum

Because there is little consensus on the issues discussed above, it is often pointed out that we no longer agree as to what educated people should know. In criticizing scholars for abandoning the ideas of the Western tradition, Bloom points out that “there is no
vision, nor is there a set of competing visions, of what an educated human being is. The question has disappeared, for to pose it would be a threat to the peace" (Bloom, Closing 337). Bloom's solution to this lack of consensus is the "Great Books" approach, in which an education includes reading widely recognized classic texts and "letting them dictate what the questions are and the method of approaching them - not forcing them into categories we make up, not treating them as historical products, but trying to read them as their authors wished them to be read" (Bloom, Closing 344). In contrast, some educators do not emphasize what students should know but how they should live:

The university is a failure only if its students graduate without the competence to hold a job in their chosen area of interest, if they no longer have any desire to read a book or keep up with the news, if they have not developed the basic ability to think for themselves, to articulate and argue for what they believe in, if they cannot write a simple letter of inquiry or a letter of protest to a member of Congress or a love letter. (Solomon and Solomon 18)

As shown earlier, education is thought to shape the character of students. However, due to competing rhetorical visions, there is also disagreement on the values or virtues that are most important to the character of a scholar or student. There are numerous texts that were presented at the open of this century, which represent the consensus on the purposes of education that once existed. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, argued that education is not about money or
accomplishments, but about character. In 1901 he listed the virtues of an educated character. They include self-sufficiency and "correctness and precision in the use of the mother tongue" (Butler 83). An education should also give people the ability to reflect on the truth and grow in wisdom. Finally, graduates should desire to use their education to improve the world (Butler 83-89). As America became more of an industrial nation in the early part of the twentieth century, educators like Christian Gauss wondered what pursuits should be of greatest concern to our schools. Gauss, a dean at Princeton in 1935, questioned the relevance of education as agrarianism faded: "To fill all the world's gaping dinner pails is no longer a sufficiently stimulating adventure for the spirit of America" (52).

Today, it seems that there is even less certainty about the ends that should be pursued by colleges and universities. Conflicting ideal-types promoted in popular discourse call for differing perspectives on character development. For example, the communitarian fantasy calls colleges to equip students to assimilate into and serve the greater community. Derek Bok claimed in 1992 that parents of students now wonder "how is this institution going to help my child think more clearly, be a more moral human being, find some compelling vocation in life, or embrace values that will help them make intelligent choices" (Bok,
"Reclaiming" 6). The individualistic approach calls colleges to train students to succeed as individuals. To many individualists, the canon of Western civilization, which once was the backbone of a liberal education, is now an obstacle. Such curriculum restricts our thinking and reinforces existing power structures. To others, it is just such a canon that must be restored as central to the college experience. Bloom reflects on scholarship since the 1960’s and concludes that “the calling of the humanities in our day, it seems, is to liberate us from the sway of those authors and their prejudices” (Bloom, “Western” 16).

Positioning the University to Meet the Demands of Individualistic Culture

It is clear that the legitimation of higher education is bound to the idea that schools exist for individual students. In 1992, President Judith Albino of the University of Colorado told members of the business community, “We in higher education know that, regardless of how we view ourselves, the public generally sees our primary function as that of teaching undergraduate students” (374). Higher education has experienced many recent changes. Diminished financial resources, severe budget cutbacks, and public criticism for inefficiency have forced colleges to change the way they operate. Many of these changes can also be understood in light of the dominance of the individualistic fantasy. Because the
institutional environment supports schools that meet the demands of individualism, schools transform themselves to more effectively prepare individual students for careers, to restructure themselves to operate as efficiently as a business, and accommodate the education of as many students as possible. The relationship between public attitudes and universities is the topic of this section.

Although it is widely accepted that schools should exist to serve students, it is also widely believed that they fail in this mission (Solomon and Solomon 15). As a result, this tension leads to widespread criticism of schools. In an essay published in *Current* in 1992, Bok of Harvard claimed that “the public has finally come to believe quite strongly that our institutions - particularly our leading universities - are not making the education of students a top priority” (“Reclaiming” 6). At a convocation address in 1993, one professor responded to growing criticism that higher education is not giving the public what it wants. According to Professor Hunter Rawlings III, of the University of Iowa, if universities can “infuse an ethic of service in everything we do, we will have gone a long way toward bringing the University and the public back together” (Rawlings 91). In other words, many contemporary educators believe that if educational organizations can meet the powerful demands of
their individualistic environments, they will improve sentiments toward them and the ability to secure resources.

In response to the popularity of this individualism in higher education, advocates of higher education have described intellectual, community-oriented curricula as valuable practical instruction. Financial cutbacks have caused competition for survival, and defenders of the liberal arts, for example, have attempted to show that traditional curricula meet the public demand for education to serve the needs of business. The liberal arts have been defended as a central way of equipping graduates with the character traits that are necessary to succeed in business. Bloom, for example, fears that there is no agreement on what students should study, “Liberal education – since it has for so long been ill-defined, has none of the crisp clarity or institutionalized prestige of the professions, but nevertheless preserves and has money and respectability connected with it” (Closing 342). Others point out that these traditional programs and higher education, in general, have been shaped by the view of education as individualistic training. Antagonism between liberal arts and professional programs, explain Solomon and Solomon, “depends on a misconception about the history of a university. The university has always been a professional training ground. It is the professions, not the mission of the university, that have changed” (96). As a result,
liberal arts continue to be very valuable to students in their careers: “What a good education provides is the facility for imagination and thinking for oneself as well as the material to feed imagination and thought” (Solomon and Solomon 96). Even business leaders have discussed the value of the liberal arts as business training. One typical example was provided by Chrysler’s chief operating officer, Robert Lutz, who argued in 1996 that “somebody who knows how to use both sides of his or her brain – the right as well as the left – is the type of person I want working at Chrysler in today’s highly uncertain, super-competitive global economy” (Lutz 651).

A further result of the competition for survival is the claim that business is a liberal art. Exxon’s Randall Meyer suggests that business belongs among the liberal arts because it depends on the surrounding culture and polity and the ability to motivate and influence people (120). In response, educators have appealed to employers to recruit liberal arts students and to support the liberal arts in colleges.

However, those who prefer the communitarian fantasy of business and higher education are troubled by attempts to legitimate the liberal arts as job training. They argue that making the liberal arts a servant to the business school “endangers the integrity of the liberal arts department, and it turns the business school, as well as
the university, into a glorified job shop" (Solomon and Solomon 98). The liberal arts have traditionally been conceived as a means of improving the community. As a result, those who conceive of the liberal arts as a means for individual gain have been met with resistance because their position conflicts with the institutionalized view of the liberal arts. Therefore, educators who attempt to describe the curriculum in this way should be aware of and address these tensions.

In sum, rhetoric has legitimated higher education by connecting it with free enterprise. However, the individualistic fantasy has dominated this perspective. The result has been a great deal of criticism for higher education, which, by nature, serves a communitarian fantasy. A successful educator must recognize this situation in the environment within which colleges must exist and should promote a vision of higher education that reconciles these competing perspectives.
CHAPTER 6
RELIGION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

This chapter explores the relationship that has been established in the twentieth century between the Christian church and higher education. Traditionally, religion has had a very close relationship with higher education. In this chapter, I first show that this connection has been strong over the past 100 years and continues to exist to some degree. Next, I show that the same individualistic and communal fantasies persist through Christianity and education. Finally, I look at consequences of the tie between the church and education and the competition between a communal and individual approach to this tie.

I argue that although tensions between individualism and the community causes fewer problems with higher education’s link to religion, competition for social influence among church, business, government, and higher education has been problematic. While rhetoric from earlier in this century granted a great deal of influence to religion and to education, recent educational discourse has diminished their importance. In recent discussions, the church has been given a diminished role in schools, and higher education has been described as a servant of more powerful institutions. An understanding of these arguments is useful in defending the independent role of the academy and in preserving balance among government, business, and religious influence.
LINKING HIGHER EDUCATION WITH THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Many American colleges were founded with ties to the Christian church. Although the relationship between Christianity and higher education has become more ambiguous, many denominational colleges continue to maintain a strong position in higher education. Denominations have given financial support and exercised influence over such schools. In addition, scholars working in a variety of educational institutions allow their religious beliefs to provide a foundation for their teaching and research. I show in this section that Christianity has also played a role in higher education as a foundation for character development and as an integral part of Western culture. At the same time, educators have been cautious about integrating religion and education.

First, observers of higher education have argued that an important part of the collegiate experience is character development, and for many twentieth century Americans, Christianity serves as a model for the ideal character. This idea appeared in rhetoric that preceded World War II. To educators, totalitarians could not rise to power in nations where citizens have learned to live morally. For example, Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle claimed in 1940 that people depend on universities and churches "to maintain that constant flow of education . . . which enables men to choose their lives, find their way of life"
Scholars throughout the twentieth century have also contended that one cannot truly be educated in or understand the Western tradition without awareness of Christianity. After the war, religion continued to be a part of higher education. In 1950, a conference convened to explore the place of religion in America’s public universities. At that conference, Homer Rainey, president of Stephens College, explained, “education which does not take religion into account is deficient and negligent of one of the great areas of human experience and interest. Education and religion are natural allies” (“Religion” 410). Finally, in the 1960’s, Catholic scholar Christopher Dawson wrote The Crisis of Western Education, in which he argued that the Christian tradition should be restored to its central place in Western education. He contends that Christianity gives unity and purpose to the diverse areas of knowledge. “It is the function of higher education,” argues Dawson, to give “the mind a unifying vision of the spiritual sources from which Western civilization flowed. . . it is the common concern of all the universities and colleges which are not under the control of the state” (99).

Higher education's connection to Christianity has also been troubling to many observers. Although the tie between the American college and the Church has been close, many Americans have argued that such a relationship constrains
scholarship. In a 1939 speech arguing that free inquiry is absent in the totalitarian regimes of his day, Hutchins, for example, laments that “the foundation of Columbia University was delayed for fifty years because of arguments about what religious teaching should be permitted in the institution” (“What” 52). In contrast, others are concerned that this relationship has come under scrutiny, and contend that Christianity should be taken more seriously in intellectual communities (Dawson 115).

Like democracy and business, the church has had an ambiguous relationship to higher education. For some, this relationship is characterized by individualistic values. To others, this relationship is characterized by communitarianism. Next, I show that these competing fantasy themes have persisted throughout this century and have resulted in an ambiguous connection between the church and education.

THE JUDEO-CHRISTIAN TRADITION, EDUCATION, AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Individualism has been an important part of religion in college life. Higher education has traditionally been concerned with the morality of its graduates. Often this self-improvement takes on an individualistic tone, and Christianity forms a basis for the improvement of students' character. The need for schools to shape the character of students has been questioned, but many educational spokespersons continue to defend it. According to Bloom,
“Every educational system has a moral goal that it tries to attain and that informs its curriculum. It wants to produce a certain kind of human being” (Bloom, Closing 26). Christianity has been a part of higher education by helping students attain spiritual improvement and become virtuous people.

**Spiritual Improvement**

First, it has been maintained that religious influences in colleges and universities should help students perfect themselves spiritually. According to many educators in the era before World War II, religion had a clear place in higher education. For Dodds, religious education helps students become the best people in society. He argues that religion and arts and sciences “raise the individual above popular commonplaces and stereotyped opinions. The ideal of education is therefore aristocratic rather than leveling” (Dodds, “The Art” 138). One of Bloom’s gravest concerns is that spiritual improvement is not a consideration of undergraduates today. He writes:

> As it now stands, students have powerful images of what a perfect body is and pursue it incessantly. But deprived of literary guidance, they no longer have any image of a perfect soul, and hence do not long to have one. They do not even imagine that there is such a thing. (Closing 67)

Many advocates have also addressed the need for meaning in students' jobs and lives. As schools became attached to government and business in the 1950’s, Dawson argued that scientists were not liberally educated people.
They tend “to become merely an instrument of the industrialist or the bureaucrat, a worker ant in an insect society, and the same is true of the literary specialist, though his social function is less obvious” (Dawson 132). It is further mentioned that rational, technological culture lacks a set of spiritual beliefs that can allow one to make sense of life and find comfort. Christianity offers something technological society desperately needs: “namely, a principle of spiritual co-ordination and a principle of unity - and it is in the field of education that this need and its solution can be brought together” (Dawson 160).

In addition, it has been frequently established that a college degree helps one achieve the good life. And, it has been argued that a graduate can only live well if he/she lives in accordance with God’s will. In a baccalaureate address intended to inspire graduates in 1949, Dodds articulates this perspective:

The good life is not a state of 'frictionless ease' (to borrow a phrase from Sir Oliver Frank) to be arrived at by a comfortable, mechanistic adjustment of our animal natures to our environment such as an oyster enjoys . . . the good life is a constant struggle within himself between good and evil. The good life is attained only as the good prevails over evil in the personal experience of each one. And the source of what good is a Divine Spirit, the Lord God Almighty. We achieve that good as we mold our lives to His will and purpose. (Dodds, “The Cultivation” 556)
Virtue

Allegedly, education also makes individual students more virtuous people, which leads to contentment and happiness. According to an essay published by Hutchins in 1938, “The object of education is the production of virtue; for virtue is that which makes a man good and his work good, too” (“University” 710).

A logical offshoot from the ability to form virtuous individuals is the ability to define virtue in an individual. Christianity in higher education advances a vision of the virtuous individual. There must be agreement on this issue, and by institutionalizing the process of making people virtuous in schools, we sustain and reinforce that agreement. Thus, faculties have been seen as nurturers in the spiritual lives of students. During his presidency at the University of Wisconsin, for example, Glenn Frank gave speeches urging his faculty to infuse their teaching with spirituality. Frank called the faculty at his institution “shepherds of the spirit as well as masters of the mind” (“Welcome” 196). To school teachers in Wisconsin, Frank discussed teaching in spiritual terms: “now and then God lends one of his prophets to the classroom. A man appears to whom teaching is a passion as well as a profession.” Such a teacher “redeems teaching from routine and lifts learning to the level of a creative enterprise” (Frank, “Jesus” 403).
This section has shown that to many supporters of church influence in colleges, any education should develop the character and spirit, and no education is complete that does not consider religion. Although many modern universities limit this influence, it persists as an important concern to many observers of higher education. Religion is presented as a basis for character development in college life. On the other hand, many twentieth century educators have been concerned that colleges no longer put adequate emphasis on religion. In a commencement address in 1952, Clergyman John Heuse explained that although religion is not studied in many schools today, that "does not alter, in one degree, the fact of its importance. All that its absence indicates is that modern higher education frequently is not the fullness of what an education ought to be" (Heuse 573). To others who continue to connect higher education and Christianity, a community-oriented fantasy is also desirable.

RELIGION, EDUCATION, AND THE COMMUNITY

The contribution of higher education to religion and moral values can be seen from a communitarian point of view. According to James Laney, an influential contemporary defender of the integration of faith and higher education, most Americans believe "it is not enough simply to prepare a generation to pursue individual success, but that our colleges and universities have a
commanding duty and obligation to at least address what is a loftier aim of life” (Laney, “Liberal” 74). This goal of religion and higher education to create benevolent students who reach out to others in the community provides a basis for servant-leadership. It also promotes a healthy democracy and a harmonious culture, provides a basis for agreement among the community, and trains students to deal with difficult issues.

The role of higher education is to provide the community with servant leaders. Educators have to encourage others to adopt the role of servant-leader by honoring such behavior. For example, President of Emory, James Laney, remarked to college alumni in 1989 that one’s life should “never be lived merely for one’s self, but also for the good of others. There is a place for service, and service should not be at the bottom of the totem pole of those things that society applauds and honors” (Laney, “Liberal” 79). Advocates of colleges and universities have argued that such leaders base their leadership on values and morality, which is inculcated in them by a college education.

Improved Democracy and Culture

Religion, as it is promoted in colleges, has been mentioned as a vital component in a healthy democracy in a variety of contexts. In 1938, Hutchins explored morality and citizenship in light of the fascist regimes of Europe.
He wrote, “As virtue makes a man good and makes him happy, so also it makes him a good citizen, and this is the aim of
general or liberal education” (“University” 710). Education must preserve consensus on religious values. Others in the pre-war era, such as A.A. Berle, have talked about faith guiding the search for shared morals and the avoidance of sin, and democracy depends on this cohesion. In 1941 Berle further explained that higher education plays a key role in preserving religious beliefs and connecting them to democracy: “universities in the democracy of today have as their fundamental task the choice and the guardianship of eternal and spiritual values. This is their primary reason for existence and their ultimate reason for survival” (Berle 149).

Educational institutions that draw upon Biblical principles are often discussed as essential in improving society as a whole. During the Cold War’s ideological struggle between democracy and communism, Harold Dodds drew parallels between his day and Biblical times: “Jesus lived and taught in a society marred by gross injustices, economic slavery and degradation” (“The Cultivation” 556). Dodds adds that the issues his contemporaries faced could be addressed by religion. Thus, religion is often described as an important factor in promoting harmonious society and curing a variety of social and economic ills. At a convention exploring religion in state universities,
Homer Rainey argued that higher education "can let its students know that it believes that religion is relevant to human life and society and that it is its obligation to study and teach about it just as it does all other areas of human experience" (Rainey, "Religion" 412). In this speech, religion plays a key role in the social improvement that many believe can be brought about by education.

**Unifying Principle**

One vital role religion plays in academia is the basis it can provide for forming world views. The communitarian fantasy of higher education calls for colleges to build and reinforce consensus on values and beliefs on social and transcendent truths. Many Christians have recently argued that religious beliefs can provide a foundation for such agreement. Patrick Ellis, a defender of religious education and president of Catholic University in 1994, contended that a well-defined value system to which the community can generally agree comes out of religious beliefs: "in our Catholic institutions, we are free to complete. We can require theology and philosophy . . . we are free to stand for something . . . we are free to be proud of our faith" (Ellis 629). The role of religion as a unifying principle has existed throughout this century. Before World War II, this unifying principle could be used to make sense of the turmoil in Europe. Dodds urged students to draw from their religious beliefs to understand
things they encounter in the academic world and in life, in
general: "in your plans for a full life, do not overlook
the claims of religion as the explanation of an otherwise
unintelligible world" (Dodds, "The Art" 138). After the
war, religion continued to be seen as a unifying principle.
Robert Wilson, chair of Standard Oil in 1953, argued that
religious beliefs can provide focus for scholarship and
learning. According to him,

It is one of the glories of the Christian college
that, while open to all faiths and tolerant of all
beliefs, it has throughout its history emphasized the
relationship of man to his Maker . . . it is our
colleges which add the vital factors of breadth,
through their emphasis on the liberal arts, and depth,
through their emphasis on religion. (214)

Without this foundation for consensus, the educational
experience is empty and meaningless. During the
contemporary era of politicized universities and
deterioration in consensus, many universities have
questioned the role of religion in their curricula. John
Howard of the Rockford Institute responded to this
condition in 1987, and he contended that life in the
academic community "like the life of the individual . . .
has been trivialized, and impoverished and rendered hollow
and mean-spirited by the rejection of transcendent purpose
and the cancellation of the civilized norms imposed by such
purpose" (Howard 316). According to Howard, this condition
has been caused by a lack of a unifying principle.
Spiritual Community

Consistent with the claims that colleges and universities should be small, free communities providing experience that is valuable for democratic government and for free-market business, some observers of higher education have claimed that colleges should be a community that provides spiritual experiences and allows students to explore religious issues. Expert of medical education, Abraham Flexner, addressed the need for a school to be a spiritual community in 1932. Like Hutchins and other traditionalists who advocated isolation of the academy, Flexner contended that those who work in higher education should possess “a sense of intellectual and artistic value” and the college should “be a paradise for scholars – places where men are free, without constraint, to work out in their own way their spiritual and intellectual salvation” (92).

Religion, when assimilated into the academic community, also is thought to help scholars to make sense of and apply the scientific knowledge that they accumulate in the university. Like others, James Laney, advocate of religious education, contends that all academic disciplines are more relevant when they are guided by religious beliefs. “In many academic disciplines there has been a retreat from the attempt to relate values and wisdom to
what is known and demonstrable," argued James Laney ("Education" 61).

A final way that a college, as a small community that incorporates religion, can provide opportunities to explore spiritual issues is by teaching students how to deal with tensions created by competing institutions. For example, with the growing influence of government and business, students may be faced with contradictory demands from their business and from their church. These issues can be contemplated during the college years. Catholic scholar, Patrick Ellis, tells students that

you can never be overqualified for your family, for your parish life, for civic life. Your job is not your sole measure: that is another kind of secular heresy - that a person's worth is represented by his or her income, neighborhood, and wheels. (630)

In sum, the Christian church has been recognized as a part of higher education. Religion is thought to shape the preparation of individuals to be well-rounded, content people. Religion can also be a cornerstone in promoting a benevolent community. Although these fantasies are less contradictory than the individualistic and communitarian fantasies that characterize higher education's relationship to democracy and business, they do manifest some dialectical tensions. Like other dialectical tensions, balance must be maintained. Even more important, however, is the dialectical tensions among government, business, church, and education. I show in the next section that
there is a delicate relationship among these institutions. While each exerts influence on the others, twentieth century rhetoric reveals that higher education is often seen as a servant of the others.

STRUGGLING FOR INFLUENCE: INTERACTION AMONG INSTITUTIONS

In the previous chapters, I showed that higher education is a socially legitimated institution through its connection to democracy and business. Higher education is also legitimated through its relationship with the Christian church. These connections are less problematic because the Christian concept of individual virtue is based, in part, on service to others. It is more important to note that observers of higher education have placed less importance on education’s bond with both individualistic and communitarian religion. On the other hand, the late twentieth century texts examined in this study show a growing dominance of government and business over higher education.

Whether linked to the individual or community, higher education is often subject to the power of other institutions. This shift has caused concern because it undermines the independence of the academy and because the three social institutions I have identified as legitimating factors for higher education have contradictory interests. In other words, democracy, capitalism, and Christianity all place very different demands on higher education. The
result is an ambiguous role for higher education. In arguing against the changes advocated by progressives in the 1930's, Hutchins asks if colleges must "do what the church, the family, the state, the YMCA and the Boy Scouts allege they are trying to do?" (Hutchins, "Education" 500). First, I show that in legitimating higher education through its contribution to other social institutions, discourse from various constituencies has revealed points of conflict and cooperation among them. Second, I argue that many discourses have subordinated higher education to other institutions. 

Conflict and Cooperation among Education, Religion, Democracy, and Business

The previous chapters demonstrated that democracy and business are thought to exert great influence. The church, however, is often seen as less influential. Among others in the era since World War II, educator Homer Rainey observed the absence of religion in American universities at a conference on religion and higher education in 1950. Rainey argued that colleges have become too secular, and he called for a closer connection: "we need a formula for a satisfactory religious program in our state institutions of higher education. We need to find more effective relationships between the university and the various religious groups" (Rainey, "Religion" 410).

As the Church has become less assimilated into higher education, some have argued that religion stands in direct
competition with other ideas in colleges. In the contemporary era of secular education, Dawson points out that Christianity and education both seek to mold the character of people. This leads to conflict between the two:

the modern movement towards universal education inevitably tends to become the rival or the alternative to the Church, which is also a universal institution and is also concerned directly with the human mind and with the formation of character. (Dawson 102)

As argued above, the interests of different social institutions stand in conflict, and these institutions compete for influence in education. It has been argued that the demands of the free market stand in direct competition with Christian principles, and, as a result, colleges would be called upon to promote very different bodies of knowledge and world-views. Laney, for instance, highlights the tension that is experienced between the church and business:

Education no longer seems to be the institutionalization of what we think is important to society. Instead, what we are emphasizing today, largely by default, is careerism. We seem to be turning out people who are bent upon exploiting careers for their own ends rather than upon service through their professions for the sake of society. And that is exactly what we are bound to do if we do not educate the heart. Without virtue, without the education of the heart, expertise and ambition easily become demonic. (Laney, "Education" 62)

To others, democratic government and religion are not compatible in higher education. In conceiving of higher education as a means of preparing citizens for democracy, a
conflict is created with higher education's bond with the church. A democratic world view, according to Dawson, can stand juxtaposed to a Christian perspective. Dawson is concerned that state education creates a common mind, in which democracy is a substitute religion that replaces the religion of the Church. Catholic education "attempts to create its own community of thought and to separate its adherents from the common mind of the democratic society and from the State school which is the organ of that common mind" (Dawson 107). Therefore, an essential function of colleges and universities is to equip students with a way of living. To some, this life-paradigm should be based on democratic principles. To others, it should be based on Christian principles.

In connecting free enterprise, education, and democracy, it has been argued that education must help graduates to take care of themselves by making a comfortable living. When higher education claims to train students to earn better salaries, it frequently posits that a true democracy provides all citizens with the opportunity to acquire material wealth, which makes higher education a democratic institution. As Christopher Dawson writes,

> any democratic system of education must conform to the economic and practical needs of democratic society rather than to the old ideals of scholarship, and the American form of democratic education is the most universal and the most encompassing that the world has ever seen. (84)
This lack of influence given to religious traditions in educational rhetoric has implications for colleges and universities. Sectarian institutions, in which religion is integrated into educational practices, have grown rapidly. The educational landscape is now composed of different types of institutions that pursue different types of objectives. As a result, religious schools are perceived to emphasize the character of students, often at the expense of intellectual growth. And, secular institutions emphasize intellectual improvement, sometimes to the exclusion of character development. Without consensus on the type of character that is desirable in a graduate, it becomes especially difficult to educate the whole person.

In sum, higher education has been impacted by other social institutions. Perhaps this is inevitable and desirable as colleges and universities must, like their students, be servants to the community. Such influence helps schools to meet the needs of America. However, higher education must maintain its independence in American culture. Like dialectical tensions explored earlier, the tension among institutions for influence in higher education should be maintained. Religion, democracy, and business should each impact schools. Yet none of these should gain disproportionate power and higher education should not become subordinate to them.
The Subordination of Higher Education

There may be a great deal of difficulty that is created when education is expected to reconcile the various demands put upon it by diverse constituencies. Friedland and Alford, scholars who study institutionalized organizations, ask: "Are families, churches, or states to control education?" (256). From this point of view, education is "controlled" by those outside of the academy. Rather than an independent institution that acts out of its own intellectual motives, colleges become servants of multiple constituencies. Friedland and Alford write,

The major institutions of contemporary society are interdependent and yet also contradictory . . . institutional contradictions are the bases of the most important political conflicts in our society; it is through these politics that the institutional structure of society is transformed. (256)

In connecting these institutions one must be cautious that higher education does not become completely subordinate to institutionalized business, government, or religion. This power relationship has appeared in a great deal of twentieth-century rhetoric. Such discourse contributes to the subordination of rhetoric if it convinces the general public that education exists only to provide resources for other organizations. From this point of view, schools would have to be responsive to the requirements and demands of the institutions they serve. For example, the academy could not be critical of business, government, or religion if that criticism undermined
economic prosperity, the established political order, or religious doctrine. In this section, I present texts that subordinate education, and I consider the implications of these relationships.

Although it is often thought that the influence of business is new to colleges, discourse shows that this power relationship has persisted through most of the century. For example, a member of the Detroit business community, Allen Crow, argued in 1944 that because industry employs graduates, “no other group is so dependent upon and so indebted to the prosperity of American industry as are all of those who are engaged in the pursuit of higher education” (Crow 376). In 1954, Robert Wilson of Standard Oil addressed an association of educators and contended that employees should be trained in a way that best suits the needs of business: “Our colleges are supplying business with its trained men and leaders, they are creating the kind of climate and providing the know-how conducive to material advancement” (R. Wilson 215). To many other leaders in business, colleges serve industry by providing a workforce that meets the needs of employers. As a result, businesses would hope to influence the type of education and preparation that is given to students. This further illustrates the power that is acquired by organizations when the public is persuaded that education exists to serve the needs of those organized entities. Businesses,
for example, might require that students focus on acquiring job-related skills and are discouraged from questioning the capitalistic status quo.

Some intellectuals have bemoaned the direct relationship that has been posited between education and the professions. To these critics, education improves the intellect of students, and such improvement may or may not lead to occupational success. In 1947, Hutchins articulated a popular argument among traditionalists: “Those who seek education for financial success are doomed to disappointment.” He adds: “the belief that education can in some way contribute to vocational and social success, has done more than most things to disrupt American education. What education can do, and about all it can do, is to produce a trained mind” (“Where” 593).

One result of this subordination of education is the call for educational institutions to have a form and function that resembles the private corporation. There have been frequent calls for colleges and universities to be organized and function like corporations in the private sector. Today’s conventional wisdom is that such an organization reduces waste and operates more efficiently and effectively accomplishes its goals. To many educators, however, such a structure is problematic. Solomon and Solomon contend that a school is an established community “with deep roots, a long history, a long-term outlook, and
a resistance to short term solutions. Insofar as the modern corporation violates these prudential concerns, it is no model for the university" (32). Finally, a university campus, unlike a business, is characterized by free discussion and expression of a variety of ideas. Solomon and Solomon explain that "According to the management mentality, it is consensus, not debate, that indicates a healthy corporate atmosphere. But the university is all about controversy" (37).

In response to the demand that students are treated like "consumers," some educators suggest that colleges are too responsive to the tastes of their students, and that a desire to increase enrollment numbers has negatively influenced campus life. Such critics have argued that schools have transformed themselves to become more palatable to larger numbers of students, and students who would otherwise be undeserving have enrolled. Traditionalist, Robert Hutchins told business executives in 1947,

> The vocationalism of our schools results, in part, from the difficulty of interesting many boys and girls in what are known as academic subjects, and the whole apparatus of football, fraternities, and fun, is a means by which education is made palatable to those who have no business to be in it. ("Where" 593)

Contemporaries who respond to these worries, such as Robert Spaeth of St. John's University, remind educators that they should maintain authority over students and not indulge the individualism of students. Allegedly, contemporary
education has lost its value because schools have adopted the business model and have been too responsive to students. Spaeth calls educators to be advocates of a communal perspective, "We can do little to influence what sort of students will enroll in our colleges; they will be individualists, and they will expect their individualism to be encouraged by the college they choose. But colleges need not honor that expectation" (Spaeth 24).

Along with the subordination of education to business, higher education has been linked similarly to government by contending that democracy is a way of life. The democratic way of life is supported by the educational system. Education becomes an institution that creates the type of people the government needs to be successful. According to progressive educator, John Dewey, democracy is devoted to education. In his influential book, Democracy and Education, he explains,

The superficial explanation is that a government resting upon popular suffrage cannot be successful unless those who elect and who obey their governors are educated . . . But there is a deeper explanation. A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily and mode of associated living, of cojoint communicated experience. (Democracy 101)

Thus, education is a means of perpetuating a democratic world view and lifestyle.

Those in higher education often express concern that a close connection with government will lead to a loss of independence for schools. In the 1980’s businesses were
especially uneasy about government intervening in their affairs. One such member of the business community was Harold Logan of W.R. Grace Corporation. He warns a college audience that “state financing means State control, and State control in the educational system is inherently out of whack with intellectual freedom” (Logan 287). The interests of the government are thought to limit the freedom of scholars. To educational scholars, the increasingly close and secular relationship between state and university limits academic freedom (Tribe 153).

As shown above, the role of education is often seen as a servant of competing interests. While a connection to highly valued institutions helps the academy maintain its legitimacy, those links cause a great deal of independence to be lost. One consequence of the subordination of education to business and government is the need for many educational institutions to answer directly to other entities. Often state legislatures influence both the financial and programmatic activities of state universities. In addition, teaching and research might be influenced by the need to attract corporate resources. For example, the academic departments and research projects that provide obvious benefits to industry or government are well funded, while other forms of research go largely unsupported.
When subordinated to these diverse institutions, higher education acquires an ambiguous role. Following the observations of Hutchins above, higher education is not valued for its purely intellectual contributions, and Americans from various constituencies have sought to legitimate colleges and universities for their contributions to areas other than the academic. From this perspective, for example, graduates would see their degrees not as an intellectual or academic achievement, but as a useful tool for accomplishing things in business, government, or religion.

This study also suggests that public universities are more controlled by outside institutions than other types of schools. Public universities must answer to taxpayers and legislators. Therefore, advocates who speak on behalf of public education seem to go to much greater lengths to legitimate their schools by claiming that they are meeting the demands of outside constituencies. Schools not driven by enrollment or public funding, on the other hand, seem to be more liberated from the constraints of other institutions.

The vision of college as a means of supporting other individualistic areas of life competes with the true purpose of education. That true purpose, the opportunity to live an intellectual life and serve others, should be seen as an end in itself. “You may never make a nickel
that you would not have made if you had never come here, that your education will not hoist you by so much as a single rung up the social ladder," argues Hutchins. "For many, the day’s work has become only a means of sustaining life, but there is no life unless it is enriched by other activities. Thus, the intellectual life is the aim of higher learning" (Hutchins, "Democracy" 587). This analysis has shown that through their connection with individualism, Americans do not value intellectualism on its own merits. Intellect is only valuable if it serves the pragmatic ends of business and government. To legitimate higher education as independent and not as a servant of other institutions, texts justifying American colleges must present an attractive vision of intellectual life and articulate the importance of intellectualism.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

This chapter presents conclusions that can be drawn from the results discussed previously. In this chapter, I first summarize the method and findings of my dissertation. Next, I consider directions for future inquiry and limitations of this research. Finally, I discuss the implications of my research, arguing that American educational rhetoric has been characterized by a dialectic between individual and communal fantasies. In the latter half of the twentieth century, these fantasies have become unbalanced. Despite its social legitimation, the dominant individualistic fantasy undermines important aspects of the college experience for American students.

SUMMARY

American culture has long accepted a college degree as a mark of distinction or a means to a better life. Despite criticism, colleges and universities have been perceived to be essential to the health of our democracy, our free-market economy, and our religious institutions. This dissertation sought to discover and analyze the different ways that higher education has been institutionalized by American discourse over the past century. I began by inquiring, through two research
questions, how American rhetoric in the twentieth century has legitimated colleges and universities in contrasting ways. I employed Bormann’s fantasy theme analysis, which accounts for the relationship between rhetoric and the institutional environments that shape colleges and universities.

Institutional theorists contend that the social-cultural environments within which organizations exist provide rules and requirements that organizations must conform to if they wish to receive support and legitimacy (Scott and Meyer 123). While the traditional view of organizations focused on the rational pursuit of goals, institutional theory believes that many of the actions of individuals in organizations are driven by beliefs and values that are separate from technical requirements. These beliefs and values are expressed in fantasy themes and rhetorical visions of organizations.

These influential attitudes are shaped, challenged, and reinforced by rhetoric. This dissertation posits that rhetorical visions shared by the public establish the values and beliefs that form institutional environments. Such a shared vision becomes an expression of the social reality of those people who enact organizations.
Therefore, people from both inside and outside universities will base their evaluation of an educational organization on the rhetorical vision that they embrace. My study analyzed collective rhetorical visions to determine how Americans conceive of the value and purpose of higher education, and I have shown that there are conflicting rhetorical visions of higher education. An imbalance between these rhetorical visions has led to a lack of understanding of higher education’s purpose, contradictory ideal-type colleges, and a lack of appreciation for intellectualism.

The remainder of this section summarizes my findings. My first set of observations focused on the relationship that twentieth century discourse has promoted between higher education and democratic government. Throughout this century, higher education has been legitimated as an institution that strengthens democratic government. It has even been argued that democracy cannot exist without higher education. However, this link to government has led to contrasting rhetorical visions of higher education. Bormann provides an ideal theoretical framework for discovering and examining this tension: “symbolic convergence theory provides specifically defined analytic
tools to help sort out the typical complexities of subcultures within subcultures and communities in conflict" ("Symbolic and Culture" 118). Some have seen education as an individualistic venture, while others see it as communal. According to the individualistic fantasy, higher education allows students to become independent citizens who can defend themselves, and college is seen as a right to which all people in a democracy are entitled. The communal vision of higher education encourages servant-leadership, acts as a watchdog in the community, and provides a miniature community that teaches students to interact.

According to Bormann, a rhetorical vision is a description of a rhetor’s social reality ("Fantasy and Vision" 216). Rhetoric in the last half of this century seems to favor constructions of higher learning as a servant to the individual rather than a servant to the community. A manifestation of this imbalanced dialectic is concern that contemporary colleges too often undermine consensus and rarely build agreement on issues and values. For example, Brand Blanshard finds that in American institutions there is "growing skepticism and anarchy about values. If we are to accept as really good that
which each man finds good in his own sight, then
everything is good, which means equally that nothing is”
(45). These competing visions also juxtapose higher
education for training the elite to lead the community
with higher education for equipping every individual to
function. Solomon and Solomon also recognize this tension
in American schools. They contend that Americans are
uneasy with elitism, but they are also uneasy with
“egalitarian mediocrity” (23).

Secondly, higher education has been closely tied to
private enterprise in the twentieth century. This link
has also been developed using both an individualistic and
a communal rhetorical vision of higher education. A
college degree benefits individuals in business by
equipping them with an effective personality for business
and a pragmatic approach to their affairs. The communal
fantasy posits that a strong economy and diligent industry
improve the community and that colleges contribute
resources to these private efforts. According to Bormann,
large communities of people “may participate in a series
of fantasy themes until a fantasy type comes to play an
important part in the development of their culture”
(“Fantasy Theme” 367). Therefore, our culture’s agreement
or disagreement on the purposes of a college education results from shared fantasies. Because there are two widely shared fantasies, opposing ideal-types for colleges can be seen in American rhetoric on higher education.

Finally, higher education has maintained a long-lasting link to religion. The individualistic fantasy describes the college experience as a means to spiritual improvement and the development of virtue. The communal vision believes that religion, integrated with education, can improve democracy and culture, can serve as a unifying principle for communal values, and provides students with a spiritual community. Although tension between individualism and the community causes fewer problems with higher education’s link to religion, competition among church, business, government, and higher education for social influence has been problematic. Organizational scholar, Charles Perrow, suggests that groups gain power when they benefit from an organization’s outputs. Power is “the ability of persons or groups to extract for themselves valued outputs from a system in which other persons or groups either seek the same outputs for themselves or would prefer to expand their effort toward other outputs” (Perrow 259). Because educational rhetoric
does not often promote the use of education to serve religious ends, the power of religion in higher education may be reduced. Also, power struggles among business, government, and education for influence in colleges raise questions about the independence and authority that the academic community has in relation to more influential interests in business and government. Next, I discuss limitations of this research and suggest directions for future study.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE STUDY

Because this study focused on in-depth analyses of texts, it does not claim to represent all twentieth century discourses that link higher education with government, business, and religion. The arguments that are discussed in this dissertation are representative of the trends revealed by a reading of many available materials. However, a mathematical sampling method was not used, and exceptions to these trends are possible.

Also, this study may not satisfy all the demands of fantasy theme analysis. A fantasy theme analysis should examine ways that the public visions identified in this study chain out in particular colleges and universities. A sampling of the conversations and official university
correspondence I have observed, however, reveals that there is tremendous fear among faculty members at a variety of colleges and universities that the business model will continue to gain prominence and the communal vision will be lost permanently. At times administrators have attempting to mix these visions in their rhetoric. To some constituencies, they favor individualism, and they favor community to others. For example, a memo sent by an administrator to faculty and staff at a large southern state university encouraged support for a “vision” of his school’s future which fosters community. At the same time, this institution has recently undergone transition and challenges from state legislators, and administrators have also advanced an efficient and individualistic business model (Fogel 1). These interactions also reveal a recognition among educators that there is a need to restore the communal mission in institutions by molding both the intellect and character of students.

This analysis attempted to document the consistent use of individualistic and communal fantasies to describe higher education. In doing so, it provided only limited consideration of the context of each rhetorical artifact. The twentieth century has provided varied political and
economic circumstances that influenced the texts analyzed. However, it is important to note that the tension between individualistic and communal visions persisted throughout the century, regardless of the context.

In addition, this study is justified by the assumption that rhetorical criticism can be employed to document social trends (Hart 24). However, no methods were employed to examine the response of Americans to the educational rhetoric included in this dissertation. It was deduced that, since rhetoric has been shown to shape organizational environments and legitimate institutions, attitudes toward higher education would be similarly reflected by relevant discourse.

In light of these limitations, it is clear that much research remains to be done in the future. Fantasy theme analysis has proven to be a valuable tool for understanding the development of organizational environments. Those who use institutional theory to explain and understand organizations would be well served by a more rhetorical perspective. Therefore, future studies of institutional environments should use rhetorical criticism and fantasy theme analysis to examine the development of organizations and their legitimacy.
Finally, future research might expand this study to include an examination of texts from other time periods or issues. Rather than focusing exclusively on twentieth century discourse, one might look at themes in educational rhetoric from the eighteenth or nineteenth century in hopes of understanding the origins of our current attitudes toward higher education. One might also consider themes other than the communal and individualistic tensions that were the focus of this analysis. In the next section, I discuss my final conclusions and implications of this dissertation.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Higher learning has enjoyed a great deal of status in American culture. Many young people go to college, accepting that it is the “right thing to do” or the “smart thing to do.” Politicians or businesses often seek to identify with the public by demonstrating their support for a college background. Most organizations would be envious of such legitimacy. However, this legitimacy has come at an expense. I close this dissertation by concluding that an understanding of the need to balance dialectical visions is essential for colleges and a familiarity with effective expressions of a communal
vision of higher education can help advocates to restore balance by promoting an appreciation for this collective perspective.

This study set out to identify the purposes of higher education that were expressed in twentieth century American rhetoric. These purposes were identified and organized into two fantasy types. Through symbolic convergence, members of a community are likely to assemble these fantasies into rhetorical visions (Bormann, "Symbolic and Culture" 103). Symbolic convergence, according to Ernest Bormann, "explains how people come to share enough symbolic ground to achieve coorientation and also explains how individuals come to share a common sentiment or emotional involvement" ("Symbolic and Culture" 103). Because two visions that are clearly defined and widely shared emerged from the texts I analyzed, a dialectical tension was identified. This tension suggests that Americans will approach and conceive of higher education in two very different ways.

Those conceptions of higher education that are embraced by the general public are very significant because they grant legitimacy to colleges and universities. As mentioned in my opening chapter,
legitimacy is “the rhetorically constructed and publicly recognized congruence between the values of a corporation and those of a larger social system within which it operates” (Hearit 2). Further research suggests that higher education is very responsive to the beliefs and traditions of a culture (Davis 488). However, this historical analysis of the legitimation of American higher education and its institutional environments revealed diverse beliefs and values that compete to influence colleges.

Diversity is among American higher education’s greatest strengths, and there are countless institutions with unique missions and approaches to education. Students are able to choose the form of education that best suits them. As shown in this analysis, underlying many of the diverse views of higher education is a dialectic between instruction for the individual and for the community. Maintaining this dialectic maintains institutional diversity.

As a result of diverse visions, there is not a clear consensus on the purpose of higher education. In examining fantasy themes, one must consider the ways that rhetoric deals with “the problem of creating and
celebrating a sense of community," and how the vision helps those who participate in it to live with those who embrace a different vision (Foss 297). In assessing the two visions, it becomes evident that balance and some amount of agreement must be maintained. Derek Bok illustrates: "the bonds of understanding between our universities and the nation have not grown stronger . . . neither educators nor community leaders share a clear, compelling view of what universities can do for the society" ("Social" 109-110).

**Implications for Educational Institutions**

The tension that exists between individualistic views of higher education and communal views of higher education can be connected to conditions that contemporary colleges and universities must deal with. The institutionalized attitudes and beliefs, developed by rhetorical visions of higher education, lead to rules imposed on schools by their environments. Meyer and Rowan expand on this idea:

The creation of institutionalized rules defining and standardizing education creates a system in which schools come to be somewhat at the mercy of the ritual classifications. Failure to incorporate certified personnel or to organize instruction around the topics outlined accreditation rules can bring conflict and illegitimacy. At the same time, the creation of institutionalized rules provides educational organizations with enormous resources. ("The Structure" 85)
Those students, professors, and administrators who are a part of colleges will be influenced by the fantasy themes that provide them with a vision of the ideal college. When members of an organization are attempting to advance conflicting visions for that organization, conflict seems inevitable. There are several ways that unbalanced individualistic and communal fantasy themes might influence or have already caused conflict in higher education.

First, the dominance of the individualistic fantasy in higher education has deteriorated the academic community. My research showed that rhetoric since World War II is replete with the theme that opportunities in higher education should be given to all deserving candidates, and it has often been discussed as a right to which all citizens in a democracy are entitled. In the latter half of the twentieth century, more students believed that their careers would be enhanced by a college degree and took advantage of the expanded access to higher education. As a result, large, bureaucratic institutions have continued to grow to accommodate these students. However, the academic community has broken down in the absence of a communal fantasy to counteract this growth.
Universities have become large and departmentalized, and exaggerated emphasis on individualistic values might diminish the desire of various departments to remain connected to the university community. Many professors, who base their identity and motivation on membership in this academic community, have been threatened by these changes. The dangerous result of an uninspired faculty would likely be a very ineffective university. In addition, students come to campus, assuming that the information they need for their careers will be communicated in the classroom, and they often do not appreciate the value of interacting with others on campus and in the academic community. In sum, the organizational model for the British residential college no longer seems to enjoy strong social legitimation.

The dominance of the individualistic fantasy also might be linked to a lack of consensus in the curriculum. Universities have become politicized, and there is not any clear consensus on what a college education should emphasize. According to those who promote communal fantasies, colleges should build consensus among students on values. From this point of view, educators should encourage students to support and build up the various
social institutions in their culture. At the same time, individualism encourages scholars to be critical of those institutions. From the individualistic point of view, students should be taught to develop their own individual perspective and to question the authority of social structures. Clearly, both functions are central to the educational enterprise. However, the dominance of individualism can be linked to the criticism cited earlier that colleges undermine consensus and do not build anything positive in society. When colleges fail to preserve the ideas and traditions that are valued by a society, it is likely that the schools will experience sharp criticism from their environments. This is because representatives of institutions who fail to justify their decisions encourage distrust because they do not meet the criteria set by the larger culture (Francesconi 58). Like any organization, schools must demonstrate that they meet the requirements and expectations of the general public.

In addition, the close link between higher education and business, when viewed from an individualistic perspective, is related to the criteria used to evaluate educational experiences. Because fantasy themes in the twentieth century have emphasized the role of colleges in
preparing students for employment, an education is often judged on its direct relevance to a specific career. Whenever an organization adapts itself to meet the requirements of outside institutions, those outsiders acquire power (Weick 168). This is the case when business, government, and the church influence the demands that are put on higher education. For instance, when college learning is seen as an individualistic, career-oriented pursuit, resources are allocated to those academic departments that are seen as capable of meeting the demand for relevant job-training. Students often focus only on attaining the degree and neglect the process of becoming educated. Moreover, the research and classes provided by departments that are seen as capable of making contributions to government and business are often very well funded. On the other hand, resources are withheld from disciplines that focus on the intellectual development of students but do not demonstrate a clear link to occupational skills. Finally, the emphasis on career training can encourage students to learn how to do the things necessary in their jobs, but it discourages them from developing critical insights. According to the sample of discourse cited in this study, critical
abilities can help an employee to "live the good life" by understanding his/her environment from an intellectual or spiritual point of view. As discussed previously, the demand to teach practical curricula is related to the growing desire for colleges to assess students' acquisition of career-oriented skills. However, the development of intellectual or critical faculties is not easily quantified, and those abilities often lose their importance because they cannot be measured.

The development of dramatically different types of colleges might also be related to the contrast between the individual and the community. Some schools are constituted to resemble the communal fantasy, while other schools resemble the individualistic fantasy. Meyer and Rowan explain that organizations reflect socially constructed reality, and they are "dramatic enactments" of the values and beliefs pervading modern societies ("Institutionalized" 47). Varied types of institutions result from differing visions of schools. Small, liberal arts colleges have prospered recently. These schools resemble the ideal-type promoted by the communal fantasy. On the other hand, large bureaucratic universities resembling the individualistic fantasy have also grown.
The strengths of large universities - including the resources to attract well-known scholars, the ability to accommodate large numbers of deserving students, and the diversity to offer study in a large array of disciplines - are often the weaknesses of liberal arts colleges. On the other hand, liberal arts colleges often offer the personalized environment and academic community of the British residential model, which can be lacking in state universities. Unfortunately, contrasting fantasies can make it difficult for an institution to combine both of these models. Educators might recognize the value of both ideal-types and discover ways to combine both strengths in one school. For example, some institutions have established smaller, personalized honors colleges within large universities, which might be one way to combine the virtues of both models. Finally, different schools often pursue different goals. While some public institutions constantly struggle to acquire funding from state governments, many private schools are assured of healthy enrollments and budgets. Thus, public schools are sometimes forced to make more sacrifices to maintain legitimacy in the eyes of the much-needed legislators and tax-payers.
Based on my findings, it seems that combining both fantasies to build a consensus or shared vision will come through an attempt to articulate the attractiveness of higher education and its benefits to both individuals and to the community. The university should be described as a unique experience that is unlike any other form of job-related training. In the early part of the twentieth century, while speaking in the state of Florida to raise funds for a university, William Jennings Bryan offers a unique example of this balance:

You take a risk in educating the mind of the young man if you have not taken the trouble to train his heart as well. The sin of our generation is mind worship. A good heart with a good mind will make a good man, but the good mind alone will not be successful and if the heart goes wrong it takes the mind with it. (qtd. in Mills 167)

Bryan articulates a vision that embraces two factors that are both necessary for a student’s success. Colleges and universities must see themselves as institutions that are concerned with the total development of students. Participation in the academic community can encourage the mental and moral growth of students. Too often, colleges help students develop professional skills while downplaying the importance of developing the character. The emphases identified in my study as parts of the
communal fantasy, including spiritual and academic community, the desire to provide society with leadership and resources, and the ability to serve as a productive citizen in a democracy, can provide a foundation for restoring a vision similar to Bryan’s in its ability to accommodate the individual and the community.

It is also essential to show that the student’s growth is consistent with public expectations because general belief systems define how specific types of organizations must conduct themselves (Scott and Meyer 123). In promoting varied fantasies of higher education, advocates have failed to make the communal purposes of higher education appear to meet the needs of the people. As Bok argues, “Today, universities need new ways to serve the public . . . we must associate ourselves prominently once again with efforts to solve problems that really concern the people of this country” (Bok, “Reclaiming” 7). This seems to be the key to maintaining legitimacy without sacrificing the mission of a university. Educational institutions should not attempt to accommodate contradictory visions in response to contradictory demands in their environments. Instead they should maintain a clear purpose and work to convince the public that the
communal aspects of higher education are attractive and valuable and can complement individualistic values in schools. Models for this are provided by the advocates in this study who recognize education as an endeavor to train a student as a total person. These texts emphasize the idea that the best educated and most complete individuals are those who serve others and identify with their communities.

In response, the communal rhetorical visions cited in my study, should be revived and integrated into popular culture. For example, following the lead of Hutchins, advocates might present intellectualism as an end in itself. Rather than a tool that might lead to individual prosperity, intellectual thought should be valued on its own merits. Educators might provide for students examples and arguments that illuminate the value of thought and of participation in an academic community.

Spokespersons might also draw from the examples of influential leaders in the era preceding World War II to encourage students to desire to serve other people. Membership of educated citizens in the community should require servant-leadership. Educators can actively promote higher education’s role in convincing its students
to serve others. In sum, educational advocates should be aware of and attempt to maintain the balance between the individual and the community in higher education.

It seems likely that more favorable attitudes toward participation in academic communities will result from the effort to revive communal fantasies. Not all forms of communities are productive or serve the intellectual ends of a university. In fact, some activities may undermine intellectualism. Yet, many institutions do offer varied activities and opportunities for students to engage in a true academic community. Although these programs are rarely taken seriously or well-attended, new programs may not be necessary. It may simply be renewed attitudes and enthusiasm for membership in the community that will motivate students, faculty, or administrators to engage in productive interaction. This revival of community is possible because, as I discuss in the next section, the extreme individualism of our age has created a need for communal experiences. And, as fewer communities are available, the ability for schools to meet this need becomes increasingly important.
The Disappearing Community

The ability to participate in a vital community has diminished in the twentieth century, and this breakdown in community has led to severe problems. The dialectical tension between the individual and community pervades our culture. Many types of organizations will face these contrasting values. In particular, advocates of higher education should be sensitive and responsive to cultural trends. Colleges need to articulate a communal perspective in an increasingly individualistic society. Thus, schools can demonstrate that they meet a growing need in the public. Examples from many spheres of public discourse reflect concern for a lack of community. Robert A. Nisbet, in his book The Quest for Community, observes that "Despite the influence and power of the contemporary State there is a true sense in which the present age is more individualistic than any other" (Nisbet 9). Likewise, the themes that I have identified as characteristic of the institutional environments surrounding higher education in the twentieth century are very individualistic. Nisbet argues that the release from the contexts of community have not led to freedom and rights but "intolerable aloneness and subjection" (25).
Further, he sees individualism as the defining characteristic of twentieth century thought:

If the Renaissance though it was the myth of the reasonable man which predominated; if in the eighteenth century it was natural man; and, in the nineteenth century, economic or political man, it is by no means unlikely that for our own age it is alienated or maladjusted man who will appear to later historians as the key figure of twentieth-century thought. (Nisbet 10)

This maladjusted individual of the present era, argues Nesbit, is uprooted, without status, struggling for meaning, and searching for fellowship in some kind of moral community (11). This need for community has also affected higher education. My study shows that an individualistic approach to higher education has changed the way that colleges and universities are enacted in their environments. To truly serve contemporary culture, higher education should provide communal experiences that might help students to overcome the lack of status, fellowship, and meaning that characterizes the current age.

The advocates and opponents of higher education cited in this dissertation provide excellent insights into the development of the public attitudes that decide whether resources are provided for or withheld from colleges and universities. In addressing such attitudes, promoters of
higher education should be aware of the need to balance emphasis on individuals and emphasis on the community. A balanced rhetorical vision will see higher education as an enterprise for equipping students for individual success in business, democracy, and religion, but it will also see higher education as an enterprise for equipping students to selflessly serve the community. Unless higher learning can restore communal visions, it is possible that schools will become ineffectual. According to Nisbet, universities that do not maintain their own communal characteristics will make no distinctive contribution to culture:

Deprive these entities of their distinctive functions through increasing nationalization of service and welfare, divest them of the authorities over their members through increasing centralization of political power in society, and these associations, like the extended family, the church, and the local community, must shrink immeasurably in their potential contributions to culture. (Nisbet 269)

Nisbet is suggesting that schools are communal, by nature, but when they lose their communal characteristics, they become ineffectual. This study revealed that despite the prominence of individualism, communal fantasies have persisted throughout the century. The overly individualistic fantasies of the current era will only intensify the need for community. As Nisbet observes,
individualistic culture is unfulfilling and creates a strong desire for identification with others. Those schools that can meet this need and maintain a balance between the fantasies examined in this study will best serve the public in the future. It is not impossible for colleges and universities to achieve this distinctive mission. To do so, educators should continue to promote communal fantasies in public and in their classrooms.
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