THE FRESHMAN YEAR EXPERIENCE, 1962-1990:

An Experiment in Humanistic Higher Education

By

Elsie Watts

A thesis submitted to the Department of History
in conformity with the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
June 1999

Copyright© Elsie Watts, 1999
Abstract

The Freshman Year Experience, an administrative response to student unrest at the University of South Carolina during the late 1960s, demonstrates how campus turbulence affected American higher education after the 1960s. The turbulence brought to the fore a long-standing problem. The research paradigm of the twentieth-century American university focused on augmenting knowledge rather than student development. This research focus prevented the integration of knowledge necessary to achieve a holistic approach to higher education. As administrators coped with the arrival of the post-World War II “baby boom,” which included many nontraditional students and social activists, some renewed the academy’s fitful search for a basis of collegiality compatible with the research paradigm.

University President Thomas F. Jones saw in behavioural psychology a scientific means of developing collegiality to ease the adjustment of underprepared entrants to the requirements of the university. After efforts to control student unrest at USC finally failed in May 1970, he decided to produce “students who would not riot” through an extended orientation seminar utilizing experimental human relations methodology. By not tying USC’s University 101 to a discipline and by requiring faculty members to take training before teaching it, Jones sought to transform USC and, eventually, American higher education.

In 1974, Jones entrusted his humanistic concept to general studies instructor John N. Gardner. Gardner promoted the UN101 concept at USC and, through a widening network of consulting, conferencing, and publications under the name of The Freshman Year Experience, throughout the United States, Canada, parts of Europe, and Australia.
FYE influenced mainly student affairs professionals interested in student development and educational administrators concerned about student retention to humanize the transition of first-year students into university culture. It thus proved a boon to university and college bureaucracies.

Though Gardner introduced academic requirements to UN101 to accommodate the research orientation, most academic specialists resisted FYE’s collegial paradigm. Instead of transforming the academy through reconciling research and collegiality, FYE contributed to its fragmentation by spawning the new academic specialization of the first-year transition. Yet it also interlocked with other agents of humanistic reform, like the American Association of Higher Education and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, to maintain the momentum of its quest for a collegial university in the twenty-first century.
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Chapter 1

Introduction: The Research Ideal and the College Ideal in Conflict

In the nineteenth century, American higher education administrators replaced Christian higher education, which focused on education for life, with an adaptation of the German research ideal of the academic enterprise for the pursuit of new knowledge. Clearly the ideal of education for life, also called the college ideal, survived into the twentieth century. A significant number of undergraduate institutions continued to champion the liberal arts as requisite for becoming "educated" as opposed to being "trained." Some institutions still organized curricula around a religious worldview and never wavered from their underlying emphasis on education as holistic development. Yet by the early twentieth century the research ideal, introduced at the graduate level, came to dominate American higher education. Increasingly, the lower forms of education were driven by the requirements of the higher. As requirements at the undergraduate level affected policy at the high school level, so too did requirements at the graduate level affect the nature of the undergraduate experience. Even institutions which championed education for life acknowledged the demands of the research ideal, through professionalization and specialization.

The transformation of higher education in accordance with the research ideal carried with it tensions concerning education for life. For one, professors no longer needed to focus on students. Professors no longer built lives; they built fields of knowledge. They taught subjects rather than students. Interest in students arose mainly from their potential to advance the professor's field. A high failure rate no longer indicated the failure of institutions or teaching, but of students. Professors boasted about
the number of students lacking promise whom they culled from their courses. Institutions warned incoming students that they probably would not succeed. They expected students to succeed in an academic atmosphere of impersonality. Not all institutions reflected this view, but it became the norm in research-oriented institutions.

The research ideal that came to dominate American higher education also undermined the intellectual coherence of universities. Whatever its individual practitioners believed, the research-oriented institution as a whole accepted as knowledge only empirically determined particulars. This perspective soon rendered irrelevant the modern university's founders' confidence in a Supreme Being, which had given them an organizing principle for knowledge. The research emphasis carved knowledge into multiple, specialized disciplines with little apparent connection with each other. The research ideal's rejection of an overarching organizing principle made education for life problematic. Since the research ideal undermined moral certainty, it could not provide a foundation for the ethical basis of American citizenship. Beginning in the 1950s, court interpretations of the separation of church and state eliminated vestiges of religious practice that had provided public campuses a veneer of coherence and certainty.

The dehumanization of higher education resulting from the dominance of the research ideal became a compelling issue during the student protest movements of the 1960s. Some higher educators began grappling with the possibility of a renewed emphasis on education for life. Their efforts necessitated that they face the lack of integration foundational to a coherent worldview. If higher educators were to create a partnership of the college and research ideals, they would have to do so from the foundation of
uncertainty required by the research ideal. Their efforts, however, remained problematic because the two ideals remained essentially incompatible.

The Freshman Year Experience, developed at the University of South Carolina, exemplified efforts of American higher educators to deal with the tension between the research ideal and the college ideal that became apparent in the 1960s. Thomas Franklin Jones assumed the presidency of South Carolina in 1962. A former MIT engineer, Jones was committed to the research ideal. During his tenure, the university integrated and led in promoting educational opportunity for young South Carolinians. Its student population soared. Free Speech, Black Power, and Students for a Democratic Society arrived. Jones met currents that threatened to undermine the status quo by introducing bureaucratic management of student behaviour and educational innovation. Within the requirements of the research ideal, he increasingly sought to foster student success through a more holistic approach. When USC students angered by discipline proceedings against protesters of the US entry in Cambodia and the subsequent Kent State killings trashed the university's administration building, Jones's preoccupation with humanistic education intensified. With seed money from the Ford Foundation, he funded programs to establish a more personal relationship between institution and students -- that is, a relationship based on mutual recognition of needs.

Most of Jones's programs did not survive the end of his presidency in 1974. One program that did was University 101 (UN101). What Jones had learned from programs which aimed to increase access for students who for socio-economic or racial reasons had not been prepared for higher education fused in his mind in May 1970 with a
determination to engineer students who would not riot. He presided over the development of an extended orientation seminar for freshmen to facilitate bonding between institution and students through bonding between professors and students in small groups. Students would feel that the university responded to them and would become more content. At the same time, through drawing professors from a broad range of disciplines and requiring them to take a training course to teach UN101, Jones intended to establish a holistic attitude throughout the university. UN101 achieved three-credit status and a director before Jones resigned. It survived the subsequent administration’s review of Jones’s innovative programs because it proved that student satisfaction equalled improved retention. Retention thereafter became its institutional justification.

John Napier Gardner was not Jones’s first choice for director of UN101, but he became an important factor in its subsequent success. In addition to his humanistic academic orientation, Gardner possessed administrative ability, political smarts, perseverance, and an entrepreneurial spirit. The UN101 Gardner promoted appealed to educators and administrators seeking to advocate for students and improve retention. It also appealed to student affairs professionals who saw themselves as equal partners with professors in a holistic model of higher education. Gardner invited them to participate in the program. By 1982, interest in UN101 from educators, administrators and student affairs professionals in both the United States and Canada led Gardner to found The Freshman Year Experience (FYE) as an umbrella organization to foster the success of the first year student. FYE subsequently grew into an international movement, sponsoring conferences, operating a research centre, and publishing monographs and a refereed
journal. Gardner came to be regarded as the leading advocate for the first-year student in the United States.\textsuperscript{2} By 1990, most institutions in the United States had established variations of UN101 programs, many using textbooks created by Gardner and his associates.\textsuperscript{3}

Despite FYE's utilitarian emphasis on UN101's positive effect on student retention, Gardner remained loyal to its original holistic vision. The tensions created by the presence of this vision in the University of South Carolina illustrated the inherent tensions between the research ideal and the college ideal. In the first decade of his presidency, Jones aimed to continue USC's postwar World War II transformation from a complacent "party school" into a competitive research university.\textsuperscript{4} Remnants of collegiality still apparent at USC largely were left behind as the university both expanded its student population and aligned itself with the research ideal. Then, as underprepared students on the one hand and protesting students on the other directed Jones's attention to the need for renewed collegiality, he met profound resistance from faculty. His administration evaluated the faculty on the basis of research. If the research ideal ultimately defined the institution, student-centred teaching or even a mentoring function were at best voluntary. Jones and later Gardner acknowledged this when they chose to reintroduce a new college ideal through a course which would reshape the thinking of faculty as well as students as they participated in it. Their legitimization of student affairs participation in the academic process further antagonized faculty concerned about scholarly respectability.

The internal history of FYE also demonstrated difficulties in reconciling the
research and college ideals. Jones created UN101 to strengthen both ideals. He meant UN101 to enforce the values of the academy, through utilization of the human science of experimental psychology. Yet it was easier for FYE to name the objectives of a college ideal - for example, to help the student develop an integrated worldview - than to answer how those objectives might be defined, in the context of the research ideal. The FYE attempt to advocate holistic higher education constantly conflicted with the necessity of conforming to the academy's disciplinary paradigm.

FYE grew into a persistent, powerful agent for humanistic change in American higher education. While it succeeded as an educational movement, it did not achieve a new college ideal. FYE made the academy a more friendly place for many students, but it did not challenge the research ideal. Its humanistic objectives remained of secondary importance to the requirements of scholarly research, and, it served them in purpose and approach. In creating “students who would not riot,” it lessened the possibility that such a challenge would occur. A consensual holistic integration of knowledge on the basis of disciplinary incoherence and even interdisciplinary experimentation which could resolve the tension between the research and college ideals remained elusive.

Achieving collegiality in higher education is a profound problem; it is much more than arranging friendly first weeks and professors knowing students' names. The creators of the research university envisioned it as the institution in which human beings would be most clearly understood and which would facilitate their most complete "actualization." Research universities have dominated American higher education for nearly a century, long enough for their performance in this area to be examined and debated. My
investigation of the origin and development of FYE is one way of exploring the university's struggle to satisfy its educational mission, which, the existence of FYE shows, is not merely outdated rhetoric in speeches and catalogs. The objective is to provide a historical case study to assist in the debate concerning the nature of the American university which has gained momentum since the 1960s.

The tension between the collegial and research ideals furnishes a useful construct for analysis. The concepts of a college and a research ideal are not new; they appear frequently in the historiography of American higher education. This study defines "college ideal" as the expectation that a central, if not most important, purpose of the undergraduate experience is the development of the person. In other words, the undergraduate experience focuses not only upon knowledge but upon what to do with knowledge. Students learn not only facts and procedures but the application of facts and procedures, for their own and the community's advantage. Such an ideal recognizes values as basic curricula. Professors have a moral role that extends beyond the subject to their students as persons. They assist students not only to become competent vocationally but also mature personally as individuals and citizens. Higher education, if it is to promote human understanding and actualization, should include a developmental aspect.

The expectation of the "research ideal," on the other hand, is the development of fields of inquiry. The emphasis of the undergraduate experience is the accumulation of knowledge. Exploration of values is a specialized branch of knowledge -- it resides mainly in the philosophy department, or in the campus religious network, both of which see relatively few students. The research ideal is not driven by the person or the community
but by the requirements of the field. Professors are obligated first to their specialized
academic communities, the source of their legitimation. The demanding nature of a
research career as well as, perhaps, the notion that cultural pluralism requires silencing of
discussions of value, makes a moral role in teaching problematic even for professors who
would contemplate it.

While the ultimate aim of this study is analysis, the evidence for the argument,
mainly from FYE records, USC presidential records, and interviews, is presented in
narrative form. Chapter two explores the campus ferment at USC under President Jones
in the 1960s, when he tried to align the university with the research ideal while coping
with rapid expansion in numbers and constituencies of students. The changing character
of student affairs at USC which accompanied these circumstances is examined in chapter
three. Chapter four focuses on Jones's efforts to serve his constituencies as unrest grew
and, after the unrest could no longer be contained, the process he put in place to
institutionalize a renewed emphasis on collegiality. The result was UN101, the
socialization program that is the subject of chapter five. Chapter six traces the subsequent
rapid development of USC's UN101 into the FYE movement, which suggests that
Jones's vision of a contemporary college ideal resonated with higher educators throughout
North America, and elsewhere. This narrative sets the context, then, for a concluding
assessment of the problem of the tension between the college ideal and the research ideal.
Chapter seven analyzes the progress of UN101 and FYE's struggle to bring American
higher education rhetoric and actual practice concerning the collegial ideal into closer
alignment.
According to historians of American higher education, the gap between rhetoric and practice is largely a twentieth-century phenomenon. Historians also agree that the college ideal dominated American higher education before the twentieth century. According to Laurence Veysey, the basis of the college curriculum was mental and moral discipline for the inculcation of character. The primary consideration in choosing faculty was religious moral character rather than scholarly competence. Julie A. Reuben shows that the emphasis on character was associated with both religious and gentlemanly character models. The character that a college education inculcated was meant to serve a social purpose -- social leadership. The pre-twentieth-century college ideal was inherently concerned not just with the student's intellect, but with the whole person.

Educators addressed their efforts confidently to the whole person because they possessed a unified view of knowledge. George Marsden, whose work in the history of higher education explores the changing relationship between the American academy and Christianity, argues that early educators believed that reason and faith were reconciled in Scottish common-sense philosophy and Baconian science. Reuben, who fills an important historiographical gap by analyzing curriculum in relation to moral education in the academy, demonstrates the importance of integration of knowledge through the moral philosophy course. The course, routinely taught by the college president, made the curriculum applicable to the lives of seniors by arguing an essential unity rooted in revealed truth. Such an essential unity could be taken for granted; it was the dominant religious view of American society. Educators seemingly had the blessing of parents and guardians and, despite rebellions, the cooperation of students, in their perceived
responsibility to emotionally reinforce intellectual integration through residential life. Because of faith in integration, interactions between faculty and students, students and students, and faculty and students and the formal curriculum all could be considered important to the educational experience.

Veysey argues that the new late-nineteenth-century emphasis on science ran away with the academy. The academy specialized and professionalized; by the 1920s, the academy was structured for the pursuit of knowledge rather than for the development of character. Early higher educational reformers Daniel Coit Gilman, of Johns Hopkins University, and Charles William Eliot, of Harvard, did not discuss college teaching or student affairs in their correspondence. According to Frederick Rudolph, “[t]hese were irrelevant to the new orientation, the new university spirit.” Rudolph notes that the university spirit was entrenched enough by the 1890s that the founders of the university "proposed in this institution to make the work of investigation primary, the work of giving instruction secondary."  

Douglas Sloan, exploring the history of the integration of faith and knowledge in the academy in the interest of the possibility of ethical education, notes that by the 1920s college teachers no longer addressed these issues. The academy, having redefined knowledge as a product of the scientific method, no longer thought such questions relevant. Faith-based institutions attempted to keep the possibility of integration alive through critiques of curriculum from theological perspectives, theological reformulations such as those of Reinhold Niebuhr, Richard Niebuhr and Paul Tillich, and campus ministries. Sloan concludes that the redefinition of knowledge by the academy made the
possibility of integration unrealistic -- the education of the whole person continued to be problematic. Sloan's solution is to explore the possibility of re-opening the definition of knowledge.

The bias Rudolph, writing in the 1960s, displays exemplifies the philosophical change from character development to knowledge production. According to Rudolph, concern with the whole person came at the expense of the intellect. Rudolph equates college with developing character and the university with developing intellect and sees the two purposes as antithetical in the university. Roger Geiger also defends the triumph of the research ideal in American higher education both in his arguments and his attitude. He argues that while the twentieth-century university was essentially research-driven, the public perceived it as devoted to the education of undergraduates. The public held a romantic notion of undergraduate life, based on the college ideal. Research universities would have liked to discard their college role but needed the financial support that its romantic image brought in. They introduced the argument that research is necessary to good teaching to ensure funding for research. Throughout his study, Geiger treats teaching as antithetical to scholarship, a task that scholars barely tolerate.

A seemingly innocuous offering to the American public by the former dean of the flagship college and, then, university in the United States, Harvard, demonstrates the continuing dominance of this focus. Henry Rosovsky, in The University: An Owner's Manual, intends to give the public a sense of ownership in universities. It is difficult to see how this is possible since the picture that emerges is of Harvard unabashedly pursuing proven research "stars" at the expense of undergraduates. During his tenure from 1973 to
1984, Rasovsky lured leading academics away from the institutions which gave them their start and gave them latitude to pursue research and off-campus opportunities which often meant that their students seldom saw them.\textsuperscript{21} In \textit{Coming Apart: A Memoir of the Harvard Wars of 1969}, Roger Rosenblatt quotes a prominent alumnus who describes Harvard's climate in the late 1960s as "almost completely unsupportive of undergraduates."\textsuperscript{22}

Charles J. Sykes argues in a work published in the same year as Rosovsky's that critics within the university were silenced by the power of the academic structure that supported the research ideal.\textsuperscript{23} Careers in the twentieth-century academy were subject to academic associations, which did not reward teaching. Although Sykes argues in a sensational tone, his conclusion that research dominates the academy to the detriment of teaching is supported by the historiography of higher education generally.\textsuperscript{24}

Since the emergence of the research ideal, higher educators have been aware of, and concerned about, the effect on the teaching function of the narrow focus of the academy. Educators mourned the loss of integration that made addressing the whole person problematic and made many attempts to find new unifying principles, and educational approaches to implement them. Marsden suggests that liberal Protestant educators changed the basis of integration from traditional Christianity to the moral idealism of national service based on "free" naturalistic scientific investigation. This gave research a moral meaning, but by the 1920s it was clear that this meaning was not sustainable by the very premise of "free" investigation.\textsuperscript{25} According to Veysey, utility evaporated as an ideal, leaving the large institutional structure which functioned as its own end.\textsuperscript{26}
Another potent means of integration appeared to be culture. For a time, while the dominant culture in America was able to keep the lid on the melting pot, many educators thought that instruction in the literature, art, and history of Western civilization could fulfill the function of moral philosophy in the academy. As the twentieth century wore on, it became clear that if there was to be an American canon, it would have to recognize America's diversity. Allan Bloom, lamenting the loss of the hegemonic received heritage, observes that it had been rendered irrelevant by twentieth-century relativism, but Bloom fails to acknowledge that that relativism was a logical conclusion of the Enlightenment reason which formed the foundation of the research ideal.27 Conversely, Laurence Levine celebrates the opening of the canon, and salutes the legitimacy of relativism in the progression of scholarly investigation by not expecting the canon to fulfill an integrative function.28 Diversity, interpreted in the twentieth century as necessarily relativistic, would not provide educators with a generalizable worldview or ethic. The notion of culture was at heart anti-integrative. As the twentieth century ends, Bill Readings argues that the university no longer sees itself as an instrument of culture but as a global corporation, with all the impersonality of a corporate bureaucracy, appropriately assuming as its integrative principle the "fill-in-one's-own-content" slogan of excellence.29

Reuben examines, in historical sequence, attempts by educators essentially committed to the research ideal to combine morality with instruction: laboratory work, science courses, survey courses, research-teachers of approved character, humanities, extracurricular activities, community life in residential programs, and professionalization of student affairs. None succeeded. She concludes that twentieth-century educators came
to rely on extracurricular life to compensate for the academy's inability to find a solution to the tension between the research ideal and the college ideal. This conclusion is supported by Rudolph. Rudolph, while scorning the college ideal as anti-intellectual, recognizes the problem of the diminishment of the whole person. He is satisfied that a desirable element of collegiality came to co-exist with the research mentality of the academy through the student-developed extracurriculum.

The work of other historians raises questions about the ability of extracurriculars to fulfill the function of the college ideal. Students began to develop their own version of campus life, according to Rudolph, in reaction to higher education's narrowing focus favoring the intellectual enterprise. According to Paula Fass, the mature extracurriculum was less a component of academic life than it was a reflection of the larger society. Students of the 1920s, their numbers burgeoning, formed a peer culture based on individual pursuit of pleasure rather than tradition. Veysey characterizes the dominant student culture as mainly homogeneous, white, middle-class, and reflective of the moral, political and social values of the larger nonacademic society, expressed in the common dictum: "Don't let your studies interfere with your education."

For much of the twentieth century, however, this student culture was not authentic in terms of the larger society, partly due to manipulation by university administrators. Marcia Synnott's study of ethnic and racial diversity before 1960 at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton reveals that though academics failed to find an inherent basis for moral education, they attempted to ensure familiar values through admissions policy. The introduction of character as an admissions requirement suggested acknowledgement of the
university's responsibility for education of the whole person. In fact, argues Synnott, the character requirement enabled the university to screen applicants to preserve the white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant peer culture.

Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz examined student culture because she desired to understand why her late-twentieth-century students seemed joylessly enslaved to intellectual development at the expense of more integrated development. She concludes that the culture students created for themselves did serve the college ideal. However, as social position increasingly became linked with academic success, the student extracurriculum that was meant to round individual development lost its attraction. By the 1980s, the research ideal had triumphed over the college ideal in the area of campus life. Students Horowitz interviewed “connected their ability to earn with their college marks....I could sense in them little desire to know or understand, to experience, or to do. Though, with two exceptions, liberal arts majors, they could have been studying arcane or technical fields for all the difference a college education was making in their lives.36

David Levine corroborates Horowitz's conclusion, but from the perspective of the educational administrations as well as that of students.37 Between 1915 and 1940, both administrators and students recognized the growing power of the universities over upward mobility. Administrations emphasized their position by stressing the link between college attendance and future success. Institutions grew as more students bought the message. Competition between institutions for students strengthened this growing culture of aspiration and the pervasiveness of the research ideal. In turn, the trend had the effect of weakening the student culture. Success in life narrowed to success by the standards of the
research ideal placed the value of a socially oriented undergraduate experience in doubt. In addition, competition between institutions placed in question "non-practical," "character-building" programs. Under the competitive culture of aspiration that the institutions fostered, liberal arts programs were more marketable for their prestige value than for their intrinsic worth. In the end, student culture had less to do with character than it did with the culture of aspiration.

The historiography of student culture suggests that Rudolph's faith in the ability of the student-developed extracurriculum to balance the reigning research ideal with a college ideal is questionable. The extracurriculum was not a co-curriculum; its greatest participation occurred in opposition to the university ideal, its values were taken from the larger society rather than from the academic society, it was subject to manipulation by administrations, and it was trivialized by the culture of aspiration. It is not surprising, then, that in 1963, Clark Kerr, president of the largest "knowledge factory" in the United States, voiced again the inherent tension between the college ideal and the research ideal. The historical direction of American universities towards practicality, said Kerr, creates a tension between needing to teach undergraduates and to produce profitable knowledge. Universities, he said, need to pay more attention to undergraduates, find a unifier for the university community, and question the production of knowledge without regard for its consequences.

Kerr described the role of president of the university as a bureaucratic mediator who serves peace and progress - progress first. This is the conclusion to which Veysey, writing two years later, comes. According to Veysey, "bureaucratic
administration...made possible the new epoch of empire-building without recourse to specific shared values....The success of the university...is best explained as the product of a working combination of interests, only one of which [the faculty's] was inescapably linked to values which the university could uniquely promise to realize.\textsuperscript{41} A vague goal of social service justified the compromises the American academy made on its way to domestication by practical interests.\textsuperscript{42}

The preceding scholarship provides an indispensable context for the study of FYE as a fresh attempt to integrate the college and research ideals, but this research does not extend in depth beyond the 1950s. Much remains to do to illuminate the problem beyond World War II. One recent attempt to reconcile the college and research ideals is the professionalization of student affairs. This study, regrettably, does not have the benefit of major historical studies of the development of student affairs on which to draw.\textsuperscript{43} Other areas related to this study of collegiality in the American university in the late twentieth century which deserve historical investigation are renewed debates on improving undergraduate teaching, the role of liberal arts, experimental approaches like general studies,\textsuperscript{44} and outside involvement in encouraging increased collegiality on the part of institutions such as foundations.
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Chapter Two

From Party School to Research University

At the beginning of the 1960s, the research university was well-established as the premier model in American higher education.\(^1\) The leadership of a range of research universities like Harvard and Michigan was undisputed. Not all of the wide range of American institutions calling themselves universities, however, had embraced the full ethos of the research ideal.\(^2\) Many remained essentially teaching institutions, gradually awakening to full participation after World War II.\(^3\) The postwar consolidation of the research ideal across the broad academic community reflected a variety of factors -- Cold War competition, technological momentum, availability of federal government funds, the possibility of profit from new knowledge, and regional development. President Jones's primary task at the University of South Carolina was to turn it into a research institution. Regional development appears to have been the key in the awakening of USC, which began after World War II and matured in the 1960s.

W.J. Cash, in *The Mind of the South* (1941), a work widely endorsed in the white South as an explanation of its psyche, argued that early industrialization in the region did not seriously threaten the socio-economic hierarchy and culture. Solidarity against African Americans and against encroachment on Southern culture created a hegemony which did not tolerate dissent, including dissent against poverty.\(^4\) Before World War II, economic development that enabled the underclasses to get out of debt and raise their standard of living above subsistence levels was never pronounced. Ownership of industries mainly resided outside the region. The South owned its culture, but it did not control its wealth.

White Southern business began to close the gap between ownership of culture and
economic self-determination in the 1940s. Business and political leaders aggressively pursued manufacturing in particular. While much business growth was still of the branch-plant variety, its development meant that many more Southerners joined the urban middle class, with its increased opportunities for realizing their aspirations. More wealth stayed in the South; its circulation generated entrepreneurial opportunity and a more general prosperity. Indeed, South Carolina entered the New South economic competition only when its World War II industries demonstrated the value of a manufacturing tax base.

Southern leaders connected the ability of their states to attract business with the quality of their educational systems, particularly as these systems served state and business development. Realizing that it initially could not offer an educated workforce, South Carolina wooed manufacturers by introducing industry-specific technical training programs. State leaders also began to evaluate their universities from a progressive perspective. Increasingly linked to the prosperity of the state, the University of South Carolina changed dramatically from 1945 to 1965.

Though it was a state university, the tradition of USC was classical. USC was chartered in 1801 as a college for the education of the sons of South Carolina's "aristocracy." Its major sibling as a public institution, Clemson University, was a land-grant institution, associated with scientific and practical programs. For the most part, USC retained its emphasis on traditional arts and science and professional programs, with an easygoing attitude which helped preserve its early reputation as a party school. It was mainly a teaching institution, in which research and publishing were not requisite to successful faculty careers.
Admiral Norman M. Smith's 1945 presidential report revealed the stimulating effects of World War II on USC. The extended scientific instruction required for military purposes during the war had been supported with borrowed facilities and equipment. USC desired to improve its postwar scientific instruction, both to meet the increased and focused educational aspirations of veterans and to support the development of the state. The majority of veterans applied for engineering or business. USC accommodated the increase in engineering with apparatus acquired from surplus government stocks but, lacking faculty and facilities, deflected many of its commerce applicants to other departments. Most of the university's departments did not have enough faculty to serve the veteran demand for graduate education, and the biology and chemistry departments declined "nearly all applicants who wished to take graduate work...because of the lack of laboratory facilities." Smith lamented that efforts to improve graduate offerings were hampered by a "serious overload of undergraduate students." Subsequent presidential reports showed USC beginning to move toward modernization, but the main business of the university remained teaching undergraduates.

In the 1950s, President Donald Russell, determined to modernize the university, completed new science and engineering buildings and strengthened graduate-oriented academic life. The university introduced doctoral programs in biology, chemistry, physics, English, economics, and education. It hired scholars from inside and outside the United States for visiting lectures and professorships and touted the importance of faculty research, especially relating to South Carolina. The School of Business Administration established its long-planned Bureau of Business and Economic Research, "to bring the
School into closer relationship with the economic and business interests of the state." In 1958, the science and engineering departments created an Institute of Science and Technology to encourage fundamental research, improve teaching of science in the university, and serve the state and its industries. President Russell worked to raise salary levels and graduate funding to attract distinguished scholars to USC, and to develop USC as a top-flight research institution.

After the brief presidency of Robert Sumwalt, in which USC began to seek accreditation of all its faculties, USC hired Thomas F. Jones to lead the institution. Jones was hired with an eye to state development. He appealed to the southern progressive leadership as a meld of new and old. Jones was a southerner, born and educated in Mississippi. He had northern experience, having taken his doctorate in electrical engineering at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and served as an MIT faculty member after his wartime service in the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington. When Governor Ernest F. Hollings found Jones, he was head of the prestigious school of engineering of Purdue University in Indiana. Hollings and his colleagues believed they had found a president whose values would be congenial with their own and who would give the university progressive, competitive leadership, in South Carolina's interests.

Jones was a forward-looking administrator who accepted the challenge of making USC competitive, and with it South Carolina part of the New South. Despite its progress toward the research ideal since 1945, USC was not a competitive institution in the South or nationally. Russell had understood the necessity of attracting faculty with advanced degrees from leading national institutions, but he was hampered by lack of appropriate
funding. USC's faculty was largely provincial and professionally comfortable. Research
and publishing had improved, but many faculty enjoyed a lengthy academic career without
either. USC's admissions standards did not attract ambitious students, and, furthermore,
the university had few programs to promote superior academic achievement. The
graduate division had grown significantly, but undergraduate teaching demands limited
what faculty accomplished in graduate instruction and research.

Jones's Mississippi upbringing was as important as his prestigious degree. Rufus
G. Fellers, whose impeccable Carolinian pedigree and Yale doctorate made him a coup
when Russell hired him as dean of engineering in 1955, said that Jones being a "southern
boy" made it "more or less a natural thing." Southern leaders understood the advantages
of economic modernization, but not at the expense of the regional culture.

Jones could not escape public scrutiny, as the state legislators stood literally next
door -- the statehouse adjoined the university. South Carolina was in the Deep South. It
was not integrated. Its political structure, with majority representation from county seats
and unlimited terms of office, ensured that elected officials were culturally conservative
southern Democrats. From Columbia, South Carolinian leaders shrewdly watched
integration battles in other states until they knew they could not hold out longer without
damaging their national economic prospects. Then they proudly executed a peaceful
integration process, though they kept the Confederate flag they had installed over the
capitol in protest of the civil rights movement flying. Any head of a state institution in
South Carolina, especially one directly concerned with educating the state's youth and
training future leaders, had to expect a deep-seated concern on the part of the general
citizenry for the preservation of regional culture.

South Carolinian culture also had a special intimacy about it. Ordinary as well as leading citizens customarily expressed their concerns directly to their officials. During the course of Jones's presidency, South Carolinians apprised him of their views on campus events in a confident tone which suggested a lack of distance between ordinary citizen and official. They wrote Jones for consideration of their children's admission, grades or personal circumstances, and asked him to explain alleged misbehaviours of students and faculty. The public also came into Jones's office through the legislators. South Carolina politics emphasized access, at least for whites. Elected officials and their constituents lived in close proximity; county senators cultivated the appreciation and votes of their constituents by paying attention to their personal milestones and advocating for them in the public arena. Jones regularly received inquiries from legislators in the nature of, "William Smith III is a good boy who is being held back by some standard, and could not something be done for him?" Jones meticulously answered the inquiries, except the ungracious few which merited the "fool's file."

This broad intimacy was possible within USC when Jones came to office because USC comprised a relatively small community with shared values. The 1962-63 undergraduate enrolment on the main campus in Columbia was 6105 and the graduate enrolment 620. Eighty-four percent of all day students were South Carolinians, nine percent from other southern states, seven percent from nonsouthern states, and one percent from other nations. Of the 349 main campus undergraduate faculty, at least 224, or 64 percent, took their first degree and at least 163, or 47 percent, took their last degree
in southern institutions. In addition to Jones, the dean of the university and six of the eight department heads (excluding the graduate and extension deans) earned their first degrees in the South, though only three of these academic administrators earned their last degree there.27 These statistics underlined the cultural homogeneity of USC in 1962.

In this cozy environment, USC still was collegial in character. One way of exploring this collegiality is to look at USC's religious life. Religious pluralism, where recognized, meant relative values, and thus the inability to enforce a community standard. This trend was clearly evident on research campuses by the end of the 1950s, if only in the discontinuance of university chapels.28

In 1962, USC did not hold regular chapels, but it valued and actively cultivated its relationships with organized religion. It sanctioned and cooperated with religious bodies which undertook to provide a spiritual component of the university experience. The participating bodies were Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish. USC's annual reports and catalogues took for granted religious life as a necessary component of higher education. President Smith's postwar annual reports devoted several pages to religious life. "Realizing that Democracy without character is impossible and the foundation of character is religious faith, the administration feels concern for the spiritual life of the students of the University."29 Russell noted that all religious activity was voluntary but "the response of the students to the whole program is most gratifying."30 Sumwalt confined his remarks to academic aspects, leaving the description of religion on campus to the dean of students. Under Jones, the dean continued to comment on religion and the traditional encouragement to students to attend local churches remained in the university
catalogue.

The catalogues referred students to the university chaplain and urged them to participate in the activities of the Young Men’s or Young Women’s Christian Association. Though the Y was Protestant, its branches were accepted by USC as the umbrella campus vehicle for student spiritual development. The Y ran a camp which provided orientation for first-year students, and used campus facilities to provide recreation, discussion, hands-on leadership training, and Bible study. In the early 1960s, it was joined at USC by InterVarsity Christian Fellowship (IVCF), a more conservative counterpart, but the activities of IVCF were never as extensive as those of the Y. USC subsidized the Y; all students paid Y dues as a part of their registration. The Y’s personnel worked closely with university personnel.

The university also cooperated with the denominational student centres which fringed the Columbia campus. Baptists, Methodists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, and Jews maintained student ministries, most with buildings and clergy. President Jones, himself a Presbyterian elder, took part in the hiring of new denominational chaplains. A student affairs administrator met weekly with the Y and denominational staff members. USC's counseling bureau and the campus ministries routinely referred students to one another for counseling and the university was especially appreciative of the assistance the clergy provided in personal crisis situations. It regarded favourably faculty involvement with campus ministries.

The university offered Bible and religion courses as electives for all students, and as professional training for some. In 1962, the Bible and theology department had one
full-time faculty member and offered ten courses, all from a Protestant Christian point of view. The chair, Lauren Brubaker, Jr., also served as the university chaplain and participated in the campus network of nondenominational and denominational ministries.\textsuperscript{37}

Every December, all the religious arms connected with USC and Columbia's churches cooperated to stage a campus Religious Emphasis Week. The university's president legitimized the annual event by helping to plan, promote and host it.\textsuperscript{38} Faculty approved modified class schedules so students could hear visiting speakers and participate in workshops.\textsuperscript{39} Reports in the late 1940s and early 1950s claim Religious Emphasis events were popular with the students.\textsuperscript{40} The involvement of the community and lack of any effective opposition suggest that the religious climate of the campus harmonized with that of the South, which had a reputation for resisting the twentieth-century trend toward secularism elsewhere in the United States.\textsuperscript{41}

The consistent emphasis on character development through involvement with religious activities demonstrates that USC entered the 1960s attempting in some measure to promote holistic education. There were signs, however, that this emphasis was fading in the face of the desire for a research orientation. The descriptions of religious activities in official university publications had shrunk to a formal, basic statement. Another crack in the holistic ideal was the compartmentalization of religious life under student affairs. Although the university remained convinced that education included a spiritual dimension, it had begun a trend toward separating it from academic life. Delegating concern for the student's inner well-being and growth to the emerging student affairs profession made it part of a specialization, and took it out of the implicit job description of professors.
Indeed, the professionalization of student affairs, meant to preserve collegiality in the face of fragmentation, itself contributed to diminished collegiality because total development was less and less a shared responsibility of the whole community.

In this paradox, USC was catching up to American universities that already embraced the research ethos and drew from more heterogeneous and secular populations. USC kept up with the general development of the student affairs profession in structure and application, but its religious orientation helped mask the divisive potential of its increasing preoccupation with competitive research after World War II. A strong concurrent trend was the privatization of character development, which carried the seeds of further fragmentation of the nature of higher education and which, over time, pointed to the secularization of character development. For even as the university charged student affairs professionals with keeping some kind of holism alive, its adoption of the research ethos made such holism problematic. Taking character development out of the job description of the university altogether seemed to solve the problem. In mid-twentieth-century America, the growing role of student services was acute care rather than prevention; that is, assisting with personal crises and rehabilitating character rather than of forming character. Increasingly, even student affairs specialists had remote connection with personal formation.

The research ideal began its disintegration of the college ideal through the separation of responsibility for academic and personal development between faculty and student affairs before Jones arrived. As noted, however, the university's incorporation of religious frameworks masked the disintegration process. In addition, the student affairs
division had not yet professionalized. It took responsibility for character development, acting in loco parentis, and was paternalistic in structure and roles. Called student personnel services, the division consisted of a dean of students, who, in 1962, doubled as an assistant professor in economics, a dean of men, dean of women, and directors of student activities, placement, housing, student health, Russell House (the student centre), and intramural activities.\textsuperscript{44} The university required all undergraduates not living with relatives to live in its dormitories, the men under a graduate student, the women under a housemother. The very term "dormitory" implied rooms under supervision rather than rooms as private residences. In law and practice, supervision was more stringent for female than male students. The institution expected all students to follow a campus conduct code as well as to obey "generally accepted standards of decency and morality."\textsuperscript{45} The dean of men and dean of women dealt with conduct violations, backed up, if need be, by a faculty discipline committee.

Given the classical bent, fledgling research orientation, relatively small size, cultural homogeneity, religious cast, and in loco parentis attitude of USC, the college ideal comprised part of its character in 1962. Jones never was insensitive to the college ideal, but his mandate was to build a competitive research university to serve South Carolina's economic ambitions. In Jones, Hollings and his associates secured a president capable of executing the mandate. Jones was a friendly, effusive man, even flamboyant. People were accustomed to seeing his smiling cherubic face and waving cigar as he was being driven around campus. He kept an open door, though who was listening to whom was often in doubt because he enjoyed holding the floor with his enthusiasms. He combined the
analytical mind of an engineer with a genuine interest in people, one evidence of which was the personal tone of his official correspondence. Jones exhibited immense energy. In addition to interacting freely with campus people, he involved himself with the city of Columbia, the state of South Carolina, the federal government, and numerous state and national educational organizations. He was well-informed and had a taste for innovation, already demonstrated in curriculum revision at MIT and the strengthening of the school of engineering of Purdue. Jones was decisive; he understood the power of the presidency and did not hesitate to use it. When he was convinced that change needed to occur, he was capable of moving the human pieces on the campus chessboard to achieve it.46

Jones inaugurated his presidency with an address to state educators gathered at USC. While speaking within the familiar frame of Southern conservatism, Jones dedicated his administration to the rapid modernization of South Carolina.

Seemingly prosperous states in the Northeast are suffering from...confiscatory taxes, socialism (which causes the taxes), annihilation of the individual, ascension to power of apathetic masses, juvenile delinquency, religious decline, slums, graft, labor-dominated machine politics, and so on.... We have a heritage of individual freedom, of free economy, of states' rights, and of education for all. We have a view of democracy as equality of opportunity rather than one of coercion...to the mediocre.... We have a determination to overcome our adversity, to reverse our status of 100 years of trial and mourning....[T]he time required to achieve a desired end might be several generations or hundreds of years....You don't want to wait that long. I don't want to wait that long....[E]ducators in partnership with the people of the state must launch an all-out and concerted attack on all facets of our problem.47

Jones presented his mandate to the faculty in similar terms. He planned to develop USC into a major research university, in keeping with South Carolina's distinctive character. "Our mission is not the same as that of Harvard," he continued. "Our mission is to serve the higher education needs of our state. Our greatness is, and will be, measured on the
basis of how we achieve our mission."  

Jones confided that his emphasis on the needs of the state was partly a public relations strategy to convince the legislature to fund the university more adequately. "I find a University that is far under-financed for its size and for the job it has to do." Jones knew he had to lighten the faculty's teaching loads and increase their salaries. He also had to stimulate a dramatic rise in externally sponsored research. Having requested and received an accounting of recent grants, he knew that from 1960 to 1962 only thirty-eight or 11 percent of USC's faculty - overwhelmingly from sciences and applied faculties - received independent funding, mainly from government agencies. Jones called for the creation of a faculty committee to assess and plan for improvements in graduate study and research.  

These measures might have been routine for an ambitious new university president of the time. But before Jones could put his mandate into practice, he faced the additional challenge of maintaining the traditional authority of the president over the faculty. USC faculty had been working on a restructuring proposal which included transferring the prerogative to appoint academic committees from the president to the faculty. When they met, in May 1962, to vote on the proposal, a minority voice argued that the incoming president should be consulted. The dominant voices insisted that the reorganization was merely a tidying of procedures, that it had little to do with the president, and that the faculty would not work at cross-purposes with him. With Sumwalt's compliance, the proposal passed.  

Jones waited until his first meeting with faculty to inform them that the trustees did
not approve the move, that they expected the president to have the authority for which he was responsible. He stressed that the issue was important, and that unity between faculty and administration also was important, and he welcomed suggestions for committees so that "you and I can have complete faith in them." So work could begin immediately on his vision for academic upgrading, Jones appointed new ad hoc committees for extension branches and special programs, educational television, expansion of graduate study and research, and outstanding students. After the meeting, he advised Rutledge Osbourne, board chair, that despite some disgruntlement, he was sure he had made the" right move and [was] prepared to stand with it without fear or appreciable concern."52

If Jones disgruntled faculty at their first meeting, he surely began to win them at the next. Jones made it clear that research expectations for faculty would be raised and that research would be financially rewarded. After reiterating the goal of USC's greatness as a university and decrying low salaries, heavy teaching loads and "the opportunity for development of staleness and obsolescence from overload and lack of opportunity for scholarship," he announced the main points of his proposed budget.53 These included relatively competitive salary levels for graduate and research professors and graduate assistants, merit raises, new teaching positions and clerical assistance, guaranteed sabbaticals, and more library staff and acquisitions. Jones encouraged recognition of faculty scholarship through a new faculty newsletter and the creation of a display of faculty publications.54 Jones' budget signaled that USC would attempt to provide faculty with the institutional supports needed to develop competitive scholarly careers.

The institutional drive toward research included increased expectations for
students. The emphasis on scholarship required able and prepared students. In 1961, the state had raised admission standards in its state-supported white institutions.\textsuperscript{55} Jones defended USC’s admission requirement of a grade point average of 2.0 against dismayed parents and students caught in the transition. He also emphasized the importance of maintaining a competitive grade point average. To the dean of students, he protested the practice of nominating students for \textit{Who’s Who in American Colleges and Universities} who had averages of 2.5 or less. "I think we must put the ‘pay-off function’ on scholarship on our campus in every way possible if we are to overcome the stigma that we ‘enjoy’ being a place for boys to play instead of a place for men to work."\textsuperscript{56} At the same time, Jones argued that admissions and registrations policies did not always reflect merit.

"[W]hat I am pleading for,” he stated, “is the use of rules as guides for action rather than as absolutes...Rules are made by men to be lived by men or broken by men, not according to their conveniences, but according to the dictates of their conscience and intelligence.” Students with inadequate academic records should be allowed to prove they could meet the university’s standards. "In meeting the needs of a population,” Jones noted, “this seems to me wise. It seems to me in keeping with the nature of a democracy. Furthermore, it seems to me to be in keeping with the tenets of Christianity which indicate that one should forgive and forget past errors or past sins....[T]he door should never be closed to completion."\textsuperscript{57} Occasionally Jones invited prospective students having difficulties meeting requirements to visit him at USC to discuss their educational possibilities.\textsuperscript{58}

As the university raised its academic expectations, Jones kept in mind what could be done for students who for good reasons did not meet the normal standards. This
interest would become one of the defining features of his presidency. As the creation of
the committee for outstanding students demonstrated, however, Jones's democratic
proclivity did not deter him from seeking to entrench institutional supports for more able
students. While USC faculty had studied enrichment programs before, the increasingly
competitive academic direction of USC made their implementation more probable. 59

Jones understood that if he was going to be able to make USC more competitive
as a research university, the state legislators next door needed to accept the university's
mission. He confided to the president of Purdue that "I was disturbed at first by this
nearness, but now I am looking for ways to capitalize on it." 60 In January 1963, he invited
the legislators to cross the street and see for themselves how the university was carrying
out its responsibilities, which he defined for them as the traditional function of
"transmission of man's inheritance of knowledge to a younger generation, and two new
functions: 1. the sifting, sorting and organizing of new knowledge and the relating of this
knowledge to contemporary problems, and 2. the creation of new knowledge." 61 The
wooing of the legislators was crucial. In 1963, almost the sole support of the university's
ambition rested with them. Historically, Southeastern politicians gave their scholars the
lowest funding in the nation. 62 In a discussion concerning the probability that the federal
government might have to step in to ensure better funding for American higher education,
Jones expressed to the president of Ohio State his pessimism that South Carolina, a poor
state to begin with, would increase the percentage of its tax base it appropriated to the
university. He hoped that USC's focus on state development would increase the state tax
base and therefore the university appropriation. 63
The activity of the academic administrators, while they waited for the legislature's decisions regarding their proposed budget, suggested a new era of academic seriousness. Jones wrote the board chair that he was "convinced that the quality of education available to our young people over the next two decades depends, in large measure, on the funding, planning, and organizing that we accomplish in the next two years. During this period, we should set out standards and patterns for the 'war baby' era." Some initiatives came from Jones, some from deans. In February, William Savage, dean of the school of education, complained that the extension division, recently renamed the School of General Studies and Extension, offered equivalent education courses with non-equivalent faculty. Savage requested that general studies standards be brought in line with those of the university. Savage's preoccupation with academic credibility antagonized many, including Solomon Blatt, speaker and USC's chief advocate in the legislature, but Jones defended him. "[He] is running a good School of Education which he is keeping accredited and which he guards like a mother hen." 

Also in February, the South Carolina Press Association notified Jones that, in response to his interest, they would make renewed efforts to assist the school of journalism. "[T]he press of South Carolina has felt for a number of years," John F. McGee wrote Jones, "that the School of Journalism was not near what it should be and had endeavored to lend it assistance to improve it. For one reason or another, however, no well organized program was developed." In March, to a parent who wrote that his son hoped to study physics but "in all honesty, it is my observation that the image of our South Carolina schools in the fields of scientific study and research is somewhat blurred,"
Jones replied that the university was developing rapidly in technical areas. He was, in fact, searching for a physics head who would be a strong researcher. The College of Engineering was orienting itself nationally by following UCLA, Harvard, California Institute of Technology, Stevens, and Michigan State in the direction of engineering science, which would allow for more research specialization and interdisciplinary cooperation, and the introduction of doctoral programs. And in April, Havilah Babcock, head of the English department, suggested that if Jones planned "to advance the usefulness and prestige of the University by building on a plateau which already has a few peaks observable from a distance," he should know that the English department had published "more books by nationally known publishers than the rest of the University combined," and also two periodicals. "There is a feeling in the faculty that in the past the administration has not been too conscious of, and certainly not too grateful for, publishing. I ardently hope that you will find it possible to utilize this great resource...." 

As Babcock pointed out, in America research output determined scholarly prestige. As in the established research universities, the research ideal now dominated USC's assessment of its faculty. Some winnowing occurred as when, for example, the engineering department asked for and received the resignation of a veteran professor whose business activities had long since overwhelmed his professional interests. Interest and demonstrated ability in scholarly research became the primary criteria for all new faculty appointments. Jones underlined this requirement by hiring a former director of the National Science Foundation to help faculty members generate research proposals and to mediate between them and funding sources. Jones, however, sometimes did not abide
by his own guidelines. He early gained a reputation for hiring people he met in airports, for departments they were not qualified for, because he saw something in them that he wanted for USC. A handwritten letter of May 30, 1963, reads, "You have my envy sitting in the shade sipping mint juleps & smelling the magnolia blossoms. I was overwhelmed at your suggestion that it may be feasible for me to join your staff at USC." A letter of July 20 reads, "We are all looking forward to this move and thank you for the opportunity." Within six months, the department of engineering asked Jones to relieve it of the writer, whose degree in philosophy did not enable him to teach even introductory science.

At the end of his first year in office, Jones told the student newspaper, The Gamecock, that the most significant advances USC had made during the year were accreditation, an emerging plan, and increased standards. He promised that "we will do everything possible to continue the development of this university so that your pride will grow with the years." Jones received, from faculty, letters of appreciation for his academic and personal leadership. But he admitted that his first year had not been a "bed of roses." For one thing, his earlier confidence that he had nipped the power struggle for academic authority with the faculty had been premature. In January Jones and the faculty had agreed that faculty committees could proceed because the president's appointments coincided with the faculty's. Jones reported to the board that "the action I had to take up at the first faculty meeting regarding the faculty committees met with some resistance, but the resistance group has largely disappeared." In April, however, faculty members came back to the board with a statement to the effect that they had joint authority with the president for academic administration. The board continued to insist that the faculty
functioned in an advisory capacity to the president. Finally, in July, Jones recommended that the trustees accept a statement which asserted that they held primary authority, that they delegated the powers of president and faculty, and that the authority of the faculty was coordinate and cooperative with the delegated powers of the president. They did so reluctantly after the chair commented that some educational institutions had been taken over by faculty, and he believed that some at USC would do this. But approval "would help Dr. Jones with the faculty."  

The faculty reorganization did not threaten the consolidation of the research ideal at USC. Indeed, it ensured the triumph of the research ideal because concentration on scholarship served faculty's professional interests. One department dramatically demonstrated the research ideal's overriding importance. USC intended to play a prestigious role in American political science when Russell established its department of international studies in the late 1950s. The department, under Professor Richard Walker, rewarded the university's expectations, by quickly gaining a national reputation for distinguished scholarship.

In its region, however, the department of international studies challenged deeply conservative southern sensibilities. Southern Americanism often meant a deep fear of anti-American forces that misread and quoted out of context academic analyses of controversial ideas. The international studies faculty were seasoned veterans of American international relations who kept themselves on the cutting edge of current issues. In the context of American international relations of the 1960s, one of their principal tasks was the analysis of Soviet Communism. Conservatives followed their work and periodically
 pressured the university to censure them. In 1963, the American Bar Association asked Walker to prepare an extended syllabus on democracy and communism for use in teacher education. A USC trustee launched a campaign to stop its publication not because the guide advocated communism, but because "communism is evil. It has its strengths and its weaknesses; but one of its strengths as this book sadly demonstrates -- is the gradual erosion of American doctrine." According to the trustee, Walker's analysis should not reach youth in the classroom.

As his inaugural speeches indicated, Jones understood the sensibilities of the South Carolinian constituency. He was well aware of the financial necessity of maintaining the constituency's loyalty to USC. When he tried to enlist the support of the board in his campaign against the syllabus, the trustee subtly pressed the point. "I...repeat here the highest compliment that I as a South Carolinian can say of anyone -- 'He is one of us.'" In this test case, however, Jones had the support of most board members in defending scholarly considerations, including national recognition, over regional politics. Board members replied that it was a compliment to be recognized by the American Bar Association, that Walker was considered the outstanding American in his field, and that they would endorse Walker although they might disagree with him.

Walker and the department of international studies, free to develop their scholarship, continued to garner widespread accolades. The commanding officers of the U.S. Army Intelligence School, the Naval War College, and the Air Command and Staff College wrote to express appreciation for Walker's work. So did the dean of Columbus College in Georgia, after a guest lecture by Walker. "One student epitomized the essence
of the value...by saying, 'This is the first time I have ever heard an objective presentation of Communism without a lot of ranting and shouting. I learned a lot.'...[I]f [Dr. Walker] is a harbinger of the other speakers the University of South Carolina is indeed an outstanding institution in this area."90

Conservatives continued to attack the department. Professor William Zartman accepted an invitation to address the integrationist South Carolina Council on Human Relations, which conservatives believed had Communist connections. They drew Jones's attention to a Charleston News and Courier editorial which argued that "[a]cademic freedom can be stretched beyond the limits of public interest."91 To one critic, Jones replied, "I don't read the News and Courier regularly because I find the newspaper so completely reactionary and unprogressing (sic)....Insofar as we know, Professor Zartman did not act outside of his rights....I think the attached editorial from the April 16 Columbia Record expresses some thoughts on the matter that are worthy of consideration."92 Zartman's critic answered, "I find very little of interest on the editorial page of the Record since they have apparently adopted the faculty of the Department of International Studies of the University."93 More controversy ensued when Professor Paul Blackstock published The Strategy of Subversion. Although approved by the Department of Defense and the CIA, and offered by the Book-of-the-Month Club which also donated copies to every university and college library in the United States and Canada, the book worried many in South Carolina.94 Conservatives could influence public attitudes toward the university - approximately half of USC's professors and two-thirds of its students were Barry Goldwater supporters - but the department of international studies was protected by the
quality of its scholarship.95

USC's research direction remained undiminished as Jones began his second year in office. The university administration sought advice on how to secure the research fulcrum. A consultant on graduate education expected that graduate education could "remove the present psychological 'ceiling' on South Carolinians' ambitions, and further provide the brain power for home-based industries of real significance."96 It would take fifteen years for USC to attract and graduate as many Ph.D.s as leading national universities. USC should solicit support from business and industry, and regional private colleges that would benefit from faculty with higher qualifications, and upgrade one basic department at a time, particularly chemistry, physics, English, history, mathematics, and biology. To support the development of graduate studies and research in the sciences, it should utilize Du Pont's immense nuclear plant in Savannah. A consultant for English graduate studies stressed creating a new graduate coordinator position within the department and hiring faculty who could engender distinguished, not just respectable, graduate work, and who would keep a knowledgeable eye on the library to ensure its collections could support it. He suggested that the relatively weak reputation of USC's English graduate studies could be overcome more quickly if the university brought in distinguished scholars for a summer seminar program.97

Other consultants reported that "in...productive scholarship...the USC department of English fails of even average performance for a standard university." They recognized that a "teaching load of [until recently] fifteen hours...inadequate salaries, poor research facilities, too much committee work, and ineffective leadership" limited ability to research,
but observed little "flame in the belly." Their remedies included replacing the department head with a chair with a limited elected term, re-evaluation of tenure and retirement policies, and relating salaries and teaching loads to research productivity. More intellectual stimulus could be introduced through visiting lecturers and professorships and encouraging faculty to participate in national and international professional activities. Going beyond the English department, they urged that upgrading humanistic studies must include upgrading the administration of the library. Finally, outside evaluators of the law school echoed the concerns of the graduate and English consultants. While they commended the quality of the faculty, they recommended improvement in facilities, admission standards, library holdings, faculty size, salaries and teaching loads, and specialization. Clearly, the research ideal was a long-range goal, and Jones would have to determine some priority objectives.

Jones decided to begin with four departments - history, English, chemistry, and physics. He promised the board that "all these departments will be in the next two years or so turning out as many Ph.D.s as the University as a whole has in the past decade." The board received his promise favourably, but introduced a discordant note in terms of academic upgrading into the discussion. Were South Carolinian students failing to gain admission to the university? Jones replied that "they were not being turned down, but preferred not to come under the conditions offered."

It was a clever reply, but the question could not be deflected easily. The university realized that its ambitions regarding the academic quality of its undergraduates would have to be balanced by the relatively unprepared state of the prospect pool. The task was to
maintain university standards while allowing students sufficient room to adjust to them. In 1963, faculty instituted a policy of suspending students with unsatisfactory grade point averages at mid-year, "as a necessary step toward improving the University's scholarship." It had the support of the student council but raised the already high drop-out rate and proved difficult to administer.\textsuperscript{104} Within a year, faculty changed the policy back to a yearly evaluation, to give students more time to acquire academic discipline and to use summer courses to improve their grades. The university carefully emphasized in a press release that this policy was common in American higher education and did not represent a lowering of USC's standards.\textsuperscript{105}

Jones had to pay attention to the issue of underpreparedness because it was a key obstacle to the progressive development of South Carolina. In his leadership of USC, Jones was committed to the industrial development of South Carolina. The State Development Board, and his institutional colleagues, considered Jones "one of South Carolina's best salesmen."\textsuperscript{106} The governor regularly invited him to participate in his annual conference on business, industry, education, agriculture, and the government.\textsuperscript{107} USC's department of business administration and the South Carolina Regional Expansion Council co-hosted the South Carolina World Trade Conference.\textsuperscript{108} As applicants' SAT scores indicated, the underdeveloped state of South Carolina's public education did not supply the competitive undergraduates South Carolina needed to supply its educated workforce. In the interests of the state, it was Jones's peculiar responsibility to make them competitive.

Progressive South Carolinians who looked to the university to improve the
fortunes of the state shared his concern. Businessman B.A. Siddall of the Sumter Machine Company called Jones's attention to the University of Miami's Guided Studies for "salvaging the flunk-out." The program, available only to failing students, combined strict academic supervision and personal counseling. "The counselors are all the kind of people who would oppose that Darwinian - or survival of the fittest - type of education, and all staff members...are people who care what happens to each student."\textsuperscript{109} Skeptical Miami professors called the program "guided muscles," thinking it was for athlete drop-outs, and competed with the program to retain the failure rate. In its first five years of operation, however, the program proved itself by managing to return half its charges to the normal academic track. Jones advised Siddall USC would discuss the program and that he might travel to Miami to see it for himself.\textsuperscript{110}

Moving into his third year in office, Jones did not lose sight of individual students. He continued to take the time to advocate for them, sometimes calling them at home when he knew they were struggling academically.\textsuperscript{111} In one case, he admitted, "I'm afraid we bent over backwards to protect 'academic standards' instead of protecting the individual."\textsuperscript{112} In his thinking about teaching, Jones combined the growing call of the technological economy for flexibility with an interest in individuality. Asked to identify one of the greatest advances in education, he named the "discovery technique." "The result of use of the technique is the generation of new heights of motivation in students, a 'yearning for learning,' education becomes adventure." Preparation for a competitive technological, knowledge economy required "a learning process in which old habits, behaviour patterns, and convictions must be set aside as inappropriate, inefficient, or
useless and new habits, behavior patterns, and convictions must be mastered. How much we have yet to learn about how to teach men to learn!" Jones watched "with hope and interest" an experimental Learning Resources Institute at Florida Atlantic University which adapted instruction to the pace of the student. "I got the impression that they will achieve a new kind of scholarly atmosphere for the undergraduate university. No doubt, it will be controversial for a number of years, but...I wish them every success..."  

A track which underprepared students could use to obtain specialized employment skills and exposure to university standards already existed in USC's division of general studies and extension. Its "catch-all" offerings included law enforcement and secretarial programs, on-the-job training for specific corporations, and correspondence, evening and off-campus versions of regular USC courses. Traditionally, the standards of the division were lower and many faculty questioned its connection with the university. In the fall of 1964, instead of letting the division languish, Jones moved to give it greater academic validity. He proposed that it be renamed School of General Studies and award diplomas legitimated by the signature of the president of the university. He asked that the school be allowed to award diplomas for two-year science and arts programs. His proposals passed and the general studies offerings expanded to include nursing. The school, however, did not attain respectability in terms of the research ideal. Even the housing policy made its status clear. General studies students received accommodation in university residences only if degree students did not fill them.  

In fall 1964, a promising, even exciting, source of tackling the problem of underpreparedness came under discussion in the South. Across the nation, universities
with research aspirations long had been frustrated by a markedly uneven distribution of aggregate American research funding. Most funding went to a small number of long-established research institutions. After World War II, the federal government moved to address regional disparities, and southern universities, slow to join the competition, received some funding but proportionately far below that warranted by their educational population. O.C. Aderhold, president of the University of Georgia, suggested that the funding imbalance might be corrected somewhat by redirecting attention from science to humanities. "Research in humanities does not require the expensive equipment needed to furnish a laboratory. And, in the long view, humanities research may be the most rewarding, for...concern with humanities is the particular province of democracy." 117 Aderhold's suggestion held particular potential for the South in the 1960s. Foundations and the federal government, stimulated by civil rights and poverty activism, desired to invest in research aimed at making equal opportunity more equal in terms of ability to compete. While they could also improve their science funding, southern universities could benefit from the new interest in social research.

Robert C. Edwards, president of Clemson University, testifying before a Senate sub-committee on employment and manpower on behalf of South Carolina's state-supported higher educational institutions, made another proposal which would help redress the research funding imbalance. Edwards argued that the imbalance could be traced to the practice of awarding grants to individual researchers. Universities competed for sponsored researchers, promising them little or no teaching. The faculty they hired to do the teaching saw the prestige of sponsored researchers and sought to join their ranks.
The result was that a limited number of powerful educational institutions garnered a disproportionate percentage of available research funding while other institutions did not receive enough to attract the scholars who could help them achieve the status of a research university.\textsuperscript{118} A further problem with awarding funding to the researcher was that the loyalty of the researcher easily could belong to the sponsoring institution rather than to the university. Not only could the researcher take up a more attractive offer from a rival institution at any time, but the university's ability to determine its own research agenda with some regional sensitivity was limited. Edwards asked that more research and development grants be awarded "on an unrestricted basis to the institutions instead of to individual researchers."

The southern presidents did not succeed in their attempts to align their institutions with the research ideal by reforming the grants system. Indeed, their attempts may have exacerbated their plight as the established institutions formed alliances to lobby as a bloc to maintain their funding levels.\textsuperscript{119} The South's ability to attract sponsored research would depend on their ability to attract sponsored researchers. As its priority of academic achievement indicated, USC would "play the game," though it did seek to maintain some control over its research by informing all faculty that they would have to gain approval from the Office of University Research, for all forms of outside professional contracts and awards.\textsuperscript{120}

Nevertheless, the proposals of Aderhold and Edwards would comprise the funding route for USC's assault on underpreparedness. South Carolina's regional needs made USC a prime candidate for federal and foundation funding intended to address American social
inequities. In Jones's fourth year in office, such programs began to figure strongly in USC's research agenda. Jones created a Bureau of Urban and Regional Affairs, answerable directly to him, "to serve as a clearing house for interdisciplinary research in education and the social sciences."\textsuperscript{121} The bureau utilized the Economic Opportunity Act for graduate research and education to stimulate South Carolina's economic development,\textsuperscript{122} and it asked the federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a graduate educational research training program to assist the state to solve its educational problems.\textsuperscript{123} To do the same for the region, USC helped North Carolinian educators develop a proposal for a educational research laboratory, to be funded by the U.S. Office of Education.\textsuperscript{124}

Regional underdevelopment and public sympathy demanded measures on behalf of underachievers; the research ideal demanded measures on behalf of high achievers. In May 1964, a well-meaning student expressed the tension this created for the university. Carl Hendricks believed that the more average high school graduates of his home city, Beaufort, would not attend USC because USC had gained a reputation for a "business-like atmosphere" and a "tough attitude that only a few can make it."\textsuperscript{125} On the other hand, of the top twenty graduates, only one planned to attend USC. Clemson and The Citadel would claim those not going out of state. According to Hendricks, USC should recruit proven students and institute an honours program. "This would be an inducement for students to come to USC and it would also tend to improve the academic atmosphere on campus."

USC remained committed to the vision of becoming a competitive research
institution. In 1965, faculty were ready to consider a proposal for an honours program within the college of arts and science. At Jones's request, all departments supplied an accounting of their plans for development over the next ten years. The departments aimed mainly to achieve equity with the established research model. H. Willard Davis, dean of arts and science, believed that "the University should set as its first goal that of being a first-rate institution in the usual sense of the term. If we solve some problems along the way, well and good, but we should not lose sight of our main goal." Bruce W. Nelson of geology argued that "there is plenty in our current operation devoted to poor or average quality; there should be a counterbalancing concern for excellence." He continued, "Our academic prestige is related to this problem, and it is our academic prestige that greatly affects the staff we can attract and that we retain. It also affects the caliber of students...that we attract. The caliber of student we attract in turn influences the attraction and retention of staff. So there is no more fundamental concern for a university." Davis argued that, ultimately, a "first-rate University" would best serve the interests of South Carolina. But, he worried, "even if it needs this kind of university, does the State want it? Can the State afford it?"

Jones did his best to ensure that the state both wanted and was willing to pay for USC's educational ambitions. He intended to build a research university. The well-being of the South Carolinian student intruded, however, on this vision. According to Davis, it began to influence Jones's approach to his task in his first year of office. Thinking Jones's stated goal of making USC one of the top ten universities in the country "a little fanciful," Davis asked him after eight months "what he meant by a top university.
He said one which served its students better. That was a different idea from what I thought was a top university. I think he [changed] his aspirations after he came.\textsuperscript{131} Jones's interest in the success of the student formed a discernible sub-theme to his efforts to modernize the university. It appeared that Jones could or would not ignore the human cost of a "sink-or-swim" attitude in South Carolina. The well-being of the student and the well-being of South Carolina increasingly merged in his mind with the research mission of the university. In the context of mid-century South Carolina the research mission included social as well as physical development. In immediate terms, improving the student was improving society. Because Jones approached the problem of development scientifically, the improvement process was itself research.

Jones tried to communicate his developing conception of the research mission when, in 1965, he commented at length on "the policies, the plans and the thinking and activity which are giving the University of South Carolina its optimism and its momentum for reaching the glories of its earlier years and of taking its place among the great universities of the United States.\textsuperscript{132} After discussing conventional aims, Jones devoted the bulk of his address to his understanding of USC's unique educational opportunity.

The function of the University as a source of developed manpower is well known. But less well known is the university as an instrument of progress....It is common for new educational programs to follow the needs of the region which the institution serves, rather than to predict needs and foster plans that will lead the socio economic system and thereby bring about progressive change. As a matter of policy the University of South Carolina is an instrument of progress dedicated to the development of the state of South Carolina.

Jones offered a number of examples of "the university as an instrument of progress" during his administration. USC led urban renewal in Columbia by turning a
ghetto at the edge of campus into athletic facilities and parking lots. It participated in the national movement to train early childhood educators to stimulate the early development of culturally-deprived Americans. Its Bureau of Urban and Regional Affairs "developed research techniques to better understand the nature and problems of the underprivileged with the expectation of evolving feasible techniques for effecting moral and cultural changes which will develop these people into assets to our society." Jones reported that "students in sociology, psychology, economics, political science, and education are now involved in these studies, and the interdisciplinary scope of the progress is expected to extend into other disciplines." "Is it possible to change moral and cultural patterns within a generation?" he asked. "If it is possible we will achieve it, and if it is not possible we will have the best possible start toward solving the problems in two generations - providing we have the resources."

In 1965, USC had an opportunity to relegate its more underprepared students to other institutions. The junior college movement, pioneered in California, was gaining momentum in American higher education as a means of providing upgrading or short career programs to "the masses." Governments did not intend junior college academic standards to match those of universities. Higher educators embraced junior colleges because they made it easier for universities to maintain their research ethos in the face of increasing numbers of ambitious, nontraditional students. The idea of junior institutions which would ease enrolment and academic pressures on universities appealed to many South Carolinian leaders. The state legislature formed a committee to study the possibility.
Initially, South Carolina's university presidents came out in favour of junior colleges for the state. Jones reconsidered, however, and began a campaign to keep the university open to underachievers. To head off the appropriation of USC's regional campuses as junior colleges, which also would constitute the creation of a voting bloc of rival educational institutions, Jones asked USC's admissions committee to raise their admissions standards and improve the transferability of their courses into the main campus, if the student met the required grade point average. He voiced the possibility that the regional campuses might become four-year institutions. Then Jones pleaded that the need for a junior college system was already being "reasonably fulfilled." South Carolina's "greatest concern in education is the training of the school drop-out group," he noted, in other words, basic education, and "this is not a college problem."

California's system was intended to contribute to social stability by functioning as a ethnic melting pot. In South Carolina, Jones argued, relations between the two racial groups were exacerbated by black poverty and illiteracy. He believed that "we in South Carolina must crawl before we can walk. We must try---and study---small-scale socio-cultural experiments before jumping into large ones." Instead of developing junior colleges, the state should develop crash literacy programs, enforce school attendance laws, establish regional trade schools and vocational training, continue technical education and general studies programs, expand and strengthen the regional campuses, accelerate teacher-training at all levels, and strengthen the universities and graduate schools to provide the personnel to implement these measures.

The USC faculty, never comfortable with general studies programs, questioned
Jones' commitment to them. Jones explained that, since two-year programs were inevitable, the university should control them. He assured faculty that "we will...plan for these matters in such a way that our major functions are not impaired...and it is understood that regular University and general studies courses will not be mixed, but that separate courses will obtain for the two-year program." In USC's research ethos, many general studies courses continued to lack credibility and therefore transferability to baccalaureate programs.

Table I: Enrolments, 1945-1970 (from University of South Carolina annual reports)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE</th>
<th>GRADUATE/LAW</th>
<th>GENERAL STUDIES*</th>
<th>REGIONAL CAMPUSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>4490/1564</td>
<td>366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5465/2290</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>5777/2206</td>
<td>564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>6942</td>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>5803/2333</td>
<td>518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>6538/2781</td>
<td>623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>7194/3279</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>8320</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>9130/3354</td>
<td>1201/502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>9503/3173</td>
<td>1403/500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>10345/4131</td>
<td>1619/491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>10901/3652</td>
<td>2006/651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The figure following the undergraduate enrolment is first-year, transfer, and readmit students.
*General studies includes evening, field, and correspondence courses, and diploma and certificate programs, but not summer school. After 1969, the evening school enrolment was not included in the general studies total, and the general studies total no longer appeared in the annual reports.
Jones considered teaching the key to solving the South's educational problems. Other educators shared his perception that the research ideal would not supply the graduates required for the region's development. Members of the Southern Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities that year indicated a desire to study the improvement of college teaching. As usual, Jones sought innovative, dynamic approaches. At a Southern Regional Education Board workshop on teaching with technology, he noted John E. Svey's suggestion that teacher education should be oriented around results of research on the learning process. Svey suggested that experts in social psychology, biology and education should research the learning process as a team and that universities "could consider orienting most appropriate departments in understanding [it]." Jones decided to investigate North Carolina's Learning Institute to study Svey's ideas further.

As Jones concluded his fourth year at USC, the concerted modernization of USC as a research institution was well underway. Reviewing the state of the university's undergraduate programs, Jones set them in the context of the graduate programs. In 1966, the undergraduate programs served as feeders into the graduate programs. Good undergraduate and graduate programs reinforced each other. Jones assessed the undergraduate programs on the basis of academic quality, noting which had improved and which needed further development. One particularly exciting improvement, according to Jones, was the new arts and science honours program, with selective admissions and special classes. In his review, good undergraduate teaching or education for life did not appear to be general priorities. His evaluation of teaching implied undergraduate teaching
took second place to graduate. Because undergraduate enrolments were increasing faster than faculty could be hired, most faculty still taught undergraduates as well as graduates. Yet the university relieved the faculty of this responsibility somewhat by hiring more faculty, using graduate assistants, and increasing class sizes where required.

Jones's review demonstrated that the college ideal had become irrelevant to the university. Jones did not think that the university's emphasis on graduate programs hurt the undergraduates. He did, however, identify impersonality as a problem to be addressed. The miniscule number of students in the honours program, less than one percent of the Columbia student body, enjoyed some personal attention. The professional schools had advising programs and the college of arts and sciences had an office to which undergraduates could take their problems. The dean of students was interested in the non-academic aspects of the problem and Jones hoped that he would get "some things going in that area that will moderate [it]." The dean's attempts to solve the problem of the person in the ethos of the research ideal resulted in the professionalization of student affairs at USC.
According to Laurence Veysey, the American academic model which took shape in the 1890s was established by 1910. "Henceforth initiative had to display itself within the lines laid down by the given system" (Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965], 338-40).

Frederick Rudolph argues that the South in particular failed to develop research institutions. "Only in the desolate, abandoned Southland was there an absence of these dynamic movements. Laid waste by war, impoverished, robbed by death and poverty of the college-going generation, the southern colleges, like the South itself, could but hold on...to the romantic dreams of an old South that never was or hold on until the day when the Union might become one again" (Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History [New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962], 244).


Cash believed that the desire of southern whites to maintain a "solid South" against Yankee encroachment, including efforts to change race relations, united all classes. Eventually any dissatisfaction expressed even from within could be labeled anti-cultural. Asking questions could bring violence or at least social isolation. Bound by their cultural fears, lower-class whites did not rebel against their poverty. They continued to look to their white leadership to provide for them. White southern leaders were able to use the "solid South" paranoia to carry the plantation socioeconomic structure through to the industrialized twentieth-century New South (Ibid., 66-68; 134-36; 168-71; 200-202).
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Chapter 3
Professionalization of Student Relations

The university's answers to the problem of impersonality were bureaucratic and increasingly nonholistic. Laurence Veysey argues that as the research university developed, a uniformity of standard practices replaced unity of purpose. USC attempted to counter impersonality with administrative solutions which served the academic structure. Through the professionalization of its student personnel division, the university compartmentalized its student relations and brought them under bureaucratic regulation. It remained necessary for Jones to seek some foundational means of reintegrating the personal into the university experience.

At the beginning of Jones's presidency, administration, faculty and student personnel made policy concerning students confidently, nominally soliciting student input. As common in American universities, the student government represented students but it normally did not function as an independent voice. The student newspaper, The Gamecock, did not trouble the administration. Students, for the most part, conformed to the policies set for them.

The university's approach to student relations was paternalistic. Jones made clear to the incoming class that they were not achieving independence in coming to USC. "If your parents don't already know it, explain to them that you have not left home but that "home has been extended into the University Campus." The university exercised the role of substitute parent, particularly for first-year students. In loco parentis, it expected to house, feed, and regulate the behaviour of all undergraduates from homes beyond Columbia, through both academic and student personnel policies.
On the academic side, the university defined good behaviour in terms of scholastic achievement. The administration believed it could use class attendance and parking as external controls. All students with less than a B average could not miss more than five classes without an excuse. In September 1962, Jones began to loosen this paternalistic framework. Because hearing excuses took too much of the dean of students' time, Jones proposed that sophomores be released from the policy. "For upperclassmen, they simply must meet the academic standards of the university. After the freshmen are here for a year, they should be treated as adults." The board, which Jones consulted as representatives of parents, agreed, but it opposed any restrictions on student parking for first year students or students with unsatisfactory grade point averages. Faculty, on the other hand, favoured the idea and asked the dean of students to bring them a detailed proposal.

On the non-academic side, the pressing behaviour issues were drinking and profanity at football games and dances. From the university's perspective, these were partly public relations issues, since they brought letters from the community. "It has gotten so I am ashamed to take my girlfriend to a game or a dance," or, "That is, I think, a little raw considering the fact that we have women and children in the stands." Jones replied that while profane cheers were customary at USC, he was discussing the complaints with trustees, faculty and student groups and working on shaping student opinion through newspapers, administration, and campus chaplains. "In the end, our behaviour as a group will be no better than that which student opinion expects of it....[T]his is a very difficult thing to enforce, but I do plan enforcement." The student personnel division, headed by Dean of Students George Tomlin,
enforced the regulations for conduct for the university. In the judgment of a 1962 faculty discipline subcommittee, the authority of the dean of students in loco parentis on campus should be absolute. The subcommittee proposed that the dean of students be given jurisdiction over the university police, so that he could combine discipline with understanding. "[M]any [students] are immature and indeed attend the University in part to develop maturity.... The University's role is not simply to separate the sheep from the goats but to make sheep of as many candidates as possible.... In those instances where a student should be prosecuted for violations of the law, the decision is to be made by University authorities outside of the police department."

Jones moved to reduce the dean of students' power somewhat by suggesting that new non-student personnel administrative positions be created to take over some of his responsibilities concerning admissions and registration and housing. Tomlin reacted negatively. He disagreed that "housing activities at the University are primarily accounting, custodial, and housekeeping functions. Discipline begins in the dormitory." Tomlin would transfer accounting and maintenance duties to the comptroller but he believed that, "to adequately supervise and encourage responsible behaviour," the dean should work with dormitory counselors to "make continuous appraisals of student behaviour."

Jones also exerted his authority over orientation of incoming students. Various forms of orientation existed on campus. The engineering department required its incoming students to take a first-semester, one-credit orientation course, which introduced them to the field and to the university. Students met the president and learned to use the library. The course had been organized by William H. Patterson, former engineering
professor and now second-in-command to Jones, to help incoming students understand if they were suited to engineering. The naval college called in its students early to introduce them to its program.\textsuperscript{11} The YMCA and YWCA (Y) ran a three-day orientation camp before classes started and a first-year guidance program during the semester. USC's orientation, organized by Dean Tomlin, provided academic counseling before registration.\textsuperscript{12} Tomlin planned to bring small groups of students to campus on Wednesdays during the summer.\textsuperscript{13} Jones cooperated with Tomlin's plans until he received a letter from Dean Fellers of engineering, arguing that faculty were not available in the summer and a three-day, focused academic orientation would be more efficient.\textsuperscript{14} Jones quickly replaced Tomlin's plan with that of Fellers. Observing that knowing what to expect academically and socially lessened the apprehension and frustration of incoming students, the Methodist campus ministry encouraged Jones to continue it.\textsuperscript{15}

Jones's beginning changes in student administration were consistent with USC's academic ambition. Rather than encouraging holism, they represented fragmentation. The academic and housekeeping functions were integrated in the position of dean of students because they were considered facets of character formation. Breaking Tomlin's responsibilities into specializations de-emphasized the holistic nature of his mandate and sidelined it. Tomlin pointed this out in his argument regarding housing. The university's pursuit of the research ideal, however, made his position unpopular.

In 1962, however, the students began to assert themselves. Osce Self, student government president, presented Jones a resolution requesting that since "many of the policies placed into effect by the administration have not been explained to the students nor to their elected representatives," the administration immediately begin informing and
conferring with students through their elected representatives. Two policy decisions which upset the students were the extension of metered parking and the stipulation that all male undergraduates not living with approved relatives live in residence. "We feel that even if student suggestions are not incorporated...that the satisfaction of having been heard would lead to a much more favourable climate of cooperation and understanding between students and the administration." In reply, Jones offered explanations if asked for, but not consultation.

In January 1963, seeking to improve student morale and encourage scholastic seriousness, Jones hired fresh student personnel leadership. He had a candidate in mind - Captain Charles H. Witten, commanding officer of the USC NROTC Unit and professor of naval science. Witten, a northerner who had commanded four ships and held a number of staff jobs, expected to take another ship command when he concluded his tour of duty at USC at the end of the 1962-63 academic year. Jones, impressed with the "initiative, industry, and imagination" Witten demonstrated in serving the naval science department and the entire university, offered him a job as his assistant and a faculty appointment in the department of education. After Tomlin returned to the department of economics, Witten accepted the dean of students position.

As Jones reshaped USC's student personnel division, there were signs that the university's direct involvement with religion would diminish. This was not a planned objective; the support for religious involvement still was strong. Yet the direction of American church and state politics and of the research ethos tended more toward separation of religion from official university life. In this climate, Fellers's annual motion to end special considerations for Religious Emphasis Week gained enough support to
engender lively debate among faculty. Jones defended pre-empting regular classes for visiting religious speakers on the grounds that they were scholars, but he created a committee to try to resolve the issue. The campus chaplains petitioned Jones not to make a quick decision. The Presbyterian chaplain, Jerry Hammett, lobbied the Presbyterian faculty, arguing that "an institution of higher learning has failed if it educates a man or woman and at the same time denies him (sic) the opportunity to develop the moral fiber that is necessary to give direction to his new-found knowledge." Fellers protested this action as outside interference. The Jewish chaplain took the opportunity to lobby for more separation between faiths in the offerings for Religious Emphasis Week. Religious Emphasis Week remained essentially unchanged, however, for the time being.

The position of the Y on campus also was deteriorating. The finances of the Y were entwined with those of the university. Y staff members drew their salaries both from the Y and the university; the Y secretary/chaplain, Theodore (Ted) Ledeen, directed the university student centre. The Y staff normally included a woman to serve female students but this position had been vacant since 1959. Both the university's board of women visitors and the YWCA asked Jones to correct the situation, arguing that "there is no provision for personal counseling for [female students] other than that provided by the Dean of Women and the Residence Hostesses." Jones replied that there was no room in the budget to fill the position and placed the problem under the jurisdiction of the incoming dean of students. While the situation implied some disregard of female students, it appeared that the university believed they could be served adequately by the student personnel division.

Cavalier attitudes toward student concerns, however, grew problematic. Jones
and the community could not ignore the growing assertive mood of American university students nationally. Legislator Jerry Hughes, who admitted he had done nothing for USC as its student body president except knock out Clemson's entry in a boxing match, questioned USC's association with the National Student Association. Jones now showed more interest in taking up the student government's initiation of communication between administration and students. After learning from Self that the USC students had withdrawn from NSA in favour of a southern association, he informed Hughes that "the most effective key to these issues is good student leadership. I don't believe NSA will ever get a significant hold on our campus."

After this, Jones explored means of expanding communication with students, including a weekly press conference or "fireside chat" on the campus radio station. The station agreed, but the university's publicity director argued that news spots would be fresher and less demanding than regular programming. Jones tabled the idea and concentrated on the overtures of the student government. That body wanted Tomlin's resignation reconsidered. Expressing appreciation for the student government’s recommendations regarding parking, Jones asked Self to "talk to the committee to whom this matter was referred and determine whether they would be willing to bring in the matter of the restriction of freshmen. I think things would work out much better if this were a student decision...." The students thanked Jones for hearing their appeals regarding dormitory rental fees and consulting with them about plans for Commencement. They ended their term, however, unconvinced that the university valued their insights. "The student body has exhausted every tacit method of implementing [adequate] communication."
Self argued that the university's lack of interest in student input was unwise, particularly as South Carolina neared the end of its ability to deny African Americans access to white institutions. According to Self, the student government was trying to work with rather than against the university: "It is felt that Carolina will need to act as a unit in the face of the coming integration. At this point, the Administration appears to have neither the confidence nor the respect of the Student Body in general." Self's successor, Todd Wilson, took up this theme. "I look forward to working with you so that we may not be looked upon as administration, faculty, and student body, but that we may be one in unity as we seek to serve the best interests of the Carolina Community. Jones assured him that the coming year would "mark a new era in the relations of the students, faculty, and the administration."

Jones understood that "everywhere students are trying to show their disregard for authority in the universities." Yet, when The Gamecock inquired as to the role of the student government and how he planned to implement it, Jones answered only the first question, and in line with academic conventionality: "To work as representatives of students with the faculty and adm (sic) for achievement of a great and effective university."

The student issue that most seemed to concern Jones, other than motivating students academically, was the increasing impersonality of the institution. This problem also troubled his critics. Solomon Blatt, Jones's legislative conscience, continually goaded him to make the university more responsive to students. One frustrated correspondent referred to Jones by Blatt decided to return to college after eighteen years spent raising a family and working as a teacher. The dean of education ignored her for months while she
tried to get an interview with him. The interview came about when she finally dissolved into tears and the "gentleman dean" felt obliged to take care of her. She claimed that women like her faced the same difficulty being taken seriously. Upon investigation, Jones learned that the dean did not believe that his correspondent had a sufficient average in her early college career to meet the academic standards that he claimed for his department. She did not receive satisfaction.

But what Jones's correspondent had to say next interested him more. Her experience made her sensitive to the effect of USC's impersonality on younger students. "[W]ith all the excitement, all the rush, and orientation, long lines, registrations, I.B.M. cards, we dare not lose sight of the fact there stands before us a youth on the threshold of a new experience and wanting 'someone who cares enough.' And if a college representative gives the off-hand impression that 'we don't really care,' then, how can we even hope to have a great university?" Another correspondent, a mother, wrote that "I am sure this is of no interest to the College...as there are many pupils there and no one individual is given special attention." She wished the university to understand her son as a person. Her son held jobs and earned high standing in high school but inebriated the "don't study" atmosphere of the university and failed his first term. He was sorry and would work his way back. "Why am I writing this? Because I know Lee and if someone on the faculty had just walked up and patted him on the back and said son go to work, he would have done just that." Perhaps "just one minute of an instructor's time with a pupil might just might save a pupil. Not many are able to be their own advisors when entering college." Jones admitted that "the modern university has difficulty having the personal touch that we all would like it to have," but he assured her "there are many of us who still
care about what happens to our young people," and that he was doing what he could to put the university on a personal basis.\textsuperscript{40}

In one of his first acts as dean of students, Witten convened the student-faculty committee on campus affairs to discuss commencement and the fall 1963 orientation.\textsuperscript{41} The committee set clear goals for a compulsory three-day orientation for all first-year students.

(1) The development of personal relationships between faculty and new students and ensuring that new students know where they can go for personal and academic assistance. (2) Introduction of new students to academic requirements and regulations and the educational opportunities open to them. (3) Development of an awareness of the history and traditions of the University. (4) Introduction of new students to the social and religious opportunities available to them and ensuring a knowledge of disciplinary regulations. (5) Pre-registration advisement followed by registration.\textsuperscript{42}

As the student government pointed out, the beginning of the 1963–64 academic year required careful planning. A new student group was pushing its way into the university, after being shut out for almost a century.\textsuperscript{43} The prohibition of African-American association with USC was so complete that the university's extension division gave up its thriving military extension programs "after the integration decision of 1954 since we could not control student enrollment on military bases, and there was always a possibility that a non-White might apply."\textsuperscript{44} The extension director advised Jones that he did not object "to the University's giving credit for integrated courses, just as I see no reason for our continued refusal to accept enrollments of negro students in correspondence courses; but there are certainly some people who would oppose this vigorously."\textsuperscript{45}

African Americans began to break out from under the South's social traditions with
the lunch-counter sit-ins in Greensboro, North Carolina, in February 1960.\textsuperscript{46} The civil
rights forces mobilized sufficiently that their movement gained national attention and
momentum. Significantly, college students provided the catalyst for the sit-ins, and their
actions caught the imagination of many of their peers in and beyond the South.\textsuperscript{47} The
arrival of northerners, mostly students, to threaten their culture once again tasted bitter in
many southerners' mouths. The South fought integration, but could not win against
federal powers wielded by the Kennedy administration.

Because education in America represented the foundation of equal opportunity,
universities quickly became a major battlefront. As Jones began his presidency in 1962,
South Carolinians watched African-American challenges for admission to the University of
Mississippi, Jones's alma mater and which his son attended, and their own Clemson.
South Carolina leaders, according to the \textit{The New York Times}, would usher in integration
peacefully for economic reasons, but they knew that a large proportion of their population
would not accept the change gracefully.\textsuperscript{48} Jones's task was to bring USC through the
transition uneventfully without losing the support of the recalcitrant population.

Integration had not reached USC, but Jones knew it was coming and intended to
be prepared. The task called for leadership; his various constituencies held widely
divergent views, and the South had a tradition of expressing itself through violence. To a
correspondent who suggested that USC offer to host the University of Mississippi after it
closed to prevent integration - "South Carolina could do no less for our fellow
Southerners"\textsuperscript{49} - Jones replied that, while it was a "noble thought," it would be improper
for USC to become involved.\textsuperscript{50} Moderate correspondents asked that South Carolina not
be embarrassed by the kind of violence occurring in Mississippi. "[P]erhaps Oxford
[Mississippi] might prove to have been a blessing in disguise. Now [segregationists] should realize the futility of their efforts and refrain from taking actions which will hold U.S.C. up to the ridicule and public disgust that was the fate of Ole Miss." Jones answered frankly that, under political and sociological circumstances, USC could not integrate voluntarily. "You will be interested to know that the local newspapers and the Governor have gone on record favoring quiet compliance with the courts when the order comes."\(^{52}\)

At the end of October, a local African-American parent filed a suit for admission to USC for her daughter, Henri Monteith. Monteith met the university's requirements but, after consultation with Sumwalt, the registrar replied as usual to African-American applicants, "Your application has been received but cannot be favorably considered."\(^{53}\) Solomon Blatt, Jr., received the complaint on behalf of the university on November 12 and assured the state attorney general that "the university officials and our entire Board [will] cooperate in every request you make."\(^{54}\) The campus chaplains offered prayers and assistance in planning for the transition.\(^{55}\)

The Gamecock, which had started the year cautiously, arguing that "regardless of how we feel about it individually...there's no turning back the tide of integration," began to openly support it. One irate student, concerned that The Gamecock was misrepresenting the majority of students and giving a false impression of their support for integration, asked USC to curtail the newspaper's activities. "Any complaint regarding this as interference from freedom of the press would, of course, be an empty complaint due to the fact that historically universities have not been democratic...."\(^{57}\) Jones encouraged the student to turn The Gamecock into an open forum by using its "Letters to
From flyers picked up around campus which connected a photo of Anna Rosenberg talking with African-American soldiers in Germany, with the claim that the result was thousands of "Negro babies which our taxpayers are being asked to support," and a photo of mixed couples kissing, with the caption, "Is this what you want?", Jones knew that segregationists on campus were fighting back with their own press. With the legal challenge in hand, Jones started the planning process for the smooth registration of the African-American students. Determined to avoid violence, he noted that "the climate of public opinion in the state is predominantly for law and order....I had the privilege of spending a full day with state leaders at a hunting lodge in the low country. There was much discussion on this matter, and everyone agrees that South Carolina will face the matter with strength and dignity." Jones followed the handling of integration crises at other southern campuses. When the administration of the University of Mississippi failed to exercise leadership, he noted, the faculty organized nightly campus patrols to talk with students and calm them. Clemson, which kept South Carolina's white higher education institutions informed throughout its legal battle with Harvey Gantt, warned its students that it would not tolerate any action that impinged on its good name. Jones's public relations assistant, David Abeel, learned that Georgia Tech accomplished a peaceful transition by keeping the press from campus and requiring them to get their information from one university representative. Georgia Tech recommended meticulous planning and that students know "what is going to happen and why, what is expected of them, and the penalty for failure to cooperate." In assessing this information, however, Abeel noted that "there are outspoken anti-integration elements in the Student
Body....There are similarly outspoken parents of students who may influence their offspring to undertake physical resistance.\textsuperscript{63} 

As planning continued, the university carried on its business according to traditional interracial relations. The mathematics department asked the state Department of Education to rectify its accidental inclusion of a black teacher in a USC event.\textsuperscript{64} At the request of Governor Donald Russell, Jones investigated a complaint that the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, assigned white students to take their CEEB tests at USC's African-American counterpart, South Carolina State College.\textsuperscript{65} USC withdrew an application for funding from the Housing and Home Finance Agency because "it would probably not be politic at the present time to borrow money from HHFA because of the non-discriminatory provision."\textsuperscript{66} 

The anti-integrationist feeling in the community and on campus came to the fore when the USC chapter of the American Association of University Professors secured Attorney-General Robert Kennedy as their year-end banquet speaker.\textsuperscript{67} The previous year, Olin D. Johnson, who had been governor, almost lost his bid for re-election to the United States Senate because he supported Kennedy.\textsuperscript{68} Columbia's The State newspaper played down Kennedy's April visit but many citizens found it difficult to understand. "Mr. Kennedy is an avowed enemy of the South, he is determined to do away with our way of life, and his very presence in the state will cause useless bitterness and resentment by thousands of honorable South Carolinians."\textsuperscript{69} Radio Station WDIX of Orangeburg editorialized after Kennedy's speech that "[o]nly on the grounds of academic freedom could the University professors have entertained Kennedy. This promotion of integrated schools is not academic freedom. It is academic prostitution. The University of South
Carolina has some explaining to do to the South Carolina General Assembly.\textsuperscript{70}

In July, the court ordered USC to admit Monteith and all other qualified African Americans and refused to hear applications for a stay order.\textsuperscript{71} The board of trustees issued a statement that they were forced to comply with the directive of the court and that they expected "the full cooperation of students, faculty, and administration of the University in its determination to maintain law and order on the campus and in the community."\textsuperscript{72} Jones issued a directive to the registrar and to the dean of the graduate school to "admit students on the basis of qualification and other such regulations of the University as may be applicable at the time without regard of race, color, or creed."\textsuperscript{73} The president of the student body contacted Jones. "If there is anything you should like for Student Government to do in connection with the preparation, please contact me, and we shall begin immediately. We also shall have the Student-Faculty Relations Committee ready to meet at any time...." Jones referred him to Dean Witten, to whom he had delegated student relations.\textsuperscript{74}

USC's integration coincided with the beginning of the integration of the city of Columbia.\textsuperscript{75} As he planned for the September registration of Monteith, Jones participated in city planning through a city council sub-committee of fifty responsible white citizens, put together by Mayor Lester Bates to advise on racial issues. The committee proposed the end of discrimination in hiring and signs and salutations indicating racial ranking, and tried to convince community organizations and owners of accommodations and eating places to desegregate.\textsuperscript{76} The committee stressed the rule of law and that Columbia could be proud of meeting African-American demands with civility. Nevertheless, most Columbia businessmen did not want to be seen as too compliant, and even Bates
suggested that hotels and theatres should wait until a month after demonstrations ceased to desegregate "so as not to give credit to the present demonstrators."  

In August 1963, Jones informed USC's board that the registration plans were ready. The plan called for limited press coverage and comprehensive security under State Law Enforcement Division (SLED) chief Pete Strom. All members of the campus community would be briefed and given identity cards. The dean of students would use a letter, orientation and the student government to persuade students to "refrain from any activity that might be construed as contributing to a disturbance, and go about the business of obtaining an education." Jones issued a statement that the trustees and administration were "determined that the admission of Negro students will [not] impede our present progress...." He then offended the conservative population by declaring, "We will obey the letter and respect the spirit of the court order." Faculty took exception to the sentence: "The university faculty, students and administrative staff have been given to understand that their continued presence here implies compliance with the altered circumstances." Jones apologized to the faculty for his heavyhandedness, explaining that he was "balanced on a tightrope," harassed by the press and the usual demands of the beginning of an academic year, and therefore liable to make errors.  

The university's careful planning resulted in an uneventful registration, however. One of the reasons the registration of USC's African-American students proceeded smoothly was Witten's leadership. Witten tackled his new position with the dedication he had applied to his naval career. He approached student personnel as a professional field, participating in its associations and keeping abreast of its development. He was a first-rate administrator. Demonstrating commitment to both students and university, Witten
commanded respect and inspired cooperation. He initiated working relationships with student representatives, while keeping the institution as a whole in mind. He saw his mandate in terms of educating "the whole citizen - - mental, physical, moral, social, etc." Rather than being rigidly authoritarian, Witten seemed fitted to foster a holistic unity on campus.

The role of the dean of students, however, was narrowing. The university now construed it to be mainly administrative. The "pastoral" aspect -- the personal counseling -- would be accorded to trained psychologists. Jones recommended that the university establish a centralized counseling clinic "whereby all students with personal and vocational problems can obtain complete guidance in adjusting to college life or in solving personal problems.\textsuperscript{84} Though Jones promoted it in terms of enhanced academic success for students and improved retention for the university, the clinic also constituted another double-edged development for holistic education - serving the whole student, but in fragments.

Witten worked with Todd Wilson throughout the summer to prepare for orientation and registration. He and Wilson discussed Wilson's prerogative as student body president to nominate the members of the student-faculty relations committee. They decided that Wilson should make recommendations to Jones, who would do the actual appointing. This was framed as a courtesy, but it fit an emerging pattern of tightening policies and procedures in favour of the authority of the university.\textsuperscript{85}

The university scrutinized the management of its student publications. Jones believed that "the greatest problem" of the student press was "assuring 'responsible journalism.'\textsuperscript{86} In November 1963, Jones used a dispute between the campus literary
societies and the student government over control of The Gamecock to organize a committee of South Carolina communications executives to evaluate USC's student publications and radio. Before the committee, which the student government regarded as its ally, the student senate argued that it should control all student communications because it allocated the funds for them. The senate, being generally elected, was more representative of the student body. Because the literary societies failed to keep The Gamecock in check, the senate wanted to take it over, "more or less to see that it operates in good taste." The Clariosophics Society argued that they founded The Gamecock in 1906, and placed it under a student board of publications. They agreed with Jones that "every phase of campus activity, academic or otherwise, is subject to periodical review to assure it fulfills its purpose for the best interest of the university." With the addition of student government and faculty representatives, their board should continue to control The Gamecock. The societies made no claim to be representative of the student body. They were interested in writing and any student could join. They were not interested in censoring the paper. Indeed, they owned the paper legally and historically.

One student appointed to a proposed board of publications as representative of "the masses," commented that The Gamecock's editorials seemed to be "running wild." But many students believed the paper should "pioneer in the field of journalism." Gamecock editor Dick Bledsoe reminded the inquiry that "The Gamecock does not always comment in a way favorable to the Senate. It evaluates the news." When the Clariosophic Society challenged Wilson's contention that, under the control of the student government, The Gamecock could present "anything of vital interest to the students," he amended the assertion to "anything of vital interest that needs to be presented to the
student body, upon the approval of the Administration."

Broadening its inquiry, the committee questioned the radio station manager concerning the controls under which he operated. The manager, who opposed blanket control of campus communications under the student senate's proposed board of publications, argued that responsibility under libel laws, student opinion, and the fact that the student government and Witten could cut off their funding were sufficient regulation. Like the paper, the radio station was established by students with their own funds. Hence, the senate takeover would nullify their constitution.

Closing the inquiry, Jones promised that changes would occur. He declared that "the problem was to set up a long-term program that will function." The committee would continue to deliberate and, he assured the students, he would not attend. He did, however, monitor the process of tightening the regulation of student media through his public relations assistant, Ashley Halsey, Jr. In December, Halsey worried that the next year's Gamecock editor would be appointed before the inquiry committee made its report. He expected that the report would give the university "sound basis for future publications management," but in the meantime gave Jones an assessment of the reliability of each of the likely candidates for the editorship and reported that the new literary magazine of the English department, The Crucible, did not contain anything "explosive."

Committee member H. Moody McElveen, general manager of WNOK Radio-TV in Columbia, warned that awarding student media to the student government would put them under political control. He favoured a communications board of seven members, respectively named by the literary societies, student senate, students heading the three campus publications and the radio station, student body, president of the university, the
faculty representative who served as chair of the board, and the dean of the School of Journalism. The board would answer to the student government and the university administration, and, in the event of a serious disagreement, submit to arbitration by a group of outside experts selected by the board of trustees. The committee report, however, decisively tipped the balance of control in favour of the university. It recommended creation of a board of student publications and communications consisting of three faculty representatives appointed by the president of the university, and four student representatives - two appointed by the president of the student body, one by the literary societies, and one by the heads of the student media. The new board would have complete authority over making and enforcing policy. The university believed it gave students adequate representation.

The present committee report...would provide a long-range permanent plan for stabilizing student publications....While we do not believe that the plan is 100% perfect, we do feel it promises to give the University, for the first time in my 38 years in contact with it, an equitable and workable system of student publications control with the students exercising a full share of participation.

Jones asked Witten and his staff to avoid discussing the proposal without his or Halsey's permission while they moved to put the new communications policy in place. Jones assumed that the students accepted the policy, because no one complained to him after it was announced.

The policy created a new board of student publications and communications as recommended by the communications committee. The policy set the board under the dean of students, as a student activity. Jones appointed one of the faculty members to the chair and asked the board to institute media staff qualifications, such as experience, demonstrated competence, and acceptable academic standing. In setting out the policy for
the new board, Jones emphasized its accountability. "All publications and communications media originating from the campus contributes to the public image of the University and thus are the proper concern of the administration and the Board of Trustees." On the other hand, "[s]upervision and control of student media by the administration should be held to a minimum, provided an adequate and constant degree of responsibility is manifested by students who hold positions of authority over such media."

Some persons on campus noticed administrative tightening of student regulations, but did not officially raise the issue. In December, activities of the Young Democrats raised another threat to the "best interests of the university." Two first-year students, one of whom the dean of men, at Jones's request, counseled at the beginning of semester to stop participating in civil rights demonstrations, inspired the Young Democrats to pass a resolution calling for the end to the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Charleston News and Courier called for a university investigation. USC advised them that "those who voted for the extremely left-wing measures in question represented something like .003 per cent of the student body." Witten and Halsey talked with Wilson. The student senate passed a resolution that "recognize[d] the right of this group to issue such a statement, but [stood] in direct opposition to this position." The university released it to the press. Halsey advised Jones that the chair of the campus AAUP politely asked Witten "about rumours that Witten was repressing the Young Democrats....He was apologetic in his approach and accepted Witten's statement that he had taken no such action."

In the spring of 1964, while the administration had its ear to the ground and moved to protect itself through bureaucratic management, the general campus mood seemed relatively quiet. The faculty's discipline committee still dealt largely with false attendance
excuses.\textsuperscript{102} Orangeburg's WDIX disapproved of a \textit{Gamecock} editorial noting the national relaxation of standards of sexual morality on college campuses, but Jones was able to point out that the USC editorial did not endorse this trend.\textsuperscript{103} Behind the scenes, Blatt renewed his complaints that students did not receive personal attention.\textsuperscript{104} Jones proposed that the legislature fund his year-old proposal for a student counseling service, for both vocational and personal counseling.\textsuperscript{105} This was not what Blatt had in mind - he simply requested that faculty take time to answer student questions out of class. Jones's reply indicated a desire to approach student needs professionally through programs, techniques, and, in the climate of the research university, empirical investigation.

The university continued its religious connections. Rufus Fellers again moved to end academic considerations for Religious Emphasis Week, and faculty again sent the matter to committee.\textsuperscript{106} The Y's place on campus seemed assured, as Jones and Witten remained ex officio members of its largely faculty board.\textsuperscript{107} The Y did much of the planning for Religious Emphasis Week, which, in 1964, dealt with the size and impersonality of the university.\textsuperscript{108} Wilson asked the student government freshman council to assess USC's orientation, with the assistance of Witten and the Y.\textsuperscript{109} The Y's freshman council wrote the resulting orientation guide.\textsuperscript{110} Among other things, the council suggested smaller orientation groups so students could get to know one another, a Sunday morning class to get the freshmen up for church, and the continuation of the Y camp. At the end of the academic year, however, the Y encountered another problem which would loosen its interrelations with the university. Unable to afford necessary maintenance, it deeded the camp to the university.\textsuperscript{111} Consequently, the fall 1964 Y orientation was held at a rented camp some distance from Columbia, and fewer administrators and faculty,
including Jones, participated.\footnote{112}

A transition of sorts was occurring, as the university was gradually took over the holistic functions the Y exercised at USC. The gradual assumption of the Y's orientation by the university was one manifestation of the transition. The holistic functions in the hands of the university did not, however, have as their objective education for life. They served the research ideal. After the fall 1964 orientation, Jones thanked faculty for participating because their involvement strengthened relationships between the faculty and student body, contributed to increasing interest in scholarship, and diminished the first-year drop-out rate.\footnote{113}

The approach to residence life for males also changed. The university now considered education for life's paternalistic "dormitory" approach oppressive. In fall 1964, USC's men began living in "residences" with peer counselors trained to help the student "learn to control his individual life and actions according to acceptable practices of the society in which we live."\footnote{114} The new housing philosophy linked student development to academic success. "Too often we lose sight of the primary goals because we have failed to develop worthwhile programs which would lead to self discipline and academic achievement."

Witten and his peer counselors faced a challenging semester. President Lyndon Johnson hoped that the American people would confirm his succession as John Kennedy's heir. But Johnson alienated many southerners by championing the passage of the Civil Rights Act. After July 1964, the rule of law included integration and non-discrimination in employment, housing, and education. Though South Carolinians normally voted Democrat, in that year many preferred the conservative Republican Barry Goldwater.
Feelings ran high on campus. Witten agreed with the dean of administration that political materials should be kept in authorized areas and canvassers away from the residences. But he did not want to limit student political activity, including political discussion through recognized campus organizations. "I do not see any great problem in this regard." At the same time, Witten obtained through Jones trustee approval of a new policy statement on student behaviour: "Persons who exhibit behavior which deviates from the normal to the extent that their habits and practices are generally unacceptable to society will not be acceptable as students of the University."  

In October, Lady Bird Johnson's special train briefly stopped in Columbia. About twenty hecklers, carrying Goldwater placards, harassed her from the train to the speaker's stand and would not let her speak. After the press identified them as USC students, embarrassed South Carolinians asked Jones to investigate "[t]his violent, insulting, uncultured, rustic, clownish, uncivil, boisterous, and illiterate act...a perfect example of gross lack of discipline at the University." Jones hesitated to "take any action that might stir up the crackpot element and give them a rallying point...." He informed Mrs. Johnson and his correspondents that the university's investigation found no one who participated, and all students, left and right, condemned the act. If the demonstrators were USC students, the reaction of the student body provided efficient censure. "In any case, the entire student body has been put on notice that misconduct of University students cannot be tolerated."  

Concurrently with the attack on Mrs. Johnson, The Gamecock published an editorial declaring for Goldwater. Halsey advised Jones to deflect the many petitions which circulated in protest to the board of student publications and communications.
The Gamecock intensified the controversy, however, with an editorial claiming that faculty in certain social science departments, "disconcerted over our conservative and pro-American editorial policies," were placing themselves "in the unscholarly position of opposing freedom of the press."122 Jones, who knew that campus newspapers often declared for candidates in elections, informed critics that the paper's editor, Sheila Reardon, did not have the support of her peers. "The reaction of Miss Reardon's classmates was one of the most encouraging things that has happened on the campus since I have been here. I have long been concerned about an apparent apathy among our students. It is now clear that they are quite able to arise and shout when the occasion demands it."123

Reardon kept her job, but the manager of the radio station lost his after a campus disturbance in November. Witten asked the publications and communications board to investigate whether the radio station incited the disturbance.124 The manager denied responsibility but offered a change in policy for newscasts, to which the board added the statement, "Any unauthorized gatherings shall be labelled as such."125 Since the manager had an insufficient grade point average for the position, he was removed without difficulty.126 The board appointed a new manager and approved a statement of principles concerning editors of campus media, which prohibited "the promotion of a political party or candidate."127

In the fall of 1964, American student activism reached a new stage in the Berkeley Free Speech Movement. USC followed events along with other American higher educators and joined the discussion concerning appropriate responses. Jones noted Clarke Kerr's The Uses of the University and statement that his university would enforce the rule
of law against the few students and non-students disrupting the Berkeley campus.

"Members of the University community," Kerr declared, "...are not...entitled to exploit the University's good name, or to use the university community, or any part of it, as a captive membership, or to violate the law. The University, in turn, is not entitled to limit the off-campus actions of students or faculty members when they are acting as private citizens." Gordon W. Blackwell of Florida State University, speaking to the Southern Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, observed that "students are being entrusted with a greater measure of freedom, though that seems to be coming more slowly in the South." Blackwell argued that academic freedom meant freedom to learn, and therefore freedom to learn through extracurricular as well as academic activities. The university should tolerate controversial organizations, outside speakers, publications, and civil rights, within prescribed limits. Though he was attracted to the national trend toward due process for students based on individual rights, Blackwell was somewhat reluctant to give up in loco parentis. "As we grope for sound footing on the treacherous shifting sands of continuous testing and demonstrations," he reflected, "we are uncomfortable and sometimes unsure."

Parents and alums read about the spread of "free the campus" movements in the press and wrote administrators like Jones. They advised Jones to "prepare to meet [demonstrations] decisively and effectively, that the students will be forewarned and that the penalties for such action will be well understood by them, and will be strictly enforced by the university." Jones replied that the university was conscious of Berkeley and its implications, -- "It represented a distinct departure from ordinary student demonstrations and campus commotions." So far, USC had been "fortunate in having no leftist-inspired
uprisings. Needless to say, the widespread activities on other campuses have made us skittish.\textsuperscript{132}

USC's free speech uprising came from an unexpected source. The student presidents of the YMCA and the USC Unitarian Fellowship invited Carl Braden of the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee to speak at Russell House.\textsuperscript{133} State legislators immediately introduced legislation outlawing communist speakers from state-supported campuses.\textsuperscript{134} Jones assured the national press that "[g]roups and organizations of recognized standing have been free to invite speakers of their choice in accordance with nationally accepted standards of academic freedom. They have used discretion in their choices and there has been no problem."\textsuperscript{135} Winthrop College's president released a statement that "the speaker ban law would do irreparable harm to the image of the state."\textsuperscript{136} Reviewing policy once again, USC decided to require students arranging campus gatherings to ensure that academic functions were not being impaired, a faculty member presided, the speaker had not advocated violent overthrow of American government or been convicted of a crime, and the dean of students had 48-hours notice.\textsuperscript{137}

Having learned that the FBI did not have Braden's committee on its list of subversive organizations, Braden had not been unfavorably identified nationally, and the Unitarian Fellowship was properly constituted by university policy, Halsey advised Jones to "sit tight and hope that the speech isn't too explosive..."\textsuperscript{138} A state official, however, sent representatives to acquaint Jones with a report "linking Braden with several extremist and Communist-front organizations."\textsuperscript{139} The report admitted that Braden had never been convicted for anything other than contempt of Congress for refusing to tell HUAC he was
a Communist, but he kept company with people like William Worthy whom The New Yorker had quoted as saying that "if Fidel Castro were President of the United States instead of John F. Kennedy, 'Bull' Connor would be given a fair trial and then shot. Ninety-five per cent of the police would have to flee to South Africa for political asylum. J. Edgar Hoover would be thrown into an integrated cell."

Jones then searched for "some definition of speaker qualifications which will protect the tradition of free speech from possible misuse." After talking with the president of the Unitarian Fellowship, he announced that the student group sponsoring Braden had withdrawn its invitation. Halsey learned from United Press International and Associated Press reporters that USC administrators, faculty, and students, believing that the invitation had been withdrawn under pressure, were signing a petition protesting denial of free speech. Braden, speaking in a private home rather than on campus, declared that the real issue was "not whether he should speak but 'the right of the students of the University to hear whatever they want to hear.'" Asked whether he was a Communist, he answered, "It doesn't do any good to answer that question...."

Jones received hearty congratulations from his critics on the right, including the Charleston News and Courier and a Citizen's Council in Tennessee. Despite an attempt by the Orangeburg delegation to revive it, the state bill regarding controversial speakers died in committee, on the grounds that spelling out terms for speakers would remove Jones's discretionary powers and thus allow in more controversial speakers. YMCA president Brad Poston, however, wrote Jones that "[w]e have done an excellent job of condemning a man that even the Charleston News and Courier doesn't label for fear of being sued. The material that you have...is the product of laws in Louisiana that have
recently been ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. In any case I was under the impression that our campus was open to speakers—and not just speakers who have passed some hazy criterion of "being acceptable." He regretted that "I have so much studying to do in order to graduate that I won't be able to create a ruckus over this event. I sincerely hope that some other students do have more time....Maybe in the future USC will become a place where students will be educated in the true sense of the word rather than indoctrinated with the same old ideas that have been floating around for years."  

American legislators and educators had been set on edge by J. Edgar Hoover's repeated warnings that Communists intended to subvert America's youth through campus speeches. Addressing the issue was not easy, since it set rights and responsibilities in tension. A North Carolinian senator explained to Jones that North Carolina's law prohibiting speakers who were Communists or suspected Communists left them faced "not only with serious repercussions from the Trustees, administrations and faculty of the various institutions, but also loss of accreditation." Jones replied that he was glad South Carolina did not have such a law. "Without a law, we were able to see that Braden was not an acceptable speaker. With the law, we could not have banned him as a Communist because he does not admit to being one." Jones then stated his intention to consider "means of more effective control of what goes on about the campus. We want our young people to be able to know the facts about what's going on in the world, but we feel the campus is a place for scholars rather than a place for agitators!"

In his handling of the Braden affair, Jones did not have the complete support of his faculty. Laureen Brubaker, Jr., university chaplain and chair of USC's AAUP, earlier had settled for polite inquiry regarding the university's handling of the Young Democrat call
for the end of HUAC. Now, as secretary of the state AAUP, he distributed a resolution opposing the state bill.\textsuperscript{149} Jones again fielded criticism as the political science department brought in a Congressman from Atlanta to speak on "The House Un-American Activities Committee and the Extremists on the Right: A Revised Concept of What is 'Un-American'?\textsuperscript{n}\textsuperscript{150} Some faculty helped found an unofficial publication, The Carolina Free Press, which argued that "if restrictions are placed upon free and open inquiry at the university, the decision and the basis of the decision should be publicly announced. Without this formal procedure, we believe, there is nothing to secure a free forum of ideas against arbitrary decision."\textsuperscript{151}

Likening the Free Press stance to the California situation, Solomon Blatt, Jr., reasoned that" there must be some way that the University administration can put a stop to those members of the faculty whose sole purpose is to cause us trouble. Possibly academic freedom overrides all other considerations, but I do believe that University loyalty must have some part in the picture."\textsuperscript{152} Halsey considered the publication serious enough to recommend the university write a free speech/free press statement, but one that was brief and vague and therefore difficult to attack.\textsuperscript{153}

At this point, the university appeared to have the student media under control. Jones "had small groups of student executives in for coffee and heart-to-heart talks on three afternoons...and all responded admirably. This does not imply a flawless performance on their part, but the general level is constantly improving."\textsuperscript{154} The board of student publications and communications reported that "there was a decided growth in a feeling of mutual respect on the part of the staff members of the publications and the radio station in regard to the board personnel."\textsuperscript{155} The Carolina Free Press may have been partly
a response to this relative media calm. No inflammatory editorials appeared in The Gamecock during the speakers controversy. Instead, the paper silenced an activist columnist. The Carolina Free Press picked up his column, which envisioned the institution would one day erect a monument, "[i]n memory of Thomas F. Jones who eliminated all controversy on the campus of the University of South Carolina."

The free speech controversy inconvenienced Jones as he lobbied the legislature and the state press for appropriations to match an anticipated 30 percent increase in admissions for fall 1966. Students and parents, including Solomon Blatt, Jr., reminded Jones that his planning for the increase must take into account the impression the admissions and registration process made on the public. The university did not respond immediately to applications nor did it have any provisional acceptance policy. Applicants had difficulty obtaining information from the registrar's office. General studies applicants received simply a receipt, with no information as to where they could stay, eat, and so on.

Advised that legislators and others continued to condemn USC for its impersonal attitude, the administration studied a proposal to "improve this situation by at least giving greater attention and priority to the better students." Those with SAT scores of less than 1100 would continue as "tourists."

The administration focused on residence life as a means to integrate students once they arrived on campus. To encourage cohesiveness, Jones and Witten asked the trustees to require all resident first-year students to eat in USC cafeterias. The student government president questioned the plan -- a student survey on USC cafeteria food and cleanliness overwhelmingly rated it fair to poor -- but the trustees agreed to try it in the 1965-66 academic year.
Witten also acquainted USC's administrators with a residence experiment at the University of North Carolina. UNC transformed pilot male residences into small-home living units, with their own academic services, chaplains, and social activities boards. UNC Chancellor Paul F. Sharp observed that: "The idea is to reduce the social and academic community to human size.... The University does care. The devices, the methods, may well vary but we need to make sure that whatever its size, the university can meet the human needs of its students." He added, however, that "the most challenging and difficult thing is to call the attention of the students to the true spirit of the university." Witten extended the North Carolina experiment to USC's male residences, beginning with Preston House. The Preston House model included food service, counselors, self-government with resident faculty advisors, a student newspaper, social and educational programs, and "other aspects of small-community life." In theory at least, some male students now could develop as individuals in community through small-group participation. The residence philosophy for women remained unchanged; they continued to live in loco parentis.

Jones also got his counseling centre. This meant that professionalization of student relations at USC had developed to the point that Jones could ask the school of education to introduce a graduate program in student personnel services. The program would supply apprentice personnel to assist Witten, especially in the areas of counseling and student development research. Its development demonstrated that Witten's position had become an academic field with its own research interests. To demarcate itself from the passing paternalistic student personnel orientation, the field now called itself student affairs. USC acknowledged the change by giving Witten a lateral promotion from dean of
students to vice president of student affairs.

By fall 1965, Jones was ready to expand his relationship with student government leaders. At Witten's suggestion, rather than meeting with them once in September, he designated them a cabinet of advisors on "problems of mutual interest." 166 The university's pattern of rule by bureaucracy was well established, however. When The Gamecock upset the campus with an critical editorial involving athletics at USC, Jones clarified the university's publications policy for the trustees. "Approval of copy before publication in a student publication has been tried on a number of campuses, but with cries of 'Censorship!' and other dire consequences. As you know, we have followed a policy...which develops responsibility in students through guidance by the Board of Student Publications." 167 In the case of The Crucible, in 1965, guidance took the form of Halsey and the board alerting the faculty advisor and the editor to "make sure that nothing untoward appears in the [Fall 1965] issue." 168 Increasingly nervous about student relations, Jones, Witten and Halsey attempted to formulate a new policy extending the board's authority to the miscellaneous student publications of all campus organizations. The policy required the organizations to send two copies to the board, on the pretext that they would achieve greater circulation that way. 169

Rule by bureaucracy could appear to be an instrument of unspoken coercion. As the civic leaders of Greensboro, North Carolina, found in 1960, it only would work if its subjects cooperated. 170 In 1965, USC students displayed a growing lack of patience with traditional authority. They reacted to changes in Homecoming with talk of "demonstrations, sit-ins, a march on the President's home, and castigation of the faculty." 171 People in the community complained that students would not give their seats at
football games to ticketholders. "One student was so rude to a gentleman when asked to move," one wrote, "that he had to backhand him." Sol Blatt, Jr., received anonymous letters from students, complaining that they could not "catch [the administrators] in their office." 

Student questioning of traditional authority reached to the highest level. In January, Jim Graves, president of the student body advised Jones that he did not plan to call another meeting of the student-faculty committee. "Frankly I see very little benefit being gained...It seems as though our trivial requests are granted, while our real concerns and interests for students go completely - or almost so - unheeded. We are at times urged and told not to talk, discuss, or try some things; while other ideas are subtly suggested to us for our concern." The student government formed an alliance with The Gamecock to hold the administration's attention. Witten took to reporting to the student senate regularly on the status of their bills. After protracted pressure from the student government, which included The Gamecock embarrassing the university into an independent inspection of food services, the trustees made eating in optional. Witten would not be able to encourage cohesiveness through "requiring the family to be home at mealtime."

The religious organizations associated with USC added to the campus ferment. The university continued to value religious perspectives. "Unless our universities maintain our interest in the whole man," Jones wrote, "we may find that we are 'winning the battle, but losing the war.'" At the suggestion of the student Carolina Christian Fellowship, he invited evangelist Billy Graham to campus and asked Witten to make the arrangements. Religious Emphasis Week carried on as usual. Jones and the campus ministries
sponsored workshops to teach state clergy how to serve their students. Instead of
emphasizing the campus turning students toward God, however, the ecumenical
workshops focused on how clergy could prepare their students for the objectives of USC.
"The purpose of the meeting was to acquaint the ministers with the lives of students when
they come to the university. The idea was that we should all know how best to prepare
our students for academic study."

Nevertheless, the campus ministries had a stake in the social issues of the 1960s.
Their focus on students and their essential concern for persons gave them points of
identification with much of the cultural upheaval of the decade. They participated in,
and sometimes gave leadership to, social activism. To "facilitate communication between
the students and prominent members of the community on matters of a moral and ethical
nature," the campus ministries funded a coffee house called "The Crumbling Wall." The
Y supported the Peace Corps and occasionally surfaced in connection with radicalism, in
the person of officers like the student president who invited Braden. Y members tutored
in high schools disadvantaged by lingering class and racial traditions. With students
from other campus ministries, they adopted the Wilkinson Orphan Home for Negro Girls,
providing recreation, tutoring, and practical assistance.

The Y's position was now uncertain, however. In 1965, for the first time, it did
not hold its own orientation. While the denominational ministries were independent and in
a position of cooperation, the Y's university funding gave it official status on campus. In
1965, that funding came to an end, in part because of "the National concept of separation
of church and state." Jones advised the Y board that "I, too, share your concern for the
decline of the YMCA on this campus." Yet instead of accepting the board's suggestion
that the university could stop the decline by changing Ledeen's dual appointment by the Y and the student personnel division into a full-time one for the Y, Jones moved Ledeen to full-time employment in the university's student personnel division. That left Ledeen fulfilling Y duties in his spare time and effectively severed the Y's official status on campus.\textsuperscript{188}

The Y's identification with social activism may have been a factor in its loss of status. This is suggested by a controversy which arose over the students' association with the Wilkinson orphanage. Other campus ministries participated, but they were not funded by the university. The students got to know the girls at the orphanage and invited them to church. Consequently, the archdeacon of the Diocese of Upper South Carolina informed St. Patrick's Episcopal Chapel that "[t]he bringing of children from Wilkinson Home into St. Patrick's will cease as of last Sunday. This is not debatable."\textsuperscript{189} Such associations offended the South Carolinians who clearly hoped to avoid anything more than minimal desegregation in 1965, particularly in education.\textsuperscript{190} Sol Blatt, Jr., asked Jones to explain a rumour that a political science professor planned to teach half time for both USC and an African-American institution and also board students from both institutions in his home.\textsuperscript{191} An informant drew Jones's attention to a letter in \textit{Playboy}, from a student who gave his address as USC. "Hatred and bigotry reign as gods here....It gets extremely exasperating and sometimes it hurts, but I will continue my fight."\textsuperscript{192} The informant supplied Jones with the letter writer's origin, grade point average, father's place of employment, and the information that, months before, whites had beaten him up as he participated in an integration march.

USC was a community fighting itself. As many maintained the status quo through
their silence, many envisioned the university as an institution which ultimately could change traditional attitudes. At least, the economic vision of the new South demanded compliance with civil rights objectives. Upward mobility for poor South Carolinians was a necessary condition for prosperity. Further, the federal government had funds for institutions which would experiment with higher education for the disadvantaged. Braving the wrath of conservatives, USC invited Sargent Shriver, Peace Corps director and Kennedy family member, to receive an honorary degree and speak at its 1965 commencement. 193 An alum quoted an old USC song - "In heaven above where all is love, the faculty won't be there, But down below where all is woe, the faculty will be there" - and suggested that the committee responsible for Shriver's appearance could join them. 194 WDIX chided Shriver for leading his Peace Corpsmen - "we should say Peace Corps women" - to sing "We Shall Overcome" instead of "God Bless America." "[W]here are our university leaders leading us if they should choose Sargent Shriver as the shining example of today's American boy?" 195

The answer to the question remained unclear. The committee which chose Shriver also recommended General William Westmoreland, commander of the American military in Vietnam and native of Spartanburg County. 196 Troubled times were just beginning for USC. The peace movement came to share the stage with civil rights activism, just as the post-World-War II population boom reached American higher education. USC had its student personnel apparatus mainly in place, but this apparatus operated within the context of the research ideal. The religious agencies, mainly functioning as auxiliaries to the true business of the university, seemed increasingly irrelevant as guides to values.

Nevertheless, many university students of the late 1960s hungered for a world that did not
sacrifice holism to bureaucratic administration and "value-free" science. They would force Jones and other American higher educators to consider new approaches to student relations.
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Chapter 4

Unrest and Innovation

In the late 1960s, Jones's interest in the broader needs of undergraduates grew more compelling. The arrival to campus of the postwar population boom, by its sheer size and nontraditional demographics created unprecedented pressures for institutional growth and change. Enough USC undergraduates sympathized with the social activism of their counterparts on other American campuses to dismay already edgy conservative South Carolinians. Many students not overtly involved in radical causes, convinced that the university did not prioritize their development as persons, desired to participate in administrative and educational decision-making. To keep activism under control, Jones and Witten continued to strengthen the university's regulation of students bureaucratically. At the same time, Jones's innovative temperament and dynamic philosophy recognized in cultural upheaval the opportunity to learn how to reshape higher educational practice to produce citizens fit to enable South Carolina and America to compete economically in the world of the future. Federal government and foundation programs for attracting and assimilating more disadvantaged students to higher education provided laboratories which Jones could watch with all USC's undergraduates in mind. By the end of the decade, Jones had developed an educational philosophy which he believed would restore collegiality to the university, while keeping its research mission intact.

The university's attempts to meet student unrest with bureaucratic policymaking met with increasing difficulty. In summer 1966, a new student organization called Aware informed faculty and student leaders that it intended to bring in speakers of all viewpoints and address the problems of teacher evaluation, censorship, coed restrictions, and due
process. Knowing that Aware had been in contact with the American Civil Liberties Union and meant to invite outside speakers regardless of USC policy, Witten secured faculty approval to require sponsors of outside speakers to gain his permission. Neither the student affairs nor faculty advisory committees had approved Witten’s draft policy concerning outside speakers, however.

When faculty returned to strength in the fall, it asked the trustees to table the policy until it could meet over it. USC’s AAUP chapter passed a resolution that “university governance is a joint enterprise involving faculties, administrations, and governing boards” and endorsed a slightly amended version of the national AAUP statement of student rights and responsibilities, which defined means to participate in the formulation and application of regulations affecting student affairs “and protection from arbitrary intervention.”

Meanwhile, Jones sought solutions for the problem of impersonality in rapidly growing institutions. He listened to Victor Butterfield’s assertion that “while producing future scholars is of utmost importance, this is not our main business and most of our students want and need an education primarily designed for humanizing their professional and personal life,” and noted one of Butterfield’s counterattack strategies: “We should do all we can to retain and recapture situations that will help the student find his identity in the academic community as an adult person, both socially and intellectually.”

Jones’s receptivity to Butterfield perhaps was influenced by his reading of Kenneth D. Benne’s *Education in the Quest for Community and Identity* (1961). According to Benne, the two quests of moderns -- for identity and community -- are interrelated. If individuals cannot develop an integrated personal worldview, they cannot participate in
the free discussion of ideas and values that is the only viable basis of community in the expanded environment of the twentieth century. Teachers achieve self-understanding partly by humanizing their teaching; that is, by going beyond hard-headed positivism. This process does not require giving up the quest for intellectual excellence. Self-understanding grows through active and personal interaction between teachers and students and subject matter. "It is in these relationships to subject-matter and to other people that important content about the self in its conflicts, aversions, preferences, and aspirations is provided, if it can be objectified and analyzed reflectively." If educators learn to facilitate this process, they and their students can leave behind their pseudo-resolutions of identity - noninvolvement, specialization, fantasy, total identification with an ideological formulation - and achieve real identity and community.

Benne helped pioneer the human relations approach to behavioural change which developed in America after World War II. The approach married small group theory, behavioural psychology, and John Dewey's educational instrumentalism. Small group theory posits that small groups provide persons with interrelations that challenge their set ideas and behaviours in an atmosphere of support and trust, and therefore enable them to join the larger society. Behavioural psychology, arguing that science properly draws conclusions on the basis of observation, examines manifest rather than hidden causes of behaviour. Followers of Dewey believe that learning is a process of discovery of new knowledge. Truth -- that is, what is useful for the moment -- is ever being made as learners together experiment in the classroom. In postwar America, the human relations movement used small groups, known as T (training) groups, as experimental laboratories to break undesirable human behaviours and form desirable ones. It defined undesirable
human behaviours as those which stood in the way of science, democracy, and the development of the helping professions.\textsuperscript{11}

Human relations training developed first under the auspices of the National Education Association. Benne, with educator Leland B. Bradford and social psychologist Ronald Lippert, founded the National Training Laboratories, in Bethel, Maine, in 1947, as a branch of NAE, to study how small groups could re-educate human behaviour scientifically. As it developed, varying applications of human relations methodology emerged. Business executives seized on it to combat corporate impersonality. Health professionals explored its potential for healing mental maladjustments. Professionals working with disadvantaged groups explored its potential for facilitating social adjustments. Some progressive educators discerned in human relations methodology a means of mediating social change. Jones saw the NTL approach practiced at USC after Dr. Robert Heckel, a much-published and well-sponsored researcher in physical and mental rehabilitation, joined the psychology department in 1964. Heckel utilized it in the school of general studies’ federally funded Institute on Methods and Techniques of Serving Disadvantaged Youth for staff of South Carolina's Youth Opportunity Program.\textsuperscript{12}

Heckel represented the opening avenue of opportunity for USC and other southern universities to obtain sponsored research and build their academic reputations foreseen by A.C. Aderhold. USC’s school of general studies constituted a convenient umbrella for federal developmental research programs because it offered a wide variety of courses and training in and beyond Columbia.\textsuperscript{13} In 1965, the federally funded training programs it administered included training for Head Start child care workers, and Cause II Poverty Program counselors.\textsuperscript{14} The school also established its own early childhood
education/kindergarten workshops to encourage enrolment in USC's early childhood education program, and a pre-college clinic for underprepared students. Social experimentation centred in four faculties: general studies, education, psychology, and student affairs.

One experimental program which especially caught the imagination of Jones and Witten was the federal Office of Economic Opportunity's Upward Bound. On the grounds that "one of the surest ways to escape poverty is through post-secondary education," Upward Bound aimed to "motivate youngsters from backgrounds where higher education [was] not only untried but unmentioned." It brought low-income high school sophomores and juniors with intelligence and imagination to university and college campuses for academic experience, inspiration, and encouragement. In 1966, OEO awarded USC's school of education and student affairs counseling bureau a 10-week summer program, with follow-up during the succeeding school year. Jones, who believed that "explosions of knowledge, technology, productivity, [and] affluence are rapidly making uncultured man obsolete, useless," observed that Upward Bound enculturated deprived students by changing their "basic underlying attitudes, concepts, beliefs, and interests." It was an experimental program which would be "carefully evaluated" and "the results...used to formulate desirable new programs." With characteristic haste, upon the completion of USC's initial session of Upward Bound, Jones and Witten asked the Ford Foundation in New York to consider funding a similar program for all students having poor high school experiences.

While he sought to improve access to USC for underprepared high school graduates by lowering the admissions standards at its seven regional campuses and seeking
transferability of general studies courses into baccalaureate programs, Jones did not intend to compromise the essential nature of the university. Jones argued that the development of South Carolina offered unique opportunities for social and economic research. “We must programmatically design efficient methods of moving the culturally and economically underdeveloped people of our State, our nation, and our world into the mainstream of man’s progress. Building men is far more complicated than building automobiles or long distance telephones. Mammoth on-the-site research efforts must be authorized and funded!”

Though he talked about “building people,” Jones did not believe he was running an educational factory. He told Solomon Blatt that “(t)he new residence hall concept,.our fantastic athletic program, and our burgeoning academic strength have, taken together, made the University a place where red-blooded young people want to be.” Students who, through their social and political activism, had come to believe that America did not practice the ideals of democracy and freedom for which it stood and now faced Vietnam did not wholly agree. In fall 1966, Witten drew Jones's attention to a Students for a Democratic Society discussion paper calling students to free the university from 'corporate liberalism.' "[W]hat would happen to a manipulative society if its means of creating manipulable people were done away with? We might then have a fighting chance to change that system.”

SDS pressured students governments to help change “the system” by urging radicals to take them over. USC’s student government established a weekly "Students Speaking Out," endorsed the efforts of the newly formed Association of Women Students to ease in loco parentis for females in residence, and worked on its own version of a
student bill of rights. It sent a resolution objecting to the speakers regulation to the trustees, the administration and the press, on the grounds that it "smacks of censorship." Faculty also expressed concern that the administration might be going too far in its attempts to regulate free dissent. Aware tested the regulation directly by hosting Julian Bond, Georgia’s African-American, anti-war legislator. While the dissent issue simmered, Witten clarified the student affairs policies concerning the role of police in various types of campus disturbances. If campus police efforts were not effective, the university would ask SLED or the State Highway Patrol to take over.

USC convened a special convocation in April 1967 to award the honorary degree it had offered to General William Westmoreland. SLED officers and highway patrolmen forcibly removed student anti-war demonstrators and their signs and literature from the campus. When the demonstrators claimed that SLED had violated their right of free speech, Jones characterized their treatment by SLED as protection. To force Jones to deal with their allegations, the students promised a fresh demonstration.

Jones announced the formation of a committee of “students, faculty, and administration to study the problems…raised by Aware and others, and recommend policies and regulations to me for implementation,” sanctioned student assembly after due notice, and promised police protection if requested. Aware boycotted the committee, however, claiming that the “[g]uidelines amount to prior consent being required.” Prior consent being a limitation of the rights already guaranteed in the South Carolina and US constitutions, Aware would “test any guidelines and do our best to break them down.”

So students would “feel that the President is interested in them and that their educational welfare is of primary importance to him,” Jones planned monthly meetings
with student leaders. Jones expected the meetings would make the students more cognizant of his perspective, but also realized he would be more vulnerable to theirs. Jones was susceptible to student concerns, first, because he pursued development as well as order. An engineer by training, he analyzed problems and experimented with solutions, in order to achieve objectives. At USC, his primary subject was not technology, but humans. The university comprised a laboratory for human engineering, and the South Carolina context and the cultural upheaval of the 1960s provided him with unusual stimulation and opportunity to utilize it. Human engineering was, in the university, a respectable concept. Apart from its connotations of social control, it followed logically from the university research ideal. Since the scientific methodology of the research ideal found human intangibles difficult and tended to deny them, the university necessarily saw the problem of social perfectibility as a continuous cycle of experimentation and application. Therefore, if Jones desired to create not only a competitive research university but also a "better" society, his logical recourse would be human engineering. Learning to engineer students required taking students seriously as research subjects.

Jones grounded his aspirations for progressivism in South Carolina in an academically credible university which fostered human development. He used general studies as USC's main vehicle for fostering upward mobility among under-educated, and undermotivated South Carolinians. Many faculty, believing that general studies's less qualified instructors, lower admissions standards and "generally somewhat less demanding" level of work compromised the academic nature of the university, resisted his vision. Jones argued that the kind of education offered by general studies stretched the research image of the university but it could be justified. "[Q]uality can be built into any
educational process and must not be confused with intellectual level or 'standards.'

Programs should meet needs." Professional and semi-professional and liberal studies
were related and faculty could ensure quality by "responsible oversee[ing] and verify[ing]
the academic program in areas related to their own." The transferability problem could
be eliminated altogether if general studies students could take their general education and
professional courses in the mainstream.

Getting disadvantaged students even into general studies was a challenge,
however. South Carolina spent less than almost every other state on public education,
did not have compulsory education, and approximately one-fifth of the state population
was illiterate. Lack of development in literacy meant lack of development in verbal and
mathematical skills. Fewer South Carolinian high school graduates went on to higher
education than in any other state. Experimental research programs gave USC the
opportunity to see how educationally disadvantaged South Carolinians could make the
transition from academic neglect to academic success. The experimental program which
most excited Jones and Witten was Upward Bound. In the summer of 1967, USC
repeated its program, running a class for the previous participants, who were now high
school graduates, and a class for a new group of high school juniors. Its purpose was to
inspire students to seek academic fulfilment and their parents, teachers and counselors to
support them. The writer of the 1967 Upward Bound proposal reached back to USC’s
1955 catalogue for a description emphasizing education for life.

Run by the student affairs counseling bureau, USC's Upward Bound resembled
human relations training. The Upward Bound students lived from six to eight weeks in
residence with student counselors. For classroom work in the mornings and varied
experiences in the afternoons and evenings, they divided into groups of 20 students, a faculty member, two high school teachers, and two student tutors. USC did not prescribe their curriculum. "It is expected that the direction of the curriculum for each group will emerge as a result of the planning of the professional staff in conjunction with the student participants from each group."\(^{40}\) The faculty members, representing the sciences, humanities, and social sciences, the high school teachers, representing English, mathematics, and science, and the special instructors, representing art, music, and health, took the lists of topics the students submitted, for example, "What makes the Green Bay Packers great?" and scheduled a period in each one. Students set up their own schedules from the master schedule. The unstructured nature of the program called for teaching staff who were academically competent and flexible. "Most of the... procedures were pre-planned but in many particulars they have grown and evolved during the program.... Nearly every standard 'form'... has changed considerably as the program has progressed.... Staff lunch meetings have kept the entire procedure exceedingly conscious."\(^{41}\) The staff interacted with students informally and gave no homework. They drew freely on the resources of the university. "It is imperative that these students be offered first-rate material which is at the same time exciting and relevant to them. To do this requires... a willingness to try new material, new ideas, and new ways of provoking student interest."\(^{42}\)

Jones desired to encourage effective teaching at USC. Observing the Upward Bound program, Jones identified effective teaching with humanistic teaching. The Upward Bound program began not with the curriculum but with the person. The teaching staff began with the interests of the students. Upward Bound participants saw that their
interests had educational value, and that the university could help them pursue them. Their learning connected with their identity; studies became relevant and compelling.

Despite their subsidiary position to the university, those who claimed to be able to provide holism, the leaders of campus ministries, had no intention of being sidelined. USC was receptive to their efforts to play critical and prophetic roles. Identifying dehumanization and socialization as current issues, student leaders of the Y wondered if "we have abdicated the task of character-building and surrendered to the socialization process.... The University, the 'Y,' and the church provide merely a model to fit folk into a bureaucratic society." Rather than conformity, the students agreed, the Y should teach freedom to become through understanding of self and choices to be made. Their vision would be difficult to implement, however, because the traditional southern relationship of Y and administration now held them captive and underfinanced.

The task of keeping a spiritual dimension alive in campus life, then, fell to the chaplains. Finally acknowledging that the Spring 1967 Religious Emphasis Week would be USC's last, they, in cooperation with USC's student affairs division, applied for a foundation grant to mount "a year-round program which allows us to move into the mainstream of the academic community." Called Exposure, the program would bring a visiting scholar to campus each month to dialogue with faculty, graduate students, appropriate classes, and the public and "call into question the view that allows one to compartmentalize his life into separate categories."

Jones supported the chaplains, but preferred to translate their initiatives into the university's frame of reference. In summer 1967, having observed educational research for several years, Jones was ready to bring innovation into the spotlight as a primary
component of USC's character. He hired a new administrator to evaluate, "on a university-wide basis," in cooperation with other administrators and faculty, existing innovative programs and develop and administer new ones. The administrator, Dr. Laurence Flaum, had moved from public to higher education administration before Jones serendipitously met him and invited him to South Carolina.

Flaum's hiring reflected the growing emphasis on institutionalizing a more personal approach reflected in a report by USC's director of development. Summarizing interviews with senior administrators and deans regarding the university's next five-year plan, the director suggested that perhaps the plan "should be some unique approach designed to protect and promote the individuality of the student and his general well-being. Many needs could be tied into this angle from the proper construction of facilities to diversified curriculum and qualified counseling and guidance." A priority need was improvement in first impressions. USC's admissions and registration still radiated impersonality. At the beginning of the 1967-68 academic year, the use of computers in the registration process did nothing to ease the university's uncaring image. Then orientation reinforced the uncertain welcome. Earlier enthusiasm about the benefits of the university's fall orientation subsided as the incoming classes increased in size. Testing and advising 2500 incoming students at once involved much confusion. Witten's orientation committee reintroduced voluntary summer orientations to ease the crush of the fall one.

In keeping with the development of a competitive university, Jones and Flaum sought an honours program which would attract academically outstanding students to USC. They envisioned the program as an educational laboratory similar to their general
studies innovations. Flaum advocated that USC provide honours students the option of developing their values, interests, and specializations within a core curriculum -- "an interrelated unified body of knowledge," based on Western civilization but drawing from all the resources of the university. Working with tutors in small seminars with choice of issues and flexibility in projects, honours students would experience integrated learning which amounted to personal development. In effect, Flaum's proposal would return USC's "best" students to the old liberal arts college, with widened resources. This was an elitist application of collegiality, but one of which the state appeared to approve.

Table II: Degrees Conferred, 1947-1971 (from University of South Carolina annual reports)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PH.D.</th>
<th>MASTER'S/LAW</th>
<th>BACHELOR</th>
<th>DIPLOMA</th>
<th>CERTIFICATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Law was subtracted from this column and added to bachelor column.
*After 1967, the annual reports reported only graduate degrees.

This was seen, to Jones's discomfort, in the Moody report, a proposal for the configuration of higher education in South Carolina commissioned by the state, partly to settle the junior college issue. The draft recommended that the state's universities “should begin seriously to pursue the path of excellence and eminence, taking as their first
and overriding priority the development of high level talent." Jones called this "innuendo....We do take it seriously." The report argued that "[i]t requires full attention to the great task at hand of becoming eminent universities, and the consequent abandonment of activities which are of less than university level and which dissipate the energies and the resources of the universities." Jones retorted that activities concerning students at risk should not be abandoned but "[r]ecast into 'pilot program' function." The draft claimed that there were many workable solutions to the state's educational problems. Jones replied, "No one has a really good solution. Techniques developed elsewhere can be used with some limited success. Our racial relations and understandings put us in a position that possibly is unique for development of real breakthroughs." He continued, "We must try. This is relevant research."

In addition to the associate degree bridge into the university general studies provided for medium-risk students, Jones hoped for wider application of Upward Bound techniques. For students seriously or completely unprepared for higher education, Jones thought "USC should be doing pilot work to find out how to make [the] finest possible people out of these. We should spearhead curriculum development." The effective approach, Jones suggested, would be to match curriculum to the needs and abilities of the students.

Jones believed that USC had "sold the product," that is, "awakened the state to higher education," and should make it generally accessible. Through its student affairs counseling bureau, the university applied for funds to rejuvenate educational possibilities for high school drop outs through Upward Bound concepts. It also proposed to establish a human resources research bureau to seek rejuvenation of the state's workforce. "Social
and economic development are inseparable." Therefore, "positive programs must be undertaken for the eradication of [social] problems." The bureau would bring together faculty from economics, sociology, personnel administration, psychology, education, and engineering to study manpower supply, increasing productivity, and human reclamation and reconstruction. The proposal defined subjects for reclamation and reconstruction as the "handicapped and those who are otherwise limited, the disadvantaged and deprived, and those who seemingly reject our [modern economic] culture."

If USC truly wanted to make higher education accessible, it needed to pay attention to the aspirations of South Carolina’s large African-American population. Though industrialization and ghettoization had not disrupted traditional social relations as they had elsewhere, some frustrated African Americans were rejecting the non-violent path to self- and social respect preached by Dr. Martin Luther King. In spring 1967 South Carolina's African-American students agitated forcefully for improvements in their own institutions. Three institutions of particular relevance to USC were South Carolina State College, established by Governor Ben Tillman in Orangeburg in 1896 to end integration at USC, and Allen University and Benedict College founded respectively by African Episcopal Methodists and American Baptists in Columbia in 1870. When Allen's dissidents and administration asked USC for assistance, the university chose quiet cooperation with the administration in a consulting capacity. Flaum helped Allen develop philosophy statements and institutional and program handbooks, and USC faculty members, including Edward Beardsley, taught as visiting lecturers or consulted in their disciplines, particularly in teacher training. USC offered similar services to Benedict College, but avoided public notice of these activities.
Though USC ostensibly was integrated, virtual segregation continued in most
campus organizations, activities and residence rooms. In fall 1967, African-American
students began to assert their presence at USC by forming a branch of the Association of
African-American Students. USC’s student affairs committee, chaired by Witten’s new
assistant, Paul P. Fidler, chartered the newly-formed branch so it could "present its ideas
and outlooks to the Carolina community through programs and discussions." Advising
Witten that on other campuses similar associations had campaigned for more African-
American faculty, African-American content in regular courses, courses in African-
American studies, and integrated off-campus facilities, Fidler supported similar provisions
at USC. "The more problems we anticipate now and act to overcome, the less problems
we will face in the future."

Jones’s immediate preoccupation was to find an acceptable balance between rights
and responsibilities for students who were claiming their democratic heritage. Learning
that USC’s freedom of assembly interim regulation was illegal, Jones appointed a special
committee to hear submissions, obtain legal advice, and recommend a new policy
statement. In December, the trustees approved a vague statement, summarized in its
concluding paragraph: “To the limit of its resources, the University of South Carolina will
protect the rights of its students on its campus, and in the event of conduct intended or
reasonably calculated to interfere with or prevent the free exercise thereof...it will invoke
appropriate legal and disciplinary sanctions.” The faculty repeatedly rejected the student
senate’s student bill of rights and responsibilities. Witten, believing that the faculty
regarded the bill’s provision for a student discipline committee analogous to the
university’s discipline committee, as “one that would be set up to try members of the
faculty,\textsuperscript{69} suggested that USC appoint an ombudsman to help students settle their problems.\textsuperscript{70} In the meantime, he held almost sole responsibility for mediating between the university and students.

In February, in Orangeburg, simmering African-American and white supremacy feeling clashed. On February 5, South Carolina State College students failed in their attempt to gain admission to the bowling alley across the street from their campus. On February 8, the National Guard, SLED agents, state troopers, and others ended the integration effort by shooting 38 students, three fatally.\textsuperscript{71} The "Orangeburg massacre" pushed African-American students toward Black Pride, if not Black Power. At the subsequent memorial service co-sponsored by the USC student government and Association of African-American Students, the Association president took a clear stance.

"Sooner or later we all must die, and there is only one Heaven. We Black folks intend to make it to the promised land of Heaven, so I guess you white folks will have no alternative but to burn in Hell unless you change your ways."\textsuperscript{72} The student government president declared the cooperative service a symbol of the racial cooperation that must occur in South Carolina. "By holding this memorial service we are expressing our solicitude over the situation in Orangeburg and are paying our respects to those who died. The service is purely memorial in nature; it is not intended to justify or condone any one faction."

At the beginning of April, Dr. Martin Luther King fell to an assassin's bullet in Memphis, Tennessee. International studies professor Paul Blackstock understood that King's death would feed the rise of Black Power. Black Power founder Stokely Carmichael declared that "[w]hen White America killed Dr. King she opened the eyes of every black man in this country."\textsuperscript{73} Deeply shocked themselves, administration, faculty,
and African-American and white student leaders broke curfew and braved the snipers on the rooftops of Columbia trying to prevent a conflagration. Blackstock argued that "Moral and psychological measures are as important as the physical disposition of troops and a deterrent show of force." This time, however, African-American students were not open to the university’s desire to cooperate on a memorial service. The Association’s militant wing, called the Black Alliance for Self-Defence (BAD) in recognition of its ties with the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee and Stokely Carmichael’s Black Panther Party for Self Defence, asked, “Why did the student government give a memorial service for the students at S.C. State College if they didn't condemn the actions of the police? WHY DID THEY WANT TO HAVE A MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR MARTIN L. KING WHEN A LARGE NUMBER OF CAROLINA STUDENTS HAD A PARTY ON CAMPUS CELEBRATING HIS DEATH?”

In their relations with the Association, USC’s administration held to its bureaucratic pattern. When the Association president interpreted the discipline of a student as a "scheme to eliminate militant black students from this campus," Witten replied that USC aggressively recruited “students from culturally disadvantaged backgrounds, including Negro students,” through high school visitations and programs like Upward Bound, Talent Search, and the Presidential 100. “We join with you in deploring unjust and discriminatory practices and...my office, as well as the President's, stand ready to discuss the formal grievances submitted by the Association of African American Students.” Jones acknowledged the Association’s demand for African-American content in curriculum and reading lists, more African-American students and faculty, integrated sports teams, promotion of African-American staff to white collar and supervisory
positions, bringing in more African-American outside speakers and scholars, fair awarding of grants, scholarships, and fellowships, ending of discrimination by "Greeks" and harassment of militant students, an official statement condemning racism on campus, and elimination of references to race in official records. At the next meeting of the American Council on Education Commission on Administrative Affairs, Jones explored with his colleagues how to work with African American students to redress their grievances.

The Commission also explored the history and program of SDS, expecting they would escalate their activities. ACE director Joseph Shoben noted that "SDS rapidly forms alliances with representatives from the National Student Association, with the official personnel of formal student governments, and even with members of the highly conservative Young Americans for Freedom." At USC, the most likely home for SDS was the Aware organization. In April, however, the SLED agents who regularly infiltrated Aware meetings reported to Jones that Aware had decided to disband. It would maintain its identity and charter but cease to meet.

In addition to racial and anti-war tensions, USC faced a new challenge -- students using and selling illegal drugs. Witten, keeping up with his profession, anticipated this trend with a regulation. USC's discipline committee now spent much of its time hearing cases of students facing drug charges. The university's administrators stonewalled complaints from students that SLED drug investigations often disregarded their rights.

In the intensity of campus tensions in the spring of 1968, influential American higher educators began to accord students increased respect. Robert Sullivan, president of the Association of American Colleges, told of a brilliant research professor who wanted to be a dean because "I have become more and more conscious that the small sample of
students with whom I really get to talk are always human beings and only sometimes students....As a professor...I don't work much with my colleagues -- or they with me -- on what we might do for them or with them. As a dean that would be my job more clearly, more fully, and more satisfyingly...."\(^65\) Shoben observed to an ACE meeting of administrators that students desired "genuine participation and its educative effects, for freedom in the exploration of ideas as young adults develop the habits of the examined life, and for dignity in the conduct of their personal affairs."\(^86\) Nevertheless, John Caffrey of ACE acknowledged the primacy of the research ideal in urging reformers to remain focused on "the continual struggle to make our system of higher education the best in the world."\(^87\)

The constant pressure of protest made increased respect for students in the university both necessary and difficult. To control outside influences, Witten spelled out guidelines for its student affairs committee to use in chartering new student organizations. Before approving their constitutions, the committee could require changes in their criteria for membership, statement of purpose, and source of financial support, to conform to USC policy.\(^88\) The trustees promised that extremist students making irresponsible demands "will become former students as soon as proper disciplinary action can be taken."\(^89\) Jones and Witten added another proviso to the assembly policy. "The right of peaceable assembly does not include the right of individual students or groups of students to invite outside speakers. Such speakers can be invited only by recognized student organizations in conjunction with...aforementioned procedure."\(^90\)

At the end of May, Witten began a discussion of student unrest with incoming student president Tom Salane which turned into a dialogue on issues of institutional
governance. Salane, insisted that "[a]ll students wish is an opportunity to make a positive
contribution. Given that opportunity, you would be amazed at the amount we could
contribute." Salane did not expect 1968-69 to be a year of student unrest. "The students
are altogether too apathetic to engage in any violent disturbance; however, it would seem
that all that is required to foster student unrest is a hard-core group of agitators—in which
case any...suggestions [for preventing unrest] would probably not dissuade their
activities." Salane took Witten to task for ignoring the student senate's student bill of
rights and responsibilities. "[T]he University is [not] necessarily working under outmoded
rules but...because they are not codified, administrative discretion...is all too often taken to
mean by students a discretion that is not legitimate. The adoption of a Student Bill of
Rights would eliminate this problem." The student senate planned to send the bill, without
the grievance committee provision, back to faculty in the fall.

Salane stressed "the importance of allowing the students to feel that they have
initiated any change and that what they contributed had a distinct effect on the final
decision." Jones, who described himself as "somewhat of an iconoclast," was not far
apart from his activist students in his desire for change. He believed, however, that the
university should bring about change "in a form which does not alienate the society which
sustains us." He desired change by "evolution - not revolution." In the exciting era of
the 1960s, the process of evolution was not slow and gradual. "Events since WWII (sic)
have made us understand that the only stability possible today is stability in motion." Jones felt at ease with this kind of stability and urged his faculty to "contribute to
accelerating our change toward a dynamic, vital, timely, and relevant university." Like
many of his students, he was in a hurry. "Today is almost yesterday!"
Dubbing 1968 the "Year of Innovation," Jones asked faculty to evaluate USC's entire educational undertaking. He framed this undertaking humanistically; the university should motivate students to self-development for their own and the nation's good. This self-development included developing a worldview and a world conscience. USC must rethink its teaching methods, course content, degree requirements, curriculum organizations, and calendar. To establish innovation as the status quo institutionally required shared power, free communication, and open criticism; personally, it required creativity, versatility, adaptability, and the courage to take risks. Jones believed USC had such a faculty. "I have watched many of you see challenges where others failed to see them." He encouraged faculty members to bring their ideas to him and Flaum.

By making educational experimentation an institutional priority, Jones gained increased flexibility to pursue his innovative ambitions concerning USC's educational mission. He and Flaum brought out an internal publication called *Innovation and Innovative Programs* which reported the flood of proposals being generated at USC. Some, like Flaum's proposal for student-initiated courses, seemed well-meaning but frivolous. The academic advisory committee discussed and tabled it. Most proposals concerned the challenge of mass education. Jones and Flaum hoped to establish an experimental instructional laboratory at USC. While this did not materialize, Jones took advantage of a sudden opportunity provided by Heckel to establish a new research institute which he could use in similar ways.

USC conducted a search for a new psychology chair in spring 1968. Heckel had political connections who championed him for the position. The university, determined to bring in a scholar-administrator from outside to build psychology into a distinguished
department as it had previously done with English, history, and chemistry, resisted their campaign.\textsuperscript{101} Asked quietly by representatives in the legislature what could be done for Heckel, Jones suggested that the legislature add funding for a research institute to the appropriations for the university.\textsuperscript{102} The legislature complied, Jones created the Institute for Research on Problems of the Underprivileged, answerable directly to him, and asked Heckel to head it.\textsuperscript{103} Heckel, in turn, hired behavioural psychologist John Zuidema to write proposals and manage the research programs the institute attracted. The institute took over several of the student affairs initiatives on behalf of disadvantaged students, such as Upward Bound. Since it was not connected to a department, faculty did not accord the institute a high level of academic respect,\textsuperscript{104} but Jones now not only had an assistant to generate ideas for innovation but also an agency to bring them to fruition.

In preparation for an evaluation of USC's regional campuses by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), Jones clarified his thoughts concerning general education. He carefully distinguished the regional campuses from the community college type of institution, which emphasized terminal technical and vocational training.\textsuperscript{105} Only the established university could offer the curricular range to provide both the means of a comfortable material existence and a refined way of life. The "socially mobile group" must be moved "into understanding and partial acceptance, at least, of existing values."\textsuperscript{106} Further, widespread acculturation would reinforce political stability. "[T]he most stable long term outlook is to develop those who have the potential to rise out of the low income and underprivileged elements and make them a part of the existing culture and power structure." South Carolina educational planners could develop "semi-automatons for the industrial mill" or "an appropriate educational program that [could] change those who are
ready to change and maintain a balance and a political stability that will permit our state to
develop culturally and materially at a maximum rate. Isn't that what we should plan for?"

While Jones and his colleagues worked on educational innovation, USC students
developed their own programs. Two major sources of leadership in this development, both
couraged by Jones, were the student government and United Methodist chaplain Bob
Alexander. Student volunteer work in the African-American community and King's
assassination prompted Alexander and the student government to establish, with the aid of
African-American student and community leaders, the Metropolitan Education
Foundation, to "give some creative outlets and build some bridges."107 The university had
no obligation to MEF. Very soon, however, Jones brought the student volunteer initiatives
under the auspices of USC. At his invitation, Alexander resigned his chaplaincy to accept
the position of director of student activities and assistant to the vice president of student
affairs.108 Like Ledeen before him, his employer now would be the university rather than
the church. Alexander joined a growing group of higher educators around Jones,
including Witten, Fidler, Heckel, and Zuidema, who promoted humanistic innovation - in
Alexander's case, through development of community. Jones noticed and encouraged the
innovative student leaders but his group of educators provided consistency for long-term
development.

As Jones looked ahead to the fall of 1968, his desire to establish a premier research
university was undiminished. His conception of the business of his university had moved
strongly toward social research. In the context of South Carolina, while not neglecting the
university's role in economic and physical development, Jones had become increasingly
preoccupied with the educational needs of the disadvantaged. At the same time, the both
strident and quietly insistent efforts of student protesters and student government leaders
to be heard kept him struggling toward a new understanding of the educational process as
a whole.

In the fall of 1968, basic life issues confronted American students wherever they
turned. Introduction of a draft lottery meant that disadvantaged youth might no longer
have to disproportionately bear the burden of combat. Johnson, having conceded that
Vietnam was more powerful in the minds of the American electorate than his civil rights
and anti-poverty record, left voters free to choose a new direction. Republican Richard
Nixon promised to preserve America’s honour in Southeast Asia and look after the
“forgotten” conservative Americans whose viewpoints had been neglected in the domestic
turmoil of the decade. The resolution of racial, class, and political realities with American
ideals appeared doubtful.

These unresolved issues could be seen clearly in South Carolina. The American
dream did not exist for many African Americans and whites hampered by illiteracy,
unemployment, and poor health. In fall 1968, a House subcommittee sent an investigator
to inquire why Dr. Donald Gatch accepted ostracization by his colleagues rather than keep
quiet about hunger and disease in Beaufort County. Harvard psychiatrist Robert Coles
and Washington lawyer Harry Huge reported in The New Republic that widespread
poverty in the county meant substandard housing, malnutrition diseases “which medical
students are taught no longer exist in America,” almost non-existent health insurance, and
an infant mortality rate comparable to that of an under-developed nation. Further, “about
half the county’s people have less than eight years of education and 20.4 percent have been
declared ‘functional illiterates’…. (A)mong blacks about four fifths of the population has
not gone beyond elementary school, and many have not had any schooling at all."\(^{109}\) Flaum articulated a philosophy of USC’s involvement with South Carolina’s social problems which expressed Jones’s laboratory approach to service. Flaum argued that the twentieth-century research university "is central to the state's and nation's activities."\(^{110}\) Its achievements generally in teaching, research, and service "have been so centrally important as to lead some observers to believe that the society's future salvation will depend essentially on the university (emphasis by Jones)." Nevertheless, the service function could become a financial drain, distract from responsibilities to students and faculty, and result in the development of a university "doctrine" that would limit free inquiry. Flaum thought that "perhaps the most constructive role for the university was to engage only in those public service activities which are a direct outgrowth of its regular teaching and research programs and which, in turn, feed back into and strengthen them."

Innovation continued to develop in a humanistic direction at USC. Correspondence concerning admissions and registration contained compliments as well as complaints.\(^{111}\) To avoid a confusing mass orientation in fall 1968, the university invited incoming students to complete their orientation during the summer and hired student leaders to help them.\(^{112}\) The university retained a fall orientation for those who chose it. Witten informed the board of women visitors that "group guidance...is being continued throughout the freshman year and is proving to be of great value."\(^{113}\) At the same time, Jones explored extending orientation into the curriculum. He ordered multiple copies of a Hazen Foundation study which concluded that "the freshman year should be a breathing-spell of orientation rather than intensive academic study."\(^{114}\) It suggested that universities should break with the academic guilds to give first-year students tutorial classes, learning
facilitators rather than lecturers, reduced competition through optional or pass-fail grading, and more flexibility in determining the content and length of their programs. USC experimented with some of these concepts in the Upward Bound and President's Opportunity Scholars programs.\textsuperscript{115} To further explore them, members of the school of education and the division of student affairs urged Jones to involve USC in the research-oriented remedial "adjunct education" along the lines of Upward Bound recommended by the state's Moody Report.\textsuperscript{116}

The thinking of American educational innovators demonstrated a clear trend. Stimulated by efforts to expand educational opportunity and by student activism, they argued that higher education should begin with the student rather than the subject. According to Flaum, the student of 1968 "is aware that most colleges talk about being concerned with the development of the students' 'total personality.' He does not believe it."\textsuperscript{117} Students desired "a vehicle for learning where... each classroom is a laboratory dealing with live problems, and where teaching and learning must be critical of itself (emphasis by Jones)." If free inquiry led to change, so be it. "[Students] believe that a university has neither the right educationally, nor morally, to provide an education for one generation that is not open for rejection by another generation. They plead the right to reject the education which has been handed down to them."

The student-centred educational philosophy developing in the minds of Jones and congenial colleagues did not touch most USC classrooms. Jones proffered research and college objectives without explaining how they could be reconciled. USC's determined efforts to weed out faculty with a college rather than a research orientation meant pursuit of new knowledge according to the dictates of disciplines preoccupied most faculty,
however humanistically inclined. Activist students did not see change in the institution. As they continued to push against established boundaries, most of the university's responses to them were administrative in the interests of maintaining control.

The turbulence of the Democratic national convention in Chicago in August 1968 left student radicals bitter and educators in no doubt that further actions lay ahead. Witten warned the academic advisory council that "across the nation, students are planning to continue to foment disruptive incidents."\(^{118}\) He felt that USC students would push for the adoption of their bill of rights. Witten's suggestions for preventing student unrest included more student appointments to committees, improved communications between administration and students, appointing an ombudman, and training for campus police.\(^{119}\)

Though Witten did not mention curricula, his warning prompted the dean of arts and science, Dr. Bruce W. Nelson, to open discussion with the student government "concerning curricular matters. It seems to me that we should react to such potential problems as Dean Witten raised by anticipatory action."\(^{120}\) Salane, at his suggestion, formed a curriculum committee of students "who have already demonstrated their ability to handle our present curriculum successfully, since it will only be from those students that the faculty will feel that meaningful criticism of our present system can come."\(^{121}\)

The student government presented its bill of rights and freedoms as expected.\(^{122}\) It also dealt the university an unexpected controversy by requesting that USC allow the sale of beer in the Spur Night Club in Russell House.\(^{123}\) Predictably Jones received a flood of protest from the community.\(^{124}\) A concern raised both on and off the campus was whether it would raise the image of the party school once more in the public mind.\(^{125}\) The trustees decided that sale of beer on campus was not "in the best interest of the university."\(^{126}\)
Undeterred, the student senate, with Salane abstaining, asked the trustees to reconsider because "political pressure brought to bear by people outside the University should not effect (sic) the internal governing of an educational institution."\(^{127}\)

Meanwhile, a new student voice gained strength. When the 1960s began, women did not hold student government positions. In the mid-1960s, USC women organized Associated Women Students, a subsidiary student government devoted to making the relaxation of *in loco parentis* more equal. By fall 1968, the female residents of Capstone, by earning superior scholarship records despite less restrictive hours than usual for women, had demonstrated enough "maturity, wise judgment and...desire to assume more personal responsibility," to request another less restrictive residence hall.\(^{128}\) After AWS president Linda Burton successfully solicited the board of women visitors's support for liberalization of hours in women's residences, Jones sent the matter to the trustees for consideration. "The attached is, I believe, very important reading for Board Members and Administrators. Note the students' concern for being over-protected."\(^{129}\)

The university was not so sanguine about the resurgence of Aware. Its founders had left the organization intact. Brett Bursey decided to reactivate it. Bursey was the son of a career military officer. As a teenager living on the Parris Island, South Carolina, base, he frequently awakened at dawn to the sound of thousands of Vietnam-bound soldiers in exercises chanting, "Kill!" "It's provocative, you know. It makes you think."\(^{130}\) His racial sensitivity crystallized when, after the civil rights act passed in 1964, he saw inside a popular barbecue restaurant in Columbia a large sign which read, "The law makes us serve niggers but any money we get from them goes to the Ku Klux Klan." After high school, Bursey entered the University of Georgia to study law and politics, but began to
concentrate more on protest when Lester Maddox earned the governor's chair with a racist platform. He joined the Southern Student Organizing Committee and transferred to USC. Bursey developed a socialist outlook after the Chicago Democratic convention. "A whole bunch of young people just really gave up on the United States in general and I think on capitalism in particular." He spent much of his time travelling to campuses organizing SSOC chapters. Under his influence, Aware changed its name to AWARE, elected a slate of officers, and voted to affiliate both with SSOC and SDS.

The new AWARE announced its intended affiliations, arguing that SDS would carry on Aware's mandate of working toward fulfilment of a democratic society and that SSOC would help it do so cognizant of the social problems of the South. ¹³¹ Jones assured concerned South Carolinians that resentment of the other USC students would keep SDS under control. ¹³² The university did not, however, take a passive stance to AWARE. SLED agents again infiltrated AWARE meetings ¹³³ and the student affairs committee revised USC's student rules and regulations to require chartered organizations to keep their constitutional changes and affiliations in agreement with university policies and to submit semesterly lists of officers and faculty advisors. ¹³⁴

WDIX in Orangeburg informed its listeners that SDS was about to enter the state through USC. ¹³⁵ AWARE capitalized on the attention by announcing it would "work for... a new South, a place which embodies our ideals for all the world to emulate not ridicule." ¹³⁶ USC's trustees directed Jones to "work out as strong a statement as possible for the news media," that SDS was not at the university as an organization and "setting forth the Board's aversion to radical groups or violence of any nature on campus." ¹³⁷ Witten urged Jones not to force AWARE's hand. "Although very few of our students
sympathize with AWARE and its aims, a vast number of them would immediately become sympathetic if they thought 'Student Rights' were being disregarded.\textsuperscript{138} The dean of the school of law thought Jones should not comment unless pressed and then only vaguely.\textsuperscript{139} Jones delayed the public statement and passed the recommendations of his colleagues on to the trustees.\textsuperscript{140}

The strategy of denying AWARE the exposure it desired extended to the student affairs committee. When the committee received complaints that AWARE ignored university regulations concerning the use of a sound system, off-campus speakers, and fundraising, it decided to investigate both the complaints and AWARE's affiliations. AWARE explained that it was not an SDS chapter, in which all members belonged to the national organization; therefore, it retained its autonomy.\textsuperscript{141} The committee decided not to act until it had reviewed AWARE's constitution and ensured that AWARE understood the USC student rules and regulations.\textsuperscript{142}

Administrative silence appeared effective. Attendance at AWARE meetings dwindled from 70 to 25, although attendance at rallies varied between 100 and 300.\textsuperscript{143} AWARE received a boost in December, however, when the student government passed a resolution accepting the SDS affiliation and recommending that it not affect their charter.\textsuperscript{144}

Over the semester, USC's radicals addressed the war, race, labour, and the 1968 election with all the passion of their counterparts across the nation. In the area of racial discrimination, AWARE cultivated African-American involvement in the peace movement and included inflammatory rhetoric in its publications. The state and the university exhibited vulnerability to AWARE's rhetoric. A USC law student analyzing causes of
racial unrest in Columbia for Mayor Lester Bates argued that the white conservative "openly voices his opposition to 'Negro advancement' whereas the liberal attempts to cope with it only because he has the foresight to know he cannot hinder it successfully." Progressives had made little progress on behalf of African Americans through USC. Jones reported to National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges that African Americans comprised less than two percent of undergraduate and less than one percent of graduate students. The university employed five African Americans in faculty positions and six in administrative or professional positions. USC’s efforts to improve African-American mobility consisted mainly of federal programs, educational experiments, and history department initiatives. Participation of African-American students in campus life consisted of membership in a national leadership honorary society, the Association of Afro-American Students, student union activities and committees, and MEF.

Jones told NASULGC that "channels of communication for all groups, administration, students and faculty are open in order than an active dialogue will be maintained for all groups." USC's pressured administrators continued to encase dialogue in bureaucratic structure. The trustees formed a student, as well as a faculty, liaison committee. Jones, Witten, the faculty advisory committee, and the student government reworked the student senate's student bill of rights and responsibilities once more and sent it to faculty in December with the assurance that it took their objections into account, it reflected university policy, and passage "would be a significant step toward improved student-faculty relations." Witten now came out strongly in favour of the document. "The rights called for in this statement have long been understood and practiced on this campus and...only in a very few respects is any major change in present policies called
for."152 Witten made it clear that the statement's "implementation would be in harmony with the university's stated educational purposes."153 Rather than being an expression of student autonomy, the statement "promotes a community approach to those problems which are of proper concern to the University as a whole." Faculty still, however did not approve it.

As 1969 began, Jones added to USC's roster of educational innovations. In the fall, he had had another of his serendipitous meetings -- this one with a Caltech student who hoped to organize a consortium of institutions interested in an experimental student-directed program called Contemporary University. Impressed that Joseph Rhodes aimed to bring about educational reform through a "peaceful and positive program," Jones invited him to USC to open discussions with the school of education.154 With Flaum, Jones also explored the idea of an experimental college to test a more student-centred model of higher education.

Flaum, in his last major paper before taking a research administration position at the Medical College of Charleston, inquired: "Is the ultimate justification of our educational system the development of the individual or the preservation of society? (emphasis by Jones)."155 He believed that the reconciliation of the two ends required a re-examination of institutional priorities. "The conflict is not between liberal and professional, for professional subjects can be taught in a liberal way. The conflict is between liberal and specialized, between breadth of general understanding on one side and a narrow competence on the other." Flaum was able to offer as a connector only teaching that was more interestingly presented and relevant to the condition of the students. He asked, "How far will we be willing to go in stating our curriculum objectives in terms of
student emergence, selfhood, transcendence, commitment, and nexus? If we were to look at the possibilities in these lights, we might even discover how easy it is to bring students into the nexus of the academic community."

Flaum concluded that the university should, "however imperfectly," both develop the individual and preserve society. To Jones, "rather than trying to decide whether there should be activists or non-activists," the relevant question was where to draw the line between learning and socially acceptable behaviour.\textsuperscript{156} In the spring of 1969, USC students thoroughly tested the line as they pressed their interests. The semester opened with the Clariosophics asking the university to disallow AWARE's SDS affiliation.\textsuperscript{157} Jones skirted the issue: "I have discussed thoroughly the question of membership in the SDS and other similar organizations with the Attorney General and the Dean of the Law School and it is clear that the students are within their rights in such a membership. On the other hand, it is important for you to know that the University has not given its recognition to SDS."\textsuperscript{158} Non-recognition would limit AWARE's growth "and that is the most important continuing problem." Bursey quickly demonstrated that he would not give USC reprieve. Security officers who did not appreciate Bursey's discourse on civil liberties after they broke up his demonstration against President Nixon's post-election visit to Columbia forcibly subdued him and put him in "the hole." Undeterred, he returned to campus to pursue his revolutionary agenda.

The student governments also remained committed to their issues. Witten, Salane and Burton met with the board of women visitors to discuss the AWS issue of housing.\textsuperscript{159} The student senate articulated three goals: to improve the life of the student body including to "make the Ombudsman program a viable institution,..to improve the
educational structure itself, [and]...to improve the impression that Carolina makes on the 
community and the state." The student union supplemented the university's curriculum 
with student-arranged, non-credit short courses. After United Press International 
publicized them, Jones received letters from all over the nation and Europe demanding to 
know why USC offered courses in lovemaking and witchcraft. "This...idea is the answer 
of the middle-of-the-road student to student unrest," he replied. "These courses are 
tended to occupy spare time usefully and open up new worlds of knowledge."  

AWARE planned a White Awareness Week to raise consciousness of African-
American issues. The student senate resolved to give it their support. At the same time, 
the Association of Afro-American Students planned to commemorate the Orangeburg 
massacre. Witten's division denied their request for official permission to burn a 
Confederate flag, to declare that "it is a tribute to the peculiar institution that enslaved 
human beings (and)...it offends and outrages normal sensibilities." Picking up the cause, 
Bursey torched a Confederate flag. Counter activists then invited students to fly 
Confederate flags "in your rooms - out your windows - everywhere" and attend a Dixie-
singing rally. "The South is Rising Again!" Because flagburning was a misdemeanor in 
state law, Bursey was arrested and released on bond. The student affairs committee 
went over AWARE's accumulated violations and decided to hold an open hearing 
concerning its charter.  

The news that some students desired the banning of the Confederate flag and of 
the singing of "Dixie" set off one of the angriest reactions to student protest of Jones's 
presidency. Many letter writers promised that democratic majority rule would ensure that 
the symbols would remain. African-American students vented their frustration. A Black
Rap asked: "What shall we do now, Brothers?...We are vastly outnumbered and surrounded by the man. We must avoid mass confrontation. The lives of black folk are too precious to lose in another massacre."\textsuperscript{168} The student affairs committee suspended AWARE's privileges and activities and gave it a week to prepare to defend its charter.\textsuperscript{169} USC automatically suspended Bursey because of his arrest, but he continued to work with AWARE. A petition protesting the suspension of AWARE's rights of speech and assembly appeared,\textsuperscript{170} followed by a list of student demands concerning process, including that students should no longer be suspended for unbecoming conduct or arrest.\textsuperscript{171} Nevertheless, the student affairs committee voted to extend AWARE's suspension "until such time as the officers of the organization submit in writing their intent to abide by the rules and regulations...."\textsuperscript{172}

USC's administration increased their efforts to build communication with acknowledged mainstream student leaders. Jones called the heads of the student government and AWS, student union, residence halls, Greeks, and The Gamecock to acquaint them with "some of the background data and philosophy involved in various changes that the University makes."\textsuperscript{173} Though these matters -- for example, cafeteria hours -- did not touch on current controversies, Jones reported to the board the next day that "the meeting...helped to ease the strained relationships which resulted following the Confederate flag burning incident...."\textsuperscript{174} The board received as information that the students on their student liaison committee did not want to be judged by the few radicals in the university but felt that "responsible students were not afforded an opportunity to do their fullest in recent situations on campus." Though the faculty had not approved it yet, the students urged the board to pass their bill of rights.
Jones sent the student bill of rights with faculty amendments to the trustees.\textsuperscript{176} USC students still, however, were not convinced that the university listened to them. The Association believed Jones was particularly remiss "in not publicly acknowledging... problems they have raised, or in denouncing racism on campus."\textsuperscript{176} On the grounds that "recent decisions made by the board of trustees make it quite obvious that their actions are governed more by external forces than by the just interests of the students," the student senate asked for student participation in the selection of the trustees and the president.\textsuperscript{177} It also called for an ombudsman who went into the residences to talk with students, and for a student referendum on the sale of beer on campus.\textsuperscript{178}

In mid-March, AWARE submitted a letter of intent to obey USC regulations. The student affairs committee lifted its suspension while keeping it on probation.\textsuperscript{179} As WDIX of Orangeburg reported, AWARE resumed its demonstrations, demanding free speech, assembly and press, "abolishment of the automatic suspension when a student is arrested, student disciplinary trial by peers, an end to military recruiting on campus, an end to the ROTC, prevention of undue authority by law enforcement officers, student admissions in ratio to race, a black studies department, standards of conduct for women lowered to the level of that of the men students, and the banning of the official use of 'Dixie' and the Confederate flag."\textsuperscript{180}

The student government seconded the Association's complaint that USC also had "in the past arbitrarily moved into and cleared out communities in order to build for its own uses."\textsuperscript{181} At Nelson's request, it also enthusiastically formed a large committee on curriculum revision.\textsuperscript{182} The committee delegated the development of an African-American studies proposal to a student who called himself Redfern II and other members of the
Association. It decided to carry its investigation of the ultimate goal of education, the purposes of an arts and science education, and the course and degree requirements of an ideal program through the summer and prepare an orientation questionnaire to survey the views of incoming students.

Jones reassured all correspondents who worried about student unrest at USC, "I think we can state definitely that we have the situation under control." He expressed gratitude to SLED, the Columbia police department, and the governor's office for helping USC maintain order on the campus. Witten prepared to present to the trustees strongly worded disciplinary notices to students violating USC's "normal educational and institutional processes." The mood of the administration, however, leaned toward conciliation. The trustees followed Jones's recommendation that they adopt the student bill of rights and freedoms, and braved an inevitable public storm by accepting Witten's recommendation that students be allowed alcoholic beverages in their rooms in accordance with federal, state, and local laws. To critics, a trustee declared that "[e]very member of the Board of Trustees supports Dr. Jones in the manner in which he and the members of his staff are handling our problem at the University. Without the hard work of these individuals we may have already sustained a serious disruption of our educational facilities."

The federal government also acknowledged that tough measures would not mollify student activism in the late 1960s. Statements from Washington promised some relief directly to students and indirectly to institutions by seemingly addressing student concerns. Most importantly, Nixon announced his intention to end the draft altogether and, in the meantime, change draft regulations to decrease vulnerability to being drafted between the
ages of 19 and 26.\textsuperscript{139} In recognition of student volunteerism on American campuses, including USC's MEF,\textsuperscript{191} the federal Housing and Urban Development Department announced a National Program for Voluntary Action. "The desire of students to come to grips with the problems of society confronts college administrations and our Nation with an unusual challenge. I hope you will join us in a program to meet the challenge of helping the student to help others."\textsuperscript{192}

As students left campus, the legislature and the university began preparations for the coming year. The legislature passed acts to prohibit firearms in school buildings and entry into school buildings to destroy records.\textsuperscript{193} Witten discussed with Jones how to make USC's new ombudsman position effective and the possibility of a regulation requiring "students, as well as faculty and staff, to show identification on request by University officials."\textsuperscript{194} The business affairs department suggested creation of faculty-student committees for each food service area and the addition of student members to the faculty traffic and parking committee.\textsuperscript{195} The counseling bureau, which since its inception had been involved with many of USC's student-centred innovations, announced that a new director of freshman services "would be in charge of, not only summer and fall orientation, but on-going orientation and all special services for freshmen in the year."\textsuperscript{196} No mention was made of the freshman seminar course recommended by Flaum.\textsuperscript{197}

Jones fostered a burst of major student-centred educational innovations. He received the news that the Ford Foundation had awarded a $95,000 grant to Joseph Rhodes to implement his Contemporary University program at the University of Massachusetts, Federal City College, and USC on June 13.\textsuperscript{198} Jones established it immediately, presenting it to faculty as a \textit{fait accompli} in July.\textsuperscript{199} USC's Contemporary
University accepted 25 proven students who created their own semester-long program of independent study and research, under the direction of a faculty advisor. Jones planned to expand accessibility to about the same number of underprepared and undermotivated students through a reorganization within the college of general studies. He proposed to bring Columbia's associate degree-granting Midlands College to campus, give it a dean and faculty and a four-year degree in general studies, and apply for its accreditation as part of the university. Connected with this, he planned to apply the concept of individual study and research through a new socially-responsive associate degree in contemporary studies. Its interdisciplinary and dynamic curriculum, "an attempt to challenge and reject conventional, arbitrary boundaries of knowledge," would have five academic divisions. In communications, students would explore interpersonal skills; in humanities, humans in relation to society and environment; in behavioural science, self; in professional exploration, employment; and in learning systems, ways of learning and "planning and modification of curricular experiences." Its collaborative and flexible nature would require faculty "committed to: general education, humanistic instruction, interdisciplinary views on knowledge, experimental education, and risk of rejection." Jones expected Midlands College, like Contemporary University, to be in operation by September. If after two years, the associate degree approach succeeded, it could be extended into a four-year degree for students who did not have the educational background to cope with traditional expectations.

The concepts underlying Contemporary University and the Midlands College proposal had caught Jones's attention through Upward Bound. Upward Bound provided an ongoing laboratory for experimental curriculum. At the end of the 1969 summer
session, its instructors reported that their "interest-centered" curriculum had convinced 45 of the 47 high school seniors who had participated to go on to higher education. Follow-up of Upward Bound graduates nationally showed their success rate "about parallel to all other students." A member of USC's public advisory committee commented that the Upward Bound approach should be made available to "middle class and lower middle class students who needed the motivation that is so important in developing students."

All USC's educational innovations drew on the human relations approach promoted by NTL of Bethel, Maine. It comprised the dominant orientation of Heckel's Institute for Research on Problems of the Underprivileged, renamed Social Problems Research Institute. Heckel, maintaining his professorship in the psychology department and his research interests, depended on Zuidema to run SPRI. Zuidema was a Carl Rogers enthusiast, whose career experience in South Carolina in public special education and mental health included NTL training. In summer 1969, SPRI hired Manning Hiers who had earned a doctorate in clinical psychology at USC and who shared Zuidema's interest in group dynamics, social psychology, and teaching. Heckel, Zuidema and Hiers excelled at research grant proposals. Contemporary University had directed the attention of the Ford Foundation to USC; SPRI helped Jones exploit it. They learned that "Ford apparently is currently a little disillusioned with merely supporting activism." The foundation wished to support "training and research working toward the development of leadership in the underprivileged within the establishment." Jones thought the Midlands College concept would be within Ford's purview and invited their program advisor to review it. Upward Bound allowed Jones to demonstrate to the foundation the success of group dynamics as a change agent in the lives of nontraditional students.
Jones blended a desire for humanistic education with a determination to maintain law and order. "I assure you the question of 'Who runs the colleges?' has a very definite answer at the University of South Carolina." In the context of social unrest, as the Ford Foundation perspective suggested, humanistic education and law and order could serve each other. Student-centred education could become a powerful agent of socialization. Jones had been moving in this direction for some time in his efforts to bring disadvantaged South Carolinians into the social mainstream. His experience with Upward Bound led him to consider applying it to all students. With Ford Foundation assistance, this could happen.

While USC continued to be hospitable to religious entities, it saw itself as the source of human actualization rather than religion. Though Jones was a Presbyterian elder, his socialization programs exemplified truth as process and humanity as something to be engineered. Religion was useful to meet human needs, as the ongoing relationship between the student affairs division and the chaplains demonstrated. In Spring 1969, the administration revised their agreement with the chaplains, formally recognizing that "some knowledge of religion and an adequate opportunity to mature in religious understanding through intellectually respectable media is a sound part of a college education." The university continued to approve appropriately educated ministry personnel and give them use of campus facilities for their programs. When the members of the student religious organization temporarily neglected their visiting scholars program in favour of MEF, USC's student affairs division kept it going for them. The university carried on certain rituals comforting to its constituency, notably prayer at trustees meetings and football games. The Y experienced a small resurgence, while pondering the old questions of
staffing and finances. Religion, however, other than as social service or an academic subject, now had only a vague connection to the purposes of the university.

Despite the steps USC took to increase student involvement in its affairs, Jones expected 1969-70 to be "a year of protests against Vietnam, racism, the Establishment, and the status quo in general." USC's troubles began with orientation. To support the academic purpose of the university, Witten discontinued the "fun and games" relational character of the Y orientations. Incoming students underwent tours and talks, wrote testing instruments, saw academic advisors, and registered. The process culminated in a freshman convocation, at which the president scared new students by telling them to look around them because most of those people would not survive to graduation. Some students discomforted parents by handing out dissident literature from a booth that they believed the university had approved. The material signaled continued student pressure on institutional authority, whether it came from AWARE, the Association, which had received permission to participate informally in orientation, or from a renewed movement to test constitutional rights through offensive speech.

To a recipient of the literature who objected to the university "acquainting ladies and gentlemen with four-letter words," Jones confided that he "would love to destroy this junk personally...but...I cannot properly do so under the American Constitution." He reiterated his "one important objective: Make the radical group...ineffective. We avoid the development of sympathy or an 'age-gap' conflict by carefully according everyone his lawful rights (emphasis by Jones)." A faculty member pointed out that rights conflict and worried that the right to learn might "be preserved at the cost of popular suppression of the right to protest." Jones replied succinctly and vaguely. "It is
important to recognize that any right becomes questionable when it infringes on the rights of others....I am unconcerned about protest or dissent so long as it properly respects the rights of others.\footnote{221}

AWARE started the year with a military resistance fair which emphasized "the need for political and educational redefinition; redefinition that is necessary if the university is to become an educational institution, and not simply a tool for the perpetuation of the status quo."\footnote{222} It planned to take a calculated risk regarding its speakers, believing that "the University wouldn't stop a speaker once they started talking."\footnote{223} Jones cautioned faculty that "there was far more danger in over-reacting than under-reacting." The student government agreed that USC should enforce its regulations if unauthorized speakers participated.\footnote{224} Jones and Witten outlined plans for handling security, and a sit-in should one occur.

Despite its bluster, AWARE kept within its speaker guidelines.\footnote{225} The public frowned on the event, however.\footnote{226} Jones again minimized the influence of radicals on campus. "Frankly we have been pleased with the reaction of our students concerning unrest, and I believe that we have the problem under control."\footnote{227} Witten spelled out existing speakers regulations to show that students had the right to invite speakers who would help them examine varying viewpoints.\footnote{228} At the same time, he obtained board approval for a proviso to the regulations that "[t]he right of peaceable assembly does not include the right of individual students or groups to invite outside speakers. Such speakers can be invited only by recognized student organizations in accordance with the aforementioned procedures."\footnote{229}

While AWARE recruited students to go to Chicago to commemorate the 1968
Democratic convention and to Washington to "paralyze the Pentagon," Jones pleaded his "armchair presidents" with his handling of a second controversy which arose in September.\textsuperscript{230} That the language which upset parents at orientation foreshadowed a trend became clear as the printer of The Gamecock informed Jones that a forthcoming issue contained a decidedly informal word. Jones obtained legal advice and held up publication until the word was deleted. He framed the issue not as one of censorship but of good taste, which, if not the editor, the board had a responsibility to ensure.\textsuperscript{231} Jones supported a free student press but did not believe that the editor had the right to arbitrarily "force vulgarity upon others" against the wishes of his constituency.\textsuperscript{232} Jones's counterparts in other institutions expressed sympathy. "The duties and responsibilities of the college administrator become more difficult day by day. Maintaining compatibility between academic freedom, student rights, and public expectations can sometimes be an impossible task."\textsuperscript{233}

The student government, under president Barry Knobel, kept the interests of the students before the administration. AWS persuaded the university to end curfews "for women students above the freshman class who have parental permission."\textsuperscript{234} The student government again put food services on the defensive after a group calling themselves the Nutritional Liberation Front advertised a sit-in. "We must take control of the decisions that effect (sic) our lives...educationally, socially, and nutritionally."\textsuperscript{235} When the student government presented a petition regarding parking to Vice President for Business Affairs Harold Brunton, he advised them the university planned major expansion in that area and said the petition would help convince the legislators to pay for it.\textsuperscript{236}

The student government's curriculum committee aimed to rethink American higher
education. "Insignificant course changes have been significantly astronomical and have constituted "curriculum revision' for much too long. We need to set forth basic principles and purposes for the existence of the entire USC complex." Jones sent them a proposal for an experimental college intended to extend unstructured, student-driven learning into the university. "There would be no curriculum, no requirements in the usual sense of courses and subject areas." Students, working in groups of 10 to 15 with faculty facilitators, would pursue independent humanistic, social, and science studies and research. They would complete their programs with unstructured student-developed courses and sequences and summer opportunities such as international travel and social service, fine arts, and recreational projects. The university would grant students intending to receive a degree credits based on achievement of behavioural goals rather than grades. It would set no time limit for completion. The student government committee, however, used the semester to develop and administer a survey of undergraduate educational goals and attitudes to learning methods, possible curricular innovations, and degree and major requirements.

Concurrently, the Association of Afro-American Students prepared their African-American Studies proposal for presentation to the faculty's new courses and curriculum committee. SLED reported that "[t]he Black Movement at USC is independent. The whites in AWARE have repeatedly invited the Blacks to join them; however, the Blacks have made it clear that they do not want association with the whites." Accordingly, only Association members participated on Nelson's Black Studies committee, with faculty members they selected, like Heckel. Their proposal argued that by failing to provide African-American content, "the University of South Carolina is perpetuating a racist,
white-oriented, European-centered education which negates the presence of black students and contributes to [their] psychological depression.\textsuperscript{242} In a play on USC's motto, the proposal challenged the university "to become a 'faithful index to the ambitions and fortunes of the state.'" The Association wanted changes in existing courses, new courses, and a Black Studies major. Within a month after beginning work with the committee, Heckel analyzed the inclusiveness of his own courses.\textsuperscript{243}

Members of the Association cooperated at some risk because many of their fellow African Americans now eschewed civilities.\textsuperscript{244} A wave of racial violence swept South Carolina which prompted seven South Carolinian civil rights and human relations organizations to ask: "[W]here are all the 'progressive' South Carolinians who say they care for the progress and dignity of all men?"\textsuperscript{245} Teaching at both USC and Allen, Beardsley invited students from both institutions to his home for a barbecue. When they saw the African-American students in his home, one neighbour announced his family would be moving and another that her daughter could no longer play with Beardsley's daughter.\textsuperscript{246} USC, though it was inviting students into process, still had, in all its campuses an enrolment of only 342 African Americans.\textsuperscript{247} Many young Americans felt it was insensitive to African-American needs and an appropriate target for their hostility.

The continuing strained relations with students convinced the university that they would have to be taken into process at the highest levels.\textsuperscript{248} The trustees agreed to invite a member each from its faculty-board and student-board committees to its open meetings, with the privilege of speaking but not voting.\textsuperscript{249} Hailing this decision as "a leap forward in solving campus difficulties which are due to lack of communication," the president of the student body appointed himself the student member of the board.\textsuperscript{250}
The student president and the editor of *The Gamecock* agitated for student access to faculty deliberations, with mixed success. The president of the student body asked for the revival of the inactive student-faculty committee, one of only two faculty committees with student members. "Student-faculty relations are severely lacking on this campus. The student tends to think of the professor in an academic sense only... truly this is an unhealthy situation." The faculty advisory agreed. On the other hand, it unanimously recommended refusal of *The Gamecock*'s request to attend faculty meetings, arguing that, "[b]alancing the principle of freedom of information and a proper zone of privacy in the decision making process, we have concluded that this opportunity belongs to the faculty."

At an inter-university meeting on students as agents of campus change, Contemporary University's Joseph Rhodes asked students and their distinguished academic facilitators to discuss "ways in which governance processes, confrontation tactics, person-to-person organizing and education, and other methods of change have actually worked on their campuses." Student union president Vickie Eslinger believed that public opinion stalled any change for which students agitated. Nevertheless, USC governance demonstrated that students willing to challenge traditional authority influenced administrative policy, even in conservative South Carolina. USC's experimentation with a more collegial approach to learning demonstrated that they also influenced educational policy.

Jones's interest in educational experimentation led him to the human potential or Esalen movement. The movement, positing that humans use only perhaps five percent of their potential, sought to unlock the remaining 95 percent. This required reshaping
environments. "With increasing sophistication has come the recognition that institutions are not sacrosanct and that they have but one purpose and function - to serve as a framework for the actualization of human potential." Believing that the best environment for personal growth is a small group, human potential advocates founded "Growth Centers" such as Esalen in Big Sur, California. They encouraged scientists to incorporate it into scientific inquiry. "Exploring the human potential can become the meeting ground for a wide range of disciplines, offering a dynamic synthesis for seemingly diverse fields of research. It is possible that the field of human potentialities offers an answer to the long search for a synthesizing and organizing principle which will unify the sciences." The human potential belief that individuals are disoriented and reformed through interpersonal relations in small groups harmonized with the NTL framework on which much of USC's social experimentation was based.

USC's school desegregation consulting centre used the human potential concept to foster integration. The centre brought together an equal number of African-American and white school personnel from each district for two days of examining their personal feelings and values and characteristic attitudes and behaviours of the ethnic groups under the guidance of trained facilitators, in the hope that they would learn to clarify their own views and isolate problem areas and help others to do the same. Contemporary University, which shared instructors Warren Buford and Jim Luck with the desegregation centre, also utilized the concept. When Nelson enlisted Heckel to assess the Contemporary University program, Heckel argued that the concept be applied more widely. "There are problems that extend well beyond this innovative program for any growing university such as ours." He "urge[d] consideration of the development of an experimental
college....In such a setting the forces which normally obstruct innovation and change would be largely absent and new ideas could be tested which if demonstrated successfully could be incorporated in the total university.\textsuperscript{261}

Heckel's institute, after a uneventful first year exploring funding and putting out research publications, found its niche as a catalyst for change through behavioural psychology.\textsuperscript{262} It advertised its willingness "to work with any group in developing programs of research and training which require interpersonal skills training, social problems, manpower problems and other psychologically related factors."\textsuperscript{263} Using NTL methodology, it participated in a variety of state and volunteer research and training programs, including MEF's "Project Unity" adult education efforts in the low-income neighbourhood of Wheeler Hill.

The diminished role of religion in providing integration for higher education showed itself in the university's assumption of the social work of the campus ministries. In conjunction with its redevelopment policy, the university increased its involvement with MEF in community relations in Wheeler Hill, helping to provide facilities for a teen club and a children's playground.\textsuperscript{264} In addition, the student government appointed a South Carolina Voluntary Action Commission "to encourage and coordinate all voluntary service activities originating on campus."\textsuperscript{265} Its faculty advisor was Alexander. Jones believed the university had taken the place of the church as the central institution for human development. "Society has moved from dependence on faith, as centered in the Church, to dependence on authority as centered in government, to dependence on knowledge as centered in great Universities." To fulfill its developmental function, universities needed to "focus strongly on knowledge needed for tomorrow's affairs as compared to the worship
of analysis of the irrelevant past."\textsuperscript{266}

To help USC's student curriculum review committee focus on knowledge for the future, Buford and Luck described an unstructured curriculum which they were piloting in general studies.\textsuperscript{267} As students decided what they wanted to study and assigned their own grades, they learned to evaluate learning environments and methods. Buford and Luck helped them perceive developmental tasks through human potential exercises, such as strength acknowledgment and clarification of values. The faculty members of the committee concluded that the experimental curriculum program could provide pedagogical insights, but that the instructors' unstructured and unfocused presentation "would do more harm than good to the future prospects of the program."\textsuperscript{268} When Buford inquired as to whether he could order University Curriculum Development letterheads, Jones replied, "No."\textsuperscript{269}

Jones sought funding to bring to USC Antioch College's University Without Walls, a flexible independent study program.\textsuperscript{270} Meanwhile, for its 1969 accreditation study, USC evaluated its established experimental programs. Most Opportunity Scholars succeeded but would do better in smaller, more frequent classes, which included counseling.\textsuperscript{271} The honours program, which utilized small seminars, independent study and close faculty-student relationships, enjoyed a high degree of acceptance among faculty. Evaluators recommended that the university reduce honours professors' teaching hours, to exploit the potential for learning to teach offered by the flexibility of honours courses.\textsuperscript{272}

Nelson's arts and science curriculum review committee finally sent a draft proposal to selected faculty for comment. Their surveys showed that students and faculty agreed
that the main purpose of degree requirements was "to provide a fundamental core of
general education," though students were more oriented to employment skills than were
faculty. At least half of students and a third of faculty believed that students should be
able to choose half their course work. Most faculty and students approved of independent
study and interdisciplinary courses. They favoured a degree with a major over a general
studies degree. Consequently, the committee proposed "a reliance on options within
different areas to meet the general education requirements rather than specific courses."
The committee expected that choice would spur "effective undergraduate teaching.
Improving undergraduate teaching has become a major concern." In answer to concerns
that the changes would devalue the B.A. and B.S., the proposal stressed that the "quality
of any degree...depends on the quality of the faculty who provide it, not on specific degree
requirements."

Jones asked the participants in the self-study to read a SACS report which
assessed American higher education from the perspective of student development. "The
quality of relationships in higher education...must be improved... primarily because unless
trends towards giantism and dehumanization are reversed, the college will not be able to
educate even the technician." Arguing that "[e]veryone wants a face, not a mask," the
report called for "a far better integration of the cognitive and noncognitive dimensions of
human growth." This would be achieved through multiversities utilizing insights of
behavioural sciences in experimental colleges which "combine living, learning, working,
social service, and recreation into one integrated educational experience in which small
groups of students and faculty would participate together, regardless of the rigid demands
of course work, credits, and degrees." Multiversities would have to take the lead, the
report argued, because smaller institutions operated in bondage to their requirements.

The report recommended a first year which integrated "orientation to learning" and "the search for identity and intimacy," using tutorials and small seminars, and optional and pass-fail grades. Knowledgeable but not necessarily academically qualified faculty should act as facilitators. These innovations would challenge academic guilds whose interests blocked student-centred undergraduate education. Since commuter students found developmental influences elsewhere, commuter colleges "face an even greater challenge that will enable them to act on this concern." The SACS committee stressed that the time had come to end higher education's neglect of development.

USC's educational innovators sought to establish the behavioural approach to higher education in USC's graduate school. The school of education planned to offer degrees in educational psychology, which would translate and apply "the methods and body of knowledge of behavioural sciences particularly social psychology and psychology, to the problems which exist in the educational setting." At Jones's suggestion, Heckel wrote a proposal for a graduate school of applied behavioural science. The school would take an interdisciplinary stance, integrating results of research from various behaviourally oriented departments and moving them quickly into application. It would train students from a broad range of disciplines to apply behavioural science in "government, business, industry, and university affiliated centers." Heckel cautioned, however, that the program needed careful planning because it would have to earn acceptance in the academy. His institute could provide leadership.

To members of USC's faculty, innovation was of interest but academic credibility was most important. When USC announced plans to build a new football stadium
without a similar announcement concerning the new library it needed to fulfill its research university ambition, faculty called a special meeting to question the governance and role of the university’s athletics program. 280 Jones affirmed the importance of the library. "I came to the University of South Carolina committed to developing an institution of academic excellence....This commitment has not changed in any way....The University fundamentally and above all else is an academic institution." 281 Jones and the trustees, knowing both the ability of athletics to generate state loyalty and financial support and the importance of USC’s academics to the competitiveness of the state, mollified the legislature and the faculty by deciding to build the library as well as the stadium. 282

Student relations remained tense. Nixon's selective service changes failed to quiet student concern over Vietnam. New anti-war student groups, Vietnam Moratorium and Student Mobilization Committee, the latter mainly a subsidiary of AWARE, attracted considerable interest. 283 Many students sympathized with AWARE when the university closed its fall peace rally to outsiders. 284 AWARE forestalled discipline by moving the rally off-campus.

Though Witten banned Bursey from campus until the faculty discipline committee heard charges of taking tables from Russell House without permission, the issues that Bursey championed were unresolved. 285 USC, with other institutions of higher education across the nation, continued to debate amongst themselves the most appropriate approaches to dealing with campus unrest. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities and NASULGC argued that federal intervention in student discipline would be counterproductive. 286 Enacting laws would restrict the tension-releasing flexibility of institutional procedures. Federal authorities should leave university
governance with local administrations and local and state law enforcement agencies.

When the Florence campus left the USC system, Jones found an administrative
"strongman" to take the pressure of unpopular administrative moves.\textsuperscript{287} He transferred
Harry "Sid" Varney to Columbia "to assist him with the great number of academic and
student problems which tend to bog down the President's office."\textsuperscript{288}

At the beginning of February 1970, the faculty discipline committee permitted
Bursey to re-register with only a written reprimand on his record.\textsuperscript{289} Though the
committee allowed Bursey only to attend classes, he led the planning of AWARE's 1970
commemoration of the Orangeburg massacre. AWARE had a new martyrdom to
commemorate in the "bust" of Columbia's UFO coffeehouse. The UFO, established by
Quakers as a centre for peace propaganda and counseling, attracted the support of
activists of varying religious and radical viewpoints. It doubly irritated South Carolinians
who suspected it was a centre of drug activity. Because city solicitor John Foard finally
closed it and laid charges of maintaining a public nuisance against several of its operators,
AWARE invited "Fort Jackson G.I.s and students from other schools in the Columbia
area, also church and civil groups" to its commemoration, arguing that USC often opened
its facilities to people outside the university community.\textsuperscript{290} USC limited the number of
outside attendees to 50, and called AWARE before its student affairs committee after
approximately 300 came. AWARE agitated for due process, pointing out that the student
affairs committee merely had the power to advise the real disciplinarian, Witten. "[W]e
would remind the administrators that the points at issue, a forum in which to resolve
grievances, are rights and not favors to be decided at whim."\textsuperscript{291}

Unknown to students, the university suddenly came under intense pressure to pay
more than lip service to rights in another direction. A HEW team visited campus to assess USC's compliance with Title V of the Civil Rights Act which required that "all facilities and services provided by recipients of Federal assistance must be provided without regard to race, color or national origin." It found that USC did not comply fully with the requirements of the law. While USC offered Upward Bound and Contemporary Studies programs, it did not try to attract African American students. The president did not use his office to counteract racially offensive aspects such as "Dixie" and the Confederate flag, pictures in the annual, and alleged harassment by campus police and students. USC required African-American personnel in recruitment, admissions, counseling, dormitory staff, faculty, coaching, and administration. Less than two percent of the athletic scholarship budget went to African-American athletes. Few African Americans belonged to student organizations, particularly fraternities and sororities. Employment recruiters on campus did not display equal opportunity statements. HEW required USC in particular to actively recruit African-American students and employees, and to establish affirmative action programs. It gave USC 60 days to respond.

HEW's letter set off a frenzy of activity as Jones passed it on to the provost, vice presidents, deans and athletic coach. Jones released a statement to faculty and administration that: "No person shall be denied employment at any level of the University of South Carolina on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin, nor shall he or she be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any employment policy." He asked personnel with hiring responsibilities to record their efforts to employ more African Americans. The chief of security advised Jones that Zuidema would give the campus police training in human
relations. The public relations and admissions departments provided proof that they had tried to include African Americans in the image of the university. Nelson sent an Afro-American Studies proposal to faculty. "It is particularly appropriate that an Afro-American Studies program be initiated here in an area where the cultures and peoples of Africa and America were first joined, and where the materials for serious scholarly research are consequently most readily available." Though the Association communicated "their official disinterest in the program," the arts and science faculty approved it.

While the university struggled to comply with HEW's directives, a minority of students were becoming more activist concerning drugs. Jones believed that "at present the problem of drug usage at the University of South Carolina is not too serious but in an experimental stage." Nevertheless, the number of students appearing before the faculty discipline committee regarding drug charges increased. Drug activism accelerated with the emergence of a student group with ties to AWARE which called itself Freedom to Research Every Aspect of Knowledge, or FREAK. FREAK lobbied the administration for legalization of marijuana and LSD. "We feel that...the university's position in our society demands their leadership in educating the populace on this topic."

A faculty member warned Jones at the beginning of the year that student government would not tolerate the repression of unrest. He had witnessed a student leader declaring "that at USC the Administration could rely on the Student Government being on hand, with baseball bats, to suppress any incipient threat to their freedom to learn. He was a gentleman and I believe a scholar, but he was also very serious." Now the student government proposed to revise its constitution to take student discipline away
from faculty. The faculty advisory committee agreed that faculty "could well be relieved of discipline," but convinced the student government that much discussion was necessary to arrive at a workable student court.\textsuperscript{306}

Students also revived agitation over living conditions. They were irritated, and at night endangered, by insufficient parking.\textsuperscript{307} With the approval of alcoholic beverages in rooms came a demand for refrigerators. Student entrepreneurs flooded residences with refrigerators in opposition to the university's reluctance to allow the appliances. The student government argued for relaxing visiting hours in the dormitories, on the grounds they were the students' homes.\textsuperscript{308} They also revived the issue of the sale of beer in the Russell House nightclub.\textsuperscript{309}

USC had successfully controlled most student unrest throughout Jones's presidency. Now the various campus tensions of the 1960s began to escalate as though seeking in a precipitating event a violent release. Observing "growing sympathy for 'violence groups,'" the administration began to explore stronger prohibitive measures, including requiring expensive peace bonds.\textsuperscript{310} When AWARE's disciplinary hearing finally convened, by prearrangement SLED officers arrested Bursey and his AWARE co-chair, who turned out to be an undercover officer, for vandalizing a Columbia draft board office.

The administration decided it was time to protect Russell House from use by groups associated with the UFO and drug dealers.\textsuperscript{311} Jones approved a policy recommended by the student union which would give the university the right to require persons entering Russell House to prove with appropriate identification that they were students, faculty, staff, or guests invited for a specific occasion.\textsuperscript{312} The trustees instructed the administration to "cooperate fully with all law enforcement agencies."\textsuperscript{313} They rejected a resolution asking
for immediate suspension of a student accused of a major crime, on the grounds that this would be presuming guilt before it was proven.

The resolution, though it failed, put the student drug community on edge. After three drug arrests occurred on campus, FREAK led about 250 demonstrators to Jones's home on the Horseshoe. Meeting with FREAK representatives the next day, Jones listened to their demands, including for an end to illegal police raids on residence rooms.314 That evening FREAK again led demonstrators to the president’s house and then to Russell House to “take it over.”315 Jones obtained permission from the governor and board chair to keep Russell House open, not an unusual practice for special events. Student government leaders stayed in the student union with the protesters and helped them arrange another meeting with Jones.316 No outbreak occurred as Jones and state attorney general Daniel McLeod called an assembly to give students "the facts of life" and asked them to report violations of legal procedures.317 Most students thought the meeting demonstrated that the administration was willing to listen to them.318 However, legislators who sat in on the meeting made statements to the press which added to student tension.319

Jones reassured students concerned about the tindery atmosphere of campus that the university would not condone abuses of legal procedures by law enforcement officers and promised that these allegations would be investigated. He congratulated students for maintaining order and called for responsible behaviour in the days ahead.320 Jones argued that the tensions faced by USC were "simply a manifestation of the problems faced by our entire society and we must consider the inherent rights of the individual, the traditional rights of the academic community and the legal rights of all of us as interpreted by the courts." At the same time, Jones struck an ad hoc committee of community legal experts,
and a faculty and a student representative, to review the university's code and consider changes which would preserve its integrity and security.\textsuperscript{321}

In addition to the events on campus, students followed the UFO coffeehouse trial.\textsuperscript{322} They were stunned when the trial concluded with convictions and six-year prison sentences. Furthermore, Foard, for whom the trial had served as something of a political show, told the press he thought the university should use the trial transcript to review whether witnesses for the UFO, including Y veteran Ted Ledeen, were suitable employees.\textsuperscript{323} Jones stated that "we have not asked for any transcripts of the UFO trial and we do not have them. Furthermore, we subscribe to the AAUP statement on academic freedom as official policy...."\textsuperscript{324} Foard also announced that he had met the trustees in secret to discuss the use of Russell House by UFO advocates.\textsuperscript{325} His attack encouraged legislators to publicly and forcefully advise Jones on governance.

Jones reviewed university policy concerning Russell House with Strom and thought he was satisfied. Within hours of his conversation with Strom, however, Jones received a call from Provost Patterson notifying him that SLED was taking over the university. A deputy of Strom's delivered SLED's dictum. "Put your police in Russell House or we'll take it over. Put all violations of law in courts. We will audit performance of USC police."\textsuperscript{326} That day, the USC director of security barred the convicted UFO officers from campus and activated the identification policy prepared by Witten and passed by the trustees in March.\textsuperscript{327}

While they coped with the news that the United States had entered Cambodia, students simmered at the presence of a campus policeman at the entrance to Russell House. The president of the student body, presenting a resolution from a newly
constituted ad hoc student emergency coalition for academic freedom at USC, reported that students were "disturbed, dismayed and distressed by the brazen attempt by a few ill-informed local politicians to exercise unjust and dictatorial control over the University of South Carolina." Two days later, at Kent State University in Ohio, National Guardsmen shot four students who were protesting the Cambodian invasion.

Bursey, though banned from campus, was ready to seize this new opportunity for leadership. Police kept Jones informed of his activities. On Thursday, May 5, Bursey's group invited representatives from AWARE, FREAK, the Association of Afro-American Students, SMC, Vietnam Moratorium, Grimko Sisters Union, the student government, the student union, the interfraternity council, and AAUP to the Methodist Center to discuss a demonstration of solidarity with the slain Kent State protesters. The AAUP representative declined to support a takeover of Russell House. The student government also would not participate in a takeover but would support a voluntary student strike.

Wearing black armbands, the "USC Strike Coalition Committee" staged a quiet protest march to the university's awards ceremonies and then expectantly attended a press conference Jones was holding in a downtown hotel. When Jones ignored them and did not mention Foard, academic freedom, or Kent State, they adjourned to another meeting with Bursey at the Methodist Center. The Committee planned a two-day student strike, followed by the takeover of the student union. The student government affirmed the strike, as long as it was voluntary and nonviolent, and planned to co-opt the Committee's plans with a rally and memorial service for the Kent State students. To make a radical occupation of Russell House practically impossible because the proceedings would be under their jurisdiction, they reserved the Horseshoe and Russell House day and night.
The student union arranged entertainment. The faculty affirmed the right of students to demonstrate "for redress of grievances by proper democratic processes," in the context of its 1969 resolution that expression of opinion be orderly. In the morning while classes proceeded as usual, Jones called the governor, who assured him that the highway patrol and the National Guard stood ready for trouble. Witten approved the further refining of the responsibilities of the student affairs committee. "When a student organization has violated any of the regulations for student organizations, or has reflected discredit on the University, review the circumstances involved, and decide appropriate action (including warning or revocation of charter) subject to review by the president." At midday, about 500 students gathered at the flagpole in the Horseshoe and the student government started the rally. As several speakers were cited for violating the off-campus speaker regulations, the crowd grew restless. A majority of students wanted the flag lowered to half mast. Radioed by a campus policeman, Jones, fearing bloodshed, reluctantly agreed. The student government, still in control, adjourned the rally to Russell House. Bursey, acting within the strictures that had been placed on him, stood at the edge of campus communicating with his fellow radicals with a walkie-talkie. When a fragment of the demonstrators took possession of the student union, its employees called Jones and, along with the student government, vacated. Jones notified the governor. Believing that they were in their own student union legally, since it had been reserved for their vigil, most of the occupiers ignored the university's warnings to leave or be arrested. In late afternoon, while a crowd of perhaps 1000 onlookers waited outside, Strom made the decision to enter Russell House, arrest the students, and move them out. Outside,
however, students sat in front of the waiting prison bus and others threw bottles and rocks. Finally, reinforced by a National Guard unit called for by Witten, the police formed a wedge in front of the bus and got it through the crowd. Informed that Bursey was on the sidewalk at the edge of campus, Strom arrested him for violating the order of the court that he keep the peace. The university closed Russell House. Jones arranged with student government leaders for explanations in the residences and the governor met with the press and Jones and left for Washington to attend a meeting of governors called by Nixon.

Though the strike stretched to the next day, which was Friday, most students returned to class. Acting on a state statute that the trustees should act in the case of threat to property of the university, the executive committee of the board selected a hearing committee of eight trustees, four faculty and two student body officers and made plans to hear 14 defendants on Monday. About 1000 students and anxious faculty gathered peacefully on the capitol steps. The students who had been both charged with trespassing and suspended from the university joined them.

On Monday, the Russell House demonstrators appeared before the Columbia magistrate, who said it would be impossible to try their cases quickly. Seven hundred twenty-three students and faculty signed a petition "that it is the lack of a responsive channel of communication which resulted in the thirty-one students' individual and spontaneous decisions to remain in their student union building" and "that to proscribe these students would both undermine their non-violent precedent and jeopardize the development of effective communication on this campus." Other students advertised a rally in support of amnesty, to end at the administration building where the hearings were
to be held. Rufus Fellers's daughter, Rita, and other student leaders took a list of requests to the board chair. The board refused amnesty and the use of normal disciplinary procedure, but promised to improve communication.

When the hearings convened, a crowd of around 400 students gathered in the Horseshoe. Fellers informed the crowd they would not receive satisfaction. Jones, "purposely not a part of the Hearing Committee," became increasingly nervous. Because it was Confederate Memorial Day, most police were off duty. Jones released the employees on the first floor and stayed on the second floor with fellow administrators and trustees. Hearing someone shout, "Take administration!", he called the governor's office for help. Several hundred students entered and ignored the arrival of Strom and his small force of available officers. Strom radioed for prison buses and his outnumbered force concentrated on holding the second floor and taking pictures while students vandalized the first floor, particularly, in retaliation for parking tickets, the records in the treasurer's office. After Fellers admonished the officers to "lay down their symbols of war," the students began chanting "Power to the People!" and finally, "Orangeburg!" Jones refused to negotiate with the protesters because he could not accept their demand of amnesty for all defendants. Television crews filmed the growing crowd of spectators listening to speeches with numerous references to "pigs," Orangeburg, Black Bottom (a poor black neighborhood in Columbia) and Cambodia. Some spectators, increasingly frustrated at the "no concessions" attitude of the trustees and administration, damaged cars and got into a rock-throwing battle with the city police. When, after four hours, a line of National Guard vehicles approached, students jeered, threw objects, and unsuccessfully tried to block them. One patrolman required hospitalization.
The arrival of the Guard ended the action. Protesters stopped throwing computer cards out the administration building windows and disappeared. The Guardsmen, with live ammunition in their rifles and bayonets drawn, backed by tear gas, quickly cleared the Horseshoe and the street in front of Russell House. Jones, after conferring with the governor who had returned from Washington, announced an 11 p.m. curfew. “This is a sad day,” he said. “We have tried in every legitimate way we know to mediate, and in other ways keep the University family working together toward common, attainable goals. Unfortunately for the majority of responsible students on this campus, a pitiful few students and non-students have earned what they have been after for a long, long time -- violent confrontation....” Jones pledged that “[t]o the best of our ability and with the help of all concerned members of this University, the citizens of this State and agencies of State government we will continue to operate despite these emergency conditions.”

Student marshals persuaded many students not to cause further trouble. Tear gas in many residences and dorms, however, precipitated a night of bottle throwing.

On Tuesday morning, the governor issued an executive order which stated that because the violence interfered with the academic freedom and educational processes of the university, "I do hereby declare that a state of emergency does exist...." The order authorized SLED to keep peace and order, limited assembly on campus to six persons who could show USC identification, set a curfew of 9 p.m. to 6 a.m., and allowed evacuation of buildings as commanded by Strom, Jones, or the head of the campus police. Jones asked dormitory leaders to encourage students to obey the governor's order. After much discussion, faculty passed a statement condemning violence and pledging that academic goals would not be subverted. It agreed to discuss current tensions in class,
utilize existing means of dialogue with students, volunteer to meet with students in
dormitories each evening, encourage students to obey curfew and avoid trouble, and
express support to administration and students as they tried to resolve the crisis, but
rejected a joint student-faculty corps of marshals. The student senate also voted to help
keep the university open.

Though the university clung to normal routine, life on campus was far from
normal. Police and students, both belligerent and frightened, goaded each other. Tear gas
shot into dormitories and projectiles from dormitory windows constituted a dangerous
vicious cycle. The denominational chaplains' first aid station in the Lutheran Center saw
hundreds of students. Students collected for Jones a thick brief of grievances "in the hope
that it will be used as a basis of information for investigation by a student-faculty
committee." Student government leaders saw police, many with masking tape covering
their badges, invade dormitories, clobbering and gassing students. Tear gas inside and
police spotlights outside made sleep in some dormitories impossible. In the evening alone,
at least 75 students and 16 non-students were arrested. Because the police picked up
youths indiscriminately both on and off campus, the university did not act against curfew
violators.

On Wednesday, to the anger of politicians, SLED, police and the Guard were
ordered not to respond to provocative behaviour with force. Though classes continued
and Russell House re-opened, the campus atmosphere was very tense. Jones went from
student group to student group, saying he would not close the university as long as he
could "assure the safety of all students who obey orders." He and his own family would
not leave campus. The university would lock the dormitories "to keep out violent
confronters" and students should stay in their rooms. Jones asked The Gamecock, publishing out of the public relations office rather than Russell House, to "comfort students" with a special edition. The governor extended the curfew area. Faculty members not only came into the dormitories to "rap" but to stay the night. This became protection for students because it kept police out of the dormitories.

On Thursday, politicians and press threatened to ignite tensions once again as they unleashed their interpretations of USC's crisis. The State called for "no pity, no special consideration and, most of all, no amnesty...Where society countenances terrorism, free inquiry ends. Force dislodges intellect as the principal instrument in man's affairs." Blatt desired more authority for the trustees regarding admissions and discipline, and anticipated that the legislature would provide it by law. A petition Jones received demonstrated that the politicians reflected the convictions of many in the state. "If the presidents and administrations of our colleges and Universities are not able to control the subversive activities of the faculty and students, they should resign or be fired and be replaced by those who are capable of doing so."

Jones knew he had to keep talking with students. He had always had good rapport with students on a personal level; students found him willing to listen and help. Because Jones stood for the institution, however, many observers associated him with institutional lack of communication. Faculty and students reminded Jones of the need for institutional frankness. A professor reported that his "students keep asking: where is Dr. Jones? Why doesn't he come out in the open?" One student warned, "Your persistent 'business as usual' attitude does not begin to speak to the concerns of...students, who are troubled and vexed by feelings of oppression and even of paranoia in the face of a non-communicative
Administration. He invited student government leaders to propose a new security plan for Russell House. Through The Gamecock, he affirmed academic freedom: "It should be pointed out that the nationally accepted statement on academic freedom is and has been the policy of the University for many, many years." When calm returned to campus, the police presence would be withdrawn.

The state, which had been viewing photographs and films of the administration building action issued its first 23 arrest warrants for conspiracy and entering a public building for the purpose of destroying records or other property, and five for rioting and inciting to riot. The administration worried that a rally with Jane Fonda scheduled for the evening would give students an opportunity to vent their feelings once more. Friends offered to take Jones's family into their homes but his wife replied, "When we are fearful for our children, my husband will send everyone else's sons and daughters home." The faculty met to evaluate its work in the dormitories and plan more extensive involvement. Fonda, however, did not exploit USC's crisis. Despite the news of student killings at Jackson State, only one residence warred with the police overnight. The police arrested no one for violation of curfew.

On Friday, Jones addressed his public relations problem with an interview in The State. USC had kept dissidents under surveillance for three years, he said, and none had infringed others' rights until now. Contrary to a statement in the News and Courier that "USC's resident radicals are being reinforced by an influx of student agitators who are beginning to pour in from colleges and universities already closed by violence around the nation," "out of more than 100 arrested, virtually all of the non-students were people who
were known in this area or formerly had connections in this area. \(^{378}\) Jones blamed Foard for precipitating the crisis. The other major issues were "the presence of a police officer in Russell House... the status of the Russell House itself...[and] the question of those arrested and suspended."\(^{379}\) Members of the faculty expressed their appreciation. "The students and the public needed to hear those statements. The major emphasis in the past few days has just been on 'keeping it cool'....But the students, and the public, also needed to know that the administration recognizes that there are legitimate grievances and concerns, and that we (administration, faculty, and students) will in fact work toward solutions, not just mere words and committee meetings."\(^{380}\)

After a quiet weekend, the governor tentatively ended the police presence in Russell House, the curfew, and the state of emergency. Because Jones restricted gatherings to scheduled meetings, faculty held a special meeting off campus. Many faculty members had, by their efforts on behalf of the university and the students, developed a new sense of the institution and their role in it.\(^{391}\) The crisis had integrated them in the sense that specialists in different disciplines mixed and began what would be long-term professional relationships. It also gave them a fresh understanding and appreciation of students, and that they could contribute to the development of values as well as of intellect. Briefly in the classroom and the dormitory, students and faculty had broken through their normal, narrowly focused institutional and personal strictures and experienced community. Led by Professor Donald Weatherbee, the approximately 200 faculty members who had volunteered extraordinary services in the crisis offered faculty a series of motions.\(^{392}\) Those expressing confidence in the student body, censuring student violence, endorsing student government security for Russell House, activating the faculty-
student liaison committee, recognizing the necessity to keep up "a regular and continuing relationship between the Faculty and the students in the dormitories," and forming a committee to review dormitory rules and regulations passed easily. Jones observed that USC perhaps had "some added immunity because of its experience."

Despite the newfound community on the part of some faculty, student-faculty relations remained compartmentalized. The trustees, in response to questions concerning their handling of the crisis, restated the responsibilities of the faculty. "The Board believes that the faculty has the primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. Student relations reverted to bureaucratic process. Witten proposed to the academic advisory council a reorganization of the structure of the division of student affairs to include a legally-trained dean for campus relations, answerable directly to him. Jones observed that, with the state of emergency lifted, "we will have the opportunity to see how effective the Student Government can be." The student government asked the board not to commence their hearings until after examinations. "Our responsibility is to the students who want to...finish the year successfully. From reports we hear, the trouble-makers would be surprised and pleased to have the hearings begin immediately. Another confrontation could result."

There were suggestions in the immediate aftermath that the crisis heightened bureaucratic sensitivity to student concerns. The academic advisory council reacted negatively to Patterson's proposal to hire a vice-provost for academic affairs on the grounds that "there seemed to be a tendency to centralize all of our operations and this in
turn takes the organization further away from students. Witten's proposal also included a dean of human development.

Jones delegated the university's investigation of the Russell House and administration building actions to Varney. He thanked the faculty and the law enforcement agencies for their respective roles in quelling the unrest. Students hurriedly studied and wrote their examinations. No one used commencement as an opportunity to demonstrate. Nixon's message to the class of 1970 formed an ironic counterpoint to the radical experience. "Your challenge will be that of reconciling continuity and change, of giving new applications and fresh expressions to our traditional values - especially our concern for the dignity and integrity of every individual. By meeting this challenge, you can make this time of rapid change a time of substantial growth and fulfilment -- for yourselves, for your community and for your nation."

The riot killed AWARE. This appeared to produce tension between student government and student affairs over the regulation of student organizations. The student government objected to allocation of student funds to the Young Americans for Freedom and the Young Republicans, arguing that they were partisan student activities. Queried by Varney on behalf of Jones, Witten "stated...that student government was only complaining." Fidler explained that the educational value of the organizations exceeded their political value, their members were too young to vote, and the student government might be considered political as well, in relation to the state student legislature. He added, however, that when more student members gained voting privileges on the student affairs committee, the allocations probably would not succeed. Though Jones had asked for a review of the ratio of students on university committees, the student government began
pressuring Witten to give them the responsibility of allocating student activity funds.\textsuperscript{393}

In doing so, student government addressed an important actor in the student unrest. Student affairs, the specialist in charge of the whole person, had in fact made itself so completely subsidiary to the academic apparatus that it functioned as a manager on behalf of social order against student aspirations of independence. Despite the professionalization of student affairs at USC, it continued to act as parent with a different parenting style - a style which seemed to encourage dialogue through bureaucratic procedure but which met its limits in "the interests of the university." Jones, beginning with the taming of the student media, and then Witten set up apparati and wrote regulations which both dissipated tensions and exacerbated them as students understood they were being manipulated. Just before the riot, Witten summed the instances of unrest at USC since the chartering of AWARE in 1966, to call Jones's, as well as the board's, attention to the role of student affairs. "USC is not immune to national pressures; however, once these influences reach our campus, their impact is partially predictable if we keep abreast of national developments. A major function of the student personnel staff has been to keep itself informed of national influences and to take steps in advance to deal with them in the most effective manner."\textsuperscript{394}

Though USC students had in fact participated in national student tensions since Brad Poston challenged Jones regarding free speech in 1965, the university was able to convince its constituency that May 1970 was almost an isolated incident. While Jones stood directly in the crossfire from all elements of the constituency, Witten managed to remain a "good fellow" throughout the unrest. In the bureaucratic pattern, committees and student affairs personnel rather than the vice president actually enforced the
university's interests. Witten acted in good faith in his understanding of his position in the line of authority and the task assigned him. But the role of his division in the interests of the research university, despite the range of its services, did not appear to have as its goal the development of the whole person. Instead, the development of the whole person would have to come through a transformation of the university itself.
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Chapter 5

Collegiality Returns?: University 101

USC's student riot of May 1970 deepened President Jones's resolve to bring educational experimentation and research to bear on the whole university. Dealing with administrative and educational challenges, Jones had come to believe that the research university should concern itself with development of the whole person, within the framework of its values. As disadvantaged South Carolinians had to be engineered into middle-class citizens, so apparently did students in the mainstream. In his view, Jones could not have prevented the riot of 1970. But he could prevent a reoccurrence. Jones fostered the development of an orientation course intended to produce, through small group interaction, students who would not riot and faculty who would teach persons as well as disciplines. Faculty showed less interest in University 101 than did student affairs personnel. One faculty member who caught the UN101 vision was John N. Gardner of general studies. Gardner firmly established the course as part of USC's curriculum, as students who were introduced to the university through it tended to be more successful and persistent than other students.

After the riot, Jones's first task was to retain public confidence. Employees of the university distributed "The Months of May," an official version of the Spring 1970 unrest, spoke around the state, and visited nervous families. Jones released to the press a letter to "all returning students, new students, and those whose admission is under consideration," guaranteeing their safety and making it clear that the university would not tolerate any compromise "of the educational functions for which this University was established....At registration every student is required to sign a statement which makes
clear that he is responsible for his actions, and that the University may take disciplinary action, including suspension, where warranted.\textsuperscript{3}

Though the trustees expressed confidence in his leadership, Jones's tenure was far from assured.\textsuperscript{4} The actions of Solicitor Foard, however, ensured that Jones would retain his post at least for a time. Foard's call for Jones's resignation raised a groundswell of support for Jones from faculty, students, alums, and the press.\textsuperscript{5} The board issued a statement that "Mr. Foard must stick to his assigned area of law enforcement and prosecution based on fact and refrain from continued interference and harassment of the University, its faculty and students."\textsuperscript{6} Fortified by favourable public reaction, the solicitor called for Jones's resignation and the creation of a board-solicitor liaison committee "given certain authority to act on behalf of the University from time to time," on behalf of the people.\textsuperscript{7} The board rejected Foard's requests, noting he had not taken up his charges personally with Jones or against specific faculty publicly in the courts.\textsuperscript{8} Foard subsided in public, but a political science professor later complained that a member of Foard's staff visited his class to tape portions of his lecture on Vietnam.\textsuperscript{9}

The State observed that student unrest was subsiding.\textsuperscript{10} With radical groups in a state of disintegration and many radicals, including Bursey, hiding from the law, American institutions of higher learning could analyze the past and make plans for the future.\textsuperscript{11} Jones told Nixon's Commission on Campus Unrest that he did not anticipate a violent fall semester.\textsuperscript{12} Still, USC continued its efforts to ensure this would be the case. Jones arranged a retreat at Hilton Head to give representative students, faculty and administrators an opportunity to air their feelings. To prime discussion, he brought copies of philosopher Sidney Hook's views on student unrest being circulated by President
Nixon. Hook advised institutions to gather faculty, students and administrators to draft guidelines for expression of dissent, form a student-faculty discipline committee, and use faculty and student marshals, the courts, and civil authorities in that order to enforce the guidelines. Little forward discussion occurred at Hilton Head, however, as students vented their bitterness about the past. The retreat produced a list of twenty issues which formed the agenda of a November meeting in the president's home. The Hilton Head group set up a university ad hoc committee on women's affairs and recognized minority affairs with a position in Witten's division, a seat on the student cabinet, and an ad hoc committee. Other longstanding concerns included a revision of the speakers policy and more student representation on faculty committees. The meeting decided to strike another committee to follow the twenty issues and involve new people in them through another conference.

Apart from Hilton Head, faculty had its own list of issues. A self-study faculty survey revealed that USC's faculty members mainly were young, well-qualified, active scholars. Their complaints included that USC emphasized athletics over academics, valued research over teaching - "Those dedicated to teaching get shafted" - and did not provide an adequate library. Faculty split on the accessibility and supportiveness of the administration. Some members regarded it as "prone to take 'shortcuts' at the expense of academic standards, 'not candid,' and, worst of all, 'incompetent.' One expressed a 'growing anxiety over where these policies are leading.' Faculty shared the students' desire to participate in institutional governance. After board chair Rutledge Osborne, who opposed division of the president's powers, retired, the faculty obtained the right to elect representatives to administrative committees and to a newly created faculty senate.
Perhaps awareness of its own struggles made the faculty senate sympathetic to the student government's revised constitution. The constitution set up a student supreme court to "hear all appeals from cases arising under this Constitution, the Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities, and the Student Senate statutes, and all cases involving chartered campus organizations and their officers, and all cases arising from the 'Code of Academic Responsibility.'" It also gave the student senate the powers to charter campus organizations, control student activity fees, "determine rules for traffic and parking in student areas," and formulate residence governments. With only minor questions, the faculty senate approved it.

Perhaps with a sense of time running out, Jones intensified his efforts to fulfil his educational vision for South Carolina through innovation. The Ford Foundation awarded a $20,000 grant to Contemporary University on the understanding that the program would support itself henceforth. The federal Office of Education, encouraged by the Ford Foundation, endorsed University Without Walls. UWW now operated under a consortium of subscribing institutions, called the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities. Some consortium members were new experimental institutions. These included SUNY's Empire State College, headed by president Ernest L. Boyer and academic vice-president Arthur Chickering. Other members, like USC, intended UWW to make an institutional home for the innovations underway in psychology, education and general studies. Looking beyond his immediate purpose for UWW, Jones appointed a committee, including Heckel and Buford, to "study implementing an experimental college" within USC.

USC's New Left maintained its most visible presence in the Student Mobilization
Committee, led by Rita Fellers. SMC intended to rebuild anti-war dissent at USC peacefully. The non-confrontational character of their march to protest the extension of the Vietnam War into Laos seemed to reassure students; attendance at SMC activities gradually increased. The Gamecock applauded SMC for persisting with their attempts to solve local and national problems, but doubted that peaceful protest would bring change.

Jones and Witten collected Gamecocks as the paper ran a series of provocative front pages. The Gamecock devoted two front pages to the return of Julian Bond as a speaker. As a lead-in to an article from exile by Bursey, another front page featured the message Bursey left in the draft office to explain his direct action. "Amerika," it read, "You have become a monster, a self-destructive monster that thrives upon war, racism and desperation...." When Witten asked the board of publications and communications to censure The Gamecock, the editor struck back with an unflattering profile, calling him authoritarian and hierarchical in the nature of a career military officer. A succeeding front page advertised a debate over the My Lai Massacre with a picture of Vietnamese dead. "Was Calley Guilty? Are the Generals War Criminals?" Though the publications board absolved The Gamecock, the student body vice president promised a student senate resolution supporting the paper and condemning the publications board. The trustees did not agree on appropriate action, and Jones, as he had at the beginning of his presidency, appointed a special committee "to work on the problem of how to have a free but responsible University newspaper."

Some students complained to Jones that preoccupation with non-academic matters interfered with the academic purpose of the university. A USC Contemporary University student who visited campuses that had seen unrest, such as Columbia, the University of
Connecticut, and Harvard, found students more interested in consuming the university's product than in rethinking the university itself. The student government, however, worked diligently to advance student initiatives inherited from the 1960s. These emphasized relaxation of residence regulations, especially for women, and greater participation of students in governance.

Faculty further modified governance and academic policies on behalf of students. The faculty advisory council recommended that more students be added to faculty committees, including the discipline committee. After consulting its student government representative, the faculty senate rejected a motion "that the criteria for eligibility for holding office in all student organizations be determined by the Office of Student Affairs" in favour of a motion to "turn the matter over to the students for the student organizations to determine their own criteria." The student and faculty senates approved a "positive emphasis" grading reform which limited grades to A, B, C, or no credit, and eliminated F on transcripts for failure of a pass-fail course. Faculty support for such modifications was not unanimous, however. One member complained that students were not performing well on committees and called new alternative programs in arts and science a "profoundly retrogressive step."

The member specifically mentioned UWW. Though it had not been approved, UWW had hired an instructor and registered students. The faculty senate also raised questions about the academic management of Contemporary University. When its investigating committee recommended permanent acceptance of the program, however, the senate turned aside an attempt to keep it temporary and complied. Jones attributed Contemporary University’s success at USC, while similar programs elsewhere failed, to
the academic rigour required of its students by its faculty.\textsuperscript{45}

Encouraged by the acceptance of Contemporary University, Jones appointed a committee to shepherd through faculty a proposal for an experimental college, as the "proper structure to administer both Contemporary University and University Without Walls."\textsuperscript{46} The experimental college would offer a special studies degree requiring 120 hours from no specified curriculum.\textsuperscript{47} The committee understood that Jones wanted the college to test innovations in undergraduate instruction. Accepting its assignment "only with the assurance that the traditional liberal arts curriculum will remain the heart of the university," the committee recommended approval through existing academic bodies, ongoing monitoring through "an advisory committee drawn from existing schools and colleges, including representatives of the new college," and hiring only highly qualified academic personnel. Jones and Buford selected the college as USC's research project for Chickering's Strategies taskforce, which aimed to ensure that the institutionalization of self-renewal processes in higher education resulted in solid research.\textsuperscript{48}

Ultimately, Jones realized that he could not transform the university humanistically without the faculty's cooperation. Committed to the academic reputation of USC, Jones continued to emphasize research. He intended to bring faculty into the university he envisioned by familiarizing them with new approaches to teaching. Jones began to apply human relations to the problem of transforming faculty attitudes. He organized lunch meetings of full professors in small groups to discuss readings on experimental pedagogy.\textsuperscript{49} Some readings dealt with human relations training directly, explaining how T-groups modified behaviour. They argued that while psychologists doubted the effectiveness of T-groups, group participants did not.\textsuperscript{50}
In June 1971, Jones expressed his aspirations for USC in a statement for the institutional self-study. Upward Bound and now Contemporary University had convinced him that USC should break the rigid academic pattern in which American higher education was delivered. Changing student populations, types of employment, and parenting patterns called for "hybrid curricula of affective skills, communications arts, and cognitive skills (even as minors!) leading to appropriate associate degrees and baccalaureate degrees not having traditional cognitive hurdles." Such curricula would release the significant and worthwhile person inside the human body, integrate disadvantaged groups into the "establishment," and more effectively teach the mechanisms of democratic government. Facilitation was the appropriate teaching style to achieve these aims.

In mid-1971, Jones obtained outside funding that would enable him to carry his experimental aspirations for USC forward. If Upward Bound had set his course for educational innovation in South Carolina, Contemporary University consolidated his reputation with the Ford Foundation as an educational innovator. Ford offered college presidents and deans Venture grants -- discretionary funds which would enable them "to support special efforts to attune undergraduate education to contemporary needs and conditions, and to overcome institutional inertia that might otherwise block such efforts." It awarded Jones $250,000 over a period of four years. Now Jones could foster his ideas "without having to operate on a year-to-year basis because of financial restrictions."

Traditionally oriented faculty increasingly wondered where Jones was taking the university in his preoccupation with humanistic higher education. They grew uncertain that Jones would maintain academic standards. His reliance on the instructors he hired for
the experimental programs did not reassure them. UWW instructor Conrad Lodziak, though popular with his students, antagonized the school of education, one of the original practitioners of human relations in the university, with his hostility to their questions about his approach. Yet Jones turned to Lodziak for a proposal for a first-year seminar to "teach students not to riot." As usual, the experimental programs came up for approval during the summer. Dean Nelson, whose college UWW most strongly affected, learned of it in the July faculty senate meeting. The committee on curricula and new courses, unable to answer questions about it definitively, both promised to investigate it and recommended its continuance. Then, in August, the committee on curricula and new courses recommended that USC establish an experimental college to take over Contemporary University, UWW, and the general studies associate degrees and offer a special studies degree. To ensure academic integrity, an advisory committee would track college programs and report yearly to faculty concerning their effectiveness.

The experimental college recommendation disappeared from discussion after Nelson discovered that many UWW registrants did not meet admissions requirements, were under suspension, or lacked required prerequisites, and were being allowed to circumvent "normal pathways." Buford and Lodziak called most of the points raised by Nelson non-issues. Buford took a medical leave, and the faculty senate struck an ad hoc committee to seek "an adequate explanation of the UWW, to include such facets as its program, students enrolled, and credits given." When the Union of Experimenting Colleges and Universities notified Jones that Nixon intended to use UWW to convince Congress to create his proposed National Foundation for Post-Secondary Education, the
committee recommended that UWW continue through the spring semester under restrictions and supervision. At the end of the semester, USC and Lodziak parted cordially as Lodziak's visa expired and he returned to England to write a report on USC's program for the Union.

Contemporary University, which many professors respected as a credible approach to independent studies, objected to being identified with UWW through the experimental college recommendation. The Contemporary University advisory chairman learned of the recommendation in his faculty senate meeting packet. When the vice provost warned them that the experimental college proposal would not succeed if Contemporary University was not included, the advisory asked the faculty senate to table the experimental college proposal for further study. Subsequently the members of the advisory voted unanimously "to come out against Contemporary University's role in Experimental College as proposed so far but offer its assistance in future planning for the Experimental College." Demonstrating a lack of trust in process, they designated a member to monitor curriculum and new courses committee meetings. Then they tightened regulations and structure to make the Contemporary University program more comprehensible to both students and faculty.

The Camp Gravatt retreat of fall 1971 compounded faculty unease. Jointly sponsored by the student government and the administration, the retreat assembled 100 students, faculty and administrators to evaluate USC's academic life. The resulting Gravatt Report recommended to faculty alternative deliveries of programs, courses, instruction, and advisement requiring smaller faculty-student ratios. Recommendations new to most faculty included an academic centre to stimulate academic excellence, a four-
year honours program coupled with the renovation of the historic Horseshoe "as a centre for academic excellence with a careful blend of classroom, common, and residential space," and the development of an experimental first-semester freshman orientation seminar. Jones demonstrated the importance he placed on the development of the seminar by joining, with Mrs. Jones, that discussion group at Gravatt. After Gravatt, he appointed a committee to prepare a seminar proposal.

Meanwhile, Jones continued his voluminous reading on affective curriculum. John B. Haney, Phil C. Lange, and John Barson, instructional services personnel at the University of Illinois, Columbia University, and Michigan State University respectively, argued that developers of curriculum legitimately use principles grounded in instinct rather than science and that these heuristic principles could supply a new instructional model for higher education. Jones, however, also noted William J. McKeachie’s contention that instructional methods no longer had to be grounded heuristically because attempts to scientifically evaluate instructional methods produced reliable results. He learned from a Carnegie study that students, no longer receiving personal guidance from traditional sources like church and family, were flocking to courses which began with personal issues rather than abstract knowledge. In that vein, Jones followed the efforts of Ben C. Finney of San Jose State College to foster emotional as well as intellectual growth by placing incoming students into "clans" of ten members each for regular small group counseling and academic support. Within the clans, Finney used techniques like "Flower Power," gleaned from peak oriented psychotherapy which aimed to teach clients to achieve and maintain highs through pleasant experiences rather than chemicals. Participants stimulated their senses with aids such as flowers and cookies to achieve an emotional
peak, then began to touch each other and tell the group their feelings. Through "flower power," according to Finney, participants surpassed emotional barriers, gained freedom to grow, and developed intimacy with the group.

To transform teaching at USC, Jones initially targeted less experienced instructors.\textsuperscript{77} He used Ford money to establish a Seminars in Teaching program to introduce them to "experimental approaches to learning."\textsuperscript{78} In preparation, Jones paid for NTL training for the primary staff of Heckel's Social Problems Research Institute.\textsuperscript{79} All but one participant reported some benefit from the seminars, if only the opportunity to meet academics from other departments. Acknowledging that the research university did not reward teaching, many suggested that USC "change the reward structure so that classroom performance...would become a 'legitimate alternative' for faculty who needed it for promotion and tenure."\textsuperscript{80}

Jones then targeted experienced faculty, "who have some decision-making power and who can best influence the pedagogical atmosphere of their particular departments."\textsuperscript{81} The majority of participants in these seminars and concluding Fripp Island retreat found the group dynamics approach stimulating, though many thought the exercises trivial and not applicable to large classes. They echoed the concern of the fall participants that the seminar series encouraged faculty members to sacrifice themselves for something that the university did not reward," but also appreciated the opportunity to share ideas and experiments across disciplines.\textsuperscript{82} "One of the most often expressed sentiments at the conference was that the faculty is fragmented, isolated, out of touch with one another, and the situation seems to be getting worse as the campus expands, departmental divisions harden, and specialization grows."\textsuperscript{83}
Jones hoped UWW would improve instruction within disciplines. The UWW tutors from the English, psychology, mathematics, and geology departments used less structure and grew more student-centred and personally aware. They, however, felt hampered by content expectations and doubted their ability to influence their departments on behalf of educational innovation. In addition, Nelson remained skeptical of UWW methodology. Evaluating a positive report of a UWW geology course, he asked what diagnostic criteria resulted in almost all the students receiving "A." On their self-evaluations, he noted, "the students could not identify that they had developed academically." Jones could not effect widespread teaching reform if faculty felt secure in traditional relations with students. The rising issue of accountability, however, provided another stimulus to change. Jones drew faculty's attention to the warning of a non-academic university administrator that to keep their institutions viable and therefore to keep their jobs, faculty would have to modify their notion that they defined the university. Standards would not be controlled by disciplines, the administrator predicted, but by the "clients" of education. "Regardless of the strategies which emerge, the stimulus to change...will come primarily from students and fiscal funding agencies because in the present context of higher education I do not see sufficient incentives for the faculty to change themselves." His experimental college recommendation for the moment inactive, Jones returned to his original home for experimentation, general studies. The curriculum and new courses committee recommended that the faculty senate place the alternative bachelor degree there. Jones promoted the dean of general studies into senior administration and
established Harry Varney in his place. Varney expected that the university’s experimental programs would be consolidated in his department within weeks. A faculty ad hoc committee, however, sent two major counterproposals to faculty senate. The first asked that general studies, still an umbrella for evening and long distance courses, and training and associate degree programs, be reorganized into a four-year college to offer alternative educational approaches without endangering the mainstream research-oriented direction of the university. The second proposed an experimental division which would incorporate the existing experimental programs and test new proposals in small, supportive, controlled, academically credible environments.

Faculty senate, in an effort to cope with the many proposals coming in, designated committees to study them. It asked the faculty advisory committee to evaluate the entire Gravatt Report, from which many proposals also were in process, and tabled the experimental bachelor degree when the ad hoc committee argued that it should be housed in a proper college of general studies so faculty could control its curriculum and requirements. The faculty advisory endorsed the Gravatt Report’s vision of academic community, but decried its "scattergun" approach to reform. The advisory favoured “general improvement as arising from such well-known criteria as: increased recognition for distinguished traditional and experimental teaching, better counseling, a better library and a new bookstore.” To evaluate lower priority reforms, it recommended the creation of a committee to plan for academic development "on a continuing not an ad hoc basis." The faculty senate accepted the recommendation. Subsequently, the faculty advisory committee announced the reorganization of the college of general studies and the discontinuance of UWW.
Witten acquainted faculty with student affairs efforts to "aid in the accomplishment of the overall educational goals of the university....[Student Affairs] fosters the education of students beyond the classroom by being a partner in the process of development of self-identity and the development of skills, attitude, and concepts...."96 To this end Witten's division operated an academic skills centre and based instructors in some residences to create more intimate living/learning environments. It also promoted leadership training for first-year students, African-Americans, student government, and the student media.

The chair of the faculty senate called the academic planning committee, which consisted of Jones and six faculty members, potentially "one of the most important, if not the most important, academic committee on the campus."97 If it appeared that the research mentality would thwart efforts to re-integrate a college ideal into higher education, Jones was not about to admit defeat. In preparation for the committee, he listed his ideas for "achieving a better intellectual climate," under the heading: "Goals - Define idealistically, then make compromises."98 For faculty, he listed "publish or perish...or other, seminar groups, faculty club, [and] townhouses adjacent to campus."

For students, he listed "orient student affairs more strongly to ed., living-learning groups, Human Potential fr. seminar(s), involvement in designing own curriculum, more variety in learning experiences, student-centered ed., future oriented ed., [and] token economy and other incentives."

Jones still could achieve his dream of humanistic higher education through involving new students and faculty in a first-year seminar program. He ended the first academic planning meeting with a request for members to consider such a program. The post-Gravatt seminar committee envisioned faculty sharing their passion for their
disciplines through lectures and small-group discussions. To justify its credits, the committee expected the seminar to be "both an intensive orientation and introduction to the uses of the university, [and] a course with real intellectual content, particularly philosophical, psychological and bibliographical." The committee's proposal was not what Jones wanted. The head of USC's psychology department warned him, with supporting literature, that "the psychological 'establishment'" did not endorse human relations training. Nevertheless, Jones informed the committee that he desired to provide "leadership training in human relations for a group of faculty members, who in turn will offer a seminar section to a group of freshmen." The responsibility for the first-year seminar proposal then fell on the members of the committee who had a background in human relations -- Frances D. Atkinson of the college of librarianship, whom Jones had sponsored for advanced NTL training on the understanding that he would assist with the development of the experimental first-year program, and Heckel and Hiers of SPRI. Atkinson recommended two inexpensive programs which had enough cognitive content "to provide some needed security for both students and faculty." The Human Potential seminar of Roy W. Trueblood and James D. McHolland of Kendall College in Illinois, also used by UWW, encouraged students to share developmental experiences and values, receive feedback from other group members, learn conflict resolution, and set personal goals in accordance with personal value systems and strengths. The program in Interpersonal Communications from the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory taught interpersonal skills to educators.

Before Atkinson got these materials to Jones, however, SPRI wrote a preliminary
proposal for a first-year seminar. It called for experienced trainers to facilitate during the summer one week each of "intensive growth experience," small group management, and organizational skills and evaluation for a group of up to 16 amenable faculty members. The trainers would continue to work with the faculty members as they took student groups in the fall semester. If successful, the seminar experiment could result in a three-credit, pass-fail course which "would be assigned to a new area of study to be called Applied Behavioural Science, with the course to be taught under the aegis of the Social Problems Research Institute as its first academic offering." Other formative influences on Jones regarding the first-year seminar were papers by Robert R. Carkhuff, of American International College, and Conrad Lodziak's manuscript on UWW at USC. Carkhuff argued that counselors must become whole persons before they take responsibility for guiding others to self-realization. He defined whole persons as those who are fully self-defined, not dependent on any external influence and not allowing any other persons to interfere with their self-definition. Lodziak's manuscript advocated "the self-exploration group," in which "formal activities are used as 'a last resort." A formal activity would be the facilitator asking questions -- "Relate an experience of joy, hate, sexual fantasy, etc." -- rather than letting self-exploration come from the group.

After discussing formats including an entire uniquely conducted introductory semester, the academic planning committee endorsed a three-credit, pass-fail course in tandem with four regular first-year courses. To keep it from being identified with one department or college, the committee named it University 101. It recommended that the course have a director and a summer training program for faculty paid for from Jones's
Venture grant, and that it experiment with a variety of learning situations.

Among other things, these could include (1) investigations of major ways of perceiving knowledge ranging from empiricism and statistical manipulation to revelation and intuition; the attributes, capabilities and limitations of these approaches could be discussed (2) investigation of different learning environments ranging from large impersonal situations to independent study and small-group participatory learning (3) exposure to different learning skills ranging from effective reading to use of computers as a learning tool (4) the development of self-motivation for learning, etc.\textsuperscript{110}

While the curriculum and new courses committee considered the academic planning committee's recommendation, SPRI identified 16 faculty members representing each division of the university to invite to the UN101 training workshop.\textsuperscript{111} Jones added four names to the list, including John N. Gardner from general studies, who experimented with media in his history class.\textsuperscript{112} By the time the curriculum and new courses committee's recommendation reached faculty senate on July 12, the list included almost 40 names.\textsuperscript{113}

The student-centred approach of UN101 received some validation in the general higher education community at this time. The Union for Experimenting Colleges and University's UWW program achieved pre-accreditation with the North Central Association of Colleges and Universities and awarded its first degrees.\textsuperscript{114} Strategies recommended institutions use small groups to achieve teaching innovation, but cautioned that such training needed to be "owned" by faculty.\textsuperscript{115} Because USC faculty did not yet own the UN101 concept, Jones and Witten lobbied for the passage of the UN101 proposal.\textsuperscript{116} The curriculum and new courses committee stripped the course of credit and asked the senate to approve it for one year. In the senate's July 12 meeting, the UN101 proposal "evoked a great deal of comment and debate pro and con." Jones promised that "Ford Foundation Venture Funds will be put behind this course in the fall if it is approved, and if it looks good in the fall he will find more money in the spring."\textsuperscript{117} Senate restored UN101's three
credits on a pass-fail basis, and approved a conditional commencement.

Jones and Witten agreed that, because UN101 integrated the entire university, any university employee with graduate academic credentials could teach it. Nevertheless, to retrain faculty, it would be taught by faculty members and key administrators, with minor representation from student affairs.¹¹八 Jones personally recruited the first training participants. He had Gardner paged in a restaurant, asked him to attend, and told him he would learn what it was about at the workshop.¹¹九 Jones himself attended the opening of the workshop on July 18. On July 19, he asked the deans and department heads to allow their students to take UN101.¹²０ On July 31, he informed the deans of participating faculty members that they were training for the seminar.¹²¹ He asked the deans to allow their faculty to teach the course on an overload basis and referred them to SPRI for further information. On August 24, he wrote the deans again and requested that they inform their student advisers of the program. "Many individuals throughout the nation have responded in an exceedingly favorable manner this summer when I told them of this new experimental adventure for freshmen....Again, let me ask you assistance and cooperation in making this new program a positive addition to the University."¹²²

Jones now had his vehicle for blending the college ideal with the research ideal in the twentieth-century American university. The new model for which he strove was not different in its outlines from the old college ideal. He sought a re-integration of person development with intellectual endeavour, in a setting which included informal interaction. What was different in this integration was its behavioural premise that humanity and knowledge are created in interaction, apart from tradition or dogma. Jones intended the human relations-oriented training program to convert USC faculty members to think
collegially according to this reinterpretation of the college ideal in ever-widening circles until the university as a whole thought collegially. Empirically-oriented faculty were uncomfortable, however, with the training’s inherent bias toward interdisciplinary generalization and knowledge as personal experience.

The recognition of the person integral to the training and the course was problematic. Jones’s efforts to produce contributing citizens paradoxically aimed both to free individuality and keep it within the perimeters of an established way of life. In addition, the model had a specific philosophical base while purporting to respect personal "truths." In Jones’s UN101 model, first faculty, then students, and finally the larger society were candidates for these human engineering paradoxes.

Jones did not talk openly about human engineering. He confided to the Ford Foundation that USC gave out few press releases about USC’s educational innovations because "[a]n old adage in these parts says, 'The rooster which crows before dawn stews (in the pot) before dusk.'" Bob Alexander heard the talk uncomfortably. Most faculty did not equate UN101 with human engineering. The SPRI trainers, John Zuidema and Manning Hiers, gave them a three-week human relations workshop calculated to erase personal barriers between faculty and students, to improve communications and learning. The workshop modeled the course.

On the first day of the training workshop, Zuidema and Hiers opened as in a traditional classroom, explaining UN101 in lecture format. Participants were bored but psychologically comfortable. Then the trainers asked them to arrange their chairs in a circle and began again, with a name chain. The first person introduced herself, the second person re-introduced her and himself, and so on. After conversations in random pairs, the
participants revealed "the highs and lows of their life" in small groups.\textsuperscript{126} They began to trust each other and cohere. Finally, they "processed" their experiences. On the second day, the unstructured nature of UN101 emerged. When the trainers asked them to set the goals of the workshop, the participants had difficulty understanding that they were expected to set the agenda for their learning. Then they could not agree on common goals because, thinking as individuals, they did not listen to each other. Therefore, the trainers introduced a listening exercise. To gain the floor a new speaker had to summarize the previous speaker's comments to his satisfaction. Again, the group processed their experiences. On the third day, the group evaluated its growth. Attempting to communicate emotions without speaking, the participants concluded that non-verbal communication is easily misinterpreted. Though the trainers next put them into a trust exercise in which four people made a cradle to carry a fifth, it was the non-verbal exercise that held their attention. On the fourth day, to continue to build trust, the trainers assigned small group conversation about happiest memories, greatest fears, loneliest times, aptitudes, and something of their own choice. By this time, "[i]t seemed that the trainer-led group had become quite group-led....In short, an environmental atmosphere in which learning could take place effectively had been established."\textsuperscript{127}

Zuidema and Hiers also trained a group "B" with similar results. Then they brought groups A and B together, to decide how they would become group "C." Though A and B preferred to remain intact, they began to work toward cohesion. Opening communication, they discovered common experiences which drew them together.

The trainers interrupted the melding process, however, with a series of more cognitive, structured sessions with consultants. A consultant explained that Kendall
College's Human Potential program improved the self-concepts of underachievers through exercises such as articulating highlights and influential persons in one's life, feedback to life stories, a bidding game to discover values, and questions which explored values and attitudes. Next, first-year students recruited as consultants met each other in a "fishbowl," the centre of the circle of participants observing their interaction, and then circulated among small groups of faculty to answer questions: "What are his fears? hopes? expectations? goals? What are some of his motivations and attitudes? What are some of the things that make his functioning at U.S.C. more or less difficult?" A consultant from the University of North Carolina informed the group that other universities used the UN101 format. He demonstrated the Johari Window, by having the trainees comment about themselves in a four-square diagram and circulate for reactions in larger groupings. They ended the day with another fishbowl. The trainees forming the circle alternated participation and observation by moving in and out of the discussion going on in the centre.

The frail bond of Group C surfaced on the first day of the third week, when some participants gave others insensitive and inappropriate feedback. The trainers repeated the fishbowl, but soon interrupted the melding process again with another visiting consultant. Buford explained his UWW format. He indicated "that in his group exercise he had originally been almost exclusively feeling or affect-oriented. He had changed and seemed (sic) thinking now should be included." Perhaps because of the lack of structure and length of the workshop, however, participants were restless. They began to carry on their own conversations.

The trainers did not compromise the unstructured concept. The next afternoon,
they began by asking participants to decide what they wanted to do. The trainees broke into groups to discuss how to teach the course. Once they warmed to the discussion, they did not want to stop. Without prompting, they critically assessed curriculum for active learning. When the larger group reconvened, the trainers again refused to set the agenda.

"There was a moderate interest in the issue of describing University 101 which would be understood by the various academic interests who were already having questions and in some cases making negative remarks." The group felt, however, that it could not improve the course description written by Jones:

University 101. The Student in the University (3 credits) The purposes of higher education, and the potential roles of individual students within the university and within other learning environments. Open to freshmen only. Approval for one year.131

The group ended its agenda with a "happy hour" at the home of the university ombudsman.

On the final day of the workshop, the trainers communicated through discussion that SPRI would anchor the efforts of the group to maintain cohesion. The group preferred to continue by means of luncheons. It noted, however, that group C had not achieved the unity of groups A and B, due to the scheduling of consultants. Further, their judgment that group C duplicated the group-building of the smaller groups implied that the training should be shortened. The trainers closed with a "warm fuzzy" graduation. Hiers told a story about people not thriving because they hoarded their warm fuzzies and gave each other "cold pricklies" and "plastic fuzzies" instead.132 The trainers presented warm fuzzies, fur balls with wiggly eyes and a pom pom nose, hanging on a string. They asked the graduates to place them in their offices as a reminder of their training and their membership in a support group on behalf of educational innovation.
UN101 was not the only change which greeted faculty members returning after the summer. Jones changed the name of the college of arts and science to the division of liberal and cultural disciplines and divided it into colleges of arts and letters, science and mathematics, social and behavioural sciences, and general studies. While the faculty advisory committee read into record a statement that "the reorganization appears to have been conceived and carried out in a manner to be described as almost administratively unilateral," Jones announced that the legislature had appropriated $150,000 for USC's experimental college, which he hoped, would "prove to be a model for demonstrating new ways of teaching and learning." USC hired an educational development officer, Jay C. Smith, who organized a fresh teaching/learning seminar series to acquaint faculty with use of the behavioural approach elsewhere and provide human relations training. At the instigation of Zuidema, Trueblood held a Human Potential training institute at USC. Jones attended and invited Trueblood to join USC's faculty. The faculty advisory committee, noting that "there are several movements around campus to improve teaching and it was thought it should have a base," recommended the senate form a committee to propose a statement of teaching standards and goals and a meaningful ongoing teaching evaluation system. The chair of psychology sent another article to Jones, this one calling for professional standards and ethics in the use of small group process.

Though direct action no longer threatened campus life, memories of the 1960s continued to drive Jones. He frequently recounted the shock of receiving a Christmas card from a student signed only with a student number. In the absence of pressure of activism, however, Jones needed new rationales to promote his educational vision. Always abreast of trends, Jones found them in the future. He argued that universities that
did not innovate would wither.\textsuperscript{141} Shrinking student demographics and budgets would bring a "student power" of their own. Universities would seek ways to keep students happier in order to survive financially at the same time they kept students in line with "the interests of the university."

In the fall of 1972, then, USC tied innovation in teaching to retention. Carolina Type, the university's new monthly publication for university employees, alums and parents, quoted Hiers: "We know that about one third of the freshmen that enter USC leave for various reasons and roughly 50\% never graduate. One reason a lot of students tell me is that they don't see any relevancy in higher education."\textsuperscript{142} In UN101, relevancy would come through teachers who had been trained to begin with the person. Jones offered the argument of S.I. Hayakawa of San Francisco State College that a student's self-definition affects what she is willing to learn and therefore a primary task of higher education is to help students define themselves through small groups.\textsuperscript{143} UN101 instructors would "bring their own disciplines into the course" but would "focus on helping the students understand themselves as persons."

Funded by the Ford Venture Grant and administered by SPRI, UN101 began with 17 sections and 250 students recruited by student affairs during summer orientation.\textsuperscript{144} SPRI discouraged structuring sections with syllabi, textbooks, and assignments in favour of instructor and students planning their section together. SPRI also opposed confining learning to traditional classrooms. Consequently, each section had its own character. After clarifying goals, Perry Ashley's group used the classroom infrequently.\textsuperscript{145} They role-played a trustees meeting on location, observed a drug case in county court, met with representatives of student government, toured the university's coliseum, discussed films on
human creativity and interpersonal relations, interviewed faculty members about their feelings toward their jobs, students, big classes and so on, and toured historical sites in Charleston. Gardner's section tended toward introspection. Self-introductions sparked ideas to explore and a beginning understanding of group dynamics. As members of the group alternated between purposeful activity and aimless chatter, and between cohesion and noncooperation, Gardner realized that "it is as hard for me to give up structuring as it is for them to get used to my not structuring." In the end, students were pleased with the way they achieved their "easy three credits." Gardner left them with three thoughts. He hoped they would let USC help them get their lives together, that they would see UN101 as proof that USC cared about students, and that they would continue to call on him as a resource person.

As the initial sections proceeded, Jones and Hiers worked to improve faculty acceptance of the UN101 concept. Despite an incentive of $500 to offset the overload status of the course for faculty, seven of the original instructors did not have teaching as a primary condition of employment. Jones and Hiers tried to reassure faculty by publicizing that UN101 would be treated as a research project and evaluated accordingly. The actual evaluation, conducted by SPRI, consisted of instructors' notes and open-ended questionnaires. One instructor wrote that, rather than finding students able to evaluate their goals, beliefs, potentials and learning, he had acquired a "brood of biddies who will be coming to me for advice and assistance for the next three years." Another found UN101 such a positive experience that he planned to change his approach to all his courses.

Jones himself found practical considerations crowding his humanistic expectations
for the course. He had based UN101 on applied behavioural science as a means of achieving attitudinal and values objectives. He noted that, in practice, UN101 served research objectives. The three of the 18 objectives for the course articulated by the workshop participants could be linked to values: "To liberate students intellectually and personally in order that they might find out more about their self-identities....To encourage students to analyze the different roles they play in life....To teach students how to understand and operate within a university system." The "liberated known self" aim had evolutionary potential in that it legitimated student disagreement with a professor's point of view. The "university system" objective, however, relegated knowing self to academic success, on the terms of the university. Jones hoped to go on to "the use of applied behavioural science to adjust attitudes and values. It will be interesting if we do, but in the meantime if we can define the objectives, we should be on our way toward more successful learning."

Jones asked USC's educational administrators to nominate outstanding teachers who might like to join the UN101 experiment. By the beginning of the spring 1973 semester, 14 faculty members, three student personnel, and one SPRI employee were ready to teach the 288 students registered in UN101. Five charter faculty taught an additional experimental course modeled after UN101. Education 399 Experiential Learning - A Model for Education, also seeded by Venture funds, enrolled approximately 150 students.

Hiers awarded Jones two "warm fuzzies" for underlining his support for UN101 by entertaining the instructors and visiting classes. Changing the nature of higher education in South Carolina had become Jones’s passion. He told a reporter that his leisure reading
consisted of "literature dealing with educational innovations. That's what makes Tom run." Some of his educational changes rooted. USC made Contemporary University a permanent independent study option, granted the college of general studies a baccalaureate degree, and established an honours college in the Horseshoe as South Carolina College. Jones knew, however, from his work with the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities that humanistic higher education had a tenuous future. The Union counted few research universities among its small membership.

In spring 1973, the administration made the academic planning committee, faculty’s hedge against incessant experimentation which threatened to undercut their understanding of their profession, directly responsible to the administration. "It was pointed out that upon occasion faculty participation is inappropriate due to the vested interests of the faculty or political action which requires a specific response rather than a formulation of policy.” To force rethinking of the status quo, the committee then surveyed the general faculty concerning university goals.

Jones informed the senate that the anticipated enrolment decline had begun in the Midwest and schools were seeking ways to maintain numbers so they would not have to terminate faculty. He noted that the financial implications for institutions of falling enrolments were exacerbated by conservatives in Washington who called for restricted federal funding and careful accounting. Retention in the interests of the student was a major rationale for Jones in the long germination of his first-year seminar concept. Now he used retention in the interests of the financial health of the institution as a selling point to ensure its survival.

The problem of faculty acceptance of UN101 was not that faculty did not support
educational innovation. Contemporary University faculty demonstrated a high level of commitment to that program, though they did not receive remuneration for supervising independent research projects.\textsuperscript{166} Faculty disliked UN101's association with the "touchy-feely," human relations methodology emphasized in UWW and the teaching/learning seminars.\textsuperscript{167} Jones meant to shape new persons/professors to shape new persons/students. Apart from personal implications, faculty resisted being reshaped because the context of their professional lives did not undergo commensurate change. They needed to be convinced that the collegial concept fit the research model which governed their professional lives and that it merited the personal cost of adopting a small group dynamic teaching style.\textsuperscript{168} Increased hiring during the demographic explosion in the 1960s assisted Jones's efforts to build a cadre of committed behaviourists in teaching. On the other hand, because the research model downplayed teaching as a primary function in academic careers, Jones could not count on even beginning professors committing to his humanistic model.

SPRI's Kanuga Lake retreat to train faculty who attended the fall teaching/learning seminar series did not help.\textsuperscript{169} Many attendees regarded participation as a "command performance." Their enthusiasm diminished further when, after a long ride in school buses and a late night arrival, the trainers expected them to brainstorm retreat objectives. Feedback was overwhelmingly negative. "If I performed in class like the staff of the Seminar performed for us," commented one participant, "I know that today's students would either read the newspaper, get up and leave or make loud and clear statements to the effect that I should quit shooting the bull and get on with it."\textsuperscript{170}

Smith promised the professors a re-evaluation of the teaching/learning series.
"[T]his program was meant only to be a catalyst for discussion. From that standpoint it has succeeded."¹⁷¹ Jones kicked off the next series with a presentation arguing for a humanistic academic revolution at USC.¹⁷² The series drew strong attendance and positive evaluations.¹⁷³ The obtuseness of a special seminar on "Instructional Objectives, Dynamic Learning, and How It All Fits," however, frustrated faculty again. One member wrote Heckle that "I am willing to do, but I need some specifics...to which my department and I can relate." He suggested "the goals of the institution should be published...I can work (or resign) within those goals, but I must know what they are."¹⁷⁴

A faculty member, concerned that UN101 was a "touchy-feely" course which gave first-year students three credits with questionable academic justification, reminded the senate to re-evaluate it. While waiting for an assessment from SPRI, the senate approved registration for the fall 1973 semester.¹⁷⁵ SPRI pointedly asked UN101 students for qualitative as well as quantitative data.¹⁷⁶ Most respondents answered that the course was a good "icebreaker," but that it had no effect on their relationships with faculty members or on their other courses.¹⁷⁷ They would not change the course or its elective status, and they would take it again. SPRI published its evaluation in a promotional monograph called University 101: An Educational Experiment.¹⁷⁸ In July, the faculty senate accepted the curricula and new courses committee's recommendation that they give UN101 permanent status and include it in the USC catalogue.¹⁷⁹

While Jones's office promoted a summer UN101 for USC students with poor academic records, SPRI recruited faculty for the summer training workshops.¹⁸⁰ The trainers introduced Human Potential workbooks to both preserve spontaneity and provide reassuring evidence of direction and procedure.¹⁸¹ The trainees indicated openness to
group dynamics techniques. They resisted the presumption that all teachers should adopt a human relations approach, however, observing that it appealed to some personalities more than others. ¹⁸²

At SPRI's suggestion, Jones assigned the supervision of UN101 to a dean of freshmen. ¹⁸³ To fill the new position, he chose Edward Beardsley, who was a passionate and popular teacher. Beardsley dutifully added UN101 to his professorial duties and took the training, but UN101 was not his main professional interest. ¹⁸⁴ As obsessed with promoting love of learning as Jones was with promoting the humanistic model, Beardsley saw in the deanship an opportunity to develop intellectual enthusiasm in the first year. ¹⁸⁵

Speaking to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Alexander spelled out the magnitude of Jones's achievement in establishing UN101. "The faculty had great difficulty approving [UN101] on an experimental basis because it (1) had no specified content, and (2) had no home in any of the traditional disciplines." Its approval meant the reintegration of cognitive and affective learning in higher education. "A new relationship between the classroom and the process of self-actualization is beginning to develop when we can see the emergence of courses such as this in academic areas." ¹⁸⁶

Alexander saw important implications for student affairs professionals in the UN101 model. According to the research-centred model, faculty were responsible for cognitive learning and student affairs for personal development. UN101 sought integration through holistic faculty-student relationships. Alexander suggested that the integrational character of UN101 logically provided student affairs professionals a means to achieve equal status with faculty. As the specialists in holism, they had "the potential to
help shape the future direction of the academy."

Alexander advocated that student personnel intentionally develop their educational role in line with and as part of the "sophisticated research in the behavioural sciences." They could use Chickering's seven vectors of development - competency, emotional maturity, autonomy, interpersonal relationships, purpose, identity, integrity - to show the interface of student activities with the classroom. The research required to extend the definition of higher learning beyond the classroom raised questions of personal privacy and "big-brotherism." If these could be resolved, said Alexander, "we will have a formal acknowledgement on the part of the University as to the interface between the affective and cognitive modes of learning."

Jones also took the message of UN101 to the larger higher education community. In behavioural science he believed he had found at least the spout of the educational "Aladdin's lamp" that would reduce drop-out rates: "We strive to develop an environment in which the student can explore his understanding of himself in relationship to others and to the institution, and in which he can develop the motivation for other academic work." Jones believed that experiments like UN101 yielded "hope that the Aladdin's lamp we seek may be within our reach."

In fall 1973, it appeared that Jones's Aladdin's lamp was beginning to burn on the USC campus. UN101 proceeded with 44 sections and 751 students. As Religion 399, Gardner applied its methodology with readmitted students. Jones ended the teaching/learning seminars series. He arranged a workshop for faculty to promote the Northwest Educational Laboratory interpersonal communications exercises recommended by Atkinson, but did so to "help us 'bridge' the content and process aspects of the dynamic
learning techniques” of UN101.\footnote{191}

Pressured by Jones’s initiatives and a fresh student campaign for instructional accountability,\footnote{192} the academic planning committee identified as a primary goal "the encouragement of new and improved teaching/learning techniques and skills and faculty self-renewal opportunities and the rewarding of outstanding teaching.”\footnote{193} The faculty advisory recommended that faculty establish a committee on teaching standards and goals to revise statements concerning teaching responsibilities in the faculty manual and to recommend procedures for "internal improvement of instruction and for administrative judgments."\footnote{194} In the midst of the pressure, the faculty committee on curricula and new courses struck at general studies. The committee couched its request that the senate "examine all aspects of the relationship of the College of General Studies with other Colleges and Divisions” in terms of "establishing a harmonious relationship" between the college and other units of the university.\footnote{195} To ensure that general studies would not be overpowered in the process, Gardner successfully moved that the examining committee consist of three members from general studies, three from other units, two students, and one administrator.\footnote{196} Its precarious standing made it unlikely that the college of general studies would become Jones's long-anticipated experimental college, at least in the near future.

Meanwhile, the academic planning committee presented the results of the institutional objectives survey. Faculty’s greatest concerns for improvement were intellectual orientation regarding students, community communication and trust, intellectual/aesthetic environment, individual personal development, democratic governance, and the reading/writing/math competencies of graduates.\footnote{197} Those who
accepted the administration's invitation to offer ideas and plans for change believed that most students regarded university as a necessary gateway to employment rather than as an intellectual opportunity. To awaken them to learning, the university should redesign the first year and have faculty instead of graduate assistants teach it. USC should evaluate UN101 for promotion of academic purposes as well as self-awareness. Campus units should recognize that one curriculum did not fit all and examine "alternatives from honors to remedial work...." Believing that students responded to instructors who showed personal interest in them, respondents recommended more attention to instructional proficiency. Although the survey indicated that teaching duties took up three times as much of faculty time as did research, "a single criterion -- research/publications -- was being given undue emphasis." 

While the participation rate in the survey discussions of almost one-fifth warm fuzzy holders suggested that UN101 was generating an activist critical mass in favor of humanistic educational innovation, instructors found the change to its student-centred approach demanding. An instructor who reported that "[t]here was no overall 'plan' for my University 101 class, rather I played it from week to week," found it necessary to have a plan ready for the many occasions when class plans fell through. Instructors made the arrangements for the activities their classes chose and entertained them in their homes. They endorsed the UN101 format, but asked that UN101 be recognized as part of an regular teaching load.

Beardsley attempted to conduct an assessment, but doubted that either its impressionistic method or its results would convert skeptical faculty to the UN101 model. His survey confirmed that the model formed positive relationships between
students and the university. Students, however, expressed educational reservations about the model. They desired more direction to get the group started, objectives so they would know what to do to pass the course, and a traditional grade. They "resented the fact that loafers usually passed."207

Planning for the spring 1974 semester, Beardsley worried "that the course has fallen too much in the hands of non-faculty..."208 It was important to keep it oriented to faculty if its philosophy was to achieve acceptance and eventually influence the entire institution. Previously, approximately 85 percent of the UN101 teaching corps had held disciplinary appointments.209 SPRI sent Beardsley an increasing number of self-referrals for training from support personnel, particularly from student affairs and the independent campus ministries.210 Beardsley relaxed, however, when only three of the 17 spring instructors came from administration or staff.

Provost Patterson, who normally did not take "centre stage," came to the forefront in the institution's planning process at this point. Calling administrators to workshops to develop a "management communication system," he assured them that there was "nothing sinister" about the agenda, "nor should it be interpreted as an 'end run' by any group." In light of declining enrolments and greater financial accountability, "we...believe that our timing is such that we can structure our own future prior to someone else or some other organization doing it for us."211 Jones's humanistic influence, particularly regarding the first year, was evident in the discussion. Participants asked whether USC meant to concentrate on quantity or quality. Why did USC lose so many first- and second-year students? How could USC develop greater receptivity to academic change and experimental programs? How could it develop new recruiting markets? Could the
university recognize experience beyond the classroom? Graduate students should receive teaching instruction. Could the university develop greater cohesion between faculty and administration? "How can we once more make the student, instead of the discipline, the focal point of higher education?\(^\text{212}\)

In January 1974, however, innovative planning suddenly became even more of an open question than it had been. Jones resigned the presidency, effective at the end of June. Though Jones declared his desire to "give full time and thought to the teaching and learning process" and received accolades to the accomplishments of his twelve-year term, few colleagues believed his resignation to be voluntary.\(^\text{213}\) Some state leaders had not forgiven Jones for the riot of May 1970 and many on campus were not at ease with Jones's experimental pedagogy. The trustees awarded Patterson the presidency for the short term before his retirement.

As Jones prepared to return to MIT as a visiting professor in engineering and education, he sought to preserve a humanistic legacy at USC. UN101 was the major vehicle with long-term potential to fulfill Jones's vision because it was not tied to a department or discipline. Faculty pointed out that no credible evaluation of the UN101 experiment existed to convince them of its educational value.\(^\text{214}\) Nevertheless, Smith believed that faculty would tolerate UN101 "as long as it does not interfere with [their] individual activities."\(^\text{215}\)

Decisions had to be made about UN101's funding, organizational position, and administration. Jones offered Venture funds for a semester, but Smith believed the course could be state funded. "It does bring in state revenues," he argued. "It costs relatively little for the FTE's produced. (Where else can we get a 3-hour course taught for
To justify its funding, "students should be informed that there will be academic work" and "faculty...should be monitored and asked to submit a written report of activities at the end of the semester." The administration moved UN101 to USC's center for cultural development to distance it from association with Jones. Associate Provost Keith Davis asked Smith to prepare a job description for a UN101 coordinator. Smith also listed four persons who demonstrated outstanding administrative skills and interest in UN101. The first person, Roy Trueblood, chose instead to take up a Ford-funded laboratory education internship. The second also declined. The third, Gardner, accepted the challenge of establishing the UN101 program and, through it, Jones's humanistic vision for American higher education.

Because he was an associate professor without tenure in the college of general studies, Gardner was surprised to be entrusted with the challenge. Like Jones, he believed in taking advantage of "serendipity," however, and perceived the challenge as one which would make sense of his life. Gardner grew up in New Canaan, Connecticut, the adopted son of a lawyer/corporate manager and an independently wealthy mother. From his silver high-chair-tray babyhood to high school, he imbibed privilege, civility, and conservative politics, and resisted Episcopalian religious indoctrination. As a teenager, Gardner, realizing he did not share the values of the corporate world of his father, attended public rather than private school and ran a landscaping business. He displayed a developing social idealism when he urged his senior class to give the money for their lavish Roman banquet to the needy.

Gardner's father, who expected him to become a lawyer, persuaded him to attend one year at Marietta College in Ohio. Homesick, unmotivated, and lacking study skills,
Gardner came close to failing. After sophomore Dan Berman volunteered advice on notetaking, Gardner came alive academically. Eagerly imbibing Marietta’s critical liberal arts curriculum, he quickly adopted an agnostic, liberal world view. His knowledge of politics and administration grew as his social idealism led him to student government and the reformation of Marietta's honour system. Gardner’s attempts to differentiate himself from his father's image, however, were not entirely successful. His corporate skills and values were deeply entrenched. Working summers in one of his father's plants, Gardner had to be strong-armed to lower productivity to protect other workers' jobs. When his father chided him for not working on a holiday, he went back to the plant and internalized an immoderate calvinistic work ethic.

A generalist who thrived on constant and varied experience, Gardner did not choose a major for his undergraduate degree. Accepting being cut off from funding by his parents, he chose to pursue a master's degree in American studies at Purdue University in Indiana. Upon completion, not wanting to support American involvement in Vietnam but knowing he could be drafted, he enlisted in the Air Force medical corps. The military trained him as a psychiatric social worker and sent him to South Carolina. Because he had more education than the usual recruit, Gardner was asked to teach USC extension courses on-base for soldiers and off-base for mill workers' children.

In teaching, Gardner discovered his vocation. In addition, teaching exposed him directly to rural, isolated, poor, religious, and conservative southern culture. Confidently messianic, Gardner did not hesitate to expose his students to his agnosticism and liberalism. He carried a combination of scornful sarcasm and benevolent paternalism into his teaching career after discharge from the military in 1968. 224 Winthrop College
reinforced it by not renewing his contract after he promoted an American Civil Liberties Union event, unaware that the ACLU had helped workers sue the father of one of his students. Coming to USC in May 1970, Gardner kept quieter about his liberalism, but continued to live consistently with his values. He volunteered for Upward Bound and committee work, experimented with teaching techniques, and helped Jones test the UN101 concept with first-year, education, and readmitted students. Jones's humanistic model fit Gardner's worldview and he was both eager and equipped to promote it.

Gardner hinted that he favoured more structure and academic content in UN101. He advised the warm fuzzy network that, "I see this role of coordinator as being a faculty responsibility, just as I see the future of this program resting more in the hands of faculty." He asked them to suggest modifications for the training, and, "as a matter of heresy: If you were to give your University 101 students something to read...what would you use?"

Gardner knew that UN101 recruitment adversely affected its reputation. Many advisors told students not to take it. The administration filled UN101 sections after the semester started by promising students they would not have to read or write. This made it difficult for faculty instructors to utilize any traditional academic methods. Gardner used orientations and promotional materials to tell students and advisors that UN101 might include assignments. He encouraged faculty instructors to incorporate perspectives of their disciplines; that is, to demonstrate to their students a scholar at work.

To test his proposed changes, Gardner prepared to teach an Upward Bound summer UN101 section. "This course represents a significant experimental modification of the...University 101 in which I am introducing much more academic content than is
customarily included."228 Gardner assigned a textbook and readings, two written themes and a research paper, two examinations, and library orientation, and enforced USC's attendance regulations. "[M]y aim is to give the students as realistic a college learning experience as is possible over seven weeks, one that will help them adjust to the university per se and help them over the difficult transition in which they now find themselves."

Gardner composed a memorandum to Patterson to introduce himself and his vision for UN101. He presented himself as a "faculty member who uses traditional teaching tools in my regular courses...but one who has also been able to make use of some of the techniques learned in University 101 to become a more effective teacher."229 He desired to institutionalize the course because he believed it helped first-year students adjust, rejuvenated faculty, humanized the educational process, improved undergraduate instruction, developed community in faculty, and provided an opportunity for experimentation in teaching methods. Though he hesitated to accept the coordination of the program because of..."the sentiments of a number of the tenured associate and full professor faculty to 'end such nonsense' as University 101," he hoped to establish a program "worthy of three hours USC credit." Problems facing the program included general lack of understanding of the UN101 concept, need for more structure and reading and writing content, recognition in the faculty reward system, domination by younger faculty, and identification with the outgoing administration.

Gardner informed Patterson that he had numerous nominations for prospective instructors as well as enthusiastic commitments from previous instructors to teach again. He planned to add to the training research data about teaching methods, Human Potential and human relations exercises that previous trainees found helpful, information about
needs and problems of entering students, the culture of the South, and the history of USC, and suggestions for course content. To improve communication, he was mailing a new brochure to all incoming students, speaking at orientations, and meeting with deans, departments chairs, senior faculty, and advisors.\textsuperscript{230} Gardner aimed to give UN101 a new image and substance to strengthen and institutionalize it, make it part of the regular teaching load, make the training worthy of the designation "faculty development," and involve more senior professors. He asked for Patterson's visible support, and time "to make some positive measurable changes in what I believe is a course whose basic intentions are sound."\textsuperscript{231}

Contrary to the expectation of many in the USC community, Patterson replied favourably. "I have high hopes for the continuation of University 101 in the direction you seem currently headed."\textsuperscript{232} Patterson knew the orientation course was not a new idea. In the 1930s, USC gave him one credit for its orientation "to being a gung ho fighting Gamecock fellow."\textsuperscript{233} Joining the USC engineering faculty during World War II, he established a course which led to an invitation to write an orientation guide. He believed, however, that UN101 must satisfy the requirements of the academy. In early July, he met with Gardner "and told him that unless I felt he could come up with something that had more value to it, more purpose to it, and had standards high enough that the students had to take an interest and had to pass or fail, that I would go to the faculty...and see if we just couldn't abolish the thing." Further, Gardner could not only state that students and the university benefited from UN101, he must prove it with credible research data.\textsuperscript{234}

The transition between presidencies illustrated the tension between the research ideal and the college ideal which Gardner inherited. Jones's first address to the faculty in
1962 focused on turning USC into a major research institution. In his last address, Jones reviewed his accomplishments, emphasizing buildings and academic programs.235 Predictably, however, he returned to his campaign to restore collegiality to the university. To combat alienation and foster personal development, USC must humanize itself and its educational processes. Teaching and learning must recognize the whole person, even if this meant sacrifice of content. Similarly, in his farewell interview with The Gamecock, Jones stated that his "major accomplishment was bringing the University of South Carolina into the national mainstream."236 He then argued for educational flexibility to meet student needs. Jones reflected that his greatest fulfillment as president was "proving out a replicable experience which deals directly and effectively with the affective behaviour of students, including their attitude to the learning experience."237 USC's experiments convinced him that faculty could facilitate change in student attitude and motivations. Knowing education by facilitation would not be achieved by committee or legislative processes, Jones "concentrate[d]...on changing the insights and outlook of the existing faculty members as well as looking for a limited number of new faculty with special attributes needed to bring about changes seen as desirable." He found young faculty more receptive, and engineers and hard scientists resistant, to the NTL training he provided in various forms. Nevertheless, he had built the base of faculty support needed to launch UN101 and begin faculty 'retraining.'

That Jones's tenure had established the research orientation at USC was evident in the first speech Patterson made to faculty as president. Patterson's remarks contained none of the rhetoric characteristic of USC presidents from 1945 on about adopting the research model. They reflected reassurance rather than initiation, implying that USC was
a research university for which Jones's experimentation with collegiality was problematic. "Even a casual examination of American universities today will indicate clearly the close relationship between faculty responsibility and academic excellence." Under Patterson, faculty interests would predominate. Furthermore, he demoted student affairs from equal partnership to subordination to academic affairs by changing Witten's position from a vice-presidency to a deanship under the provost.

In his welcome interview in The Gamecock, Patterson noted that younger faculty might think him conservative because he was approaching retirement age. He did think it was time for faculty to "see whether the road we took was the best one or whether there are greater improvements ahead." In particular, he thought a grading system which eliminated failing grades punished better students. He did not understand the purposes of the centre for cultural development and wanted Contemporary University assessed. On the other hand, he supported the college of general studies because "[t]here are more ways than one to do the job." UN101 "could be used very profitably" as an introduction to university. "It probably should be structured a little bit more than it has been in the past. But then again, perhaps it is serving its purpose best as it is."

With Jones gone, Hiers and Zuidema of SPRI could not resist the introduction of structure in the UN101 program. Heckel resubmitted a proposal which earlier had been rejected by Jones and the trainers, which suggested developing a constellation of models for UN101 from which faculty and students could choose. Patterson decided, however, that Gardner's revisions were satisfactory. Gardner joined the SPRI training team to ensure that trainees both experienced group process and had it explained to them. He followed the SPRI workshop with a cognitive component, instructed by USC specialists in
education, student affairs, and history.

Despite these measures, the professorial ratio of trainees declined. Forty percent of the summer 1974 trainees came from campus support services, particularly student affairs. The reason was pragmatic -- professorial recruitment did not keep pace with student recruitment. With a limit of 20 per section and a course registration of over 700, Gardner required 35 instructors for the fall.\textsuperscript{243} Another development suggested that Gardner would continue to need non-faculty instructors for UN101. Smith, now dean for learning resources, revived the teaching/learning seminars to improve conventional teaching.\textsuperscript{244} To distinguish them from Jones's innovations, he called them instructional development seminars and promised that "[t]here will be no Seminars devoted to behavioral science/dynamic learning/sensitivity training type activities."\textsuperscript{245}

Gardner carried a full teaching load in the college of general studies while promoting UN101. Patterson, and Jones from MIT, stood behind his efforts. Gardner told Jones that Patterson "met with the trainees this summer in the Board Room as you used to, and he volunteered to write each 101 Fall faculty member a letter of support and encouragement."\textsuperscript{246} Patterson hosted a luncheon for UN101 faculty, to "show his interest in and appreciation for [their] efforts."\textsuperscript{247}

The faculty luncheon perhaps was Gardner's idea since it came out of a meeting he had with Patterson early in the semester.\textsuperscript{248} Gardner had a way of giving credit to others for his ideas. He paid attention to detail which generated goodwill. The luncheon created goodwill for UN101 in Patterson as the host, the faculty as the recipients, and even in the hotel program instructor and students to whom Gardner wrote that "I heard many compliments and I believe the President was pleased, too."\textsuperscript{249} Gardner then invited the
UN101 instructors to help articulate the program's goals. At the end of the semester, he sent each a letter of appreciation. His genuine civility, thoroughness, and perseverance made it difficult for members of the USC community to resist his objectives.

A survey of the instructors indicated that only three would not participate in the program again. Gardner filled the January training workshop and had more requests to teach the course than he needed. Patterson, however, sought proof that UN101 adjusted students to the university so that they succeeded academically and did not drop out. He asked Fidler, who was now director of the educational development office, and Smith to "conduct an intensive and extensive evaluation" to "determine whether or not University 101 should become a regularly offered course." Gardner's position was not secure at this point. Both his program and his college were under scrutiny. The administration announced that the college of general studies would be reorganized and delegated the matter to the academic planning committee. In the midst of this uncertainty, Gardner developed the UN101 training's content component and the beginnings of a literature. Trainers and consultants now distributed bibliographies, readings, handouts, and teaching worksheets. This nascent literature had the potential to standardize class activities and inhibit group process. Gardner showed his commitment to process, however, by providing opportunities for human relations training.

When he learned that the university had selected him for its 1975 Amoco outstanding teacher award, Gardner told Jones he hoped it would "give General Studies some help in their struggle to stay alive" and also bring prestige to UN101. The latter's position, however, had improved. By the end of January, Fidler and Smith provided "good statistical evidence that University 101 has a statistically significant impact on
retention of freshmen and there is apparently a whopping difference in University 101 students' awareness of the resources of the University versus freshman who did not take University 101. Further, "slightly more structured format in 1974 seems to have had a measurably greater impact on the GPR of those freshmen who took the course as compared to those who took 101 in 1973." The evaluation showed that students who took the course were better informed, made better use of university personnel and services, and participated more in extracurricular activities. The program was too new to yield complete data on retention but preliminary findings suggested that UN101 alums were more likely to remain in university.

Convinced that "University 101 plays a beneficial role in the orientation and educational progress of many freshmen," Patterson decided that "University 101 will continue as a regular academic program of the University as long as student interest and need continue to exist." The Gamecock announced that "University 101 is here to stay!" Davis instructed Gardner to recruit instructors for the coming year, with the proviso that "[w]herever it is feasible, I would like to see faculty assume the teaching load." Though USC's departments did not approve UN101 as part of a regular teaching load, Gardner reported that, "I still did not have to twist a single arm or make a single phone call to recruit a faculty member for a University 101 Workshop." Gardner elected to keep UN101 under the provost to protect its university-wide character, but it no longer needed exclusive patronage. Its nature and direction were set. With careful management and continued independent assessment, it could develop and grow. Gardner could proceed with the transformation of the university according to Jones's humanistic vision.

UN101 had a long way to go. The UN101 evaluation included an attempt to
measure its effectiveness in moulding humanistic professors. The faculty survey measured attitudes of UN101 instructors against those of total faculty.\textsuperscript{264} Acknowledging that the UN101 outcome reflected somewhat its high proportion of faculty holding administrative appointments, the survey found that UN101 instructors were more likely than total faculty to seek personal development of students, interact with students and discuss non-academic matters with them, teach through discussion and collaborative methods, require less structure, desire a relationship of mutual trust and respect, spend time and gain satisfaction from student advisement and committee work, and pursue development of teaching, committee, and advising skills. Total faculty were more likely to seek their own professional development and research, spend time with students discussing academic matters, favour an information transmission role using lectures, assignments, outside resource people, student evaluation and feedback, and audio-visual materials, emphasize structure and clear standards, spend time preparing for class, and pursue improvement in knowledge, skill, and productivity in their disciplines. While the survey perhaps did not prove anything more than that there were a significant number of faculty at USC who were as or more interested in teaching than research, it demonstrated that most USC faculty considered their role to be academic rather than holistic. Collegiality, or education for life, was not their primary concern.
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Chapter 6

The Experiment Widens: The Freshman Year Experience

In the early 1970s, many higher educators were interested in the potential of the ideas of Carl Rogers and of NTL to transform American higher education humanistically. There were even a few experimental first-year seminars. UN101's model of requiring instructors to undergo group dynamics training before putting it into practice in the first-year seminar was, however, unique. President Jones planted the model using foundation funding and President Patterson established a credible research base for it. The "touchy-feely" nature of the model encountered considerable resistance from faculty concerned with academic standards, but John Gardner kept the UN101 program staffed partly through the eager participation of non-academic specialists, largely student affairs professionals. As the program succeeded at USC, Gardner began promoting it nationally, initially through student affairs venues. UN101 garnered the support of James Holderman, Patterson's successor, when he observed the interest it attracted in the United States and Canada. Gradually, attracted by UN101's favourable effect on retention of students, other institutions introduced similar programs. Under Gardner's tireless promotion and facilitation, UN101 grew into a movement called The Freshman Year Experience which offered consulting, training, conferences, and publications. It broadened its scope from the first year to include other student transitions, notably the Senior Year Experience. FYE proved influential in bringing about humanistic change in American higher education, but did not resolve the tension in the academy between the research and college ideals.
Jones had predicted that a diminishing supply of traditional-aged students would fuel ongoing interest in student-centred reform.¹ Now deeply involved in educational innovation at MIT, he followed affective experiments and aggressively spread his own “UN101 gospel.”² The monograph SPRI wrote to convince USC’s faculty to approve the UN101 course supplied Gardner with an explanatory literature to send inquirers.³ Reading it, a University of Cincinnati psychiatrist called Jones’s experiment, “one of the most stimulating that I have heard and also one of the most convincing,” and suggested to his president, well-known behavioural scientist Warren Bennis, that its wider dissemination could strengthen the promotion of NTL.⁴

By fall 1975, it was clear that other campuses would adopt the Jones model. The observer Bennis sent to USC’s faculty training declared his life changed by the experience.⁵ “Carl Rogers was everywhere,” he told UC. “[T]he point of a venture like University 101 [is] getting into the problems of the human spirit and acknowledging the presence of the totality of body, mind, and soul for greater learning.”⁶ Subsequently, Jones explained UN101 to UC’s faculty and UC’s academic affairs committee and student senate endorsed a seminar for its university college.⁷

Gardner was not dependent on Jones, however, for the wider dissemination of UN101. In 1976, the administrators to whom he was responsible, Dean Varney and Provost Davis, encouraged him to “go out and sell it.”⁸ Maintaining control but working cooperatively, Gardner "formed a task-force of interested individuals in the program (like Manning and John and Paul Fidler) who are taking steps to expand national publicity about 101 and we hope to get several publications out this fall as well as make several conference presentations."⁹
The taskforce made immediate progress. A brief description of UN101 in the American Association of Higher Education College & University Bulletin doubled the number of inquiries received previously. To reply, Gardner added to SPRI’s monograph a UN101 brochure mailed to incoming students, a course description, a paper by Gardner and Smith entitled "University 101: a multi-purpose course approach to fundamental problems of higher education," and Fidler's data. The enthusiasm of USC’s student personnel for UN101 and the high percentage of inquiries from student personnel elsewhere encouraged the taskforce to submit a proposal to explain UN101 at the fall meeting of the National Orientation Directors Association.

As it became known beyond USC, UN101’s respectability "in its own land" increased. Fidler's ongoing assessment strengthened UN101's claims that it fostered both better use of the university's resources and academic success. Only the honours college and engineering refused to count UN101 credits for graduation. Gardner and SPRI had no trouble filling the summer and winter training workshops. However, in 1974-75, almost 50 percent of the UN101 instructors came from outside faculty. Gardner believed that the university-wide and holistic nature of UN101 justified participation by student personnel, staff, and denominational chaplains. Further, using other personnel enabled Gardner to advertise the program as cost-effective. Only faculty received a stipend for teaching UN101; USC units absorbed the cost of other employees by including the seminar in their workday. Use of non-faculty instructors cost in credibility, however, because most research-oriented faculty did not perceive UN101 as an academic offering.

Goals of UN101 articulated in the training workshop included "growth, self-ego, campus resources, humanize one instructor, build one reference group --- feel less alone,
helpful in other situation, responsibility, introducing non-academic components to your class, assertive training, and expose them to what you do in the university." These goals dominated in the sections facilitated by non-faculty. Gardner reminded them to include some intellectual content. At the same time, he struggled with affective and cognitive balance in his own teaching, telling his assistant dean that he had "attempted to make greater use of...the good old 'traditional lecture method.'...Although we don't usually think of the lecture method as being 'innovative,' I think an exceptionally good lecture can in effect be 'innovative.'"

While Gardner allowed instructors to structure their courses as desired, the focus on discovering self-identity in community meant a rough similarity of activities between sections. Most sections used group dynamics and values clarification exercises and either visited the library and campus services or had campus personnel come to them. Some met out of class time for meals, service, and field trips.

The attempts of some scholar-instructors to introduce more academic content into their sections demonstrated the ambiguity in UN101 between needs of USC as an academic institution and of students as citizens in formation. After completing the UN101 faculty training, Professor Jerry Jewler created a section to introduce journalism students to both USC and their discipline. He combined his academic expectations with the usual UN101 format. "They are to bring essays on the walk on Tuesday and read them to the class, if they so desire....What next? Damned if I know." USC's new courses and curricula committee denied Jewler permission to repeat his specialized section on the grounds that it "was antithetical to the philosophy of the course." Ironically, he utilized structure in his Upward Bound UN101 section without censure. Professor Harry Miller
of general studies personalized academic success by taking his Upward Bound students through a problem-solving methodology: "How do you transform fuzzy messes into clearly defined problems? How do you state problems according to behavioural objectives? What is the value of problem definition? How does a person ideology relate to problem definition?" Miller's section was student-centred to a degree, but he determined its content.

Jones, from MIT, primed Gardner with readings from proponents of humanistic reform in American higher education. He pointed out that Nevitt Sanford, in Where Colleges Fail (1967), agreed that "nothing will happen until the Prof changes into a student developer instead of an information conveyer."24 He contended that effective teaching remained unrecognized because "there is no adequate way to change the reward system without restructuring the whole academic system of values."25 When Gardner expressed his appreciation for "papers on the basic theme of teaching as one's profession (rather than some discipline),"26 Jones recommended Sanford's Wright Institute, which sought "to effect social changes by altering the psychological-social-institutional circumstances of individuals...to enhance productivity and well-being..."27

Transforming higher education to personal development did not fit the political climate of South Carolina in 1976. The state's first Republican governor since Reconstruction cut all state budgets by eight percent.28 Pressure on USC to concentrate on its academic mission once more jeopardized the college of general studies. While he defended the college, Gardner himself underwent review for tenure and promotion. USC's trustees signaled the survival of the college by proceeding with rewards and new
appointments.29 Gardner, then, was able to approach the 1976-77 school year with academic security.

USC’s vehicle for transformation was a free-form mixture of academic and non-academic instructors, affective and cognitive content, and structure and lack of structure.30 Jewler grew more comfortable with the mixture. "[The students] have played a greater role in developing the agenda for this class," he reported, “and part of the reason is that I have learned to put more responsibility on them."31 The mixture apparently produced persistent students. Fidler’s assessment data consistently showed a correlation between participation in UN101 and retention. An increasing proportion of first-year students signed up for the course, often at the urging of parents reading promotional information sent to their homes.32

In fall 1976, Gardner and his taskforce, which now included Witten, Fidler, Hiers, and Zuidema, embarked on the national dissemination of UN101 in earnest.33 The NODA presentation produced queries concerning consulting. Gardner pledged to “do anything I can to help... get a program off the ground."34 Stressing flexibility, he offered to assist with “whatever use you might wish to make of the University 101 concept." His one proviso to a former colleague planning a program at the University of Texas was that he “give appropriate credit for the origination of the concept at the University of South Carolina."35 Senior officers also received the taskforce enthusiastically at the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 1977 meeting.36 Prompted by Witten, NASPA gave UN101 its prestigious “outstanding innovative program” award.37 UN101’s first national award also raised its credibility internally. The Gamecock reported that UN101 was
“being used as a model by other colleges throughout the United States and Canada in their attempts to solve declining enrolments and curb the drop-out rate.”

Gardner maintained that the key to positioning UN101 to influence the university was improved retention. He advised student personnel to use the seminar to improve the success rate of minority and disadvantaged students. “In the area of the numbers game this should appeal to administrators who want to help other students survive as well.” He informed HEW’s Upward Bound officer that "we...offer our most "academic" version of the course for those students." Gardner remained oriented, however, to faculty acceptance. “[I]f you can have it start and come up through academic channels rather than in a student affairs area you might be stronger politically.” He regarded the NASPA award “quite an honor considering we are not strictly a student affairs type program....”

Gardner assured Jones that "we are still at work spreading your gospel." In addition to conference presentations, he and the task force hoped to get something published about UN101. Jones suggested that he invite William W. Purkey who wrote extensively on the relationship between self-concept and success in school to speak to the UN101 instructor network. Wadsworth Publishing Company was about to bring out Purkey’s Inviting School Success. As a result of this exchange, Wadsworth asked Gardner to write a companion handbook to Purkey’s volume. In the meantime, Gardner’s taskforce prepared an article on UN101.

Patterson retired at the end of the 1976-77 academic year. His successor, James B. Holderman, was younger and ambitious to head a prestigious research institution. Holderman, like Jones, wanted USC’s units to develop not only national but international links on behalf of the state. The growing outside interest in USC’s first-year seminar gave
Gardner grounds to establish a positive working relationship with him.\textsuperscript{46} Gardner told Jones that "[t]he new President has communicated to me...that he is interested in 101 and plans to make some remarks about [it] in some presentation he is making to the [state] Commission on Higher Education.\textsuperscript{47}"

Holderman also visited the summer faculty training workshop. There he met personnel not only from USC but also from the branch campuses and outside institutions.\textsuperscript{48} The outside participation, in addition to non-faculty volunteers, meant full workshops, but the number of USC teaching faculty remained relatively low. Gardner estimated that one-third of the approximately 200 training graduates to date were faculty with tenure and one-third were full-time professional staff.\textsuperscript{49}

When Gardner articulated the five-year goals of UN101 in preparation for Holderman’s “Carolina Plan,” he appeared to moderate its primary goal of retraining faculty to a humanistic educational model. After providing entrants with survival skills for adjustment to the university, he wrote: "Recruitment of new University 101 faculty drawn from all academic and professional staff areas in the University."\textsuperscript{50} In 1978, the proportion of non-remunerated, probably non-faculty, instructors passed 50 percent. Gardner’s goals also tempered the human relations model in favour of academic structure. According to Gardner, this shift did not violate the student-centred nature of the UN101 concept. The more pragmatic students of the late 1970s, he argued, were “much more receptive to the introduction of more traditional academic content into the course and there is a great eagerness to acquire very practical academic skills.”\textsuperscript{51}

Gardner hoped to extend the "[n]ational publicity efforts about the successes we are having at Carolina...while simultaneously working with other institutions of higher
learning, to help solve some of their problems in successfully orienting freshmen to a university...." In fall 1977, he and SPRI took their faculty training to Georgia College, in Milledgeville, Georgia. The taskforce continued to present at association meetings. UN101 welcomed observers from other campuses.

The Carolina Plan characterized UN101 as an academic strategy. "A university as comprehensive as Carolina, "wrote Holdeman, "has a special obligation to help students survive academically without reducing its standards. Retention of students becomes as important as their admission....Some immediate steps can be undertaken, including...continuation and expansion of University 101 opportunities. From MIT, however, Jones reminded Gardner of the humanistic model. As Holdeman announced his Carolina Plan, Jones sent Gardner a Carl Rogers lecture which asked: "Do we as educators wish to take [the steps to bring about a more human and more effective learning climate] or will the politics of traditional education, leading to less effective learning, continue to stand in the way?"

A December 1977 Gamecock cartoon demonstrated that many on campus believed that UN101 credits did not represent academic achievement.

"Set the keg over there, Neantherdal. Theresa, you can belly dance on the bed - Malachi, the 'john' is thru that door - when you start feeling sick."
"WHO ARE THESE PEOPLE!"
"Oh, just some friends from my University 101 class. We've decided to cram for the final."

Within a week, a rebuttal appeared in The Gamecock. In fact, the article clarified, Gardner had introduced instructor-generated syllabi. Students now could fail UN101.

"For example, 9% of those who took University 101 in the spring of 1977 received an
unsatisfactory or an incomplete grade. The rate for fall 1977 was 4% either unsatisfactory or incomplete.\(^59\)

Jewler achieved a politically acceptable middle ground between student-centred and knowledge-centred instruction in his experiments with Upward Bound. His third Upward Bound sought rapport between students and instructor but he guided the students’ curricular choices, “stressing that they could digress from the list [of recommended subject matter] only if they could convince me that their topic was of equal value of (sic) those I had chosen.”\(^60\) Jewler’s students practiced grammar, letter writing, and public speaking while they analyzed such disparate cultural artifacts as advertising, American musical comedy portrayals of African Americans, Kris Kristofferson ballads, Russian classical music, and a movie about the holocaust. The variety of topics rivalled Witten’s Upward Bound experiments in the late 1960s but the content and method of delivery were calculated to satisfy Jewler’s own standards as a faculty member.\(^61\)

The flexibility of the seminar concept convinced Gardner that it could be applied to the needs of all kinds of postsecondary institutions. Vice President for Two-Year Campuses John Duffy, though not a warm fuzzy convert, supported UN101 from its inception for his jurisdiction. In 1978, Gardner reserved half the training openings for branch faculty members.

Gardner warned the UN101 network that "the University will be under increasing pressure to improve our retention of our students, and so we will continue to need your help in many ways."\(^62\) He attended an American College Testing Service retention seminar and took extensive notes.\(^63\) When Clarion College in Pennsylvania asked for a training workshop preliminary to starting an orientation course, Gardner included a
summary from the seminar. Financilly pressed institutions were paying fresh attention to drop-outs because they represented lost revenue. Researchers linked dropping out to isolation and loneliness, incompatibility or noninvolvement with the institution, absence of caring professional adults, insufficient supports for challenged students, academic boredom, and irrelevancy. Because UN101 answered these issues, retention was a legitimate theme for its promotion. Gardner notified Drake University's Retain that UN101 would stress retention at the 1978 AAHE meeting.

AAHE, "happy to give visibility to University 101, for we think it is a creative response to a knotty problem - helping freshmen feel a part of their university," ensured a good attendance by asking Patricia Cross of the Educational Testing Service to respond. The AAHE meeting was significant for UN101. Previous major conference presentations had been to student personnel. This presentation brought the course to the attention of senior academic administrators. Gardner's taskforce, solidly supported by Fidler's research, presented UN101 as a "simple, inexpensive program [that could] positively influence: student retention, faculty development, student orientation, and utilization of student support services, while simultaneously increasing revenues." Afterwards, a "mob" asked for handouts and the University of Alabama in Birmingham requested a copy of Gardner's paper for publication.

Gardner acquired a national reputation as an expert on retention. "[It]'s getting now...that we don't have to write proposals any more to present at national meetings," he wrote Jones, "because now proposals are being sent to us to do!" Professional societies asked Gardner to turn the presentations into articles. Gardner's message also crossed international boundaries. Canadian educators queried USC about UN101 in the mid-
1970s. In 1978, Provost Paul Gilmour of Ontario’s University of Guelph invited Gardner and Fidler to explain the UN101 concept to his faculty and to the annual meeting of the Canadian Association of College and University Student Services. Gilmour pledged to “press our people in this direction with as much creative spirit and sensitivity to local custom and requirements as possible. . . . I will do all I can to be of assistance and support to others in the Student Services field in Canada interested in the University 101 program.” Personnel from major Canadian universities, including the University of British Columbia, the University of Toronto, and McGill University in Montreal, contacted Gardner for further information. One educator in particular caught the UN101 vision. Ken Long, professor of English and assistant dean of students at the University of Windsor, asked for a place in USC’s next training workshop. He created a program called Studentship, sent members of his staff to USC’s training, and joined Gilmour in promoting UN101 in CACUSS.

The AAHE meeting also unexpectedly brought an internal benefit to UN101. Francis Borkowski, who was considering the provostship of USC, sought out Gardner. Borkowski impressed Gardner because he had pioneered a bachelor of general studies degree at Ohio University. When Borkowski took the provost position, Gardner advised Jones that "he seems really supportive of the University 101 concept so I am very optimistic about how we are going to fare in the new regime."

Borkowski’s first speech to the USC faculty, in September 1978, stressed academic excellence. "There is...one primary goal for which this university must strive and which should be the basis for the development of specific missions. That goal is the achievement of excellence and, through that achievement, the gaining of international recognition for
the university." Borkowski argued that "the antithesis that some perceive between general studies and honor studies, between liberal arts departments and professional schools, between general education and technical education, is fallacious." Nevertheless, the common denominator between them was not humanism but academic performance. 

"[T]he direction in each discipline must be towards greater academic rigor." Borkowski called the "view that the university is first and foremost a place for students to 'find themselves' or to 'grow up'" with which the learning of irrelevant facts might interfere "a thinly veiled anti-intellectualism" which "strikes at the very heart of what we regard to be the reason for the existence of the University. Students will find themselves and grow up when they undertake significant and systematic work." Declaring that "our commitment must be to continue the development of the University of South Carolina as a major research university," he emphatically linked teaching to research. Research meant finding something new in one's discipline, however, and therefore could include "investigating other modes of instruction which seek to accomplish traditional tasks more effectively."

Borkowski endorsed UN101 as "an important instructional vehicle for both students and faculty." In keeping with the Chronicle of Higher Education report that a "19-per-cent decline in the number of 18-year-olds in the 1980's has universities worried about finances, faculties, and research," he expected that "national visibility of the program will increase." USC's UN101 was in demand for conference presentations and articles. Approximately 260 American and Canadian institutions of higher education had asked for information. Gardner and his task force traveled North America, consulting and conducting workshops. UN101 conscientiously developed contacts with leading voices in higher education like Cross and Lee Noel of ACTS. Georgia College and
Clarion College instituted spin-off programs and many others were in the proposal stage. The dean of student affairs at Georgia College nominated UN101 for another national award, this one from the Academy for Educational Development.

UN101's submission to AED suggested that the participation of student affairs in UN101, originally a side benefit, had become a philosophical fundamental of UN101. It described UN101 as "a unique, innovative freshman program that included both an academic credit-producing orientation course and an instructor training model, a combination of which would accomplish three important goals: (1) improve student retention; (2) promote faculty staff development; and (3) help humanize the University environment." Its principal faculty staff development objectives were, first, "greatly increased and successful interaction between student personnel professions and faculty, thus reducing the typical barrier between these groups" and, second, "involving large numbers of traditional faculty in the orientation process." Gardner, believed the program succeeded because it "[met] the needs of both the students and faculty who participate[d]...while simultaneously achieving academically legitimate goals and the fact that all of this [took] place as the result of a University-wide effort."

The partnership of student affairs in UN101 did not increase significantly the number of student-centred faculty at USC. Gardner thanked Holderman for supporting the course in the face of "a very small group of reactionary faculty who would like to set the clock back to a bygone era." According to Gardner's AAHE presentation, in 1978, only one-third of UN101 instructors held academic appointments. Gardner explained student affairs participation to the Southern College Personnel Association. The democratization of higher education raised developmental issues which "have,
understandably, been viewed with disdain by many traditional faculty. In turn, this has provided an opportunity for student personnel professionals to enter into what has become part of the academic mainstream and to become involved in teaching students many of these skills in which they are so obviously deficient, while...helping to achieve the so necessary enhancement of self-esteem in these students." Vehciles like the first-year orientation seminar positioned them to initiate educational change. According to Gardner, "well over 90% of...inquiries [about UN101] are usually made by senior administrators or staff members who are student personnel professionals." When Gardner consulted, "without exception...the idea...originated with a Student Affairs professional."

With Gardner's assistance, the student personnel initiators cultivated faculty support. They obtained a joint student personnel and faculty taskforce which generated a course proposal, "sold" it to faculty opinion makers, and used faculty surveys to raise general concern about retention. At this point, Gardner encouraged the initiators to invite faculty to a UN101 training workshop. He cautioned them to carefully avoid "[a]ny image of an emerging 'in' group... Skeptics, traditional faculty conservatives, etc., must be involved and educated." After approval, student affairs professionals should teach faculty humanistic skills, establish research, and promote results. Gardner valued student affairs involvement because it "link[ed] the student personnel objectives of human development with the prevailing academic needs and concerns (e.g., retention)."

While he argued for integration of the university experience through academic and student personnel partnerships, Gardner did not abandon Jones's crusade to transform faculty attitudes concerning education. He continued to promote UN 101 as a "faculty development experience...In essence, the training program seeks to develop 'affective'
skills in faculty (to complement their cognitive skills)."88 Gardner acknowledged to SCPA, however, that UN101’s success thus far had been largely due to “the support, involvement, leadership, and instruction provided by student personnel professionals.”89

The UN101 concept appealed to student affairs professionals because it dovetailed with the student development movement by which they hoped to gain partnership status with faculty in the American academy. Some noticed, however, that the goal of humanistic higher education was losing revolutionary force as students adjusted their expectations of the academy. Many students accepted the failure of the research university to engage them holistically, requiring only that it prepare them for specific employment. SPRI trainer and UN101 instructor Richard Lawhon observed that his 1978 section was a "stern test for some of the principles of 101 group development...which I had taken for granted....Group building exercises which have always worked well...lacked permanency. Similarly, trust-building exercises did not seem to have as long-lasting an impact on students."90 Gardner reflected that this trend furnished an opportunity to move UN101 in a more academic direction.

Gardner seemingly was content with the split personality of UN101, reflected in its practice and personnel. More pragmatic than philosophical, he remained both loyal to Jones’s humanistic crusade and open to accommodations which would ensure its survival in an increasingly utilitarian higher educational climate. In addition to making academic accommodations, UN101 appealed to business rather than humanistic instincts in its emphasis on retention. Speaking to academic administrators assembled by AAHE, Gardner placed retention at the head of his list of UN101’s goals and outcomes.91 Preparing the AED application, he moved retention from sixth to first, and “To develop in
freshman students a more positive identification with the University and to give the
University a more caring and supportive image for the new students” to twelfth and last.92
Gardner also subtly reshaped the early history of UN101, noting that Jones foresaw the
effects on institutions of declining enrolments. In 1972, then, he meant “to develop a
unique, innovative freshman program…that would accomplish three basic goals: (1)
improve student retention; (2) promote faculty/staff development; and (3) help humanize
the University environment.” 93 Hitching the first-year seminar to the “star” of retention
was a rewarding market strategy, one that could be educationally justified. Clarion
College’s seminar proposal linked retention to democratization of higher education and
focused on USC’s UN101 as the model vehicle for improvement.94

Internally, Gardner listed the goals as “providing an extensive orientation to the
purposes of higher education in general and an orientation to this University in particular;
helping freshmen adjust to the University and develop more positive attitudes to the
University; improving the retention rate of freshmen; and giving faculty special
preparation….“95 USC’s UN101 delivered on all these goals. First, around 40 percent of
first-year students enrolled annually.96 1979 saw a record enrolment and 200 turned away
for lack of instructors.97 Second, Fidler’s longitudinal data showed that students who
enrolled had a higher survival rate than non-enrolees with higher entrance scores.98 Third,
resources for instructors now included some direction in content. Gardner circulated a list
of books instructors used and published a guide to campus services and programs willing
to work with UN101 classes99 He called the content possibilities “a real smorgasbord,
where, if anything, the problem becomes not what to include but what not to include.”100
Though students knew that instructors could require them to read and write, Gardner
imposed few actual requirements.\textsuperscript{101} Instructors could eschew academic exercises and major on psychological games. If they assigned a textbook, it might be something like, *Born to Win: Transactional Analysis With Gestalt Experiments* (1971).\textsuperscript{102}

The popularity of UN101 was not as evident among USC faculty as among students. Gardner distributed a cartoon of himself in Uncle Sam’s “We need you” pose to advise potential instructors that they could volunteer up to the start of classes.\textsuperscript{103} In the faculty training workshops, the ratio of roughly one-third academics, one-third services personnel, and one-third branch campus or outside participants held.\textsuperscript{104}

Gardner kept Holderman and the provosts apprised of the growing national and international profile of UN101.\textsuperscript{105} He maintained his punishing schedule of conference and consulting appearances.\textsuperscript{106} Academic and student affairs administrators, stimulated by the increasing coverage UN101 received in their journals and bulletins, queried USC for more information.\textsuperscript{107} The Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education shortlisted Zuidema’s request for a grant to assist the national dissemination of UN101.\textsuperscript{108} Variations of UN101 multiplied as the University of Miami, Southern Connecticut State College, the State University of New York at Plattsburg, and Indiana University instituted first-year orientation courses and Florida State University prepared to offer one.\textsuperscript{109} Provincial funding awarded to Long’s Studentship program strengthened Canadian ties with UN101.\textsuperscript{110} Every type of American higher education institution looked to UN101 for leadership in socializing first-year students, including religious colleges.\textsuperscript{111} Religious colleges presumably were not troubled by a tension between research and collegiality because they normally stood for an integrated world view. They had long practiced many of the small group and learning innovations popularized by UN101. Whether they
competitively adopted a fragmentation mindset in spite of their inherent integration or linked retention to institutional survival in an era of religious challenge, they formed a noticeable presence on the list of inquiring institutions Gardner updated for Holderman.112

While he answered inquirers concerning the UN101 concept, Gardner did not relax his calvinistic work ethic on campus. In nine years at USC, he had served on over 40 committees.113 When in February 1980, the South Carolina legislature directed its Commission on Higher Education to prepare a state master plan for education, Gardner again defended general studies. The senator behind the master plan argued that technical schools and universities should not compete with each other and that, in the interests of economy, USC’s college of general studies associate degree program should defer to that of a technical institution in Columbia.114 This would eliminate the college which Jones developed to give disadvantaged and late blooming students a means of assimilating into the university. Gardner attacked CHE’s emphasis on graduate and professional programs at the expense of undergraduate programs, and questioned singling out the college of general studies. He warned the administration that “[w]e believe this concerted effort to divest the University of its fourth largest undergraduate college (and growing) is an attack which will leave the University even more at prey to future such efforts, should this succeed.”115

Gardner also generalized his efforts on behalf of teaching. UN101 established its own outstanding teaching award.116 Gardner joined a university committee still trying, after a decade, to introduce course evaluations.117 While UN101 did not assess its own impact on university teaching, the accumulating mass of training graduates suggested it had some influence. By 1980 almost three-quarters of training workshop graduates
attached to USC’s main campus were academic faculty. Few actually taught sections -- normally, approximately one-third of instructors came from student affairs and other instructors came from miscellaneous services or from outside, and the total number of instructors in 1980 equaled only approximately 18 percent of the total full-time faculty. Oriented to traditional conceptions of scholarship, most faculty maintained distance from Gardner’s crusade.

The crusader’s mentor, Jones, now stumped his cause with a sense of denouement and urgency. He was approaching retirement from MIT and battling cancer. In a flurry of presentations, which he sent to Gardner along with his usual reading recommendations, Jones harnessed educational reform to American ability to compete in the world technology market. The development of the university toward the needs of the global market, he argued, constituted reinterpretation rather than compromise of academic integrity. Ensuring America’s economic success included attention to the problem of self-concept because Americans needed healthy self-concepts to compete in the corporate regime.

For Jones, teaching represented the university’s greatest challenge in the development of healthy self-concepts. First, “to cope effectively with...culturally disadvantaged youths,” the university “will require a highly supportive environment, student-centered teaching, and a new...intensive concern with processes which allow and encourage modification of attitudes, values, and the self-concept.” Second, teachers must “take responsibility for the total development of the person.” Jones agreed with Nevitt Sanford that professorial disregard for the whole person stemmed from the post-World War II transformation of liberal arts, humanities, and classics faculty into technical
specialists, but did not argue for rejuvenation of the humanities. Instead, he urged the university to “devot[e] more of its efforts to student-centered teaching and this can be done only by massive efforts in retraining faculty.”

Stimulated by the inroads of Japanese products into American markets, Jones called for greater involvement of business in the education and research activities of the university. Universities must emphasize accumulation of knowledge less and ability to do research more. “One of the most promising of presently evolving processes is that of the involvement of undergraduates, even freshmen, in ongoing research projects. In these assignments undergraduates become apprentices to...role models who have learned how to learn....The focus is on self-learning rather than being the object of teaching!” Self-learning required positive self-concepts. Jones’s advised teachers and industrial supervisors alike to: “Make a major effort to generate self-concepts that are consistent with the behaviours you wish to achieve.”

Jones recommended as a guide to moulding student identities William Purkey’s Self Concept and School Achievement (1969). Purkey’s philosophy of creating an atmosphere of success rather than failure, when applied to adults in or destined for the workplace, became a behavioural strategy to improve performance, stimulate learning, and “increase the psychic energy” its subjects brought to their assignments. Jones held that this professional humanism would benefit individuals as well as industry by making them more successful and reducing the dissonance between their self-concepts and the new political economic reality.

Deeply appreciative of his mentor, Gardner welcomed his ideas and recommendations and sought to honour him. He ordered Sanford’s Where Colleges Fail
when Jones called it "the greatest written justification for UN101 that I know of. He would try to rebuild personal development activities into the humanities (like the good old days). I believe your efforts to build them into all parts of the university will prevail and, even, be superior." After Jones visited USC, in March 1980, Gardner assured him he was ready to do "any ‘conversion’ work you want St. Paul to do while he’s still in the business." When, two months later, USC’s Spartanburg campus awarded Jones an honorary degree, Gardner ensured that the degree citation included his educational innovations.

Nevertheless, Gardner’s educational purposes did not exactly parallel those of Jones. Having studied humanities rather than an applied discipline and having formed his social ideals during the egalitarian struggles of the late 1950s and 1960s, Gardner tended toward a more individualist application of the educational doctrine of self-esteem. He also preached Purkey, but more in the context of individual actualization than American industrial strength. Gardner, however, used the commodification of the student brought on by economic change as a vehicle for the national dissemination of UN101. "[T]he student has become a more precious commodity and institutions must now concern themselves with making their students more effective learners so that, if nothing else, they can be retained and budgets preserved....University 101 is a response to this challenge...." Marketing UN101 with a rhetoric of commodification and retention enabled Gardner to achieve his both paternalistic and student-centred desire to improve student success.

Helping the denominational chaplains evaluate their continuing relationship with USC, Gardner considered the effects of changing conditions on institutions of higher
education. He predicted that state governments would call for more control and accountability. Economic restraints and demographically based enrolment declines would tempt universities to emphasize survival over excellence and indulge in misleading advertising. Students, increasingly materialistic in outlook, would complain that their arts degrees did not immediately lead to employment. South Carolina would suffer less than other regions because it had not overcome its "third-world" conditions and the time it took for national trends to reach the state would give institutions time to prepare.

Nevertheless, the chaplains could help alleviate the human costs of change and provide for those who sought stability in old values. They should follow the lead of student affairs professionals and work closely with faculty "so as to have student development concepts permeate more of the traditional academic structure." A positive outcome of the changing conditions, suggested Gardner, would be that "students will be sharper consumers... they will force us to be more responsive to their needs."

Faculty resisted being student-driven, but institutions, often prompted by student affairs professionals, increasingly did not. By spring 1980, some 340 postsecondary institutions of every kind had expressed interest in UN101. USC's UN101 trained approximately 25 percent main campus faculty, 25 percent staff, 25 percent from branch campuses, and 25 percent educational personnel from other institutions in the US and Canada. Gardner took workshops to such diverse institutions as San Francisco Theological Seminary and the University of Windsor in Canada. The number of institutions introducing seminars swelled. This started a snowball effect as Clarion College's Charles Blochberger conducted a training workshop for the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay and the new seminars generated press coverage of their own.
Publications now were routine. An item in the *Journal of Higher Education* attracted a query from sociologist David Riesman, who advised Gardner he had, in 1959, “against faculty opposition to the whole idea,” successfully inaugurated a first-year seminar at Harvard University.¹³⁹ UN101 moved in the direction of textbooks as Jossey-Bass asked for a chapter in its *Facilitating Students’ Career Development* and Holt, Rinehart commissioned an instructors’ manual for its *Student Success 2*.¹⁴⁰ Gardner, sensing “extensive international interest in UN101,” thanked Jones for “spreading the gospel” in Puerto Rico and advised him of an invitation to “do missionary work” at the Conference on Improving University Teaching in Switzerland.¹⁴¹

Gardner’s activities dovetailed with Holdeman’s research and international ambitions. Like Jones, Holdeman raised faculty salary levels to attract major scholars. By 1980 he claimed that USC had “firmly established itself as one of the leading elite 100 universities in America in acquisition of external research support.”¹⁴² Unlike Jones, Holdeman did not have his research orientation tempered by student challenges. At any rate, some 40 percent of students eased into USC by way of the first-year seminar. Holdeman, “in the name of raising standards and improving quality,” reduced the first-year intake.¹⁴³ Nevertheless, USC’s enrolment increased -- more students persisted to graduation.¹⁴⁴ Holdeman phrased his ambitions for USC in terms of service to South Carolina. Here, too, UN101, in its proven contribution to student success and retention, stood on firm ground

Contributing to the realization of Holdeman’s goals placed UN101 and Gardner in position to thrive despite the fiscal restraint of the early 1980s. Although the state imposed a seven percent budget cutback on all its agencies, Gardner retained his office
assistant. A promotion to full professor strengthened his academic standing. Gardner’s success helped him to again lead the fight for the survival of the college of general studies. The university renamed it the College of Applied Professional Sciences, gave it baccalaureate degrees in secretarial science and hotel, restaurant, and tourism administration, and allowed it to retain some of its experimental nature.

UN101, too, retained much of its experimental nature. Gardner assured the instructors that “I respect your academic freedom to determine your course content as you see fit.” Personal dynamics prevailed over content. Gardner pointed to Carl Rogers’s experience that “personality changes in therapy come about not because of such factors as professional qualifications and training or knowledge or skill or even professional orientation, but primarily because of the attitudinal characteristics of the relationship.” To illustrate the power of the personal relationship between teacher and learner, Gardner cited the Pygmalian effect, reported by Robert Rosenthal, that student performance matched teacher expectations.

SPRI, anticipating that economic restraints would restrict student access to career counseling, proposed to translate UN101 to television and market it nationally. Though he did not dismiss the suggestion, Gardner argued in an article that campuses had thousands of career counselors to draw on, in the form of faculty. They could utilize this “cadre of career facilitators...willing and waiting to be tapped,” through the UN101 model. It was, however, mainly student affairs personnel who heard Gardner. The article was published in a student affairs journal and tapped the student affairs drive for recognition in the academy. “Student affairs professionals and academic faculty must unite in a common effort to facilitate student development. Faculty should not be assigned
only the cognitive component...leaving Student Affairs to handle all student concerns outside the classroom.”

Though, in fall 1981, all departments except engineering gave credit for UN101 toward their degrees, only 18 academics taught sections of the course. Only two came from the sciences. Many USC academics still regarded UN101 as “touchy-feely” -- with reason. An instructor at USC’s Sumter branch informed Gardner that his class had challenged another section to a hug-in to “fight apathy and promote friendliness on our campus. It was a signal success with over 500 certified, signed hugs.” Gardner endorsed the idea. “The ‘Hug-In’ I think is symbolic of that warm and fuzzy atmosphere you folks seem to have created on your campus which has to have a lot to do with your dramatic growth.”

Gardner made it easier for faculty to take the training. In contrast to three weeks in 1972, the workshop required five days. The prescribed format eliminated the perception that it was disorganized and insubstantial. Nevertheless, it continued to rely on human relations methodology. The facilitators now drew out participants’ expectations and reactions with index cards. On the first day, the participants discussed ideas for icebreakers, shared lifelines, practiced values clarification, and held a values auction. On the second, they recalled first-year experiences and outstanding teachers. USC’s teaching award recipients facilitated discussions of effective teaching, an administrator told how he would introduce the university to a student, and Miller of general studies used left-brain charts and exercises to explore the meaning of higher education. On the third day, the trainees discussed needs and problems of first-year students, and attempted to make goals for University 101. They practiced teaching mini-versity classes briefly before hearing
resource presentations and receiving the UN101 resources directory. The fourth day, after Fidler updated his UN101 research, group members took turns completing the sentence, "When I first came to the University of Carolina I felt..." and prepared questions for a game of musical chairs with former UN101 instructors. On the final day, verbal feedback replaced the index cards. As on the third day, Jane Young of the Baptist Student Center had represented the perspective of chaplains on human sexuality issues, the Open Door presented that of the campus counseling centre. The trainers explained the Human Potential process and the "nuts and bolts" of overseeing a UN101 section. After Borkowski delivered a charge, they welcomed the graduates into the UN101 network with a warm fuzzy.

Gardner shortened this format again for his external workshops. UN101 continued to blossom through consulting, conference presentations, and publications. Its information booklet for inquirers now included the brochure mailed to incoming students, Fidler's latest research summary, four conference papers, and lists of institutions with spin-off programs. Perhaps because the spin-off programs mainly originated in student affairs, they emphasized personal rather than academic development.

In 1981, Gardner felt at a crossroads. He had achieved full professor status at USC and success in disseminating UN101 elsewhere. Seeking professional development, Gardner applied for NTL training in Bethel, Maine, and soaked up what ACTS offered on retention, but he did not find a literature or association which focused on first-year students. For himself and other educators, he decided to act on Zuidema's suggestion that he host a National Conference on the Freshman Orientation Course/Freshman
Seminar Concept. The conference would provide a network for course advocates and give their efforts greater legitimacy.

While Gardner planned the conference, he and Varney travelled to Massachusetts for a final meeting with Jones. Jones displayed an undiminished preoccupation with the future. He mused that UN101 would be his educational legacy and charged Gardner with its continuation. Three weeks later, on July 13, 1981, he died. Mary Jones visited Columbia briefly to acknowledge the naming of the new physical sciences building after her husband. As Mary knew and Holderman hinted, however, Jones’s heritage did not consist of a name on a building. He attempted to bequeath nothing less than a revolution in American higher education and his vehicle for the revolution, UN101, was about to make a giant step forward.

Gardner had not hosted a conference before. With no external funding, the conference was a financial risk. Gardner and his assistant, Vicky Howell, invited friends and major educational contacts, mailed brochures to everyone who had contacted UN101 since the early 1970s, advertised in The Chronicle of Higher Education, and waited to see if enough people would come to pay the bills. Approximately 175 higher educators from the United States and Canada -- 60 percent student affairs, 26 percent academic, and 14 percent unidentified as either -- came to hear over 30 descriptions of experience already gained in the UN101 concept.

Presentations like SUNY-Plattsburgh’s demonstrated concerted efforts to involve academic faculty. Ken Long’s presentation, “Studentship – What To Do When You Don’t Have a Credit Orientation Course,” showed the UN101 concept taking shape differently in Canada. Canadian universities had little incentive to grant credit for
socialization. Far fewer in number than in the United States, they were not pressured by decreasing enrolments. Second, they were not threatened by competition from private institutions because the provincial governments and the national association of university administrators who controlled Canadian higher education did not encourage their development. Third, Canada experienced only pockets of student dissatisfaction during the Vietnam era, usually strongly influenced by American sources. Fourth, Canadian higher education commonly incorporated discussion tutorials into first-year lecture courses. Though in reality the Canadian academy shared the American research orientation and tutorials emphasized critical thinking rather than community, many faculty believed that tutorials personalized Canadian higher education. Fifth, values in Canada tended to be a private matter. Unable to promote a single national identity because of constitutional protection for founding cultures, the country encouraged respect for diverse identities. Value development in the university came through impersonal critical analysis. For all these reasons, UN101 grew in Canada in student affairs departments, mainly winning the attention of only those academics who, because student affairs did not professionalize significantly in Canada, crossed over into student affairs administration. Long, one such academic, demonstrated the delivery of the positive impacts of a first-year seminar without access to the classroom. Lacking the efficiency and discipline of a credit course, he drew students with “brown-bag” lunch meetings and studentship videotapes.

The conference both exceeded Gardner’s expectations and generated a United Press International article. The article attracted more national coverage, and the notice of the Columbia press. Gardner began soliciting proposals for a 1983 conference, for which he chose the all-purpose name of The Freshman Year Experience. Holderman
agreed to participate. "I am excited about the Freshman Year Experience and the attention it will bring to Carolina and the University 101 program." One presenter thought the conference demonstrated that the UN101 concept had become "something of a movement" in American higher education. Gardner called it a revival movement because orientation courses had been common before World War II. He connected their disappearance and revival to falling and rising concern for retention rather than for education of the whole person. Orientation courses enabled institutions to retain students without lowering standards. Gardner's sales talk characterized the movement as a handmaiden to the research ideal rather than as a means of revolutionizing it humanistically.

Because students disliked the student success book for which he had written an instructor's manual, Gardner began developing a textbook. He believed a textbook for UN101 should be tailored for the university setting and inclusive in perspective. For College is Only the Beginning, Gardner and Jewler solicited chapters from student specialists in the local and national FYE network. A book editor called Gardner "to teachers of succeeding in college courses what B.F. Skinner is to psychologists...the top name in the field." The subject of national conferences and a literature, UN101 now had a prospect of becoming institutionalized in American higher education.

In Canada, Long's reputation as an advocate of first-year students made an important connection which stimulated the potential of the institutionalization of UN101. The 1982 Atlantic Association of CACUSS meeting featured his Studentship program. Long "acknowledged [his] debt to [Gardner] and University 101 and identified the credit seminar as the ideal long range objective." AACUSS carried over Long's focus to their
1983 conference at the University of Prince Edward Island, and invited Gardner to participate.\textsuperscript{185} Host Jim Griffith, director of student services at UPEI, decided to learn more about UN101. \textsuperscript{186} He initiated a long and often testy professional friendship with Gardner which fostered the Canadian dissemination of FYE.

Attendance at a FYE conference convinced Griffith of the value of UN101 for his and other institutions. Griffith adapted UN101 to the Canadian context. In partnership with USC, he founded a training institute at UPEI, which attracted Canadian and American higher educational personnel from all over North America.\textsuperscript{187} Then he took a year’s leave of absence to observe UN101 at USC, “just to get a feel for the way I wanted to do it back in Canada. And the one thing I knew was that the way the course was in South Carolina would not sell as a course in a Canadian institution.”\textsuperscript{188} He obtained Gardner’s permission to teach a section and assign marks as he would in Canada. A student failed to pass the course. When UN101 attempted to negotiate on behalf of the student, Griffith took a traditional academic stance. “You don’t come to class. You don’t hand in your assignments. You don’t get the minimum requirement. You don’t pass the course!”\textsuperscript{189}

Griffith’s obstinacy and preparation paid off in that his UB101 gave the UN101 concept as a credit offering a toe-hold in Canada. The dean of arts made UB101 the centrepiece of his new integrated first-year curriculum and published an article about it. The faculty senate examined the syllabus and offered two semesters and six credits. UB101 combined readings, lectures, presentations, group work, written skills, and oral skills to cover orientation, skill training, and exploration of areas of study within the university.\textsuperscript{190} “It had to be a course that people could look at, understand the assignments,
evaluate it, and appear to be structured.” Griffith, who valued UN101’s human relations approach, tried “to structure an unstructured course. Inside the course there were all kinds of things the students structured.” Canadian Studies professor Andrew Robb, relishing the opportunity to get to know some students well, assumed the directorship of University 100 to strengthen its academic respectability. The course stood on its own merits when research showed that it improved UPEI’s retention rate by 20 to 30 percent.

Griffith became an important promoter of the UN101 concept in Canada, but UPEI’s course did not become the Canadian model. The experience of first-year student advocates at the University of Western Ontario was more typical. Inspired by Gardner’s first national conference, Western’s director of student affairs formed a taskforce to develop a credit course. The taskforce proposed a course which mainly covered academic issues, health, and career planning -- it allotted only one week to interpersonal relationships. Nevertheless, the director’s advisory committee of 11 student affairs and three academic administrators, most with Ph.D.s, did not recommend the course for credit. The taskforce asked Gardner to explain how academic expectations and the human relations model could be reconciled, in light of current practice. How could the seminar be made credible and at the same time be seen as a unique alternative to teaching in the classroom? How could facilitators “establish a significant mentoring relationship between student and teacher, given the extensive involvement of guest speakers/discussion leaders?”

Griffith approached the problem by hiding human relations behind academic requirements. As the Western taskforce discerned, Gardner’s behavioural format showed signs of evolution toward the university’s idea of an academic course. One indication was
Gardner’s NTL experience in Bethel, Maine. “It was like taking a step back into the past,” he wrote Riesman. “[T]he total reliance on group process, the leaderless group, their trust and supreme faith in the efficacy of the group dynamics and their confidence that all will work out and somehow we’ll all have a learning experience out of whatever spontaneously develops, has all remained unchanged for three decades.192 Also, Gardner favoured an “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it” approach to planning, but wondered if the workshop content was adequate.193 In addition to “building a supportive and cohesive group,” Gardner wanted instructors to “provide substantive, meaningful, academically worthwhile content which introduces students to higher education, in general, and to the university in particular.”194 He affirmed the USC director of student life’s decision to introduce a required text, lectures and exercises, stricter writing requirements, more instructor-determined activities, and the possibility of failing.195

UN101 grew in popularity. Twenty percent more students enrolled in fall 1982 than in the previous year.196 Fidler reported that of the students who entered in 1981, approximately 84 percent who took UN101 returned versus 77 percent of those who did not.197 Half the instructors of fall 1982 were academics.198

For its 1983 conference, FYE invited “faculty, academic administrators, and student personnel administrators to model a partnership for the improvement of the freshman year.”199 To faculty, the conference furnished an enjoyable way to fulfil a professional requirement. To senior academic administrators, FYE offered a financial incentive -- waived fees.200 The number of presentations tripled and academics outnumbered student personnel in a ration of five to four.201 Further, 400 registrants
arrived, 200 more than expected. The annual conference dramatically increased FYE's active contacts and, consequently, Gardner's workload.

The participation encouraged Gardner because educators made tough choices about the use of travel money in the American recession of the early 1980s. His own institution felt similar pressures. South Carolina's CHE required USC's programs and services to justify their spending or even their existence. USC's administration protected UN101 and FYE because they brought USC national recognition. Borkowski supported Gardner's desire for an associate director for UN101. He sought commission approval for FYE and promised that if the commission agreed, "he would announce [the] creation of a Center for Study of the Freshman Experience." Approval was not difficult to obtain. Fidler's assessment data showed that UN101 greatly improved the retention rate for minority students. Under federal scrutiny regarding state compliance with desegregation agreements, the commission went so far as to ask Gardner how UN101 might "be applicable to other South Carolina higher education institutions."

The recession demonstrated that FYE was secure but the college of applied and professional sciences still was not. Gardner was not sure that his college would survive. Even a reorganization of the college could make its faculty redundant. At this tense moment, the administration let Gardner know he was the kind of energetic visionary wanted at the board table. His propensity for committee work and the university-wide status of UN101 poised him for promotion into administration. Gardner had integrated the branch campuses into his training and arranged faculty exchanges to assist them with their first-year seminars. When the associate vice president for two-year campuses and continuing education position opened, Gardner, assured he could bring UN101 with him,
applied for it. He did not expect his application to succeed, however, because his professional home was general studies. When the library school, which like the applied college had been founded by Jones and reflected his experimental pedagogy, offered him an appointment in information sciences and office space for his growing staff, he accepted.213 Though not a specialist in information science, he could teach human relations. Gardner moved to the library school and hired Jewler as associate director of UN101.214

The university saved Varney’s college by making it more academically respectable. Finally forsaking its original purpose as an educational laboratory, the administration eliminated its associate degrees and added a third baccalaureate program.215 Jewler, who continued to teach in the journalism department, aimed to do something similar for UN101. Like Gardner, he did not abandon the personal emphasis – one of his first actions was to assess a copy of Becoming-A Human Relations Workbook for possible use in 101 classes.216 However, he preferred structure and his experience told him that “students today, while they benefit from values exercises and other exercises that help them know themselves and learn how to communicate better with others, are more and more interested in the tangible benefits of a college education.”217 Jewler also sought to introduce more structure into the training workshop. He would not “write a syllabus that everyone must follow” but desired to “include some mandatories in the shopping list of possibilities we offer to workshop participants.” Gardner reminded Jewler that the first step in faculty training was to build the group, but he did not interfere with Jewler’s ambition.
Gardner continually sought new ways to sell UN101. The initial national conferences taught him that he would have a larger market if his movement covered everything that an institution could do to assist its entrants to succeed. As FYE, the movement expanded to experimentation with first-year services in general. This meant that, as Gardner first promoted UN101 through identification with student affairs aims, he could continue its dissemination through links with other contemporary educational movements.

Gardner noticed that “[i]ncreasingly, the trend across the country...is to combine the teaching of a freshman seminar with academic advisement. It seems understandable that with the close relationship that develops between the faculty member and the students...that this same person also could be vested with responsibility for advising.”

UN101 called on student personnel who taught UN101, Stuart Hunter and Linda Salane, to develop advising sections and, when they proved popular, advanced training for instructors. The experiment prompted Jossey-Bass to contract with Gardner and Hunter for a book chapter on the first-year seminar and academic advising. Thus the venture into academic advising expanded the exposure and appeal of UN101.

Another movement gaining momentum in the 1980s was grounded in concern for ethical education. In the 1980s, frankly materialistic and self-serving ethics appeared to increase among students. *Time* devoted a cover story to the phenomenon. Higher educators who sought a values component in teaching touched off a debate that was inconclusive even among academics who took it seriously; the only unifier for knowledge the research university accepted, existence, did not provide a basis for ethics. UN101 argued that the university should assist students to clarify values and develop an integrated
world view. It attempted to foster ethical development through values clarification; games with no sure reference points which, while seeming tolerant, potentially comprised a form of hegemonic power politics. Gardner did not attempt to explain how UN101 assisted the student to achieve an integrated worldview.

Drawn to academics who grappled with moral development, Gardner came across historian John Orr Dwyer. Dwyer framed ethical education as a problem of student well-being, to be addressed as much in the interests of retention as of student development. He argued that young students lose the comfort of their received values when they discover that the university is an “institution dedicated to disagreement about what is right and wrong.” To help them regain comfort, academics should give up their norm of neutrality and ask questions that would help students define and defend their beliefs. Integration would require interdisciplinary cooperation; in particular the social sciences furnished a site for studying values which did not conflict with traditional disciplines. Gardner invited Dwyer to participate in FYE’s next national conference and eventually to contribute to FYE publications.

Gardner also could link FYE to the movement which sought to improve traditional university instruction. Calling the professional development potential of the first-year seminar “an idea whose time has come,” he did something he had not had to do for student affairs conferences for years -- submitted a proposal to an academic conference on teaching. He offered to demonstrate how UN101 taught faculty to understand students and help them appreciate the university and its requirements. The academically oriented teaching movement was not an easy fit for FYE, however. If FYE accepted its terms, it
ran the risk of reducing humanism in the classroom to courtesy in the interests of academic achievement.

Tying FYE to American high education’s interest in retention, again a legitimate theme because UN101 improved retention, could result in a similar effect. As Dwyer confessed, institutional requirements often lay behind altruistic aims for students. Marketing Jones’s human relations approach on the basis of retention made it a retention strategy.226 As such, it could produce a “Wal-Mart greeter” methodology which ultimately betrayed humanistic values and altruistic aims.

In addition to the internal issues of academic advising, ethical education, improving teaching, and retention, Gardner recognized that FYE could benefit from “the dramatic increase in national attention now being focused on the quality of the undergraduate experience in America.”227 President Reagan, faced with recession, strong gains by foreign competition even in American markets, and low American placements on international educational rankings, established a National Commission on Excellence in Education to investigate the state of primary and secondary schooling. The commission’s finding that American education was in a state of crisis was followed by a slew of reports by major foundations and academic associations recommending improvement of undergraduate education.228 “One conclusion of these reports,” Gardner noted, “is that if American undergraduate education is to be improved, greater attention must be paid to the first year....More than any other institution in the United States, the University of South Carolina has already made a major contribution to a reexamination of ‘the freshman year experience.”229
Interest in the first-year experience was so high that almost 78 percent of institutions participating in a 1984 American Council on Education survey indicated they had adopted some form of the UN101 concept. Prior to the 1984 conference, The New York Times acknowledged FYE's momentum in an article entitled, "Freshman Orientation: No Longer a Three-Day Run." Over 500 registered for the conference. The presentations reflected the appeal of the conference for academics and FYE's willingness to promote academic guidance for incoming students with or without reference to behavioural psychology. Approximately one-third dealt with such traditional activities as academic advising, designing curriculum, and teaching writing and thinking.

Despite the catch-all nature of FYE, the centrepiece of the movement was UN101. The National Commission on Excellence in Education praised UN101 and Virginia Gordon and Thomas Grites published an article reviewing first-year seminar rationales and results. Gardner informed Borkowski that "[w]e've gotten to the point, frankly, where we here at USC and me in particular cannot begin to meet all the demands to provide [the] training experience. Thus, it has become necessary to clone the Carolina program at other institutions which are assisting us in the replication of our innovation in higher education on behalf of freshmen." Charles Blochberger and Francine McNairy of Clarion College consulted with Gardner's approval; now a number of Marietta faculty trained instructors in their region. Jewler took the UN101 message to national educational conferences. At USC, Jewler used his advertising expertise to persuade parents and students that "our nationally known freshman course not only helps freshmen build those interpersonal skills which can positively affect their chances for success, but that this same course can also help them develop study skills, provide valuable writing experiences, introduce them to the
University library and other campus resources, and help them make reasonable decisions about their academic majors and ultimate careers.

He replaced the original brochure with one which emphasized academic advising. Enrolment increased 30 percent over the previous year.

The record 1984 enrolment required more than 50 instructors. Jewler's message to them was similar. "I think...nonbelievers will be pleasantly surprised at the new thrust of the course, which stresses writing, career and major planning, and the academic process (regulations to advisement), as well as pointing out that the value of higher education goes beyond learning a profession and also includes other kinds of enrichment experiences which are the mark of an educated person." On the surface, UN101 tempered its holistic approach in favour of the academy's competing concentration on empirical knowledge. Alternatively, it began to successfully integrate the research and college ideals. If it blended cognitive content with small group methodology, UN101 could demonstrate that a personally supportive classroom abetted the university's cognitive goals. The evidence, however, as one set of student essays indicated, was ambiguous. The essays, intended to assist self-exploration, revealed low cognitive expectations and most students answering the assignment minimally. One student chatted that "[a] lot of people say University 101 is a crip course." She, however, provided a testimonial which echoed Jewler's vision. "Maybe it is an easy three hours but honestly I have gotten more out of your class than any other class at this University because it helped me discover myself. And my major. I made new friends and I have learned a lot about this campus." Making perhaps the most important point, she concluded: "[Y]ou’re the only one that I can count on to always smile!"
Gardner declared his confidence in Jewler by designating him co-director of UN101.\textsuperscript{244} Jewler's congenial and capable leadership freed Gardner to broadly develop the FYE movement. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools asked him to pay an accreditation visit to an American campus in London. Because his ticket left him with a few free days, Gardner decided to extend FYE into Britain.\textsuperscript{245} He believed that America and Britain had a common language and a common educational tradition. A British conference would both develop a new audience for the UN101 concept and provide American higher educators an enjoyable meeting setting. Assisted by an English agent, Gardner persuaded four postsecondary educators representing seven institutions to make a tentative commitment to a conference. Seeking to bring British presenters to the 1985 American meeting, Gardner learned that they did not have a tradition of ready travel funds and expensive meetings.\textsuperscript{246} Further, the British believed their higher education already involved less intellectual regimentation and more individual autonomy than did American. FYE's expertise regarding nontraditional students appealed mainly to the "community college" and technical institutions through which the Margaret Thatcher government expanded postsecondary access in Britain. His unexpected British opportunity awakened Gardner, however, to new possibilities for dissemination of the UN101 concept. He also sought participation by German and Australian contacts.\textsuperscript{247}

Sander Merdeen, a senior lecturer in industrial relations at the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow, accepted Gardner's invitation to Columbia.\textsuperscript{248} Having returned to university after 25 years in business, he saw "freshmen, or 'first-year students' as we prefer to call them," as both "youngsters and oldsters."\textsuperscript{249} Merdeen observed that to many entrants higher education seemed an overwhelming unknown. They concentrated
on factual knowledge, not realizing that, to maximize their educational opportunity, they needed to acquire learning skills and make personal adjustments. Strathclyde coupled lectures with small-group tutorials to alleviate first-semester anxieties and set successful learning patterns.

Gardner, as usual, delivered a lengthy address. He argued that raising faculty awareness of student needs had grown more critical in the 1980s. "[M]any aspects of our higher educational system were not designed with students’ needs in mind but with our needs in mind – our needs and interests to earn a livelihood and to do our research and to teach what we enjoy teaching." Inadequate funding, recruitment competition, the challenges of assimilating nontraditional students, and federal court desegregation orders necessitated reexamination of the nature of higher learning. "[P]articularly freshmen have become a source of revenue for us and their presence...is critical to the growth of, and even the survival of, higher education as we know it." Using Napoleon’s 1812 Russia campaign as a metaphor Gardner asserted that "freshmen have become a long supply line that we have become increasingly dependent on and what we most of all don’t need as we reexamine this plight we’re in, is the faculty who ultimately control institutions in spite of what we administrators say, practicing scorched earth on us, and making our advance more difficult."

Gardner believed that faculty interest in FYE was increasing. He concluded that, despite "the primary loyalty of many of us in the professoriate being toward our discipline and the increasing materialism of our society" there was "a great deal of altruism left in the profession." Faculty ability to indulge their altruism appeared to depend on their research status. FYE saw few fledgling faculty, but more with tenure, who could
“afford politically the risks...involved in sticking [their] necks out for entering college students.” Self-interest also, however, brought faculty to FYE. In the consumer educational climate of the mid-1980s fewer students “bought” liberal arts and education. Specialists in threatened disciplines needed to learn their market so they could “sell” their fields more effectively.

Whatever their reason for coming or level of experience, Gardner found faculty open to change. He pled with them to learn to “intervene in the right way and give [freshmen] what they deserve...” In South Carolina, to lose half of the only 40 percent who sought postsecondary schooling “is still a disgrace...[Freshmen] are our hope for our state, our country, let alone more selfishly, our institution as our future alumni.”

Gardner was becoming established as the foremost American advocate for first-year college and university students. USA Today carried a summary of his remarks. Historic Marietta made him the recipient of their first honorary degree to an educator. Riesman asked to nominate him for the presidency of St. John’s University. Borkowski, communicating his pride that UN101 “has become such an important dimension to the University,” congratulated him for “being tenacious with the development of a perceptive idea.” Adding depth to that development, Wadsworth finally brought out Gardner and Jewler’s College is Only the Beginning. Geared to college and university environments and unique among college success guides because it stressed holistic development, it was quickly adopted by 120 institutions, including Harvard Medical School, and went into a third printing within months.

Borkowski utilized the moment to carry out his 1982 promise to establish a FYE research centre. He informed CHE that “there is so much being done now on behalf of
freshmen, there is an enormous amount of research being done on the effectiveness of such programs."²⁵⁹ FYE already functioned as a national clearinghouse for information on first-year programs. Given official status as a research centre, it would "undertake studies, seek external funding, disseminate findings, establish and publish a journal, etc. We are convinced that if we don't take the initiative to do this immediately, some other institution will capitalize on all the groundwork we have...laid carefully and so well."²⁶⁰

Gardner shepherded the research centre proposal through the appropriate channels of approval at USC²⁶¹ and concentrated on his nascent venture into Britain. Meanwhile, in Gardner's words, Jewler was "getting new ideas and perfecting the wheel."²⁶² Having raised enrolment in UN101, he hoped to involve more faculty with freshmen: "[F]ar too few academic faculty" volunteered to teach.²⁶³ To faculty, Jewler characterized participation in UN101 as an opportunity to help USC retain its "very best" entrants, who might flounder for nonacademic reasons.²⁶⁴ He organized a teaching series to give "frustrated academicians" a chance "to deliver their favorite lectures to a group of as yet unjaded students," and mini-workshops, wine and cheese included, on improving undergraduate instruction.²⁶⁵ He fostered group-building among UN101 instructors with unstructured meetings at the faculty club.²⁶⁶

Riesman expressed some doubt about FYE's intention to hold international conferences. While Gardner saw similarities with English-speaking higher educational systems, Riesman saw differences.²⁶⁷ When Gardner's British contacts met, however, they endorsed FYE conferences for 1986, 1987 and 1988. Issues they wanted addressed stressed both differences and similarities: sharing experiences to shed light on each other's practices, developmental stages for students on both sides of the Atlantic, programs and
services for nontraditional students, retention, and “efforts [by] institutions to insure a cost effective, high quality, and enjoyable educational experience for first-year students.”

FYE again invited them to the Columbia meeting and arranged travel funding from the British Embassy in Washington.

As FYE organized the 1986 national meeting, British motivations became more clear. Merdeen participated in 1985 in place of Alex Main, an experimental psychologist in charge of study skills and staff development at Strathclyde who could not attend because he was committed to a tour of Australian institutions. Speaking to the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association in January 1985, Main explained the educational concern which led him to FYE. He reflected that economic competition influenced institutions to play a values clarification game of deciding which human occupant should be sacrificed to lighten the ballast of the education balloon. In a climate in which the winning determinant appeared to be ability to make money for the institution, “teachers feel over-directed,” students “recognise that their learning and development may play second-place to the entrepreneurial aspirations of their institutions,” and administrators “begin to speak the same language as their paymasters—and that is a short step from accepting their assumptions.” To this commodification of persons, institutions added a “cognitive imperialism,” which honoured “intellect over the emotions,…knowledge over judgment, and fact over opinion,…treated student services as ancillary and of secondary importance to the ‘real’ mission of the institution or the culture,” marginalized expressive cultures, and created, at the postsecondary level, educational classes. Main posited, however, that successful and just adaptation to the socio-economic changes occurring in the 1980s required persons with well-developed
emotional as well as cognitive understanding. "We need," Main argued, "to look to the whole person, not to fragments."

Main's address demonstrated that despite differing educational traditions, certain themes in the history of FYE in Britain echoed those in America. Reduced funding and attempts to broaden the postsecondary population prompted educational experimentation. The experimentation centred on restoring a collegial or holistic approach to the undergraduate experience. Student affairs specialists picked up the concept of a renewed collegiality with the intention of communicating it to faculty. They experimented locally—Main helped Meredeen convince faculty that Strathclyde should institute a first-year seminar—and promoted the concept within their educational networks. At the same time, they cooperated with FYE's international conference planning, they extended the movement on their own initiative.

While he promoted FYE internationally, Gardner also expanded its conferencing in the United States. FYE reached mainly the Southeast, Northeast, and Midwest. No institution west of Wyoming had an orientation course. In keeping with UN101's interest in worldview integration, Gardner followed the work of John Whiteley, who measured student moral development in the first year of university. As their professional friendship grew, Whiteley encouraged Gardner to bring FYE to California. Gardner, recognizing "a tremendous market and opportunity" because California was a bellweather for American trends, planned a regional version of the national conference at the University of California, Irvine, in January 1987.

With planning for its expanded conference series in progress, FYE convened its 1986 meeting in Columbia. Over 1000 higher educators from the US, Canada, Great
Britain, and Egypt, and a reporter for The Chronicle of Higher Education, attended. While stressing cooperation between academic and student affairs personnel in higher education, Gardner noted that the efforts of student development personnel in the 1970s to plant the UN101 concept in academic culture were coming to fruition in the 1980s. "...I've observed...somewhat of a decrease in the number of inquiries from student personnel professionals and a dramatic increase in inquiries from academic people." The demographics of the conference supported Gardner's point in that of the 150 presentations, academic and student affairs personnel together led approximately 18 percent, academic personnel alone 45 percent, student affairs personnel alone 41 percent, and others two percent. Further, 41 percent of the presentations dealt directly with improvement of study skills or academic advising. The disciplinary origins of the 135 faculty presenters did not, however, demonstrate depth or breadth of interest in the UN101 concept among American academics. Aside from the approximately 10 percent whose positions were not listed, the only positions or disciplines with more than five percent representation were administration at 19 percent, education at 16 percent and English at 15 percent. Sociology, social ecology, government and international studies, psychology, and economics together contributed 10 percent; history, philosophy, and fine arts nine percent; communications, journalism, information sciences, social work, human services, and human relations nine percent; general education, developmental studies, and applied professional sciences five percent; mathematics, chemistry, zoology, and physics four percent; business three percent; and engineering one percent.

The lone engineer, John Cowan, of Herriot-Watt University in Edinburgh, Scotland, doubted the value of British participation because the British seemingly had little
to offer the Americans. A representative of the British Council made similar comments. Though he asserted that Americans could learn from British perspectives, Gardner frankly informed Cowan that he used conference participation to build an international network of FYE promoters. Because the embassy funding was minor compared to FYE’s investment in its British venture, “if they decide to withdraw their funding… it’s not going to discourage me… from continuing this experiment.” To Cowan’s request for less description and more research findings, Gardner replied that he strove for meetings that were unlike “deadly dull” and ineffective academic conferences. His admittedly “messianic” approach was drawing academics to “a successful way.”

A skeptical Cowan decided to provide “a spearhead which will go beyond the anecdotal and will begin to earn credibility among educationists by producing moderately authoritative findings.” His retiring department head agreed to appoint a research associate to evaluate Herriot-Watt’s first year to improve its quality on the basis of knowledge rather than merely intuition and to achieve publishable data. His new head, who did “not approve of [his] non-conventional teaching,” closed Cowan’s Learning Unit and re-established lectures as normal teaching practice. Without the support of his institution, Cowan could not pursue his association with FYE.

For the Newcastle conference, FYE pursued another British educational maverick, Reginald W. Revans. After World War II, Revans applied humanism to business by encouraging employers to give employee groups responsibility for improvement and productivity. British management educators criticized his “action learning” for being practical rather than theoretical. Eventually, however, Japanese manufacturers credited Revans with inventing the quality circles on which they built their international business
success. Revans accepted Gardner’s invitation, but warned that his presence would “likely make the educational experts all refuse to attend.”

Two hundred and twenty-eight higher educators gathered at Newcastle Upon Tyne in July 1986 for the First International Conference of the First Year Experience. Of the presenters, approximately 60 percent came from the United States, 21 percent Britain, and 20 percent, from, in order of numerical representation, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Canada, Australia, Hong Kong, South Africa, Germany, Poland, Belgium, and the Republic of Ireland. They tended toward the academic in that approximately 40 percent dealt with academic skills or advising and a further 19 percent reported research related to the postsecondary first year. As Gardner predicted, Revans fascinated the Americans. To counter attitudes like that of the Harvard business student who stated that “there is no such thing as ethics or morality—there’s just getting what you want,” Revans’ proposed an action learning, which, “genuinely pursued,...is as much interested in the development of personal values and of communal responsibility as of ‘professional skill,’...” Revans did not believe that teaching first-year students to ask, “What is an honest man, and what do I need to do to become one,” threatened the technical curriculum.

Revans’s remarks particularly applied to the British institutions present because most were polytechnics. The older universities admitted only outstanding students and gave them “pastoral care”; indeed, Revans formed his initial small group philosophy as a student at Cambridge. Large urban universities, polytechnics, and colleges of education admitted a wider range of students and found retention more difficult.

Establishing a presence in Britain, a world hub, created new opportunities for the internationalization of the FYE movement. Gardner pursued them all. V.J. Beasley, a
student services counselor at The Flinders University of South Australia, offered similar observations to those of Cowan of Strathclyde. Nevertheless, he passed word of FYE's next national conference to his network in Australia and asked the president of the Higher Education and Research Development Society of Australasia to circulate FYE's materials. Gardner did not have to pursue a Norwegian connection. Contacted by a Norwegian educational psychologist who wanted to observe American innovations, he arranged for him to visit UN101 at USC.

Gardner initiated FYE in Britain. FYE's dissemination in Canada was more indigenous. From the mid-1970s, Canadians queried UN101 for information, invited Gardner to their conferences, came to USC for faculty training, and started their own versions. After UPEI's faculty development institute attracted higher educators from across Canada and from the US, Griffith began thinking about a Canadian conference. Gardner suggested that the 1988 international conference could be held in Canada rather than Britain. He and Griffith agreed to proceed and brought in Long to help. Acknowledging that the UN101 concept had not penetrated the academic consciousness in Canada, Gardner particularly desired to "recruit more of the academic types....This is absolutely critical if we are going to achieve our objectives."

Awareness of UN101 among Americans grew as FYE organized its first western US conference. In correspondence reminiscent of the early days of the course in the East, westerners queried USC and UN101 responded with an information packet. In its preparations, FYE situated itself firmly in the mainstream of contemporary American higher education innovation. Ernest Boyer, now head of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, had just released College-The Undergraduate Experience in
America, which criticized tensions between research and teaching and between the academic and nonacademic in higher education. Gardner asked Boyer and Helen Astin of the University of California, Los Angeles, to address the California meeting and Lee Knefelkamp, dean of education at American University, to headline the Columbia one. In seeking the most influential voices on behalf of student-centred higher education for its conferences, FYE both benefited from and contributed to their momentum.

In addition to its international, national, and regional meetings and institutional consulting, FYE contributed to desegregation compliance by holding a conference on the minority first-year experience. Gardner offered 23 strategies for facilitating minority success, only one involving direct academic assistance, implying that recognition of the whole person improved academic success. In not approaching students holistically, Gardner suggested, American academia resembled Britain keeping a watchman with a bell at Dover to watch for Napoleon until 1945. The traditional undergraduate experience, to which the first year was foundational, had, like the bell ringer, outlived its usefulness. Studies showed, Gardner contended, that a new undergraduate experience would increase the success rate of all students, minority and majority.

In the midst of this activity, South Carolina’s CHE approved FYE’s research centre. Publishers provided FYE further opportunities to develop a scholarly literature. The success of Lee Noel’s Increasing Student Retention prompted Jossey-Bass to commission M. Lee Upcraft and Gardner to assemble a book on the freshman year experience. Gardner expected the book would reach not only student personnel and academic administrators but also traditional faculty. Wadsworth asked Gardner and Jewler for a shorter, more interactive version of College Is Only the Beginning. The
publisher acknowledged the marketability of Gardner and Jewler’s work in what had become a very competitive field by risking the cost of a glossy product, with pictures and extensive graphic design.³⁰⁰

Jewler’s work with UN101 reflected the frenetic pace of Gardner’s work with FYE. In addition to writing textbooks, Jewler taught five hours a week and maintained his research and service standing in journalism, organized the UN101 training and administered the course, recruited instructors and students, updated the instructional resources manual, kept the instructor network informed about the national dialogue on the character of undergraduate education through his “One on One,” arranged mini-workshops to interest more faculty in improved teaching and special lectures to involve faculty with students, consulted, and participated in FYE conferences.³⁰¹ General faculty attitudes did not change significantly. Aside from the provisional year sections, about 38 percent of instructors came from academic departments, 42 percent student services, and 15 percent chaplaincies, law enforcement, and so on.³⁰²

Jewler, to recruit faculty, emphasized UN101’s academic value. He insisted that UN101 inculcated a positive attitude to learning. Because “many of our brighter South Carolina high school graduates are woefully unprepared to cope with the demands of college,” UN101 provided first-year students “with assistance in learning skills: writing, studying, using the library, and interpreting what they read.”³⁰³ Jewler informed faculty that “students have even complained that the course should be graded A,B,C,D,F instead of the S/U system in effect, since they work as hard or sometimes harder for their “S” than for a letter grade in other freshman courses.”³⁰⁴ The freedom accorded UN101 instructors meant, however, that not all instructors structured the course as Gardner and Jewler
desired. Gardner asked one to assign a text, because “no required reading...hurts the reputation of 101.”

This concern with academic credibility restricted the collegial potential of UN101. Instructors now normally wrote the syllabus. They planned class activities to cover a standard mixture of self-exploration exercises, introductions to a wide variety of academic and student services and university cultural offerings, and, less commonly, introductions to academic material. Academic skills development consisted of writing assignments concerning class activities and journaling. Instructors increasingly used college success manuals for textbooks. UN101 made adjustment to university an academic subject, with traditional instruction and requirements. The discontinuity inherent in constantly changing locations and speakers rendered relationship building more difficult and perhaps less relevant. While UN101’s small class sizes still made group-building possible, its distance from its group dynamics roots was suggested by a “new” idea Jewell circulated to instructors. He encouraged them to consider Pepperdine University’s seminar, where students developed academic skills through following an assigned topic from lectures and readings, to research, to position paper. “Finally the group discusses methods of evaluating the performance of the students, and gives the instructor suggestions for the structure of the final exam. The whole idea is to involve the students in the management of the class as well as to model for them the skills and critical thinking methods that will see them through their four years of college and beyond.” Jones’s dynamic learning process apparently no longer was the norm for USC’s UN101.

Whether through revolutionary methodology, paying attention to the first year improved student success. So many institutions instituted extended orientation programs
that Gardner lost track. "We have good reason to believe that the number is now literally in the hundreds." Believing that "interest in the topic of improving the freshman year experience is by no means at its peak," FYE expanded the range of its American meetings to the population centres of New York and Chicago and, threatened by an Oklahoman that he would organize his own, to Tulsa. Gardner expected that total conference attendance would double to 3000 in 1987.

To the approximately 560 registrants at Irvine, Astin suggested that perhaps American higher education innovators had "reached a consensus as to where we should focus our attention and energy." Both she and Boyer promoted student-centred learning. Lee Knefelkamp followed suit in Columbia. To Knefelkamp, the purpose of improving the incoming student's experience went beyond facilitating a transition, to personal transformation. Current educational structures did not transform. Therefore, innovators should think about transforming them, including UN101, to emphasize "connection and community,…understanding and acceptance,…collaboration and dialogue,…[a]nd we must also afford our students the respect of their own personal lives and their own personal responsibility and allow them to determine the kind of knowledge they have from first-hand experience." Transformative education began with the student. "It has to begin, not with our lecture, or our didactics, but with their story well told and well heard."

Knefelkamp's remarks indicated that UN101 was institutionalized enough to be included in the review of the nature of higher education. Theodore Marchese, vice president of AAHE, underscored the point. At Gardner's request, he contrasted institutional attitudes to first-year students in the early 1970s and the late 1980s.
Marchese identified these as periods of reform, the first being “more student-centered and focused on innovation,” and the second performance-centered “so that our nation might become more competitive.” After 1971, institutions gradually corrected many of the educational “excesses” of the 1960s. Now, he observed, the Columbia conference overwhelmingly addressed student support issues, leaving “the main show, which is in the classroom,” largely untouched. Innovators must not accommodate the academy; they must change it, if it was to serve first-year students adequately. According to Marchese, this would require separating the first year from control of academic departments through creation of a college of first-year studies, with its own organizational structure. “[U]nless there is an organizational entity empowered to do the freshman experience whole, those who worry about that experience will, at best, be able to work at the margin, and all else will be rhetoric.”

To deepen the momentum on behalf of first-year students generated by the conferences, USC opened the National Center for the Study of the Freshman Year Experience in July 1987 with Raymond Murphy as co-director and Dorothy Fidler as half-time research associate. Dr. Murphy, who held degrees in counseling psychology and higher education, professionalized student affairs at Pennsylvania State University and served as president of NASPA before joining USC’s education faculty. He expected to enumerate the first-year seminars operating in America. Fidler, who held a doctorate in experimental psychology and directed USC’s mature students program, concentrated on founding a journal. Fidler understood the importance of her husband’s retention data for the short- and long-term survival of UN101 and believed that FYE needed a publication to report research on the first year. Higher educators who engaged the challenge of the first-
year “found it very difficult to find suitable organs to publicize their years of programmatic work and research.”317 To help finance the journal, Fidler decided to begin with a quarterly newsletter which would carry brief descriptive articles.318

While Murphy and Fidler launched the research centre, Gardner and associates travelled to Southampton University in England for the second international conference. This conference focused on innovations in learning. Of the approximately 133 presentations, however, only 16 addressed different ways of teaching, and, of these, only seven originated in America.319 Again it mainly was Revans who retained the teaching-learning vision of Jones. “Our present mission...is merely to insist that personally inspired pupils alone can discover through their own stumbling self-criticism and mutual advice the most effective and transitory questioning insights.”320 Education came from within, Revans insisted. It was not contained in a package.

The Southampton meeting was “indeed still a very American conference.”321 Of the approximately 186 presenters, 63 percent came from the United States, 28 percent from Britain, and 16 percent came, in order of numbers, from Belgium, Canada, Australia, the Netherlands, Hong Kong, and the Sultanate of Oman.322 Because the conference did not lose money and the British-based Society for Research Into Higher Education continued to work with FYE,323 Gardner booked facilities in Cambridge for July 1988. At a London dinner attended by high-ranking educators and government officials arranged by his British contacts, he met the principal of St. Andrew’s University, who had studied and worked at Purdue University in Indiana and who invited FYE to Scotland for July 1989.324

The expanded conference series again broadened FYE’s opportunities. A Vrije Universiteit Brussel dean asked about training faculty for a UN101 program.325 Gardner
received invitations to Aalborg in Norway and Technikon Natal in South Africa.\textsuperscript{326} Meredeen arranged a sabbatical in South Carolina.\textsuperscript{327} The expanded series also brought FYE more national recognition in the US. ACE inserted four pages into its newsletter describing it as an international movement.\textsuperscript{328}

The final meeting of 1987 was a domestic one. In Tulsa, Gardner noted a presentation on veteran professor Alan Bloom’s bestseller, \textit{The Closing of the American Mind} (1987).\textsuperscript{329} Bloom related “value-free” education to Nietzschean philosophy and the preoccupation of the German and subsequently American university with research at the expense of personal development. He argued that the research paradigm undermined the American heritage on which earlier faculty drew in educating students -- the Bible, the family, and the Declaration of Independence. Gardner conceded that institutions had given up in \textit{locum parentis} and development of personal values and civic responsibilities. “It’s time to set aside the fabricated and over-easy courses of the recent past...the special groups of ‘looks at’ courses which allow any answer to be right as long as it is relevant. How do we redefine wrong anyway?” he reflected. “When did we decide that any response is good and erroneous ideals and ideas were secure because of the magical phrase ‘we can see where you’re coming from’ or ‘I hear you say’? It is apparently never possible to be coming to the wrong place.”\textsuperscript{330} Gardner urged institutions “to the tasks of developing liberally educated, thoughtful individuals inculcated with tutored values and standards, ready and eager to solve the problems besetting their less advantaged neighbours, their country, and the world.”\textsuperscript{331} Gardner’s reasoning had a circular quality. The insistence of the liberal academy on both individual interpretation and free inquiry made answering questions such as “How do we redefine wrong anyway?” definitively enough to tutor
virtually impossible. The academy could measure to some degree the first two characteristics Gardner cited as the “true measure of an individual,” “the breadth of the knowledge [and] the depth of the convictions,” but not the third, “the height of the ideals.”

FYE publications revealed the inability of the university ultimately to go beyond rhetoric, assertion, and opinion regarding value judgments. In *College Is Only the Beginning*, Jewler and Gardner offered students Richard L. Morrill’s reasoning on value development. Morrill, who was raised “in a conservative home in which standards of personal behaviour were tightly enforced,” argues that testing values is “a central part of the undergraduate experience.” Because values determine personal actions and identity, “true values must be freely chosen by the person and cannot be accepted simply on the authority of another person.” Students could use techniques like values clarification to explore meanings and implications. “[U]ltimately the process of values awareness should become like second nature and be practiced continually.”

Practicing values awareness is imperative to Morrill because students who do not will be unable to meet the challenges of diversity, grow as persons, or cope with the typical university professor who, because “the scholar’s role is understood as involving a continual, open-ended search for truth,” tends to “see truth in a more contextual, flexible, and variable way.” Faculty expect students to have reasons for their beliefs, because “college-level education involves the assumption that…you will become the maker of your own meaning, on your own, with the ultimate responsibility for judgments of truth and error resting in your hands. The whole system of a university’s intellectual values…is based on this approach and there is no escaping it.” Nevertheless, Morrill asserts that
students may look to the American political and educational tradition for guidance.

"[O]ur participation in a democratic society [with its values of respect for others, tolerance, equality, liberty, and fairness] and in academic communities [with their values of academic freedom, open search for truth, honesty and collegiality, civility, and tolerance for dissenting views] has settled many of the deepest questions of the nature of right values...."

In a companion volume for *College Is Only the Beginning*, Robert A. Friday leads students through the steps to owning behaviour and identity recommended by Morrill. To determine origins of values, students could answer and discuss with classmates a questionnaire asking parental educational levels and attitudes toward higher education, how they chose their college and course, and "how comfortable you are with your present life course." To uncover their priorities, they could participate in a personal goals auction in which players rank values such as pleasure, beauty, closeness to God, and so on, in preparation to bidding for them in a value sale. Students then could explore consequences of values through a clarification exercise in which a minister’s daughter, not allowed home after becoming pregnant out of wedlock, goes to a back-alley abortionist, and dies. UN101 instructors could assign exam questions such as: "List three things you value the most and tell how you developed these values."

Gardner and Jewler explained UN101’s approach to values education in their own book of exercises, *Step by Step to College Success* (1987). In “Step Four: Join a Group. Discover Who You Are and Who They Are,” they reiterated Jones’s concept that values are learned “in small groups of people who are important to one another.” The UN101 class provided a small group in which values could be clarified and freely chosen. Values
clarification methodology emphasized “not...what values a person may hold, but...the process of valuing something.” It did not aim to instill values but to prompt students to form their own. It contributed to a major purpose of a liberal arts education, “to free...from ignorance, bias, prejudice, and superstition,” and develop tolerance for values of others. Therefore, students participating in values clarification discussions should remember that there are no right or wrong answers. A sample clarification exercise asks students to select scholarships winners on the basis of mainly personal information.

Values exploration in UN101 retained its “teaching students not to riot” aspect. “Unfortunately, most of us in the university sector seem unwilling...to shape peer group influences during the undergraduate experience,” Gardner confided to Riesman. “This suggests to me...the tremendous need to create special small group experiences in which undergraduates can interact with faculty...to create some alternative peer group structures to influence their thinking and act as somewhat of a counterbalance toward their small group realities.”

The UN101 training maintained elements of its original human relations approach. Jewler recounted the tale of the bad witch who influenced people to be stingy with the fuzzy wuzzies on which their happiness and even lives depended and kept them barely alive with cold pricklies and cold pricklies disguised as warm fuzzies until a newcomer revived them by indiscriminately handing out warm fuzzies again. Graduates indicated in their evaluations that the training strengthened their relationships with students, each other, and the university, and gave them fresh teaching ideas. The training demonstrated, however, that the university’s research ideal disarmed UN101’s humanistic mission. Jewler believed that professors failed to exploit UN101 for
professional development because they feared that "teaching [it] would label them as less serious scholars." Approximately one-third of the training graduates were disciplinary specialists. Most who took sections were new to USC and teaching or had achieved tenure and full professor status. The reliance on the pleasant but vapid fuzzy wuzzy tale after fifteen years of behavioural experimentation suggested little progress toward a new collegiality.

To Gardner, FYE’s foundational concept was holistic. He used pastoral language to describe his career. “I am one of those children of the 60s who ended up doing missionary work in the Deep South and who wanted more than anything else to have his life make a difference in the lives of others.” Gardner valued holistic approaches, whether in pluralistic and secular or religious settings. When John Lawry, a Roman Catholic psychology professor, began a lengthy dialogue with him about alleviating “spiritual deprivation” in students, Gardner pursued it with interest, despite his staff’s reluctance to recognize spirituality as an educational concern.

FYE’s student-centred, process-oriented definition of higher education, which, because it originated in a research ideal which accepted only empirical inquiry, required a secularized understanding of holism, was not strongly evident in Gardner’s review of themes at Irvine in January 1988. Gardner noted that “[t]hree or four sessions... address [holism] very specifically.” Conversely, at least three sessions demonstrated that “freshman seminar courses are steadily becoming more academic in their focus as opposed to being weighted toward the orientation and student development models. I am not making a judgment about that.” Gardner observed that USC’s UN101 contained both directions.
The transformational agenda of FYE appeared most directly in the speakers it chose for its conferences.\textsuperscript{345} Gardner asked Russell Edgerton of AAHE to Columbia to place FYE in perspective in the larger picture of American higher educational innovation. Edgerton articulated an agenda he believed educators already unconsciously held, that education should go beyond the broad knowledge by which current reading lists defined learning, to "developing abilities to use...knowledge."\textsuperscript{346} Lost under the "avalanche of knowledge" that came from the developing university at the turn of the twentieth century, this "discipline of the mind," as Yale called it in 1828, once more challenged contemporary educators. At the same time, increasing diversity in student populations forced them to re-examine their fundamental assumptions. "Scientists and humanists like are raising questions that go to the core values of the university. Has the scientific method itself become our highest value? Are we -- as Parker Palmer asks -- turning out students who can observe but not relate to what they observe?"\textsuperscript{347} Educators realized that students needed not only disciplines of the mind, but also, in de Tocqueville's phrase, "habits of the heart." Edgerton suggested that a more collegial approach to higher education required a more collegial setting. Higher educators should transform the assembly lines of the "manufacturing plant" university into small interactive communities which approximated residential liberal arts colleges.

Edgerton implied that educators created persons and society. He discounted other socializing institutions as having "lost some of their grip over the young." Jones understood creation of persons and society as human engineering. He based UN101 on small group psychology to weaken previous values and engender new ones. Concern for what was called the "PCP syndrome" -- parking lot, classroom, parking lot -- illustrated
FYE’s socializing agenda. Educational innovators preferred a controlled residential experience, presumably because it placed students most fully under their shaping influence. Students who merely attended the classroom viewed higher education as only one contributor to their experience and remained more vulnerable to the influence of traditional socializing agencies.

At Irvine, William G. Perry, Jr., professor emeritus of education at Harvard, explained his model for the stages of intellectual development the university should promote in students. “You may disagree, sensing that I am loading on you a trip into personality development; your responsibility, you may say, is to teach History...Students who have not progressed beyond [believing that there is truth that will be known] will be unable to understand what you as a modern historian want them to understand about History.” The teacher should “create settings in which students who are ready will be more likely to make new kinds of sense.” Dismissing the student who, meeting uncertainty, recognizes meaninglessness and is paralyzed by it, Perry argued that most would let go of certainty and begin to make their own sense of the world -- in the words of one who has reached the desired stage of intellectual sophistication: “It’s all bits and pieces with cracks in it, but I’m at the center of something, a place from where I see things as I see them and all that jazz. Get things together ---that’s it, I guess. Not getting everything I want but getting things together. Oh, hell, maybe all that holds me together is irony.” Students needed support as they stepped into the abyss of uncertainty. “The students had invested hope and aspiration and trust and confidence in the simpler design of their world of yesterday. How long will it take for them to dig out their vitality and
reinvest it in the new, problematical vision? And all the while they are being told these are the happiest days of their lives."

Knefelkamp observed that “we have a serious, serious culture clash on this country’s college campuses.” Educators and government officials alike “bashed” students for being underprepared, having different values and “viewing education as utilitarian rather than as something that beckons you back every fall because you can’t do anything else with your life.” Their cynicism bred exclusion and mistrust. Under these conditions, the learning culture could not fulfil its potential as a place “where goodness happens, lives are renewed, minds are saved.” Knefelkamp urged higher educators to listen to students, get to know their hopes and fears, and, respecting them, to nurture in them responsibility to relate their learning to citizenship. “[O]ur failure to see, hear, and respond to the needs of our students is ultimately a failure of vision.”

Francine McNairy, a favourite speaker at FYE meetings, outlined specifically how institutions could create the settings of intellectual progress, and respect and responsibility which facilitated first-year student development. She recommended that they take two years to evaluate if their mission, curriculum, services, and resources respected diversity and encouraged mutual understanding, and plan for change. Administrators could provide professional development opportunities for faculty to learn about students and teaching, incentives for them to teach orientation seminars, incentives to departments to rotate teaching assignments so first-year students could meet mature scholars, and resources for the partnerships between student affairs personnel and faculty needed to respond to the whole student. Faculty could examine the delivery, content and aims of their entry-level courses to see if they matched students and their needs and their academic
rewards system to see if it could be revised to validate emphasis on instruction. Student personnel could re-evaluate the sensitivity of their services to nontraditional populations. McNairy believed that American higher education had the "expertise, skills, knowledge, and the courage necessary to generate...change," but wondered if it had the will.

The conference appearances of Edgerton and, before him, Boyer, signalled that FYE had won a place among the most powerful voices for change in American higher education. Gardner noted, however, that the educational debate which enabled them to press their ideas also revealed academic entrenchment. "In spite of the very evident increase in the freshman year concept, there is not a week goes by that I don't receive phone calls and letters...for information to help some institution overcome resistance to bring about the kinds of changes you're talking about." Institutions had not changed significantly despite arguments for reforms and reallocation of resources to the first year. Nevertheless, government officials showed interest in FYE. Publishers were selling student success to faculty. The conferences consistently attracted large numbers of first-time attenders.

FYE strove for acceptance in Britain with mixed results. At Cambridge, 10 percent of the presenters were British, and 73 percent American.\textsuperscript{357} The London Times commented that “[w]e accept the same caring imperatives, the same pastoral tradition, as the Americans, even if we shy away from their idea of college as a secular church. But access is so restricted the difficulties experienced by many American freshmen and women are rarely encountered….Of course,” it continued, “the same problems of underachievement occur here too – but generally not in higher education….By means of access courses…the security of the British first year is maintained.”\textsuperscript{358}

Nevertheless, the FYE concept found a following in Britain. The British organized their own conference before the Cambridge one.\textsuperscript{359} The Times went on to note that “as Britain uneasily abandons elite higher education and edges toward a mass system, it will be necessary to address the same issues that have given rise to the interest in the first-year experience in the United States.” At Cambridge, the higher education editor of The Times predicted that mass access would make British higher education more competitive, utilitarian, and influenced by the outside society.\textsuperscript{360} Underprepared students would weaken academic standards. Flexible delivery would make the first year less distinct and more difficult for the institution to control. Though they would demand more attention, first-year students would not tolerate paternalism. “It will no longer be possible to see any stage of higher education, even the preparatory one, as a means by which the kind of wisdom of the old and the mature is passed onto the young and less mature, or even see it as a kind of intensive process of socialization. Perhaps a better way to look at it is as a series of negotiated deals that cover academic and non-academic questions between
students and their teachers and their institutions. Under these new conditions the old idea of pastoral care will be very difficult to maintain.”

Presenters came to Cambridge from Canada, Belgium, Nigeria, Australia, South Africa, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Bulgaria. \( ^{361} \) Gardner received invitations to attend or hold meetings in South Africa, Australia, Denmark, and Czechoslovakia. \( ^{362} \) After Cambridge, he explored interest in a Spanish meeting. \( ^{363} \) When the Universidad Politecnica de Madrid and the Universidad de Navarre responded positively, Gardner began thinking of a smaller European conference which could create more interest in the British meetings. \( ^{364} \)

While keeping the preferences of his American constituency foremost in mind, Gardner sought to learn more about and to respect international sensitivities. In 1988, he finally faced a subject which came up constantly outside the US. “The Brits talk about ‘freshers’ or ‘freshers week.’ The rest of the world seems to talk about first year students.” \( ^{365} \) In addition, some feminists objected to being called “freshmen.” Gardner recalled that “[a]fter speaking at the University of Western Ontario in Canada… I was vilified in the student press… for being an American who came across the border promoting a highly sexist and outmoded term.” Further, in community colleges, the first year might consist of a series of entries until a year’s equivalent of hours had been accumulated. Gardner wondered if all his conferences should bear the name normally used internationally, The First-Year Experience.

Planning the first Canadian-American conference in Toronto for November 1988, Griffith determined to mount a conference with which Canadians identified. Gardner referred Canadian proposals to Griffith’s committee for review. \( ^{366} \) Long-time friends of
UN101 at institutions like St. Lawrence College and the universities of Windsor, Guelph, Waterloo, Western Ontario, and Ottawa in Ontario, and the course and faculty institute at UPEI, provided a solid base in Canada for a conference.\textsuperscript{367} Proposals preceded the call for papers and institutions as diverse as Northern College in South Porcupine, Ontario, Seneca College for Applied Arts and Technology in Toronto, and Acadia University in Nova Scotia queried UN101 regarding first-year programs.\textsuperscript{368}

The attendance of 438 at Toronto demonstrated significant grassroots interest in a first-year focus in Canada. Gardner observed that “it was the first international conference we’ve ever done where more than half the participants were not Americans.”\textsuperscript{369} Approximately one-third of the presentations came from Canada.\textsuperscript{370} The meeting promoted academic concerns. Of the 96 sessions, at most five, none Canadian, argued for a radical pedagogy. Key speaker Borkowski, envisioning the flexibility technopolies of the twenty-first century would require of students, asked how higher educators could prepare them to become “smarter, faster.”\textsuperscript{371} Solutions included computer access, instruction through technology, developing writing, critical and interdisciplinary thinking, teaching languages through global conversation, and planning for growing cohorts of nontraditional students. Noting that “it has been said that ‘the best way to predict the future is to invent it,’” Borkowski suggested that if university administrators did not lead in a “drive for excellence” with “international perspectives,” they would be led.

Borkowski balanced his predictions with the assertion that “before all else, the purpose of education is to assist [students] in understanding and expressing their humanity. He voiced a “deep concern that higher education today suffers from a lack of moral values. Higher education is weakest in this respect, in great part because of the
nature of our enterprise – the unfettered search for truth. Consequently, there is little agreement on what those values should be and even less on how they might possibly be part of higher education.” Therefore, Borkowski favoured teaching a process of valuing. “I submit that in an increasingly globally interdependent world where myriad cultures will come into increasing contact with one another, and where rapidly changing social, technological, and ethical contexts will provide us with perplexing dilemmas, we must understand the process of valuing and its centrality to the great human conversation.” His concern remained inconclusive, however, because its process of valuing remained unfocused.

Despite the holistic tone of FYE’s keynote addresses, the meeting presentations tended to support or facilitate the research ideal. This was seen in the significant participation by academic administrators more than in the still low involvement by disciplinary specialists other than from English, psychology, and education. Most importantly, the lines between student affairs and faculty were blurring in favour of the academic. An increasing number of participants were academics specializing in subjects like reading, basic studies, and critical thinking and student personnel specializing in services like learning assistance, advising, and developmental studies. The attendance of deans and instructors for first-year students and seminars, whose specialization could be placed in either category, grew. Presentations which featured faculty and student affairs partnerships did not necessarily display a humanistic character. Approaches to first-year students showed more integration developmentally in that the person was increasingly social science. For example, presenters recommended that institutions analyze entrants through use of the Myers-Briggs personality test. Few presentations approached higher
education as human relations. Despite its radical mission, FYE had entered pleasantly and innocuously into the mainstream of American higher education.

In a meeting of student personnel, Gardner affirmed his unwavering commitment to humanistic higher education. He probed the problem of collegial versus research-oriented higher education from a standpoint of deep concern for persons. "We are all former college undergraduates and therefore have something in common with the basic humanity of these people. They are what we once were." Observing that somehow "some of us as individuals, or sectors of institutions, or some entire institutions do not necessarily put students first...", Gardner asked: "What has happened in higher education to bring us to this point?" Sanford called rejecting responsibility for total development a "loss of a sense of community." Gardner, echoing Jones, attributed the change to liberal arts, humanities, and classics specialists giving up their role as people developers. "The classroom is a vehicle for transfer of knowledge. The individual is not in focus, and is almost peripheral." Gardner did not expect humanists to return to their former focus. "Rather I believe that the whole of the university and college experience must devote a significant portion of its energy to promoting personal growth and development of students. This will require new training and new attitudes in teachers — all teachers." In 1988, Gardner believed student groups who could benefit particularly from the humanistic approach were first-year students, "minority students who face what has been called 'the new racism,' women students who face what has been called... 'The Chilly Climate,' international students, [and] victims of sexually transmitted diseases, some of whom are facing certain death."
The Chronicle of Higher Education called Gardner "the dean of freshman happiness." Nevertheless, Gardner did not slacken his pace. On his way to do "missionary work in the states of Iowa and Florida," he wrote The Chronicle that "[t]his work gives me the greatest imaginable feeling of fulfilment." He now served as a vice president of USC, taught courses, consulted and held workshops, delivered papers, increased involvement in associations like AAHE, co-edited publications, and maintained control of UN101, the conference series, and the activities of the new research centre. As he added responsibilities, he hired more UN101/FYE staff, many in collaborative capacities.

With its National Center for the Study of The Freshman Year Experience, FYE could evaluate and strengthen its influence on American higher education. The centre surveyed 3168 institutions to ascertain how many offered first-year seminars. It initiated an ambitious roster of publications. In May 1988, the centre mailed complimentary copies of the premier issue of Fidler's newsletter to some 15,000 subscription prospects. Fidler assembled manuscripts, blind reviewers, and a "star" board in time to put out the first edition of the Journal of the Freshman Year Experience in Fall 1988. The newsletter and journal found a ready readership; subscriptions quickly covered costs. Their continued success also depended on attracting high-quality manuscripts reporting "research findings, applied programs, teaching techniques, and results of program evaluations." To Fidler's relief, the field was sufficiently developed to provide these. To make available research reports longer than 20 pages, the centre also planned a monograph series, beginning with John Whiteley and Norma Yokota's Character Development in the Freshman Year and Over Four Years of Undergraduate
Study (1988). Gardner, encouraged by Whiteley, believed the publications necessary to the “further institutionalization and legitimization of the freshman year experience concept.” At the same time, he “hope[d] that by taking on more and more of the trappings of our established scholarly peers that we don’t lose some of the messianic zeal that led to this movement in the first place.”

Gardner continued to work with Upcraft on the Jossey-Bass compendium, and with Jewler on the Wadsworth textbook. Wadsworth brought out Create Your College Success, a companion volume to Gardner and Jewler’s College Is Only the Beginning (1985) and Step By Step to College Success (1987). After leaving South Carolina, Meredeen found a London publisher for his Study for Survival and Success: Gudienotes for College Students and, when it sold well, began an edition for international students. Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch commissioned a sequel. FYE researcher Betsy Barefoot asked Meredeen to enumerate first-year programs in Britain. Judy Chapman, a student affairs specialist at the University of Regina embarked on a similar study in Canada, aided by research underway at Guelph.

There were signs in early 1989 that at the same time economic pressures again restricted education travel budgets, the FYE movement was maturing in the United States. Though the international meetings grew and the American meetings attracted new people, attendance leveled off in the national conferences, and diminished in the smaller ones. Further, as the occupations of the presenters at Columbia demonstrated, the first-year transition had become a specialization in its own right. If FYE became the professional focus of a new specialization consisting of a mix of “university studies” and learning supports, its crusade to redefine American higher education humanistically could
stall. The maturity of the movement also was evident in the failure of its research centre to attract significant external funding. Direct discussions with FIPSE indicated that FYE was "too far along in [its] development for serious consideration by many funding sources." 

Gardner adapted the conference series to maintain FYE's momentum. After attendance dropped at Irvine, he made the California meeting topical, stressing "the ethnically diverse freshman year experience. That seems to be an idea whose time has come." The Columbia conference, also less-well attended, retrieved its status as the flagship meeting. Gardner changed the New York and Illinois meetings, which attracted about half their previous numbers, to roving locations. The small colleges and universities meeting increased its registrations and the international market still appeared fertile. Aalborg, Denmark, planned to host a meeting in 1990. Gardner kept Griffith, now at the University of Victoria, advised of programs and research stimulated by the Toronto conference, particularly a taskforce examining the first year at the University of Manitoba and the possibility of a credit course at Regina.

The numbers also fell at the British conference, held for the first time in Scotland. Gardner asked Main, who had moved from Strathclyde to West Murdoch University in Western Australia, to introduce FYE at St. Andrews, as he had at Newcastle four years before. After the 1960s, Main argued, the Scottish university goals of personal development and wealth creation became separated and polarized. The latter goal now pressured Scottish institutions to convert from a community of students who elected a rector to look after their interests to industrial-style management by a board, director, and management team. The accent on business needs and research increased access, but also
impersonal treatment of students. Main observed the same polarization in Australia.

"You can imagine," he said, "how refreshing I find amongst the objectives of this conference a focus on the development of the freshman 'as a whole person, as a successful student, a well-adjusted and caring human being and a responsible citizen.'"

Main stressed that the movement to restore education for delight was not value-free; ideas such as writing across the curriculum and holistic orientation were grounded in philosophical presuppositions. "There is a real need for us first of all to acknowledge that we are agents of change within our institutions, and then that we are likely to be marginalized....The more that governments move towards models of accountability, cost-effectiveness, and links with wealth creation, the more that marginalization is likely." Main warned that current movements in Britain which promoted holistic education as developing knowledge and skills, ability to communicate and use them, and flexibility in their subsequent application might "become mere agencies for the development of entrepreneurial skills for a materialist society." Instead, higher education should bestow on the young a culture which will enable them to "in a liberal spirit direct and use the experts rather than be the experts themselves."

Gardner continued to invite influential American innovators to headline FYE's domestic meetings. At Irvine, Upcraft critically analyzed student development theory as a means of understanding first-year students. He argued that after the traditional theory, in loco parentis, which was characterized by negative rules, was overthrown by activism and legal pressures in the 1960s, educators abandoned students and regulation of behaviour "to an extent that we now look back on and regret." Demographic trends raised interest in retention and spawned new theories based on psychology, sociology and
anthropology. Researchers should question the inclusiveness of the theories, and how to help students who arrived in different developmental stages due to changing family patterns.\textsuperscript{400}

Also at Irvine, Alexander Astin, a psychologist who studied student development through national surveys, analyzed first-year student profiles from the 1960s to the 1980s. “Ability to make money” replaced “gaining a general education and appreciation of ideas” as the dominant reason for going to college. More students sought advanced degrees, for status reasons. At the same time, student depression increased. Astin argued that institutions which equated excellence with academic reputation or resources rather than how well they educated both dehumanized students and affirmed competitive values. He cautioned that “[students] discover that collegiality gets very little weight in the personnel review process….The implicit message is that what is really important is how much you, as an individual, are able to develop your professional career and status primarily through publishing and secondarily through teaching.”\textsuperscript{401} Educators would be able to fulfil the role of the university articulated by Derek Bok of Harvard, “helping students develop a strong set of moral standards,” to the extent they transcended their institutional egos and examined their own humanistic values.\textsuperscript{402}

Because Germany’s universities under Hitler were highly advanced academically, ACE’s Reginald Wilson contended that the important question of higher education was: “what sort of person do we want to emerge from that experience.”\textsuperscript{403} He did not believe that teaching ethics was the solution. Students could give “right” answers without believing them. “Therefore, it is not the curriculum that is my principal concern, it is the hidden curriculum.” In rhetoric reminiscent of the 1960s, Wilson argued that “[w]hen the
academy makes congruent its operational values with its philosophical values, it will indeed be a transformed institution.”

At the small colleges meeting, Kniefelkamp also personalized the impact of an integrated educational environment. She had experienced connected teaching and learning through a professor who mixed Simone de Beauvoir and Albert Camus, her own participation in the French resistance, and Kniefelkamp’s 1960s social activism to demonstrate that “curriculum and life, in fact, were one and the same.” Kniefelkamp posited that students sought a connectedness between teachers and curriculum and their lives, that they did not receive from institutions which essentially were federations of disciplines which rewarded research over teaching. She preferred Perry’s developmental model because it emphasized connectedness between intellectual and self development, and teachers and learners.

Gardner, with Upcraft, refined his years of study of the first year into an FYE model of student development. Introduced in The Freshman Year Experience (1989), the model identified six developmental tasks successful students completed as undergraduates. First, they developed academic and intellectual competence, maturing in critical thinking and in making connections holistically. Second, they established and maintained interpersonal relationships, cooperatively and multiculturally. Third, they developed identity; that is, following Erikson (1963), came to see themselves as others see them. Fourth, they chose a career and life-style. Fifth, they actively maintained personal health and wellness. Sixth, they developed an integrated philosophy of life; that is, “reconsider[ed] their sense of what is right and wrong, their priorities in life, their religious and spiritual beliefs, and how they fit into the larger order of things in the universe. Their
values and beliefs must be integrated and internalized so that there is a consistency between what they believe and how they behave.\textsuperscript{406}

Gardner believed this model “transcends the racial, ethnic, gender, and age diversity of freshmen and describes their basic commonalities.”\textsuperscript{407} The sixth developmental task was problematic because the university’s research paradigm did not allow for diversity of basic presuppositions. Perry’s educational model stressed that religious belief constituted immature intellectual development. Values clarification exercises reinforced this perception, with their implication that there are no right or wrong answers. Gardner was unfailingly respectful to client institutions which integrated religious belief and scholarship. He welcomed the involvement of denominational chaplains in UN101 and urged the Baptist Student Center’s Woody Hammett to write a chapter for the UN101 textbook.\textsuperscript{408} He told Lawry that “[w]hen I hear people such as you describe so sincerely the notion of the Holy Spirit, I almost want to believe in it,” and endorsed his work which included spirituality in wholeness.\textsuperscript{409} The FYE conference definition of wholeness included “spiritual.”\textsuperscript{410} Gardner informed Lawry, however, that Fidler, and Barefoot did not believe his work struck “the right chord for our publications” and that “there was no way I could persuade...Wadsworth that there was a sufficient market to guarantee their risks and initial investment” for his work.\textsuperscript{411} Respecting religious viewpoints in the ethos of the research academy proved inherently awkward.

The FYE journal and newsletter reflected this unease with seemingly speculative aspects of humanity. Fidler, certain that the human being could be quantified, sought reports of research from experimental psychology and social science perspectives, in their set form of review of literature, rationale, question or hypothesis, methodology, results
with statistics, data, tables and figures, and discussion. The journal and newsletter did not acknowledge disciplines which explored humanity in other ways. Though Gardner incorporated the liberal arts debate into the movement and was himself fond of history, the publications disregarded questions and insights of the past which contributed to human understanding. The journal and newsletter served as an important resource for ideas and discussion for educational administrators and specialists in the new psychology-based discipline of the undergraduate experience. Their reduction of holism to quantifiable analysis satisfied, in a distinguished manner, the university’s criteria for academic credibility but it did not strike a common chord across the academy or stimulate discussion from a broad range of faculty voices and disciplinary approaches.

In the midst of the activity on behalf of incoming students at USC and beyond, a number of personnel changes took place. Murphy returned to the college of education, Fidler assumed the co-directorship of the center, and Barefoot, who achieved her doctorate completing the national seminar survey, edited monographs. Witten, anticipating retirement and believing that too much structure had entered UN101, ended his association with the course. Jewler decided to continue his highly successful textbook collaboration with Gardner from the journalism department. Dan Berman, who had mentored Gardner to success at Marietta and later followed him to USC to teach film studies, accepted the directorship. As had Jewler, Berman remained active in his department while directing UN101.

Jewler feared Berman’s enthusiasm for involving more faculty at USC would end in disillusionment. “The goals Dan proposed may be unreachable. I haven’t been able to budge faculty or academic departments in the six years I’ve been trying....” On one
hand, the dissemination of the UN101 concept succeeded. Transitional services and courses became normal in American higher education.419 On the other hand, it did not change the knowledge-centred character of the undergraduate experience and in practice appeared integrated with it in a support role.

The FYE conference "industry," as U.S. News and World Report termed it, comprised a key vehicle for Gardner’s crusade, perhaps because it enabled him to model humanistic education.420 Before an audience, Gardner practiced disclosure so that his listeners came to feel they knew him personally. One-to-one, he gave others his full attention and treated them with genuine courtesy. With Howell, he compulsively answered all correspondence, often adding a handwritten note. As one USC senior administrator explained, "I respect him because he treated me the same way when I was a student as he does today."421 Further, in his professional activities, Gardner worked collaboratively, ensuring that recognition went to his co-workers. He inspired enthusiasm and loyalty because he modeled his message. The conferences communicated the interpersonal power of the UN101 concept in a way that the publications, by their scientific character, did not.

With the conferences flagging somewhat, Gardner moved to keep the movement interesting for himself and extend the mission of FYE beyond the first year. Adherents of the movement realized that the first year was one of many transitions that students encountered in higher education. With an emphasis on students in transition, FYE could probe and influence the entire undergraduate experience. Gardner decided to widen his mission by introducing a senior year "capstone" course "to encourage colleges to look more specifically at preparing leaders, lifelong learners, spouses, parents, and good
citizens, more deliberately than they are.\textsuperscript{422} The idea debuted at the 1986 Columbia conference, when Murphy described a seminar for seniors which applied the UN101 concept to the transition from university to the "real world."\textsuperscript{423} In 1989 Gardner called for papers for a meeting on the senior year in Atlanta in March 1990.\textsuperscript{424}

On the surface, the idea of a capstone course dovetailed startlingly well with the contemporary quest for ethical curricula. It perhaps would form a late twentieth-century parallel to the moral philosophy course regarded as the culmination of undergraduate education until the research paradigm overwhelmed the collegial idea. Moral philosophy, often taught by the college president, integrated the knowledge acquired in the undergraduate experience and emphasized its moral implications. In its coverage of the charter senior year meeting, \textit{The Chronicle of Higher Education} reported that colleges were instituting senior seminars to answer "critics who say graduates lack a sense of ethics and have unreasonably high job expectations...."\textsuperscript{425}

For the Senior Year Experience meeting, Gardner invited Perry to explain intellectual and ethical development and government and business leaders to discuss preparing students "for corporate, bureaucratic, and political life."\textsuperscript{426} The presenters included few academic and student affairs administrators, more business and sciences faculty than liberal arts, and mainly student personnel in career services, academic support, leadership, and alum affairs.\textsuperscript{427} The moral philosophy model of integration and application of knowledge was not in evidence. Lynchburg College, Wayne State University, Holy Family College, and Northeast Missouri State University described senior experiences which stimulated students to draw together their general education foundation or major.\textsuperscript{428} Most seminars prepared students to accept entry-level jobs, perform them responsibly, and
continue to learn and develop their careers. Kennesaw College’s capstone course, taught by the president, dealt with “what really counts – values and being a good human being,” but the Chronicle stated that it did so in order to answer criticism that graduates expected to start as chief executives rather than entry-level management.  

Gardner’s efforts to maintain an audience for his humanistic crusade succeeded. The audience, however, changed. The 1990 conference programs reveal that many institutions now took a comprehensive approach to the first year. An analysis of presenters shows little participation by disciplinary specialists and relatively high participation by administrators. Diversity issues attracted a new faculty group: specialists in ethnic studies. The balance between academic and student personnel evened again, but the majority of student personnel presenters were administrators or learning support staff. A notable trend was the number of administrators, either academic or student affairs, hired specifically to manage the first-year course or program.

The first-year conferences continued to link with change agents in the broader higher educational community. The Columbia meeting gave Trudy W. Banta of the assessment movement a platform. Faculty, satisfied with abstract justifications for their work, resisted assessment. Student personnel and professors of education promoting holistic education recognized that the assessment sought by governments could drive change and pioneered the field. Faculty felt little need to learn from FYE, said Banta, but outcomes assessment required by external funding sources was “stimulating a good deal of self-study by academics and compelling them to make immediate improvements in academic programs and services.”
After Columbia, FYE held a successful meeting in Austin, Texas, and participated in the long-planned European conference at Aalborg in Denmark.434 The second Canadian-American meeting in Halifax in July focused on first-year efforts to enhance academic success.435 Though the meeting attracted fewer registrants than the first and the American presenters outnumbered those from Canada, Britain and Finland over three to one, it showed the UN101 concept taking root in Canadian institutions.436 More universities paid attention to the first-year, usually in a manner which involved the academic administration but did not affect faculty.437 The meeting attracted important new converts. Historic Queen's University sent twelve academic and student administrators to learn how to change deeply rooted controversial student traditions, spurred by newspaper photos of male students hanging banners from their residence windows reading, "No means Yes." Queen's developed a residence-based UN101 program and its faculty of arts and sciences guided student committees to reinvent student customs so successfully that sanitized songs and collecting for charity became characteristic of orientation week.

Promotion in Canada was still arduous.438 To lobby for a first-year seminar at Regina, Chapman gathered representatives of the federal Secretary of State, the Saskatchewan Department of Education, and the universities of Regina, Manitoba, Guelph, and Victoria, Luther College, and Saskatchewan Indian Federated College to discuss what had been forgotten about the mission of undergraduate education.439 Sid Gilbert argued that higher education traditionally, as the aims of Guelph stated, concerned "the intellectual, social and moral development of students so that they can realize themselves as complete human beings."440 He blamed the failure of this aim on lack of
assessment...." If Canadian universities assessed on the basis of goals and outcomes, they could no longer neglect developmental goals.

Chapman’s seminar coincided with a *University Affairs* article noting efforts by Manitoba and Guelph to correct the neglect of the student.441 The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation picked up the story. As a result, Regina offered to co-sponsor with Victoria FYE’s third Canadian-American meeting. Regina’s faculty approved Chapman’s course but balked at credit.442 Chapman again lobbied for implementation of a credit course in following year.443 The Regina faculty again refused the course credits.444

Gardner asked Chapman for a monograph reporting research on the Canadian first year. His efforts to supply a literature for the FYE movement also were maturing. In 1990, Barefoot added to the monograph list a report of the national survey of first-year programs, a compendium of keynote addresses, and an annotated bibliography.445 Jewler and Gardner’s textbooks and teaching guides for Wadsworth grew into a profitable and prolific “Freshman Year Experience Series.”446 With Griffith’s former colleague at UPEI, historian Andrew Robb, Jewler and Gardner edited a Canadian version.447 Wadsworth also republished *Ready for the Real World* as the first in the “Senior Year Experience Series.”448

In addition to FYE meetings, publications and consulting, Gardner carried his change agent message to the meetings of other American higher education organizations. His speeches illuminate the status of the UN101 concept 20 years after the USC riots of May 1970 led Jones to establish an experimental orientation seminar. In a speech to the Association of College and University Housing Officers, Gardner disclosed that “[a] theme for this set of reflections could have been ‘we’ve come a long way but we have a long
Many institutions had adopted the new undergraduate model "that includes not only academic but also a more holistic focus on relationships, ... identity, ... career planning, ... wellness, and ... a meaningful philosophy of life." But most faculty did not participate. "All of us are emulating the graduate school model. But few of us are equipped to deliver it. This results in frustrated faculty and students who are poorly served." Gardner noted that, historically, faculty lived among students, but a separation occurred as their professional value system changed. "[N]ow an entire new profession has developed to perform many duties formerly performed by faculty; and this ... is the student affairs profession that does the advising, the counseling, supervision of discipline, sponsoring of student activities, supervision and administration of residence halls, etc."

Gardner concluded what he jokingly referred to as a sermon to AAHE with what arguably might have been the key factor in the success of the UN101 concept. "[C]aring for freshmen is the key to building institutional community and such effort forces us all outside the boundaries of our own turf. Become the litmus test of concern for all students. This is far preferable to student bashing a la William Bennett, Mr. Hirsch, and Bloom."450

To the Minnesota College Personnel Association, Gardner predicted that in the 1990s, the competition in American higher education that gave change a chance in the 1980s would intensify. Restricted financial resources and a shrinking pool of traditional students, along with high tuition costs, would increase attention to diverse student populations and their needs. At the same time, institutions would compete for faculty to replace professors hired for the "student boom" of the 1960s. Gardner both argued that competition enhanced quality and improved services to underprepared students, and
admitted that the goals of quality and access were difficult to reconcile. Overall, the collegial transformation of the university showed little progress. Though the nature of undergraduate education remained under debate and external pressures forced adjustments in favour of collegiality, most faculty did not interpret their role in the holistic, process-oriented terms of the higher educational innovators. They understood teaching in terms of intellectual development and beyond that, the development of scholars, an understanding also strengthened by external pressures. The tension between the research and college ideals remained unresolved. The university continued to provide for the whole person in fragments.
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Chapter 7

Conclusion: The Research Ideal and the College Ideal Reconsidered

Seeking solutions to higher educational pressures of the 1960s, University of South Carolina President Tom Jones developed a reinterpretation of the college ideal for the late twentieth-century university. After 1974, John Gardner successfully promoted Jones's holistic UN101 concept within the mainstream of American higher education. Gardner took it first to student affairs professionals, as a means of achieving partnership with faculty, and second to academic administrators, as a way to improve rates of retention. For the most part, however, the American professoriate ignored or resisted the attempts of UN101 and FYE to persuade them to rethink the hegemonic research ideal to accommodate a humanistic approach to undergraduates. Without their participation, the research ideal remained essentially unchallenged and most disciplines failed to confront collegial issues. The efforts of FYE itself ultimately produced a new specialization in the academy -- that of meeting the transitional needs of first-year students. UN101 and FYE provided many American students sustaining first-year experiences, but did not resolve the inherent conflict between the research and college ideals in the American university.

Jones's preoccupation with students appeared to grow in tandem with his development of USC as a research university. Like Clark Kerr at Berkeley, he saw that the research university focused on knowledge rather than students and neglected education for life. As the 1960s unfolded, education for life grew compelling. From the first, Jones took a personal interest in students and tried to meet their concerns. He also believed that raising the educational level of South Carolinians for economic reasons included changing traditional southern values. Then, as mainstream students perceived
little connection between their studies and citizenship issues, and some actively challenged the university’s moral authority, Jones sought to reconcile research and collegiality to restore education for life as a basic function of the university.

One difficulty in balancing the research and college ideals was that the research ideal failed to promote either integration or stability of knowledge, and therefore no foundation for collegiality. The research ideal did not supply an organizing principle for knowledge to replace the broadly Christian one which integrated American higher education before the twentieth century. Rather than providing a consensual framework for human understanding and connectedness, the research ideal, with its empirical standard for knowledge, regarded them as irrational and speculative. Even humanists turned into technical scholars.

Jones grounded his college ideal in behavioural psychology, which eschewed a priori explanations and drew conclusions from observation of behaviour in “laboratory” settings. He believed that behavioural experiments like the human relations of National Training Laboratories and Human Potential, expressed in educational programs like Upward Bound, demonstrated a collegiality true to the requirements of the research paradigm. They placed persons in unstructured small groups to examine their beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours in interaction with each other. As group members identified and worked on their tasks, they trusted one another more and recognized that their learning came as a result of this interaction. Applying human relations methodology to higher education, Jones concluded that learning is dynamic and results from interaction between teacher/facilitators, students and subject matter. Knowledge and persons are inextricably
linked, as contact between them produces learning and new knowledge. Effective education, then, requires classrooms to become communities in which professors and students freely explore both knowledge and identity, without reliance on tradition or notions of common truth.

By making psychology the foundation of meetings involving professors and students, Jones hoped to bring into the classroom methodology and content that the research paradigm had excluded. The behavioural underpinning of the college ideal could be construed as scientific, because it made students and indeed the collegial approach to learning the subject of empirical inquiry. Jones intended UN101 to train professors to teach experimentally and use specialized content as a catalyst to personal development. In effect, Jones's collegiality relied on -- and was a logical extension of -- the metanarrative of the American research ideal, a secularized Protestant vision of knowledge evolving toward social perfection.² It still stood in tension with the metanarrative, however, because by the terms of the ideal behavioural psychology comprised but one contemporary approach to understanding humanity among many.

The leadership of UN101 and FYE after Jones left USC reflected this essential contradiction. John Gardner built the UN101 concept into a national and international movement. He was a talented educational entrepreneur and manager. Above all, he was a teacher, a pragmatic generalist interested in student development and anything that facilitated it. Though he diligently promoted the UN101 concept as a means of assisting students, his own attraction to NTL was at best lukewarm. Though by following academic procedures he developed a new educational field, Gardner used current concerns and
practical arguments to establish it in the academy through its most receptive audiences — student affairs personnel and institutional administrators. Gardner's UN101 co-directors at USC, Jerry Jewler and Dan Berman, also had generalist backgrounds and were passionate teachers. More attached to specific disciplines than Gardner, however, they were less sanguine about retaining behavioural freedom as they sought academic respectability. Jones's concept demonstrated as much tension between ideals as integration as all three men introduced structure and requirements to counter faculty skepticism at its "touchy-feely" character.

The role of student affairs professionals in the growth of the movement also demonstrated the continuing tension between the ideals. Though this point requires nuancing, it may be argued that before the entrenchment of the research ideal at USC, integration resided in the faculty. The YM/YWCA, a voluntary organization, pioneered many of the functions of student affairs, with student leadership, a faculty board, and widespread faculty approval. The university's dean of students also was a disciplinary specialist. Jones transferred the deanship to a full-time administrator, who took over most of the functions of the Y and denominational chaplaincies, and key members of their staffs, and developed student affairs into a program of study. Charles Witten and his student affairs contemporaries assumed official responsibility for holism in higher education as faculty let it go. They subsequently grew frustrated professionally as the research bias of the professoriate undercut any attempt to achieve a holistic higher educational experience. Most disciplinary specialists not only did not view their own contact with students holistically, but also regarded the student affairs role as lower status,
even suspect in terms of the research paradigm.

Student affairs personnel were keenly aware of the problem of educational integration. Witten experimented with it through Upward Bound. In doing so, he helped set a direction for Jones in his quest to bring together student and institutional needs. The concept Jones developed constituted both a powerful vehicle for student affairs personnel to promote collegiality on campus and a means to achieve partnership status with faculty in the education of students. At first, however, Jones and Witten aimed to achieve integration by training faculty to teach holistically. Witten initially resisted significant student affairs participation in UN101 on the grounds that the seminar aimed to transform faculty attitudes. UN101 required faculty training for this purpose. Because faculty demonstrated reluctance to associate with the concept, however, and student affairs personnel did not, the latter came to sustain USC's UN101. Gardner emphasized that UN101 gave student affairs personnel opportunity to teach and thus gave them a means to become “faculty.” Even in this setting, however, the notion of partnership meant separation, and an isolated rather than integrated holism.

This pattern echoed beyond USC. UN101 grew into FYE partly because Witten encouraged Gardner to take it to his field. Student affairs personnel gave Gardner a platform, published his papers, invited him to their institutions, and started building a critical mass of first-year seminars. Their involvement preserved the uniqueness of the concept and prevented the seminar from becoming simply an academic skills course. It also kept them its main custodians because most faculty declined the partnership idea. As FYE made accommodations to the research context, student affairs personnel generally
did not achieve partnership status in their institutions and their dominance within the movement diminished. Even as their field redefined the focus of its contribution to higher education from personal development, per se, to supporting higher learning through personal development, many student affairs personnel found their involvement with the UN101 concept evolving into an academic specialization.

The dominant faculty response to the UN101 concept also demonstrated the tension between the research and college ideals. In the Jones era, USC revised its expectations for faculty and students. Previously, the university placed more emphasis on teaching than research. Faculty had time and “room” to educate, if they desired. Further, relatively low entrance standards suggest that grades did not define the educational experience of students. Jones introduced competitive research standards for faculty and students which made previous standards appear lax and unproductive, but which reflected academic ambitions that had little to do with students. These standards made faculty’s own holism problematic, but they provided a context in which faculty might pursue academic ambitions. The swelling of the professoriate required to teach the baby boomers established a critical mass of faculty primarily acquainted with research expectations. Interest in teaching became remarkable rather than normal. Disturbed by the increasingly evident human cost of the research ideal, Jones made sustained efforts to revive interest in teaching, but most faculty did not respond. When Jones discovered the pedagogical concept which he believed bridged the college and research ideals, faculty resistance led him to bypass and “strong-arm” academic channels to establish it.

Again, this pattern extended beyond USC. UN101 and FYE attracted faculty
interest, but never more than a smattering from a wide range of disciplines. It drew more representatives of disciplines like psychology, education, English, and the social sciences than from hard or applied sciences. The disciplines which originated and supported the UN101 concept in fact may have hindered general academic acceptance. The traditional academic bias against “impractical” subjects, which Jones acknowledged when he turned to social experimentation as USC’s main hope for research funding, continued to affect faculty attitudes. Most FYE conference key speakers and publications reflected psychology, education, and student affairs perspectives and methodologies. It did not help that many in these disciplines, including some lacking the Ph.D., and not attuned to the full rigours of a discipline in the traditional sense, implied in their advocacy of holistic higher education that faculty could not be trusted to teach without having been trained in their ideas. They argued that professors should be educators based on the psychology of education first and content specialists second. The lack of integration inherent in the research ideal, however, meant not only that academics communicated poorly across disciplines, but that pedagogical approaches amounted to theory. Clearly academics could not be expected to conform to one theory, if any.

To meet and overcome faculty resistance, Gardner promoted the institutional benefits of the UN101 concept and offered senior administrators incentives to attend FYE conferences. These strategies succeeded. In the early 1980s administrator involvement increased significantly and the number of institutions introducing first-year programs snowballed. Often programs co-existed uneasily with faculty and occasionally, when their champions moved, folded. Although faculty participated at the institution level in planning
and approving FYE-inspired programs, they did not disturb established conceptions of academic practice. Instead of evolving a new integration in the academy, the UN101 concept stimulated a further fragmentation as disciplinary specialists hived off the task of assimilating fresh students to their requirements to first-year specialists. FYE inadvertently facilitated this development by providing a disciplinary organization, conference, journal, textbooks, and resource centre.

UN101 and FYE’s drive for academic acceptance rendered ambiguous its crusade to re-establish collegiality in American higher education. This ambiguity had roots in Jones’s seemingly contradictory aims for UN101. Jones hoped UN101 would promote both collegiality, by transforming the nature of the university through making inquiry inseparable from the person, and research, by socializing students into the university. If its revolutionary focus on the person weakened, in the end UN101 would serve mainly its conservative purpose. Its humanism would amount to simple courtesy. Alternatively, as behavioural “programming,” the course could keep students dependent on cheap affirmation, and not fully respect their autonomy and personal dignity, thus paradoxically teaching them to receive rather than create learning. At worst, UN101 would become an institutional marketing strategy. USC’s UN101 came to emphasize traditional rather than process-oriented academic modes. Further, the university utilized UN101 to condition students to accept questionable learning conditions. In 1986, USC’s assistant provost told the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges that USC used UN101 to make incoming students more sympathetic to teaching assistants who did not speak English clearly. Increasing subservience to research-driven standards and
institutional priorities appeared to upset the balance between UN101’s revolutionary and conservative aims and diminish the possibility that it would transform the academy humanistically. Paul Fidler’s assessments showed that UN101 consistently achieved its conservative purpose. While Gardner held onto Jones’s radical legacy both in UN101 and in his involvement with other educational innovators beyond USC, it became less apparent in rhetoric and practice and, eventually, something of a historical curiosity.

Gardner believed the accommodations to traditional academic structure necessary to the advancement of his movement. The research ideal allowed the UN101 concept to survive. But it also undermined it. Fundamentally, the ideal’s lack of integration prevented FYE from furnishing the academy with a generally applicable new collegial paradigm. Nevertheless, FYE’s promotion of the concept did perceptibly change the character of the American undergraduate experience. It stimulated the majority of educational institutions in the United States, and many elsewhere, to institutionalize means of addressing student needs to foster successful transitions into higher education. Though the UN101 model gradually admitted academic structure, it contained elements that connected the educational experience with the person. Even without an integrating basis, holism in the classroom in their first year made higher education more compelling to students and strengthened their commitment.

By the late 1980s, concern regarding the apparent lack of ethical grounding in some students provided fresh impetus to keep alive the pursuit of the personal in higher education that had emerged from the 1960s. Recognized as one of the most influential educators in America, Gardner helped facilitate the discussion. There was some evidence
that Jones’s collegial vision might produce academic change despite disciplinary
resistance. The drive to humanize the first year stimulated many institutions to embark
on the behavioural and interdisciplinary assessment of the undergraduate curriculum
sought by student developers like Boyer and the Astins. This perhaps was a hopeful sign,
but the university’s discomfort with the personal remained unresolved. The Carnegie
report, Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America’s Research
Universities (1998), published in Boyer’s memory, pointedly aligned student development
behind the research ideal “rather than striving to replicate the special environment of the
liberal arts college.”


3 “Student affairs must model what we wish for our students: an ever increasing capacity for learning and self-reflection. By redesigning its work with these aims in mind, student affairs will significantly contribute to realizing the institution’s mission and students’ educational and personal aspirations” (“The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs,” Statement from the American College Personnel Association Meeting, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1994).

4 These included enhancing the reputation of the institution in order to attract better faculty, students, and academic rewards.

5 Other tendencies of interested faculty included an interdisciplinary perspective, crossover between academic and student affairs, or willingness to experiment with student-centred teaching near the end of a faculty career.


10 The debate is generating a volume of discussion on the nature of the university comparable to that of the late 1960s and early 1970s. For example, see Julius Getman, In the Company of Scholars: The Struggle for the Soul of Higher Education (Austin: University of Texas, 1992); David Damrosch, We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the
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