

5-2019

Educating Citizens: Representing the Social Function of American Higher Education in Three Periods from the Rise of Modern University to the 21st Century

Elizabeth Jacoby

Follow this and additional works at: <https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Jacoby, Elizabeth, "Educating Citizens: Representing the Social Function of American Higher Education in Three Periods from the Rise of Modern University to the 21st Century" (2019). *Theses and Dissertations (All)*. 1684.
<https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/1684>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (All) by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact cclouser@iup.edu, sara.parme@iup.edu, edzimmer@iup.edu.

EDUCATING CITIZENS: REPRESENTING THE SOCIAL FUNCTION
OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THREE PERIODS FROM
THE RISE OF THE MODERN UNIVERSITY TO THE 21ST CENTURY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Elizabeth Jacoby

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

May 2019

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Elizabeth Jacoby

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

David Downing, Ph.D.
Distinguished University Professor,
Advisor

Todd Thompson, Ph.D.
Professor of English

Christopher Orchard, D.Phil.
Professor of English

Eric Leuschner, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English, Fort Hays
State University

ACCEPTED

Randy L. Martin, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Educating Citizens: Representing the Social Function of American Higher Education in Three Periods from the Rise of the Modern University to the 21st Century

Author: Elizabeth Jacoby

Dissertation Chair: Dr. David Downing

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Todd Thompson
Dr. Christopher Orchard
Dr. Eric Leuschner

This dissertation investigates the social and political functions of higher education in the United States by examining three novels, each one engaging key issues in their three respective historical periods. The basic premise of this study is the remarkable growth of the university in the Post-World War II period, especially in the 30-year period from 1945-75 when undergraduate enrollments in the U.S. went from about 2 million to 12 million; today, there are more than 20 million. Yet, in the last 40 years there has been an equally remarkable decline in public funding for higher education. Jeffrey Williams has characterized this as a shift from the welfare state university to the defunded, post-welfare state university. Indeed, higher education in the 21st-century is in crisis. Given these circumstances, it is especially important to gain a clear historical understanding of these changes by gaining a much broader historical perspective of the rise of higher education in the U.S. through influences over the past 100 years. One way to begin that process is by examining some of the widely received literary representations of higher education since the rise of the modern university.

Therefore, this dissertation contributes to that project by offering close readings of three key novels, *Stover at Yale*, *Changing Places*, and *Moo*, each one set in a significant period of transformation of higher education. Williams outlines the three periods: 1) the late 19th and early 20th centuries, with the rise of the modern university when its institutional organization of disciplinary departments and specialized faculty came into being; 2) the expansion period of the

Welfare State University (1945-1975), witnessing the massive growth of higher education in the U.S.; and, 3) over the last 40 years the restructuring of higher education leading to the Post-Welfare State University (1975--2018). My basic theoretical orientation will draw upon New Historicism, Cultural Materialism, and Critical University Studies because they situate the texts within their socio-historical contexts within the political economy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to extend my deepest appreciation to Dr. Christopher Orchard and Dr. Eric Leuschner for helping with this project. To my colleagues in the English Department at Saint Clair County Community College who also spent many hours discussing the nature of higher education. To Phil, for the inspiration and endless love. And to Dr. David Downing: without his help this project would have never been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
ONE	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND IN THREE PHASES: THE MODERN UNIVERSITY, THE WELFARE STATE UNIVERSITY, AND THE POST WELFARE STATE UNIVERSITY	1
TWO	STOVER'S EXPERIENCE OF THE MODERN UNIVERSITY	32
THREE	THE WELFARE STATE UNIVERSITY: FROM EUPHORIA TO RUMMIDGE	95
FOUR	MOO U: AN EXEMPLAR OF THE POST WELFARE STATE UNIVERSITY.....	137
FIVE	CONCLUSION: CONJECTURES ON THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION	185
	WORKS CITED	199

CHAPTER ONE

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND IN THREE PHASES: THE MODERN UNIVERSITY, THE WELFARE STATE UNIVERSITY, AND THE POST WELFARE STATE UNIVERSITY

This dissertation investigates the social and political functions of higher education in the United States by examining three novels, each one engaging key issues in their three respective historical periods. The basic premise of this study is the remarkable growth of the university in the Post-World War II period, especially in the 30-year period from 1945-75 when undergraduate enrollments in the U.S. went from about 2 million to 12 million; today, there are more than 20 million. Yet, in the last 40 years there has been an equally remarkable decline in public funding for higher education. Jeffrey Williams has characterized this as a shift from the welfare state university to the defunded, post-welfare state university. Indeed, higher education in the 21st-century is in crisis. Given these circumstances, it is especially important to gain a clear historical understanding of these changes by gaining a much broader historical perspective of the rise of higher education in the U.S. through influences over the past 100 years.

This dissertation contributes to that project by offering close readings of three key novels, each one set in a significant period of transformation of higher education. Williams outlines the three historical periods: 1) the late 19th and early 20th centuries, with the rise of the modern university when its institutional organization of disciplinary departments and specialized faculty came into being; 2) the expansion period of the Welfare State University (1945-1975), witnessing the massive growth of higher education in the U.S.; and, 3) over the last 40 years the restructuring of higher education leading to the Post-Welfare State University (1975--2018). Such terminology will be used throughout this project in order to historicize the three periods. This last phase, the post welfare state, has been characterized by diminished public funding,

escalating tuitions, and skyrocketing student debt (despite the continued increase in student enrollments). This dissertation explores this history by analyzing one representative text from each of the three periods. My basic theoretical orientation draws upon New Historicism, Cultural Materialism, and Critical University Studies because they provide clear ways of linking literary and non-literary texts, situating them within their socio-historical contexts within the political economy. Each of these texts serve as a literary representation of higher education from the modern period through the post welfare state. The three main body chapters, therefore, follow the three main periods. The first chapter analyzes Owen Johnson's campus novel (focusing primarily on student life), *Stover at Yale*, set in the period around the First World War, a version of Yale through the eyes of Dink Stover, a student, during the rise of the modern university. While Yale is an elite private university, it displays much of the conflict for students during the modern university period. David Lodge's *Changing Places* is an academic novel (focusing primarily on faculty experiences), and it serves to represent the situation within higher education during the Welfare State period and set at a fictionalized University of California-Berkeley, an elite public university which illustrates the lives of students, faculty, and the heavy-handedness of a fictionalized governor of California. While Lodge is a British author, his focus on American higher education reflects the continuing transatlantic influence shaping the welfare-state university. The portrayal of a fictionalized British public university allows for the examination of how the welfare state university differs depending on the geopolitical economy. Finally, the last body chapter addresses Jane Smiley's *Moo*, a brilliant novel that provides an exemplary model of how, during the post-welfare period, the roles of faculty, staff, and students have been dramatically altered by contemporary neoliberal policies of austerity, privatization, and defunding of public higher education at a rural land grant institution.

The literary selections are admittedly not entirely representative of their respective historical periods because there are, indeed, idiosyncrasies in each of the texts. Nevertheless, they also each bear witness to the particular historical circumstances of the geopolitical economy that have shaped their institutions. The genres of the academic and campus novels also reflect key historical differences. The genre of the campus novel focusing on student life is most appropriate for the modern period. Johnson's *Stover at Yale* is a campus novel focusing on the plight of the student during the rise of the modern university when student life mattered more to most than their strictly academic pursuits in the classroom. The inclusion of Lodge's academic novel is an attempt at capturing the voice of the professoriate towards the end of the period associated with the welfare state university; and Smiley's *Moo* is a kind of hybrid blend of features shared by both the academic and campus novels. Despite these differences, there is ample room to discuss both roles in each respective historical period in order to better capture the voices of both faculty and students within the evolution of the U.S. higher education system.

Surprisingly, the genre does not receive much critical attention from the academy. During a period of crisis, like the one we are witnessing during the post welfare period, such omissions seem counterproductive. However, it is less surprising when considering such omissions may be linked to their livelihoods during our current tumultuous political climate. With academic freedom under attack, any attention given to the faults of the local, state, and federal governments, much less the individual institutions themselves, could cause turmoil and upheaval for any member of the professoriate. This project proves that this is not an altogether new attack on the professoriate. For example, Lodge demonstrates a fictionalized Ronald Reagan who is hell bent on going after certain members of the professoriate by name on national television for "encouraging" the behavior of the students during the height of the welfare state.

Further critique of the university is exhibited in Smiley's novel where a revenge-seeking governor is convinced he must punish Moo University through budget cuts merely because students, staff, and faculty exercised their constitutional right of free speech. Professors inhabiting the post welfare state institutions of higher education are increasingly afraid of political and social backlash, and respectively the lack of critical attention to the academic and campus novel seems akin to job security. Many are not willing to sacrifice their employment to shed light on the ailments present within the genre of such novels. While there are innumerable novels in this genre, the three novels chosen for this project were carefully considered because of content and the characters involved. Johnson's *Stover at Yale* adequately illustrates the plight of a young affluent student who has difficulties navigating the social terrain at Yale. While this novel is set on the campus of an illustrious and private university, it highlights many of the societal ills of the early twentieth century. Most of the students who inhabited the university were affluent because of the lack of financial aid and the cost of attending any college was out of reach for many in middle and lower-class America. Thus, the elite nature of Yale's campus only amplifies the economic and social issues of the modern period. Dink Stover illustrates the snobbery of the affluent class and the struggles of those of lower economic standing while challenging the system from within. While this novel escapes the satire filled academic and campus novels of later decades, it is a literary representation of all that ailed the modern university before the state became a player in funding American higher education. The ideology of education as an individual good morphed into one that was viewed as a social prerogative where most of the bill was footed by the United States government which took off with the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944. The outcomes of social programs such as these is highlighted in Lodge's *Changing Places*. This university is exemplified ideologically in a public

state institution, a fictionalized UC Berkeley, during the height of some of the most prominent social movements in the 1960s. While not a mimetic representation, it is a literary masterpiece when highlighting some of the trials and triumphs of the welfare period. It is clear within Lodge's text that higher education has morphed into a social good. This ideology permeated the fabric of the American higher education system during this period only to cause its own demise. In later decades, or what Williams refers to as the post welfare state, this crumbling structure is illustrated through Smiley in her campus novel, *Moo*. The setting is even different from the private Ivy and the elite public university; *Moo* is set as a rural college in Iowa and is a land grant institution void of any elitist titles. The societal ills of defunding shows this institution falling in on itself whether it be through outdated dorms or crumbling former agriculture buildings or even accepted business ethos jargon of the post welfare period. The differences in each of these three institutions are important, but what is more important to recognize is the influence of the capitalist world system effects all three similarly. This project sheds light on those similarities.

Before we turn to the novels themselves, I will first provide a brief historical overview of the three periods pertinent to this study.

I. The Rise of the Modern University

The late nineteenth and early twentieth century brought about significant changes in American higher education. While the sectarian, denominational colleges still existed, the rise of the modern university saw gradual curriculum shifts. Course offerings and degrees were expanded to include many fields of study, and by 1869, the newly appointed President of Harvard, Charles Eliot, had introduced the elective curriculum, and it set a model for many others to follow. By 1860 there were 241 colleges in America (Thelin 41-42). The Post-

Revolutionary College had provided some necessary steps toward providing government aid for public institutions. However, it was not until after the Civil War had begun that the federal government issued the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. Although not its primary intention, this gave rise to public institutions of higher education in the United States. The passage of this legislation was made possible due to the start of the Civil War in 1861. Federal legislation such as this had previously been hotly contested because state legislatures had already taken steps to delineate land to those interested in college building and federal involvement was seen as overreach by some. This program “began in 1862 with a generous incentive system whereby each state was allotted by formula a portion of federal lands commiserate with the number of its congressional representatives” (Thelin 76). The Morrill Land Grant Act also gave incentives to offer the liberal arts as well as practical agricultural and engineering courses. These incentives fueled the growth of other academic programs. But, in reality, the primary intention of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 was to promote expansion westward. One way of doing so was to allocate land for education as that served as one way to attract such expansion.

By 1880, there was a huge decline in the expansion and growth from the initial land grant act. Separately, yet another federal program, the Hatch Act of 1887 promoted the growth of agricultural colleges. Although farmers harbored great distrust for governmental intervention, such programs proved fruitful for the economy in the United States in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Such an investment by the federal government was cemented by a second Morrill Act in 1890, which held several provisions for “materials” (Thelin 135). These federal programs effected regions all over the United States in different ways, military training and the sciences gained support as well. The success of these programs began a tumultuous marriage between higher education and the state.

The Morrill Land Grant Acts and the Hatch Act were the first federally sponsored programs that funded higher education and solidified the relationship with the state apparatus. This gave rise to the modern university shaped by the institutional divisions of the university into separate liberal arts and professional colleges. Following the German influence, the shift from teaching to research-based institutions of higher education produced the American research university with its separate colleges under the umbrella institution. It is important to distinguish the shift from sectarian to “science” based education. As Thelin argues, “‘Science’ as it was invoked in American institutions—government, business, and education—was less a value system at odds with religion than an organizational ethos that prized order and efficiency” (Thelin 114) As it applies to higher education during the modern period, Thelin continues, “For an endeavor or an organization to be ‘scientific’ meant that it was disciplined, ordered, and systematic—in other words, that it adhered to the principles of ‘scientific management’” (114). Further, a university or college was considered successful if it had the following characteristics:

1. Presidential presence,
2. Professors as professional experts,
3. Pedagogy that replaced recitation with lecture and seminar,
4. Professional schools where a student could only be admitted after completing two years of coursework
5. Curriculum focused on science, utility, liberal culture, and piety,
6. Professionalization of students (Master’s degree pursuers and beyond),
7. Facilities: libraries, observatories, laboratories, and proper storage space, and
8. The dynamics of the academic enterprise—to build strong scholarship. (Thelin 127-

131)

Yale would have already established such a system by the turn of the 20th century when Dink Stover landed on campus. Yet, his initial major concern is not centered on curriculum, but social status. While the modern university was defining itself, students set out with different ideas concerning the purpose and structure of the institution. The students were part of the collegiate architecture and were situating themselves as college men and women. In fact, it became fashionable to attend university (Thelin 156). It is at this juncture that Dink Stover and his classmates inhabit the formal and informal spaces at the fictionalized Yale University.

One such informal space was the social aspect of college life. Yale had a system of secret societies, which were supposed to be based on merit, but often were based on popularity and wealth. “This American collegiate ethos radiated from the influential core at Yale. The key to the ‘college system’ was ‘Yale’s democracy’—the proposition that campus activities provided a free forum in which students might demonstrate their talents and be judged on their merits by student peers” (Thelin 166). In fact, many of America’s most prominent future leaders came out of Yale and were heavily engaged in this part of collegiate life. As Thelin argues, “Yale was America’s college” (167). Still, the merit-based system was not working because wealth and popularity were still overwhelmingly components of who was chosen for secret societies. Some of the more notable endeavors were participating on the Yale eleven, making the *Lit*, or to be selected for the glee club. It also mattered how successful a man was in each of these individual endeavors. For instance, if a Yale man were to become captain of the football team that would almost surely result in an election to a senior society. This concept was equally as applicable of men who were to become managers of student teams or the editor-in-chief of the student newspaper (Thelin 167). While the ultimate goal was to gain an election to a senior society, sophomore societies also existed and were often prerequisites. “Although undergraduates may

have been indifferent about final examinations for courses, they were serious about the solemn 'Tap Day,' when senior members of the honor groups went through elaborate rituals to identify the chosen few initiatives" (Thelin 167-8).

Furthermore, the rise in popularity of the university also placed added emphasis on other extracurricular activities, which included athletics and school spirit. Between 1890 and 1910 the everyday American became infatuated with the life of undergraduate students. One of the reasons Johnson's *Stover at Yale* was so popular was in part the rise of such popularity, "This genre of popular literature was the outcome of the combination of pride on the part of insiders (students, alumni, faculty, and presidents) with the curiosity of outsiders" (Thelin 157). College spirit was definitely on the rise and each respective institution took steps to be included in the national conversation by "...adopting institutional colors and mascots" (Thelin 159). While many schools were adopting such totems and emblems, they were also creating fight songs often referred to as "college hymns" and were meant to portray belonging long after the student left campus. To illustrate how much donors were appreciated in the modern era, the University of Chicago had a hymn that praised John D. Rockefeller. "...Wonderful man is he,/Gives all his spare change to the U. of C./He keeps the ball rolling/In our Great Varsity/He pays Dr. Harper/ To Help us Grow Sharper/ To the Glory of U. of C." (Thelin 160-161). Student life was beginning to flourish, and much of the local community became equally involved in student affairs. The connection to the community was valued, intimate, and increasingly tribal during the modern era. Yet, the value of education, monetarily and otherwise, was constantly being weighed socially, economically, and politically. Athletics added an extra layer of intrigue and importance to the modern university, "The early crew races between Harvard and Yale were often weeklong events, complete with newspaper reporters and onlookers watching from private

railroad cars that ran along the course route. Later baseball gained great popularity, especially during commencement week, with college teams playing before large crowds of alumni” (Thelin 177-8). Still, there was not a sport more popular than the rise of intercollegiate football. Major rivalries attracted the communities from both respective institutions, “According to William Oriad, college football and the newspapers mutually enhanced one another. The varsity football teams became the object of extended coverage by eager reporters, commanding front-page headlines day after day” (Thelin 178). The only major shift that occurred in terms of structure was the reorganization of athletic programs. Faculty and administration pushed, often in vain, to have coaches appointed and hired to run such athletic endeavors. Eventually the transformation occurred and they had instilled a professional coaching staff. Regardless of structure, American college football was here to stay (Thelin 180). Universities learned that steady revenue streamed in if they maintained an adequate football program.

During the early part of the twentieth century, colleges and universities around the country found that they could not operate without charging tuition. Thus, many of the men who attended university during this era were affluent. At Brown University, the average cost of tuition during the 1907-1908 school year amounted to \$393 which would be the equivalent to \$7300 per year (equivalent to the year 2000) while the average annual income of a middle-class family in the New England area was between \$600-\$2000 per year (Thelin 170). For affluent families, tuition was nominal. For others, tuition had been saved up over the course of many years just to be able to attend the American college or university. It is important to note that the German University was fully funded by the state while its counterpart in America was not. In fact,

Growth and success characterized the era of the ‘university-builders’ between 1880 and 1910. The wealth and energy of the period made for an exciting time in higher education. It was not, however, a smooth evolution. Accounts of the university-builders—a mix of donors and presidents—indicate that the risks and rivalries that defined American business competition of the era were replicated on the American campus. (Thelin 111)

Thorstein Veblen often characterized these people as “captains of erudition” which was meant to reflect the already common “captains of industry” (Thelin 111). The rise of industry during the late nineteenth century generated enormous amounts of wealth. In 1876, the largest donation that had been witnessed during this era occurred at John Hopkins University. Seven million dollars was donated for its founding and the hospital. This donation would have been the equivalent of \$112.8 million dollars in the year 2000 (Thelin 112). While Veblen is being satirical with his rhetoric, he encapsulates how the business model of higher education is operating during the modern period. While the business ethos permeates the modern university, this ideology transforms over the next several decades into a commoditized university influenced by privatization and the world capitalist system. This ideology becomes apparent because the American Modern University had to depend on outside funding to operate and prosper. The rise of industry at the right moment allowed the reality of this moment in American higher education (Thelin 115).

Despite the decreasing influence of religion, it played an integral role in funding institutions across the country. John D. Rockefeller’s donation to the University of Chicago “...was offered in cooperation with the American Baptist Education Society to create an eminent Baptist institution in the Midwest” (Thelin 113). Similarly, at Vanderbilt University the Methodists fueled their goals and further expanded them in the south when rejuvenating Trinity

College (Thelin 113). Thus, the rise in philanthropic endeavors in regards to colleges and universities cannot be solely attributed to the wealth and growth in industry, but also to the prevalent religious sects throughout the United States.

While the university was shifting, it remained a place of isolation for many students who did not come from affluent backgrounds. This makes Yale a perfect setting to analyze the stark contrasts of economic and social division. It is noteworthy to acknowledge that the college separated such students based on where a student could afford to live. For instance, Stover lives in a double with Tough his freshman year, but opts for a single his sophomore year. This was a perk that many students of lower socioeconomic backgrounds could not afford. Such separation through perks created a fragmentary experience for many students, and it is not until Dink Stover branches out that he realizes the harsh reality of such divisions. Although Dink comes from a privileged background, Johnson's protagonist represents the disenchanting student whose aim was to climb the social and economic ladder in society. The dissatisfaction Stover experiences in the course of the novel reveals the gap between reproducing an educated elite, on the one hand, and seeking the liberal goals of producing a more egalitarian vision of educated citizens serving social needs for all social classes, not just the privileged. Published in 1912, Johnson's campus novel, one that focuses primarily on the student body, conveys not only the struggle of the student, but the disconnect between the college curriculum and the student body.

II. After World War II: The Welfare State University

Higher education saw another massive shift during the post World War II era. Another war precipitated increasing integration between the university and the state, educational endeavors and military expenditures. Indeed, World War II changed the way higher education was seen in America due to the political, economic, and social response it created. From 1945-

1975, the American University saw the largest growth of enrollment in its history. Thelin would argue that this time period was one of “prosperity, prestige, and popularity” (260). Jeffrey Williams refers to this era as the Welfare State; others, such as Thelin, refer to it as the Golden Age of higher education. The influx of students occurs because of mass government spending in the form of G.I. Bills, earmarked government money from a state and federal level, as well as the overall increase in population (Baby Boomers). During the Welfare State, academic freedom and funding were at an all-time high despite attacks during McCarthyism and Cold War suppressions, which came at the cusp of the Modern University and the Welfare State. During the 1930s-40s, there was a lot of spying done by the FBI on college campuses. J. Edgar Hoover collected thousands of names that were alleged communists or those affiliated with such people and groups. During the McCarthy hearings in the early 1950s, many professors were fired because of allegations of being affiliated with those who were accused. Hoover stated, “You cannot have a free intellect if you are a communist” (Wilson 55). Despite the distrust that had formed between the state and higher education, federal and state programs continued to fund universities and colleges. On the horizon, many recognized the need to expand and fund higher education due to the influx of the “baby boom.” By the time Baby Boomers entered the university, mass higher education had taken hold.

Many of the Baby Boomer generation profited from the GI Bill that was created for WWII veterans. This bill was the largest “social-entitlement” program in American history (Williams 193). In 1940, 1.5 million students attended college. By 1950 it rose to 2.7 million, and in 1970 this number had almost tripled as 7.9 million students attended university (Williams 191). “The fundamental historic change that set into motion the dramatic expansion of enrollments as well as numerous curricular innovations was that higher education had come to be

a major focus of attention in the formulation of public policies at both the state and federal levels” (Thelin 261). To understand this shift more accurately, the analysis of certain policies that directly (or in some cases indirectly) influenced the rise of the Welfare State are pertinent. This is why the G.I. Bill was so imperative; the bill stood to help transition once the war ended and to retrain or train men coming home from war so they could continue to be productive members of society. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, with the cooperation of Congress, were worried about what would happen to these men returning home from war so they set out to accommodate. “In 1944, Congress focused its attention on drafting a bill that showcased a program known as the ‘52-20 Club.’ It guaranteed each veteran an unemployment benefit of \$20 per week (\$195 in 2000 dollars) for one year” (Thelin 262). This bill, later known as the Serviceman’s Readjustment Act of 1944, also figured this would help out automobile factories transition from “tank treads to automobile tires” (Thelin 262-263). Eventually, education benefits had been worked into the language of the bill and passed narrowly by one vote. A man returning home from war would be allotted one year of education for every ninety days of service “plus one month for each month of active duty, for a maximum of 48 months” (Thelin 263). This bill also allowed for up to \$500 dollars annually for tuition, fees, and books. During this era, the average cost of tuition was about \$300 and textbook costs were relatively low and inexpensive. There were also monthly allowances given to men depending on the status of their families. Single men were given \$50 a month while married men received slightly more at \$75 a month (Thelin 263). There were very few politicians who believed this plan would have as much of an impact as it did. “Even supporters of the G.I. Bill projected that only about 8-10 percent of veterans would take advantage of the federal government’s program that allowed them to enroll in college” (Thelin 263). The results were quite astonishing—sixteen percent had

signed up to use their G.I. Bill for acquiring a college education. One of the reasons for the success of the bill was due in part to colleges. They made a concerted effort to advertise the bill in brochures and pamphlets. Marketing strategies were geared toward luring the veteran whose bill would be footed at the expense of the federal government (Thelin 267-268).

As enrollments soared, universities and colleges had to find ways to make room for incoming veterans. Two years after the bill was enacted, President Harry Truman put together a task force to research the function of higher education with the state called the Commission on Higher Education. It was charged with the “task of examining the functions of higher education in our democracy and the means by which they can be best performed” (Thelin 268). This marked the first time that a sitting United States President wanted research and inquiry regarding the function of higher education with the state. The result of this commission was published as the Truman Commission Report and was unique because it showed that “...higher education was integral to the national interest, including its international and social roles as well as national defense” (Thelin 268). While Truman lacked the support to dramatically change the structure of higher education on the basis of this report itself, it still addressed the importance of higher education in American society. While this ideology became increasingly popular, there were others who believed that many of the dissidents and troublemakers originated from the university and colleges campuses, “The Cold War campaign of Senator Joseph McCarthy’s House Un-American Activities Committee and other investigative bodies caught most campus leaders off guard, since their presumption was that they were part of the solution, not the problem, in safeguarding the United States as potent democracy in the new international order” (Thelin 274). As McCarthyism took hold in American society, the welfare state became more violent and unpredictable.

On a blustery day in January in 1952, the McCarran report that appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee and claimed that there were at least 3500 known professors who were members of the communist party and they meant to infiltrate institutions of higher learning because they wanted to influence youth. While the Red Scare felt very real, it also allowed the government to attack academic freedom due to an ever-increasing anticommunist American political landscape (Lucas 224-6). The AAUP's position was "'so long as the Communist party in the United States is a legal political party, affiliation with that party in and of itself should not be regarded as a justifiable reason for exclusion from the academic profession'" (quoted in Lucas 226). It took many years into the decade before McCarthyism began to lose momentum as he began to lose credibility (Lucas 227). In fact, when the Soviet Union launched the first artificial satellite into orbit in 1957, a shift occurred. With the threat of being outdone by the Soviets or other countries, Americans focused on cultivating education for national security interests, both political and military. "As concern mounted over the possibility that the United States lagged behind the Soviets in the 'space race,' the official standard for judging education was whether it could be made politically or militarily useful" (Lucas 253). Even during the Kennedy presidency, the shift on education focused on how to achieve national agendas items.

Student protests during the 1950s and 1960s were an added component to the turmoil surrounding higher education post McCarthyism and previous to the conflict in Vietnam. There was muted criticism of racial segregation; and sporadic protests took place against the escalating international arms race. Opposition to the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons was another cause that inspired relatively small numbers of students to join in petition drives, marches, and rallies (until by international treaty all testing by the superpowers went underground, whereupon interest waned). (Lucas 255-6)

Protests, however, were actually scant in the 1950s. Relatively few college students became engaged in political and social issues and this is one of the many reasons why this generation is often referred to as the “silent generation” (Lucas 256). This shifts dramatically with the turn of the decade.

The 1960s saw student protests and campus involvement rise to an unprecedented level. The fight for civil rights became a central issue for college students. With the oncoming draft in the early part of the decade, young Americans were particularly engaged politically and socially. Male enrollment in colleges and universities soared in an effort to avoid the draft. Antiwar sentiment also soared exponentially (Lucas 256-7). “One social cause interacted with another synergistically, building momentum; and in process many American youths were thoroughly radicalized” (Lucas 257). This is where David Lodge’s novel, *Changing Places*, becomes relevant. Although situated at the end of the welfare state, Lodge accurately portrays a university that has been affected by student unrest that resulted in increased civic engagement in the form of protest, campus speakers, sit-ins, walk-outs, and an overall distrust of authority. According to Loss, this era was known as “The Rights Revolution.” The ideology that existed before this revolution was rooted in a deep desire to cultivate “better” citizens: “While citizens have always been trained to serve the state, not until the twentieth century did the state take an active interest in, and provide financial support for, training democratic citizens” (Loss 11). As we have seen, the United States government sought in vain for years to make higher education accessible and a priority in order to develop its nation’s citizens and develop new educational institutions through various programs such as the G.I. Bill and the National Defense Education Act of 1958. But while attempting to create more civically engaged citizens, the government was also fueling a social and political force that had not yet realized the potential of its power.

The later part of the Welfare State proved to be quite tumultuous. Students and faculty alike took to the sidewalks and streets to protest various issues. Christopher Loss discusses activists such as Mario Savio who took to the steps of Sproul Plaza at the University of California, Berkeley in 1964 to gain support for the freedom of speech (181). Individual groups with special interests began forming around the country. Women's and African American Studies became two major political movements for students and higher education. The student body absorbed causes and ideologies. As a result, universities started to preach diversity, which caused a shift in who was permitted access. This strain between the student body and the university became a controversial issue once more. Lodge's novel addresses the conflict of People's Park, the Women's Movement, Third World Country Hunger, Students for a Democratic Society, and the influence of a conservative Ronald Reagan and his minions—The Alameda Sheriff's Department and the United States National Guard in Berkeley, California in 1969.

Further, Lodge's campus novel, *Changing Places*, provides useful and detailed analysis of how the roles of faculty and students had changed largely due to contact and access within a transatlantic context of British and American higher education. While Professor's Zapp and Sparrow have varying experiences, many expansionist agendas become transparent beyond each country's borders. The narratives that the reader follows, mostly of Professors Zapp and Swallow, are representative of many changes that occurred as a result of the Golden Age of academia, or what Williams commonly refers to as the welfare state university, with the United States and Britain because higher education enjoyed a period where social entitlement programs fueled the experiences of faculty and students alike. While Rummidge did not see the level of civic unrest and violence, there were residual effects that reached the institution (and the real

version—the University of Birmingham). Issues such as academic freedom, tenure, and opening the curriculum were brought to the public sphere by faculty and students alike; and overwhelming pressures from local, state, and federal governments were all culminating into violent clashes with police and the United States National Guard on Euphoria’s campus, a fictionalized elite public university, and manifesting themselves in the UK, at a small British public university, as sit-ins and peaceful demonstrations. This era of higher education would forever change the landscape of university and college campuses across the United States and forced painful conversations among many European institutions as well. Thus, it is nostalgically referred to as the Golden Age of academia, which precedes the starved beast of later decades.

III. The Post-Welfare State University

The shift to the post-welfare state university was quite catastrophic. In reaction and backlash to the student uprisings, policies were enacted that began the defunding of higher education while shifting the burden of cost onto the students. From the Reagan era onward, the university has been under attack. Presidents Bush, Clinton, Obama, and Trump have done little to help the defunding issue when it comes to education. Indeed, President Bill Clinton was responsible for domestic discretionary cuts in the 1997 Welfare Reform Act which allowed states to allocate federal monies, once earmarked for education, elsewhere. Domestic Discretionary monies are allocated toward “education, community and economic development, transportation, housing, national parks, energy—and, of course, the Older Americans Act and other programs servicing seniors and their families” (Congress). Politicians, regardless of their affiliation, have been restructuring the higher education system by continually cutting funding.

This fallout further resulted in a never-ending attack on the academy as well. The attack has had very tangible consequences during our current post-welfare state period. For one thing,

“the state-higher education partnership collapsed” (Loss 215). This collapse and defunding of higher education after 1975 was partly a right-wing reaction to the “radicalization” that had emerged on many campuses during the 1960s-70s. “Events such as these convinced many observers that higher education had become a breeding ground for political radicalism, not democratic citizenship” (Loss 217). As a result, neoliberal political policies were employed to restrain the university system and such policies helped to sufficiently end what Williams has coined the “Welfare State” of higher education. This periodization of higher education is often referred to as the post welfare state. Yet, other theorists have labeled the same period the “corporate university,” “neoliberal university,” “commodified university,” or the “privatized university.” Each of these terms refers specifically to this period encapsulated in *Moo*, roughly from 1975 onward, in American higher education. Such terms often refer to the business ethos of the post welfare state university that has evolved since the modern period. As public policy began to control the financial situations at most institutions, , and was then interrupted by privatization, such terms were created to contextualize which facet of the capitalist system was adversely affecting the post welfare state university. For example, some of those policies include the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 and the Welfare Reform act of 1997 which aided in breaking the back of the New Deal. With the rise of successful neoliberal agendas, the United States saw the rise of for-profit colleges, adjunct faculty labor, and tuition that has risen three times the rate of inflation (Williams 196). With such increases, a dramatic shift had taken place regarding the role of faculty and students alike, and for-profit colleges began to challenge the very foundation of higher education as a social good deserving of public support. When George W. Bush took office in 2000, he embraced Clinton’s economic policies and extended those tax policies that were introduced in the previous era throughout his two terms in office. With an increasing

demand of private funds, President Barack Obama followed the Bush mantra even after promising to lower the burden of student debts.

While many have hoped that with the Obama administration such flagrant abuses might be curtailed, the reality has proven otherwise. The global economic crisis provides even further justification for the privatization of education and thus the shrinking of the public protections for knowledge, labor rights, and basic human services. (Downing 1)

It is here that the increasingly privatized university system is taking hold. With the election of Donald Trump, the outlook is bleak for higher education. In the last three decades, the average tuition at four-year institutions has risen by 156 percent (Kelton 11). The current President of the United States and his appointee for United States Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, are even further fueling the same neoliberal rhetoric that began to dominate political and economic life in the U.S. as the more generous public funding of the welfare state period came to an end. DeVos may have long established views on the K-12 systems, which are far from favorable, but she has virtually little record on her positions in regards to higher education. She was recently quoted,

I'm reminded of a recent conversation I had with the Israeli ambassador to the United States. He posed a rather provocative question: 'Why hasn't America's higher ed bubble burst?' He was baffled as to why America's businesses haven't simply stepped in to create their own education programs to equip individuals with the necessary skills, instead of relying on others to get it right for them. In many other parts of the world, employers and educators work hand-in-hand to line up the skills required with those actually taught. (Strauss)

In support of DeVos's economic model of higher education, the Israeli Ambassador goes so far as almost to suggest that degrees obtained at an American college or university is worthless.

Accordingly, DeVos urges businesses to become more involved in higher education because the federal government cannot be part of the solution (Strauss). Such a shift in rhetoric reinforces the notions of the corporate university.

Although set in the early 21st century, Jane Smiley's *Moo* provides a highly satirical and often comic novel reflecting this neoliberal re-structuring of higher education, into what some may also refer as the neoliberal university, around short-term principles of profit and loss. For example, as we will see, one of the leading and most influential professors at Moo U, Dr. Lionel Gift, consistently deploys the neoliberal rhetoric that permeates the entire institution. He refers to students as “customers” and attempts to allocate large funds from outside sources for personal gain. While Smiley uses Gift as a political ploy, she reveals many issues of the post-welfare state through the eyes and actions of many of her characters. Even the governor in her novel, Governor Orville T. Early, is employed as a neoliberal politician who will not stop at anything to further restrain the power of the higher education system.

The defunding of public higher education has meant that universities must depend much more on outside funding and donations, which come with repressive stipulations in an increasingly privatized university setting. Tuition has skyrocketed in an effort to drive out those of the middle and lower classes who cannot afford the sticker price. Students are suffering because of crushing tuition debt and are forced to pick up part time jobs. While they no longer have time to be students like those who occupied the university during the welfare state, faculty are facing a similar pitfall when it comes to time. Faculty cuts, as a result of economic recession, are occurring at every institution of higher education across the country. As a result, part-time labor is on the rise often out numbering the number of full-timers at an institution. Neoliberal agendas are allowing the economic conditions not only to effect students but their professoriate

as well. We will see the results of this agenda most pronounced in the post-welfare period, but the ties between business and higher education have much deeper roots as we will also see in each of the succeeding chapters.

Chapter-by-Chapter Overview

Chapter 2 begins with a close reading of Johnson's *Stover at Yale*. This novel is a poignant depiction of the modern university during the early years of the 20th century. Published in 1912, this campus novel is told from the perspective of young Dink Stover. Stover begins his career at Yale under the distinct impression that he will rise the social ladder by joining one of the many prestigious student clubs and becoming captain of the football team. What Stover did not realize was how isolating a college experience could be when the status quo is challenged. Stover quickly realizes he does not want to be a part of something elite and exclusionary and often bucks the society system and men of his own social and economic class. Johnson uses Stover to illustrate the difficulty in remaining an individual in a system that promotes conformity through curriculum and social status. He is disgruntled with the entitlement that many of his classmates have and with the disassociation from academic matters that so many students experienced. As modern universities began to let go of the metaphorical chains of discipline that were associated with their clerical ancestors, the participation of groups and clubs rose exponentially. In the end, such groups gave Dink a sense of belonging and the role of the student became closely tied to social functions of the university students.

Not only does this text serve as an interesting lens into the realm of higher education, but Dink Stover represents the social, economic, and political struggle endured through critical personal introspection. As Helen Horowitz would say, "College Life was born in revolt" (23). In fact, much of the terminology in Horowitz's argument is present in Johnson's novel: grind,

college man, slicker, and outsider. These students were also upset with the outdated course material from the classical curriculum of rhetoric, mathematics, and classical languages. Occasionally, even as the men at Yale focused on their social life, they would organize an uprising to protest their submission to course work unrelated to their lives as aspiring businessmen. The reality was that many men who attend the university with Stover are there merely to increase their social capital before they have to take over for their fathers.

By the early 20th century, the time of Johnson's novel, the reader finds that Dink Stover expresses this distaste when he comments on social status when he says that each student should have an opportunity to be successful no matter his background. From a contemporary perspective, it is difficult to understand Stover's disgruntlement with the university because it did not, in his or some of his peers' opinion, prepare students for a career after graduation. Their economic, social, and political backgrounds had their futures sealed up for them and college was merely a way of extending their adolescence. A diploma was not a requirement for employment. Lucrative employment still depended on social and economic class status. This opinion was generated from what he witnessed with other young men with whom he attended Yale.

Chapter 3 turns to David Lodge's novel, *Changing Places*, which is the first of a trilogy of academic novels including *Small World*, and *Nice Work*. The first novel, *Changing Places*, provides useful and detailed analysis of how the roles of faculty and students had begun to change largely due to changes in the post-World War II political economy. It is through the eyes of the characters Professor Sparrow and Zapp that the reader encounters the American university and its European equivalent at the end of what Jeffrey Williams, following John Thelin, have called the Golden Age of academia because of the economic prosperity that surrounded funding higher education. Lodge's Euphoric State University is meant to represent UC Berkeley in the

late 1960s. Ronald Reagan was currently the governor of California and is eloquently dubbed “Governor Duck” in Lodge’s novel. By using this campus novel, political climate represented in its pages provides a lens into the historical radicalization of the period.

In terms of the roles of faculty and student, Zapp and Sparrow are each products of their respective models of higher education, U.S. and Britain. Professor Morris Zapp is a well-known American scholar who, of course possesses a Ph.D. but more importantly a long list of distinguished publications. Professor Phillip Sparrow is an English educated elite whose highest degree is equivalent to a Master’s degree in the American system. However, such discrepancies in education cannot be compared merely on degree awarded as the two systems function in slightly different ways. But, when compared to the conditions experienced by faculty at Moo U, Zapp and Morris both have more leisure time because of the welfare state support of funding for higher education on both sides of the Atlantic. From the students’ perspective, tuition was far more affordable and did not leave a student with massive student loan debt.

Other student and faculty expectations of behavior and responsibility are laid out for us in the pages of Lodge’s academic novel. Essentially, it was a great moment to be a faculty member, and it was equally as great to be a student, that is, if you were White and male. Despite its exclusionary nature, this historical period set the bar for our expectations of higher education as funding provided a plethora of time to study and conduct research. A student during the welfare state did not have to work to attend school; therefore, they became involved in other activities on campus. Students often became civically engaged and productive members of a participatory democracy. This afforded pause for some conservatives as they did not necessarily appreciate the newly founded Students for a Democratic Society and other student groups because they caused problems for the government. One such voice was Lewis. F. Powell, future

Supreme Court Justice, who wrote a memorandum to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on August 23, 1971. His main objection was “the campus.” Much of the criticism he is addressing, in his estimation, began within the halls of the University, “The most disquieting voices joining the chorus of criticism come from perfectly respectable elements of society: from the college campus, the pulpit...It is the sum of their total views and influence which could indeed fatally weaken or destroy the system” (Powell). Much of the criticism he addresses in this manifesto is that allocation of tax dollars toward an institution that generated the revolutionaries of the 1960s. It seems the government realized they did not appreciate the "monster" it had created. Participatory democracy was no longer in the best interest of the American Government because engaged citizens were unruly and unpalatable. This can be seen in Lodge's novel through the eyes of Professor Sparrow who has spent most of his time at Euphoric State (UC Berkeley). The students on the Euphoric campus are far more engaged and enraged than those at Rummidge. Still, Zapp has to intervene and play the role of mediator at the latter institution in order to avoid continuing sit-ins and push back from students questioning curriculum and university policies. This novel is positioned in a way that is truly telling of the times to come as it is published at the cusp of the post-welfare state. Many of the fears demonstrated by faculty in this novel do come to fruition in the years to come.

Chapter 4 focuses on Jane Smiley's *Moo*. By the late 20th and early 21st century, a country founded on the ideals of democracy morphed into that of a plutocracy. *Moo* represents what it means to be a student after the defunding of higher education during the Regan Revolution. It is within this frame that a true understanding is gained for the push toward the privatization of higher education. On the heels of the chapter concerning the welfare state,

Smiley's novel is the epitome of everything that has caused devastation and ruin in the post-welfare university.

In Smiley's novel, the reader is presented with critical undercurrents that allow a deeper understanding of the troubles that face university professors such as tenure problems, pressures of publishing, and budget cuts, and its students, who find that capitalist America has invaded its once publicly defended spaces. The contraction of these public spaces has resulted in competing private interests.

Indeed, *Moo* provides a historical window into the post-welfare state of higher education because it reveals how private money has poisoned the true nature of what it means to obtain a liberal arts education. Moo University is located in the Midwest in a sleepy rural town. Smiley examines university life through the eyes of administrators, faculty members, and students. In reality, many of the conflicts that arise are a result of the state government's spending cuts. Set in the year 1990, Moo University appears to be on the radar of Governor Orville T. Early who does not seem to favor investments in higher education:

Of education, the governor had this to say, "Education is an investment. The trouble is, they don't run it like an investment over there, with the students as customers, because that's what they are, you know. Now they run it like welfare, but I'm telling you, if they won't turn it around themselves, we've got to turn it around for them. This administration believes strongly in education. (Smiley 111-2)

The categorization of higher education as a welfare run program is largely a neoliberal response. Thus, the response of the fictional governor is representative of the emerging neoliberal focus on exclusively market mechanisms for evaluating higher education. The only problem with this statement is that it places an emphasis on private profit in a non-profit institution. While some

may maintain that non-profits may entertain or service “customers,” it is largely the opinion of most of the professoriate that this is a faulty equivalent. However, in wake of for-profit institutions such as the contemporary University of Phoenix and Kaplan, the perception of the university system has been altered. The sad part of this pervading ideology is that some faculty members are beginning to believe the rhetoric of the business model which has always been an underlying current in higher education. In this text, Dr. Lionel Gift, is an economics professor who is continually referring to his students as customers because of his obsession with the market. At one point in the novel he writes a memo to the university Provost, which must have used capitalist rhetoric because the return memo (which is the only one we get to see) states:

One more note—in your last memo to this office concerning your spring course, you referred to certain “customers.” Does this indicate that you intend to seat more than the enrolled number of students? If so, these nonstudents will be billed a “seat charge” of \$35.00 for the semester. (Smiley 114)

While this inevitably allows us to laugh at Dr. Gift’s stupidity, it does carry a cautionary message especially if this rhetoric becomes popular. This display by Smiley was obviously an attempt at making the reader aware of such ideologies. If the Provost had been a nonacademic, as Ivar Harstad was not, this may not have prompted a response. Instead, this rhetoric becomes commonplace jargon between the academic Dr. Gift and the nonacademically-trained Provost.

Dr. Gift also had an interesting way of viewing his employment. He believed because of the money and publicity that he brought to Moo University that he was anything but expendable. The book is wrought with examples of him abusing university funds and getting away with it while others lost their jobs or were demoted for similar injustices. Dr. Gift spent an enormous amount of time in Costa Rica helping the local government in regards to trade and other

economic issues while secretly attempting to allocate grant money from a private benefactor who wants to destroy a local rainforest in an attempt to mine for gold. This excavation would poison the drinking water, yet he writes the proposal for the private benefactor anyway in hopes of obtaining future funding from this source.

This also has an effect on those who work in higher education. Collectively, the faculty's consciousness has been tied to the market. While Lionel Gift's rhetoric is comical, it is an issue that permeates the entirety of the institution. Administration's continual emphasis on money and fundraising has effected how faculty situate themselves within the realm of their respective colleges and universities. While this example cannot possibly represent faculty members across the country, it is highly representative of the emphasis placed on acquiring outside funding.

Moo offers an insight as to what neoliberal agendas and policies have done to the student and the faculty in the Post-Welfare state. Smiley's novel highlights further how the business model of education has corrupted not only the education of American college students, but the minds of politicians and some members of the professoriate who are now forced to rely heavily on outside funding. Smiley focuses on the economic hardships while making thinly veiled references to Ronald Reagan and conservative policies that have strained the university system since the welfare state outlined in chapter four.

In the Conclusion, I draw on my analyses of the three novels to address the current state of higher education in 2018-2019 and offer a few conjectures about where the institution may be headed. President Trump has proven he cares little for education. With the appointment of a lame duck, Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, it is apparent that substantive change in terms of funding is out of sight. Thus, higher education still suffers; and major reform is only

referenced in political sound bites, which lack any real gusto or backing. The federal government has not shown much interest in education on the whole, let alone higher education.

Neoliberal policies have defunded public higher education. These changes began with Ronald Reagan and the Bayh Dole Act in the 1980s. As represented in Lodge's novel, Reagan's legacy, starting with his governorship of California, set the platform for the issues he would run on when he later ran for President. California's economy and public education system were both in worse conditions when Reagan left office even though his political agenda was very appealing to the majority of conservatives in California. Since the publication of Smiley's novel, it has become clear that the blame cannot be placed exclusively on Reagan and the republicans despite the blatant initiation of neoliberal education reform by the GOP. In Michael Meeropol's book, *Surrender: How the Clinton Administration completed the Reagan Revolution*, he addresses how Clinton signed a piece of legislation that broke the back of working Americans. By signing the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 and the 1997 Budget Compromise, Clinton completed the disintegration of The New Deal. These pieces of legislation turned the responsibility of welfare reform over to the states as well as won large cuts in the domestic discretionary budget. Domestic Discretionary monies are allocated toward "education, community and economic development, transportation, housing, national parks, energy—and, of course, the Older Americans Act and other programs servicing seniors and their families" (Congress). Cutting education funding is one of the keys to this agenda.

When George W. Bush took office in 2000, he embraced Clinton's economic policies and extended those tax policies that were introduced in the previous era throughout his two terms in office. President Barack Obama has followed suit even after promising to lower the burden of student debts.

While many have hoped that with the Obama administration such flagrant abuses might be curtailed, the reality has proven otherwise. The global economic crisis provides even further justification for the privatization of education and thus the shrinking of the public protections for knowledge, labor rights, and basic human services. (Downing 1)

It is not shocking, therefore, that faculty consciousness has evolved and morphed over the past sixty plus years. The Civil Rights Revolution of the 1960s and 70s had powerful, positive, and lasting effects for minority citizens of all kinds and allowed women a voice to express their anger due to treatment of inferiority in patriarchal American society. It is, however, important to acknowledge the backlash from the Right that came as a result. Internal and external forces utilized their political and positional power to implement rules, regulations, and policies that diminished the rights of faculty and students of the university systems.

The move from a well-funded educational institution to one that will “live or die” based on the market has caused intense competition within all academic departments. As we will see, prior to World War I, colleges and universities operated as social clearinghouses similar to what we found represented in *Stover at Yale*. The social clearinghouse of the 21st century is clearly all reduced to an economic agenda: vocational training, profit-loss ratios, and commodified education on nearly all fronts. Indeed, from the rise of the modern university through World War II and into the 21st century, the role of the professoriate and its students has been dramatically restructured as a result of global shifts in the geopolitical economy. The ever-increasing business rhetoric that pervades the academy is not new, but it has certainly intensified. Our hopes for the future of higher education depend on our ability to understand the historical causes of these changes so that we continue to work towards education as a common good rather a strictly private asset.

CHAPTER TWO

STOVER'S EXPERIENCE OF THE MODERN UNIVERSITY

Owen Johnson's *Stover at Yale* is a relevant depiction of the modern university in the late 19th and early 20th century. Published in 1912, this campus novel is told from the perspective of young Dink Stover. Stover begins his career at Yale under the distinct impression that he will rise the social ladder by joining one of the many prestigious societies. Stover did not realize how isolating a college experience could be when the status quo is challenged. Johnson uses Stover to illustrate the difficulty in remaining an individual in a system that promotes conformity through curriculum and social status. The dissatisfaction Stover experiences in the course of the novel reveals the gap between reproducing an educated elite, on the one hand, and seeking the liberal goals of producing a more egalitarian vision of educated citizens serving social needs for all social classes, not just the privileged. While this dissatisfaction is thematically traced through the genre, Johnson's novel is much more serious while later novels tend to be much more satirical. Despite these differences, *Stover at Yale* serves as a remarkable fictional representation of some of the key institutional and ideological challenges faced by the modern university.

Freshman Year: Confronting the Social Anxieties of Higher Education

At the opening of the novel, Dink Stover boards the train taking him to Yale to begin his freshman year. The social hierarchy is soon established when Stover offers a physical description of himself. He boasts about how well dressed he is and how his demeanor is “with the deliberate savoir-faire of the complete man of the world he had become at the terrific age of 18” (Johnson 1). Not surprisingly, then, he turns his nose down at other students who lack the sort of confidence he finds distinctive of a Yale freshman so that, for example, he describes another freshman student as “spasmodic,” and that such students “imputed to him the superior

dignity of an upper classman” which “was pleurably evident to Stover from their covert respectful glances” (1). After all, in his mind, Dink had been a “big man” in a big school because at Lawrenceville High School he had been named captain of the football team as well as the vice president of the entire school. Big things were, therefore, expected of him at Yale. His manners, his hair, and the slang he uses secure his social status: “His walk had been studiously imitated by twenty shuffling striplings. His hair, parted on the side, had caused a revolution among the brushes and stirred up innumerable indignant cowlicks. His tricks of speech, his favorite exclamations, had become at once lip-currency” (Johnson 1). He even influences style. Golf pants became all the rave as soon as Dink began to fancy them (Johnson 1). Johnson’s satire can even become pretty heavy handed when he describes the Dink’s commitment to otherwise trivial matters, as when in high school he crusaded:

first, at the insidious and alarming repetition of an abhorrent article of winter food known as scrag-birds and sinkers; second, to urge the overwhelming necessity of a second sleighing holiday; and third and most important, firmly to assure the powers that be that the school viewed the indignation and would resist to despair the sudden increase of the already staggering burden of the curriculum. (Johnson 1)

Stover, of course, carries these social pretensions to Yale. In this respect, Helen Horowitz’s book, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, illustrates nicely the distinct social categories present in the early 20th-century modern university. She categorizes three types of students: the college man, the rebel, and the outsider. In these terms, upon his arrival at Yale, Stover aspires to become a college man: “In the competitive world of peers, *college men* could fight for positions on the playing field and in the newsroom and learn the manly arts of capitalism” (Horowitz 12). As the train departs the

station, Dink admits to himself that he was a free man, and he could do what he pleased outside the restrictions that boarding school provided. He believes that he is well-prepared. He had engaged in all of the activities of a young man—gambling, drinking, and women. “There was not much knowledge of life, if any, that could come to him” (Johnson 2). Dink believes he will become a college man, and he also aspires to that status partly by becoming a standout football player.

Just as he has these reflections, he overhears two men in the seat behind him discussing football, and he immediately hears his name spoken. These two young men discussing football, Schley and McNab, then move the conversation to social societies. McNab says, ““I say, what do you know about his society game?” Schley quickly tells him to shut up, ‘You chump, you never know who’s around you... You don’t talk about such things’” (Johnson 2-3). Schley and McNab are talking about secret societies and fraternities. According to Schley, there are three sophomore societies: He Boule, Eta Phi, and Kappa Psi who take seventeen members (Johnson 3).

Significantly, fraternities had gained popularity in the New England area in the 1840s, but were first notably seen on the campus of Union college in 1825 (Horowitz 32). Horowitz even credits the earlier student revolts in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries for the rise of the fraternity system in American higher education. These early societies, or fraternities, were secret because they were created in the spirit of the student revolts that were often frowned upon, and they were ardently against university rules (Horowitz 28-30). Yet, as we can see in the novel, university life in the early 20th century for students like Dink Stover was measured by social standards and membership to a secret society or fraternity was beginning to be the

measure for a successful collegiate career. It is for these reasons that Schley tells McNab to shut up and play by the rules of secrecy.

Once he finally arrives at the house where he will be living in, he is only allowed inside after he responds to McNab's prodding—after he admits he has a “twitching foot”—a password of sorts (Johnson 4). Dink Stover then acquaints himself with the men he will be living with, and not unsurprisingly, many of his new fellow students are from exclusive private boarding schools (for men) such as Andover and Lawrenceville. Immediately, Stover realizes he is living with men who have similar backgrounds to his own. The reason for this is quite simple—the economic means by which a man can afford living space at Yale keeps men of the same economic crowd together. The men begin discussing what they will “go out for.” Two of the men admit to going out for the *News* and the *Record*, the former of which was live broadcast and the latter a printed publication on campus. Another man is going to try out for crew, but McNab willingly admits he will not join anything, “I will not be harnessed up. I will not heel” (Johnson 5). To this extent, McNab appears to be what Helen Horowitz refers to as a rebel because he refuses to conform to the social standards of “joining up” or “heeling” anything. “College rebels fought the social distinctions that sorted out college students and reveled in difference, not uniformity” (Horowitz 16). Once on campus, rebels were more interested in getting as much fun and enjoyment out of their collegiate careers as possible.

After the freshman have some time to get to know each other, Stover is introduced to a junior by the name of Rogers. Each time Dink is introduced to a member of a higher class, he is impressed by his demeanor. Rogers impresses Stover merely by the way he speaks and conducts himself, and he even keeps Stover from a hazing incident that is incited moments later. When Stover informs Rogers that he is having dinner with a sophomore student, Le Baron, Rogers

seems impressed, and only then does he ask his name. Having heard of him as the captain of the football team at Lawrenceville, Rogers tells Dink to come see him later on during the year. After all, being a part of the Yale eleven was a highly prestigious position to obtain.

Collegiate football was beginning to become a staple of many students' lives in the early twentieth century. Whether or not they directly participated, many of the students on campus were drawn to the gridiron. The first organized football game was between Rutgers and Princeton in 1869. It did not resemble the game that appears on television each week in the twenty-first century; instead, it looked more like a loosely organized rugby or soccer match. The issue that arose from such activity was whether or not it was appropriate for "gentleman" to participate. Many critics believed that it was grotesque, unfitting, and outside the realm of appropriate behavior for upper class, collegial men. But opposing arguments eventually won the day on the grounds that such activity was not only physically healthy, but also mentally because men needed breaks from the academic rigor that accompanied such academic pursuits (Lucas 176-177). In short, by the early 20th century, football had become an organized and highly popular campus activity: "The incorporation of football as yet another defining feature of the university transformed the nature of the loyalty and sense of institutional affiliation retained by alumni long after graduation" (Lucas 176). Indeed, in these circumstances, Stover's potential stardom represents a highly prized social position.

This becomes more apparent after Le Baron arrives and they head over to eat at Heub's. On the walk over, Le Baron is routinely stopped in order to say hello and shake hands with men he has met in the past and those delirious with the desire to meet him. Stover meets many new people and as they sit down to order dinner, "He, too, wished for success acutely, almost with a throbbing, gluttonous feeling, sitting there unknown" (7). During the course of their meal, Le

Baron points out some of the more popular and prominent men in the restaurant. When Stover goes out to dinner with Le Baron, he is introduced to Dana, the captain of the Yale football team (commonly referred to as “the eleven”). Dana inquires about Stover’s playing career at Lawrenceville as a tight end and his weight (150 pounds) before inviting him to varsity practice scheduled to be held the following day, and, of course, Dink heartily agrees to do so.

On their walk home from dinner, Le Baron asks the freshman what he knows about the society system. Dink admits he knows about Skull and Bones, Keys, and Wolf’s head, but he soon learns much more about the underlying prestige of these societies. Le Baron also informs him of some of the criteria taken into account before a person is asked to join. “‘There are fellows in your class,’ said Le Baron, ‘who’ve been working all summer, so as to get ahead in the competition for the *Lit* or the *Record*, or to make the leader of the glee club—fellows, of course, who know’” (Johnson 7). Stover cannot believe his ears and responds with, “But that’s three years off” (Johnson 7). While Le Baron admits it does seem like a long time away for consideration, the judgment of a man begins the day he enters the college scene as a freshman. Dink also learns that Le Baron is already a part of a sophomore society.

Becoming a member of a secret society would only increase Dink Stover’s chances of social and economic mobility upon graduating from Yale. As David Alan Richards explains in *Skulls and Keys*, many known society members went on to become the heads of major corporations such as Philip Rogers Mallory who was the founder of Duracell, Samuel F. B. Morse who became the president of Del Monte, or Clive Livingston DuBall who became the president of the Carnegie Institute. Yet, most notable is the number of men who end up serving as government officials. Even Woodrow Wilson, a former president of the United States, was a member of a senior society at Princeton (Richards 402-410). Thus, the success of previous

generations of society men makes being tapped a highly attractive and desirable goal during their tenure at Yale.

Le Baron also informs Stover that how much money a man's family has does not count; instead, it is the way a man carries himself that matters most. Getting involved with women, drinking too much, hanging out with the wrong people, or even gambling too much will "queer" any young man. Dink also learns that he is going to be carefully watched to see if he is worthy of becoming "one of the big men in the class" (Johnson 8). As Le Baron walks off into the night, Stover admits that something naive and innocent has been robbed from him because of this new perspective he has acquired from Le Baron.

Indeed, these newly acquired insights into the society system lead him directly into a conflict with his roommate, McCarthy, whom Stover refers to as "Tough." Without giving too much away, Dink attempts to relay to Tough what he learns by way of Le Baron. While Tough agrees with much of the advice, he begins to question Dink's remarks concerning the "right crowd," and he denounces the elitist attitude: "What the deuce are you talking about Dink? Do you mean to say any one cares who in the blankety-blank we eat with? What! Who the deuce's business is it to meddle in my affairs? Right crowd and wrong crowd— there's only one crowd, and each man's as good as the other. That's the way I look at it" (Johnson 9-10). McCarthy cannot believe his ears and even says, "Why, Dink, I never expected you to stand for the right and wrong crowd idea" (Johnson 10). Soon anger gets the best of McCarthy:

"I've been filled up of the last hour with nothing but society piffle by a measly-faced runt just out of the nursery called Schley. Skull and Bones— Lock and Keys— Wolf's Head—gold bugs, hobgoblins, toe the line, heel the right crowd, mind your *p*'s and *q*'s, don't call your soul your own, don't look at a society house, don't for heaven's sake look

at a pin in a necktie, never say ‘bones’ or ‘fie-fie-fo-fum’ out loud—never— oh, rats, what bosh!” (10)

Stover’s desire for social status seems representative of the entering Yale class. With the exception of Tough McCarthy, very few men dare make negative comments in reference to the system or else fear “queering” themselves and therefore losing out on a sophomore bid.

Still, McCarthy conveys honestly his perception of the tomb-like buildings and how scary they really look. Stover contrastingly explains to his roommate that he believes the society system stands for democracy. Based on his conversation with Le Baron, Stover equates the membership of a social society such as Skull and Bones as a way of gaining access to the great opportunities that American democracy creates for all citizens. As Dink is daydreaming about belonging, Tough McCarthy suggests he ought to “Go right up and sit on the steps of the bloomin’ old thing and eat a bag of cream-puffs” (Johnson 11). After Stover almost keels over with laughter, he asks, “What the deuce would be the sense of that, you old anarchist?” (11). McCarthy, trying to get Stover to see reason, equates this gesture with the equivalent of being asked to join one of the societies when he says, “To prove to my own satisfaction that I’m a man” (Johnson 11). There is an obvious chasm opening up between the two roommates, even as Stover’s views seem to reflect the majority view. John R. Thelin even describes the Yale system as one of the most influential in terms of the “American college ethos” and American democracy: “Visitors to Yale described the campus as a ‘dynamo,’ energetic and intense in all student pursuits” (Thelin 166). Still there were men like McCarthy who could not understand the awe that Yale instilled in some men.

This notion is further illustrated when Ray Gimbel, who claims to know McCarthy from playing football against him in high school, invites them to a party and invites the men to a

political gathering at his place later on that evening. While McCarthy is excited about accepting the invitation, Stover takes a pass at the idea presumably based on what Le Baron had told him concerning politics. As he surveys the crowd, he notices subtle differences reflecting their social status: “It was a heterogeneous assembly, with a preponderance of quiet serious types, men to whom the financial problem was serious and college an opportunity to fit themselves for the grinding combat of life. Others were raw, decidedly without experience, opinionated, carrying on their shoulders a chip of somewhat bumptious pride” (12). Dink begins to assess the merit of these men as grinds who are more concerned with the intellectual side of college in hopes of elevating their current station in life.

The effect of social expectations is further solidified when McCarthy and Stover run into a man named Saunders on the walk back to their room. When they tell Saunders about the get together that Gimbel is hosting he says, “I say fellows, of course you’re not on to a good many games here, but don’t get roped into any politics. It’ll queer you quicker than anything else” (12). After he rides away, McCarthy remarks in disbelief that the entire campus is “loaded up with wires” (Johnson 12). It is at this point in the novel that McCarthy and Stover both wish to go separate ways—McCarthy to Gimbel’s and Stover to the gathering at Saunders’s place (12). Their friendship will undergo more tests as the year progresses.

In order to obtain the ultimate goal of being tapped for a senior society, Dink attends football tryouts. As Lucas explains, “playing football built character; it prepared young men for success in the rough-and-tumble world of business; it instilled determination, cunning, and team spirit” (178). Such persons believed that those who fought valiantly on the football field were bound to be the leaders of American democracy in the future. Even President Hadley of Yale believed that football broke up the hierarchy placed on class and forced men to view each other

in terms of character (Lucas 178). Thus, Dink is excited to begin his career as a star football player at Yale, but the first day he endures a grueling practice where he is never rewarded with praise. He finds this extremely unsatisfying, and at one point the coach suggests, angrily, that he was not demonstrating the proper tackling form. The biggest insult came later when Stover realizes that Tompkins, the man running practice, had no idea who he is and made it relatively clear that his best chance of playing is to become the team's punter even though he is not very good at it. More disappointing is that Stover learns that he is trying out for the second team. Tompkins tells him that these are captain Dana's wishes. Practice the next day ends without Stover ever seeing the scrimmage, and "...he jogged home, in the midst of the puffing crowd, with a sudden feeling of his own unimportance" (Johnson 14). Not only is Stover isolated because of his quest to join a sophomore society and become a college man, but he also feels like an outsider in a sport where he has always been a star.

Later, it surprises Dink that Gimbel does not share these worries because he is more interested in being a politician than scrambling for social status. When Dink asks, "Isn't this sort of thing going to get a lot of fellows down on you?" Gimbel laughs and says what he is most interested in is fun and has no regard for the sophomore societies, "Will politics 'queer' me—keep me out of societies? Probably; but then, I couldn't make 'em anyway. So I'm going to have my fun. And I'll tell you now, Stover, I'm going to get a good deal more out of my college career than a lot of you fellows" (14). Not only does Gimbel admit that he is not interested in such things, but he mentions vehemently opposing the mere existence of sophomore societies, "There's a whole mass of us here who are going to fight the sophomore society system tooth and nail, and I'm with them" (14). Flabbergasted, Dink asks Gimbel what he means, and Gimbel acknowledges that Dink will most likely make a society and deserve it. What he and others

oppose is the admittance of “lame ducks,” those who are let in because of who they know and not because they deserve it. As a rebel, Gimbel reflects a rising critique of the social class system. In a *New York Times* article released March 13, 1912 titled “Danger in the Snobbery of Colleges,” Owen Johnson says, “It is my deep conviction that the successful man is the rebel, the one who analyses and criticizes the social system, and will not let his imagination be dictated by it, the man who rebels openly and stubbornly against the particular form of tyranny it may oppose to his liberty of thought and action” (SM3). Helen Horowitz claims this rebellion from the social societies takes root in 1910 at Harvard, but soon spreads to other colleges and universities, “College *rebels* took their language from early modernism, whose creative currents they identified with the ideal university” (Horowitz 15). Furthermore, she illustrates that their idea of education is not to gain social status, but to challenge the status quo, “As excited by ideas as any outsider, college rebels could be as caviar about grades or as hedonistic as a college man, for they did not see their four college years as instrumental to future success” (Horowitz 15-16). Gimbel is one such rebel. He knows he cannot make the sophomore societies because he does not have the “right” background (affluent, boarding school, etc.) so he makes it his mission to challenge them. Conversely, Stover cannot figure out why any man would not want to be a part of such an illustrious and elite group of men, but his disconnect is personal. Dink Stover wants to belong, wants to be loved by the masses, and wants to have respect. By becoming a member of a sophomore society, he thinks he will be granted these things. Gimbel, on the other hand, believes that this type of success has to be earned which is why he is involved in politics. He attempts to get to know everyone he can in order to make a name for himself, but a man like him is so rare that Stover has a difficult time believing what his fellow classmate is saying, “Is he

sincere? he said to himself—a question that he was to apply a hundred times in the life that was beginning” (Johnson 14). Dink is thus presented with another opposing view on college life.

Despite such competing viewpoints, Stover continues his quest to become a college man. His social status gains momentum after a night of wrestling. Despite his protesting, he volunteers to wrestle for the middleweights against a sophomore named Fisher. After going three rounds, Stover is victorious. His name becomes well known around campus and other students stop to introduce themselves. Such introductions were akin to the experience Stover has with Le Baron earlier. This is extremely satisfying: “He went to bed, gorgeously happy with the first throbbing, satisfying intoxication of success. The whole world must be concerned with him now. He was no longer unknown; he had emerged, freed himself from the thralling oblivion of the mass” (Johnson 18).

Yet, disappointment arrives again the very next day when he is not called upon to scrimmage with the football team. As he is sitting on the bench, Stover begins to reflect seriously about the situation:

And then he suddenly realized the stern discipline of it all— unnecessary and stamping out individuality, it seemed to him at first, but subordinating everything to one purpose, eliminating the individual factor, demanding absolute subordination to the whole, submerging everything to the machine—that was not a machine only, when once accomplished, but an immense idea of sacrifice and self-abnegation. (18)

The machine Dink refers to is Yale. This metaphor also extends to American capitalism, “The open competitions, the power struggles among fraternities, and the battles in which the strongest rose quickly to the top presented the right kind of challenge to some young men gearing up for the trials of American capitalism” (Horowitz 119). This competitive individualism anticipates

the business model of the 21st century, but there are differences. Most of these differences will be highlighted later, but the business ethos in the modern university is shaped by the rise of industry and the distinction between economic class as it pertains to captains of such industries. Thus, a degree from Yale does not necessarily, in and of itself, elevate a man's economic standing. It is the social capital gained through grinding through the business that is Yale—acquiring the right contacts and meeting the right people—that prepares a man for a lucrative life beyond graduation. The business ethos of this period was an extension of the rise of industry and the divisions created by economic disparity. In later decades, the business model expands its reach into the political arena which disrupts policy making that influences funding to the entire higher educational system. This is a non-issue during the modern period as most universities are funded by private monies, donors, and affluent fathers. A college education during the modern period was considered an individual good versus what will come in later decades as a social good. Thus, Yale is preparing Dink Stover for life beyond the ivory tower. The competitive nature at Yale reflects the great American capitalist machine. Further, the juxtaposition between his victorious wrestling match and his lackluster football career are polemical inasmuch that his victory over Fisher was completed and entirely won by him with no mechanism other than his own desire propelling him. There was no one controlling him, or coaching him. He had devised a plan of attack and followed it. He does not have the same sort of control over his football career, which is dictated by the machine. His success in that realm is decided by others—coaches and upperclassmen. He has to conform to play and he feels as if the rest of his college career is going to be this way. “Directly, clearly visualized, he perceived, for the first time, what he was to perceive in every side of his college career, that a standard had been fashioned to

which, irresistibly, subtly, he would have to conform..." (18). He laments that this is something much bigger than himself and clearly outside of his control (18).

Stover continues to believe that his prior success should carry weight with captain Dana yet it does not seem to be the case. While he is willing to work for a sophomore society and follow a new set of rules in order to obtain a bid, he does not harbor the same ideas concerning his football career. Yet, the notion that conformity will lead to success is still the foundation of his understanding of becoming a college man.

Yet, Tom Regan continually challenges Stover's notions. Stover admires Regan because he does not seem affected by the conformity to the machine: "the man's perfect simplicity and unconsciousness impressed Stover more than all the fetish of enthroned upper classmen; he was always a little embarrassed before Regan" (Johnson 19). On the initial train ride to campus, he learns that Regan is most concerned with educating himself and earning his own way (18). Regan is so clearly an outsider and a bit of a "grind" or a "brown noser" because he is more concerning with his studies than being involved in the social scene. As Helen Horowitz explains, "such terms of derogation have been necessary because college life has always had to contend with a significant number of students who have wanted no part of it—the *outsiders*...By the early nineteenth century their numbers increased, as per men, often in their twenties, came off the farm, fired by the ambition to become ministers" (13-14). By the early twentieth century, the use of college to secure a position as a minister may have diminished, but the sense of college as conferring an avenue for social mobility had increased (Lucas 210). For instance, it is apparent that Regan is poor and from a working class background. For that reason, "College was for them not a time for fun, but a period of preparation for a profession" (Horowitz 14). Despite Regan's resolute nature, Stover asks the other men that he eats with if Tom Regan can

join them, and they agree. Hungerford says, “Our crowd’s too damned select now to suit me. We need him a darn sight more than he needs us” (Johnson 19). Regan agrees to join, and he also begins reporting to football practice and engaging other men in conversation at dinner. Nevertheless, as Stover laments, Regan is left without a true friend despite his inclusion.

Despite the uptick in Stover’s social life, he is still struggling on the football field. Many practices go by without inclusion. Yet, one afternoon Stover’s luck begins to change when he gets a start on the second team during practice. Stover performs quite well in the beginning and receives praise from his coaches and teammates. Bangs, the upperclassman who is part of a secret society, is playing opposite him on the first team. Stover did a decent number on him; so much so that the coaches start to chide Bangs on being beaten up by a freshman. On the very last play, Stover makes a mistake. He loses sight of the ball because he is so focused on keeping Bangs off the quarterback and there is a fumble. Stover would have most likely recovered the ball if he had been playing his man correctly. The result is embarrassing for Stover because Coach Harden grabs him by his jersey and accuses him of being a grandstander and a selfish player. Further, Bangs, the senior, is less than pleased with Stover, “I’ve plugged away for years, slaved like a nigger at this criminal game, thought I was going to get my chance at last, and now you come along” (21). Despite well wishes from Bangs moments later, Stover finds himself in a tenuous position because he wants to earn a spot as a starter on the football team and also make a secret society. As Stover laments, “For the first time, a little appalled, he felt the weight of the seriousness, the deadly seriousness of the American spirit, which seizes on everything that is competition and transforms it, with the savage fanaticism of its race, for success” (21). He realizes he will have to step on some people to get where he wants; he surmises that the only path to success is the competition and defeat of other men, but at a cost. Football was so closely

ted to the American Spirit that between the years of 1896 and 1915 there were "...over four hundred paperback novels and no less than 986 consecutive installments in the *Tip Top Weekly*" printed which expounded upon the sport (Lucas 178). American capitalism thrives on the defeat of others. This is the American spirit to which Dink refers previously. He recognizes this fervor as "savage fanaticism."

This concept is further exemplified when he earns considerable playing time over Bangs in their first game. After replacing Bangs in the first few minutes, Stover plays out the rest of the game and did so wonderfully that the next morning's headline in the *Evening Register* mentions him by name, "Stover, A Freshman, Plays Sensational Game" (21). Stover downplays how excited he is to have seen his name appear on the front of the newspaper. McCarthy and McNab both tease him on this publicity despite suffering such a horrid loss. Stover has gotten in with a good number of fellows and successfully earns a position on Yale's varsity squad.

This competitive American spirit carries over into the evening's activities. He is flying high after the game as he and his friends venture out to partake in the theatre scene. The men merely watch and admire many of the women in the theatre before leaving to attend a social gathering at Reynolds'. While many of the young men imbibe alcohol and gamble, Dink abstains as he remembers Le Baron's advice. Quite simply, there are those who are drinking and those who are not--those who are gambling and those who are not. Such distinctions are important because of Le Baron's earlier advice. After this night out on the town it is clear that if Stover wants to become a member of a society and a class leader that he must play their game. After all, membership in the senior society system outweighed anything else he could do at Yale. Lyman Baggs, author of *Four Years at Yale* eloquently assesses the importance of making a senior society for a man like Dink Stover: "To set up any one arbitrary standard whereby to

judge character is manifestly unfair, yet, if it is to be done, there is no single test which embraces so many, in making an estimate of a Yale man's importance, as his share in the society system" (690).

This continuous focus on the social life of the modern university reflects the continuous devaluation of the educational mission in the classroom. Indeed, the traditional classroom setting is viewed as tedious and excessive. Most students prefer to utilize their time outside the classroom for social matters versus focusing on their studies. "Most felt secure in the knowledge that while the college degree still carried with it a measure of prestige and social standing, its acquisition no longer demanded the sort of expenditure of time and effort formerly required" (Lucas 200). Lucas further argues that during the first third of the twentieth century, student life was devoted to extending their teenage/adolescent years. Attending college was merely to delay adulthood; it served no other purpose. In fact, books were rarely checked out of college libraries, "gentleman's Cs" were prominent, many students never purchased course textbooks, and a black market of student papers, tutors, and tests were already in full operation (Lucas 200).

Because of his rising popularity, Dink finds that he is bombarded with men seeking his advice. What he refers to as a "succession of visiting sophomores, members of the society campaign committees" take up a lot of his time which leaves even less time for studying. This lack of time is amplified when Captain Dana tries to put him at fullback because that is their weak spot. Stover fails miserably at his new position. Tompkins tries to console Stover with his new role, but instead of helping, he merely reinforces the power structure of conformity, "There's only one man in charge at Yale, now and always, and that's the captain. That's our system, and we stand or fall by it..." (26). Tompkins further stresses, "You may think he's wrong, you may know he's wrong, but you've got to grin and bear it. That's all" (Johnson 26).

He even reminds him to keep his mouth shut before they part ways. Stover found this very defeating because he no longer makes headlines as the best thing about the Yale squad; instead he is routinely and publicly chastised for being the weak link (25-27).

Football headlines were important to the success of game attendance. In *The Rise of the Gridiron University*, Brian M. Ingrassia argues that newspaper headlines equated into monetary gain. Football ticket sales generated large revenue for Yale even at the end of the nineteenth century totally over \$36,000 while their expenditures were only \$13,000 (Ingrassia 43). So, while Dink's football career is crumbling to pieces along with his popularity and the success of the Yale eleven, his goals of making a sophomore society seem to be out increasingly out of reach.

Yet, not every man at Yale is aspiring toward the same goals as Stover. There are other men, McNab, Waters, and Kelly, who have different ambitions. While Stover is struggling both on the football field and in the classroom, these three men decide college life is better served in stirring up mischief. They found a likeness for each other after that night at Reynolds' social gathering. "McNab, like most gentlemen of determined leisure, worked indefatigably every minute of the day. Having slept through chapel and first recitation, with an occasional interruption to rise and say with great dignity, 'Not prepared'" (Johnson 27). He would then arrive at Stover's and McCarthy's room and see what mischief he could stir up for the day until he was driven away for his obnoxiousness. For example, McNab and Waters decide to play tricks on passing patrons in the street early one afternoon. McNab asks a passerby if he or she has any clothes to sell. He follows this person until they run into Waters who would do the same. Many shopkeepers find this humorous; as they carry on like this—verbally teasing three or four different people. After finding a poodle running the streets alone, they convince a local

barber to give the dog a haircut and when they refuse to pay him for his services they are chased down the street. After McNab and Waters turn a corner full sprint, they collide with the dean and the first patron they had harassed. To make matters worse, the poodle belongs to a professor, “How the deuce were we to know the pup belonged to Professor Borgle, the eminent rootitologist?” (28). The dean also forces the two young men to pay the barber. As they reflect upon their mischief Waters says, “I say, Dopey, what’ll you do if they fire us?” (28). By “fire” Waters is inquiring about the possibility of expulsion for their misbehavior. McNab and Waters represent a microcosm of misdeeds carried out by men in the modern university as *rebels*. The modern university was full of what Lucas refers to as “student infantilism” and “childish pranks” (201). Rebels would often engage in scenarios like the one of McNab and Waters on the street that afternoon. “Sometimes it was a matter of disrupting a class with rhythmic foot-stomping in unison, or issuing collective groans of feigned anguish when an assignment was handed out” (Lucas 201). In fact, there was an incident at Princeton where students brought their alarm clacks to class and set them for various times in order to disrupt the lecture (Lucas 201). Stunts such as these helped create and widen the gap between faculty and the student body. Thus, McNab and Waters are met with scorn after their day of trickery.

Meanwhile, the Yale eleven are not performing up to expectations. With their upcoming game against Princeton, the pressure is becoming insurmountable for young Dink as he is trying to learn his new-found position at fullback. Captain Dana is also susceptible to the pressure of making sure his squad does not embarrass the school or its donors. Tompkins pulls Stover aside the night before the game and assures him that Yale will lose. Instead of a victory request, he asks the freshman to do his best to make sure the game does not get out of hand. Despite their preparations, Yale ends up getting their heads beaten into the ground and lose 18-0, and Stover’s

first football season comes to an end. He had done what he was asked, and despite the devastating loss most of his peers find honor in that. “The test he had gone through had educated him to self control in its most difficult form. He was not simply the big man of the class, the first to emerge to fame, but the prospective captain of a future Yale eleven” (37). His last name is also pictured in burning letters on the front of the local newspapers in the days following. Dink Stover believes that next year would be better, and he will have the spring to rest and recover. Also, he finds that many men would often stop by his room. He chalks this up to seeing “the advantage of being seen in his company—that his, in fact, was now the ‘right’ crowd” (37). Instead, Le Baron and his sophomore society buddies begin stopping by at random times throughout the week.

On the last night, the sophomores come calling, Le Baron inquires about the nature of other men in the freshman class. He asks Dink about Regan, and Stover replies, “One of the best in the class!” (Johnson 37). From here Le Baron strategically poses Regan as a threat by suggesting that the captainship of the football team would most certainly be between him and Stover. Even though the suggestion makes Stover immensely uneasy, he says, “He’s a man” (Johnson 37). Helen Horowitz argues that college life not only attracted men of affluence, but began to attract men like Tom Regan in the early twentieth century: “American colleges and universities were attracting not only those heading for the professions but also middle-class youth hoping to enter business...The collegiate culture created by the wealthier students of an earlier era had great appeal to aspiring middle-class young men hoping for business success” (119). Stover’s aforementioned statement is not merely one of logic, but rather he is acknowledging that Regan has something figured out that he cannot articulate. Simultaneously, Le Baron is not merely asking Stover if he would be fit for sophomore society, but he is

challenging whether or not he is a better choice than Tom Regan. Stover's and McCarthy's desire to become members of sophomore societies would help solidify their goals of becoming college men. However, becoming a college man and maintaining personal autonomy seem paradoxical. Tom Regan, on the other hand, is a curious case because he is an outsider and has no desire to conform to the society system.

Indeed, Regan later reiterates that he has no desire to join a society. Further, he tells Stover that he has to get his mind trained right if he is going to be able to become a politician. "I want to go back out West and get in the fight. It's a glorious fight out there. A real fight. You don't know the West, Stover" (Johnson 39). In the midst of this conversation Stover realizes he knows very little about Tom. Regan continues, "We believe in something out there, and we get up and fight for it—independence, new ideas, clean government, hard fighters...I've come from nothing, and I believe in that nothing. But to do anything I've got to get absolute hold of myself" (Johnson 39). It occurs to Stover that his teammate has his mind set on ambitions far removed from the carefully constructed social system at Yale. Regan contends that working manual labor and living up against the hardest circumstances are the only things that can prepare him for his life in politics once he heads back west. When Stover questions why he would consider manual labor when one of his Yale friends could get him a better summer job, Tom says he prefers

"The opportunity to meet the fellow who gets the grind of life—to understand what he thinks of himself, and especially what he thinks of those above him. I won't have many more chances to see him on the ground floor, and some day I've got enough to know him well enough to convince him. See? By the way, it would be a good college course for a lot of you fellows if you got in touch with the real thing also." (Johnson 39)

Perplexed, Stover tries to make sense of what Regan is telling him, but it is in opposition to what Stover holds most valuable. Stover's quest to become the leader of his class and a college man defines the very essence of his persona. Becoming the big man on campus is his ultimate goal, and it means playing by the rules of the current class structure rather than offering any kind of dissent from that system. Regan's dissent is therefore difficult for Stover to accept. After all, "The college society system, to many people on campus, was not the system, but The System, a macabre, Machiavellian matrix designed to weed out the weaklings and brainwash future leaders of the world..." (Robbins 53). Not wanting to become part of such an illustrious club seemed foreign to Dink as the society system was known to have power that extended far beyond its walls into political and business realms (Robbins 45). Regan, on the other hand, does not have the same affluent background and thus does not harbor the same goals as Stover. There is a clear disconnect between the two men because of their socioeconomic backgrounds. Stover cannot imagine a future without achieving the captainship of the Yale eleven, becoming head of his class, and earning membership of a secret society. Regan's desires are shaped by his living and growing up out west; his ambitions lie outside secret societies not because of ignorance, but merely because their existence corrupts what he believes it means to be a participatory member of democratic society. He challenges Stover's values, even, when he states there should be a college course in the curriculum dedicated to learning the lessons of those less fortunate. With one last comment, Stover still tries to persuade Regan, "They can help you like the mischief, now and afterward" (Johnson 39). Regan contends he can help himself, and that some of his peer's views are merely too narrow. Clearly, Yale serves a much different purpose for the two men. Stover desires social mobility which will eventually help him long after graduation in terms of economic success while Regan is going to use his college degree, by being studious, to

make a difference in people's lives back home. Dink is born into affluence and benefits from that social prestige while Tom Regan is hoping to attain affluence as a result of his education earned at Yale. Stover is, however, cognizant enough to recognize that Regan has a strength that he lacks.

While the modern university commonly served the most affluent of society, there were outsiders like Regan who saw the potential value of the college curriculum as a public good. As Stover leaves he thinks on the conversation he held with his classmate. "He had thought of which he was ashamed, for at the bottom he was glad that Regan would not be of a sophomore society—that the advantage would be denied him; and, a little guiltily, he wondered if he had tried as hard as he might have to show him the opportunity" (Johnson 40). His next thought was how wonderful a man Regan is, and if any member of these societies knew anything they would recruit him anyway. If Regan wanted, he would be top of the class. In this moment of internal dialogue, Stover admits that Regan is the better man and admires his freedom, "He thought all at once, with a sharp rebellion, how much freer Regan was, with his own set purpose, than he under the tutelage of Le Baron" (Johnson 40). When he gets back to his room he tells McCarthy that he might as well go out for crew if he is going to increase his chances for a society spot.

After Christmas break, the society race began, and thus, "hold-offs" are in full swing at Yale. Apparently expected to occur at a specific hour, McCarthy and Stover lay studiously in their dorm room waiting to be called upon. Minutes after the hour, Stover receives his "hold-off" from Le Baron. McCarthy finally gets his but seems apprehensive about beating the other men on his list. Later, on his way over to visit Regan, Stover runs into Bob Story and inquires about Tom's whereabouts since no one could find him. Stover learns that Regan was going to receive a hold-off as well, but none of the sophomores could find him. Story informs Regan of

the importance of the day, but he makes himself scarce in an effort to dodge the societies. Story admits that Regan is the type of man needed by the societies, and it is a shame that he does not want to be a part of it. When Stover inquires as to what Story thinks of joining a society, he says:

“Why, I think there’ve got to be some reforms made; they ought to be kept more democratic....I think we want to keep away a good deal from the social admiration game—be representative of the real things in Yale life; that’s why we need a man like Regan. Course, I think this – that we’ve all got too much this society idea in our heads; but, since they exist it’s better to do what we can to make them representative and not snobbish.” (46)

Story’s ideals on democracy and snobbery are raised by Owen Johnson himself in an interview he gave in the *New York Times*. Johnson believed that American colleges were “the only hope for our democracy” and that the biggest trouble Yale has is the aristocracy created by the society system (Danger in the Snobbery of American Colleges SM3). He goes on to say that his “great charge against the majority of the college men is their contempt for learning” (Danger in the Snobbery of American Colleges SM3). As he explains, men do not attend Yale for knowledge, but because “he shall make the friends most useful to him” (Danger in the Snobbery of American Colleges SM3). In the novel, Story recognizes such snobbery and Stover is perplexed at his ideas. While Stover considers himself conservative on the idea of reform, he longs for Story’s “useful” friendship. Stover believes that he has not made one friend since setting foot at Yale. Paradoxically, the very expectation that the society system is supposed to provide friends is, for Stover, the reason he has no friends. Even as he yearns for Story’s friendship, Stover also felt an air of social superiority, because he, Stover, is more popular and well-known and could

not understand why Story did not give him the respect he thought he deserves: “he rather resented it, there was not in Story the least trace of the admiration and reverence that he was accustomed to receive, as a leader should receive” (Johnson 47). In the weeks that follow, he begins to hang out more with Hungerford and Story as they were men who receive hold-off’s from the same sophomore society. McCarthy’s hold-off keeps getting renewed but his election did not seem to come.

Meanwhile, the societies try to recruit Regan and Brockhurst, but neither man seems interested. Of the latter, Stover discusses the strangeness in his behavior. Stover comes to a rather abrupt and ill-informed conclusion concerning Brockhurst’s character: “In a word, he was a little of a barbarian, who did not speak the ready lip language that was current in social gatherings, and, unfortunately, did not show well his paces when confronted with inspection” (Johnson 48). It is, ironically, exactly because of Stover’s elitist views that he did, in fact, get the final vote to become a member of a sophomore society.

While the sophomore societies are having internal political elections for their memberships, the outsiders are turning up the heat. Anti-society members are electing and running their own candidates for “managerships” and other posts on campus. Led by none other than Gimbel, they elect an anti-society member to football managership by a rather large and convincing margin as six sevenths of the men at Yale do not belong to a society. Thus, the voting odds are in their favor. They do the same with the Navy managership. This outrages many of the members of the sophomore societies. Arrogantly, Hunter believes that everyone wants to be in a sophomore society and thus any action to the contrary must be an effort to bargain. This arrogance is solidified when Stover asks him if he believes that outsiders do not count. He responds, “As a rule, no” (Johnson 48). The air of superiority that Hunter displays is

exactly what men like Gimbel are pushing back against. They want to destroy the system because of its exclusivity and elite nature. Some more democratic membership goals, as Story illustrates, or as Stover mimics, would increase participation and help assuage the situation. At the culmination of the conversation, it is clear that Hunter and Stover do not harbor the same ideas concerning reform. Hunter issues a warning, “I mean, if you have any criticisms on the system, keep it to yourself. Gimbel is raising enough trouble; the only thing is for us to shut up and not encourage them by making the kickers think that any of us agree with them” (Johnson 48). Men like Hunter and the attitude he harbors toward men who are not part of the society system is the problem Johnson aims to address. He claims that the self-isolation of society men was harmful because they never got to venture outside of their social circles and meet men from other backgrounds (Danger in the Snobbery of American Colleges SM3). “One who is afraid of being called a dig or a grind is a snob, and it is the social system that has brought him to that snobbery. The college system is inherently breeding snobbery. It teaches the college boy to believe that one set of men is more to be admired than the rest” (Danger in the Snobbery of American Colleges SM3). Johnson believes the ideals of the society system are a danger to the future of American democracy because the criteria considered for membership devalues education and the pursuit of knowledge. A country, he believes, cannot make appropriate progress if the upper class is keeping their foot on the necks of men of lower classes. “A fundamental plank of the internal rewards platform at Yale and many other colleges at the turn of the century was that it was unabashedly selective” (Thelin 168). While selection for a society was supposed to be based on talent, there was “...growing doubt that the collegiate rewards were being distributed according to the avowed criteria” (Thelin 168). The criteria that were supposed to be used as a

measuring tool to keep things fair and objective were not necessarily being checked by anyone (Thelin 168).

All of this anti-society resentment begins to come to a head. Despite Hunter's warning, Stover heads out at once to see Gimbel in his room and to discuss the matter. When he arrives, he finds a room packed with men who go quiet when they notice him there. Gimbel tells him they have some excellent candidates for the baseball managership and that he plans to give the society nominees a run for it. As the men begin to slowly leave the room, Gimbel and Stover sit down to discuss the current state of politics at Yale. Stover asks him if he is going to vote out every society nominee for any class position or managership. Answering in the affirmative, Gimbel goes on, "We are going to put up an outsider, as you call it, for every election, and we're going to elect him...Because we are serving notice that we are against a system that is political and undemocratic" (Johnson 49). Instead of agreeing with Gimbel, he takes on the argument used by Hunter earlier. Stover insinuates that Gimbel has ulterior motives, which proves to be a false assumption. In fact, Gimbel suggests that the power lies within the non-society and anti-society men because they make up "six-sevenths of the class" (Johnson 49). While both agree that the conflict causes ill feelings between the two factions, their solutions are polemical. Gimbel's motives are to dismantle the society system while Stover believes a more democratic process can save them. While Stover argues the conflict and hard feelings stems from the push back of non-society men, Gimbel believes the societies themselves created that environment long ago by taking a select group of men out of the freshman class and "herding" them together. The exclusivity makes other men feel left out and worthless. For some, losing the sophomore society election is the worst thing to happen to them in their collegiate career. Gimbel's movement is to show there is strength in numbers and that some of the best men of the class were not selected

for societies (Johnson 50). As Stover grows more frustrated by the second, Gimbel imparts one last piece of information, “‘And I’ll tell you another thing you’ll do before this sophomore society fight is ended,’ said Gimbel, with a sudden heat. ‘What?’ ‘You’ll stand on the right side—where we stand’” (Johnson 50). This is not the last time Stover’s character is questioned or challenged. After all, Gimbel is suggesting that the Yale system is not open to a “wide range of talented youth” (Thelin 168). Since there was a growing shift in the modern university to be more inclusive to those of the middle-class, there was some hostility from the affluent students. This is why much of the rhetoric surrounding those who “don’t count” is seemingly discriminatory and the subject of class warfare.

It is also the reason that some men are left out of the society system. Soon after Stover’s conversation with Gimbel, Tough learns he has not made a sophomore society. After exchanging a few words regarding the bad news, Tough bode Dink to not speak of it anymore. It was settled, but the men knew that their social paths would diverge from one another.

This did not stop the men from spending the rest of the academic year as roommates. They attended Tap Day together in May all the same. Tap Day was quite the ordeal; it began in the 1870s and continued for over a century (Robbins 69). People from all around came to see the spectacle of Tap Day, which included the drafting senior societies. The junior class would group up in the middle of campus by the society houses and awaited the senior election official’s arrival. At the stroke of five, the senior society men would sprint one by one to the group of juniors and “Tap” them to approve their admission. Alexandria Robbins reports,

On a Thursday afternoon at the end of May, the juniors would group together, regardless of the weather, on what is now Old Campus, huddled with friends for support and consolation. Other students, faculty members, administrators, alumni, and even New

Haven townies would line the perimeter, watching the event from the windows, steps, rooftops, and streets. (69)

This is showcased in *Stover*. Once the chapel bell rang, Dana, former captain of the football team, came sprinting out around the library toward the juniors. “He made his way furiously to the center of the tangle, throwing the crowd from him without distinction until opposite Dudley, who waited, looking at him blankly. He passed, and suddenly, seizing a man nearer Stover, swung him around and slapped him on the back with a loud slap, crying: ‘Go to your room!’” (Johnson 54). According to Robbins, the senior was often “black-suited, who silently, soberly emerged from his tomb and made his way alone to campus without acknowledging anyone” (69). The man who is tapped began sprinting toward his room with Dana in close pursuit. This continues until there are two men left standing and only one choice left to be made. Stover describes the scene as heartbreaking as Dudley is left without having been tapped. He is the man elected captain of the football team for next year. Dink observes him: “The pallor had left his face, which was a little flushed; the head was thrown back proudly; and the lips were set in a smile that answered the torrent of sympathy and regret that was shouted to him” (Johnson 55). In this moment, Stover is empathizing from a distance. He is wondering about the courage it takes to walk across campus after not having been chosen when he bumps into Tom Regan. When he asks Regan about Dudley’s exclusion, Regan said he is a better man for it: “He’s ten times the man he was this morning” (Johnson 55). Regan also admits he thinks Tap Day is the best thing about the society system, “If you’re going through three years afraid to call your souls your own, why, you ought to stand out before every one and take what’s coming to you. That’s my idea” (Johnson 55). After Regan departs, Hungerford wonders out loud if it is all worth it. Stover silently thinks the same. The realization for the freshmen that day was that they could do

everything right until the end of their junior year and still not make a senior society. That is the lesson Dudley teaches them. Robbins reaffirms this notion, “Tap Day always scarred. The painfully public procedure left many men broken, because there were always more qualified students than there were society slots” (70). Stover’s crisis of identity and character becomes increasingly magnified from this day forward. Lewis Welch gives an account of the pain a man not chosen suffers on Tap Day, “That afternoon has left in the hearts of a score and more of men as sharp and painful and deep wounds as perhaps they will ever suffer in all the battles of life” (quoted in Robbins 70). Stover wonders if he could endure the pain that Dudley had to endure that day (Johnson 55).

Sophomore Year: The Possibilities of Learning

Stover decides to room alone his sophomore year after learning that Tough McCarthy will not be returning due to his father passing away and having to take over the family business. Although he has received several offers for roommates, he decides this year would be best suited in contemplation and a way to escape his social circle when necessary. His pursuit of becoming a college man seems to be coming into fruition as many men stop in to shake his hand. He finds himself in a similar position as Le Baron the year before and this pleases him. As men exchange cordialities and boast about the prospect of him becoming an All-American, there is still something missing.

He feels more alone than before with his former roommate gone; yet, his social arrogance still lingers. For example, he witnesses men returning to campus, like Swazey and Pike, and refers to such men as those that “didn’t count.” Stover still considers himself socially superior to many of his classmates, although he continues to value his friendship with Tom Regan. While the two are catching up, Stover explains his motives to room alone-- to have some privacy to

think, and Regan responds, “‘Good idea’ said Regan, with one of his sharp appraising looks. ‘If a man’s given a thinker, he might just as well use it’” (Johnson 56). Nevertheless, a college routine still settles in: “He found the day marked out for him, his companions assigned to him, his standards and his opinions inherited from his predecessors. Insensibly he became a cog in the machine” (Johnson 56). Despite previously resisting becoming such a “cog,” Dink Stover’s days are filled with society business, football practice, and if he has time, his studies.

Meanwhile, the anti-society movement is getting much worse. It seems that Gimbel and his followers did not lose any momentum over the break. In fact, all of the society men that are put up for election are being voted out. It is causing quite the stir with campus officials and alumni are even beginning to stir. Stover’s cohort of society men routinely take up this matter in conversation; Tommy Bain, Jim Hunter, Bob Story, and Joe Hungerford often converse extensively on the conflict. Bain and Hunter are extremely conservative on the issue and believe societies need to remain exclusive while Story and Hungerford want to see them become more democratic with liberal reforms. Dink Stover finds himself siding with the conservative side of the argument. Still, no real headway is being made on campus in terms of resolution or in small group conversations among society men (Johnson 56-57).

It seems the issue is at a standstill, and Stover finds no use in delving into it any further as he is consumed with a successful football season that fall. Under the guidance of Dudley, the Yale eleven surpasses the previous year’s disastrous record and Dink makes All-American. It is not until the culmination of the season that the anti-society issues became a real and tangible threat to his social foundation.

One morning in chapel, he sits next to Bill Swazey, one of the men that “didn’t matter,” and is surprised to receive an invitation to visit him in his room. Stover, now having found

himself in a tight spot, agrees to see him the next night, but plans to find an excuse not to go. Kicking himself for agreeing to stop by Swazey's and reminding himself of the imposed social expectations of his society, he decides he best go, but only for a short while. He relays this to Story who tells him he is a good man for going and wears a "smile which he remembered after" (Johnson 57). Dink decides it is in the best interest of Yale Democracy to go, "Still, he had the democracy of Yale to preserve, and it was his duty" (Johnson 57). As he approaches Swazey's dormitory in Divinity Hall he remarks about the appearance of the place. It is attractive to certain students because it is much cheaper despite being a "queer place" (Johnson 57). He also wonders what they will discuss since he perceives they have very little in common: "Swazey, of course, being outside the current of college heroes, could have but a limited view" (Johnson 57). It becomes apparent in Dink's description of Divinity Hall and his perception of Swazey that they do not come from similar socioeconomic backgrounds. This is further displayed in their conversation. While Swazey does most of the talking, he provides an insight as to what the "grinds" get out of college life at Yale. He relays to Dink how "wonderful" he finds Yale due in part to finding a friend as decent as his roommate, Pike, who is out for the *News*. More importantly, Swazey and Stover aim to get different things out of their college careers. While the majority of the novel illustrates that Stover wants to become an immensely popular and influential college man, Swazey says, "Oh, I know pretty much what I want to know about men. I've sized 'em up and know what sorts to reach out for when I want them. Now I want to learn something real" (Johnson 58). Stover also describes him as a man who speaks with "a sort of rugged superiority" and a self-made man. Intrigued, Stover asks him to tell him more about his upbringing. Swazey lays out a rough sketch of his life. Stover learns he has taken care of himself since he was twelve, and he grew up in poverty. He has been all around the country

working in the streets and describes his behavior as nomadic. He changed his mind on his lifestyle when he was seventeen. He saved up some money and decided he wanted a better life for himself. He tells Stover he wants to become a gentleman and the only way he knew how to do that was to go to college (Johnson 58). As Stover is listening he realizes, “A new life—life itself—was suddenly revealing itself to him; not the guarded existences of his own kind, but the earnest romance of the submerged nine-tenths” (Johnson 58). In this moment, the world Dink Stover thinks he inhabits vanishes. He realizes for quite possibly the first time in his life that there are men out there with “real” problems. This feeling is so strong that he says, “By George, Swazey, I envy you!” (Johnson 59). All of it was foreign: the money trouble, the nomadic way in which he lives to survive, and his ideas concerning college, but most notably, his ideas concerning women. Toward the end of this initial conversation, Dink learns that Swazey is sending the woman he is going to marry to a college in Montreal. Stover can barely believe his ears, “‘To school—’ he stammered. ‘*You’ve sent her*’” (Johnson 59). After inquiring as to why, Swazey tells him that he wants his wife to know as much as he does. The modern university was open to the idea of educating women. “Women were certainly welcome as students. Indeed, their share of undergraduate enrollments was high, ranging from 33 percent to 50 percent in many cases” (Thelin 143). It was society that tended to hold them back. Thelin argues, “Unfortunately, these statistical gains in university access for women were offset by two recurring patterns: women students were often pigeonholed and thwarted in the curriculum and in campus life; and, most invidiously, those who completed advanced degrees encountered blatant discrimination in the academic job market” (143). Such women were called “pioneers” (Thelin 143). Marilla McCargar says, “By 1900 Canada’s largest centres of higher learning, with the exception of McGill, were coeducational institutions” (7). Presumably, Swazey’s soon-to-be

fiancé has to seek education in Canada because admissions standards for women were uneven in many countries (McCargar 8). Swazey's ideas are extremely progressive for the early twentieth century when it comes to this concept. He also admits she is by far the better student.

In terms of Swazey's reasoning for attending college and what he hopes to gain from the experience, Stover finds a response akin to Tom Regan. He claims he is not attending Yale for the money; instead, he hopes to gain real knowledge. "By George, Dink, money isn't what I'm after. I'm going to have that, but the big thing is to know something about everything that's real, and to keep on learning. I've never had anything like these evenings here, browsing around in the good old books, chatting it over with old Pike—he's got imagination" (Johnson 59). While Stover and his society mates are interested in social and political capital, men like Tom Regan and Bill Swazey are interested in Yale for the value they find in knowledge. While studies are secondary to Stover's crowd, they seem to be more valuable than gold to the "outsiders" or those referred to as "grinds." This concept leaves Stover speechless and he reflects on their conversation all the way back to his room,

He went from the room, with a sort of empty rage, transformed. Before him all at once had spread out the vision of the nation, of the democracy of the lives of striving and of hope. He had listened as a child listens. He went out bewildered and humble. For the first time since he had come to Yale, he had felt something real. His mind and his imagination had been stirred, awakened, hungry, rebellious. (Johnson 59)

The beginning of Stover's transformation is an education he could not have gotten if he had stuck to his society crowd. This is what Tom Regan had been referring to when he said they should offer a class for Stover and his peers concerning the lives of people less fortunate. Dink Stover is beginning to understand that there are more important issues in society than

accumulating social capital and popularity amongst the ranks of affluent society men. He also realizes that he knows very little about the lives of working class men. In fact, he knows even less about the working class men who are attending Yale. In a book written and published in 1900 by Lewis Sheldon Welch and Walter Camp, there is an entire chapter titled “The Poor Students Opportunities.” Welch and Camp argue that there were many opportunities for a “poor” man to make it at Yale and that it was a defining characteristic of the college:

The true test of college democracy is to be found in the social position which the man of limited means holds in the college community, together with the opportunities which it offers him for development; and it may be safely said that never in the history of Yale have there been more chances for a poor student to work his way, and ever has there been greater respect paid to an earnest man thus employed, than at the present day. (154)

While this may have been true at the turn of the century, there really was not ample room for many “poor” students. According to Welch and Camp, there were three ways to procure funds while attending: (1) earn a faculty scholarship, (2) apply and receive one of the many scholarships offered that were need based, and (3) find employment or utilize entrepreneurship (154-160). While many of these opportunities seem promising, the truth is they were mostly merit based which meant a student had to have certain academic skills to qualify which inherently discriminated against the poorest of the students. Welch and Camp argue that the mere existence of such monies should be incentive enough to study hard and apply in the hopes of easing the burden of cost. While need-based scholarships did exist, there were no stipulations that covered how much or how many students could partake. Further, these were to be paid back in full “as soon as the circumstances of the recipient will permit” (Welch and Camp 155). The final suggestion of accumulating income for tuition derives from what is referred to as the

entrepreneurial spirit, and those students could find ample employment or, if they were creative enough, create a product that would turn a profit. More ironically, they suggest the student bussing tables in their eating joints or asking for work in a private home. Such endeavors would almost certainly label them “poor” and thus a social stigma would be associated with that student. It is clear that Stover has never bussed a table or worked privately for money in a local family’s home. So, the economic hierarchy would undoubtedly cast such men as outsiders and they would have never been able to gain the social standing required to make a society, a managership, or the head of any club.

Dink is only now realizing that such men inhabit Yale; he refers to himself as a “conceited ass” and a “damned fool” (Johnson 59). He returns to his dormitory reflecting on his life at boarding school. In a moment of irony, Waters and McNab came calling at his door and Dink could hear them singing, “*Oh, father and mother pay all the bills, And we Have all the fun. That’s the way we do in college life. Hooray!*” (Johnson 60). For it was true, most of the men he associates himself with at Yale have similar backgrounds of affluence, which is why Swazey’s story has shaken him so, and Dink wonders for the first time if Tom Regan has more to his story than what he already knows. Data from 1892-1897 suggests that of the 1395 men that graduated during those years, only four percent of them were either self-supporting or partially self-supporting. This means ninety-six percent of the graduates during these years were receiving total support from somewhere else other than themselves (Welch and Camp 160). Swazey is one of the four percent. Staring into the fire in his room, Dink’s mind is flooding with all of these thoughts. It is almost too much for him to tolerate when he recalls Le Baron’s advice and the peer pressure surrounding making a sophomore society,

“Good Lord!” he said, almost aloud, “in one whole year what have I done? I haven’t made one single friend, known what one real man was doing or thinking, done anything I wanted to do, talked out what I wanted to talk, read what I wanted to read, or had time to make the friends I wanted to make. I’ve been nothing but material—varsity material—society material; I’ve lost all the imagination I had, and know less than when I came; and I’m the popular man— ‘the big man’—in the class! Great! Is it my fault or the fault of things up here?” (Johnson 60)

Dink wonders if the fault is his or one concerning the society system. What he does not question is the colleges placating nature surrounding the secret societies. Still, the rage that persists in Dink is a result of external expectations of men of similar socioeconomic standing. Finally, he can understand what men like Gimbel, Story, and Hungerford are addressing when they question the society system and its exclusivity. The entire system is set up for particular men—men who did not include Pike or Swazey, and Dink realizes it needs to become more democratic.

“Usually, Scroll and Key was known to tap the well-rounded achievers who were congenial, Wolf’s Head chose the gregarious prep-school men, and Skull and Bones selected the successful. Athleticism, notably, was perennially prized—in 1905, of the forty-five juniors tapped for senior societies, thirty-two were athletes” (Robbins 70). This leaves very little room for the likes of grinds and outsiders. Dink is beginning to gain a new class-consciousness.

As he ventures out of his room for a late-night stroll, he refers to the college in his thoughts as a “machine” of which he was only a small part. In the middle of this thought, he runs into Brockhurst. The two men share an impromptu conversation while smoking their pipes. A bit of tension arises when Stover encourages Brockhurst to continue “plugging away” at the *Lit* competition. Knowing Stover’s premise behind the encouragement, Brockhurst inquires as to

why he should labor away at the competition when he could “go through here as my own master, and do myself some good” by merely loafing (Johnson 61). Forgetting his earlier thoughts of rebellion and listlessness, Stover finds himself defending the society system once more, and asserts that Brockhurst is “heeling something” at the *Lit* like many other men are doing in different areas on campus. Visibly offended, Brockhurst assures him that he is not out for anything. He claims to write because he enjoys it, and if he really wants to make the managery of the publication he could. Despite being the best candidate for the job, Brockhurst refuses to “heel” anything or to compete with his peers because he is going to be his own man and do what he wants with his leisure time. He says, “Why, Stover, here are four years such as we’ll never get again—four years to revel in; and what do you fellows do? Slave as you’ll never slave again. Why, you’re working harder than a clerk supporting a family!” (Johnson 61). Again, Stover finds himself being challenged by someone with anti-society views.

Despite his “transformation” after his conversation with Swazey, Stover finds himself slipping back into his conservative and narrow view on the society system. Once the clock strikes twelve, the two men observe senior society men, marching two by two, heading back to their rooms. When Stover asks Brockhurst about it, he says, “That. A colossal mumbo-jumbo that has got everyone of you in its grip” (Johnson 61). Furthermore, Brockhurst equates societies to idol worship.

Once more, Stover finds himself speechless. The modern university, as Stover sees it, is often used to measure the worth of a man. Stover is learning that “worth” depended on the particular man asked. For instance, Stover himself still very much prides himself as a “college man” and a society man who is profoundly popular. After all, he still resents Brockhurst’s comments, “And he felt again a sort of resentment, for, after all, Brockhurst was still unplaced

according to college standards, and he[re] was Stover, a probable captain, one of those rated sure for the highest society honors” (Johnson 61). Thus, he is not quite a changed man. Swazey and Brockhurst find worth in carving one’s own way and utilizing the education for enlightenment and tools to become successful on their own after graduation. While there is very little doubt Stover would become successful upon graduation, it is not so certain for “grinds” like Swazey and Brockhurst. They could see through the façade of society life at the modern university and regarded much of it as superficial and unnecessary because society honors meant very little beyond Yale for them (Johnson 61).

This very subject became the center for debate in Swazey’s room the following night. Before Dink arrives, he bumps into Bob Story and when he inquires about why Stover refers to himself as a “damned fool” the previous evening, Dink replies, “Why, Bob, I just woke up, that’s all” (Johnson 62). When he arrives, he cautiously studies the men in attendance, noting that he is the best dressed. Internally, he is judging the “shaggy crowd” in corduroy and notices most of them adorn an unshaven face—another mark of socioeconomic difference (Johnson 62).

It is not long before Regan enters the room as well and is surprised to see Dink in attendance. Tom asks him if he has come to join the debate circle and equates it to the “verbal prize ring of the college” (Johnson 62). They discuss everything from “the internal illnesses of the university to the external manifestations of the universe” (Johnson 62). Toward the end of the night, Brockhurst begins a rather lengthy argument that equates universities to business colleges. He claims, “The great fault of the American nation, which is the fault of republics, is the reduction of everything to the average. Our universities are simply the expression of the forces that are operating outside. We are business colleges purely and simply, because we as a nation have only one ideal—the business ideal” (Johnson 62). Much of what Brockhurst says is

true; the rise of the modern university forced colleges and universities to add entire departments of administrators. While many academics admitted it was a necessity, they saw the departmentalization of university life as a threat toward academic freedom, “The acknowledged need for bureaucracy notwithstanding, critics were quick to point out its obvious affinity with the corporate business mentality as a whole” (Lucas 192). Drove of critics examined the emerging state of the modern university. Men like John Jay Chapman, John Dewey, Thorstein Veblen, Upton Sinclair, and others agree that the modern university began to imitate the business ethos and reflect what is commonly referred to as the rise of the corporate university in later decades. Chapman equates universities to large department stores; Dewey believes the inherent fundraising nature of higher ed was dangerous; and Sinclair is in accord, the power of money has corrupted academic endeavors. More telling is what Veblen relays concerning university building,

[...]the hand of business control dominating practically every aspect of the modern university. The tendency to expend large sums on impressive buildings; the growth of bureaucracy; the prominence given intercollegiate athletics; the preponderance of vocational courses of instruction offered; the undignified scramble for prestige, competitive advantage, and power among institutions [...] were symptoms of the corrupting influence of the business ethos. (Lucas 192)

But Brockhurst’s argument does not halt at the notion of business colleges; he continues to illustrate the changes in the professions that demonstrate his point. Lawyers of twenty years ago were the “ideal,” he says, now they are more concerned with making a profit than protecting the law; doctors are being overshadowed by those who are opting for specializations over general family practice because they are more profitable; and, a gentleman can no longer be involved in

politics because the two concepts are viewed polemically, and the soldier “is simply on parade” (Johnson 62). Most importantly, Brockhurst claims that aspiring to be a gentleman is a “dying breed” which insults the aspirations of Dink Stover. After all, many of the unwritten rules, originally divulged to him by Le Baron, are under attack in Brockhurst’s speech. In order to be considered a gentleman, a character assessment is in order. A former society man, Lyman Baggs, explains, “Personal character is, after all, the thing by which a man stands or falls in college; and, though the verdict which a society passes upon his case is accounted of more importance than any of the faculty’s, it, like every other arbitrary judgment, is never final” (Baggs 691). Brockhurst’s argument touches upon this notion—the idea that any man trying to make a society is adhering to business ethics. Brockhurst’s argument is akin to Andrew S. Drape’s belief that higher education could not become like a business corporation. Drape suggests, its “moral purpose, scientific aim, its unselfish public service, its inspirations to all men in all noble things” would become corrupted by the arms of commercialism (Lucas 193). Yet, Brockhurst’s argument is that Yale has become this and this foreshadows the business ethos that takes hold in later decades in the American higher education system. Further, he attacks the very foundation that societies thrive on and that makes them appealing. It is the desire of many Yale men to be chosen to join an elite group of gentlemen who have been carefully weighed and judged based on their character and socioeconomic standing and even less on their academic merits.

Brockhurst’s argument is that colleges should be a political hotbed where controversial ideas are debated and discussed. Instead, they breed conformity. Regan agrees with this notion when he says, “Good government, independent thinking, the love of the fight for the right thing ought to begin here—the enthusiasm of it all” (Johnson 63). He also says that university life

does not reflect what is happening to ordinary people. Rather, universities, Regan argues, are out of touch with what the masses are feeling (Johnson 63). During the Progressive Era, the American university was expanding between 1890-1910. Much of American society was changing due to new ideas concerning immigration and urbanization, but most of all industrialization. The American universities benefited largely from the Progressive Era. This was largely due to the wealth accumulated from the rise of industry and the popularity that surrounded philanthropic endeavors. This excluded the plight of the common man because those who benefitted most from college were those who could afford it; and, thus the curriculum was tailored toward such prep-school/boarding schoolmen. Thelin argues that by 1910, curriculum did not expand as quickly as the physical structure of the university, “Instead of a sequential progression of ascending programs, the American university offered a linear array of fields, most of which were readily open to all comers” (153). Yet, such courses of study pertained to classical languages, medicine, law, agriculture, theology, business, engineering, and forestry to name a few (Thelin 153). Until the adoption of agriculture and engineering, many of the subjects were only sought out by the affluent or those who were willing to study for ministry. Central to Brockhurst’s and Regan’s arguments is the concept of politics or political engagement which is at the heart of reform during the Progressive Era. The college curriculum did not have the traditional space for such matters. From the beginning of the novel, Stover learns that becoming political “queers” a man. Simultaneously, harboring and expressing political beliefs is often an expression of individuality, a concept that is mostly muted in society life. The stamping out of individuality, according to the men of the debating circle, is the worst result of the business college because it does not help America, a nation of conformists, and is not in the best interest for participatory democracy. After much discussion, Stover is still uncertain as to why

Brockhurst is referring to Yale (and other American colleges) as business colleges, so he asks him to clarify. He replies,

“What would be the natural thing? A man goes to college. He works as he wants to work, he plays as he wants to play, he exercises for the fun of the game, he makes friends where he wants to make them, he is held in by no fear of criticism above, for the class ahead of him has nothing to do with his standing in his own class. Everything he does has one vital quality; it is spontaneous. That is the flame of youth itself.” (Johnson 63)

Stover, however, cannot find a place within the argument to express dissent, and it makes him uneasy. Since his arrival at Yale, he has been told how to act, what not to do, what sports to go out for, and his “friends” were chosen carefully for him. For example, the purpose of the modern university “[...] was a means of socioeconomic mobility and hence an experience coveted by an increasing number of adolescents. In addition to increasing earning power, a bachelor’s degree was perceived as a way for a nouveau riche family to gain social standing” (Thelin 155). Furthermore, Thelin argues that it was also a way for a father to gain social capital if he had not gone to college himself: “The self-made man wanted his sons to have the shared campus experience that would position them to associate with young men from established, educated families” (Thelin 155).

Stover’s uneasiness is further amplified by Brockhurst’s comments on athletics. He claims that a man in college should play for the love of the game. He should go out for whatever sport(s) he chooses and enjoy the mere luxury of participating and competing at his own accord and leisure. Yet, this is not what happens. For example, Brockhurst argues, the football team is made up of many men who spend days slaving away at practice. It is not fun for them; it is not spontaneous. Many men are there out of expectation and for the solitary goal of success. With

the emphasis on the latter, Brockhurst says, “Instead you have one of the most perfectly organized business systems for achieving a required result—success” (Johnson 63). He argues further that no man can play merely for the fun of the sport because they too have been turned into businesses. Many fans of collegiate football during the Progressive Era argued that it was good for “developing men” and it increased the publicity for any given institution. There were also “Scholars who theorized the psychology of football within modern society and fragmented, disciplinary universities contributed to the Progressive Era discussion about football reform” (Igrassia 91). Even Teddy Roosevelt sought football reform in 1905 because of the increasing number of deaths that occurred from playing the game. Still, popular opinion won out. Americans liked football because it embraced the American spirit of the Progressive Era. Competition continues to fuel America’s cutthroat ideals surrounding capitalism (Igrassia 56). Additionally, Brockhurst makes similar arguments for the arts, those who are musically inclined, those who heed the *News* or *Lit*, or even those who attempt to write novels (Johnson 63). While Regan argues that colleges do not reflect the nation, Brockhurst is more concerned that they do not reflect the individual (Johnson 64). Team sport is a way of instilling conformity while working toward a common goal.

The conversation then shifts. Brown and Brockhurst begin debating about the differences between the colleges of 1870 and “the college of today.” Brown does not believe the colleges of 1870 were as prominent as the ones that exist now. Brockhurst, rather irritated, responds, “Then the college did reflect the country; then it was a vital hotbed of political thought. Today everything that has been developed is outside the campus; and it’s so in every college” (Johnson 64). This disconnect, he says, is attributed to the adaptation of the business model in colleges. James B. Angell, president of the University of Michigan argued in 1871 that the country was

changing and institutions needed to change in order to accommodate the shifting American state. The Civil War had changed the function of the colleges and universities (Lucas 139). “It was an era in which, as never before, institutions of higher learning were scrutinizing themselves and reexamining their basic purposes and goals” (Lucas 139). Out of these conflicts and ambitions, the modern university began to take shape, and it increasingly began to look a lot like the Yale of Johnson’s day. Returning to the novel, Stover’s fellow student, Brown, proclaims that:

The country has changed, the function of a college has changed. It is now the problem of educating masses and not individuals. To-day it is a question of perfecting a high average. That’s what happens everywhere in college: we all tend toward the average; what some lose others gain. We go out, not as individuals, but as a type—A Yale type, Harvard type, Princeton type, five hundred strong, proportionately more powerful in our influence on the country. (Johnson 65)

Ideas concerning elitist “typing” can be found in such prestigious late-19th-century writers as Henry Adams: “a degree from Harvard was worth money in Chicago” (quoted in Thelin 155). In this context, Stover asks an essential follow up question pertaining to what that “type” actually does for the nation. Brown’s reply includes three qualities: a “pretty fine gentlemen,” a man with ambition and determination, and lastly, a man who wholeheartedly believes in American democracy (Johnson 65). As Tom Regan aptly puts it, it means colleges and universities are merely schools for character (Johnson 65). Stover’s own purpose for attending Yale is shifting due to the conversations he is having with men outside his normal social circle in informal spaces. None of these men attended boarding school like his other group of friends and have all come from lower economic standing. He learns this by observing their physical appearances and by getting to know their stories. He already knows a little about Swazey and Regan to know

they came from less privileged backgrounds than his own. On the way back to his room, he tells Regan that he has been a “complete ignoramus” (Johnson 65). Stover’s worldview is changing by way of contact with outsiders.

It changes so much, in fact, Stover refuses to report for crew in the spring. Despite learning of the dissatisfaction of his society peers, Stover begins to strive to become his own man anyway. “Le Baron and the machine did not understand him, and he did not explain” (Johnson 65). While the society machine is rocked by his new attitude, Stover continues in earnest to become an independent thinker. He begins to spend more time with those society men referred to as “outsiders.” Dink became a frequent guest in Regan’s and Swazey’s rooms and begins to learn much about how other men live and what is important to them.

Some of the types that drifted in were incongruous, bizarre, flotsam and jetsam of the class; but in each, patiently resolved, he found something to stir the imagination; and when, under Regan’s quickening influence, he stopped to consider what life in the future would mean to them, he began to understand what his friend, the invincible democrat, meant by the inspiring opportunity of college—the vision of a great country that lay on the lips of the men he had only to seek out. (Johnson 65)

Thus, college, as Dink begins to realize for the first time, has the promise of bringing men from various backgrounds into contact with each other, and this possibility has the promise of promoting a more democratic nation. The college system at Yale was supposed to be “impervious to the advantages of wealth and social class” (Thelin 167). If they could find a more democratic way to elect members to societies, Stover believes Yale truly would evolve and maintain its’ staple as “America’s college” (Thelin 167). Yet, Stover’s newfound camaraderies came with a downside.

Spending time with these “thinkers” is questioned by Le Baron. Other society men throw verbal jabs at him in passing also, but none of this bothers him (Johnson 66). He is unaware, however, of how his antagonistic nature is affecting his own crowd. The first appearance of this is at the Story’s house. It had been two weeks since Dink had gone to visit the family. When he arrives at the home, Bain and Hunter are already arguing about the issue of exclusivity, the former is arguing for enlarged membership while the latter is convinced that doing so would destroy the system altogether. While Stover concedes that he has not yet made up his mind, one thing is clear to him and that is that the society system handicaps men. He is not so much worried about the effect it will have on the college, but more so as to what it does to the individual. Hunter demands to know what he means, and Dink explains further about how limited a man becomes once he is actively seeking membership to a society (Johnson 69). Dink elaborates on this concept, “We represent only a social idea, a good time, good friends, good figureheads on the different machines of the college. But we miss the big chance—to go out, to mingle with every one, to educate ourselves by knowing opposite lives, fellows who see things as we never have seen them, who are going back to a life a thousand miles away from what we lead” (Johnson 69). When Hunter asks him if he would abolish sophomore societies, he says he has not yet decided if that is an adequate solution. He does admit, however, that it is the changing American landscape that might very well be to blame for the changing college life they are now witnessing (Johnson 68-69).

While Stover is speaking out at the Story’s, he is operating under the notion that his activities with the outsiders have not adversely affected his relationships with his own society crowd. Joe Hungerford tells him otherwise on the way back to campus. He relays that Le Baron, Reynolds, and some other men of his crowd believe Stover is “queering” himself by

hanging around men like Swazey and Brockhurst. The interesting component to Hungerford's outlook is that he did not attend boarding school like the rest of the crowd and seems more open, even from the beginning, to branch out socially. Yet, Hungerford is attending Yale to increase the family's social standing and meet men that will help him run his father's business after graduation. Over the course of the conversation, Joe also asks Dink to bring around more of the outsiders so he can begin to experience the college life he describes at Judge Story's dinner table. He claims he wants to "wake up" too (Johnson 70).

The fallout from Stover's quest for social enlightenment comes after he parts ways with Hungerford. Le Baron and Reynolds visit him later that evening in his dorm room. At first, he thinks they are going to inquire about what senior society he is interested in joining, but he soon learns they are there to discuss his newfound friends. Reynolds is particularly harsh and straightforward, "You're shaking your own crowd, and you're identifying yourself with a crowd that doesn't count. What the deuce has gotten into you?" (Johnson 71). On the other hand, Le Baron is calm and claims he is only approaching Dink out of concern. As Dink grows angrier with the inquisition, he asks, "Am I to understand that you have come here to inform me that you do not approve of the friends I've been making?" (Johnson 71). Stover becomes more frustrated when he realizes neither Reynolds nor Le Baron will give him a straight answer. With the men finally answering in the affirmative, he quickly ends the conversation and tells them he would think it over. Reynolds and Le Baron inform him that his friendships and time spent with men that do not count is social suicide. "He, the big man of the class, confident in the security of his position, had suddenly tripped against an obstruction, and been made to feel his limitations" (Johnson 72). Yet, the full consequences are not quite clear to him. Stover believes he is socially untouchable or he never would have ventured out of his social circle in the first place.

Dink relays that he will not have his friends chosen by society men: “If this is what your society business means, if this is your idea of democracy—I’m through with you—” (Johnson 72). Le Baron tries to reason with him but Stover’s anger and resentment is too much for him to control (Johnson 72).

In the last minute of haste, he removes his society pin, throws it to the ground, and steps on it. After he spends sometime walking around campus, he returns to his room to find Le Baron, Story, and Hungerford. The three men try to reason with Stover, but his attitude remains the same. He even tells Le Baron this latest incident has sealed his opinion on the society system, “I’m against you now, because for the first time I see how the thing works out, because you’re wrong! You’re a bad influence for those who are in, and a rotten influence for the whole college” (Johnson 73). He then finalizes this conversation with the declaration that he is going to be his own master and he will not let anyone else govern his life. Le Baron tries to get Stover to at least agree to secrecy; yet he refuses that suggestion as well (Johnson 73). The most important part of this conversation is what Story and Hungerford relay to Dink the morning after Le Baron departs. Hungerford says, “‘Damn you, Dink,’ he said, ‘get this straight, we’re not thinking about the society, we’re thinking about you—about your future’” (Johnson 73). Joe says this because there are lifelong consequences to foregoing the opportunity that society life brings. Stover informs the two men that he is going to fight against them in an effort to eliminate the society system because he does not believe they stand for much of anything. He then asks Hungerford and Story three questions:

[1] “First: you think if I stick to my determination that most of the crowd’ll turn on me?”

[2] “That I have as much a chance of being tapped for Bones as Jackson, the sweep?”

[3] “Now, boys, honest, if I took back my pin for any such reason as that, wouldn’t I be a spineless, calculating little quitter?” (Johnson 74)

While both men answer in the affirmative for the first two questions, neither said a word after he asks the last. Knowing neither one could change his mind, Hungerford and Story depart (Johnson 74).

Soon after, something happens to Stover that he, himself, had never thought possible—he becomes an outsider. After trying to eat at his eating joint for one week, he gave up going. He soon became tired of trying to fight the dirty looks and flat out avoidance some society members utilize to get the message across that he is no longer welcome. Hungerford and Story also begin to distance themselves, and Stover begins to eat with Regan, Gimbel, and Brockhurst to avoid the resentful society crowd. By relinquishing his membership to his sophomore society, he betrays tradition and many society men are unwilling to overlook it. His new eating arrangements went without questioning, yet:

That something had happened which had caused him to break away from his society was soon a matter of common rumor, and several incorrect versions circulated, all vastly to his credit. His influence in the body of the class was correspondingly increased, and Gimbel once or twice approached him with offers to run him for manager of the crew or the Junior Prom. (Johnson 75)

Despite his rising popularity within the ranks of the anti-society gentlemen and other outsiders alike, Stover grows troubled. The promise of gaining a bid for a senior society from now outside the system slowly disappears, and he begins to avoid many of his old friends because he felt that much of the anti-society tension has been amplified by his actions.

It does not take long for many outside forces to get involved in the conflict. Alumni, faculty, and the president of the college are now involved and a mass meeting is scheduled. “Shortly after the news spread like wildfire that the President, taking cognizance of the intolerable state of affairs, had summoned representatives of the three sophomore societies before him, and he gave them a month to deliberate and decide on some scheme of reform that would be comprehensive and adequate” (Johnson 75). The upheaval constantly reminds Stover not only of what he has given up, but also heightens the bitterness directed at him from society men. He is stuck between two worlds and is having trouble navigating the new terrain. For all of this thinking, Stover cannot understand why he cannot have the friends he wants and be a society man. He admits that Regan is his one true friend. Still, he admires Swazey, Pike, Ricketts, and many of the men he meets during those late night bull sessions. “But after all, the men of his own kind—Story, Hungerford, and others, whom from pride he now avoided—were largely the men of the society crowd. They spoke a language he understood, they came from a home that was like his home, and their judgment of him would go with him out into the new relations in life” (Johnson 75). This further proves that success in the modern university depended on the membership in prestigious societies like the one Stover has recently cast aside. He knows turning on the society system will hold life-long consequences. Yet, Stover is not the only man in the history of Yale to turn on or straight out reject society membership. It was not uncommon for men to hide during elections or to outwardly turn down election bids (Richards 438).

Soon, Stover becomes a man of excess, something Le Baron warns him of avoiding. He begins to frequent Mory’s where he gambles and drinks among men who are also outside the society crowd and considered men who “didn’t count.” He even avoids many of his old friends

in order to avoid remembering what he has given up by relinquishing his membership to his sophomore society. This behavior carries on until he bumps into Hugh Le Baron on the way home from Mory's on evening (Johnson 75-79). Misjudging just how drunk Dink really is, Le Baron gives him a lecture on his behavior, "You ought to be the biggest thing in your class, and you're headed for the biggest failure. And it's all because you've cut loose from your crowd, Dink—from your own kind, because you've taken up with a bunch who don't count, who aren't working for anything here" (Johnson 79). While reinforcing the social hierarchy by illustrating there are men who matter and those who don't, Le Baron informs Dink that he is throwing his future away because of his current state as a drunkard. This lecture has a lasting effect on Stover.

Despite his regression, Stover is still firmly against the society system, but refuses to feel sorry for himself any longer. He heads back to the debating circle with Regan to find a new purpose at Yale. It is a good evening to join back up, as it seems, Brockhurst proposes holding more inclusive debates. He suggests getting twenty of the best men of the class together and having similar debates to the ones they have held in their rooms. Stover is immediately thrilled with the idea but suggests being more inclusive by asking 40 or so men so they can "get into it all the representative elements of the class—make it a real meeting place" (Johnson 80). In fact, Owen Johnson was responsible for starting up the Wigwam Club that was structured similarly to how this idea is laid out in the novel (Richards 405). Swazey then asks what the debate topics will include and Regan believes it would be best to begin with college subjects because every man should have an opinion on those. Then, he says, they should jump into the more controversial topics like politics.

While Brockhurst maintains he wishes for the debates to be more intimate, Stover opposes because of the current state of their class, “We’ve been torn to pieces, all at loggerheads, and I believe, outside of the debating, this is the first step to getting together” (Johnson 81). Further solidifying Stover’s point is the news of the sophomore societies being abolished by the college president. Due to all of the unrest between the societies and the anti-society movement, the president had asked the sophomore societies for a plan to diffuse the tension. When they could not agree on a plan, the president moves to abolish the sophomore society system altogether. Stover has mixed feelings on the news. The very thing he has been fighting against has been abolished. A similar occurrence on Yale’s campus occurred in 1900. An article in Harvard’s *The Crimson* reported that a similar meeting had occurred with the president and the heads of sophomore societies had similarly not produced anything fruitful and furthermore they could not agree on a resolution. So, on December 10th the three sophomore societies were abolished (Yale Sophomore Societies Abolished).

With the abolition of the sophomore societies at Yale, there is internal pressure to find a way to unite the class. Stover takes Brockhurst’s idea to Bob Story who is highly enthusiastic concerning the idea and sets out to recruit members. Later that evening, Stover decides he would pay the Storys a visit. When he arrives, he finds Jean, the Judge, Hunter, Bain, Hungerford, and Stone are all present and already discussing the big news of the day. Bob Story begins to relay Brockhurst’s idea and Dink jumps in to explain. Hunter and Bain are not too keen on the idea since they view the abolishment of their societies as partially Stover’s fault. Hunter demands to know what the difference is between the sophomore societies and this organization. Ignoring the resentment in Hunter’s voice, Stover says that the organization is more inclusive of men of the class and it allows men to get to know each other who would normally not cross paths. Dink

says, “The sophomore society was an organization drawn from one element of the class, consciously or unconsciously for the purpose of advancing the social ambitions of its members at the expense of others. One is natural and democratic, and the other’s founded on selfishness and exclusiveness” (Johnson 82).

As sophomore year is coming to a close, Dink explains that he is going to spend the summer with Regan to get a “real” education: “We are going down to work among men who work, to know something of what they think and want—and what they think of us. It appeals to me tremendously. I want to have an all-around point of view” (Johnson 83). Stover questions the purpose of education for a man in early twentieth century America. He claims that even men like McNab who spend most of their days goofing and loafing around seem to be getting more out of their education than him. The Dink Stover of freshman year would never entertain going with a man like Regan for the summer to work among blue-collar men. His education has sparked the desire to learn about things he does not know, and for Dink, that is enough for now (Johnson 83).

Junior Year: Some Real World Concerns for the Modern University

When he returns to campus for his junior year, we learn that Stover “had gone into construction gangs, and learned to obey and to command. He had had a glimpse of what the struggle for existence meant in the stirring masses; and he had known the keenness of a little joy and the reality of sorrow to those for whom everything in life was real” (Johnson 83). Stover admits to forgetting about the goal of winning a senior society election because “[h]e had returned a man, tempered by knowledge of the world, distinguishing between the incidental in college life and the vital opportunity within his grasp” (Johnson 83). His experiences propel him to head back into the successful debating circle that had been established the spring prior.

Stover, without realizing, has turned himself into a politician. He has undertaken the job of recruiting men to join the organization. He frequents many different haunts of various men (Johnson 83). The resentment from the year before begins to vanish. Men start going to the football games in large groups and meet at the Tontine on Saturday evenings (Johnson 84). Dink has become quite the social and political college man and makes it his priority to unite the class that he feels responsible, in part, for dividing. Stover's increasingly changing worldview permeates everything that he does at Yale. For example, the captainship that he so passionately and innately desires is given up through his own volition. After his junior year season, he gives an emboldened speech on how Tom Regan is the best fit for the captaincy. No one is more upset with this decision than Regan. When he objects, Stover tells him that he is by far the better man and if he thought himself worthy he would have kept his name in. The pressure of making a senior society subsides and "...the truth was that he succeeded because he had no underlying motive, because he had achieved in himself absolute independence and fearlessness of any outer criticism and his strength with the crowd was just the consciousness of his own liberty" (Johnson 84). The freshman version of Dink Stover would most certainly not have done the same because being named captain was one of the most important goals he harbored upon arrival at Yale. He did what is best for the collective and buries the selfish ambition.

Despite the internal revelations occurring for Stover, he does not see the same changes happening for others in his class. The debate circle, which was supposed to help stir the imagination and ignite a similar desire for learning, is losing popularity. Regan could not figure out what the disconnect is,

"What the devil is the matter?" said the big fellow savagely. "Why, where I come from, the people I see, every mother's son of them, feed on politics, talk nothing else—they

love it! And here if you ask a man if he's a Republican or a Democrat, he writes home and asks his father. A condition like this doesn't exist anywhere else on the face of the globe. And this is America. Why?" (Johnson 85)

While Regan has an obvious economic disconnect, he also has a geographic one. Of course, political affiliations are influenced depending on where a person lives. In the early twentieth century, "westward expansion changed the political landscape of the United States" (Robertson 240). The West became a collusion of various peoples from a variety of different backgrounds. "Eleven Western states joined the union between 1876 and 1912, altering the previous North-South axis of U.S. politics" (Robertson 240). Thus, Regan would have been used to rubbing shoulders with men and women of grossly different ethnicities and socioeconomic backgrounds. The east was already established. Regan's disconnect is one of bewilderment as the western frontier is being settled, and conversations on how the west should organize itself are hot topics for debate.

Thus, it does not take long for Brockhurst to weigh in on the issues concerning the average Yale student. He, of course, blames the college itself. He says that colleges are "social clearing houses and everyone is too absorbed in that engrossing process to know what happens outside" (Johnson 85). Brockhurst also states that most colleges prevent students from learning anything of real value. He quizzes the group of men sitting in front of him on music, architecture, religion, literature, and the politics that concern other parts of the world. The only man in the room who seems to know most of the subjects he is covering is Bob Story. None of the other men have heard of any of the subject matter to which he refers. In a passionate rant he also claims, "You have no general knowledge, no intellectual interests, you haven't even opinions, and at the end of four years of *education* you will march up and be handed a degree—Bachelor

of Arts! Magnificent! And we Americans have a sense of humor!” (Johnson 86). Brockhurst’s intentions are not to humiliate the men in front of him, but to force them to question the curriculum at Yale. He argues that the modern university has become not only a social clearing house, as he so aptly put it, but also a ruthless businesses enterprise: “Do you wonder why I repeat that our colleges are splendidly organized institutions for the prevention of learning? No, sir, we are business colleges, and the business of our machines is to stamp out so many business men a year, running at full speed and in competition with the latest devices in Cambridge and Princeton” (Johnson 86). Most men in the room are in accord, but Story suggests that most of this influence is external and permeates from the outside in. The modern university is thus affected by external business endeavors, but has yet to be severely affected by private interests internally except for the manner in which the students establish social hierarchies within the institutions.

While Brockhurst agrees with the influence of external businesses, he also argues that American colleges could do a better job at structuring the curriculum. It is the structure that Brockhurst takes most exception; he argues it is the mere presence of a schedule that hinders its growth. While seemingly unreasonable, he continues, “The whole theory is wrong, the archaic and ridiculous—the theory of education by schedule. All education can do is to instill the love of knowledge. You get that, you catch the fire of it—you educate yourself. All education does today is to develop the memory at the expense of the imagination” (Johnson 86). He is not arguing with the schedule of attending class, he is instead illustrating that the method to which education is delivered is at fault. Memorization for the mere act of memorization suits no one well. Imitation is not learning. It is not transformative.

When Regan asks how it can be fixed, Brockhurst suggests studying foreign models. He speaks to the systems in England, France, and Germany. In England, class sizes are very small, and one instructor develops not only an academic relationship with the men, but a personal one as well. Instead of lecture, they hold discussions on topics and are not limited to memorization. This pedagogy allows room for discussions on societal issues that were not often addressed via written exam. In the early twentieth century, Graves wrote, “At the present time there are constant efforts at a modification and a reconstruction of education in the interest of a better adjustment of the individual to his social environment and of greatly improved conditions in society itself” (356). The early twentieth century saw minor and subtle shifts in the delivery and focus on education transatlantically. In France, education is much more serious, Brockhurst says, “In French universities, education is a serious thing because failure to pass an examination for a profession means two extra years of army service. Men don’t risk over there, or divide up their time heeling the *News* or making a team” (Johnson 86). He is right to say that many European universities did not traditionally place added emphasis on extracurricular activities, but this was changing in the early twentieth century. Many European colleges and universities were allowing time for free play outside. While it still may have been spontaneous, there was a shift occurring. The afternoons were often dedicated to sports such as rugby, rowing, cricket, or golf (Education in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland 34). Additionally, France had done a better job educating students during the rise of industry. They, too, had small class sizes and operated under basic needs of the state (Graves 364-5). Most importantly, France was never criticized for training men of character during the rise of the modern university. This “[...] may account for the strongly developed individualism of the people, their unruliness and inability to combine” (George 273). Conversely, Brockhurst argues that the inability to focus on the individual has

created the business ethos of the twentieth century. He further emphasizes the German model because the student has to produce so much original work before he can actually graduate. This model was also linked to industry. Their educational system was coupled with classroom learning, apprenticeships, examinations, and recitation (Graves 365). The practicality of education and low enrollments lead to more individuality within the university.

In America, he argues, men are sent to school to become ranked and organized according to social standing. All of the aforementioned models focus on the development of an individual suited for the society he is entering into. The American model of higher education reinforces what is routinely referred to as “the machine” throughout. The practicality of the American system was in the cultivation of social capital, not necessarily developing individual technical skills for the betterment of the nation. He continues, “In a period when we have no society in America, families are sending their sons to colleges to place themselves socially” (Johnson 86). Owen Johnson himself once remarked that he personally believed this to be true. He claims that all colleges during the modern era are social clearinghouses and “everyone is too absorbed in that engrossing task to know what is going on outside: our universities are admirably organized instruments for the prevention of learning” (quoted in *Dangers of the Snobbery of American Colleges* SM3).

Brockhurst feels the sting of the “social clearinghouse” firsthand when he is passed over for the chairmanship of the *Lit*. He stops by to discuss the bad news with Stover. As they walk, Brockhurst claims if he had been won the chairmanship he probably would have been tapped for Bones. When Stover inquires as to whom they chose, Brockhurst explains that a “grind” named Wiggin had been named. This man has laboriously dedicated the past three years heeding the *Lit*, while Brockhurst writes and submits work at his leisure and is passed over despite being the

better writer. Brockhurst's disdain for "heeling" anything is what ultimately cost him the chairmanship, but he is disappointed nonetheless (Johnson 87-89). Brockhurst even refers to the senior society houses as something of idol worship once more; he claims it is a fetish, "Curious," said Brockhurst, turning away. "The architecture of these sacred tombs is almost invariably the suggestion of the dungeon—the prison of the human mind" (Johnson 89). While Stover accepts any chance of being tapped, Brockhurst reignites the desire once more. This is intensified the next afternoon when he notices his name has reappeared on the list near the bathing area. His name is now listed third from the top and underlined. Instead of taking the news with pride, he becomes very angry with himself and with Brockhurst's disdain concerning senior societies. Stover realizes once more that he does wish to be tapped.

Throughout the novel, Stover is trying to lure the love and affection of Jean Story, Bob's sister. He knows how important it is to her if he makes a senior society. The accumulation of such social capital means a great deal to her. For example, he learns that she is angry with him for allowing Regan to become captain of the eleven. Furious, she asks him why he would do such a thing and also why he did not run the idea by her beforehand. Of course, she does not approve, Jean says, angrily, "Stuff and nonsense. What do you care for their opinion? You should be captain and chairman of the Prom, but you renounce everything—you seem to delight in it. It's too absurd; it's ridiculous. It's like Don Quixote riding around" (Johnson 91). Stover is hurt by her outburst, but finally realizes how much weight certain social titles hold. He says, "It's something to be able to refuse what others are grabbing for," he said shortly. "But all you seem to care for is the name" (Johnson 91).

The goal of being tapped seems further out of reach after some bad luck strikes Dink Stover. One afternoon he decides to take a joy ride with Schley and Troutman. With Stover at

the wheel, they cruise through town and Schley picks up two young women for a laugh. If the men are caught gallivanting in this way, it will raise serious questions concerning their character and motivations. One of the women, Fanny LeRoy, suddenly has an appendicitis attack and needs immediate medical attention. Once they find a doctor, Troutman, Schley, and Fanny's friend, Muriel, flee the scene in order to escape being seen. The seriousness of the situation is perceived by the doctor who recognizes Stover as one of the Yale eleven and suggests, "'Do you want to go quietly?'" said Dr. Burke, with a look of sympathetic understanding" (Johnson 93). Despite the suggestion, Stover asks for the quickest way to the hospital, placing the women's life over his social popularity. In the days that follow, Stover's character becomes the subject of great scrutiny. It is such a scandal that anyone who looks hard enough to could find the entire story on the front page of the New York newspaper, "Dink Stover's Lark Ends Seriously" (Johnson 94). The reaction to the front-page news proves that social status is still important to a man like Stover, and it also reinforces Brockhurst's argument concerning Yale as a social clearinghouse. For Dink truly believes that his chances at Skull and Bones is gone after this public ordeal. Eventually, Fanny skips town and relieves Dink of his "burden."

Desirous of earning a spot in a senior society, but impermeable to bend at the will of other men, he ventures out to discuss his stance with Judge Story. Upon his arrival, he meets Jean in the parlor and relays his intentions of marrying her and the conversation he wishes to have with her father concerning the society system. After she learns of his feelings on the society system, she is immediately angered by his defiant attitude towards Skull and Bones. Dink says that secrets are unamerican, "undemocratic, and stultifying..." (Johnson 98). He believes the society system thus causes more harm than good, but he is open to reform if he will be heard. Stover soon finds out that Jean believes admittance to a senior society is an illustrious social

mark, “‘But I want to see you go Bones,’ she said rather illogically, in a rush. ‘After all you’ve gone through, you must go Bones!’” (Johnson 98). She claims his immovable pride ruins him. After he meets with Judge Story, he sees Jean once more on his way out. Her temperament changes and she apologizes for acting foolish. She then proceeds to tell Dink she will marry him no matter the outcome of Tap Day. Luckily, Stover is chosen for Bones and so is Tom Regan. Hungerford is the odd man out. In all of his defiance, he is elated at being chosen, “He heard them cheering, then he saw hundreds of faces, wild-eyed, rushing past him; he stumbled and suddenly his eyes were blurred with tears, and he knew how much he cared, after the long months of rebellion, to be no longer an outsider, but back among his with the stamp of approval on his record” (Johnson 100). Even his defiance and rebelliousness could not separate him from his upper class entitlement of becoming a society man.

At the close of the novel and the culmination of junior year, the conversation yet again reverts to “being one’s own master.” With senior elections over, Brockhurst laments that it could not be this way for all four years of college life. Hungerford argues that the fight against the system has somewhat been won with the abolition of the sophomore societies and the very notion of acceptance when it came to tapping Stover. Brockhurst replies,

“I’m not satisfied with Yale as a magnificent factory on democratic business lines; I dream of something else, something visionary, a great institution not of boys, clean loveable and honest, but of men of brains, of courage, of leadership, a great center of thought, to stir the country and bring it back to the understanding of what man creates with his imagination, and dares with his will. It’s visionary—it will come.” (Johnson 101)

The modern university at Yale may have been exclusive and elite in the early twentieth century, but some of the men who inhabit Johnson's novel show a desire for a more inclusive and democratic system not only within societies, but also with the college curriculum.

One poll conducted at Yale in 1912 showed that 86 percent of people believed *Stover at Yale* was immensely an exaggeration. Almost two-dozen newspaper articles in the *New York Times* alone addressed the upheaval the novel had caused on campus and throughout the ranks of alumni. Owen Johnson even held an essay-writing contest to address the troubles of the modern university. While he received some essays that dissented with his overall notion of "social clearinghouses" and the social problems that existed at Yale, many students wrote provocative essays on the troubles that existed at other American colleges and universities. The American university was shifting at the turn of the century to align with the needs of a Progressive Era state apparatus. Despite the criticism, Owen Johnson's *Stover at Yale* closely represents the social function of the American university in the early twentieth century.

CHAPTER THREE

THE WELFARE STATE UNIVERSITY: FROM EUPHORIA TO RUMMIDGE

The welfare state university began in 1945 right after the culmination of World War II. In the two previous periods, the university system was ill-funded, poorly attended, and often suited for persons who were more financially stable. After the war, higher education became a well-funded institution, enrollment soared (especially under the GI Bill that enabled many returning veterans to attend college), and members of all economic classes found solace in knowing they could use their education for upward mobility. David Lodge's *Changing Places* (1975) is set in 1969 and examines the transatlantic connection in higher education between Britain and the United States at the end of the welfare state university. This novel is the first of a trilogy including *Small World* (1984) and *Nice Work* (1988), and all three novels follow the lives of the same main characters, but only *Changing Places* is set so clearly at the height of the welfare state university.

Philip Swallow is an English instructor at the University of Rummidge in the United Kingdom. He is trading places with a man named Morris Zapp who is a Professor of English at Euphoric State (formally known as the State University of Euphoria) on the U.S. west coast. While Zapp is a highly published, tenured professor with a PhD., Philip Swallow lacks the PhD and an accomplished publication record because such research prominence is not a requirement in the UK system. The University of Rummidge is a thinly veiled University of Birmingham, and Euphoric State represents the University of California, Berkeley. While both institutions are public, respectively, the latter is far more elite. These two men are participating in a six-month exchange program where they each serve as visiting professor in the other's home university.

Under the original agreement, each visitor drew the salary to which he was entitled by rank and seniority on the scale of the host institution, but as no American could survive for more than a few days on the monthly stipend paid by Rummidge, Euphoric State made up the difference for its own faculty, while paying its British visitors a salary beyond their wildest dreams and bestowing upon them indiscriminately the title of Visiting Professor. (Lodge 10)

Euphoric State usually sends one of its younger, aspiring professors because the salary associated with the position at Rummidge does not often lure professors such as Zapp, while Rummidge tends to send one of its more senior professors because it is considered a prestigious reward for years of service.

Transatlantic Plane Flights

The novel opens with the two men in flight to their new homes for the next term. With Zapp eastbound and Swallow westbound, the narrator reveals some of their respective differences. Morris Zapp had flown many times to attend conferences and deliver papers, although only within the United States, so this is his first trans-Atlantic flight. He was a well-known Jane Austen expert, and he had become one of the leaders of importing some of the esoteric continental literary theory into the interpretation of literature. He had enjoyed many of the perks of having a tenured position at Euphoric State. He has a distinguished publication record with several books and many articles. When he took the position at Euphoric State, he had negotiated for twice the regular salary; he also had the good fortune to become a full professor by the time he was thirty at one of the most prestigious universities in America (Lodge 11). He “had already served as the Chairman of his Department for three years” and could only make more money if he moved to “some god-awful place in Texas or the Mid-West” and that was

beneath him, or if he had traded in his tenured position for that of a university president's job (Lodge 34). Those jobs, Zapp thought, were a "ticket to an early grave" (Lodge 34). Thus, his interest in teaching at Rummidge was not academic or in pursuit of furthering his career; Morris Zapp was getting divorced and was asked to leave his house by his own wife, Desiree. After all, "The members of that elite body, the Euphoric State faculty, who picked up grants and fellowships as other men pick up hats, did not aim to teach when they came to Europe, and certainly not to teach at Rummidge, which few of them had ever heard of" (Lodge 11). In contrast, the Rummidge professor, Swallow, had flown but had never traveled for conferences or research. "Swallow was a man scarcely known outside his own Department, who had published nothing except a handful of essays and reviews, who had risen slowly up the salary scale of Lecturer by standard annual increments and was now halted at the top with slender prospects of promotion" (Lodge 11).

The description of the academic careers of these two men illustrates a few of the differences between the British and American systems. The British educational system from primary, through secondary, and on into higher education was much more rigorously stratified at every stage. As the narrator explains, earlier on and thus, "Four times, under educational rules, the human pack is shuffled and cut—at eleven-plus, sixteen-plus, eighteen-plus, and twenty-plus—and happy is he who comes top of the deck on each occasion, but especially the last" (Lodge 12). At each juncture, examinations were given. Only those who scored well enough to advance could eventually have the opportunity to become university professors. But in the end, if a student made it through all the stages, he or she could have a secure job even without a terminal degree, equivalent to a Ph.D. For example, Swallow only needed to acquire a master's

degree to teach at the university level in Britain, whereas in the U.S., earning tenure typically required both a Ph.D. and a substantial publication record.

Even after attaining such a position, Swallow further laments of the nature of those who dare to enter the profession. He states that the British post-graduate student is a sad and troubled person indeed. “The British postgraduate is a lonely, forlorn soul, uncertain of what he is doing or whom he is trying to please...” (Lodge 12). Such a student is noted too often be spotted sitting alone in the British Museum or in a vacant coffee shop with a “distant” look. The British student that Lodge describes is seemingly perceived as an outsider because very few students attended university when Philip Swallow would have been a student and even less aspired to become a university professor. Prior to the 1960s, British universities were seen as elitist institutions and admitted a small percentage of the general population, but, as in the U.S., the statistics tell the story of rapid expansion on both sides of the Atlantic, although there were significant differences. For one thing, In the U.K., for example, there were fewer institutions—forty-four in Britain by 1970 (Brewis 156). At the same time, there were more than sixty colleges and universities in the Boston area alone (Thelin 291). While the British system was behind enrollment numbers in the United States, they similarly began to see an influx of students from middle and lower classes. “Before the war there had been around 50,000 students in universities across Britain, a figure which had more than doubled by 1962-1963 to 118,000—although this still represented just four percent of the age group. By 1970, there were 262,000 students in British universities (of whom 30% were women) out of a higher education field of 600,000” (Brewis 156). Prior to the Robbins Report of 1963, the British university was primarily exclusionary. The move to a mass institution during the Robbins Era allowed students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds to enter the university because there was not a prior

mechanism that allowed access to social mobility (Anderson 149). While many scholars credit the Robbins Report in 1963 for the influx of students, Collini disagrees,

Many people including those who hold forth about universities, still think that the new ‘plate glass’ universities of 1960s (Sussex, York, Essex, East Anglia, Warwick, Kent, Lancaster) were set up as the outcome of the famous ‘Robbins Report’ (the report of a committee on the future of universities chaired by Lionel Robbins), but simple chronology indicates just how far from the truth this is. (30)

Collini goes on to say that it was actually the UGC in the 1950s that decided to fund the construction and operation of new universities. In fact, Sussex was opened two years prior to the publishing of the Robbins Report in 1963 (Collini 30). Thus, the British higher education student was about a decade behind the mass institution of learning unfolding in America. Civic engagement by the British student never really matched the level of unrest in American students during the welfare state.

Indeed, the differences in the welfare state university in the U.S. are significant. For example, Lodge maintains that in the American university, in 1969, it was much easier to obtain a bachelor’s degree. It was not until graduate school that the hard work escalated. Lodge speculates, American students were left to their own desires during their undergraduate work, “...he accumulates the necessary credits as his leisure, cheating is easy, and there is not much suspense or anxiety about the eventual outcome” (11). The author also makes a remark about the leisure time outside of class, “He (or she) is therefore free to give full attention to the normal interests of late adolescence—sport, alcohol, entertainment and the opposite sex” (Lodge 11). Students in the welfare state had leisure time to engage in extracurriculars because of increase in social programs and state and federal funding.

From 1945-1975, the American university system saw the largest foundation for federal and state funding than ever before. This is in part due to the increasing enrollment across the nation. Jeffrey Williams explains that:

This occurred for several reasons, the most well known of which was the GI Bill, or the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944. The student body increased from 1.5 million in 1940 to 2.7 million in 1950 to 7.9 million by 1970, and whereas 12% of the population passed through the university in 1930, 30% did so by 1950, and 48% by 1970...(192)

The GI Bill functioned much like what Williams refers to as a "single payer system." The bill was a voucher to attend any university of the student's choice and the government footed the bill and allotted the money directly to the student. This became an extremely popular way of attending higher education for the many returning veterans, so much so that the government underestimated how many would utilize it. Enrollment soared: "During the 1960s, enrollment rose by 120 percent. By 1969, college enrollment was as large as 35 percent of the 18-24 year old population" (National Center for Education Statistics). It was the public, four-year university that most benefited from this as they accounted for seventy-four percent of this enrollment (National Center for Education Statistics).

Philip Swallow encounters first-hand at Euphoric State University the perks of this dramatic expansion in U.S. higher-education. In fact, tuition in the UC system had been free since 1868 for all California residents. Swallow encounters a vastly different student in this university structure because of such perks. While the British system is also free of tuition costs, it is still highly selective in its admissions process. The UC System enrollments had soared with more lax admissions standards. But the luxury of tuition free universities would soon be an idea of the past with the election of a conservative governor. Lodge refers to the California governor

as “Ronald Duck” throughout *Changing Places*. Ronald Reagan served two terms, 1967-1975, as the state’s governor and had a particular view on the function of higher education. In Gerard De Groot’s “Reagan’s Rise,” he addresses the campaign for governor of California in 1966. Republican hopeful, Ronald Reagan, would ascend to the podium and ask time and again, “Look, I don't care if I'm in the mountains, the desert, the biggest cities of the state, the first question is: What are you going to do about Berkeley?” (DeGroot 31). Each time Reagan posed the question, it received applause from a largely conservative California populace. This was a populist theme during his campaign and he won by a rather large margin and was even reelected.

Major civil unrest began to intensify during the welfare state at Berkeley in the early 1960s with the Free Speech Movement. Yet, *Changing Places* intervenes at the height of the conflict on this particular college campus in 1969, and a few years after Reagan had already been dealing with the student demonstrations. David Lodge makes reference to him often:

“...Euphoric State had perhaps reached its peak as a center of learning, but was already in the process of decline—due partly to the accelerating tempo of disruption by student militants, and partly to the counter-pressures exerted by the right-wing governor of the state, Ronald Duck, a former movie actor” (Lodge 10). At this juncture, Euphoric State was nearing the end of the Golden Age of academia, but was witnessing some of the largest student demonstrations the United States had ever seen (Lodge 11). Set at the culmination of the 1960s, *Changing Places* depicts the height of the student protests coupled with continuous police and National Guard occupations, especially concerning something Lodge refers to as the conflict of the “People’s Garden.” This is actually a reference to the conflict of the People’s Park located on UC Berkeley’s campus. At the forefront of those student revolutions in America was the California State College and University system, and none more prominent than the campus in Berkeley. It

is at this juncture that Philip Swallow lands on campus as a Visiting Professor in the English Department. He briefly reflects on a time during his academic tenure where he visited the old haunts of the Beats. While often confused with members in the Hippy Movement, the Beat generation was the literary spark that preceded much of the conflict in the 1960s and 1970s on university and college campuses. Kerouac's *On the Road* was first published in 1957, and Allen Ginsberg published "Howl" the year prior. These two men had met each other on the campus of Columbia University. Two of the most popular pieces of their literary era, both author and poet relay a world riddled with the disease of capitalism and empire building. Ronald Reagan often equated the student movements of the welfare state to "beatniks, radicals and filthy speech advocates have brought shame to...a great University" (DeGroot 32). Swallow begins recalling these social conflicts in the U.S. during his plane flight across the Atlantic, but his experience is limited as he himself admits, he still idealizes U.S. higher ed as a kind of "Paradise:"

Though he has followed the recent history of the United states in the newspapers, though he is well aware, cognitively, that it has become more than ever a violent and melodramatic land, riven by deep divisions of race and ideology, traumatized by political assassinations, that campuses in revolt, the cities seizing up, the countryside poisoned and devastated—emotionally it is still for him a kind of Paradise...(Lodge 16)

The truth is this type of campus upheaval was happening across the country and in various places in different parts of the world. The connection to student uprisings was becoming global with protests in Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, Africa, the Middle East, Poland, Belgrade, Yugoslavia, Italy, Germany, Great Britain, and Ireland just to name a few (Boren 149-183). Mark Boren labels 1968 as the "Year of the Student" because of the conflicts occurring across the globe. While many of the issues varied, student demonstrations had become commonplace. How they

were dealt with was another matter. The English simply allowed the student occupations and demonstrations and waited for them to tire. For example, in 1968, at Hornsey College of Art in the London Borough of Haringey, England, students took over the university for six weeks before giving up. The administration reprimanded and disciplined students after it was over. This same approach did not work in the United States as law enforcement officials found that they did not tire so easily (Boren 157). It is at this point that Philip Swallow encounters the student movements at Euphoric State.

In contrast, of course, Morris Zapp had been deeply exposed to the protests on campus, but despite this exposure, he seems surprisingly disconnected from the student movements and the issues on campus. It is not until he ends up on a Boeing on his way to Britain when he learns about the women's movement. Morris learns from the woman sitting next to him that he is on a plane full of women who are traveling to the UK in order to obtain an abortion. Due to the stringent laws in America, they were selling "abortion packages" to women. Morris Zapp realizes the young female student he had bought his ticket from had purchased the same package. On his flight, he sits next to a young woman named Mary Makepeace who informs Zapp of the women's liberation movement. As Lodge concedes, few people have learned of the women's liberation movement on the first day of 1969 to which Zapp replies, "I've never heard of it." The "Second Wave" of the women's liberation movement arose during the 1960s, but Zapp seems remarkably unaware of it.

There is a deep irony in this lack of awareness. Although Zapp reflects on his relationship with his students and the current state of education, many of his colleagues had speculated that he took the post at Rummidge in order to escape his students, but in reality, it was the impending divorce from his wife that sent him away. He did, however, admit that his students had become

harder to educate. Zapp believes that his teaching style no longer suited the current student population. He was embarrassed by this. “His style of teaching was designed to shock conventionally educated students out of a sloppily reverent attitude to literature and into an ice-cool, intellectually rigorous one” (Lodge 36). Yet the culture of the time was more one of challenging conventionality, and Morris Zapp did not like that his students were challenging his knowledge base and his qualifications. He often had nightmares about student protests that had emerged from his discussions of Jane Austen (Lodge 36). Students began questioning curriculum because they were questioning any member that appeared to be part of the establishment and many of the professoriate harbored values of previous generations. Morris Zapp was therefore not immune to being challenged by the Baby Boomers.

Meanwhile, Philip Swallow has bumped into a former student, Charles Boon, on his flight to America. Boon proceeds to educate Swallow about the current political situation at Euphoric State. Swallow was under the misapprehension that Boon would need his tutelage in order to navigate the California landscape, but, rather it was the opposite. Boon illustrated the divisive nature of the student protests and the opposing forces,

The factions, the issues, the confrontations; Governor Duck, Chancellor Binde, Mayor Holmes, Sheriff O’Keene; the Third world, the Hippies, the Black Panthers, the Faculty Liberals; pot, Black studies, sexual freedom, ecology, free speech, police violence, ghettos, fair housing, school busing, Viet Nam; strikes, arson, marches, sit-ins teach-ins, love-ins, happenings. (Lodge 38)

Charles Boon points out many thinly veiled personas while discussing the state of affairs at Euphoric State. The aforementioned Chancellor Binde represents the historical Chancellor Heyns—a man hired after the unseating of a highly popular Chancellor Clark Kerr, Mayor

Holmes is the equivalent of Mayor Wallace Johnson, and Sheriff O'Keene is a thinly veiled Sheriff Frank Madigan. Boon may have been a less than exceptional student at Rummidge, but Philip Swallow is somewhat flabbergasted at his knowledge of the Euphoric State political landscape. Boon clearly illustrates the state of the welfare state university in terms of learning spaces, both formal and informal. Helen Horowitz would say the welfare state university was dominated with men and women akin to Charles Boon. She argues higher education was dominated by the "New outsider" beginning in the middle of the 20th century. The term "New Outsider" is derivative of her original term "outsider." Students who inhabited higher education pre 1960s and who only focused on their schoolwork and their relationship with their professors were deemed "outsiders." They did not concern themselves with joining social clubs or advancing their business careers. Many of these students were ministerial or naturally outside the system because of race, ethnicity, or gender. The "New Outsider" emerged as an agent of social rebellion during the Cultural Revolution due to the negative feelings concerning the Vietnam War, the Women's Movement, the Civil Rights Movement, and other power moves by subgroups of American society. This "New Outsider" was politically engaged, but detached from the traditional educational spaces of the university. True learning for such individuals, many scholars argue, took place in informal learning spaces. Charles Boon remarks, "To tell you the truth, Phil, I'm not bothered about my studies. It suits me to be registered at Euphoric State—it allows me to stay in the country without getting drafted. But I don't really need any more degrees" (Lodge 40). Indeed, part of the reason for the increase in college enrollment from 1966-1972 was because many men were avoiding the draft. The Census Bureau reported "the college enrollment rate for civilian men 18 to 24 rose to 36 percent in 1969 from 24 percent in 1960 and then dropped to 27 percent in the mid-1970s, as the draft was dropped" (Bruno).

Boon's involvement in the social and political movements, including his service as a local radio station disc jockey, represent some of the informal spaces he occupies the most and finds the most value in; his enrollment at the university primarily serves as a vehicle to keep him out of the war in Vietnam.

Initial Adjustments

Upon arrival at Euphoric State, Philip Swallow is denied entrance to Dealer Hall by campus police because there is a bomb threat. Minutes later, he hears an explosion coupled with shattering glass. Simultaneously, Morris Zapp arrives at Rummidge to investigate his office and the university. He uses this as an opportunity to get to know Swallow through the examination of his office. Before he left for Rummidge, he engages in a conversation with the Chairman of Euphoric's English Department, Luke Hogan, concerning the placement of professor Philip Swallow. "Goddammit, Morris, what are we gonna do with this guy Swallow? He claims he ain't got a field." To which Morris recommended assigning him general education courses and remarked, "...any clown with a PhD should be able to teach English 99." Hogan replied, "He doesn't have a PhD" (Lodge 47). Despite all preconceived notions of the British professor and the university system that launched him, Zapp finds Swallow's office much nicer than his own. Morris refers to this as "public affluence." While he admits that the standard of living is less than desirable at Rummidge, he concedes, "...even the most junior teacher here has large office to himself, and the Staff House was built like a Hilton, putting Euphoric State's Faculty Club quite in the shade" (Lodge 47). He is certain that the comfort to which Swallow had become accustomed at Rummidge was missing from Dealer Hall at Euphoric. Also, Zapp questions the relationship between Swallow and his students. This train of thought is sparked by a letter Zapp finds in Swallow's bureau addressed to himself. As he reads, he is inundated with descriptions of

individual student's personalities and some of the quirks of the study groups that Zapp will have to teach. One of the most disconcerting perceptions is the one he harbors about the British in general. He refers to them as people who acted like "fags" and turned out not to be which was confusing to him.

At parties they wolfed your canapés and gulped your gin as if they had just been released from prison, and talked all the time in high, twittering voices about the differences between the English and American university systems, making it clear that they regarded the latter as a huge, other amusing racket from which they were personally determined to take the biggest possible cut in the shortest possible time. (Lodge 37)

Zapp continues with a diatribe that defames the English professoriate because their publication records were substandard, "...amateurish, inadequately researched, slackly argued, and riddled with so many errors, misquotations, misattributions and incorrect dates that it was amazing they managed to get their own names right on the title page" (Lodge 37). So, not only is Morris Zapp disconnected from his own American students, but he lacks a general knowledge of the British professoriate. While he professes to be well published and educated, he displays arrogance when it comes to understanding the British system and its' relationship with their respective government. Zapp is measuring the higher education system in Britain with American metrics. This ignorance is further displayed earlier during a discussion with Hogan where he reveals he does not know or understand the qualifications of becoming a professor in Britain.

In contrast, back at Euphoric State (the narrative proceeds by toggling back and forth between Swallow at Euphoric and Zapp at Rummidge), Philip Swallow is allowed back into Dealer Hall, so he gets acquainted with his temporary office and meets a young man by the name of Wily Smith. He is waiting outside his office in an effort to get signed into English 305: Novel

Writing. While Swallow willingly admits that he should not be teaching such a course, Smith is still adamant about getting signed in. Philip also learns a great deal about student life and some of the interworking in the English Department from Wily Smith. The “Keep Kroop” button that Smith is wearing is in support of an Assistant Professor of English who had recently been denied tenure because he lacked a sufficient publication record. Smith tells Philip that he is “a real groovy teacher” and gets some of the highest reviews in a publication called the *Course Bulletin*. When Swallow inquires as to the purpose and the content of such a publication, Wily Smith hands him the most recent issue. In the issue, there are reviews of professors and their respective courses. Professor Ringbaum, in the Department of English is criticized as he “does little to make his subject interesting to students. One commented: ‘He seems to know his material very well, but resents questions and discussions as they interrupt his train of thought.’ Another comment: ‘Dull, dull, dull’” (Lodge 53-54). There is also a review for Morris Zapp, which is less than flattering. He is described by students as “vain, sarcastic, and a mean grader, but brilliant and stimulating” (Lodge 54). Over the course of the conversation between the two men, Swallow learns it is Wily who is responsible for publishing the *Course Bulletin*. Of course, Kroop receives rave reviews from his students. This evaluative performance on professors at the university was a relatively new concept in 1969. Student groups began publishing documents like Smith’s *Course Bulletin* in the 1960s and they gained popularity in later decades,

Although course evaluations have been administered on some campuses since early in the century, their use jumped in the 1960s, when student activist groups began publishing them to guide students in selecting courses. Evaluations have become even more a fixture in the 1990s, "spurred by a widespread trend toward seeking consumer satisfaction in higher education," according to Wendy Williams, an associate professor of human

development at Cornell University. "As tuition has skyrocketed, parents and students have become more demanding about what takes place at college. They want control, and to be able to provide meaningful feedback. And colleges and universities are expected to listen to and respond to this feedback," she explains. (Lewis)

Student evaluations during the welfare state university are beginning to bear some political and social clout. If we can safely assume the *Course Bulletin* guides many students in choosing courses, then student groups are beginning to wield power over enrollment.

Morris Zapp exemplifies this ideology of the welfare state university when discussing how he perceives he will be received by other Rummidge faculty: "In all modesty Morris imagined he must be the biggest fish ever to swim in this academic backwater, and he was prepared for a reception of almost exaggerated (if that were possible) interest and excitement" (Lodge 55). He is disappointed to learn, however, they care little about his publication record and reputation. Zapp is highly critical of the British professoriate. He sees them as subpar, lackluster academics (Lodge 37).

Professor Swallow also learns that sleeping with his students would not be a deal breaker in the search for tenure at a place like Euphoric State. He engages in a conversation with Dr. Ringbaum, also of the English Department, at the Hogan's party concerning the quest for tenure. After being negatively scorned for asking if he can meet Dr. Kroop, Ringbaum informs him of the steps necessary. Swallow's interest in Kroop stems from his conversation with Wily Smith and the remarks in the *Course Bulletin*, especially since Kroop, like Swallow, lacks a publication record. Ringbaum informs Swallow that Kroop does not come around those parties—that he is an outsider because he has been denied tenure and lacks a sufficient publication record. Later on, it is revealed that Kroop is heavily involved with the student groups on campus and operates

outside of the purview of his peers. More importantly, Swallow gets the impression that Kroop's English colleagues do not view him as an authentic academic and thus not as an equal. Of course, this makes Philip uncomfortable, but he also explains the difference in the English university system and structure to Ringbaum. At the end of Ringbaum's generic discussion of qualifications he informs Swallow he is up for tenure this year and says,

“You must have the same thing in England?”

“Oh no. Probation is more or less a formality. In practise [sic], once you're appointed they can never get rid of you—unless you seduce one of your students or something equally scandalous.” Philip laughed.

“You can screw as many students as you like here,” said Ringbaum unsmilingly. “But if your publications are unsatisfactory...” He drew a finger expressively across his throat.

(Lodge 60-61)

In a matter of irony, Ringbaum is later on denied tenure after a night of *Humiliation*, a game introduced to the Euphoric State English Department by Philip Swallow. The object of the game is to name a popular literary work that you have never read. The more people who have not read it, the more points the game player earns. Apparently, Ringbaum named *Hamlet*. Of course, no one believed him, and he grew angry and stormed out. He blames his not getting tenure on the game and for admitting he had never read *Hamlet*. They decide to offer it to Kroop instead (Lodge 108).

At the same party, Philip meets Mrs. Zapp who is standing out on the terrace admiring the view. After exchanging a few brief formalities, they begin an interesting discussion on education. While Philip maintains that schools and education are extremely important, Desiree does not harbor the same feelings. She claims that our culture is obsessed with education. This

obsession, she claims, makes it harder on future generations and becomes all-consuming. ““You’re knocking yourself out to educate your children so they can knock themselves out educating their children. What’s the point?”” she asks. Desiree also questions the practicality of education when she suggests that “...nobody is actually *doing* anything” with their education (Lodge 65). When Desiree asks about the “point” of education she is revealing a much larger chasm concerning the need for a degree. While enrollment in the American university soared during this period and reshaped how society viewed a person with a college degree, students and onlookers alike continue to question its practicality. Similarly, Swallow has a much different take on acquiring a degree because there are still much smaller enrollments at Rummidge albeit a steady increase during the welfare state. Practicality is questioned because of what the awarding of a degree grants. During the welfare state, an awarding of a degree granted access and increased economic and social mobility. The practicality of a college or university degree in the welfare state is at the forefront of Governor Duck’s arguments concerning the education system.

A former FDR Democrat and New Deal Supporter, Ronald Reagan changed his political affiliation and became governor of California. The newfound Republican governor not only ran on the promise to clean up Berkeley, but found a disdain for how education was being run by university administrators and faculty, and thus began to find ways to diminish its power and influence in any way he saw possible. One of those ways was to question the purpose of higher education, not necessarily in the way Desiree does, but to challenge its morality and practicality as an investment. In order to understand the inner workings of Reagan’s involvement with UC Berkeley, it is imperative to understand his relationship with the CIA and FBI. Seth Rosenfeld revealed a close and investigatory relationship between the office of the governor, FBI, and CIA in *Subversives: The FBI’s War on Student Radicals, and the Reagan Revolution*. In 1969,

Reagan openly admitted to having two FBI agents stationed on the UC Berkeley campus. Later on, new information suggested the occupation of several hundred FBI agents on and around the campus at the same time Philip Swallow is teaching. These officials attended meetings, lectures, and demonstrations in an effort to collect data on leaders and would be communists.

Both University officials and the city police 'Red Squad' attended radical meetings, and the police often took photographs. Surveillance could easily turn into sabotage. A former CIA employee stationed in San Jose later confessed to more than forty antiradical burglaries in the Bay Area, including one at the *Ramparts* magazine office in San Francisco. (Rorabaugh 515)

A former professor of immunology and bacteriology, Leon Wofsy, further substantiates these reports. He reports that the FBI had briefed local officials of his presence on campus because he had been identified as a communist sympathizer (Wofsy 353). Reagan challenged the reason for the upheaval on campus and often referred to Berkeley as a "jungle" and a "war zone" while simultaneously he had investigations carried out to see if anyone on the Far Left had traveled outside the country. The assumption was that some other foreign entity was behind the protests, sit-ins, and teach-ins. There was never any evidence of this nature (Rosenfeld 430, 486-487). For Reagan, higher education in California had diminished its practicality and usefulness when student groups began questioning the authority of the status quo. While rebels were winning in Berkeley, conservatives were winning statewide in California.

Morris Zapp's biggest concern (and challenge) when he arrives at Rumbridge is the opportunity to meet the English faculty for the first time. Several days pass, as Morris sits in his office, before anyone introduces himself or herself to him. They avoid him altogether, and Zapp is increasingly becoming more depressed. It is not until Professor Masters returns from holiday

that he meets his British colleagues. Gordon Masters ushers him into the Senior Common Room on campus and begins introductions. Zapp meets many of them, but holds a rather long conversation with a man named Bob Busby. Morris asks questions concerning Professor Masters and his qualifications. Zapp cannot figure out how a man like Masters became Head of the Rummidge English Department because of his physical appearance, lack of publication record, and the incomprehensible nature of the way he speaks. Morris asks Busby if he has a cleft palate or some other speech impediment. Busby responds by stating that Masters is a great man. When Morris inquired as to why, Busby said, "Well, he was. So I'm told. A brilliant young scholar before the war. Captured at Dunkirk, you know." (Lodge 71). As a follow up, Zapp asks about Masters' publication record to which Busby replies, "Nothing" (Lodge 71). Morris Zapp firmly believes the measure of a brilliant young scholar and a great man is the length of his publication record. He cannot figure out how an institution like Rummidge educates students with professors who lack publications and PhDs. This is, of course, Morris Zapp's way of measuring himself against the other member in the English Department at Rummidge.

While Zapp harbors a rather high opinion of himself as a university professor, his students think differently: "He's a well-known campus fascist. Everybody knows Zapp" (Lodge 76). Swallow learns this information from several students who live in the same building as he does. Zapp was among those faculty members who were staunchly opposed to the violence and upheaval caused by student organizations; although there were also many faculty who were on the side of the students. Reginald E. Zelnik writes, while there were clear "pro" and "anti" groups among the Berkeley faculty, that often it was not that simple. There were many nuances the faculty harbored. One of which was that the faculty were often stuck in the middle of

students and administrators. The conflicts most often occurred between these two groups, which left faculty to their own devices and often in the role of mediators. “The most important role of faculty was as the elusive object of both the FSM [Free Speech Movement] and the administration’s attention. Many of the words and deeds of these two sets of players were designed to sway faculty opinion” (Zelnik 265). Many faculty members soon realized it was the students that needed the most protection. Faculty members had louder voices because they often had a seat at the table within the university administrative structure than individual students or student groups lacked. “Shared governance” was still an operative principle in 1969. While students could flex their proverbial muscles through demonstrations and sit-ins, this did not save them from disciplinary action or from being arrested.

Many of the earliest faculty allies came from the young and untenured professors at Berkeley. Yet, not all faculty were willing to stick their necks out. Lawrence Levine, a former professor of history at the University of California, Berkeley, writes that many of his older, liberal and tenured colleagues were unwilling “to commit themselves publicly and take the lead...I find it remarkable that my junior colleagues and I did these things with no thought about whether or how our actions might impact our eventual tenure prospects” (342). Levine further admits to purchasing *Roberts Rules of Order* in order to educate himself properly, or as he puts it, “If I was to engage in battle I needed the appropriate armor” (Levine 342). Morris Zapp is exemplary of one of the older, tenured, and unengaged professors to whom Levine makes reference to, and rather unpopular with the Baby Boomer student population. Phillip Swallow becomes privy to Zapp’s reputation among students when he decides to partake in smoking some marijuana with the students who live downstairs from him. He meets a young woman named Melanie and four other Euphoric State students. The student referred to as the “confederate

soldier” acknowledges Zapp’s political appearance and also comments on Karl Kroop’s progressive teaching style as he allows students to grade themselves. Swallow also comments on the nature of the welfare state student when he says, “All of them, it appeared, either were or had been students at the University, but like Melanie they were vague and evasive about their backgrounds and plans. They seemed to live entirely in the present tense” (Lodge 77). This is juxtaposed with Swallow’s perception of himself as uptight and worried about his future.

There is a generational difference between Professor Swallow and the students inhabiting the American university structure during this historical period. Such students during the welfare state are politically and civically engaged because they fear the future of the American nation. Students had begun to change the culture of American society by rejecting and challenging the establishment’s norms and thus did so unapologetically. Levine writes about one particular demonstration on campus that concerned a young man delivering a speech that was “replete with filthy language. A young campus policeman pointed to a blond woman in the crowd and told the speaker to halt the flow of profanity because a ‘lady’ was present. The young woman walked up to the cop, looked at him directly, and said, ‘Officer, fuck you!’” (Levine 343). The look on the officer’s face proved there was a breakdown of the paternalism that had become commonplace on university campuses with *loco parentis*. Such norms did not survive the 1960s (Levine 343).

Charles Boon presents the same sort of defiance with his radio station. Swallow soon learns that Boon is a celebrity at Euphoric State. Many know his radio station, and a noncommercial news network sponsored it. Thus, it was free from any political strings so Boon could conduct his shows with absolute freedom. “He took an extreme radical position on such issues as pot, sex, race, Viet Nam, and argued heatedly—often rudely—with callers who disagreed with him, sometimes abusing his control of the telephone line by cutting them off in

mid-sentence” (Lodge 59). Student engagement in the welfare state was at an all-time high. Charles Boon exercised his right to free speech on the open airwaves on a radio show that aired close to midnight. His popularity also informs the reader that others were equally as politically engaged. Swallow mentions that *The Charles Boon Show* was appealing to all sorts of demographics: “...students, professors, hippies, runaways, insomniacs, drug addicts, and Hells Angels” (Lodge 59). FM radio stations were far more prevalent to engage in this type of dialogue during the welfare state because they only began in the 1960s. Berkeley’s KPFA was created and established in 1949 and it was the first radio station that was supported by listeners (Chorba XIV). “As FM receivers became popular in the 1960s, the Pacifica stations became sources of information for the Vietnam antiwar movement, the Berkeley Free Speech movement (1964), and the student uprising at Columbia (1968)” (Chorba XV). KPFA hosted many persons who were deemed controversial at the time, but who were critical to the left—Lawrence Ferlinghetti, Allen Ginsberg, and Alan Watts just to name a few (Chorba XV). Thus, the power and influence of Charles Boon at QWYZ had caught the attention of Governor Duck. Boon, during a radio interview, tells his listeners that his station is the one the governor tried to have banned from the air.

Student protests continued on the campus of Euphoric State as Philip Swallow had begun the winter term. After letting Wily Smith into his novel writing course, he staged a total class walkout in an effort to help the Third World Students Strike. In a letter that Philip writes home to his wife, Hilary he says, “Wily Smith harangued his fellow students and persuaded them that they must support the strike by boycotting my class. There’s nothing personal in it, of course, as he was kind enough to explain, but it did seem rather a nerve” (Lodge 100). A few days later, Wily came in with an army helmet on, acting as if he were evading law enforcement. He asked

Professor Swallow if he could see his balcony—he disappears, and Swallow surmises he has crawled into an open window and escaped out of the building (Lodge 107-108). Wily manages to escape the building and the police who were chasing him. He had purportedly come from a demonstration as he was “wearing a motor-cycle helmet as protection against the police truncheons (nightsticks as they rather sinisterly call them) and his face was glistening with Vaseline, which is supposed to protect your skin against MACE” (Lodge 112-113). Swallow dismisses the visit as a way to evade being arrested and thinks no more about Smith’s escape.

Settling In

Philip Swallow slowly became involved in the campus uproar. Initially, he wrote to Hilary often complaining about the “rumble” on campus and even called it “amateurish,” but as the novel progresses, so do his opinions on the politics surrounding Euphoric State. There was a constant presence of the National Guard, as ordered by Governor Duck, and sounds of helicopters, tear gas canisters going off, and the voice of protests became an everyday occurrence. Also, the Women’s Liberation Movement seeped its way into both the Zapp and Swallow households. Mary Makepeace, who comes to live with the Swallows in Rummidge, introduces Hilary to some of the ideology behind the movement which she relayed to Philip in a letter (Lodge 124-128). She also informed him that there are the beginnings of student rumblings at Rummidge, “Believe it or not, we may be in for some student trouble here. There is talk of a sit-in next term” (Lodge 123). Simultaneously, Desiree, in Morris’ absence, also became involved with the Women’s Liberation Movement in Plotinus:

Have you ever heard of Women’s Liberation, Morris? I’ve just discovered it. I mean I read about the way they busted up the Miss America competition last November, but I thought they were just a bunch of screwballs. Not at all. They’ve just started up a

discussion group in Plotinus, and I went along the other night. I was fascinated. Boy, have they got *your* number! (Lodge 124)

Eventually, the Plotinus Women obtain permits for a March and it is written about in the local paper. Desiree becomes more involved with the movement as a result of her distance from Morris. She realized she is not alone in her feelings of isolationism when it comes to being a woman in a traditional patriarchal society (Lodge 124).

The revolution finally reaches Rummidge, and the students have organized a sit in after they felt their voices were not being heard. The Student Union Council had formally proposed a document titled *Student Participation* and petitioned the University Court of Governors to agree to three things: the acceptance of the aforementioned document, suspension of classes for a teach-in over the course of two days, and “immediate action to set up a Commission to investigate the structure and function of the University” (Lodge 126). The University Court of Governors is a reference to the sub group of administrators on Rummidge’s campus. However, this might also be a larger reference to the University Grants Committee (UGC) and it had a rich history in British higher education. Established in 1919, the UGC

was a body established to distribute the small grant-in-aid which governments had begun to make to some institutions... this was essentially an arrangement for protecting the autonomy of universities by allowing a small group mostly made up of senior academics to act as intermediary body to advise the government on the needs of universities and then to distribute such sums as the Treasury should allocate for the purpose. (Collini 29)

It is thus imperative to understand that the students are challenging the governing body of Rummidge and asking it to rethink its mission and purpose, but this is also indicative of a larger social shift within British higher education. Many student groups were asking similar questions

of the UGC. It is at this juncture of the Rummidge student protests that Gordon Masters, Head of the Department of English at Rummidge, begins to destabilize and begins to wear his old war uniform to work. He went on record stating that the situation was similar to World War II while equating the students to Hitler's Nazi Germany. His office began to look like a bunker and strategy and situation room. The walls bore maps of the Rummidge water piping system, and he claimed the knowledge of such a system would "make an excellent base for resistance activity should Senate and Administration have to go underground" (Lodge 131). While Masters claims the university is at war, the sit-ins continue. Many students attended an administrative meeting in hopes of getting some answers to their questions. One student referred to addressing the Vice-Chancellor and the administration as a waste of time. It appeared the administration did not value the input from the students, "He showed no understanding of the legitimate demands of students for democratic participation in university decision-making" (Lodge 130). The students then staged a sit in with sleeping bags and backpacks. There were approximately 150 students who had occupied Assembly Hall of the University after this meeting (Lodge 127). So, the revolution is finally legitimizing itself in Rummidge as it had at Euphoric State, but still at much smaller numbers. Many of the sit-ins and teach-ins in Britain were inspired by what was happening in France and the United States, which were the models when organizing protests. Lodge is referencing a specific historic event that occurred in February of 1969 when two thousand students took part in a community action week at Birmingham. Much of the growing unrest at the university was the disconnect the students felt from the local community.

Involving a [sic] third of the university's undergraduates—a greater proportion than any of the higher profile university sit-ins or protests of the "long sixties"—the Birmingham community Action week reflected growing dissatisfaction with a lack of contact with

communities outside the university, and was a key episode in the development of a national Student Community Action (SCA) movement in Britain. (Brewis 175)

In that same blistery February, some students at Oxford became involved and organized a grass roots campaign that went door to door to discuss problems occurring in the third world. This led to a rather large donation of student grant money to third world causes (Brewis 175-176).

Georgiana Brewis argues that 1969 was a rather pivotal year for students in Britain and served as a proverbial launching pad for other student groups. While campus upheaval in the United Kingdom did occur during in the years 1968-69, they had trouble maintaining momentum: “The British government and university officials, too, had witnessed the threats posed by the students in France and other countries and learned from the mistakes made by de Gaulle and his education officials in dealing with those threats” (Boren 158). Instead of meeting the students with force, they would attempt to defuse the situations by meeting with student groups and organizers to work out a resolution (Boren 158). This is evident at Rumbridge when education officials decide they are in need of a mediator.

Morris Zapp gets involved in the student revolution at Rumbridge because he is asked to be the mediator between students and the administration after Masters’ recent comments forced him to resign his post as Head of the Department of English and into early retirement (Lodge 132). Later, Zapp learns that Masters has been admitted to a mental institution. Acting as mediator, Zapp and administration allow students to conduct a teach-in. There are three main questions that they would like addressed:

What is the role of the University in modern society?

What is the social justification of University Education? [and]

What do Ordinary people really think about Universities and Students?” (Lodge 133).

These three questions have been inspired by what the students at Rummidge are seeing in student protests in other parts of the world. The scene that Lodge lays out at Rummidge is occurring at many British universities in the late sixties. Students began to organize campaigns, question their access to their files, adopt the notion that having a say in their respective universities was important to the overall governance of higher education. Most importantly, they challenged the apolitical stance the university had accepted with the local communities and world at large. Thus, the questions posed by the Student Community Action group were a response to the historical moment in the United Kingdom. In response to the political stirrings at Rummidge, an Education student submitted a response to a publication called *Rumble*,

most student don,t [sic] like the way colleges and universitys [sic] are run tats [sic] why they have protested and sit-in. When students are older they will find it was ran in a good way. Students waste people and police-mens [sic] time, i [sic] think just for a laff. [sic] Most of them are hippies and act like big fools and waste thier [sic]brain when someone else would be proud to be brainy. (Lodge 133)

This student response, albeit humorous, is the reason why those three proposed questions by the Rummidge Student Group are so imperative. The university is vastly misunderstood not only by the majority of the general population, but also by some of the students who inhabit its physical structure. Brewis references community responses such as this one in *A Social History of Student Volunteering*. The student response at Birmingham, she felt, came too late and “the image of the 1969 action week, in which the students were portrayed by the local press and the university authorities as the responsible majority to be contrasted with the radical, trouble-making minority” did not gain momentum (Brewis 183). Part of the disconnect with the local

community is witnessed in the aforementioned statement in Lodge's novel by the education student who refers to such student groups as hippies and rebel rousers. The fundamental difference between the student groups in Britain and the political upheaval in the US is the mission and the historical moment that generated student organizations. British students really did not get involved until the latter part of the 1960s. Moreover, they are most interested in forcing universities to create student outreach groups, which connect the university, by extension of the university student groups, to the local communities as well as global causes. Most of these student groups began to take up issues concerning Third World countries, housing, education, women's rights, and various social problems (Brewis 183). The issues concerning the American students were violently amplified by the Vietnam War and started much earlier.

While the Rummidge students continue having their teach-ins, Philip Swallow is arrested for stealing bricks from a church. In reality, he was giving a lift to Wily Smith and a few friends who were carrying the bricks. When the police stopped the vehicle, the students ran and Philip was left to shoulder the blame. Swallow had to hand over his Euphoric State Identification Card and his British driver's license, "The former provoked a curt homily against professors encouraging their students to violate property, the latter provoked deep but silent suspicion" (Lodge 155). He became a local hero after spending some time in jail, "Some of Professor Swallows students gathered outside the Court and cheered as he emerged, smiling" (Lodge 128). The bricks were going to be used to build the People's Garden, which had become a rather controversial topic of late. Governor Duck began enforcing a curfew because of the violence ensued a few days after Swallow had been arrested.

The conflict that Lodge is referring to at the People's Park continued to grow worse as administration officials and political forces doubled down their force. In January of 1969,

Ronald Reagan “ordered state police troops to suppress student demonstrators at the Berkeley campus” (Boren 179). It was not until April of the same year that tensions escalated surrounding People’s Park. The students began to beautify a vacant lot owned by the university. They put in a children’s playground, planted grass and flowers, and gave it its name. University administrators hired a company to erect a fence to keep people out as they had marked that space to build another dormitory. Local police were also called in to monitor the area to make sure no vandalism occurred (Boren 180-181). Despite the university’s efforts,

On May 15 [1969] thousands of students attempted to possess the park physically; police troops at the park and close to two thousand national guardsmen assigned to control the site and the campus by Governor Reagan repelled the students by shooting tear gas at the demonstrators and then opening fire on them with shotguns loaded with birdseed. (Boren 181)

This historical event is fictionalized in the novel. Lodge reports on the violence surrounding the same event. He reports that thirty-five people were shot while sixty in total were hospitalized after an altercation broke out between police and protestors outside the garden fence. Many were tear-gassed and shot by police. There was also an injured policeman who had been stabbed while three of his peers had been hit with rocks and other debris (Lodge 129). One student victim, John Roberts, dies, and the already tenuous relationship between protestors and police intensifies. John Roberts represented a real life student who was shot and killed named James Rector. “Although the birdseed was intended to sting the legs of students and make them run away, the troops discharged their weapons at too close a range and aimed too high, hitting a number of protesters in their faces, blinding one and killing another” (Boren 181). This act of

violence only escalated an already dangerous situation. Thousands of students emerged and took to the streets in protest.

Lodge's numbers were a bit off. Historical sources claim that over 180 persons were hospitalized after the altercation at People's Park. In response to the student's death, 3000 mourners marched in his memory. The National Guard trapped 700 of these people and sprays the crowd with tear gas. This was executed and authorized by the Alameda (Lodge's Miranda) County Sheriff's Department. "Wind blew the gas and carried it hundreds of yards away. It blanketed residential houses, entered university classrooms and offices, seeped into the wards of the University Hospital. Faculty wives, and children in the Blueberry Creek swimming pool 3/4 mile away were affected by the gas" (Lodge 132). What Lodge does not report in the novel is that the irritants sprayed at those marching were chemicals often used by the U.S. Marines in Vietnam (Boren 181). Sheriff Madigan (Lodge's Sherriff O'Keene) later admitted that he was not responsible for the tactics that were used that day. He claims all of the orders came from somewhere much higher (Boren 181). The governor had enlisted the California National Guard the evening after the riot. As a helicopter passed overhead, the voice of Ronald Reagan proclaimed,

"No person can loiter in or about any public street or other public place in the city of Berkeley, including the campus of the University of California between the hours of ten p.m. and six a.m. of the following day."[and]

"No person shall conduct or participate in a meeting, assembly, or parade or use a sound or voice amplifier in or upon the public streets or other public place in the City of Berkeley, including the campus of the University of California." (Rosenfled 460)

On May 15, 1969, 2,500 troops were stationed in Berkeley at the command of Sheriff Madigan and martial law was imposed (Rosenfeld 460-461).

After this clash, the faculty filed a complaint with the chancellor's office in an effort to challenge the unchecked power of the police force and National Guard. The chancellor's response was an effort to figure out how to lease the city property for the park. However, this was unlikely since the Governor, "an ex officio member of the University Council," would have to sign off on the lease and "he is bitterly opposed to any concession to the Gardeners" (Lodge 135). Many UC Berkeley professors, after filing an internal complaint, travelled to Sacramento to meet with Governor Reagan in an effort to mediate the occupation. On May 21, 1969, they were invited by the governor to attend a meeting. Wofsy reports that Nobel Laureate Owen Chamberlain did most of the speaking on behalf of the UC Berkeley students and faculty and attempted to tell the governor why they had come. Reagan must have had a different agenda concerning the nature of the meeting because he began to chastise the faculty for promoting the violence on campus, "'you' told your students that they could break the law. Reagan went on, lecturing and accusing the eggheads for the benefit of the evening TV news and the morning headlines" (Wofsy 353). But the story did not end there for Leon Wofsy, when he interrupted the governor to explain they were there "to see what [could] be done to avoid further violence," Reagan demanded to know his name and offered a subtle threat about knowing exactly who Wofsy was and eventually called him a liar (353). Unsurprisingly, the governor denied the professor's request to remove the troops from Berkeley. He also backed the use of force exhibited by the Blue Meanies—deputies of the Alameda County Sheriff's Department.

Berkeleyans refused to obey the martial law imposed by Reagan and the National Guard. On Thursday, May 22nd, 1969, the professors led a protest with students consisting of some

1500 people from Sproul Plaza into downtown. The result was overwhelmingly ugly. Many were arrested including innocent bystanders and transported via bus to the country prison farm where they were beaten and told they would be thrown into concentration camps. One man, “Super Joel” Thornabene refused to eat after they were given some watery milk and cereal for breakfast at 4:45 in the morning. The officers made him place his face against a pole and hit the other side with their nightsticks. After a while, his nose began to bleed. It was no secret that he had been one of the organizers of the protest regarding People’s Park. The prisoners were kept overnight at the Santa Rita prison farm and were refused bail. Many were beaten and were not allowed to sleep. This event is routinely referred to as the “Operation Box” and all 482 arrests were thrown out because of the tactics used. Sheriff Frank Madigan later apologized for the actions of his men (Rosenfeld 465-466). This incident is omitted from the novel. For what reason is not apparently clear, but there was so much going on, it might have been overlooked or not widely known considering some of the tactics the Blue Meanies used in “Operation Box.”

Lodge does cover the lead up to the large march in Berkeley. With no resolution in sight, the Gardeners planned a march for the following week with participation estimated to be at 50,000 people through the streets of Plotinus (Lodge 135). While this march would include members of the community as well as students, it was widely known that the students were the early organizers of the park. Students in Lodge’s novel and those who inhabited the welfare state university had the time to organize and become participatory members of a democratic society because college was affordable. The University of California, Berkeley was free for all California residents. They did have to pay a \$300 registration fee, but that was all. Nonresidents had to pay tuition of \$1200 per academic year (Vega). This system was largely the result of the former chancellor of UC Berkeley, Clark Kerr (Vega). Unfortunately, Kerr butted heads with

Governor Reagan: “Shortly after being elected governor of California in 1966, Ronald Reagan proposed a tuition (U.C. Berkeley, like the whole California system had been tuition-free until Reagan’s initiative) and a 10% cut from state funding and the firing of UC President Clark Kerr, who stood by students who were protesting rising costs” (Stone). From here, Governor Reagan began to defund higher education and “demonizing” student protests and campus movements. Governor Reagan’s views on the student movements and higher education were popular with a conservative California voting base in 1969. He was met with little federal and state resistance when ordering the occupation of the university by police and the National Guard. His policies in California would later help him become the 40th president of the United States.

Protests Continue to Escalate

After the English faculty submitted their complaint with Binde, they organized a vigil to be held on the steps of Dealer Hall to show their support for the protesters. By this point, Philip and Desiree have shackled up together in the Zapp home. Swallow tells Desiree that the faculty are having a silent vigil in an effort to get Binde to stand up to O’Keene and Duck. Swallow concedes that Binde is in an awkward situation—between the university and law enforcement and Governor Duck. When he asks Desiree about what she would do in a similar situation, she comments that no woman had ever been chancellor of Euphoric State University. Philip also admits that he supports moving the “troops off campus.”

Prior to the silent vigil on the steps at Dealer Hall, Philip Swallow is informed that he received a write up in the *Course Bulletin*. Swallow learns this from Hogan after half-jokingly asking for a permanent teaching position at Euphoric State. Of course, Swallow does not have the publication record nor the PhD to be qualified for a tenured track position at the university. Yet, Hogan concedes that Philip received a tremendous write up in Wily Smith’s publication and

“...these days, teaching counts, really counts” (Lodge 148). Hogan further explains that his demographic does not help him either, “Now if you were black, of course, it would be different. Or better still, Indian. What I wouldn’t give for an indigenous Indian with a PhD” (Lodge 148). It is in this moment that Philip Swallow feels like he does not belong once more because of the differences between the British and American higher educational institutions regarding qualifications for not only tenure, but employment.

Once Philip reached his office, he read up on the current state of political affairs in the newspaper, *Euphoric State Daily*, where some headlines were “RESTRAINING ORDER ISSUED AGAINST SHERIFF O’KEENE,” “OTHER CAMPUSES PLEDGE SUPPORT,” “PHYSICIANS, SCIENTISTS, PROBE ALEGED BLISTER GAS,” and “WOMEN AND CHILDREN PROTEST MARCH TO GARDEN” (Lodge 149). It became clear to Philip Swallow that the response by the governor and police sheriff had only intensified the political tumult seeing as members of the local community were now inflamed as well. Once the English Department congregated on the steps of Dealer, Swallow also learned that Governor Duck had a ban on public assemblies on campus (Lodge 152). Many of the buttons that Philip had seen read “TROOPS OFF CAMPUS” and “END THE OCCUPATION NOW” (Lodge 152). Kroop gives instructions not to fight back if police show up because that always made things worse, and he warned if tear gas is used to retreat promptly and to walk—not run.

After the Vigil ended and they are left unscathed, Philip decided to take a stroll across campus. He encountered many booths and tables set up advocating various issues and participation in various student groups. Some of the more prominent of those included Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the Black Panthers, a way to contribute to the Garden Bail fund,

and a petition to legalize pot (Lodge 157). Such student groups at the height of the Golden Age of academia wielded tremendous social and political power.

While such student groups are off limits to professors, Philip Swallow became so politically engaged in American politics that he found himself a guest on Charles Boon's radio show. They discussed Women's Liberation, Viet Nam, the protests, the occupation of the National Guard, the Underground press, academic standards, drug usage and law, and the environment just to name a few. He realized he had an opinion on each question he was asked. One caller asked him if anything like this had happened at Rummidge, and, of course, there had never been anything of this magnitude. For two hours, on the Charles Boon Radio Show, Philip Swallow laid out his liberal ideology, and he felt important. He also felt that he clearly understood America and American Literature for the first time. The previous evening, Philip Swallow sat silently in Pierre's Coffee Shop in Plotinus thinking that he finally understood:

...Walt Whitman who laid end to end words never seen in each other's company before outside of a dictionary, and Herman Melville who split the atom of the traditional novel in the effort to make whaling a universal metaphor and smuggled into a book addressed to the most puritanical reading public the world has ever known a chapter on the whale's foreskin and got away with it; understood why Mark Twain nearly wrote a sequel to *Huckleberry Finn* in which Tom Sawyer was to sell Huck into slavery, and why Stephen Crane wrote his great war-novel first and experienced war afterwards, and what Gertrude Stein meant when she said that "anything one is remembering is a repetition, but existing as a human being, that is being, listening and hearing is never repetition..."(Lodge 159)

In this moment Philip Swallow addresses the beauty of American Literature, but also the inherent beauty in American higher education. The study of all of the aforementioned authors,

poets, and works allows a person to examine the history and culture of many places in America. It creates, for Philip Swallow, room for empathy and understanding of a culture that is foreign and strange. It is the humanities that creates the intangible value to which Philip Swallow refers—what it means to be an American (student, professor, or other), is to capture the landscape, its inhabitants, and disseminate the news to the masses to create a better society.

In a fleeting moment earlier in the novel, Swallow questions his identity. He claims he does not feel “British anymore” (Lodge 141). While he admits he does not feel American either, he describes himself as, “Wandering between two worlds, one lost, the other powerless to be born” (Lodge 141). Swallow is not only wandering between the UK and the American model of the professoriate, but ideologically he is trying to figure out what the differences mean. The realization Swallow comes to concerning America is something new and born from his experience. The Euphoric State’s Philip Swallow is not equitable, but altogether removed from Rummidge’s version of the same man. Swallow’s role as a faculty member at Euphoric State means something quite different that at Rummidge during the welfare state. This change resonates with Leon Wofsy’s description of faculty involvement during the Free Speech Movement and People’s Park Protest:

Contrary to academia’s ‘ivory tower’ image, faculty are not insulated from society’s expectations, nor from its positive inducements, nor from its negative pressures. The challenge of youth, however, exerts its own pressure, sometimes pushing ideas from strictly intellectual to moral ground as well. That can infect faculty, and that’s what the FSM did for a time for some of us. (355-356)

Philip Swallow is forever changed by his position as Visiting Professor at Euphoric State University for one semester because politics and power struggles alter societies. Morris Zapp

does not appear to be the same either as he, as mediator, has effectively worked to end the sit-in at Rummidge. Zapp had become rather popular around campus with faculty, staff, and students alike due to his involvement in solving the matter. He ends up occupying Masters' office and operating as head of the department even though Rupert Sutcliffe was the official Acting Head of the Department. Sutcliffe consorted with Zapp on many occasions to get his input and approval when making decisions. Even the Vice-Chancellor of Rummidge, Stewart Stroud, called meetings with Morris to get his advice. The most recent meeting concerned the promotion of a Rummidge English Professor to a Senior Lectureship. The promotion has been narrowed down to two professors: Robin Dempsey and Philip Swallow. While Morris privately admitted that Dempsey was by far the better candidate for promotion because of publications and research, he recommended Philip Swallow because of Zapp's personal relationship with Hilary and the children. He knew the family could use the money and so, against his academic judgment, he recommended Philip. Swallow's grounds for promotion were accredited to teaching and years of service and while Morris Zapp found that useless, so he recommended him out of pity. He does not share the personal reasons with Stroud, but did inform him that Swallow would be better for the Department because he was popular and his colleagues felt safer with him around. Dempsey on the other hand, Morris argued, could make the paranoia worse if he is promoted over the older professoriate in the English Department. The meeting is broken up when campus security arrived to inform the two gentlemen that Masters had escaped from the mental institution and they have reason to believe he is headed to Rummidge to attack Morris (Lodge 181-190).

Stroud called Morris later that evening to ask a follow-up question in regards to their meeting. The Vice-Chancellor informed Zapp that their meeting was broken up before he could ask him another question concerning the English Department. Zapp quickly learned that Stroud

wanted him to apply for the Chair of the English Department. When Morris inquired about the salary, he is assured that there is leeway and that: “The University has funds at its disposal for discretionary supplementary awards in special cases” (Lodge 190). Yet, they do not have the funds to promote both Dempsey and Swallow. As Morris Zapp pondered taking Stroud up on the offer he realized all of the power associated with having such a post:

Rummidge wasn't the greatest university in the world, agreed, but the set-up was wide open to a man with energy and ideas. Few American professors wielded the absolute power of a Head of Department at Rummidge. Once in the driver's seat, you could do whatever you liked. With his expertise, energy and international contacts, he could rally put Rummidge on the map, and that would be kind of fun....(Lodge 191)

The vice chancellor's proposal solidified most of Zapp's reflections even though they seemed a tad farfetched. He would have power to do a lot of what he wanted with university funds and his political clout. Funding at British universities during the 1960s was decided by the University Grants Committee and divided out block grants to universities to spend at their disposal. “UGC grants normally covered only current expenditure, and universities had to seek extra funding, often from charitable trusts and wealthy philanthropists, for new buildings, professorships, equipment, and student facilities” (Anderson). Thus, Morris Zapp's fantasies of starting a new journal, erecting a post graduate center for Jane Austen Studies, hiring bright American scholars to teach at the university, and recreating a “logical course system” were somewhat unreasonable within the British University structure during the welfare state (Lodge 191). Zapp's logic is convoluted with his American professorship. Nevertheless, the purpose of the British block grants allowed a space for total academic freedom, so it did offer a tangible sign of public beneficence to higher education during the Golden Age when Zapp conjectured that he might, in

fact, be able to do exactly what he wanted to do because of the funding readily available to him and others of his elite academic ilk.

Generational Differences

At the heart of Lodge's novel, it was the student revolts and civil unrest of mid-twentieth century in American society that forever changed the landscape of higher education. Two polemical generations inhabited the university system at the same time. Philip Swallow addressed the differences between his generation and that of his American students toward the culmination of the novel. Ironically, those differences involve not just changing academic positions, but also changing (or swapping partners/spouses). Throughout much of the latter half of the novel, Zapp is shackled up with Swallow's wife, Hilary; and conversely, Swallow is sleeping with Zapp's wife, Desiree. This element of the plot is mostly satirical in nature as both end up swapping back in the end. Before that can occur, all four mutually agree to meet up and discuss the situation.

In the end, Morris, Desiree, Hilary, and himself occupy a hotel room in New York City in an effort to work out their differences and they are watching the grand march in Plotinus on television. On Memorial Day in 1969, 50,000 people took to the streets to protest killing of Rector and the blinding of Blanchard, and the violence that erupted when a memorial march for these men was met with resistance from local police and the National Guard two weeks prior. As these four adults watched this march on television, Swallow spoke to the political engagement of the young people and remarked that he wished he could feel that passionate about any issue. He admitted that he did not harbor the same passion for politics like Melanie or Charles Boon. An important distinction is made between how the two generations view public and private affairs:

We're private people, aren't we, our generation? We make a clear distinction between private and public life; and the important things, the things that make us happy or unhappy are private. Love is private. Property is private. Parts are private. That's why the young radicals call for fucking in the streets. It's not just a cheap shock-tactic. It's a serious revolutionary proposition. (Lodge 204)

Much of the tumult between those in power (World War II Generation) and the students (Baby Boomers) is how they view public and private affairs. While Swallow uses a large oversimplification to get his point across—he is exposing a large part of the World War II generation's consciousness while admitting that the students have radically deviated and subverted such ideas while utilizing the university structure as a social tool of limitless power. While Desiree, Morris, and Hilary almost adamantly disagree with his thoughts, he continues, "All I'm saying is that there is a generation gap, and I think it revolves around this public/private thing. Our generation—we subscribe to the old liberal doctrine of the inviolate self" (Lodge 204). He explains this idea means that the private life is the most important and, in the foreground, while everything else takes a back seat. For the younger generation, this is not the case. Swallow argues that the public life, the political one for them makes the private life better, more bearable. There is a "for the greater good" mentality with the Baby Boomers, while the older generation is "every man for himself" (Lodge 204). The students who inhabited the university structure during the Golden Era of academic wielded the power of education as a "public good" for political, social, economic change.

While society was changing as a result, those in power took steps to reduce the power of its new found tenuous and often dangerous relationship with the university. For much of the history of the American university, it had rarely become burdensome in its' relationship with the

state. The Golden Age changed that. After the cultural revolution took place, the state reevaluated the role the state should take when it came to funding the American University. The university structure had become something the government could not control and it became a struggle over power. Patriarchy and bureaucracy began to defund and thus destroy the greatest era ever witnessed in the history of the university system in the United States. This allowed ample room for the private business ethos to further permeate the American higher education system because public funding slowly diminished.

On June 26, 1969, Mario Savio once more took to the steps at Sproul Hall to address the ugliness of the People's Park conflict and the Reagan militarized zone that was UC Berkeley. He spoke of the 1950s as the "Dark Fifties" because of the previous generation's unwillingness to change with the times. Savio made specific reference to the concept of "free time,"

Try to remember back to the distant nineteen fifties—the period which functions in our mythology much as the Dark Ages did for the men of the Enlightenment. Whatever would people in the future age of automation do with so much free time? Just imagine such a problem! Why, people might go quite mad with the boredom, now that American capitalism had solved all the major problems, and was fast doing away with much of the "worthwhile" work... We are those very same poor souls. So what do we do with all of our free time? As I see it, the great hope of the People's Park is that in our leisure time—so to speak—we will make the social revolution. (Rosenfeld 472)

And so they did—The welfare state university allowed the Baby Boomer generation the leisure time necessary for starting a cultural revolution. Furthermore, a space that stimulated intellectualism and provided the physical structure necessary for organized grass roots campaign forever changed the way higher education was viewed in relationship with the state. Since then,

the draft has been eliminated and subsequent G.I. Bills are subpar with their counterpart during the welfare state. The Reagan Revolution began the mass defunding of higher education and provided the proper political and social arguments popular—popular enough for the necessary votes in Congress and among the masses. So, “The question now, he [Savio] said, is whether the new generation will escape being subverted by commercialism and authoritarian social pressures” (Rosenfeld 473). As Leon Wofsy surmises, colleges and universities provide the education that helps innovate and steer society. This type of learning forces the questioning of the establishment: “Moreover, the university functions by the continuous flow into its midst of new generations, those who are most prone to challenge that old and, periodically, to kick over the traces” (Wofsy 356). While the welfare state has now been eviscerated under the neoliberal policies of privatization, deregulation, and defunding of higher education, the legacy of the Golden Age and the student revolutions remains a crucial part of U.S. history.

CHAPTER FOUR

MOO U: AN EXEMPLAR OF THE POST-WELFARE STATE UNIVERSITY

The Golden Era of higher education began to slip away between the 1970s and 1980s. The Reagan Revolution began the shift from the welfare state university towards the much more privatized, post-welfare state university. The university presented in Jane Smiley's novel, *Moo*, comically represents the fully commodified university where higher education has witnessed a dramatic shift from viewing the pursuit of a liberal arts education from a public to individual good. At the time we encounter Smiley's Moo U, corporate and private monies have poisoned academic pursuits for faculty and students alike. Further, the student experience is being capitalized on within the political economy. While Smiley's novel is satirical, the seriousness of the state of higher education should not be ignored because the irony in the humor is, of course, that most of what is reflected here is a somewhat hyperbolic literary representation of the actual state of affairs in the post-welfare state. Moo University is set in the late 1980s and early 1990s in a sleepy rural town in the Midwest. Smiley examines university life through the eyes of administrators, faculty members, and students: indeed, nearly every chapter's narrator is different in an effort to expose varying perspectives on both the campus and academic life at Moo University.

The novel opens with a work- study student named Bob Carlson who is charged with caring for a pig named Earl Butz under the supervision of Professor Bo Jones. Carlson's job is to feed, water, and care for a hog over the course of the school year. While he admits that he likes caring for Earl Butz, he laments about having to spend the summer at school while his other friends have gone home. This summer job is a necessity for Bob Carlson because the money helps cover his tuition. He had the option of returning home and working for his father, but the

work-study position put a much larger dent into the tuition bill. While Carlson's friends are out partying, lying on the beach, and enjoying what summer has to offer a traditional college student, Carlson is at school where his best friend is a 300-pound hog. Carlson's story is all too similar for many students following the shift to the post welfare state university. Those who could afford to pay off their college tuition had the luxury of taking summers off to enjoy themselves; otherwise, many students now had to become workers as well in order to survive.

We can now document the extra financial burdens that most students face. Since the 1980s and the Regan Revolution, the crushing cost of a college education has risen 350%. By 2018, "More than 44 million Americans are caught in a student debt trap. Collectively, they owe about 1.4 trillion on outstanding student loan debt" (Kelton). Coincidentally, if the cost of college tuition had increased at the rate of inflation it would cost on average \$2,536. Instead, the average cost of tuition is \$9,650 (Kelton). While the economic conditions may not have been as depressing in the 1980s as they are now, in 2018, the transition to costly higher education was well under way.

Commodifying Race and Gender on Campus

It also should not be surprising that the rhetoric surrounding higher education has changed, and as we will see, these changes have had significant racial and gender consequences. One of the more important rhetorical shifts as a result of the business model is the placement, and referral, of students as "customers." Smiley's second chapter is aptly named "More Than Seven Thousand New Customers Every August" because it exemplifies the ordinary life for a student at Moo University in a fully commodified educational system. In the first chapter we find a catalog description of Dubuque House, a campus dormitory, compared to one from 1970. The initial 1970-71 description of this dormitory is vastly different from the one published in the

1989-90s undergraduate catalog. The earlier version of the undergraduate catalog portrays Dubuque House as modern and cutting edge in terms of integrated living situations:

The experimental dormitory, Dubuque House, offers freshman students new and enlightening responsibilities for living, studying, and socializing in an unusually well-integrated and modern living situation. At Dubuque House, white students and Afro-American students plan meals together, share housekeeping duties, and largely govern themselves, free of the more customary houseparents. Most importantly, these students learn to respect each other, and to find common ground for lasting friendships. (Smiley 8).

The 1990s version looks vastly different. While offering similar rhetoric, politically acceptable for the era, the house is described as a run-down dormitory. “Originally a beautifully maintained and elegant mansion that predates the university itself, Dubuque House is a uniquely homey and non-institutional place for undergraduate women to live, but more importantly, it is a place for women of all ethnicities and backgrounds to come together in cooperation and respect” (Smiley 8). While “homey” may sound nice, it is apparent that the building has not been updated in some time so the university markets it on charm and tuition rebates. In 1970, the discount was 5% rebate in tuition monies, while the 1990s version contained a 20% rebate (Smiley 8). The reason for this large increase in rebates is most likely a result of defunding and the inability to renovate Dubuque House in an effort to lure students. If they had the funding to renovate they could continue to charge higher prices to live in Dubuque House. Without offering rebates, there would be very little to make the dormitory appealing to students. Newer dormitories saw an uptick in single rooms while Mary, Kerri, Sherri, and Diane are four young women who have chosen to live in Dubuque House as roommates. Diane makes this clear when she says, “Their

room was nice, though, with moldings and deep closets and big windows. Big enough for four—not like rooms in the new dorms. The university meant to have students in Dubuque House, and that was for sure” (Smiley 10). Moo U offers Dubuque House at discounted rates because of the desire to live in other, newer dormitories on campus.

Yet the experiential relationships of roommates is integral to university life. We see this in the interaction between the three young women. Sherri grew up in a rural area, Mary is from inner city Chicago, Diane is a wannabe sorority girl, and Kerri is the former “Warren County Pork Queen” (Smiley 9-10). These four women would most likely never have run into each other without attending Moo. Indeed, dormitory life is an essential informal space where limitless and unexpected learning can occur. While *Moo* shows the inside of the classroom later on, these four women gain intangible knowledge that can only be realized once students leaves home and is forced to experience new things. Informal spaces do not lack “scenes of instruction” even if they seem tangential to the formal classroom setting. In fact, the overlapping of informal spaces and traditional ones may be the most important component to the genre itself because the defunding witnessed in the post welfare state diminishes and minimizes informal learning spaces.

Smiley delves into the student perspective and these informal spaces by illustrating life inside the Dubuque House. The administration feared the events that occurred within the house when everyone else had gone home at the close of the business day. It was known for its parties, and violence often ensued as a result. Instead of saying “students” in this chapter, Smiley refers to its residents as “customers” to further drive home the neoliberal perspective: “Dubuque House had always been known, with a thrill amongst the customers and a shudder in the administration, for parties... With no male customers living there, plenty of security, and strict instructions to the

female customers to lock their doors and keep them locked until they went to bed” (Smiley 41). Each of the four women, Mary, Kerri, Diane, and Sherri, are struggling academically and socially. So, they decide to partake in one of the many parties held at their house. Mary is from the inner city Chicago and is one of very few African Americans at Moo. Mary seems downtrodden and lonely because she feels as if she does not fit in. She speculates that Keri “feels safe” on campus and throughout everyday life:

Keri was not as safe as she felt, but it was hard not to envy the natural joy of the safety that she did feel, the freedom it allowed her to throw back her head and laugh, kick up her leg, look square into the eyes of the nearest guy, to abandon herself to the good time that came to her as a beautiful white blond woman, a good time that she didn’t have to seek...

There was reason to envy her... (Smiley 47)

Keri does not have to worry about the color of her skin; although Mary does admit Keri is not as safe as she believes (presumably because she is a woman). Mary goes on to address what it means to be a Black student on a predominately white, rural campus. “...anytime you went among whites all day long, you couldn’t help feeling exposed to looks, attitudes, even sometimes gestures, and if you went around with other Black students, there were longer, more speculative, more aggressive looks from the white students...” (47).

The worst incident occurs more than half-way through the novel when she sits at a lunch table with a white student named Joe Doaks. Upon choosing her seat, Doaks says, “Hey, nigger, you can’t sit there” (Smiley 251). When Mary replies with an astonished “What?” Doaks repeats the epithet and threat just before Kerri ran her food tray into the back of his head. Mary has to be saved by her three roommates as none of her other black friends are around. While the roommates effectively intervene, they never speak of what Joe Doaks said and Mary wonders

whether or not she should address this. Mary goes back and forth internally and decides against it while admitting, "...it seemed to her right then that her place in this world, which had been small enough to begin with, had suddenly grown smaller, had gotten to be just a pinpoint that she could balance on for a while until it disappeared completely" (Smiley 254). Mary felt like she did not belong. This is further illustrated later when she is having a conversation with Keri. It is glaringly apparent to Mary that none of her white roommates understood what it meant to be an outsider, let alone Black. In fact, it was quite apparent that all of her roommates had never had much contact with Black people. "First of all, none of them knew any other black people, so you had to explain every little thing ('And even after you do that, they get half of it wrong,' said Divonne), then they assumed that you were talking not just for yourself but for all black people, so they got nervous or offended or something, so then you had to explain more" (Smiley 321). Instead of trying to explain her frustration to Keri, or any of her white roommates for that matter, she had decided to move in with other Black students in an apartment next academic term where she would not feel the need to explain herself. She did not make this decision known because she knew they would not understand. Keri, Sheri, and Diane did not understand the privilege that was inherent for them in white society and thus could not possibly understand how alienated Mary felt at Moo University.

While many would like to believe that racial tensions on university and college campuses have gotten better, Mary is representative of many Black students on American college campuses. At the end of the school year and near the end of the novel, the four young women of Dubuque House are reflecting on the academic year. Diane was going to join a sorority next year, Keri was going to rent an apartment off campus, and Sheri was leaving the house to live with some of the people she knew from her hometown. Mary is not sure if she is going to return

to Moo. “When she thought of the campus or her classes or even her room, she was absent. There wasn’t even a space where a black person should be” (Smiley 381). As Mary thought to herself she further admitted:

No amount of friendliness on the part of her roommates (white) or approval on the part of her professors (white) or approval on the part of her professors (white) or partisanship on the part of her friends (black) or affection the part of Hassan (neither) got at the root of her problem—the longer she stayed here, and here was the whitest place she had ever been, as white as any world she would have to succeed in... the less she seemed to exist. (Smiley 381)

While the four young women are reflecting, only Mary is hung up on not returning to campus because she feels like she does not belong while the other three women have decided not to live together.

Racism also plays a significant role for a faculty member, Dr. Margaret Bell, who also feels very alone and isolated at Moo University. She is a professor of English at the age of thirty-four, a Harvard graduate, and one of the most highly recruited professors in the history of her department where she has now taught for eight years. Notably, she is one of the only Black professors on campus and as a result she serves on a variety of committees: Student Judicial Committee, Minority Student Affairs Steering Committee, Black Studies Hiring Committee, Dean Search Committee, Black Awareness Month Committee, Library Committee, Faculty Senate Salary Committee (Smiley 35). Her feelings of isolation are akin to Mary’s even though she experiences them at a professional level. The fact that Moo University is situated in rural Iowa does not help the lack of diversity on campus even for members of the faculty. It is not surprising that later on in the novel Mary decides to become Dr. Bell’s work-study student

(Smiley 396). This will create a learning space that will be healthy for both women, particularly Mary as she is just embarking on her journey through the academic world while feeling alone and isolated.

These situations in the novel raise some important general issues. While minority representation on college campuses has increased, it is still disproportionate in 2019. According to Ben Myers, “On average, 75 out of every 100 full-time faculty members at four year colleges are white. Five are black, and even fewer are Hispanic.” It is no surprise then that Dr. Bell feels like an outcast, which is amplified by the isolation of a rural college like Moo University where there tends to be less diversity. “In higher education, white people have had near-exclusive control of disciplinary development and university norms and expectations” (Simpson 4). Defunding higher education has placed a greater burden on minorities, but also on any student from a lower socio-economic group. Indeed, the business model of education materializes as a war on the middle and lower classes.

While Jennifer Simpson points out that university and college structures have been run predominately by white people, her scholarship does not address the gender gap. Dr. Margaret Bell, professor of English, blames her isolation on her race, but gender also plays a part. Higher education in the post welfare state on a professorial level is increasingly, and in some cases, overwhelmingly female, but they are still paid significantly less than their male counterparts. “Despite the enactment of the Equal Pay Act in 1963, many women still continue to earn significantly lower pay than more for equal work” (Odhiambo and Charoenpanitkul 67). During the period between 1991 and 2001 the number of minorities in higher education rose exponentially—by 52%, but minority faculty representation did not. In the 2015-2016 academic year, only 8.8 percent of full time, tenure track professors in the English discipline were Black.

Of that 8.8 percent, 48.7 percent were women (Flaherty). Despite the novel's setting a few years prior, it is not surprising to learn that Dr. Bell feels like an outcast at Moo University.

Students like Mary and professors like Dr. Margaret Bell are still misrepresented at colleges like Moo University in the welfare state university not only because it is rural, but because government entities reversed funding policies for higher education so that even public universities became more dependent on private sources such as corporate research grants, higher tuitions, and private vending contracts. Such defunding limits access and promotes the business model of the corporate university because an education is no longer viewed as a citizen's right; it is no longer considered a public good. Instead, the citizen is focused on obtaining an individual good that is primarily viewed as a vehicle for self-advancement and not for the advancement of society or the public good. According to Christopher Newfield, "Privatization came from senior politicians and their business allies, not from the general public"(56). Newfield also gives an excerpt from Andrew D. White who was a man who helped establish land grant institutions that would eventually be Cornell University. White wrote that he foresaw

a place where the most highly prized instruction may be afforded to *all- regardless* of sex or color.' He added that to 'admit women and colored persons into a pretty good college would do good to the individuals concerned; but to admit them to a great university would be a blessing to the whole colored race and the whole female sex—for the weaker colleges would be finally compelled to adopt the system. (Newfield 66)

White understood that diversity would be what was best for the system and the country. For example, Newfield successfully illustrates that there is a direct correlation between a college degree and a person's salary. Furthermore, there is a long list of benefits beyond this which includes "better health; increased longevity; better education and cognitive development for

one's children; more happiness; better control over family size, consumption, and savings; better working conditions in higher skilled jobs; noncash amenities at better jobs; more access to lifetime learning; and reduced obsolescence of one's own human capital, among others" (Newfield 69). The increasing price tag on higher education due largely to public de-funding not only drives tuition prices up and inevitably bars certain demographics of students from obtaining a degree, but it also makes it harder for the professoriate as tenured positions diminish and adjunct positions proliferate everywhere.

Adjunctification, Privatization, and the Disappearance of the Public Good

Much of the power struggle in the post-welfare state university can be seen as taking place between administrators seeking to reduce cost by hiring part-time and adjunct faculty and reducing expensive, secure, tenure-track positions. This struggle can be seen clearly at Moo University through the eyes of members of the professoriate and its administrators. For example, Dr. Timothy Monahan is an associate professor of English who is up for tenure. His role is juxtaposed with that of Cecelia Sanchez who is an assistant professor of foreign languages and teacher of Spanish who is just beginning her career at Moo University and is untenured. While Dr. Monahan only arrives on campus twelve hours before the beginning of the semester, Dr. Sanchez is over-prepared and nervous to begin the semester. It is her first full-time professor job after leaving California and divorcing her former husband. She served several years as an adjunct and references how "...she'd been so relieved to get a good job, a job like there used to be in the old days, before the era of a course here and a course there, all for little money and no benefits..." (Smiley 17). When Cecelia refers to the "old days" she is referring to a university system that thrived during the welfare state, a publicly supported higher education system that many fear will never return. The rise of adjunct labor has replaced full time positions in an effort

to decrease expenses and increase profit: education has been reduced to the bottom line. Indeed, since the collapse of the welfare state university, part-time and adjunct faculty make up half of the professoriate nationwide and “have grown 376 percent between 1970 and 2001” (Altbach 230). Dr. Kevin Lyles, a political science professor who teaches at the University of Illinois-Chicago, recently wrote on his blog pertaining to a rally that was to take place outside University Hall in reference to the declining amount of tenured and tenure-track professors. As he explained:

Half of the courses in my own department are taught by talented and dedicated adjunct and/or part-time instructors. As tenured faculty we cannot leave our colleagues out in the cold. After all, they do most of the real work. They deserve more job security and a decent wage. I enjoy my tenure, I love to teach, I’m still inspired to do research, but I did not sign up to work in a sweat shop. (Faculty United para.1)

There is a tremendous gap in compensation. “When salaries range as widely as \$900-3500 per section for writing courses (AAUP Committee G, 1993, p.44), how can institutions claim that students are getting the best quality writing instruction?” (Schell 332). When teachers are overworked they are not teaching to the best of their ability and this carries over into their grading. Eileen Schell claims that based on this scale of compensation adjuncts are making \$12.00 an hour. They make this while jumping around from institution to institution. Specifically, adjunct/part-time faculty often work at three or four different institutions just to make ends meet:

If this writing faculty member wished to earn the equivalent of a full-time income from teaching writing, he or she would have to teach eight or more courses per year—a labor intensive enterprise that would leave little or no time for the faculty member to

participate in professional conferences or publication, the work most likely to lead to professional recognition and career advancement. (Schell 332-3)

Schell further illustrates that if this person were to teach eight courses a year she would make roughly \$14,400 (Schell 323). Decisions to cut full time faculty members, and hire part-time or adjunct professors, are made by administrators who are most concerned with saving money and diminishing the power of the professoriate. Schell asks, “Why do institutions hire and then fail to provide part-time faculty with working conditions necessary for the provision of quality education? The bottom-line answer is simple: cost-savings—yet cost-savings at what cost to students, to educational programs, to educational quality?” (329). If nothing else, adjunct labor makes sense as a business decision because it is so cost effective.

The neoliberal myths surrounding the faculty have nearly permeated every corner of the citizenry. As Smiley illustrates in *Moo*:

It was well known among the citizens of the state that the university had pots of money and that there were highly paid faculty members in every department who had once taught Marxism and now taught something called deconstructionism which was only Marxism gone underground in preparation for emergence at a time of national weakness. (Smiley 19)

The concept that faculty salaries are the reason that tuition is so high is a keen observation in rhetoric but it is certainly not an accurate reflection of reality. *The Washington Post* did a nine part series addressing the issue of rising tuition costs and its findings disrupt this narrative. While the study still found a bachelor’s degree worth its cost, it accredited the cost of tuition to two “genuine” reasons: “administrative bloat” and the “amenities race.” This study showed that administrative salaries grew at ten times the rate of full-time professors. The latter reason

addresses the race for colleges and universities to build new and exciting attractions to lure students whether that be in the form of housing, recreation, or other. Thus, public institutions in higher education are spending money as quick as it comes in without the wherewithal of saving to lower the financial burden on the students (Newfield 25). Yet, public opinion of this issue is vastly different and Smiley demonstrates this in the subsequent chapter.

At the opening of chapter four, “The Common Wisdom” (as the chapter is aptly and ironically named), Smiley begins by outlining some common perceptions about Moo University by, among others, students, faculty, administrators, secretaries, janitors, and others who work within the university as well as the perceptions of the taxpayers of the state. Alongside the clearly mythical notion of the professoriate being underground members of the Communist party, they are also accused of using the state’s funding to undermine the entire system. Funding academia, as it was suggested in the novel, was akin to raising a “nest of vipers in your own bed” (19). This attitude towards university professors reflects the underlying fear politicians and administrators harbor toward any apparatus that has the ability to challenge the status quo, and higher education is perceived by many legislators as more of a nuisance and as a hotbed of dissent. As a result, the faculty was under constant attack by the government:

It was well known among the faculty that the governor and the state legislature had lost interest in education some twenty years before and that it was only a matter of time before all classes would be taught as lectures, all exams given as computer graded multiple choice, all subscriptions to professional journals at the library stopped, and all research time given up to committee work and administrative red tape. All the best faculty were known to be looking for other jobs, and this was known to be a matter of indifference to the state board of governors. (Smiley 19)

This state of higher education in the novel, the result of public policy since the 1980s, is a literary representation of the current state of the post-welfare state university as an underfunded and undervalued public good.

This chapter also exemplifies the pervading business rhetoric that now pervades university mission statements. Ivar Harstad, the university provost at Moo U, remarks about the goal of “excellence” that they aim for in every area. This is relayed in theory a few years later by Bill Readings. He devoted large sections of his 1996 book, *The University in Ruins*, to address the issue of “excellence.” In the 1990s, this term became a catch all for university administrators. “Excellence is clearly a purely internal unit of value that effectively brackets all questions of reference or function, thus creating an internal market” (Readings 27). Excellence pertained to class size, graduation rates, financial sustainability, PhD award winners, publishing, and of course—reputation (Readings 25). Education ‘excellence’ as outlined in Moo is a literary representation of the jargon that would come to be used at a variety of American universities during the 90s. The discourse of “excellence” facilitates standardization because it calls for all academic assessment to be achieved strictly by “objective” measurement using quantitative data. Failure to meet certain goals or standards internally can cause “performance problems” for faculty members as this data is churned out into elaborate graphs each year as an assessment tool and new committees are established in an effort to remedy the problem. “Excellence” has been recently replaced by “student success” in the last decade, which is worse than ‘excellence’ because it becomes easier to blame the teachers for student failure. A goal of “student success” is more akin to “the customer is always right.” “Cutbacks, on top of cutbacks already made, were in the air, though no one had yet used the word, which was a technical term and a magical charm to be used only at the time when items in the budget were actually being crossed off” (Smiley

21). Yet, in an administrative meeting taking place early in the novel, Cabinet members of Moo's upper administration were indeed talking about "cutbacks" and "reallocating funds" (Smiley 21). Furthermore, Harstad becomes privy to the monetary concerns for the foreseeable future in this meeting. Throughout the conversation concerning budget cuts and reminders of the fiduciary responsibility of the university, Ivar recognizes that none of these cuts will affect the administrators. Instead, there was an air of certainty and pugnacity in which they laid out the numbers before the provost. "It was clear from their manner that the actual cutting back would be beneath the three of them—they were adopting a regrettable-but-necessary-I'm-leaving-for-the-airport-right-after-the-meeting sort of detachment" and habitually referred to students as "our customers" (Smiley 21). One administrator, Elaine Dobbs-Jellinek, associate vice-president of development, used to be in charge of lobbying the legislature, but Mr. Brown had since taken over that responsibility. Ivar Harstad also learned in this meeting the names of certain corporations and the relationships that the university had with such private entities. The novel forecasts a national trend. In a recent documentary titled *Starving the Beast*, the state of Louisiana cut higher education funding from \$1.4 billion in 2007-2008 to 285 million in the 2015-2016 academic year. In 2007, the state appropriations for higher education in Louisiana was 75%. Nine years later it was 13.5% (46:12-47:23). Essentially, the state began to starve the university system so it would have to find alternative ways to fund itself; one of those ways was to lobby private monies. Moo U predicts these national trends toward the commodified university and the quest to lure private funding. Christopher Newfield illustrates this perfectly when he addresses The Higher Education Compact entered into by the University of California and the California State University systems with Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. This "...committed them to raising tuition 7 to 10 percent per year from 2005-2006 through 2010-

2011 in exchange for a state funding increase of 3 to 4 percent per year. In addition to annual tuition hikes of twice the rate of state funding increases (and triple the rate of consumer inflation), the universities agreed to ‘continue to seek additional private sources and maximize other fund sources available...’” (Newfield 55). Jane Smiley forecasts a similar situation at Moo University years earlier:

The legislature, in fact, was already counting the ‘resources’ that could be ‘allocated’ elsewhere in state government when corporations began picking up more of the tab for higher education, so success in finding this money would certainly convince them that further experiments in driving the university into the arms of the private sector would be warranted, that actually paying for the university out of state funds was irresponsible, or even immoral, or even criminal (robbing widows and children, etc., to fatten sleek professors who couldn’t find real employment, etc.) (22)

This is fictional evidence of very real-world practices: government entities (in this case state government) are purposely pushing higher education toward privatization which reflects the commodified university. As Newfield articulates, the move toward privatization and away from public funding was a move made by politicians and their business alliances. Politicians and businesspersons alike benefit from privatization while the young generations of students shoulder the financial burden (Newfield 55-56).

As a result, such rhetoric influences citizens into believing that students *should* shoulder the financial burden that comes with education. After all, it is *their* education. At the culmination of the meeting, Harstad is saddled with the realization that seven million dollars will need to be reallocated. He begins to imagine all of the departments that will disappear, along with the professional help that will have to be let go. Among those on his list include women’s

studies, broadcast journalism and the radio station, oceanography, and nuclear engineering (Smiley 22-23). This funding crisis manifests itself as a shift to cost-effective ratios as the primary rationale for academic decision-making: the new business rationales lead directly to the shifting allegiance from many core academic departments, particularly in the arts, humanities, and social sciences, to those such as business and STEM fields which are deemed most “useful,” practical, or profitable (Newfield 104-5).

Yet, against this dominant trend, there have been more recent signs of rising resistance. As Dr. Ruth Hoberman, from Eastern Illinois University argues, “We are only allowed to live one life: it’s the human condition, there’s no escaping it. In my view, only by studying the humanities can we hope to escape this fundamental limitation and understand how other people live. Because literature, history, or philosophy all provide extraordinary windows on the world.” Yet, these fields are constantly devalued because they do not have a “return on investment.” Further, since 2005-2006 the total research and development budget is approximately 40 billion dollars per year and the humanities receive about \$400 million of those monies (Newfield 104). While they receive only about one percent of federal funding, Newfield reminds us that this has become common because of the measure of a baccalaureate degree in the market, “Yet this is the treatment we expect within privatization culture for disciplines with no calculable ‘return on investment’ (ROI)” (104). Since many departments with qualitative value do not fit nicely within this framework, they are constantly devalued and scrutinized. Newfield continues, “Even the losses on STEM research fit into the privatization framework in that their advocates could attach speculative positive ROI to future developments somewhere down the road” (104). In the defunding age of higher education, it is each department for itself when it comes to competing for funding. This places an added emphasis on cultivating private monies.

Such defunding also forces the faculty members at Moo to look for monetary opportunities outside of the university. Therefore, there are some professors who have internalized the neoliberal bargain and the business model of higher education in order to survive and prosper in the post-welfare state. Dr. Lionel Gift is a professor of economics at Moo University, and he exemplifies the perfect neoliberal professor in the early post welfare state. Gift is symbiotic when it comes to explain the relationship between the business model as it pervades the liberal arts; Dr. Gift refers to his students as “customers,” and he believes his worth is measured by how much money he makes for the university and himself. He teaches “customers” about the market and gives them what he deems as “useful,” real world information that will be practical upon graduation. Gift valued money and goods above anything else: “Other universities were always after Dr. Gift, but he made the principled stand that as long as this university paid him the most money (enabling the consumption of the most goods), here was where he would stay” (Smiley 33). Neoliberal policies (and the quest for “excellence”) have encouraged his way of thinking. As if obtaining tenure were not difficult enough along with all of the other responsibilities in academia, some professors gauge their worth based on how much money they bring to the university. While Dr. Gift may seem like an anomaly, he is the product of many decades of neoliberal policy in a systematic war in order to defund public funding of higher education and the perfect example of a man in a field outside of STEM trying to create job security during an era of defunding.

Gift’s exploits and personal branding are well known across campus. Dr. Timothy Monahan comments specifically about the University’s use of Dr. Gift’s image. Gift’s image is peppered across university media, “his face regularly appeared on brochures, flyers, university publications, alumni bulletins, in the student paper...If it was printed by the university, it was

guaranteed to carry a photo and a thumbnail bio of Gift once every academic year” (Smiley 286). While Ivar Harstad still harbors the aging definition of knowledge produced at the height of the welfare state, a younger (cheaper) provost will most certainly fill his role after he has retired and further propagate the importance of neoliberal decision-making based on profit-loss ratios. When education and knowledge become quantitatively measured by market standards, the search for truth and knowledge in all educational fields suffer terrible losses.

This can be observed in the manner that Dr. Gift views his employment at Moo University. He believed because of the money and publicity that he brought to Moo University that he was the most valuable professor on campus. In recent years, Dr. Gift spent an enormous amount of time in Costa Rica helping the local government in regards to trade and other economic issues while secretly attempting to allocate grant money from a private benefactor who wanted to destroy a local rainforest to mine for gold. This excavation would poison the drinking water and destroy the largest remaining rainforest in the region, yet he writes the proposal for the private benefactor anyway in hopes of obtaining a large profit for himself. The Costa Rican project is described in greater detail in Chapter 13 where he once again refers to students as “customers.” In an internal monologue, Gift describes a lecture he is going to give titled, “Costa Rica: The Lessons of Development.” He believes giving lecturers such as this one was “good business” for the university and kept the “customers” happy. Dr. Gift and the administration saw this as an opportunity to lure “investors” or donors to the institution; in fact, many of the corporate executives were sitting in the front row of the lecture. From an economic perspective, Gift preaches about mining the Costa Rican rainforest, but what Gift is emphasizing is far more subversive. While Dr. Gift is laying out the principles of the development of Costa Rica, he is also making a much larger argument about how to run the university system in coordination with

the private sector. He states, “first and foremost, RATIONAL coordination of a nation’s local market mechanisms with world market mechanisms worked to the mutual satisfaction of everyone’s demands—which in theoretical terms were, of course, insatiable—and the local officials were capable of acting RATIONALLY once principles were explained to them” (Smiley 68). While Lionel Gift is most certainly addressing his own academic and economic endeavors in Costa Rica, he also is uniquely aware that his audience is filled with potential donors who innately believe the university systems should be run similarly to a business. Gift is acknowledging that Moo must first address the local market which consists of the local community; and then assimilate its goals toward expanding the “world market,” which is an attempt at placing external economic market value on an educational degree. He continues, “Second, the control of the international monetary community reinforced the RATIONALIZATION of an individuals nation’s choices, working to bring it into the fold” (Smiley 68). While establishing a “market” as part of the business model is foundational, Gift is now acknowledging that education must be “rational” to a nation’s best interest. This “rationality,” as Dr. gift explains, has recently been at the core of choosing a major for many students. This is when Chairman X blurted out, “Are you listening to this shit?” to the woman sitting closest to him, Cecilia Sanchez (Smiley 66). Chairman X is upset by the use of terms like “world market” and “surprising decline” but nearly fell out of his chair when Dr. Gift referred to the mining as exhuming “cash crop” (Smiley 66). This influence permeates from the political forces that spin rhetoric and cut funding to place the burden of educational cost on the backs of the students. This also devalues the value of a liberal arts education as crucial to the public where the overarching goal should consist of enlightenment and the cultivation of a well-rounded citizen who can become a productive member of democracy. No longer is educating citizens

considered a public good. This business model of higher education has transformed the inherent duty of university from the cultivation of citizens, heavily tied to the state through funding and partnership, to one that is forced to become prey to the private sector. Dr. Gift is merely a receptacle for such a model which has been radically and increasingly implemented by politicians and administrators. Dr. Gift's utilizes the political strategies in order to maintain the power he has within the university structure as a faculty member; and it is representative of the altering of some faculty member's allegiances. Still much internal resistance at colleges and universities exist when references are made to higher education in accordance with the business model. Professors like Chairman X still believe higher education is a public good. Chairman X becomes angrier as Dr. Gift further lays out his neoliberal bargain in the last two lessons in his proposal,

This Third (and here he looked to the eight-man gallery seated between the provost and the president), the greatest single component in the growth of any small nation was the RATIONAL investment of well-run corporations...Fourth (and here he looked as the assembled customers), there was a world of opportunity out there for an enterprising young American man (he looked at the customers again and made a quick recount) or young American woman." (Smiley 68)

In response, Chairman X rises from his seated position and shouts, "What kind of ignorant asshole are you?" (Smiley 68-69). He continues his resistance to Dr. Gift's ideas after the culmination of the speech when he asks about the harm done to the rainforest and the "...effects of this development on Costa Rica's natural biological system" (Smiley 69). Gift quickly evades the questions with capitalist jargon concerning how much has been gained from the exploitation.

Chairman X believes Dr. Gift is abusing his power and position at Moo University by endorsing an effort that is harmful overall.

Academic freedom should not protect endeavors such as this even though Ivar Harstad often uses this as an excuse when Dr. Gift's exploits are brought before him. Even Ivar Harstad finds Gift's answers evasive; still, Gift utilizes business rhetoric in an effort to lure the eight donors seated in the lecture hall and also because he believes a university should be the equivalent to a "well-run corporation." Thus, private interests lobby the university in an effort to serve their own agendas. Arlen Martin, CEO of Transnational Corporation, is one such man, "Your own governor says that alliances between education and business are the wave of the future, Dr. Harstad" (Smiley 73). Arlen Martin had previously donated money to Moo in an effort to have studies done on chickens when fed a diet of "dead chicken offal, ground-up bone meal, ground-up dried blood and innards, and feathers, etc." (Smiley 71). Martin's interest stemmed from the notion that he owned many chicken factories and wanted a healthy increase to his bottom line. If he could get away with feeding the chickens in a "cheaper" way, he was going to do it. Martin claimed to loathe the USDA because it limited how he could run his businesses. The results of the study were damning, and many chickens died of salmonella poisoning. Arlen Martin insisted the study not be published as he paid for it with his own money. It was published anyway and Martin saw to it that the scientist's and the graduate assistant's careers were questioned and possibly ruined by having contradictory studies published (Smiley 73-74).

Elaine Dobbs-Jellinek, an associate vice president, tells Ivar Harstad that they would be foolish to turn down Arlen Martin's, CEO of Transnational Corporation, donation for research. Dr. Harstad is worried about the faculty's response because of the tumult Martin and Transnational had caused in the aforementioned scientific endeavor concerning chicken diets.

Dobbs-Jellinek replies, “But Mr. Martin has too much to offer this university, ANY university” (Smiley 74). Arlen Martin then asks if the faculty would know where the project or grant money would be coming from. Dobbs-Jellinek assures Harstad and Martin they would not know the origination of the funds. This is problematic for the university in many ways. For one thing, Provost Harstad is concerned because academic freedom can be bastardized when private funds are donated for the sake of a private corporation’s scientific study. Thus, academic freedom can be a misnomer when saturated within the business model leading to intense conflicts of interest. Academic freedom is supposed to protect against such egregious forms of conflict of interest. In a more recent article published concerning the state of the post welfare university in *The Atlantic*, McCluskey exposes the prevalence of nondisclosure agreements signed by scientists and others in the academy. Dr. Gift’s character is similar to a man named Dr. Steven N. Blair who resides at the University of South Carolina. Dr. Blair is an obesity expert and of late has been involved with Coca-Cola. His research came under fire when his research seemed to benefit the company. Dr. Blair’s research included the health impact of the soda. While he maintains that the company did not control or direct his research, he did say he had discussed it with some PhDs that worked at Coca Cola. Blair also stated, “Don’t ask me to list all of the corporations that I’ve received some consulting fee or honorarium from...It would probably take me days to go back through mountains of computer files to find them” (Myers). Myers believes public colleges will never again be funded by the state at the same levels they were during the Golden Age or the welfare state university, 1945-1975. He also includes portions of an interview with Ryan Storm who is the sitting assistance vice chancellor of budget at California State University. Similar to the Louisiana state budget cuts, California used to be the largest contributor and investor in the

university system. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that overall, the funding for higher education has been cut by almost ten billion dollars since 2008 (Myers).

Administrators seldom concern themselves with academic freedom when it comes to accepting large sums of money from outside sources. The reason for this is quite simple—administrators are most concerned with the bottom line. While financial sustainability is incredibly important, it should not hinder the educational endeavors of a discipline or corrupt research in order to satiate an agenda from a public or private entity. In order to protect the education of students and the integrity of research of professors, academic freedom must be at the foundation of liberal arts university pedagogy. When donors like Arlen Martin and the Coca Cola company harbor ulterior motives, it is difficult to maintain objectivity and professionalism in research. This conflict is one of the cruxes of the massive divide that currently exists between administration and the professoriate: administrators are first and foremost interested in their fiduciary responsibility and the latter should be interested with preserving the purity of unhindered academic endeavors and research which comes with academic freedom.

From Citizenship to Profit: Some Conundrums of Academic Freedom

The emphasis on education has shifted from cultivating one's character to investing in one's future, "...the goals of a traditional liberal education to produce students of character who could think, speak, and act with moral autonomy were being replaced by an emphasis on accountability and measurable outcomes" (Pezzulich 238). Governor Early's budget cutbacks represent the effort to defund higher education in the post welfare era. Even though student enrollments soared, defunding forced tuition to rise. According to Williams, enrollments during the peak of the welfare state were at 4.1 million, which rose to 12.1 million in 1980. Despite how large the Baby Boomer generation appeared, the truth is Millennials now outnumber them. Williams further

articulates there are over 20 million students enrolled currently in colleges and universities across the country (quoted in Downing 6). Still, politicians from both sides of the aisle, some whom had previously praised the relationship between Washington D.C. and the university, abandoned the notion that fiscal support was essential and the duty of the state and began to focus more so on how to reallocate state and federal monies. As early as 1965, Senator Claiborne Pell (D-RI) went on record saying, “We cannot justify the expenditure of taxpayers’ money in support of the humanities, if the tendency of the program is to proliferate volumes of humanistic studies in university libraries, just for academic humanists to read” (Loss 217). The rhetoric had already shifted from viewing higher ed as a public good to one that became quantifiable by market forces. Soaring enrollment and rising tuition costs gave politicians just enough evidence to convince the majority of Americans that investing in higher education was not only bad for the nation, but it added to the national debt. While most of this rhetoric was not entirely new, it did set the stage to make the likes of Ronald Reagan attractive as a presidential candidate. His governorship of California set the platform for the issues he would run on and eventually utilizes to become President. Reagan ran on several issues pertinent to higher education:

- a. [Reagan] called for an end to free tuition for state college and university students,
- b. annually demanded 20% across-the-board cuts in higher education funding,
- c. repeatedly slashed construction funds for state campuses,
- d. engineered the firing of Clark Kerr, the popular President of the University of California and
- e. declared that the state “should not subsidize intellectual curiosity.” (Clabaugh)

California's economy and public education system were worse once Reagan left office.

However, his political agenda was very appealing to the majority of conservatives and many voters. His political stance did not change when he began his campaign for President. Reagan actually called for the elimination of the U.S. Department of Education in an effort to privatize.

This is why Smiley focuses on the economic hardships while making thinly veiled references to the Reagan Revolution and the increasing conservative policies that strained the university system in *Moo*. Set in the 1989-1990 academic year, Moo University is beginning to see the effects of the policies put into place in the 1980s. This decade marked the end of what Jeffrey Williams refers to as the welfare state university largely due to policies that cut federal and state funding for higher educational institutions across the nation. Dr. Gift is more than willing to accept private funds from Arlen Martin because it further helps his own career. Smiley even makes reference to Dr. Gift "being in bed" with Arlen Martin for the sake of personal gain. While a professor like Dr. Gift may sufficiently cultivate and lure outside donors like Martin, it is harder in other departments. Chapter 22 is titled "Trickle Down Economics" for this very purpose. Many of the conflicts that arise are a result of the state government's spending cuts. Moo University appears to be on the radar of Governor Orville T. Early who does not seem to favor investing in higher education:

Of education, the governor had this to say, "Education is an investment. The trouble is, they don't run it like an investment over there, with the students as customers, because that's what they are, you know. Now they run it like welfare, but I'm telling you, if they won't turn it around themselves, we've got to turn it around for them. This administration believes strongly in education. (Smiley 111-2)

The response of the governor is representative of the emerging neoliberal focus on market mechanisms for evaluating the price tag associated with higher education. Education is an investment, but should not be solely comparable to a monetary one. Instead of funding such endeavors, Governor Early announces that he is cutting \$200 million dollars from programs essential to the welfare of the citizens for the sake of cutting taxes. “Most severely affected are social services agencies, education, health care programs, and public works programs” (Smiley 111). In the same chapter, Ivar Harstad issues a memo that suggests the budgetary shortfall will be closer to 10 million rather than the aforementioned 7 million after the governor’s proposed cuts. A series of cuts are suggested by the provost which include: copying, travel expenses, janitorial reduction (where faculty and staff will have to begin to clean their own offices), renovation freezes, tuition and fee increases for students, a halt on library acquisitions, a 25 cent charge to students in order to log into a university computer, a raise in printing costs from \$3.00 per one hundred pages to 5 cents per page, and an increase in student seats from 25 to 32 as in the case of Cecelia Sanchez, Assistant Professor of Foreign Languages and Spanish (Smiley 111-115). The very last memo of the chapter is the most telling. Mr. Brown, Chief Financial Officer, issues a memo to all administrative offices, which reads,

Please remember that our customers do not have a “right” to any particular services in return for their dollar, though they may think that they do. Sentiment against recent cutbacks may manifest itself disagreeably in your offices, but a short, informal workshop on maintaining positive customer relations directed primarily toward secretarial personnel should limit these unfortunate but predictable effects. I am at your service if you wish to consult with me about these concerns. (Smiley 115)

Once again, budget cutbacks have reinforced the business model. The results of such budget constraints have further laid the burden of financial costs on the backs of the students, or as Mr. Brown puts it—“our customers,” who are at the whim of the market. The financial situation also places further burden on faculty members who are not tenured. Cecilia Sanchez now has to educate 32 students instead of the previous 25. This increase in workload comes with no increase in pay and longer working hours even though she is full-time, in a tenure-track position

In the same chapter (22), Dr. Gift receives a memo from the university Provost, Ivar Harstad, which states, “One more note—in your last memo to this office concerning your spring course, you referred to certain ‘customers.’ Does this indicate that you intend to seat more than the enrolled number of students? If so, these nonstudents will be billed a “seat charge” of \$35.00 for the semester “ (Smiley 114). This memo carries a cautionary message concerning the power of the business model in the post-welfare state university. This display by Smiley was obviously an attempt at making the reader aware of such emerging and pervasive ideologies.

Clearly, some academics have greatly benefited from the pervading neoliberal ideologies. While Dr. Gift believes he is flying under the radar, Ms. Walker eventually links his involvement to the Seven Stones Mining Company through research and the bribing (promise of reassignment) of Alison Thomas, Elaine Dobbs-Jellinek’s secretary. Thomas finds the document that Dr. Gift had secretly produced for Arlen Martin. After acquiring the document, Walker made copies for Ivar Harstad and left them on his desk. The report detailed an excavation for gold underneath the largest remaining rain forest in Central America (Smiley 204). While Ivar Harstad admits that he has personal issues with the project, he cannot do much about it and claims that Gift has the academic freedom to pursue such an endeavor. Furthermore, the money Dr. Gift was bringing to the university was of dire necessity. Dr. Gift was noted saying, “pure

competition would lead to an optimal allocation of resources” (Smiley 141). Not only does Gift’s economic background affect his outlook on taking Arlen Martin’s money, but he also states:

The enlargement of his class in the spring by three times was satisfying for so many reasons. In the first place, market demand has been recognized, even by the bureaucrats in the administration. In the second place, the larger amount of tuition money soon to be flowing in his direction would be good grounds for a raise, no matter what the legislature decided to do for the faculty at large (as a matter of principle, Dr. Gift was indifferent to their concerns). And in the third place, there was this intangible. As little attention as he liked to pay to intangibles, this sense in the room of knowledge pouring out of his mouth and being soaked up by their eyes and ears and note-taking hands was intoxicating. (Smiley 143)

Gift is attempting to solidify his employment value by utilizing market demand as a rhetorical strategy. And it works because Gift’s rhetorical strategy argues that he clearly has something tangible to sell, something others teaching lower-enrolled classes do not have. His economics course is most likely taken to fulfill a component towards a degree within Moo’s academic structure. It has “value” because of student enrollment, and such enrollment increase leads directly to more profit flowing to the university from Gift’s class. Certainly, university administrators are concerned with the number of students enrolled in sections across campus, not merely Gift’s. In the post-welfare state university, course enrollment leading to more profit is the single benchmark (rather than academic merit) for marking widely-enrolled courses as more important than low-enrolled ones. Pedagogically speaking, courses with lower class enrollment

often require more difficult assessment of student work which justifies the lower number. Dr. Gift views course enrollment as satisfactory in regards to his teaching role at the university because he sees it as justification for a raise.

Many academics know that this is hardly the case. Course capacities are often increased each contract year if necessary with little to no rise in pay in order to cut expenditures. Cecelia Sanchez is a great example because her enrollment has gone up but she receives no increased reward. Despite Gift's bureaucratic outlook on higher education, he does admit there are intangibles at play within the structure of the university even though he views such intangibles in a purely selfish way. His argument places himself as someone who is irreplaceable. The intangibles that he has acquired throughout his lifetime as a businessman are more valuable than many others in his profession. Such "intangibles" Gift weighs according to market value—i.e. the money he raises for the university and the money the university makes off using his image and reputation. Gift's narrow-mindedness marginalizes other professors who contribute their knowledge and research to the academy in different ways, which increase capital that cannot be wholly tied to the market. Values crucial to the "public good" cannot often be monetized easily. Even some of the students cannot see reducing all education to the market economy.

For example, Kerri is a student listening to Dr. Gift's lecture pertaining to economics as he is having these internal revelations. She cannot figure out why he seems to be enjoying himself so much while talking about "market demands." Kerri is a daughter of a farmer and her own experience as it relates to economics is far from favorable (Smiley 144). She remembers her family struggling on a year to year basis because there never seemed to be enough money, "they were in the fields day and night, every planting season and harvest was a nightmare, the family debt load soared to

astounding proportions, all the money from the farm went back into the farm, and her mother and grandmother had to get to work in town to pay for food” (Smiley 144). Kerri saw her family as indentured servants to the market and she could not figure out why Dr. Gift saw such promise in the market. For Kerri, “market” was synonymous with “impending doom” (Smiley 145). Kerri’s family’s struggles are a mere microcosm of how the market affects working class families.

While Dr. Gift sees higher education as a way to increase his capital, personal and economic, and stress the importance of capitalism, many view the goal of a liberal arts education in a much broader sense. While Ivar Harstad and Mrs. Walker are often complaining that academic freedom limits the action they can take against Dr. Gift, this is merely used as a veil. Bureaucratic administrators will utilize the term to their advantage. This is not the type of academic freedom most academics are willing to protect. Later on in the novel, Dr. Gift’s secret report that he compiled for Arlen Martin is leaked, and he is highly criticized by his colleagues, most notably Chairman X. Yet, Elaine Dobbs-Jellinek will protect Dr. Gift under the guise of academic freedom when it concerns Arlen Martin because of the large sums of money coming in through the grant. When it comes to a student versus faculty matter, academic freedom is often not applied in the same way. For instance, take the former example of Dr. Gift and Mr. Arlen Martin and the Seven Stones Mining Company. Smiley illustrates, “The grant money, of which the university would get half (10 percent less than the university’s usual take, a perk that recognized Dr. Gift’s unusual contribution to university life), would go through Elaine Dobbs-Jellinek’s office directly into Dr. Gift’s G-account” (Smiley 174). Despite the ethical concerns surrounding Dr. Gift’s memo concerning mining for gold under the

largest rainforest left in Costa Rica, the university is more than willing to accept these funds—and even pay Dr. Gift under the table.

Regarding ethical concerns more directly involving students, there is a conversation that occurs in Sherri's English class. She just so happens to be enrolled in Dr. Timothy Monahan's honors freshman year English course. While Monahan is going through the syllabus an interesting conversation takes place concerning one of the assigned newspapers, *The New York Times*. Dr. Monahan informs his students that there will be a mandatory subscription to the newspaper in order to facilitate class discussion at least twice per week. After he informs his students of the price, a young man by the name of Frank Carlson interjects,

“Mr. Monahan, some of us consider *The New York Times* to be purveyors of militantly anti-Christian bias, and would prefer not to support it with our patronage.” Tim smiled congenially. “Look at it as just another required text, okay? We can talk about those issues as they come up. “I'm not saying this because it is run by Jews, sir. I am not an anti-Semite. The problem is that most reporters and editors are well known atheists and agnostics. Believing Jews are just a step away from Christians, really, like believing Moslems [sic] on the other side. But these atheists and agnostics are in another category, and some of us can't support them. It's repugnant to us. (Smiley 311-312)

Another student named Jolleen claimed the newspaper was the “mouthpiece of Satan” and Frank Carlson suggested adding a Christian newspaper to the reading as a kind of compromise solution, “balancing” political perspectives. Yet another student, in response to Carlson, suggests reading an Islamic newspaper in order to understand the true nature of Islam, “It is the responsibility of your institutions of higher learning to correct this

flaw” (Smiley 312-313). This conversation exemplifies why academic freedom is so important to university and its learning environment. On the surface this may seem humorous, but the Frank Carlson’s and Jolleen’s of academic life are representative populations of droves of students who have yet to experience an academic environment free from their childhood indoctrinations. A student will never be forced to deal with complexities or diversities in all major fields of study if a professor’s academic freedom is continually challenged and dismantled. Academic freedom has the inherent power of opening up a classroom to knowledge and information that has otherwise been ignored or omitted in traditional K-12 classrooms and in their homes growing up. Dr. Monahan should have the freedom to teach from whatever supplementary guide, in this case a newspaper, that he chooses. This is a scenario that many professors are intimately aware of at their respective institutions. Members of the professoriate are left bewildered at the notion of the effect of the business model on how students view themselves within the university structure and how they interact with the institution. This challenges and hinders academic freedom, and thus hinders the learning environment. Katopes writes, “It is unlikely that they believe that it enhances learning. Rather, in the same way that a for-profit consumer business recognizes that it must satisfy those who are paying for their services, colleges do not wish to “offend” the people -- parents -- who generally pay the tuition bills.” And again, the core of the issue returns to funding. Academic freedom can be granted when it does not interfere with funding.

Academic freedom is most certainly not academic freedom if it is subjected to bastardization by the business model. Subconsciously, this affects how a professor runs his or her courses and how students situate their role within the higher education system. Tenure was

not only meant to protect professors from economic pressures, but from political and social ones. Teaching at Moo University would have presented many challenges for Dr. Monahan because of the politics that are often attributed to rural areas. Being from the East Coast, Monahan would have been in constant conflict with the indoctrinations of local students at Moo U. In order to cultivate an educated citizenry, academic freedom must be protected so that faculty have the autonomy to introduce students to ideas they have never been exposed to or those to which they might feel negatively inclined. Academic freedom allows exposure and dissemination of limitless amounts of knowledge, forces contact between different populations, and has the power to change the state structure and challenge the social, political, and economic foundations of societies. If students are never exposed to contradictory and opposing, often polemical, viewpoints, they will not learn. Instead, their preconceived notions will be reinforced and terms like “Satan’s mouthpiece” and the ever more popular and current phrase “fake news” will continue to demean and devalue knowledge. Fact will become fiction, and the populace will believe only their indoctrinations because it suits their political platform or lifestyle. Conversations like the one in Monahan’s classroom are evidence of a large epidemic of misinformation. It also exposes the pure unrelenting and unwavering power of the body politic.

Much of the shift in how students, like Professor Monahan’s, view themselves within the university structure is a result of defunding. Funding crises arise in various ways at any institution of higher learning due to where such cuts are directed. For example, Dr. Bo Jones is attempting to save Old Meats, a building on the historical landmark records located on Moo University’s campus, from demolition. He would like to attract funding to turn the building into a museum for hogs. Associate Vice President, Elaine Dobbs-Jellinek is in charge of allocating such funds. In Chapter 46, she has

finally found the funding needed to save the building and quickly walks over to give Dr. Jones the good news in person. While she relays the funding has been allocated, she proceeds to inform Dr. Jones that the building will be turned into a chicken museum which of course is not the original plan he proposed. Elaine continues to relay what she thinks is good news despite his feeble protest: “There are good ideas, lots of them, and then there are fundable ideas, fewer of those. Fundable ideas are better ideas. In this case, chickens are fundable, so chickens are a better idea, you see?” (Smiley 245).

Privatization has bastardized academic pursuits internally. In an early chapter on the modern university, privatization effects on the university were mostly external and had little hand in the internal operations of the university itself. In the post-welfare state, private monies disrupt academic pursuits. And, of course Dr. Jones did not see the logic behind Elaine’s argument. Outside funding often bastardizes proposals such as this one in order to accommodate private interest and appease donors in the corporatized university. The chicken museum, as Dr. Jones learns, is being funded by no other than Arlen Martin (Smiley 244-245).

Simultaneously, Arlen Martin is facing increased scrutiny after Dr. Gift’s report on the Costa Rican rainforest is leaked. Mrs. Walker had made several copies and dispersed them to the appropriate (volatile) faculty members on campus and had given an interview in confidence to *The New York Times*. It even made the front page (Smiley 315). Before the student protest on assigned readings, Dr. Monahan was planning on addressing the story leaked by Ms. Walker, “New Pressures on Central American Countries to Exploit Resources in Protected Regions.” The fallout from the publication of this story was immense, and the logic that Dr. Gift twisted in his report for economic gain

was exposed and implicated Horizontal Environment Technologies, Arlen Martin's company, and many senior officials of the Costa Rican government (Smiley 310). "Under various names, Horizontal Technologies and the TransNational America Corporation appear to have been buying and deforesting the land, then running cattle over the resulting pasturage" (Smiley 310). Martin calls Dr. Gift to confront him concerning the leak. Gift admits that he knew about it before Christmas before having to hang up on a shouting Arlen Martin. The reason behind delaying communication to Arlen Martin is simple: Gift wanted to make sure he got paid the money promised to him from TransNational and Horizontal Technologies. If he cared to protect the university and the grant money promised, he would have informed Martin as soon as he knew his colleagues had copies of his Costa Rican report.

This was only the beginning of Dr. Gift's problems. Chairman X, a horticulturalist, is deemed one of the "radicals" on campus. He is always polemical when juxtaposed with Dr. Gift because X cares deeply about the environment. While Dr. Gift cares more about making a profit no matter the environmental impact, Chairman X would go to extreme measures to preserve it. Without surprise, Chairman X begins pamphleting about the proposal concerning the Costa Rican rainforest. He organizes a group called "Stop the Deconstruction" and gets the proper documentation to stage a protest on Moo's campus. Tempers flare at this protest and a riot ensues; the four young women, Keri, Sheri, Diane, and Mary, can hear the protestors from the Dubuque House. Just before they leave the dorm to find out what is occurring, they each make a remark about what it could be about, "Race!" thought Mary. "Alcohol!" thought Keri. They hopped off their bunks and put on their coats. "Maybe it's tuition hikes," said Diane" (Smiley 323).

While it would be nostalgic to think Moo University students were angered over tuition hikes, inspired by race dynamics, or merely rioting after imbibing too much alcohol, they are instead, as they learned upon arrival, angered over the proposal that Dr. Gift produced for the Seven Stones Mining Company. The *State Journal* reported the riot in an article titled, “Faculty, Administrators Injured in Campus Meleé.” The article describes the injury of Elaine Dobbs-Jellinek, Chairman X, and Nils Harstad. Governor Orville T. Early then had a chance to address the issue head on: ““The people of this state don’t like these deconstructionists,’ . . . When informed that no English professors had taken part in the violence, the governor said, ‘So what? They’re all closet deconstructionists out there. We are going to get rid of them one and all’” (Smiley 328). While “Stop The Deconstruction” was not a group polemically opposing any political idea that Governor Early harbored, they do represent the outspoken, grassroots voices that tend to promote change. The governor’s remarks elicit a deeply seated disdain for university professors. This response also illustrates that Governor T. Early believes that it is the fault of Moo’s professoriate that this protest and riot took place.

As demonstrated in a previous chapter, such rhetorical strategies became increasingly popular during the welfare state when Governor Ronald Reagan of California spoke of the UC Berkeley professors in a similar manner. College and university professors have often been labeled the “enablers” of student unrest on campuses across the country. It has become increasingly popular once more as student protests across the country are becoming more prevalent. In the wake of the Black Lives Matter movement and the rejuvenated Women’s Movement, protests on campus are witnessing a resurgence—one that has not been witnessed since the late 1960s. At the

forefront of the criticism concerning these movements is, of course, the “enabling” university professor. In an article written by Michael Auslin, a former university professor at Yale, titled “The Pathology of the Professors” he insinuates that colleges and universities are filled with professors who “...themselves have not moved much beyond their own student days, either emotionally or intellectually.” He argues further that this group is insulated by tenure and has never had to face real life consequences. As a result, faculty are the enablers of student demonstrations because they tend to side with student concerns. Further, he states, “What’s missing in today’s protests, of course, is any attempt by professors to act as adults to control such crises, dispassionately guide debate, and assert that there are rules and procedures for investigating such charges, or for protecting speech with which they disagree” (Auslin). A group of university professors are not enough to stop a student body upset about race relations or the white nationalist scheduled to speak on campus in the upcoming week. Yet, attacks such as this one are not new. To write and stand behind the statements listed above concerning the positioning of university faculty as mediator to student unrest proves a disconnect of the plight of the younger generations. Professors are the closest to the pulse of the younger generations, and many sympathize with their societal concerns as they too harbor similar concerns. To say that the faculty are just older students who have never matured emotionally or intellectually is demeaning. Many years of training are involved in obtaining a PhD. Furthermore, if a room full of students decide to engage in a sit in, a protest, or a walk out, there is very little a university professor can do to alter that course of action as was demonstrated in Chapter Four when discussing the campus unrest at Berkeley in 1969. Also demonstrated in that chapter is that many of the older university professors were

against the actions of the students, but there was little they could do to stop what was happening. Ironically, such protests still occur and with increasing frequency in the post-welfare state. Still, this rhetoric permeates society by men like Auslin and politicians like Early because of the agenda it allows them to utilize. While Auslin is seemingly misguided, Governor Early is taking cues from the Reagan Revolution in order to continue the defunding of higher education. Defunding allows universities to cut back on hiring full-time professors, which limits the amount of “enablers” on university and colleges campuses.

This is exemplified when Governor Early proposes another tax cut and “he suggested that the university administration ‘fire all those bozos up there who are getting the sons and daughters of the people of this state stirred up. That’s what the people of this state want and that’s what they are going to get’” (Smiley 331). When asked if this was in retaliation to the riot at the university the week prior, he replied with a resounding “You bet” (Smiley 331). At the onset of 1990, Governor Orville T. Early’s policies and rhetoric seem sensationalized and fantastical; yet, this type of rhetoric and behavior too often represents the reigning views about education in a world market economy. The retaliatory effort of Governor Early is yet another consequence of the neoliberal policies that fuel the business model during the post-welfare state.

Further, the reliance on the business model in terms of economic gain is revisited in the novel when Dean Jellinek’s computer was seized by Western Egg and Milk’s representative, Samuels. The Dean was compiling research for this company on calf free lactation. He had received grant money to conduct such studies. Samuels showed up and collected his computer, a box of backup disks, and the printer. Samuels assures Dr.

Jellinek that all of his own intellectual property will be returned to him after his company looks through the files and distinguishes what belong to Western Egg and Milk and the professor. After he assures Jellinek of this he reads, ““All work pertaining to the calf-free lactation project is the property of Western Egg and Milk, its parent companies, and its subsidiaries, and may be utilized by any or all of these companies, may be sold, patented, published, or utilized in any other way that the company sees fit, in accordance with contracts between Western Egg and Milk and Dr. Jellinek”” (Smiley 350). Because this company funded the studies, they have say in what gets disseminated and what gets buried. This clear conflict of interest hinders the search of true knowledge and defeats the very foundation of academic freedom and free thought. When the professor protested, Samuels’s replies, “Sue me... I mean that” (Smiley 351). Dr. Gift’s and Dr. Jellinek’s scientific research had been corrupted by private interest. This is why government funded research is the only path to innovation because it is not exposed to the corruption of nondisclosure agreements and stipulations in the corporate university. While some work may be contracted out with government entities that may be classified for the safety of the country’s interests, much of the funding is allocated without stipulations. The logic is simple: research that is free from conflict of interest is the purest pursuit of scientific knowledge undertaken at colleges and universities. Again, this is not to say that government funding cannot come with conflict of interest, but it is the best way to avoid conflicts of the private industry, which tend to be the biggest issue in research and academic freedom within the current American higher education system.

The conflict of private interests is further illustrated when Dr. Jones finds out his bastardized hog turned chicken museum has fallen through because of the Gift/Martin

conflict. Elaine Dobbs-Jellinek delivers the news over the phone. Dr. Bo Jones is still angry about the blatant dismissal of his own proposal for a hog museum and relays to Mrs. Jellinek that he does not care about the chicken museum. They will tear down Old Meats at the end of the term—another example of how defunding has given rise to harmful effects of privatization. The promise of funding has evaporated because the Arlen Martin companies are suffering from fiscal issues after the public release of Dr. Gift's memo and the article printed on the front page of *The New York Times* (Smiley 353).

Loren Stroop's invention is different. Joe Miller, Stroop's neighbor, visits Dean Nils Harstad concerning some agricultural plans that have been left to Moo University in Stroop's will. While Joe Miller laments that he cannot procure the plans concerning the machine, Dr. Cates happens to come in possession of them from a student who had made copies of them before Stroop had his stroke. This donation will help Moo University with their budgetary shortfall, particularly if they can utilize the patent to turn a profit. Loren Stroop's invention is contrasted with Arlen Martin's and Western Egg and Milk's grant donations. Arlen Martin and Western Egg and Milk's representative, Samuels, are merely gifting money to the university for personal and professional gain. Each of these entities is hoping to utilize the information from the studies conducted to fatten their bottom lines at the detriment of academic freedom where all results would be taken into account. Loren Stroop donates his machine to his land grant institution, as he commonly refers to throughout, because he is not only interested in capitalizing through economic gain, but by revolutionizing the farming industry with his machine in partnership with the local university. The only personal gain Stroop is interested in is making sure he gets

credit for inventing the planter. Of course, he would not mind the monetary kickback, but he knows this would help agriculture studies at Moo and the future of the agricultural industry. Furthermore, his interest in donating and manufacturing the machine has no negative effect on the environment and Stroop harbors no ulterior motives. It would make the lives of everyday farmers easier because his planter requires less seed as Joe Miller attests. This cannot be said for Marin and Samuels who would be willingly stifled by the private interests of any negative results found from the research conducted with their grant money.

Faculty Salary Cuts and Student Tuition Increases

Moo University, at this juncture, is in chaos concerning budgetary shortfalls, the losing of many fruitful donors, civil unrest that resulted in three staff injuries, and an angry professoriate due to fiduciary freezes. Ivar Harstad sends out a memo in response to Governor T. Early's statement about further budget cuts as a result of the civil unrest on Moo's campus. The governor has ordered that another two million dollars be cut from the school's budget and approximately ten million to be cut by fall semester. As a result, the provost sends another memo informing them of the change so people who may lose employment will have ample time to find other jobs (Smiley 355-356). It is for the aforementioned reasons that Dr. Timothy Monahan's tenure and pay increase will have to wait. He learns that all pay increases and promotions are to be frozen until further notice (Smiley 377-378).

Surprisingly, Governor Orville T. Early decides to ease the previously enacted budgetary cuts imposed as a result of the riot that took place on campus. The conservative governor was going to allot around three million dollars back toward the

university to help account for their recent financial crisis. “He suggested, however, that ‘The people of the state are watching those pinheads, and they better watch their step’” (Smiley 395). He continued to defend the logic behind throwing the money back toward Moo University, after disastrously defunding it, by reiterating that education was a top priority to him and the people of the state. When the reporters asked him if this had been a response to Loren Stroop’s invention, he whimsically made a comment about the need for the university to accept responsibility for their financial deficits. Hidden in the political rhetoric is a desire of the governor to have access to such a machine and possibly even take credit for it with reallocating money back into the university (Smiley 395).

All of this uncertainty causes Ivar Harstad to reflect upon his own academic career. He poses the question, “What is a university?” When Ivar entered the university at eighteen years old, it was 1953. Loco parentis was in full swing and they lived in places that had housemothers. Buildings and rules safely separated men and women students. Harstad’s most significant claim concerns outside funding, “Another thing he had learned was that while from the outside it did appear that the greatest change in university life had been the grand infusion of money from all federal, state, and private sources...” (Smiley 385). Ivar remarks that as long as he got his grades, it would only cost his parents a moderate sum of money and the return on such an education would be somewhat fruitful. His thoughts also turn to the accessibility and attendance at university. “It hadn’t been obvious to everyone that spending money on higher education was worth postponing a good job or an apprenticeship to a well-paying trade” (Smiley 385). The university Ivar is referring to in the 1950s was open and practical to a rather small portion of American society. Since then there has been an increasing demand for

higher education and the cost has risen along with enrollment and defunding. Ivar laments that students are willing to pay the high price tag because of the promises made by obtaining a degree:

While a state university, unlike a private Ivy League institution, did not promise membership in the ruling class (Wasn't that the only real reason, Ivar thought, that four years at Harvard could cost \$100,000?), Ivar's university, over the years, had made serious noises to all sorts of constituencies: Students would find good jobs, the state would see a return on its educational investment, businesses could harvest enthusiastic and well-trained workers by the hundreds, theory and technology would break through limits as old as the human race (and some very lucky person would get to patent the breakthroughs). (Smiley 386)

While the cost of an Ivy League education has always been expensive, it continues to grow more expensive than most colleges and universities across the country. As of the 2018-2019 academic year, tuition, room and board at Harvard is estimated at \$67,580, which makes a four-year degree worth \$270,320 (Harvard at a Glance). While all of the above "constituencies" had, at one point, been true, no longer could the public university structure holistically make these sorts of promises in the post-welfare state. It is no longer guaranteed that students will make more money than their parent's generation.

While Millennials tend to be more educated than the Baby Boomer generation, they make 20 percent less (Roos). Baby Boomers were the last generation to be able to graduate from college without immense debt. Generation X, Millennials, and soon-Generation Z, graduate into a world where they are financially debilitated.

This is a prevalent theme when discussing the rising cost of tuition across the country. The business model propagates the idea that students are customers and thus must pay the price for a degree from any institution within the American higher education system. Dr. Gift's memos equating students to customers make the rounds of the professoriate at Moo University. One of Kerri's roommates, Sherri, discusses how this topic came about in her English course. Some of the students and the professor were laughing about the memo, which opened up a wider discussion on the topic. The surprising outcome of the discussion was how much students did feel like customers: "In fact, they all had the same opinion, which they expressed to one another after class—if they were paying all of this money, then they must be customers..." (Smiley 179). Another student challenged the quality of the English course and professor: "Factory reject? Candidate for manufacturer's recall? Obsolete model?" (Smiley 179). Students have responded to the neoliberal ideology by adopting this perspective to survive. So, they are asking business-centered questions concerning their college experiences. Certainly, if students believe that education is a business then this rhetorical positioning within the university structure seems logical.

Due to the rising cost of tuition, the state has defunded and saddled students with the burden of student loans. The state has even begun to make money off student loans. While the federal and state governments have given out monies to support its citizen's efforts in attaining a college education, they are charging interest rates in an effort to make a profit off the "investment." Students in the post welfare state, leave college in the tens of thousands of dollars in debt. It is a debt that generations before have not had. This creates an adverse impact on the American economy. In a recent study conducted by the Sanders Institute, they have found that eliminating student loan debt would benefit society because the money these young people are

spending on their student loan payments each month is not circulating elsewhere in society. While the government is turning a profit, the rest of society suffers because that money is not spent in other places. Collectively, over 1.4 trillion dollars is outstanding in student loan debt. The report suggests, as many have speculated, students are putting off major life decisions because of the burden of their loans. For instance, marriage, home buying, and procreation rates have made drastic shifts. While using 2016 as the base year, it is estimated that there are many positive attributes on a macroeconomic level to eliminating current student loan debt (Kelton et al 6). Some of those effects are as follows:

- The policy of debt cancellation could boost real GDP by an average of \$86 billion to \$108 billion per year. Over the 10-year forecast, the policy generates between \$861 billion and \$1,083 billion in real GDP (2016 dollars).
- Eliminating student loan debt reduces the average unemployment rate by 0.22 to 0.36 percentage points over the 10-year forecast.
- Peak job creating in the first few years following the elimination of student loan debt adds roughly 1.2 million to 1.5 million new jobs per year. (Kelton et al 6)

The report goes on to say that the rapid escalation of tuition prices really took off in 1990, the year in which the reader encounters Moo University. Ivar Harstad is attempting to recover 7 million dollars because public support for higher education is failing and politicians are using this surmountable wave of changing emotions to impact discretionary funding decisions. Before 1990, average tuition and fees amounted to “6.3 percent of median household income, 17.6 percent when room and board are included. In 2014, average tuition and fees for one year of college would require 15.9 percent of the median household income, or 34.7 percent with the inclusion of room and board” (Kelton et al 11-12). Furthermore, student loan debt for

minorities is higher than the average. Statistics from 2011-2012 show that sixty-nine percent of undergraduate students have to take out loans to pay for college. Of that total, African American or black students have to take out loans 84.2% of the time while white students are only at 67.5% of the share borrowing (Kelton 10). The average student loan debt for undergraduates is \$29,384. African American or black students are in debt at an average of \$33,015 while white students are averaging \$29,065. In general, “Black and Latino graduates, whose household finances are already affected by racial gaps in wealth, income, and employment—even with a college degree—encounter a disproportionate burden as debt payments after graduation constitute a larger portion of household budgets” (Kelton 11). The same study attributes the increasing student loan debt to the increasing cost of a college education. Socioeconomic factors inhibit black and other minority students from avoiding student loan debt as public funding for higher education has decreased. Coincidentally, as of 2012 almost 12 percent of students have failed to meet student loan payments consistently for 9 months (Kelton et al 12). The picture we have of Moo U falls right in line with these statistics.

Jeffrey Williams points to this important subject matter at the end of his essay “The Post-Welfare State University” when he says, “I hope no one forgets after reading this” that the incredible burden of student loan debt in this country is a great social injustice. Williams also claims that graduates will be weighed down until the age of thirty-seven at least if not later on in their lives (209). The business model corrupts the true value of education—the notion that education liberates the mind, if only temporarily from oppression, hatred, and violence, and replaces it with valuable knowledge that leads to civic engagement and creates armed, intelligent individuals of the state apparatus. Instead, the rhetoric that is used only concerns money and the defunding of higher education by the federal government when the U.S. defense budget now

exceeds 400 billion. As Downing asks, “What, then, does it mean to be a citizen of the world when the nation we inhabit spends half of every tax dollar on the military and more money on prisons than universities, when the loss of jobs accompanies cuts to Social Security, welfare, health care, and education?” (20). If the university is an agent of culture and there is a discursive nature between the university and the state, the state is attempting to marginalize the lower and middle classes by making undergraduate education unaffordable. At least, Ivar Harstad thought the students of younger generations could get drunk, indulge in illicit behavior, and sample street drugs outside of the purview of their parents (Smiley 386). Is this all the 21st century college and university system has to offer? This certainly is not in the best interest of future generations or for the future of the American educational system.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONJECTURES ON THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

For roughly the past two centuries, academic and campus novels have been windows into the intricacies of higher education in the United States. Ever since the first campus novel,

Hawthorne's *Fanshawe*, was published in 1828, novels focusing on university life in and out of the classroom have offered vivid windows into the inner workings of higher education. But since the late nineteenth century and the formation of the modern university, the geopolitical economy shifted from industrial capitalism to late, transnational capitalism (often now referred to as neoliberalism), and the novels studies in this dissertation exactly reflect that change. Indeed, academic and campus novels examine the socio-economic and political function of the American university. Since the mid-1990s, such novels are especially pertinent to the growing scholarly movement called Critical University Studies (CUS) because they are representative of the historical moment that produced them. From tracing the adventures of students to the academic hardships of the professoriate, the genre allows ample room for the characters of each generation to speak from a particular place and time. Indeed, educating citizens has been part of American society since before winning its independence from Britain. Yet, this relationship between the state and its citizens has been rather tumultuous and the academic and campus novel genre reflect such changes.

However, it is extremely rare to see students and professors in their traditional learning environments or what Helen Horowitz would refer to as “formal learning” spaces. Most of the genre focuses on the learning that occurs outside the classroom or in “informal learning” spaces (Horowitz). While it is apparent in academic and campus novels that the formal learning spaces exist, they do so most commonly in the background. Still, without the formal learning spaces that universities and colleges provide, such informal spaces would not exist. It is within these informal scenes that we mostly encounter the wealthy, poor, battered, or enlightened university student or professor. While the genre may not be overwhelmingly popular with the general public, since World War II, many citizens have attended an American institution of higher

learning or have sent their children, but this was not always the case. Looking back to the early 20th century, most of the campus novels from that period reveal that one of the key social functions of the modern university was to acquire as many potential business contacts as possible as a way of accruing symbolic capital. As we have seen, the “rite of passage” that Stover witnesses at Yale was to bring together various men from similar socio-economic backgrounds so that such men would meet as many like-minded peers as possible to ensure their family’s continued economic success far beyond graduation. The business ethos thus permeated the modern university as it functioned as a social clearinghouse and operated as a business. Many of the men Stover meets attend for such purposes. It is not until much later in the novel that he realizes men like Regan, Brockhurst and Swazey are there for entirely different reasons. The modern university was inherently harder to attend if a young man emerged from a lower socio-economic background; such a man would most likely not achieve similar social outcomes due to lack of income. Men like Brockhurst, Swazey, and Reagan saved money over the course of many years in order to be able to attend. Thus, their reasons for attending the university were much different. For these men, there was a very tangible focus on the pursuit of “real” knowledge in the sense that they maintained hopes that their education would aid their efforts to benefit their home communities and the common good. But these ambitions seemed to be altogether missing from the wealthier student’s ambitions. Indeed, it is apparent in the pages of Johnson’s novel that the modern university was set up to serve already well-educated socio-economic elites. Anyone who fell outside of this category had his own individual ambition—often aligned with the goal of cultivating a better American democracy, but they would likely struggle as outcasts at Yale.

But a dramatic change took place after the Second World War when the United States invested deeply in expanding the higher education system, especially through increased funding for public universities. The funding increases were also accompanied by demographic changes in the student population as many more women, people of color, and ethnic minorities began to find ways to attend universities. Set in the late 1960s, David Lodge's novel exemplifies these circumstances as it depicts how some of the largest social entitlement programs benefited the middle and lower classes. Further, the free tuition model in California blew the doors off a once exclusionary institution. The mass institution, as a result, enveloped many men and women from various socio-economic backgrounds. American politicians and government officials soon realized mass education was not in the best interest of the state as uprisings began to erupt from every corner of the country. This well-educated citizenry that the American university cultivated became one of the largest threats to those in power. This turmoil reignited the business ethos so much that conservative, right-wing politicians, in conjunction with the state apparatus, decided funding education should no longer be the government's responsibility and decided to slowly place the burden of funding on state governments, the institutions of higher education, and, even more detrimentally, on each individual student. Such forms of privatizing higher education have taken a great toll on university life. Through the examination of these three key novels, we witness higher education morph from an individual good tied to the rise of industry during the modern era into a social and public good for the betterment of American society in the welfare state and then back again—an individual good in the post welfare state shaped by the business ethos of corporatization and privatization in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

The business ethos that currently pervades the post-welfare state university is clearly reflected in the escalation of student loan debt: “The average undergraduate student loan debt in

2002 was \$18,900. It more than doubled from 1992, when it was \$9,200” (Williams 157). The average student loan debt as of 2016 was anywhere from \$32,000-\$39,000 depending on the institution attended and the race of the student (Friedman). Since the Reagan Revolution in the 1980s, student loan debt has soared due to corporate and capitalist interests in private profit over the common good. Such interests have corrupted a well-funded model and have placed the burden firmly on the backs of students. As Newfield has articulated many times, the privatization model that American universities now use was influenced from “senior politicians and their business allies, not from the general public” (56). Smiley’s *Moo* reflects the results of much of the early changes in funding higher education: a crumbling university infrastructure, overworked students, politicians who front as administrators, and sadly, a divided professoriate—some who resist the corporate university model and those who have found ways to exploit it.

The Crumbling University of the Post-Welfare State

Since the publication of Smiley’s novel, there have been more neoliberal policies that have derived from both sides of the aisle. By signing the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 and the 1997 Budget Compromise, Clinton accelerated the disintegration of the New Deal. These pieces of legislation turned the responsibility of welfare reform over to the states as well as won large cuts in the domestic discretionary spending (Aldo). When George W. Bush took office in 2000, he embraced Clinton’s economic policies and extended those tax policies that were introduced in the previous era throughout his two terms in office. President Barack Obama has followed suit even after promising to lower the burden of student debts.

While many have hoped that with the Obama administration such flagrant abuses might be curtailed, the reality has proven otherwise. The global economic crisis provides even

further justification for the privatization of education and thus the shrinking of the public protections for knowledge, labor rights, and basic human services. (Downing)

With the election of Donald Trump, the outlook is bleak for higher education. In the last three decades, the average tuition at four-year institutions has risen by 156 percent (Kelton 11).

Prior the rise of the post-welfare state university, a degree from a college or university was a promise for a better future. A four-year degree from an accredited institution helped a person's chance at a higher salary and a better life than the previous generation. This is no longer the case. The crushing student loan debt sets citizens back financially and they are delaying several major life events in order to meet their monthly student loan payments. Many millennials defer buying houses or getting married in lieu of the debt they have accumulated. In fact, some individuals cannot qualify for a mortgage because of how much they have accrued in student loans. While it is too early to predict what the current Trump administration plans on doing in regards to the \$1.5 trillion-dollar student loan debt, Betsy DeVos does not seem to have any concrete ideas on how to remedy the financial crisis that many young Americans are now faced with. In fact, it is not even clear if she views it as a crisis. The current President of the United States and the United States Secretary of Education are indulging in the same neoliberal rhetoric since the end of the welfare state and the rise of the Reagan Revolution. DeVos may have long established views on the K-12 systems, which are far from favorable, but she has virtually little record on her positions in regards to higher education. She was recently quoted:

I'm reminded of a recent conversation I had with the Israeli ambassador to the United States. He posed a rather provocative question: 'Why hasn't America's higher ed bubble burst?' He was baffled as to why America's businesses haven't simply stepped in to create their own education programs to equip individuals

with the necessary skills, instead of relying on others to get it right for them. In many other parts of the world, employers and educators work hand-in-hand to line up the skills required with those actually taught. (Strauss) [p.# here—there is no page number here because it is an online source. Thus, no page number is required.]

Contrary to DeVos’s totally commodified view of education, this dissertation has focused on three key novels that, among many other things, reveal the truly adverse effects of corporatization that are as dire as many theorists suggest. In fact, many companies are considering this as a business model because they find that many of the students they hire with a four-year degree are still not prepared for the job. Increasingly, companies are conducting their own research on what it would cost to hire citizens straight out of high school and train them themselves. Companies are researching the possibility of cutting out the qualifications of higher education altogether.

Forecast

The future of higher education is bleak; many suggest that many members of Generation Z will begin skipping college and heading right into trade schools in order to enter the workforce quicker. Blue-collar jobs can offer living wages without the insurmountable weight of student loan debt. It is becoming quite appealing to many traditional aged college students. With a definitive need in the trades, Allie Conti notes that the decline in career and technical education (CTE) is a result of the importance placed on obtaining a college degree. “The National Center for Education Studies found that the number of CTE credits earned by American high school students declined by 14 percent between 1990 and 2009” (Conti). Despite this decline, such jobs in trades still exist with no prospects to fill them. Some of the vacant positions are some of the highest paying and most desirable (Conti). With a return to the ethos of the Silent Generation,

Generation Z is beginning to approach the world much more cautiously than the generation that preceded them. Conti argues further that part of this disruption can be blamed on the technology industry. Trade jobs lack the glamor that most young people are in search of and had previously shifted the rhetoric and importance of certain career paths in such areas. However, the cautiousness caused by the high cost of college education has begun to create yet another shift in rhetoric, this time economic, and this will be reflected in a return to a pursuit in trades while foregoing a previously social accepted pursuit of a liberal arts education.

Others have decided they would rather skip college to become entrepreneurs. “A 2011 survey by Gallup found 77 percent of students in grades 5 through 12 said they want to be their own boss and 45 percent planned to start their own business. Today, many of those students are now in college” (Barron). With the shift geared toward “practical” education, many are either skipping college altogether or hoping to learn something about entrepreneurship in college. If the cost of higher education does not decrease, there will be a continual rise in those who opt out completely. This will be a slow and gradual process, but it has already begun. Eighty-one percent believe that a college education is important for their future yet sixty-seven percent are concerned about the cost (Barron). “Generation Z appears to be particularly averse to student loan debt; 25 percent say they don’t think any debt is manageable and 44 percent saying they could only handle debt payments of \$100 a month” (Generation Z is Entrepreneurial, Wants to Chart Its Own Future). Coupled with the financial anxiety is the ever-decreasing state and federal aid from the government. The forecast projects the costs will only increase—driving more young people away from obtaining a four-year degree.

If such predictions are accurate, soon the post-welfare state university will resemble the modern university in at least one unfortunate way: higher education will become the exclusive

province of the wealthy. If that were to occur (and no one can predict the future), American higher education will once again accelerate its pattern of serving the ruling elites and abandon the social mission of creating more opportunities for more Americans from more diverse backgrounds. The defunding of higher education since the Reagan Revolution has triggered class warfare and while many students will be deterred from enrolling so that many colleges and universities across the country will also suffer. While Harvard University Business Professor Clayton Christensen speculates a doom and gloom picture of higher education, it is arguably much less severe than he projects. “At the Innovation + Disruption Symposium in Higher Education in May, Christensen specifically predicted that ‘50 percent of the 4,000 colleges and universities in the U.S. will be bankrupt in 10 to 15 years’” (Hess). It is much safer to assume that the lower 25% of colleges will close in the next two decades (Horn). “The pool of 18-year-olds is starting to decline—with precipitous declines in certain regions forecast to begin in 2026” (Horn). Statistics illustrate that 25% of private colleges are already operating in the red (Horn). To use a few specific examples, on December 17, 2018 Newbury College announced that it would be closing its doors. Despite “rebranding” efforts, the college could not operate fiscally and announced that it would be closing after the conclusion of the academic year. Marygrove College in Detroit, Michigan announced in August of 2017 that the Fall semester would be the last for undergraduate education (while continuing online graduate coursework). This gave students mere weeks to find alternatives if they were preparing to graduate in May or anytime thereafter. “A 50 percent enrollment decline and finances are to blame for the school’s restructuring” (Clifford and Nagl). Marygrove and Newbury are merely two examples of fiscal issues that are occurring across the nation for small private colleges. This trend will continue in the next several decades.

While this may not affect the majority of institutions, it is only a matter of time before the fiscal issues become real for larger colleges and universities. The large prominent institutions will survive because of donor money and the money that prestige tends to lure. Many smaller colleges will likely fail. If we continue to defund education, there will be limited opportunities for students and this also forces institutions to drive the tuitions prices up. Community Colleges, however small, may be insulated from this financial crisis. Most will continue to receive local funds and maintain lower costs than larger colleges and universities and that is extremely appealing to Generation Z. Students may opt for the cheaper option in the future before moving onto larger universities (if they do move on); others will forego higher education altogether.

While Colorado failed to utilize the marijuana tax more effectively to fund education, Michigan has an opportunity to learn and capitalize on their mistakes. In November of 2018, Michigan voted to legalize the recreational use of marijuana. If the state of Michigan wants to become a leading example in education reform, they will look at previous tax models and plan accordingly in order to restore the health of education in the state. This funding problem can be remedied through this opportunity if politicians and education reformers are willing to devote the time and effort for the proper allocation of tax money from the sale of recreational marijuana.

Further, if we can find a way to fully fund higher education it would shift the neoliberal rhetoric away from the business model. If the government can spend billions of dollars to fund wars, then surely, they fund education serving the good of all citizens, thus ensuring a more educated and civically engaged democratic nation.

The work of many critics engaged in Critical University Studies is more important now than ever. The professoriate would benefit from active engagement in this area and devoting some of their scholarly activity to writing about the state of the American university system. The

crux of the funding problem is the misinformation that exists concerning higher education within the realm of the general public. This allows politicians to create neoliberal fabrications regarding the purpose of higher education as primarily one of increasing GDP. Such fallacies can be discredited easier if issues are made visible to the general public through scholarship and community engagement. This dissertation has focused on these three representative novels as a way of making these problems visible.

It is also noteworthy to address the lack of the academic and campus novels pertaining to community colleges. From previous research it seems the publication of campus novels that are set on the campus of a community college are limited. Dorothy Walworth's *Feast of Reason* published in 1941, which is set at Briarcliff Junior College in Briarcliff Manor in New York is the only notable community college novel illustrated in Kramer's anthology (Kramer 199). One other somewhat notable and recent community college academic novel was published in 2015 under the pseudonym Adrian Jones Pearson titled *Cow Country*. It is apparent that it was self-published as well. Yet, both of these are academic novels and lack the perspective of the community college students. If there are others, they have eluded my research. These scenes of instruction are imperative for the academic and nonacademic communities alike to understand. Community colleges tend to serve some of the most marginalized populations in terms of finances, race, ethnicity, and increasing enrollments of non-traditional students. Campus and academic novels focused on such campuses would also add depth to CUS while creating a broader understanding of how the defunding of higher education has hurt the middle and lower classes of American society as many of these students land in community college classrooms. Arguably, this genre could stand in contrast from those set on four-year college and university campuses due to their differences.

For Further Research

Academic and campus novels are the focus of this project because they offer one of the best resources for understanding the restructuring of higher education in the United States. The genre adequately illustrates the struggles of not only the professoriate, but also the students who inhabit its walls each year. Such tales also reveal the changes occurring within administrative offices to reflect the neoliberal business ethos that American capitalism tends to generate.

Colleges were established in this country long before independence from Britain was obtained in 1776. While many colleges shut down during the Revolutionary War, they were reopened soon after. The ideology that permeates the contemporary institution derives from its early roots. In order to expand this study to reflect the colonial era, I would include a chapter on William Smith's pamphlet titled *A General Idea of a College of Mirania*, which was published in 1753 just as the tensions between the colonies and the British government were escalating. This pamphlet was intended originally to help Smith obtain a position at King's College in New York. After he neglected to obtain employment there, he sent the manuscript to Benjamin Franklin who eventually hired Smith to be the provost at the College of Philadelphia. In some ways, Smith was far ahead of his time: his argument in *Mirania* was for colleges to abandon the sectarian and largely theological mission and to fulfill a secular mission based on liberal arts aimed at creating an educated citizenry necessary for a more participatory democracy. Even though Harvard was chartered in 1636, a real pedagogical shift to the more secular model did not really gain traction until after the Civil War and the Morrill Land Grant Acts. That particular transformation should be documented more fully, and the most obvious option would be to add a chapter on Nathaniel Hawthorne's *Fanshawe* published in 1828. It is also appropriately lauded as America's first "college novel" (Kramer 1). However, it might not be the best option because it does not

showcase a lot of the academic side of Harley College. Instead, it paints a heartwarming portrait of the college's president, Dr. Melmouth. Another option would be Charles Bailey's *The Reclaimed Student: A Tale of College Life* published in 1844 which depicts the lives of two undergraduate students at "B----- University" somewhere in Massachusetts. This narrative might be a sounder choice because it showcases the shift from sectarian to the German Research model but is still strangely akin to *Stover* in terms of neglect when it comes to the academic pursuits of students. Also in 1869, *Fair Harvard: A Story of American College Life* was published even though the author, William Tucker Washburn, was warned against doing so. It was received quite similarly to Johnson's novel for the mere fact that it displayed the misbehavior that occurred in informal learning spaces. In fact, in the preface of Washburn's novel, there are two different sets of dialogue included that reflect the overall feeling of publishing the novel. One reads, "'I should advise you' said one 'to commit what you have written' (the labor of several months) 'to the flames or the North River'" (Washburn). One other person states, "'I should recommend you' added the other 'to append a tabular view of the college studies to your story, so as to give the book, at least, a certain value'" (Washburn). Despite the books negative reviews, the popularity of the book rose and it became "extracurricular reading for Harvard undergraduates of the period" which makes it a notable book for consideration in light of my focus on the modern university in Johnson's *Stover at Yale*.

Given the need for more work on 18th- and 19th-century predecessors to the novels I study in this dissertation, it is important to recognize that there is considerable need for more study of the many novels focusing on the post-welfare state university since the publication of Smiley's 1995 novel, *Moo*. Set in 1989-1990, this novel provides a more than adequate glimpse into what the Reagan Revolution had done to higher education up until that point in American history.

While it is one of the best examples in the genre of how neoliberal policy negatively affects the American university, there are many numerous academic and campus novels that address the restructuring of higher education in the past twenty years. One of the best recent examples is Julie Schumacher's *The Shakespeare Requirement* is a more than suitable academic novel that portrays the state of higher education in its most current form. Published in 2018, Schumacher presents a research university adequately dubbed Payne University. Payne portrays further the crumbling infrastructure for the humanities while other fields are lauded and given incentives for their market value. The main character, Dr. Jason T. Fitger, the Chair of the Department of English, exemplifies the struggle for his discipline in light of neoliberal agenda carried out by his university president. Much like *Moo* there are many facets of university life that are revealed: academic pursuits in publishing, budget cuts, faculty cuts, the restructuring of disciplines, adjunct labor, the empowering of certain departments over others, and, of course, the business model of higher ed. The distinction is that Schumacher's novel highlights the amenities race for fancy dorms and high-end athletic facilities at the cost of faculty and education. Further, it illustrates the disillusionment of the humanities and clearly delineates the social hierarchy established amongst disciplines. It does so by displaying how university monies are allocated. Of course, it is similar to Richard Russo's *Straight Man* in also displaying some of the ins and outs of department politics. While much of this appears in *Moo*, and certainly Smiley's text is foundational, it is also amplified further recent novels.

My main goal in this dissertation has been the more modest project of attempting to showcase how the relationship with the state apparatus dictates the health of American higher education, but also the overall health of American society and its citizens. With a return to the ethos of the modern university, it is more imperative than ever to ensure access to higher

education to citizens in order to maintain and cultivate a participatory democracy. Highlighting such issues in this project has been my effort to compliment the important work of Critical University Studies as part of the larger project to increase the visibility as well as the social viability of the higher education system in the United States in the 21st century.

Works Cited

- Aldo, Gregory. "Neoliberalism from Reagan to Clinton." *Monthly Review*, 1 Apr. 2001, <https://monthlyreview.org/2001/04/01/neoliberalism-from-reagan-to-clinton/>.
- Altbach, Philip G., Robert Oliver Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumpert. editors, "Harsh Realities: The Professoriate in the Twenty-First Century." *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges*, Johns Hopkins UP, 1999, pp. 227-53.
- Anderson, Robert. *British Universities*, Hambledon Continuum, 2006.
- Baggs, Lyman. *Four Years at Yale*, The University of Michigan, 1871.
- Bailey, Charles. *The Reclaimed Student: A Tale of College Life*, Benjamin F. Brown, 1844. *Hathi Trust*.
- Barron, Eric J. "Gen Z Entrepreneurs View Higher Education as Vital to Their Startups." *The Conversation*, 3 Jan 2019, <http://theconversation.com/gen-z-entrepreneurs-view-higher-education-as-vital-to-their-startups-108645>.
- Boren, Mark Edelman. *Student Resistance; a history of the unruly subject*. Routledge, 2001.
- Brewis, Georgina. *A Social History of Student Volunteering: Britain and Beyond, 1880-1980*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.
- Bruno, Rosalind. "College Enrollment Linked to Vietnam." *The New York Times*, The New York Times Archives, 1984, *Census Bureau*, <https://www.nytimes.com/1984/09/02/us/college-enrollment-linked-to-vietnam-war.html>.
- Chorba, Frank. "Foreward." *Radio Cultures: The Sound Medium in American Life*, edited by Michael C. Keith, Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2008, pp. XIV-XV.

Clabaugh, Gary. "The Educational Legacy of Ronald Reagan." *Educational Horizons*, Summer 2004, *New Foundations*, *Eric*, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ684842.pdf>.

Clifford, Tyler and Kurt Nagl, "Marygrove College to End Undergrad programs, offer Grad programs only." *Crain's Detroit Business*, 9 Aug 2017, <https://www.crainsdetroit.com/article/20170809/news/635921/marygrove-college-to-end-undergrad-programs-offer-graduate-studies-only>.

"College as a Means of Stifling Thought." *New York Times*, 25 Mar. 1912, *ProQuest Historical Newspapers*, pp.20.

Conti, Allie. "Generation Z is Choosing Trade School over College." *Vice*, 29 Oct. 2018, https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/43ejmj/generation-z-is-skipping-college-for-trade-school.

"Dangers in the Snobbery of Colleges." *New York Times*, 31 Mar. 1912, *ProQuest Historical Newspapers*, pp. SM3.

DeGroot, Gerard. "Reagan's Rise." *History Today*, Vol. 45, Issue 9, Sept. 1995, pp. 31-36, *ProQuest*.

Downing, David. "Ethical Conundrums: Institutional Pressure and Graduate Student Needs in the Era of Contingency." *MLA Professions*, April 2015, <https://profession.mla.org/ethical-conundrums-institutional-pressure-and-graduate-student-needs-in-the-era-of-contingency/>.

---, and Edward J. Carvalho, editors. "Reframing Academic Freedom: An Introduction."

Academic freedom in the Post 9/11 Era, Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. pp.1-13.

Education in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1900, *Hathi Trust Digital Library*.

- Flaherty, Colleen. "The Missing Black Professors." *Inside Higher Ed*, 22 Aug. 2017, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/08/22/study-top-public-universities-finds-limited-faculty-diversity-and-yet-signs-progress>.
- Friedman, Zack. "Student Loan Debt Statistics in 2018: A \$1.5 Trillion Dollar Crisis." *Forbes*, 13 Jul. 2018, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/zackfriedman/2018/06/13/student-loan-debt-statistics-2018/>.
- "Generation Z is Entrepreneurial, Wants to Chart Its Own Future." *Northeastern University*, 18 Nov. 2014, <https://news.northeastern.edu/2014/11/18/generation-z-survey/>.
- George, Walter Lionel. *France in the twentieth century*, J. Lane Company, 1909, *Hathi Trust Digital Library*.
- Graves, Frank Pierrepont, *A History of education*, Macmillan, 1909-1913, *Hathi Trust Digital Library*.
- "Harvard at a Glance." *Harvard University*, 2018, <https://www.harvard.edu/about-harvard/harvard-glance>.
- Hess, Abigail, "Harvard Business School professor: Half of American colleges will be bankrupt in 10 to 15 years." *CNBC*, 15 Nov. 2017, <https://www.cnbc.com/2018/08/30/hbs-prof-says-half-of-us-colleges-will-be-bankrupt-in-10-to-15-years.html>.
- Hoberman, Ruth. Web log comment. *Eastern Illinois Graduate Organization*, Facebook, 12 Oct. 2013.
- Horn, Michael. "Will Half of All Colleges Really Close in the Next Decade?" *Forbes*, 13 Dec. 2018, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelhorn/2018/12/13/will-half-of-all-colleges-really-close-in-the-next-decade/#2622e7e252e5>.

- Horowitz, Helen. *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Johnson, Owen. *Stover at Yale*, General Books, LLC. 2012.
- Jones-Pearson, Adrian. *Cow Country*, Cow Eye Press, 2015.
- Katopes, Peter. "The 'Business Model' Is the Wrong Model." *Inside Higher Ed*, 16 Feb. 2009, <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/02/16/business-model-wrong-model>.
- Kelton, Stephanie et al. "The Macroeconomic Effects of Student Debt Cancellation." *The Sanders Institute*, Feb. 2018, http://www.levyinstitute.org/pubs/rpr_2_6.pdf.
- Kramer, John. E. *The American College Novel*, The Scarecrow Press, 2004.
- Levine, Lawrence. "From the Big Apple to Berkeley: Perspectives of a Junior Faculty Member." *The Free Speech Movement : Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s*, Edited by Robert Cohen, Reginald E. Zelnik, and Leon F. Litwak, University of California Press, 2002. pp. 339-344.
- Lewis, Ricki. "Student Evaluations: Widespread and Controversial." *The Scientist*, April 1998, <https://www.the-scientist.com/profession/student-evaluations-widespread-and-controversial-57019>.
- Lodge, David. *Changing Places*, Penguin, 1979.
- Loss, Christopher. *Between Citizens and the State*, Princeton UP. 2012.
- Lyles, Kevin. "Faculty United!" Web log comment, *Kevin Lyles*, WordPress, 7 Nov. 2013.
- Mason, Mary Ann. "The Pyramid Problem." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 9 Mar. 2011, <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Pyramid-Problem/126614>.

- McCargar, Marilla, "Femininity and Higher Education: Women at Ontario Universities, 1890 to 1920." *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository, The University of Western Ontario*, April 2016, <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/3765/>.
- McCluskey, Molly. "Public Universities Get an Education in Private Industry." *The Atlantic*, 3 Apr. 2017, <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/04/public-universities-get-an-education-in-private-industry/521379/>.
- McKenna, Laura. "Why are fewer College Presidents Academics?" *The Atlantic*, 3 Dec. 2015, <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/12/college-president-mizzou-tim-wolfe/418599/>.
- Myers, Ben. "Where are the Minority Professors?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 14 Feb. 2016, <https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/where-are-the-minority-professors>.
- National Center For Education Statistics. "120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait," *NCES*, 1993, <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs93/93442.pdf>.
- Newfield, Christopher. *The Great Mistake: How We Wrecked Public Universities and How We Can Fix Them*, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016.
- Odhiambo, Eucabeth and Chantana Charoenpanitkul. "Marginalization: A Continuing Problem in Higher Education." *Race, Women of Color, and the State University System: Critical Reflections*, edited by Vivian Yenika-Agbaw, and Amarillis Hidalgo-de-Jesus, University Press of America, pp. 67.
- Pezzulich, Evelyn. "The Academic Novel and the Future of the Humanities." *International Journal of the Humanities*, pp.237-244.
- Powell, Lewis. "The Powell Manifesto." *Reclaim Democracy*, initially published 23. Aug. 1971, http://reclaimdemocracy.org/powell_memo_lewis/.

- Professor Watchlist*. Turning Point USA, 2016, <https://www.professorwatchlist.org/>.
- Readings, Bill. "The Idea of Excellence." *The University in Ruins*, Harvard University Press, 1996. pp. 21-43
- Richards, David Alan. *Skulls and Keys*, Pegasus Books. 2017.
- Robertson, Andrew et al, editors. *Encyclopedia of U.S. Political History*, Vol 7, CQ Press, pp. 240.
- Robbins, Alexandra. *Secrets of the Tomb: Skull and Bones, The Ivy League, and the Hidden Paths of Power*, 2002.
- Roos, Dave. "Are Millennials really the first generation to do worse than their parents?" *How Stuff Works*, 11 Oct. 2013, <https://money.howstuffworks.com/personal-finance/financial-planning/millennials-first-worse-parents.htm>.
- Rorabaugh, W.J. "The FSM, Berkeley Politics, and Ronald Reagan." *The Free Speech Movement : Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s*, Edited by Robert Cohen, Reginald E. Zelnik, and Leon F. Litwak, University of California Press, 2002. pp. 511-518.
- Rosenfeld, Seth. *Subversives: The FBI's War on Student Radical, and Reagan's rise to Power*, Picador, 2013.
- Schell, Eileen. "What's the Bottom Line? Literacy and Quality Education in the Twenty-First Century." *Moving a Mountain: Transforming The Role Of Contingent Faculty In Composition Studies and Higher Education*, National Council Of Teachers of English, pp. 324-340.
- Schumacher, Julie. *The Shakespeare Requirement*, Doubleday, 2018.
- Simpson, Jennifer. *'I Have Been Waiting' :Race and U.S. Higher Education*, University of Toronto Press, 2003.

- Smiley, Jane. *Moo*, Balatine Books, a division of Random House, 1990.
- Smith, William, *A General Idea of a College of Mirania; with a sketch of the method of teaching science and religion, in the several classes: and some account of its rise, establishment, and buildings*, Eighteenth Century Online Print Editions, reprinted 2018, first published by J. Parker and W. Weyman, 1753.
- Starving the Beast*, Dir. Steve Mims. Railyard Films, 2016. *Kanopy*.
- Strauss, Valerie. “Did Betsy DeVos just trash America’s Higher Education System?” *Washington Post*, 25 Jan. 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2018/01/25/did-betsy-devos-just-trash-americas-higher-education-system/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.a45d71214cb1.
- Stone, Michael. “What Happened When American States Tried Providing Tuition-Free College?” *Time*, 4 April 2016, <http://time.com/4276222/free-college/>.
- Thelin, John. *A History of American Higher Education*, John Hopkins University Press, 2004.
- Vega, Lilia. “The History of UC Tuition since 1868.” *The Daily Californian*, 22 Dec. 2014, <http://www.dailycal.org/2014/12/22/history-uc-tuition-since-1868/>.
- Washburn, William Tucker. *Fair Harvard: A Story of American College Life*, Putnam’s, 1869. *Hathi Trust*.
- Welch, Lewis Sheldon and Walter Camp. “The Poor Student’s Opportunities.” *Yale, her campus, class-rooms, and athletics*, 2nd edition, L.C. Page and Company, 1900, pp. 154-160. *Hathi-Trust Digital Library*.
- “What is a Liberal Education?” *Association of American Colleges and Universities*, <https://www.aacu.org/leap/what-is-a-liberal-education>

Williams, Jeffrey. "The Pedagogy of Debt." *College Literature*, Fall 2006, Vol. 33, Iss. 4, ProQuest.

---. "The Post Welfare State University." *American Literary History*, Oxford University Press, pp. 190-216.

Wofsy, Leon. "When the FSM Disturbed the Faculty Peace." *The Free Speech Movement : Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s*, Edited by Robert Cohen, Reginald E. Zelnik, and Leon F. Litwak, University of California Press, 2002. pp. 345-356.

"Yale Soph Societies Abolished." *The Crimson*, 10 Dec. 1900. <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/1900/12/10/yale-sophomore-societies-abolished-pthe-three/>

Zelnik, Reginald E. "On the Side of Angels: The Berkeley Faculty and the FSM." *The Free Speech Movement : Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s*, Edited by Robert Cohen, Reginald E. Zelnik, and Leon F. Litwak, University of California Press, 2002. pp. 264-338.