

The American University: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow

James Piereson  
Senior Fellow, The Manhattan Institute

[jpiereson@yahoo.com](mailto:jpiereson@yahoo.com)

**Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author**

Prepared for the American Enterprise Institute Conference, “Reforming the Politically Correct  
University,”  
November 14, 2007

The collected papers for this conference can be found at [www.aei.org/event1595](http://www.aei.org/event1595)

There are today nearly 18 million students enrolled in the more than 4,000 colleges and universities currently operating in the United States. Over the next few years enrollments will continue to increase because the high school graduating class of 2008 will be the largest ever. In a few years, enrollments will approach 20 million students at which point they are expected to level off and perhaps even to decline.<sup>1</sup> Today nearly 70% of the age cohort (18 to 24) attends college in one form or another, and more than 80% of high school graduates do so. College attendance is now a near universal rite of passage for youngsters in our society, primarily because a college degree has become an essential requirement for entry into the world of professional employment. Parents make sacrifices, financial and otherwise, to send their children to college primarily because they wish them to succeed in the competitive marketplace. Of course, they wish them to be educated as well but they have little clear sense as to what that actually means.

This fall another two million or so 18 and 19 year-olds entered the academic world as college freshmen at institutions ranging from small liberal arts colleges with perhaps 2,000 students to large public universities with as many as 50,000 students. A small fraction of these students will attend institutions that are highly selective, admitting only between ten and twenty percent of applicants, while the vast majority will enroll in institutions which for all practical purposes operate on the basis of open admission. More than 40 percent (or 6.7 million) of undergraduate students attend two year community colleges, a rapidly growing segment of the college market. A few students who are either fortunate or enterprising will acquire over the course of four years a superb education in the liberal arts while many others will acquire little of lasting value, aside from their degrees. The educational experience for college students in the

United States today is thus widely diverse—and along many more dimensions than referred to here.

Amidst all this variation there exists a curious conformity among our institutions of higher learning. With but few exceptions, our colleges and universities define their mission in terms of a political ideology that most Americans find more than a little strange. This, of course, is the idea of diversity which originated out of the laudable goal of enrolling more minority students in academic institutions but gradually metastasized into a doctrine which asserts (usually without demonstration) that the history of the United States is one of exclusion and oppression of minorities caused in great part by the nation's commitment to property, individual rights, and the free market. Academic leaders believe that it is the job of the university to expose this oppression in all of its forms and to take steps to make up for it by providing representation in the faculty, the student body, and the curriculum for the various groups that have been its victims. This doctrine is appealed to repeatedly in academic publications and promotional brochures put out by colleges and universities. Judging by these publications, this point of view is especially influential in the most prestigious and selective institutions. Few academics who seek advancement in their profession dare to criticize or even to question this doctrine. One wonders why it has been necessary to endorse such a tendentious doctrine in order to insure equal treatment for all when this goal is perfectly consistent with the traditional tenets of liberalism. In an enterprise devoted to challenging just about every received idea, it is strange indeed that this is exempted from questioning and criticism.<sup>2</sup>

Many of the highly publicized controversies that have occurred on campuses throughout the country can be traced back to the diversity ideology, including the dismissal of Lawrence Summers as President of Harvard University, the elimination of ROTC from most leading

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

institutions, the statement by University of Colorado professor Ward Churchill that the victims of the World Trade Center attacks were “little Eichmanns” who had it coming, the tragic fiasco at Duke University where 88 faculty members declared members of the lacrosse team guilty of sexual assault before any facts were known, a highly publicized dispute a few years ago at Columbia University over the (alleged) anti-Israel bias of faculty members teaching courses on the Middle East, and the now routine protests and disruptions when conservative speakers show up on campus. When academic institutions are in the news (leaving aside their athletic teams), the story is usually related to some transgression or extreme expression of the diversity ideology.

Many who are distressed at the politicization of the academy and the quality of education now offered there see the diversity doctrine as a key source of these troubling developments. The critique of American society as racist, sexist, and materialistic obviously extends to Western Civilization in general, leading in turn a de-emphasis of this vital subject in the curriculum, its place taken by new courses in feminism, environmentalism, and sexuality. Whole areas of study, such as military, constitutional, and diplomatic history once thought to be essential to the education of the young, have largely disappeared from the curriculum. Faculty hiring has been compromised by the imposition of diversity criteria in the recruitment process. Standards for admission and graduation have been weakened. In the process, faculty opinion on political issues has moved steadily leftward in keeping with the ideological thrust of the doctrine. A recent national survey of college faculty by Stanley Rothman and Robert Lichter showed that over 72% held liberal and left of center views while just 18% held conservative views, and that over time, especially since 1980, academic opinion has moved steadily leftward as the generation shaped by the 1960s has taken control of academe. A 2005 study of voting registration among professors at California universities political issues has moved steadily leftward in keeping with

the ideological thrust of the doctrine. A recent national survey of college faculty by Stanley Rothman and Robert Lichter showed that over 72% held liberal and left of center views while just 18% held conservative views, and that over time, especially since 1980, academic opinion has moved steadily leftward as the generation shaped by the 1960s has taken control of academe. A 2005 study of voting registration among professors at California universities revealed that Democrats outnumbered Republicans by a five to one ratio and at the Berkeley by a ratio of ten to one. Other studies of faculty opinion have confirmed these broad findings.<sup>3</sup> Students at many prominent colleges report that they are subjected to a steady drumbeat of political propaganda in their courses, especially those in the humanities and the social sciences.<sup>4</sup>

What is the source of this conformity among institutions that on other dimensions are so varied and diverse? Are there trends in process or reforms that can be implemented that might weaken or displace the diversity orthodoxy and produce thereby some genuine intellectual pluralism both within and among our colleges and universities? Is there any likelihood that the universities of the future—the universities of 2030 or 2050—will look substantially different from those that we see around us today? After all, the college graduate of 1940 or 1950 must have some difficulty recognizing his *alma mater* in reports from the campus that he reads today. There is every reason to believe that college graduates of 2000 will look similarly upon their institutions thirty or fifty years from now.

The major colleges and universities in the nation today operate as never before within a single market for top students and faculty, which is one of the reasons for the ideological conformity that we see on the campus. It is very common today, as it was not in 1900 or 1950, for students to travel long distances from home to attend college. As a consequence, they tend to

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

assess their college choices from a national point of view, in contrast to the local or regional perspective that probably guided their parents and grandparents.

There is a tendency in such markets for competitors to conform along important dimensions, which is accentuated in an industry where standards of excellence are established by a few prestigious institutions. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, colleges tend to recruit their new faculty from a small number of graduate institutions who train and socialize their students in common disciplinary practices. Professors expect to be able to move from one institution to another without changing their approaches to teaching and research. Institutions that vary too widely from the expected standard will be blacklisted by faculty organizations like the American Association of University Professors or marked by a badge of academic inferiority. Colleges and universities must follow the tenure model in hiring and promotion or otherwise risk condemnation by national faculty organizations. Colleges and universities must hew to commonly accepted standards in personnel and admissions policies and in the programs they offer in order to qualify for federal grants or to win certification from accrediting bodies. The rankings of institutions put out annually by a few national publications, such as *U.S. News and World Report*, further reinforce these tendencies toward a national market of institutions that conform to an established standard. Institutions that reject the diversity ideology as a guide to practice do so at the risk of being viewed as outside the mainstream. These trends toward nationalization and conformity have been underway since at least the 1950s, and as yet show no clear signs of abating.

A further reason why colleges and universities have been able to indulge so much apparently self-defeating conduct is that they are prospering financially as never before. The competition for entry into our leading institutions is keener than ever owing to a recent

population boom among college-age youngsters. Parents are now willing to pay extravagant tuitions to send their sons and daughters to institutions that they believe will give them a leg up in the competition for good jobs. Tuitions have been rising at leading institutions for the past quarter century at rates far ahead of inflation, reflecting the rising prosperity of the top five or ten percent of the wealth distribution. Philanthropists continue lavish large donations on prestigious institutions. Colleges and university endowments, fueled by the stock market boom of the past quarter century, have reached levels never dreamed of before. In 1981, only one institution (Harvard) had an endowment exceeding \$1 billion; today more than sixty institutions have endowments exceeding this sum. Harvard's endowment reached \$29 billion in 2006, Yale's \$18 billion, Stanford's and Princeton's \$14 and \$13 billion respectively. Princeton's endowment is nearly \$2 million per student, which effectively yields about \$100,000 per student annually—a sum that is more than double the annual tuition. Many state universities, such as Michigan, Virginia, and Texas, sit on large endowments even though they receive annual subventions from the public treasury.<sup>5</sup> Even so, the academic revolution of the past generation has witnessed the rise of elite private institutions at the expense of public universities. In recent rankings of national universities published by *US News and World Report*, the top twenty positions were held down by private institutions. Among the top thirty institutions, only five were public, the rest private.<sup>6</sup> This is a reversal from rankings taken during the 1960s when several public universities (including California-Berkeley, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota) were ranked among the top ten national universities and several others were ranked in the top twenty.

Such endowments, besides providing a financial cushion, also provide colleges and universities with a measure of independence from public opinion and protection from critics who are wont to catalog their failures and excesses. It is always difficult to bring reform to

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

institutions that are prospering from current practices. No transgression seems serious enough to inflict any serious pain on these institutions. Indeed, academic leaders often find in these embarrassments new opportunities to raise funds. After the controversies surrounding its Middle Eastern studies programs, Columbia University sought funds to encourage inter-religious understanding on its campus. It is a good question how these institutions, long accustomed to abundance and prosperity, would adapt to a climate of austerity. One could make the case that the diversity orthodoxy is a byproduct of prosperity and expansion, an indulgence that could not be underwritten in a climate of scarcity and real competition for resources among institutions.

The growth in recent years of online universities, such as the University of Phoenix, American Intercontinental University, Capella University, among many others, is taken by some as an emerging source of competition for established institutions. The University of Phoenix (the largest of the online institutions) has more than 200,000 students enrolled in its programs and is enjoying rapid growth. Thus far, however, the online universities have appealed mainly to the adult education market, with an emphasis on courses in business and professional training. There is as yet no strong evidence that such program can compete with residential colleges for the patronage of the young for whom higher education is tied up with separation from parents and day to day association with peers. Some (such as John Silber) doubt that online courses can ever replace the dedicated teacher in the classroom. The University of Phoenix has been criticized for offering courses that do not meet minimum academic standards and for employing itinerant faculty members who come and go from semester to semester. It has also been embroiled in lawsuits with the federal government for alleged misuse of public funds. It is still far too early to tell whether these online programs will eventually pose a serious competitive challenge to established four-year institutions.<sup>7</sup>

At the same time, these institutions have only scratched the surface of the enormous educational potential of online technologies. In a society in which youngsters are far more adept than adults at using these technologies, it seems safe to predict that innovative educational products will be developed to appeal to the rising generation. There is no inherent reason why online technologies cannot be put to use by residential institutions of all kinds. In the future, we may see eminent professors at prestigious institutions contracting with private companies to produce high level courses that are taken for credit by students enrolled at institutions throughout the country. Universities may begin to market online courses developed by their own professors. As these products expand, administrators will find that they do not need to hire as many faculty members as before. In this way students in the future will not be limited to taking courses from professors on their own campuses but will be able to select courses in a national market while studying in a residential institution. Students will thereby be given the opportunity to “vote with their feet” in the selection of courses—and will be able to render an up or down verdict on the curriculum to which they have been subjected in recent decades. This represents the next stage in the nationalization—indeed, the internationalization—of the academic marketplace.

Critics of the contemporary academy suggest various steps that might be taken to blunt the influence of the diversity ideology, to restore rigor and coherence to the traditional liberal arts curriculum, and to open up the campus to intellectual approaches that are widely held in the society at large but are not much found on today’s campus. Most agree that colleges and universities cannot be ignored because, like it or not, they play an important role in shaping the minds of students; in addition, the ideas that have currency on the campus eventually find their way into socially influential professions, such as law, business, journalism, and public service. Conservatives who are not well represented on the campus have been able to develop and

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

circulate ideas by means of influential think tanks, such as the American Enterprise Institute, which are able to speak more effectively and directly to government officials, journalists, and public policy experts. Yet over the long run conservatives will find that this tactic will be difficult to sustain without augmenting it with a foothold in the academy.

There are some encouraging signs that the diversity crusade that has preoccupied activists and administrators over the past generation has begun to run its course. After several decades of intense effort, recruitment of minority students has reached a level where from this time forward only modest marginal gains are likely to be realized. This fact, combined with the embarrassments brought down by activists on institutions like Duke, Harvard, and Columbia, will gradually lead administrators and academic leaders to turn their attention to other academic challenges. There is a growing sense among administrators that diversity activists may at any time provoke controversies that will bring embarrassment to their institutions. Even the attacks on Western Civilization which once at least seemed bold, new, and exciting are beginning to take on a weary and boring countenance. Calls for renewal of the traditional humanities curriculum are beginning to come from unlikely sources.<sup>8</sup> If this is so, opportunities will gradually open up at many institutions to restore some semblance of the traditional liberal arts curriculum and to recruit faculty who are competent to teach it.

Some have suggested that new colleges, universities, or graduate schools should be founded so that they might be established from the beginning on sound principles. Others advocate the restoration of a required core curriculum based on the great books of Western Civilization. Some wish to influence philanthropists so that their funds are used to support sound programs instead of being directed into already swollen endowments. Still others urge the creation of new academic centers based in one way or another on the ideals of American

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

institutions or on the works of Western Civilization, an incremental strategy of first gaining entry into the academy and then, once in, building support among students and sympathetic faculty. All of these have merit, though a few strategies seem more promising than others. Conservative reformers understand that to change the university they must follow a course of thoughtful incremental action; they cannot employ the tactics of demand and confrontation that leftists employed in the 1960s to turn their institutions inside out.

The creation of new institutions is a particularly challenging enterprise today in view of the costs involved and the great difficulty of overcoming the reputational advantages of established institutions. The early half of the nineteenth century was a particularly fertile period for the creation of new religious colleges. The evangelical revivals of the period combined with the westward movement of the population contributed to the creation of countless religious colleges across the Midwestern and Plains states. Following the Civil War and into the 1920s, wealthy philanthropists like John D. Rockefeller, Leland Stanford, and Cornelius Vanderbilt created a host of now prominent institutions such as the University of Chicago, Vanderbilt University, Stanford University, Johns Hopkins, Clark University, Rice Institute, and many others. Most of these were research institutions with generally secular (rather than religious) orientations. Rockefeller contributed \$80 million to establish the University of Chicago in 1892 and Stanford around \$20 million (plus a grant of land) to establish Stanford University in 1891. In short order both became nationally prominent universities, as did Johns Hopkins, Clark, and Vanderbilt. It was, of course, much less expensive to establish such institutions at that time because expensive scientific equipment was not then required as it is today to launch a respectable institution of higher learning. In addition, the nationalization of academic life was then in its early stages and had not yet formed a firm reputational hierarchy among institutions.<sup>9</sup>

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

By far the great proportion of new institutions created since 1950 have been public universities in states with rapid population growth. It is difficult to name many private institutions that have been created since 1950 that are competitive with the leading institutions established in earlier periods or indeed with many public institutions created in the modern era. Brandeis University (established in 1948) comes to mind but few others. Liberty University, a fundamentalist college established in 1971 by the late Rev. Jerry Falwell, has made great strides in this direction, but it cannot yet be said to pose as yet a challenge to well established institutions. On the other hand, the list of public institutions that have been established since 1950 is a very long one. Few private donors can afford the near-prohibitive costs of establishing a private college or university that might compete with the well established institutions created in earlier periods. Only a few people like Bill Gates or Warren Buffett could afford to consider it, and they are not inclined to do so. In this day and age, private philanthropists (even the minority who happen to be conservative) seem more inclined to make gifts to already existing institutions, thus taking advantage of their established programs, reputations, and physical plants. To be sure, private colleges have been established in our era but by and large they have been created to appeal to narrowly defined segments of the population, usually according to religious principles, or are based on new online technologies.

The effort to restore a core curriculum based on Western Civilization or on the great books runs into equally imposing difficulties. There is most certainly a strong case to be made for a required core curriculum in the great works of Western Civilization that is taken by all students as a condition of graduation. The late Allan Bloom wrote a best-selling book two decades ago making just this case.<sup>10</sup> Yet while many people bought his book, few seem to have endorsed Bloom's conclusions. Most of the prestigious colleges and universities around the

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

country have long since adopted (following the lead of Harvard University) undergraduate curricula that are based on very loose distributional requirements under which students must take a certain number of courses in their academic majors and then a couple of courses each in other broad areas of study. Many colleges, such as Amherst and Brown, have no requirements at all beyond that of accumulating a certain number of credits for graduation. With few exceptions there is no longer any required core curriculum in place at the leading undergraduate institutions and thus no coherent body of knowledge that students are expected to master before graduation. The intellectual consensus that once supported the core curriculum has long since been shattered. There are, consequently, few professors at our leading institutions who would be competent to teach courses in a core curriculum in Western Civilization and perhaps even fewer who would be sympathetic to the enterprise in the first place. After all, these are the faculty members who dismantled the old curriculum or who have been trained under the new dispensation that was put in place following the upheavals of the 1960s. In order to establish a core curriculum worth having, it would first be necessary to replace the faculties at most institutions – certainly an unlikely prospect. There is on top of this the question as to where new professors competent to teach such a curriculum would be trained in view of the intellectual foci of most graduate programs in the humanities.

As an alternative to the above approaches, there is the strategy pursued successfully by Robert George at Princeton, Charles Kesler and his colleagues at Claremont McKenna College, and John Tomasi at Brown University under which academic centers are created on the campus to promote the study of some aspect of Western Civilization. These centers are established with the permission of deans, provosts, and departmental chairmen, and funded by modest grants from foundations and alumni. They cannot be introduced everywhere because they require for their

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

success a faculty member on the inside (preferably tenured) who is willing and able to devote time and energy to making them work. Yet there are many advantages to proceeding along these lines. The directors of such programs do not require elaborate faculty approvals in order to proceed, which would be required if they sought to make changes in the curriculum. They can be launched with modest contributions which may then be augmented from year to year as the programs gain strength on their campuses. In some cases, the directors can recruit post-doctoral fellows who may be given approval to offer courses to undergraduates. This is already happening at several institutions, including Princeton and Brown. When these courses are popular and draw significant followings among undergraduates, they send signals to administrators as to the kinds of course students wish to take. These initiatives also bring speakers to campus who would otherwise not be invited and organize conferences and symposia on subjects not in favor among the majority of professors. In time, if done well, these programs encourage a wider dialogue on campus and make students aware of alternative ways of studying politics, economics, history, and related subjects. There now exist philanthropic efforts, such as the Veritas Fund at the Manhattan Institute, willing to invest in such enterprises.

Thus, as we look into the future, the academic landscape is unlikely to be altered very much by the founding of new private institutions called into being by frustration with current colleges. Nor are we likely to see any time soon the re-introduction of traditional core curricula at our leading colleges and universities. Desirable as these instruments of change may be, they will not be able anytime soon to overcome the financial and political obstacles with which they are faced. We are, however, very likely to see the creation of undergraduate programs in the liberal arts that look very much like traditional departments in that they recruit their own

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

faculties, offer a roster of courses, and allow students to enroll in them as a major area of study.

In this way the liberal arts curriculum will return to the campus as a field of elective study.

The incremental nature of this process is likely to frustrate those who look for large and immediate changes in the academy. Many ask why, if such changes can be introduced from the left, they cannot also be brought into the academy from a conservative direction. This question takes us into speculations about the inner character of the American university and where, given the momentum provided from the past, it is likely to move in the future.

In his book, *The Soul of the American University*, George M. Marsden suggests that the American college and university has evolved according to the unwinding assumptions of liberal thought beginning with the founding of the first institution of higher learning on North American soil in Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1636. Marsden's particular concern is with the question of how colleges and universities founded by Christians for religious purposes evolved into the entirely secular institutions that we see today. However, since in this context secular and liberal are more or less interchangeable terms, Marsden implicitly raises the question as to how the academy became home to orthodox liberalism.<sup>11</sup> From the beginning, the ideals of diversity, inclusion, and universalism were central to the evolution of our institutions of higher learning. Nearly all of the colleges established in the colonial era from the founding of Harvard College down to the Revolution were of a Protestant character and were created to train ministers in one or another of the denominational faiths. At the time of the Revolution, there were nine colonial colleges, all (save for one) with denominational affiliations. Harvard, Yale, and Dartmouth were of Puritan (or congregational) origins; Kings College (later re-named Columbia) and William and Mary were Anglican; the College of New Jersey (later Princeton) was Presbyterian; Brown was founded by Baptists; Queens College (later Rutgers) by Dutch reformers. Among these early

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

institutions, only the University of Pennsylvania was secular in origin. By the time of the Revolution, these institutions faced a challenge of absorbing students representing different denominations in their educational programs. One solution, tried at Kings College, was to appoint Presbyterian or Puritan professors to teach theology to students of those faiths—a solution which proved unworkable in institutions which sought to define their missions in terms of broad or inclusive principles. A solution was found in the teaching of an inclusive form of Christianity that embraced the various denominational faiths, which left the more specific doctrinal issues to be expounded from the pulpits of the particular churches.

As Marsden shows, this approach gave way in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to an even more inclusive point of view in the form of moral science. This was a secular, even a scientific, version of human morals that developed out of the Scottish Enlightenment and which located the sense of right and wrong in inborn human sentiments. The important aspect of the new moral science was that it held that moral principles could be discovered by the exercise of reason through the study of man. These principles of human sociability did not conflict with Christian doctrine, though the new moral science pointed to a new way of discovering established truths. Thus, as American colleges evolved during the colonial and early-Republican periods, Christian inclusion replaced denominational exclusion and moral science replaced theology as the basis for moral teaching.<sup>12</sup>

The reformation of American universities according to the German research model following the Civil War extended these trends still further in secular and scientific directions.<sup>13</sup> The German model, incorporated into the founding of Johns Hopkins University in 1876 and then extended to other major institutions in the decades that followed, was based on the independent professor's search for truth through the methods of scientific inquiry. This approach

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

pushed theology and religion even further into the background of academic teaching and research, though Christian leaders remained convinced that the fruits of science would reveal rather than displace the laws of God. It further established research as a central activity of the university, implying thereby that the university would henceforth be organized around the discovery of new truths rather than by the teaching of old ones. The new model revolutionized the academy, leading in a short period of time to institutional governance by the faculty, academic freedom as a basic right of professors, the tenure system, and a revamped curriculum that stressed secular and scientific studies. The German influence, shaped as it was by the historical school of thought, was strongly at odds with the assumptions of the Scottish and British enlightenments which played such an important role in the founding of the Republic and the earlier efforts to bring scientific knowledge into the academy. That earlier school of thought, represented most clearly in the writings of Locke, Hume and Adam Smith, was judged by the modern scholars to be formalistic, abstract, and unhistorical and therefore viewed as something to be overcome by modern historical scholarship. Thus was introduced into the American academy ideas that were in tension with those that shaped the formative institutions of the nation.<sup>14</sup>

The student upheavals of the 1960s led to further organizational and intellectual changes in the university that pushed these trends about as far as they could be taken. The concepts of diversity and inclusion, deployed as ideals to promote the recruitment of women and minorities on to the campus, had something in common with earlier attempts in the eighteenth century to broaden the definition of Protestant Christianity so as to encompass different denominational interests. The modern academic dogma, however, is not nearly as coherent as that earlier synthesis, because in our era the efforts to accommodate new groups was undertaken by creating

Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.

special places for them on the faculty and in the curriculum of study. This has been accompanied by an historical doctrine which claims that these exceptions and exemptions are required as means of redressing the abuses of the past.

In this way, contemporary academic doctrine, such as it is, incorporates the same tensions between the abstract ideal of equality and the narrower interests of groups that we see in liberal thought in general. The great difference in our era is that the markers between the life of the academy and that of the democratic polity surrounding it have been blurred to the point where they are barely detectable. What we see in the contemporary academy, therefore, represents not only an accommodation to new groups on the campus, but also an accommodation to the influence of those same groups in the wider polity. American colleges and universities, which were created and driven forward in their early years by religious preoccupations, have today been captured by secular political interests.

Thus we can see that the momentum for change in the American academy has come mainly from one direction—that is, from secular and democratic directions. Such momentum is not of recent vintage but stretches back to the origins of American colleges and universities. Those who would change the academy from other directions must do so in the face of strong historical headwinds. This is not a reason to abandon these efforts but rather a cause for assessing which tactics are most likely to bring improvement.

Given this enduring pattern in the evolution of the American university, it is possible to anticipate the outlines of some of the controversies on the horizon in the ongoing struggle to shape our institutions of higher learning. As the diversity thrust loses steam, liberal and far-left groups on the campus will not be at a loss for new causes to absorb their attention and energy. The next iteration of liberal reform in the universities is likely to involve further steps to detach

these institutions from the American polity in which they are embedded. We have already noted that the intellectual foundations of the modern research university are somewhat at odds with the philosophy of natural rights that shaped our national institutions. The logic of liberalism points in the direction of the internationalization of the American university. We can already see fragments of this emerging trend at work in the banning of ROTC and military recruiters from college campuses in order to disassociate universities from American national policies. The enrollment of international students will receive greater emphasis in the coming decades which will further reinforce the trend. Academic programs in American government or in American studies will be increasingly de-emphasized on the grounds that they are parochial, in much the same way as programs in Western Civilization were de-emphasized in the past. If colleges and universities continue to augment their financial strength, some may reach a point where they are no longer in need of government grants and other kinds of governmental support. It seems strange and perhaps even impossible to think that universities can detach themselves from the nation which funds, protects, and encourages them—yet it would have seemed just as strange a century ago to have asserted that within a few generations these same institutions would divest themselves of all religious influence.

It is wise for reformers to remind themselves that in seeking to bring change to the academy they are aiming at a target that is never at rest. Such is the nature of the university in a competitive and dynamic society—that is, in a liberal society. As they gear up to contest the battles of today to restore liberal studies to the campus or to eliminate quotas and preferential hiring, they should also be prepared to engage new ones on the horizon.

---

<sup>1</sup> These figures are taken from *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 31, 2007. See p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> For a cogent discussion of the diversity doctrine and its origins, along with the ways in which it conflicts with the traditional ideals of liberalism, see Peter Wood, *Diversity: The Invention of a Concept* (San Francisco: Encounter

---

Books, 2003). On a related theme, see Roger Kimball, *Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education* (New York: Harper & Row, 1990), especially Chapter 1, “The Assault on the Canon.”

<sup>3</sup> Stanley Rothman, S. Robert Lichter, and Neil Nevitte, “Politics and Professional Advancement among College Faculty,” *The Forum*, Vol. 3 (2005); Christopher F. Cardiff and Daniel B. Klein, “Faculty Partisan Affiliations in All Disciplines,” *Critical Review*, Vol. 17 (2005); Daniel B. Klein and Carlotta Stern, “Professors and their Politics: The Policy Views of Social Scientists,” *Critical Review*, Vol. 17 (2005); Gary A. Tobin and Aryeh K. Weinberg, *Profiles of the American University, Volume I: Political Beliefs and Behavior of College Faculty* (San Francisco: Institute for Jewish and Community Research, 2006).

<sup>4</sup> See American Council of Trustees and Alumni, “Politics in the Classroom: A Survey of Students at the Top Fifty Universities,” October-November, 2004.

<sup>5</sup> The college and university endowment figures for 2006 can be found in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 31, 2007, p. 32.

<sup>6</sup> See, U.S. News and World Report, *America’s Best Colleges 2008* ([www.colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com](http://www.colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com)).

<sup>7</sup> “Troubles Grow for a University Built on Profits,” *New York Times*, February 11, 2007, p. 1.

<sup>8</sup> For a recent call for renewal of the humanities, see Anthony Kronman, *Education’s End: Why Our Colleges and Universities Have Given Up on the Meaning of Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007).

<sup>9</sup> On the rise of the modern research university, see Lawrence Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965). On the formation of the University of Chicago and Johns Hopkins University, see George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), Chapters 9 and 14.

<sup>10</sup> See Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*: (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987).

<sup>11</sup> George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter 2. See also, Douglas Sloan, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1971), Chapters 3 and 4.

<sup>13</sup> Veysey, *op. cit.*, remains the best source for the transformation of the American university along the lines of the German model.

<sup>14</sup> On the conflict between the German influences and the ideals of the Scottish enlightenment, see Moron White, *Social Thought in America: The Revolt against Formalism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957). In this volume, White examines several influential Progressive figures, including John Dewey, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Thorstein Veblen, and Charles Beard.