THE AMERICAN STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

(Lecture delivered at the Royal University of Malta, 30th March 1960)

By H.R. HOPPE

The American pattern of higher education with almost 1800 universities, colleges, institutes, and what not, is indeed confusing to the outsider and by no means easy for an American to explain. Within this larger pattern, however, the state university has shown a certain coherence which to my mind justifies calling it a system.

Institutions of higher education in the United States may be divided into three main classes, privately supported institutions, publicly supported institutions, and church-sponsored institutions. In this paper I shall not have much occasion to refer to church-sponsored institutions, but shall frequently make comparisons between state universities and private universities. Usually the private institutions were privately founded, that is, by an individual or a group interested in education; however, a considerable number of present-day private institutions were originally church-sponsored, but in time lost their religious affiliation and became private ones. Harvard and Yale represent this kind of development. In general, publicly supported institutions were established by some governmental unit: a city, a country, or a state, and most of their support comes from taxpayers' money. The state university belongs to this class. In the course of time there has been a tendency forprivate institutions to be taken over by public bodies. For instance, Rutgers University, founded in 1766, during the Colonial period, was taken over by the State of New Jersey in 1945 and made the state university; the College of Charleston, chartered as a private college in 1785, was taken over by the City of Charleston, South Carolina, in 1837, thus becoming the oldest of the numerous municipal colleges and universities that exist today. The reverse process of a public institution being taken over by a private one is very rare; I cannot adduce a single example.

Private institutions were certainly the first to appear on the American educational scene. Famous universities like Harvard, Yale, Columbia and Princeton and two or three liberal arts colleges like Dartmouth and William and Mary were established during the Colonial period. Public institutions, and especially the state universities, came into being only after the colonies had won independence in 1782. During these formative

years of the Republic there was widespread awareness that an educated citizenry was necessary if this experiment in representative government was to function and endure; and the state university was designed to be the capstone to the educational pyramid that the new states, now no longer colonies, hoped would be erected. Of the thirteen original states, those that already possessed well-established private institutions, mostly northern states, did not charter state universities. Massachusetts with its Harvard, Connecticut with its Yale, New Jersey with its Princeton and Rutgers, Rhode Island with its Brown, New York with its Columbia, and New Hampshire with its Dartmouth College saw no reason to create state universities until well into the 19th, sometimes the 20th century. The pioneers in establishing state universities were the southern states.

In view of the bad publicity that the southern states have made for themselves in recent years because of their attitudes on racial desegregation and such matters, this must be placed on the credit side of their ledger: they showed real foresight in their early days of independence. Georgia, the earliest, chartered her state university in 1785, North Carolina in 1789, South Carolina in 1801. It may be added that the University of North Carolina has long been one of the best southern universities and among the better American universities. Next the two 'border' states of Maryland and Delaware – so called because they form a kind of border between the distinctively Northern and the distinctively Southern states—established their state universities in 1807 and 1833 respectively. Virginia, a leader, especially a political leader, among the southern states in the early years of the Republic, did not charter the University of Virginia till 1819, probably because, like the northern states, she already had William and Mary College, second only to Harvard in age. It is worthy of mention that the prime mover in the establishment of this university and the designer of its original buildings was Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence and third President of the United States. 'Founder of the University of Virginia' was one of the three achievements that he wished to have recorded in his epitaph.

As new states were admitted to the Union, they promptly created new state universities, usually within two decades of admission. Considering states admitted before the outbreak of the Civil War in 1860, we find that Vermont (1791), the first new state to be admitted, established its state university in the same year; Ohio (1803), Iowa (1846), and Wisconsin (1848) one year later; Indiana (1816) four years later; Alabama (1819) twelve years later; Missouri (1821) and California (1850) eighteen years later; and Florida (1845) eight years later. Tennessee (1796), the third state to be admitted, had founded its state university two years earlier,

while still a territory, an example next followed by Michigan (1837), which had chartered a state university, under the cumbersome title of Catholepistemiad, twenty years before admission, and by Minnesota, whose university was established seven years before its admission as a state (1858). Among states admitted before the Civil War the laggards in chartering state universities were mostly southern or border states. Kentucky, the second new state to be admitted (1792) was 73 years in establishing a state university, Louisiana (1812) 48 years, Arkansas (1836) 35 years and Texas (1845) 36 years. Two northern states, however, were also laggards; Illinois's state university came 49 years after admission (1818), Maine's 45 years after admission (1820). Nevertheless the record of state responsibility for higher education is a respectable one. Every one of the twenty states admitted to the Union in this period eventually founded a state university; only one took more than 50 years to do so.

The American Civil War of 1860-4 marks a Great Divide in the history of state universities as it does in the history of the United States as a whole. Before that, the Federal government had done little for higher education; after that it did much. It is true that George Washington and many of those about him entertained the hope of establishing a National University, but nothing came of it. Also Congress in the first half of the 19th century did assign Federal land or the proceeds from the sale of Federal land to newly admitted states for educational purposes; but elementary and secondary education benefited principally from this aid. However, beginning in 1802 the national government granted two 'townships', a township being an area of 36 square miles, to each new western state for a state university, Ohio being the first beneficiary. But the great change comes with enactment of the Morrill Act in July 1862. This was passed in the midst of the Civil War, when the prospects of victory for the North were din and uncertain. To each state loyal to the North it granted 30,000 acres of land for each Senator and Representative then in Congress for the purpose of establishing in each state at least one college where agriculture and technical subjects would be taught. Inasmuch as every state has two Senators and at least on Representative regardless of population, this meant that every loyal state was entitled to at least 90,000 acres to be used for higher education and technical subjects. After the war the provisions of the act were extended to the former rebel states. Under this act 69 land-grant colleges were created, many of them to become state universities. Not all land-grant colleges were public institutions. Cornell University, for example, benefited from the Morrill Act even though it was privately founded. But most of the state universities and state colleges established after

1862 were land-grant institutions. My own university, founded earlier as Michigan Agriculture College, was the first to take advantage of this act, and a few years ago, in 1955, celebrated its centenary with the added distinction that it was the oldest land-grant institution. Thus, though an upstart as compared with the Royal University of Malta, Michigan State University has a venerability of its own.

Among later forms of Federal aid to higher education, the Hatch Act of 1887 gave substantial annual grants of money to land-grant institutions for the erection and maintenance of agricultural experiment stations. In 1890 a so-called second Morrill Act gave direct financial aid to land-grant institutions, ranging from $15,000 to $30,000 annually to each one. In the first third of the 20th century a series of Congressional acts, most notable being the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 and the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, bestowed annual sums to land-grant colleges for furtherance of agricultural and vocational education. These funds were granted on a 'matching' principle, namely that the state must furnish an amount equal to that given by the Federal government. One product of these acts is the nation-wide system of country agricultural agents. These men, themselves specialists in agriculture, and using the land-grant college or university as a base of operations, go out to the farmers in the various counties to give advice on farming problems and to keep them abreast of the latest discoveries of agricultural research. Incidentally, the tremendous productivity of American agriculture, whereby ten per cent of the population can feed the other ninety per cent and show a surplus to boot, owes much to the work of these agents. Because most of the state universities that came into existence after 1860 were also land-grant schools, their growth was greatly stimulated by Federal funds arising from these various acts.

Returning to the effects of the Morrill Act, let me explain that the recipients of these grants of land did not have to retain and establish themselves upon their shares of these 30,000-acre blocks of land. Most of them sold the greater part to provide capital. Nevertheless, they kept, directly or indirectly, some of this generous allotment; and today most of the land-grant colleges and universities are characterized by their extensive campuses, of sometimes hundreds of acres. The University of Wisconsin fronts one side of a lake itself several miles long; the University of Washington campus is bounded on one side by a considerable stretch of Puget Sound, an inland arm of the Pacific Ocean. Some, originally located in suburban areas, now appear dwarfed by the growth of cities around them; this has happened to places like the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Illinois. But even the most cramped campus would seem superfluously ample by European standards. A ten

to fifteen minute interval must be allowed between lectures so that students may make their way from one classroom building to another. The campuses are well landscaped and pleasing to the eye. Ample and well kept lawns lie between the buildings; plots of shrubbery are maintained or even created by judicious transplanting. Natural attractions like brooks and waterfalls, glens, even groves of trees are generally kept in something resembling their original state. The affectionate loyalty that most graduates feel for their alma maters is certainly nourished in considerable part by the lovely campus on which four years of their lives have been spent.

One vexing legacy of the Morrill Act has been the question of military training in the land-grant colleges and universities. Passed in the midst of a war when Congress was mindful of the country's need for officer material, the act contained a minor provision that military training should be offered. Most land-grant institutions observed this by making training compulsory the first two years and voluntary the second two years — for those who wished to obtain commissions in the officers' reserve. About fifteen years after each World War a wave of pacifistic or anti-militaristic feeling has swept over the student bodies and agitated the land-grant campuses. Some institutions have now dropped the compulsory two years; others still retain it. If the globe survives a third World War, the land-grant universities can expect a third wave of agitation.

To resume our survey of the growth of state universities after 1860, we find Kansas, West Virginia, Nevada, and Nebraska being admitted to the Union between 1861 and 1867 and all establishing state universities within ten years of their admission. When Colorado was admitted in 1876 its state university was already 15 years old. The years 1889 and 1890 produced a record crop of six new states: Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, Idaho, and Wyoming. Of these, every one except Montana had already established a state university while still a territory, and Montana created hers four years later. Thereafter all the new states entered the Union with a state university already in being. Utah, the next to be admitted (in 1896), had a university already 46 years old. Alaska was 43 years old when the state was admitted in 1958, and Hawaii's was 52 years old when that state was admitted last year.

Meanwhile, those north Atlantic states which, at the founding of the Republic, saw no cause to create state universities, began to establish their own universities or state-supported institutions that later grew to universities. Pennsylvania, having in 1855 established a Farmers' High School, transformed it, under the Morrill Act, to Agriculture College of Pennsylvania in 1862, Pennsylvania State College in 1874, and

Pennsylvania State University in 1953. Other states, aided by the provisions of the Morrill Act, followed Pennsylvania's lead. Massachusetts and New Hampshire in 1863, Connecticut in 1881, and Rhode Island in 1892 established agricultural colleges that in course of time became state universities. New Jersey, as I have already mentioned, satisfied its need in a different way, by taking over Rutgers University. Paradoxically, the last to have a state-supported university was New York, the most populous and one of the wealthiest states. As early as 1894 it took over the College of Veterinary Medicine at Cornell University, later adding and supporting the College of Agriculture and the College of Home Economics at the same university. In 1900 it established the State College of Ceramics at Alfred University and in 1911 the State College of Forestry at Syracuse University, all of these being otherwise private universities. Thus the state did not totally neglect higher education, but rather tended to subsidize technical education and to leave the sciences, arts, and professions to the private institutions. In 1948, however, the legislature chartered the State University of New York, which now embraces the colleges already mentioned; eleven teacher training colleges; Harpur College, a liberal-arts college at Endicott; two medical schools, and a number of community colleges scattered about the state, altogether about 30 units. Unlike most other states, which began with a single university and later enlarged its scope in various ways, New York appears to be committed to a dispersed, loosely integrated system aimed, nevertheless, at eventually offering everything that a centralized state university offers. Thus with the advent of the State University of New York, every state in the Nation came to have one or more state-supported universities.

A few words now about the nomenclature of these state universities, which is confusing even to graduates of a state university like myself, and utterly perplexing to most outsiders, native or foreign. The surest evidence is the word 'State' in the title: Michigan State University, Ohio State University, Kent State University, Wayne State University. If the title is 'University of' plus the name of a state, the chances are good that it is a state university; thus the University of California, the University of Maine, the University of Illinois are all state universities. But watch out! There is at least one exception. The University of Pennsylvania is essentially a private university and proud of it. One source of of its pride is that the great Benjamin Franklin had a main hand in its original foundation. Two state universities have the name of the state at the beginning of their name: Indiana University and Ohio University. (Ohio University and Ohio State University are not the same, though both are state universities!). Washington University, I hasten to add, is not the

university of the state of Washington; it is a private university situated in St. Louis, Missouri, nearly 2,000 miles from the state of Washington. If a compass-direction like northern, southern, eastern or western appears in the title along with the name of a state, then the chances are about fifty-fifty whether it is a state or private university. Southern Illinois University is one of the state universities of Illinois; University of Southern California is a private university. Finally there are some titles that seem purposely designed to confuse. Rutgers I have already mentioned. Purdue University in Indiana is also a state institution, in effect the technical branch of the state university, primarily an engineering school; whereas Indiana University teaches non-technical subjects and the professions of law and medicine. Miami University is one of the state universities of Ohio; the University of Miami, on the other hand, is a private university in Florida.

Already in the course of this exposition I have had to mention the presence of more than one state university in some states; so perhaps I shall do well to pause here and explain the matter. With one or two exceptions, all states began by creating one state university. As they grew in population and wealth there arose a corresponding need for enlarged facilities. They tackled the problem in three principal ways. Some simply created new universities, each one generally independent of the other. This has been Michigan's way, where there are now three state universities; the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Wayne State University. In other states the parent state university has reached out to create branches or to take over institutions in other parts of the state. The University of California is a notable example of this process. Beginning at Berkeley in the north central part of the state overlooking San Francisco Bay, it later established its college of agriculture in a farming region and called it the University of California at Davis. When the population of the southern part of the state began to grow, and to grow more rapidly than the northern portion, the University created the University of California at Los Angeles, U.C.L.A. for short, now with an undergraduate enrollment almost as large as the parent in Berkeley. Recently it took over a teachers' college at Santa Barbara, about half way between Berkeley and Los Angeles, naming it the University of California at Santa Barbara. The third way has been the creation of a single board in control of all state institutions of higher learning, including the universities. Twelve states now have this system: Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Montana, New York, Oregon, Texas, South Dakota and North Dakota. In some, like Oregon, each institution has its own subordinate governing board, with the state board exercising general control; in

others the state board runs everything. It should be observed that, whatever the system under which they operate, the state universities are pretty independent of the legislature. To the extent that it holds the purse strings, the legislature can exercise an indirect or ultimate control, the control of extinction or slow starvation, which it usually is not eager to practice. Universities may have to go hat in hand to their legislatures for annual or biennial appropriations, but legally they can usually employ the funds, once appropriated, as they see fit, so long as they do not outrageously flout the wishes of the legislature.

Having referred to the dependence of state universities on legislative appropriations, I wish to offer a few remarks about their general financial situation. Every year or two years when the state university's appropriation is under consideration by the legislature, everybody on the staff from the president down to the newest instructor is likely to feel butterflies fluttering in his stomach until the appropriation bill has passed. At such times I have heard staff members express a wish that they were in a private, endowed university where the staff would not be subject to such uncertainties. What they too conveniently forget is that the income from invested endowment funds has been declining while costs have been rising. In many a private university the certainty of endowment income is like the certainty of a strait-jacket that is drawn tighter every year. On the other hand, legislative appropriations, because based ultimately on taxation, have followed the tendency for taxes to rise with the rise of governmental expenditures and costs. Outsiders are likely to be dazzled by the munificence of the half-dozen universities in the Harvard-Yale-Columbia class and to overlook the fact that financially the state-supported universities are much better off than the run of private universities. Furthermore some of the state universities have greater endowments than many a well-known private university. The University of California, with over $86,000,000, has a greater endowment than Cornell, Northwestern, Princeton, Rochester, Stanford, and Johns Hopkins universities, each with over $60,000,000. Minnesota with more than $59,000,000, is wealthier than Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Washington, Duke, Emory, and New York universities. The universities of Michigan and of Washington with endowments of about $25,000,000 are in the same class with Buffalo, Wesleyan and Brown universities. Being in states whose legislatures have long been generous in their appropriations, these state universities can use their endowment income for academic luxuries that many a private university cannot afford. Furthermore, accustomed to thinking of the very wealthy Universities like Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, and Yale, each with endowments of $100,000,000 or more, as in a class by themselves, you

may be as surprised as I was to learn – and I am not a Texan – that the greatest endowment of all is held by the University of Texas system, over $287,000,000 as compared with Harvard's $278,000,000. I do not know any details about the origin of this vast endowment, but presume it represents some of the wealth from the Texas oil lands. The University of Texas can really eat its appropriations cake and have its endowment cake too!

Now some remarks about the over-all control of state universities. The control of American universities, whether private or public, is different from that of most European universities. The latter trace their origins to mediaeval times when teachers gathered in some convenient city, Paris, Bologna or Oxford, in order to lecture to their students in a communal atmosphere. When the increase in students and teachers called for some kind of formal organization and administration, this body, called the university, was created by the teachers and its control rested in the hands of the teachers. New universities as they came into being tended to adopt the same kind of administration, so that European universities – French universities perhaps excepted – enjoy a high degree of autonomy, with control of curricula and students vested in the teaching staff and university policy determined by a senate or convocation made up of teachers and, often, graduates of the university. Whether practice approximates to this beautiful theory I sometimes wonder. At any rate, the situation was different when higher education came to the future United States of America. There was no time for slowly sinking roots and allowing the leisurely growth of an educational organism. When our first institution of higher learning, Harvard College, was founded in 1636, the colony of Massachusetts had been settled only sixteen years, and the wilderness was still not far away. The general administrative organization had to be established first; the teaching staff came later. In chartering the college the Massachusetts legislature created a corporation made up of the president and a governing board in whom ultimate authority was vested. The model, I have little doubt, was the chartered corporations like the Muscovy Company, the East India Company, or the Virginia Company which had played so great a part in opening England's trade with foreign parts and in setting up her first colonies in the New World. In fact the Massachusetts Bay Colony was itself the creature of just such a corporation, the Massachusetts Bay Company.

When legislatures chartered subsequent private universities like Columbia and Yale they followed the same system of bestowing authority on a president and governing board; and in turn, when state legislatures created state universities they took the same model. But with at least one impor-

tant difference. The boards of most private universities are self-perpetuating; that is, the members of the board choose their own successors. Membership on the boards of state universities is appointive (usually by the governor) or elective, or some combination of the two. Whereas membership on the boards of private universities is often for life, on state-university boards it is usually for fixed terms of six to ten years. To maintain continuity of policy the terms of office are usually 'staggered' so that not more than a fourth or a third of the membership can change at any one time. The boards go under various names; trustees, regents, overseers and governors are the commonest terms. Besides the appointive or elective members there are often *ex officio* members, most commonly the governor of the state and the superintendent of public instruction. Sometimes there are a few alumni representatives, that is members elected by the graduates of the university. Representation of the teaching staff is almost non-existent. On a few boards one to three faculty representatives are members without vote or are permitted to attend meetings as observers. Election or appointment of staff members of the same university to the board is almost unknown. I have heard tell that a few years ago the retired football coach of the University of Michigan got elected in the regular way to the university's board. Friends who were living in Michigan at that time tell me he made a much better board member than one would dare expect, considering the intellectual calibre one looks for in football coaches. This is the only such case that has come to my attention; and I can hardly deem a football coach as speaking for the teaching staff in the same way as a professor of philosophy, physics, or history.

By a sort of overwhelmingly tacit agreement members of university boards are thus expected to be laymen, not academics. In all except church-supported institutions they are preponderantly business men. Often they are graduates of the university; nearly always they are persons who have demonstrated an interest in the university or in higher education in general. Frequently, and this is especially true of private universities, they are chosen for somewhat mercenary reasons: a wealthy business man is appointed to the board in the hope that, his interest in the institution stimulated by membership on the board, he will, in his lifetime or at his death, leave a handsome bequest to the university – and he often does! A more positive value of such men is their inside knowledge of the financial world, which is of great benefit in the investment of a university's endowment funds. They usually place their knowledge disinterestedly at the service of the board, with the result that the record of most universities for efficient management of their investments is very good. The endowments of universities like Harvard, Yale, and Chicago that run into

the hundreds of millions and of many others that can be counted by tens of millions are not all the accumulations of gifts; much represents increase through wise investment.

Though the financial benefit of having a governing board dominated by business men is undeniable — what university ever has enough money? — their influence in other ways is not always so beneficial for the peculiar needs of a university. Academic freedom is one of these. Even for those nurtured in a university environment this is a nebulous term. We can usually recognize its presence and always recognize its absence; but we are hard put to it to define the term. To a 'practical' businessman who has been managing a bank or a chain of multiple shops, still more to a self-made man who thinks of himself as having single-handedly created a large and successful factory, academic freedom sounds like perversity or an excuse for loafing. He knows jolly well what he'd do if his office staff started talking that way! Sack the lot. And he has a tendency to act in the same way when a question of academic freedom comes before a university board. The loyalty-oath controversies that have beset several universities in recent years have accordingly been more vexing than they deserved. Alarmed by reports that some of their teachers were Communists or entertained Communist opinions, a few governing boards tried to impose a loyalty oath containing a disclaimer of membership in or sympathy with the Communist party. When the staff, usually speaking through the mouths of thoroughly non-Communist professors, protested against this as a violation of academic freedom, the boards tended to react somewhat as a 19th century industrialist would have reacted to strike threat — close down the plant and hire a new labor force. Fortunately, common sense and the cooling effect of time have cooperated to bring these controversies to a sensible conclusion. Let me observe here that though state universities have their share of troubles over academic freedom, they are not the prime sufferers. Over the years there have probably been more encroachments or assaults on academic freedom in private than in state universities. The splendid record of enlightenment shown by universities like Harvard and Yale where in the course of two or three centuries the teaching staff has 'trained' the administration and governing board to its way of thinking about academic freedom — this record diverts our attention from the great number of lesser private universities which have been much less enlightened. Considering all the universities, I think the chances for academic freedom are well above average in state universities.

Another less than beneficial influence that can be laid in part to business-man domination on boards is a tendency to appreciate practical subjects at the expense of theoretical, to prefer, for instance, applied science

to pure science. In earlier days this would be shown in the way in which a department of industrial chemistry might have a proportionally larger budget for salary and equipment than the department of chemistry. As regards the physical sciences, especially physics and chemistry, the attitude has changed radically during the past three decades. There pure research, theoretical physics and the like have demonstrated their prestige value as well as practical value so triumphantly that boards are disposed to give such departments first claim on funds and encouragement. Other departments like geology get thinner fare, and the biological sciences still thinner. Arts and letters of course are away off in Siberia. While the physics department may get hundreds of thousands of dollars for a baby cyclotron – if cyclotrons come that cheap – the department of classics may have trouble in getting a hundred dollars for one of its professors to complete a book on Latin epigraphy. But it would be unfair to place the burden of blame for this on the businessman. The roots of this attitude go deep into the national past. Even the humanistically trained Thomas Jefferson, who read his stint of Greek for a half hour every morning, envisioned American education as largely practical training of competent workers to fulfill the demands of a new country and a new society. Benjamin Franklin held similar views. As we have seen, the Morrill Act and its successors were designed to foster education in 'agricultural and mechanic arts'. And today most students come to the university to fit themselves for a particular occupation like journalism, hotel administration, engineering, social work, teaching, and the like. The university governing boards are thus only manifesting the bias of American society.

The charter which established an American university, public or private, created not only a governing board with final authority but also a president to be the board's executive and administrative officer. He is without doubt the most important single officer in an American university. Appointed by the board, he is also, in effect if not by title, the chairman of the board; and so long as he 'delivers the goods' he usually dominates the board. His responsibility and authority are much greater than those of the Continental university's rector or the British university's vice-chancellor. Upon his character, vision, intelligence, and energy depends much of the effectiveness of the university. If the board deems his regime ineffective it can forthwith dismiss him.

Because of the administrative talents that the office requires, the president of a large university has great prestige within his state and often is a national figure. The most famous example of the latter is Woodrow Wilson, who rose from the presidency of Princeton University to the presidency of the United States. Without entering active politics, the univer-

sity president is often 'drafted' to serve in important Federal offices. The president of my university was granted leave a few years ago to serve several months in Washington as under-secretary of Defence in charge of manpower. He is now chairman of the joint Canadian-American defence board, a highly responsible position which, fortunately takes him from the University only intermittently. I would not want to intimate that during his absence in Washington chaos came to the university, but it underlines the importance of a university president that there was a general sense of marking time. Important decisions and changes in university policy had to be deferred till his return.

One great drawback to the constitutional set-up whereby the board and president are legally the university, and the teaching staff something of an afterthought, is the creation of a barrier, invisible but real, between 'faculty' and 'administration'. (In American parlance the faculty is the body of permanent, full-time teachers and researchers in a university.) The board itself, made up of laymen, meeting only a few times yearly, and usually considering only matters referred to it by the president, is naturally remote from the faculty. The qualities required of a president in most of his functions are non-academic; he must be a good organizer and administrator, an effective negotiator with the state legislature when the budget is up for consideration, a good public speaker if at all possible, a man with a keen scent for sources of money, plus a host of other capabilities, nearly all of them on the extrovert side. Such men can be found in an academic community, but they are rare. The increasing tendency has been to draw upon non-academic sources for university presidents. A good illustration is the presidency of the university where I took my B.A. The president when I matriculated was a former professor and world-famous astronomer. Before I graduated he retired and was replaced by the former treasurer of the university. Though in the long run the ex-treasurer proved a successful president, in early years there was much complaint among the faculty that he didn't talk their language. Accordingly the example of General Eisenhower, in other words a proved organizer and administrator, who served briefly as president of Columbia University, is becoming more typical than that of James M. Conant, former president of Harvard and professor of chemistry before that. The administration of a large university, from president downward, has become so complicated, specialized and non-professorial, that already at least one school for university administrators has come into being.

Because of the increasing size and complexity of all universities and because the president must be several diverse personalities in one body, he has had to delegate many of his duties. The consequence has been a

great enlargement of the administrative staff of the university. When I came to my present university it had about 6,000 students and five deans. It now has about 20,000 students, three vice-presidents, some fifteen deans and a multiplicity of assistant deans and assistants to the deans. In this proliferation you can see Parkinson's Law hard at work. Sometimes it seems that we have two administrators for every active teacher. This corps of administrators in their citadel – and often their offices are housed in one central structure, the Administration Building – further enlarges the barrier between faculty and administration. The faculty tend to look upon the administration as the Enemy, the source of bounty, it is true, but the enemy whose moves and motives are always to be regarded with suspicion, to whom as little as possible must be yielded and from whom as much as possible must be cajoled. I imagine the Maltese populace looked in much the same way upon the Knights of St. John in their Valletta citadel.

This barrier might never have been erected if the original charters had specified the powers and responsibilities of the faculty with respect to the governing board and president on one hand and the students on the other, somewhat as the American Constitution defined and separated the powers of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government. But this would have been the manifestation of something very like divine foresight. The legislatures vested ultimate power in the president and board, thinking no doubt that other things would take care of themselves. But presidents and boards, being human, were chary of relinquishing power. Don't think for a moment that the venerable private universities escaped the problem. They merely had an additional century or more to arrive at a workable arrangement between faculty and administration, usually through the creation of a sort of constitution which defines the relationship between the two and creates faculty organizations – senates, committees and the like – to regularize it. The state universities and the newer private universities are at various stages on the road to such a goal. Some state universities, like the University of Illinois and the University of California, are near the goal, having strong, responsible faculty government with faculty control over educational policies. Others have hardly started on the road. There the relation of the administration, including the board, toward the faculty is very paternalistic. The administration decides upon a policy, too often without consulting the faculty in any way, and the faculty must carry it out.

Nevertheless, despite this painting of the dark side of the picture, I believe the American public has displayed a basic common sense in placing ultimate control of state universities in the hands of boards responsible

to the public, directly or indirectly. To paraphrase Clemenceau's dictum about war and generals, education is much too important to be run by teachers. There is a temptation for professionals to run a profession for themselves, not the public they are supposed to serve. The attitude of the American Medical Association toward its public responsibilities has not always appeared disinterested or edifying. I am not sure that a university run solely by its faculty would display any more sense of responsibility. It must be said for the American state university that it has rarely lost sight of its purpose, to serve its state and nation. Visitors from abroad have waxed satiric over some absurdities in this concept. If offered for academic credit, courses on flower arrangement or the use of cosmetics deserve ridicule, and get it – from Americans as well as foreigners. Some courses are better than they appear at first glance. I was inclined to look down my nose at a degree in Hotel Administration until I saw the amount of chemistry, physics, economics and the like which it entails. I still reserve my esteem for a degree in philosophy, mathematics, or history, but I no longer regard a B.A. in Hotel Administration with utter contempt.

One way that the state university from the outset tried to serve the public was to set fees as low as possible. Though in theory some state universities charge no tuition fee whatever to residents of their states, in practice all exact something. But they are always much less than in private universities. The tendency is for state university fees to be highest in the northeastern part of the nation and to diminish as one moves southward and westward. Thus fees in non-technical courses range from $250 or $400 a year in northeastern states like New York, Maine, Maryland, and Pennsylvania; from $150 to $250 in central states like Michigan, Iowa and Nebraska, and from $50 to $100 in southern states like Texas, Florida and Georgia and western states like California, Washington and Wyoming. A comparison of fees in some states where there are a state university and a private university of comparable rank is instructive. A student in liberal arts at Pennsylvania State University pays $250, and at the University of Pennsylvania (private), $800 a year; at the University of Missouri he would pay $70, at Washington University in St. Louis, $600; at the University of California $85, at Stanford University, $750. No wonder that with the exception of two private universities in New York City, all the universities with enrolments of 15,000 or more are state universities.

Another form of public service has been coeducation, in other words extending higher education to the women of the state. In this, state universities, though not absolute pioneers, have been well to the front. The

oldest coeducational institution of higher education was Oberlin College, Ohio, which first enrolled women in 1837. But the state universities of Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota and Nebraska were coeducational from their start; others like Missouri, Michigan, California, Illinois, and Wisconsin became coeducational soon after their founding; and all that were established after 1880 were coeducational. Six Southern States have women's branches, their state university proper being open only to men. Though coeducation is now pretty general in American universities, private and public, remember that Princeton does not admit women at all, and Yale does not admit them to undergraduate instruction. Harvard admits them by the back door, so to speak; they enter Radcliffe College but get most of their teaching from Harvard instructors.

In the addition of new courses of study and fields of investigation, the state universities, following this concept of service, have been originators or early initiators. Agriculture as a course of study for a degree and as a subject for scientific research, seems to have been a child of the state universities. Now it has become so specialized that it has subdivided itself into departments like citriculture, floriculture, horticulture, farm crops, agricultural economics, agricultural engineering, agricultural chemistry, rural sociology, and a host of others. Business administration and finance, first established at the private University of Pennsylvania, was quickly taken up by the University of California, later followed by many other state (and private) universities. Home economics got its start in the state colleges, later state universities, of Iowa, Kansas and Illinois in the 1870's. The first school of journalism was founded at the University of Missouri in 1908, the forerunner of many others in state and private universities. The study of police administration started at the University of California and has spread to many others. The list could be extended almost indefinitely.

A recently developed kind of service to the public has been the creation of bureaux and laboratories which put the skills and knowledge of the staff to use in solving particular public problems. A Bureau of Governmental Research will stand ready to help cities and lesser communities improve their municipal administration; a Bureau of Business and Economic Research will make surveys in order to suggest the kinds of new industries a community may attract. Labour and Industrial Relations Centres are available to labour and industrial groups, not so much for arbitration of immediate disputes but to make long-range plans in areas where friction may occur. Highway Traffic Safety Centres give municipalities and counties the benefit of their knowledge and experience in solving traffic safety problems. In all these the services of economists, political scien-

tists, sociologists, statisticians, highway and civil engineers, police specialists, and many others are enlisted from the staff of the university.

Perhaps the most notable 'service' activity of state universities has been extension work; continuing education or adult education might be a better term. The activity of the county agricultural agent and his feminine colleague, the home economics extension agent, represents one phase. Related to their work are the 'short courses' offered on university campuses. Here particular occupational groups, police sergeants, life-insurance salesmen, dairy farmers, and so on spend one, two, three weeks at the university in order to take refresher courses designed to bring them abreast of recent developments in their occupations. In many state universities there are miniature dormitory villages where these temporary students eat and sleep while taking their short courses. Another phase is the year-round offering of courses, commonly at night, at points all up and down the state. In small towns, classrooms of the local high schools will be used; in large cities whole buildings in the business district are taken over for classroom space. Conducted by members of the university staff, courses of all sorts are offered. The bulk of courses inclines to the practical: engineering draughtmanship, machine design, surveying. Others are designed for better, more understanding living: courses in marital and parental adjustment – serving a purpose similar to the Cana movement here in Malta – courses in adjustment to retirement and old age, courses on contemporary events. Regular academic courses are also offered: Shakespeare, the modern novel, statistics, American history, to name only a few. I've never heard of anyone getting a degree by extension courses alone, but many who for matrimonial or economic reasons had to leave university with a year to go have been able to complete their degrees by extension courses. So varied and so extensive has this extension work become that, although the services of the regular academic staff are used, a large staff of instructors devoted to extension teaching alone has had to be employed. Sometimes, including the county agents, the extension division can number almost a fourth of the entire university staff.

This paper can best be closed with a tribute to the state university by a British-educated historian, former professor in both private and state universities and now president of a private American university. 'The state university is the parent of some of the most valuable academic reforms in American education. The persuasion that two or three institutions on the Atlantic Seaboard are the cause and source of all excellence and growth in American education is an illusion shared only by the uninformed. It was the land grant institution with its experimental and occasionally

raffish open-mindedness that brought learning and research closer to the lives and interests of a new people struggling to control their environment, and gave dignity to pursuits that had no classical roots. The excesses and even nonsense of which these institutions were sometimes guilty were but the shadowside of an enthusiasm for knowledge and a desire to apply it as widely as possible. The open frontier between university and society brought about understanding and support. The presence on the same campus of students of technology and literature, nursing and physics, agriculture and history, pharmacy and mathematics, took the idea of the university into the entire community, and took the concept of efficiency and excellence into occupations and pursuits hitherto closed by traditional ignorance.'*

*C.W. De Kiewiet, 'American Education and the British Commonwealth', *Universities Quarterly*, xiii (Feb. 1959), 139-40.