

The
UNIVERSITY
BOOKMAN

A Quarterly Review

Editor: Russell Kirk

Autumn, 1971

Vol. XII, No. 1

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Right On—Up With Higher Education! Donald Marquand Dozer | 3 |
| The Teacher Surplus: Boon or Bombshell? ... Frank D. Albro | 14 |
| Passive and Immature Students R. W. Reising | 18 |
| (Review of <i>Why College Students Fail</i> , by Pitcher and Blau-shild) | |
| Champion of 'Let Things Alone' Regis A. Courtemanche | 22 |
| (Review of <i>Frédéric Bastiat: A Man Alone</i> , by George Charles Roche III) | |
| Notes on Contributors | 13 |

THE UNIVERSITY BOOKMAN is published four times a year by The Educational Reviewer, Inc., 50 Emmett St., Bristol, Conn. Copyright 1971 in the U.S.A. by The Educational Reviewer, Inc. All manuscripts, letters, subscription orders, changes of address and undeliverable copies should be sent to:

THE UNIVERSITY BOOKMAN
 P.O. Box 3070
 Grand Central Station
 New York, N.Y., 10017

RATES: \$2.00 a year.

The editor cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editor.

**Right On—Up With
 Higher Education!**

DONALD MARQUAND DOZER

"**W**E WILL take control of your world, your corporation, your university," Mark Rudd, leader of the rebellion at Columbia University, wrote to President Grayson Kirk in the spring of 1968. "There is only one thing left to say," Rudd concluded. "Up against the wall! This is a stick-up!"

Since then, Rudd's defiance of higher education has been echoed by thousands of militant students, non-students, and their faculty supporters. They have thrown colleges and universities on the defensive. They have terrorized university presidents. They have intimidated faculties and have shattered traditional curricula. They are threatening the future of higher education in America.

In the first eight months of 1969 campus disruptions caused property damage estimated at \$8.9 million. According to studies made by Alexander W. Austin, research chief for the American Council on Education, 155 out of 195 campuses which his team surveyed experienced disruptive student incidents between September 1968 and February 1970. Of these, 175 incidents were directed against aspects of the college or university itself on 84 of the campuses; the remaining 260 incidents on the 71 other campuses involved protests against Vietnam, pollution, the "Chicago Seven" trial, and the like. Between January and March 1970 more than 30 cases of arson occurred on college campuses with total damage exceeding \$500,000. Sather Gate in Berkeley, Morningside Park in New York City, University Hall in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Isla Vista in Santa Barbara, California, have become bywords for rioting and mindless destruction with higher education as their targets.

Serious as the physical destruction has been, far more serious has been the damage to morale of faculty and students. "We are parents of a student at your campus," runs a letter written to a campus newspaper in California. "We were so proud when our daughter was accepted . . . at your beautiful and excellent school. We are no longer proud. We are appalled that the majority of

students . . . would allow a few radicals to ruin the reputation of such a fine school." Higher education is alienated from the public. It is also undergoing a crisis of self-confidence, as faculties and administrators themselves confess their lack of faith in the values they have professed to represent.

The alienation of colleges and universities from society has been mainly self-induced and self-propelled. The cause for it is not to be found in student acts of defiance; these acts have merely exposed the hollowness of much that masks itself as higher education. Long before students began to voice their complaints about the political involvements of institutions of higher education, colleges and universities—both public and private—were mirroring the concerns and preoccupations of contemporary society. They committed themselves to the ideology of a state-structured society which would be exclusively political and salvationist. Through their willing identification with government policies they accepted political criteria as measure of their success as educational institutions, they permitted erosion of their educational integrity, and they forfeited their capacity for academic balance and real dialogue. Drawn by the magnet of political power, institutions of higher learning thus accepted the responsibility of living entirely in the "now," but they still have not moved fast enough into the "now" to satisfy the new "now" generation. As they transformed themselves into political institutions they became the spoils of political opportunists who now desire to use them for their own ends.

In the judgment of modern militants, the university—and perhaps also every other institution—that does not supply the "correct" answer to all problems of the present does not deserve to survive. If they gain control over the university, they will assuredly mould its mission to respond to the fad of the present; they will relate its program directly and exclusively to solving the "now" problems. They demand that traditional structures be reconstructed in such ways as to produce the new world and the new man of the future. To them, therefore, nothing of the past is valid or sacred. As a means of accomplishing their objectives, they are resorting to the kinds of sabotage and terrorism that disrupted universities in Spain in 1936 before Franco and in Cuba in 1959 before Castro.

The thrust of the protest movement in higher education is purportedly directed against the Establishment, by which is meant the

organization that has been built and that is being maintained by the older generation. But in a broader sense it is directed against both the structure of society and the principle of form and management in society. To "hang loose" is to reject the need for order in life. The cry for the reconstitution of higher learning demands the denigration of the management function and the abolition of structure. If it succeeds it will convert the matrix of society into a spongy formless thing. To call this movement simply a counter-culture is seriously to underestimate its revolutionary potential.

The gravity of the current malaise in institutions of higher learning and of its spreading infection into high schools cannot be obscured by well-meaning efforts of school officials to excuse these symptoms as a natural result of manifest grievances which are now being called to their attention spectacularly for the first time. These officials respond with breast-beating confessions of guilt and with frantic efforts to alleviate the alleged causes of the complaints. But they are failing almost everywhere to come to grips with the real problem.

THE CURRENT IMPASSE in higher education can be partially accounted for by the breakdown in administrative authority, by the soft line which college and university authorities have chosen to follow. In 1966, the latest year for which full data are available, the current-fund expenditures of all institutions of higher education in the United States totaled \$12.6 billion. In that year those institutions enrolled more than seven million students and their investment in physical plant alone amounted to the enormous sum of \$35.7 billion. In the campus riots since 1966 college and university authorities have failed even to discharge their minimal responsibility of preserving public buildings and other public property.

A tragic gap has thus been disclosed between the legal responsibility of university trustees, regents, presidents, chancellors, and deans, and the degree of authority which they have chosen to exercise in coping with critical problems. Among them, retreat is the order of the day and heroism is a commodity in short supply. Higher education seems to have bred a generation of administrative poltroons who are acting out a death wish for the institutions which they head.

One such university chancellor even personally paid the bail of

the militants because he "did not want to lose communication with the student body." The president of Kent State University of Ohio charged that the grand jury which acquitted the National Guard of responsibility for the shooting of four students on that campus showed "a frightening misunderstanding of the role and mission of higher education in an American society dedicated to progress." By implication at least he thus suggested that the university's mission includes rioting, destruction of public property, and complete administrative resignation permitting even anarchy. "The methods of these militants are extreme," admitted another high university official, "but isn't it wonderful that these students are committed?" He failed to point out that the objective of their "commitment" was clearly stated in the declaration of one of the leaders of the student riots at Columbia University in early 1968, "If we don't have enough strength to destroy the nation, by God we can at least destroy Columbia."

IT IS the duty of administrators to administer, of faculties to teach, and of students to learn. This division of authority in higher education has been allowed to go sadly awry. Through default of administrative leadership by presidents, chancellors, and deans, administrators jump through hoops at the command of student extremists and faculties meet in almost continuous handwringing sessions to the neglect of their students and of their classroom duties.

The example set by permissive university presidents and chancellors in yielding to student demands has had the effect of prostituting grading practices in their institutions and of making classroom showmanship and popularity with students the principal measure of the success of the members of teaching staffs. The deterioration of professionalism in academic life is further attested by the proliferation of courses which are offered on a mere pass-fail basis and by the system which has been introduced on the Irvine campus of the University of California allowing students to reject a certain number of their final course grades. This system, the chancellor of that campus has boasted, has had a remarkably beneficial effect upon student morale! And why not?

By and large, universities have long since ceased to dedicate themselves to the pursuit of academic excellence. In this state of

academic demoralization higher education has rapidly shed its pose of intellectualism and has declined into a bathos of emotionalism, "relevance," and "democracy."

Students have long known that if they parroted back the "liberal" views of their professors in courses in the social sciences they would receive A grades, but grading practices have now become so lax that even in the so-called "hard" sciences—the physical sciences—students almost never receive failing grades and even in large introductory lower-division courses in such subjects as physics and chemistry students who rank in the lowest 10 per cent of their class are given passing grades of C.

In a course in South American Indians at the University of California, Santa Barbara, students received a final mark of A for dyeing pieces of cloth. In another course the professor, for his final examination, handed out blank sheets of paper to the members of his class, and said, "Write your names on this paper. I will put two words on the blackboard. If you answer *True* you will get a grade of A in the course. If you answer *False* you will get a grade of A minus; and those who helped me distribute papers during this quarter will receive A plusses." On this campus the grade-point average for all students has risen to a substantial B grade or 3.133 on a base of 4.0. Is it any wonder that under these conditions approximately one-fourth of the members of the entire senior class qualify for membership in Phi Beta Kappa?

At the American University in Washington, D.C. President George Williams and a majority of the faculty expressed their sympathy with the so-called National Student Strike, and the administration issued a statement recognizing "the legitimacy of the political concerns raised by the strike." This declaration was countered by one heroic member of the faculty, William F. Fuchs, who served notice on his students in a letter to the editor of a Washington newspaper that he was "staging his own demonstration—a demonstration for society, law, and order, common sense, and discipline. My protest will appear on your report cards. It will look like this—'F'." He continued, advising his students: "Your major undertaking ought to be passing your courses—not passing judgments on the President of the United States, Congress, the Supreme Court, Dow Chemical, everybody over the age of 30, and everybody under the age of 30 who doesn't agree with you."

A university is a place where a certain discipline is required. That discipline must not be made subject to "democratic" controls, to what Chancellor Samuel Gould has called the "authoritarianism of the amateur." The principle of majority rule, which is one of the essential characteristics of democracy, can have little place in a true university community. The mission of the university is a) to impart knowledge, b) to conserve knowledge, and c) to advance knowledge. The only one of these missions which is susceptible to even a modicum of student participation is the first. In the classroom situation continuous responsiveness between teacher and student is a vital necessity, but if teacher and student exchange places the rationale of education evaporates. In the current reversal of roles between teachers and learners the rich and essential disciplines of education are lost, and teachers vie with each other in efforts at influence-peddling with students.

A department of economics at one of the campuses of the University of California has responded to pressures, from both a frightened administration and threatening students, for student voting privileges at departmental meetings by announcing that once each quarter the department will schedule a general meeting of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate majors at which students will be expected to contribute discussion, suggestions, and questions. But, the department announcement continues firmly, "Student participation will remain advisory. The Department of Economics is not a government nor is it in any way analogous to a government. Individual faculty members were not elected as representatives but were appointed by virtue of skill, training, experience, and accomplishments. . . . Therefore the Economics Faculty reserves the right to conduct its deliberations, discussions, and votes in private session."

In a true university the hierarchy of values will be preserved. In such a university, the past, the present, and the future meet; and those who have experienced the human situation meet and talk with those who have only begun to experience it. It is a place where recipes for successful living of those who think they possess them and those who think they want them can be exchanged and critically examined. Since in this context the learned and the learners do not occupy the same level of learning, a university must operate to some extent hierarchically. It must maintain within its own

boundaries the principle of professional elitism which respects the leadership role of the learned on the one hand and the necessary disciplining of the learners on the other.

Constant vigilance must be exercised, however, to prevent this professional elitism from shading into professional snobbery. Like all members of institutional groups, educators tend their own herd of sacred cows. One of these, "Everyone who disagrees with us is an ignoramus," is likely to get loose and wreck the entire barn. Another one, whose name is scarcely even softly whispered, is called "The public be damned." Another is sanctimoniously called "Freedom to live in an ivory tower."

Irving Kristol has pointed out that "when an institution no longer knows what it is doing, it starts trying to do everything." The university, as its name implies, has universal interests and is dedicated to the investigation of all things under the sun. But it is not, therefore, a place for all men. It must be, above all, a place where mind meets mind, and positions in it for both teachers and taught must be reserved for the mentally fit. Those who cannot meet this elementary qualification should seek help in other places, for the university should not be thought of as a relief agency dedicated to salvaging damaged or improvident lives. When such people are brought into the university they find themselves in an uncongenial environment, they soon conclude that they are "sons of the stranger," and they strike back at the forces that placed them there. Even the best-equipped and best-intentioned institution of higher learning must fail if it attempts "to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear."

THIS TRUISM has been lost sight of in the demands for the universalization of higher education to which colleges and universities have enthusiastically responded since World War II. As these institutions have become objects of mass invasion by the sons and daughters of John Q. Public, they have shown themselves incapable of providing the learned faculties needed to justify their role as citadels of higher education. In substitution they have put at the head of classrooms young instructors who were already indoctrinated in the techniques of political activism and who, unable to carry on classroom dialogues in their own learned discipline, have simply imposed their immature political opinions upon their classes.

They have taken advantage of the sincere idealism of the young people under their charge and have induced them with inflammatory rhetoric and impassioned illogicalities to share their own frustrations and to serve their own destructive purposes. To them are attributable many of the depredations committed by militants on college campuses.

A professor of philosophy at Yale University urges a student audience to launch a nationwide student strike. "Go back to your communities and organize," he commands. "Make a summer of organized resistance against oppression." When professors, under the aegis of academic freedom, teach such irresponsible and subversive doctrines to young, highly impressionable people, they must expect to pay a price for their anti-social exercise of this freedom. By such utterances they reduce higher education to lower education, and they should be separated from the university community. The freedoms of education—academic freedom—must be exercised under the law.

Into the vacuum formed by the apathy of chancellors, presidents, and boards of trustees, some "liberal" professors whose teachings through the years have created the climate for student rebellion and have in some cases triggered actual acts of violence, have moved in an attempt to salvage their positions of authority over students, to ingratiate themselves with an outraged public, and to disguise themselves as honest academicians. The best that can be said for them is that, provided their own conversion is now truly sincere, they have literally been hoist with their own petard, they have been failing through the years to perceive the full implications of their own teachings, and they must be characterized now as slow learners, and, as such, too stupid to serve further as mentors of the young.

Students are not entitled to demand "relevance" from their teachers. It has been one of the glories of higher education in America that it has provided a wide range of educational opportunities from which young people could freely choose subjects most conducive to their own growth. This has been considered to be an indispensable attribute of a free society, but it is now being seriously limited by the demand for relevance. Young people must themselves assume the responsibility of supplying the relationship, if any, between their classroom experience and their own career interests. When students demand that educators supply the relevance

in their lives they are asking for more than they are entitled to ask and more than any system of formal education can give them. The late Bishop James Pike once stated that every course that he had taken in college "was relevant, including Greek grammar." The university can only say, "Here I stand embodying certain social values and equipped with certain techniques and procedures and with the facilities and the disposition to discover better ones."

INSTITUTIONS of higher learning which have allowed themselves to become advocates of suicide, destruction, nihilism, and chaos, which have assumed political roles, which have transformed themselves into universal service institutions, and which have opened their doors with the proclamation "come one, come all," have overextended themselves. Under the assaults which are now being mounted against them and which they are failing to withstand, they would do well to retreat to more defensible positions. Grim as the plight of higher education is, the only hope lies in a reassertion and revitalization of values which have been the casualties of conflict and which now lie discarded in the debris. Those values are the values of civilization itself.

First, colleges and universities must set forth their institutional objectives clearly and simply and restore conditions under which freedom to learn and freedom to teach again become possible. These two freedoms define the limits of academic freedom, which is merely the right of intellectual dissent but does not include any other form of dissent.

Second, public institutions of higher learning must be dissociated from politics to the maximum extent possible within the context of public tax policies, and private institutions of higher learning must dedicate themselves once more to the pursuit of independent education of the traditional type, divorced from political and public influences.

Third, college and university facilities must not be used for activities that do not advance the purposes of higher learning.

Fourth, campuses must not be treated as sanctuaries from the law.

Fifth, the criteria for appointment, retention, and promotion of faculty members must be broadened to include not only scholarly competence and proven teaching ability but also matters of profes-

sional conduct, and faculty members who fail to meet these criteria must be dismissed.

Sixth, universities must not appoint or retain faculty persons who are members of an organization which requires its members to accept its orders in violation of the principle of free inquiry inherent in the doctrine of academic freedom.

Seventh, existing faculty imbalances must be corrected to permit consideration of all sides of controversial questions. There is always hope when people are given opportunities to listen to all sides; when they are denied such opportunities errors harden into prejudices.

Eighth, policy-making authority which has been delegated to academic senates and faculties should be converted into a mere advisory power which will be given due consideration by officials responsible for the administration of public colleges and universities.

Ninth, the principle must be maintained that students are admitted to the university at the invitation of the university and that membership in its society is a privilege, not a right. If, on the contrary, access to higher education continues to be construed as a right, then all placement tests must be abolished, and all admissions offices in colleges and universities must be closed. The young man or young woman who comes up to the university and is duly admitted to its privileges should be explicitly put on notice both orally and in writing: "You are now entering into an institution which has been established for the purpose of offering you an academic education. We shall do this to the best of our ability according to rules of discipline applicable to both faculty and students. Should anyone disagree with any part of our programs he should present his grievance to proper officials of the university for consideration. Criticisms whenever justified will be appreciated and the appropriate rectifications will be made. During the course of the year we will not permit demonstrations or clamorous dissent that tends to constrain civil liberties in any manner, and persons who act in that way will be expelled or dismissed."

Tenth, when a student submits himself to the university experience under these conditions, he and the university enter into a voluntary contractual relationship which can be ended by the failure on the part of either to abide by the terms of the contract.

For this reason the university can and should require the student to deposit a bond for his good behavior and respect for its property and other physical facilities.

Compliance with these ten points is essential to enable colleges and universities once more to perform their primary task, which is to instill in young people a deep conviction of the need for critical intellectual inquiry into the human situation and a steadfast determination to cling to those values which are demonstrably true.

Notes on Contributors

Dr. Donald Marquand Dozer, the author of several books, is professor of history at the University of California at Santa Barbara.

Frank D. Albro, a public school teacher with experience in several states, is so disheartened with foolish certification requirements for teachers that he thinks of leaving his profession for that of journalism.

Dr. R. W. Reising is associate professor of secondary education at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Dr. Regis A. Courtemanche is associate professor of history at C. W. Post College, and contributes frequently to the *New York Times*, to this quarterly, and to other journals.

The Teacher Surplus: Boon or Bombshell?

FRANK D. ALBRO

By now there is no question about the fact that a big surplus of public school teachers is developing, nay, has already arrived. According to the U.S. Office of Education's own figures, there were no fewer than 189,000 graduates coming out of our colleges with teaching degrees during 1970 to compete for 183,000 vacancies: a surplus of 6,000 teachers. And, according to the same source, the surplus will have reached 55,000 by 1975, if present trends continue.

It appears that there will be no gradual adjustment possible, considering the speed with which this problem developed, no period of several years or many months in which to make expensive surveys and other studies in preparation for the results. Suddenly, almost without warning, the public education scene is flooded with unemployed teachers. Now all we can do is attempt to determine whether the effects will be good or bad, a boon or a bombshell, not only where the economy is concerned, but on education itself.

At first glance it would appear that the effects of the teacher surplus will be harmful to education. But this is merely a surface view. Yes, those who graduate from our teacher colleges will find it increasingly difficult to find jobs. Many will be forced to enter other vocations to make a living, some will remain unemployed indefinitely, and others will re-enter college to begin work on graduate degrees in education. It will be hard on young teachers, no question about that. But the effects on the quality of education in the public schools will be good, very good indeed.

The quality of education will improve because administrators and other hiring officials will be able to exercise far more selectivity in the process of recruiting to fill their vacancies. No longer will it be necessary to grab the first, and often the only, teacher who applies for a particular opening, as has been the situation during the past twenty-five years. It will be possible for the hiring official to select on the basis of true quality rather than mere certification requirements. The teacher's actual ability and depth of knowledge of his

subject will, for the first time in more than two decades, become the criteria for selection, and those who lack evidence of true quality, though they may be duly certified, will fall by the wayside.

In a buyer's market, quality always improves, and the teacher surplus is creating a buyer's market, so to speak. Consider the analogy of the diamond market. When diamonds are plentiful, only gems of the very highest quality command a good price, while those at the other end of the value spectrum are put out of circulation entirely. And certainly, in the vital business of educating our young, we want the cheap and shabby teachers put out of circulation. We cannot afford to employ instructors of low quality at the expense of our children's minds.

For many years, while the teacher shortage existed, the quality of the instructional personnel in the public schools declined dramatically. With this decline there was a tragic and parallel lowering in educational standards and output. That is, the amount and quality of knowledge and skills among the pupils in our schools, evident at graduation time, diminished alarmingly. This in turn forced a decline in the standards of our institutions of higher learning, both public and private, which resulted finally in the production of poorly educated, mass-produced teachers. The cycle would be almost comic were it not so real and so deadly serious a problem.

IT WAS NOT merely the teacher shortage which caused the general erosion of standards in American education. Several other factors came into play, such as a shift in attitude among the populace regarding the definition of education. People in this country came to view schooling more and more in the light of sociological and psychological theories. Perhaps the word "light" is inappropriate here, because the over-all effect of such theories has been a lack of enlightenment. But real, formal learning gradually was allowed to be replaced by something akin to group therapy in our public schools until, today, the majority of the people have lost sight of the valid definition of the term "education." Those who have not are, at best, very confused about it. Behavioral objectives are now the main function of our schools, rather than educational objectives. That this tragic transition was tolerated by the voting public points up the influences of our changed attitudes in education.

Now, at last, the pendulum will begin to swing the other way

and the standards will begin to rise once more. As the quality of the teachers improves, so will education and, hopefully, our attitudes. The better teachers, those with depth of background in their teaching subjects, have never approved the substitution of behavioral objectives for education, but they have been in a declining minority among the faculties. As teachers with depth in their subjects replace those whose college preparation consists almost exclusively of psychological and sociological theories, methods, and the like, we shall witness a return to real values and higher scholastic standards. It will take time, but it will come. And we shall be able to thank the teacher surplus for accomplishing the task.

IN DUE TIME also there will be a change in the certification requirements for teachers, in keeping with the trend back to real values and away from half-baked theories. As things now stand, teacher-certification requirements in most of the fifty states are a national disgrace. They almost guarantee poor quality education in the public schools by all but eliminating from the field those individuals, the real teachers, who have the greatest depth in their teaching subjects. The balance is swung toward those who sacrificed subject knowledge for courses in behavior and methods in their college years. The effect of such certification requirements has been to drive the most knowledgeable teachers from education into other vocations, or to force them to flee from state to state in search of a teaching certificate based on realistic values and standards. But it is a futile flight for most because the certification offices in our various states are the strongholds of the most die-hard of the behaviorists and theorists. Nothing seems to please them more than seeing such ironic events as, for example, English majors with thirty-six credits in the subject being kept out of the English classroom by minor technicalities in the certification rules, while education majors with perhaps eight credits in English are hired to teach the subject.

The state of Washington seems to be the typical example, though Colorado and several others run a close race with it for the distinction of "Most Unrealistic Teacher Certification." The Washington certification office recognizes only education degrees. All applicants with B.A.'s and B.S.'s or M.A.'s and M.S.'s who do not have

education majors are regarded as "non-degreed." And of course, non-degreed teachers are unheard of in the state because they are uncertifiable. This rule, by the way, applies to PhD.'s as well. They are also "non-degreed." If they lack the courses required for the so-called "education major." What courses are these? Why, those that entail the accepted behavioral and psychological theories that have done so much toward turning our schools into institutions for group therapy rather than education, that's what.

It would be logical to assume that teacher certification will be the last area to be affected as the teacher surplus gradually raises the standards and quality of education in our public schools, but even that will finally succumb to the change for the better.

Until then, administrators will exercise their better judgment in a buyer's market by carefully selecting those teachers who not only meet certification requirements, but have knowledge in their subjects and skill in getting it across to youngsters. No longer will they have to take the dregs, if those are the only applicants. As the teacher supply steadily increases and the surplus grows, so will the quality of the actively employed instructors. Those with no real expertise in any scholastic or academic subject, whose sole claim to knowledge lies in a headful of unrealistic sociological and psychological theories, will find themselves on the outside looking in, for a change. They will be forced to make a living by some means other than behavioral experimentation with our children in the schools.

The teacher surplus will prove to be a boon, indeed, once the initial shock wears off in the public mind. After so many years of being faced with a chronic shortage, it is a new experience to have an over-supply all of a sudden. It may take some time for administrators to recognize and begin to capitalize on their new-found power of selection. We may hear some lamenting from economists and government officials worried about the unemployment problems involved. But over-all, and in the long run, the teacher surplus will be a blessing in disguise.

Passive and Immature Students

WHY COLLEGE STUDENTS FAIL, by Robert W. Pitcher and Babette Blaushild. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1970. 277 pp.
Reviewed by **R. W. Reising**

THIS VOLUME intelligently treats the problem referred to in its title, and so it can prove valuable to a variety of readers. Like their parents, high school and college students will find it enlightening. But so, too, will teachers, counselors, and administrators at every level—all persons involved in guiding and educating American youth.

Basically, this book reports the theories and the findings of the Educational Development Center in Berea, Ohio, currently directed by Dr. Pitcher. Since 1964, over six hundred college students who failed, from approximately two hundred and fifty institutions of higher learning, have enrolled in EDC's ten-week educational rehabilitation program, after first undergoing comprehensive diagnostic testing. Although Pitcher and Blaushild do not provide statistics on the efficacy of that program, they strongly suggest that it has been successful, and that the approach and strategy employed by them can produce equally desirable results in other situations.

In addition to an introduction, a bibliography, and an appendix, which identifies and briefly describes seventeen tests useful in diagnosing educational problems, this volume consists of three chapters, within which are fourteen subsections. The problem of college failure is approached from a variety of vantage-points, all of them revealing. Much of the study represents, as one might expect, subtle indictment and oblique chastisement of various components of the educational enterprise. Neither the students who fail nor those institutions and individuals responsible for their academic careers emerge unblemished. Multi-dimensional improvements are necessary, the authors suggest, if education is to keep college failure to a minimum. But, they further suggest, those improvements are also possible, and thus the book provides a palatable blend of the damning and the promising.

At a time when observers like Charles Reich, author of the best-selling *The Greening of America*, are zealously applauding—nay,

glorifying—the wisdom of the nation's college youth, it is refreshing indeed to learn that those same youth have been known to err in providing for their own educational success. Pitcher and Blaushild mince no words in averring that one cause of college failure is students' unwillingness to assume responsibility for their academic progress. "Too passive," "uninvolved," and "immature" are terms that the authors affix to many who, having failed to earn acceptable grades, are quick to argue that they are "more sinn'd against than sinning." Success in higher education, the authors sensibly and convincingly argue, depends to a large extent on self-discipline, on an awareness that learning demands giving as well as taking, perseverance, and commitment as well as opportunity. While such an anti-Rousseauistic position is neither new nor fashionable, it is certainly logical and defensible.

Parents, too, are often remiss, the authors contend. Too willingly and too regularly they shower their offspring with attention, money, and luxuries—"and if all that were not enough, when their children have problems or get into trouble, parents even assume their guilt for them. The youngsters might be able to survive all of it, except the latter benevolence." In sections like "Parents: Guilty or Not Guilty?" Pitcher and Blaushild resemble and echo observers of the 1950s who prophesied, in the words of Philip Wylie, that "America—the world's first pediarchy" would produce a generation of "emotional juniors." Unrestrained and unrestraining parents, Pitcher and Blaushild allege, must assume a portion of the responsibility for youth's failure to cope with the demands of higher education.

So, too, must society as a whole. Affluence is a mixed blessing. With it comes the worship of goals that are suspect, if not genuinely perverse. Success, power, money, prestige, security, fun, and happiness—the authors call upon Max Lerner's list, developed in his essay "Goals and Prospects," to make eminently clear their belief that "it is true that we have been seduced and in turn have seduced our children." Reared and educated in such a milieu, young people have ample reason to be confused, quizzical, and cynical. They grope, and sometimes hunger, for goals with greater meaning and promise, and all too often in the process they fail to meet the demands of educational institutions created by an acquisitive and status-seeking society.

Those institutions, of course, are not beyond reproach in other respects as well. Many of them are so large, so impersonal, and/or so inflexible that they cannot avoid ineffectiveness. Their ill-defined concept of "excellence," their emphasis upon "publish or perish," and their graduate school thrust can all be factors in undergraduate failure, Pitcher and Blaushild maintain.

High schools do not come away unscathed either. Yet the authors do not directly center on them in any given chapter or section, electing instead to delineate their contributions to college failure at a variety of junctures in the study. Such a treatment is more devious, perhaps, but nonetheless effective. The impression that it creates is that high schools are generally unsuccessful in preparing their graduates to be self-sufficient; that they must develop "a system of custom-designed learning programs and flexible performance-expectations" if talented youth are to be served; and that they commonly fail to identify and counsel underachievers who subsequently go on to but fail in higher education.

PITCHER AND Blaushild are most concerned not with the defects in, but with the possibilities of, American education. The bulk of their study relates to the diagnosing and rehabilitating of college failures, and much of its effectiveness is the result of strategically placed EDC letters and case studies (with students' names changed) from which key conclusions logically evolve. Several of those conclusions support and, in a sense, verify what educational psychologists and theorists have long believed, that heuristic devices are necessary to the academic success of numerous students. Learning through experience, through active involvement, is a concept which is moving, and which must continue to move, through elementary and secondary schools into higher education. The findings of Pitcher and Blaushild provide convincing evidence that Jerome Bruner and his followers are correct in promoting and applauding learning by discovery.

An equal number of conclusions support beliefs regularly voiced by authorities in the methodology of English. "Students learn to write by writing, not by listening to lectures about writing," "students who have not learned their language can appear to have low intelligence," and "the abilities to express language in writing and speaking, reading and listening, cannot be isolated from each

other" are but three of the many conclusions on which the authors urge all teachers of language skills, regardless of their grade level, to premise their instructional planning and strategies.

Many conclusions, of course, transcend particular disciplines, even education *per se*. Those that do commonly both reflect and explore contemporary America—the moral anguish that so typifies the nation at present. In arguing, for instance, that "the anti-hero is in vogue," Pitcher and Blaushild affirm what many segments of society have long proclaimed. In averring, moreover, that "suicide is now the second greatest cause of death in the 15-24 year range," they alert society as a whole to the frightening realization that growing up in the Age of Aquarius is certainly as painful as it is pleasurable.

The volume contains much wisdom and an equal amount of common sense. Yet it is not flawless. The authors' irrational use of the comma is annoying, as are their occasional cloudy and/or plodding prose and their all-too-frequent subject-verb miscues (e.g., "The true sources of this student's problem is that he is an unbeliever in himself"). Their penchant for the simplistic allegation (e.g., "At college, professors have almost complete policy-making control over all matters") and for the underdeveloped point (e.g., the college's "outmoded grading system") doubtless represents a more serious blemish. But even it does not appreciably detract from the worth and impact of the study. Pitcher and Blaushild deserve considerable praise for bringing a multi-faceted national problem into clear focus and, more important, for providing an abundance of information useful to those forced to grapple with that problem.

Champion of 'Let Things Alone'

FREDERIC BASTIAT: *A MAN ALONE*, by George Charles Roche III.

New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1971. 256 pp.

Reviewed by Regis A. Courtemanche

"**A**WAY, THEN, with the quacks and the planners! away with . . . their centralization, their tariffs, . . . their regulations, . . . and their equalizing of taxation! Let us cast out all artificial systems and give freedom a chance—freedom, which is an act of faith in God and in His handiwork." These are the phrases of a French political economist much neglected since the middle of the nineteenth century, Frédéric Bastiat. He has much to say that has meaning nowadays.

Dr. George Charles Roche III, new president of Hillsdale College, has written a readable and enlightening book—the first full-length biography in English—about a man often dealt with only in footnotes. Frédéric Bastiat (1801-1850) spent all but six of his forty-nine years in provincial business and rural study. Yet he lived through Napoleon's empire, the restored Bourbon monarchy, the bourgeois commonwealth of Louis Philippe, and the egalitarian Second Republic. Shortly after his death, the cycle was completed, when the dictator Napoleon III made himself emperor.

As Dr. Roche points out, all these masters failed; and Bastiat's genius "rests on the fact that he recognized the impossibility of any lasting political solution, no matter who might control the state, so long as we fail to appreciate the necessity for individual freedom and for strict limitation of political authority to the task of protecting life and property."

Thin, intense, and tubercular, Bastiat first entered on public life as a result of the tariff question. Upon reading some English writings on Free Trade, he espoused this cause as a remedy for poverty in France. A devout optimist, he believed, as did Cobden and the Manchester school, that the triumph of Free Trade "will usher in justice among all nations and consequently will eliminate international hatreds and prejudices and the wars that follow in their train." Organizer of the first French Free Trade association, which was short-lived, he wrote voluminously in an attempt to

convince his countrymen to end protection. Alas, except for the unimportant treaty of 1860, France never lowered her tariffs to any significant degree.

No lover of aristocratic privilege, as was his contemporary Tocqueville, he supported the bourgeois revolution of 1830. When the middle class became the oppressors, he attacked them as well. But his real fury fell upon the socialists: Saint-Simon, Fourier, Blanc, Proudhon, and all the others who taught that the masses were sheep and they were the shepherds. France had suffered for years from too much government, a legacy of the Bourbons. The socialists' prescription was more government—vast and intricate plans for "ordered" society and government-guaranteed jobs.

Against them, "a man alone," stood Bastiat, now a member of the Assembly. His speeches were written out and distributed to the members, as his consumptive malady had nearly ruined his throat. In an age of prolix prose, his words are clear and straightforward. Pamphlet after pamphlet issued from his pen, asking relief for the taxpayer, admonishing the state for giving away money it had not earned. ". . . If we give them [the bureaucrats] two billion, they will immediately expand themselves and their projects up to the full amount." He attacked Communism, then in its infancy: "Communism destroys liberty, for it permits no one to dispose freely of his own labor."

But France was bored with normality and longed for a man on horseback. Louis Napoleon, who promised glory, was elected president, and in 1852 became emperor of France. Bastiat was discouraged; but now, near the end of his life, he said, "What gives me courage . . . is the thought that, perhaps, my life may not have been useless to mankind."

Dr. Roche traces the development of Bastiat's ideas in other thinkers and discusses problems of American society in the light of this Frenchman's advice. A selection of aphorisms—that peculiarly French contribution to letters—is appended to the volume, but they are undated. The index is complete and helpful.

The French economists Gide and Rist have quite rightly recommended Bastiat's writings as perhaps the best that a young student of political economy can read.