

Ethnicity, Multiculturalism, and Higher Education in the United States Prior to 1960

The development of ethnic studies and multiculturalism and their relationship within various levels of formal education in the United States have been the subject of much discussion and debate in recent years. However, little attention has been paid to historical developments that shaped these movements prior to 1960.

Subordinate racial and ethnic groups had to contend with grossly unequal access to education and a lack of control over the educational institutions in which they participated. Well into the twentieth century, group-specific educational efforts such as the historically Black colleges faced issues that were to reemerge as ethnic studies developed in the 1960s. One such issue was whether ethnic groups should focus primarily on developing group-centered education or pursue access to white-dominated higher education. A second issue related to whether the curricula should emphasize preparing students for success in a white-dominated society and economy or inculcate them in group history and traditions, while preparing them for careers that served group needs.

During the same era, the roots of the current emphasis on multiculturalism developed in efforts such as bilingual schools and denominational colleges that used education to preserve subordinate-group culture and language. Many of these early efforts developed among groups of white European origin that had some degree of power and status.

In many early group-specific educational efforts, religion and religious organizations were important components. In some cases, such as Roman Catholic universities, religion served to differentiate between groups. In other cases, religious organizations played a supportive role. Protestant contributions to the development of historically Black colleges are an example of such support. Finally, religion and religious organizations sometimes played a negative role, with Christianity serving as the rationale for attacks on group culture and missionary organizations providing government-financed educational services.

Building on these earlier roots, post–World War II social, political, and demographic changes propelled a dramatic transformation of higher education from the late 1950s through the 1960s. These changes still shape the development and relationship of ethnic studies and multiculturalism in the nation’s colleges and universities.

Unequal Access to Higher Education

Through most of the history of the United States, access to higher education has not been equally available to all groups. At one extreme, access was legally denied to African Americans solely on the basis of race. From 1896, when the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the “separate but equal” doctrine, to the mid-1930s, African Americans were excluded by law from all white colleges in the South. They continued to be denied admission to public universities in some states until well into the 1960s. Other groups faced similar legal barriers. Chinese Americans, for example, fought for integrated elementary and secondary public education in San Francisco and other parts of California in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Low, 1982).

Even when clear legal admission restrictions did not exist, African American access was limited by other means, including school policies and cultures that made it clear that African Americans were not welcome. For example, in the 1920s Harvard still did not allow African American students to live in dormitories with white students (Kennedy, 1993). The limitations on access were effective. From 1865 to 1895 only 194 Blacks graduated from Northern colleges and 75 of these were from Oberlin (Bowles and De Costa, 1971).

For some groups, such as Jews, access was limited more sporadically. Able to enter urban public universities such as City College of New York, Jews were often denied access to elite private institutions such as Princeton and other Ivy League schools. Unable to deny entry on the basis of scholarship, these establishment colleges and universities instituted character tests and psychological exams as part of their admissions requirements. Quotas were also used to limit Jewish admissions. After an unspoken quota took effect at Columbia University in the 1920s, Jewish enrollment dropped from 40 to 22 percent in two years. During the same period Harvard was still publicly discussing limiting Jewish enrollment (Steinberg, 1974).

Native Americans, Hispanics, women, and other groups, as well as those lacking financial resources or acceptable formal secondary education, have also had limited access to higher education in the United States. In some cases, group values have served to limit access when subordinate groups felt that public

education was not suitable for their children. Steinberg (1974) argues that such was the case with nineteenth-century American Roman Catholics, who developed a comprehensive educational system of their own. In other cases, groups have found that once achieved, access to higher education is not continually assured. For example, the internment of American citizens of Japanese descent during World War II disrupted higher education for their children, who prior to the war had reached levels of formal educational achievement equal to or exceeding those of the general population (Daniels, 1988).

Group-Specific Education

As one response to limited access to education in the nineteenth century, some white religious and ethnic groups in the United States established separate institutions and systems of higher education. In addition to providing higher education when none could be had elsewhere, these colleges and universities served to preserve group languages, cultures, and traditions. Moreover, in contrast to African Americans and Native Americans, the white ethnic groups controlled, for the most part, their institutions and their administration and curriculum. Among these institutions were the colleges and universities run by the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant liberal arts colleges begun by various immigrant groups, such as the Scandinavians in the upper Midwest.

Few in number until the Irish immigration of the mid-nineteenth century, Roman Catholics had been secure in areas of French and Spanish colonization. In fact, the first schools in what are now the United States were Catholic schools in Florida, New Mexico, and California. However, when English power prevailed in colonial America, Protestantism, not Catholicism, benefitted, establishing a pattern of Protestant domination in education.

Until the first Catholic college (Georgetown) was founded in 1789, English colonial colleges from Harvard to the University of Charleston were uncompromisingly Protestant. Anti-Catholic sentiments remained until the twentieth century, with some colonies (Maryland, for example) passing eighteenth-century laws against Catholics running schools (Power, 1972). Of the 182 colleges established before the Civil War, 175 were subject to denominational control. Of these, 28 were Catholic. These early Catholic colleges were established to prepare priests and to ensure the moral formation of Catholic youth (Power, 1972). By the twentieth century, Catholic higher education grew into a nationwide system, and Catholics entered public higher education in large numbers, eventually reaching attendance rates equal to those for the general population. However, the inequality of access remained much greater for African Americans, Native Americans, and Chicanos.

For African Americans, separate institutions provided access to higher education when dominant white institutions were closed to them. However, unlike Catholic and Protestant immigrants from Europe, African Americans did not control the system of colleges and universities that enrolled them and that came to be known as historically Black institutions. In reality, most of these institutions' faculty, administration, and boards were controlled or heavily influenced by whites, reflecting a situation in nineteenth-century education where European immigrants, lower-class whites, and Blacks fought for intellectual, social, economic, and political advancement, but where Blacks remained in the most subordinate position (Berry and Blassingame, 1982).

As we prepare to consider ethnic studies programs and their emergence in the 1960s, it is instructive to consider the development and changes in the system of African American higher education from before the Civil War through the middle of the twentieth century. First, however, it should be noted that during the same period no similar system of higher education developed for other groups, specifically Native Americans (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976), whose relation to higher education we shall trace later in the chapter. Likewise, no separate higher education system developed for Asian Americans. Many of the first Asian immigrants were Chinese males, and as other groups (Japanese, Koreans, and Filipinos) followed the Chinese, their struggles were first with equal access to elementary and secondary education and later with the right to maintain their own language schools (Daniels, 1988).

The system of African American higher education that emerged in the mid-nineteenth century was characterized by

- largely private institutions until well into the twentieth century
- white dominance in faculty, administration, and boards
- declining northern liberal support and growing influence from industrial philanthropists
- splits over approaches to the curriculum linked to sources of funding and to visions of African Americans' role in society.

Throughout the development of the system, some African Americans entered white-dominated institutions. Their numbers remained small until the 1930s, when the major thrust for change turned from reliance on institutional improvement, accreditation, and growing student enrollment to legal battles for increased access to all institutions, particularly to state-funded professional and graduate schools.

Institutions of higher education for African Americans emerged in a few scattered locations before the Civil War. Although the system of higher education for African Americans was almost exclusively a southern phenomenon,

with 90 percent of American Blacks residing in the South in 1900, some of the first individual institutions were in the North. Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, founded in 1854, and Wilberforce University in Ohio, founded in 1856, were the first colleges established for blacks.

Other higher education efforts trained African Americans as teachers and ministers prior to 1854. For example, as early as 1831, abolitionists and members of the Convention of the Free People of Color attempted to establish a college in New Haven. Opposed by the city's citizens, the Convention selected another site in New Hampshire, where the town quickly removed the academy. Finally, in 1842 the Institute for Colored Youth was established in Philadelphia; this eventually became Cheyney State University (Bowles and De Costa, 1971).

At the end of the Civil War, 4.5 million African Americans were freed from slavery. With the passage of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, they received citizenship and the right to vote. This freedom released a pent-up demand for basic education and an accompanying need for trained teachers for elementary and secondary schools. This demand for teachers, in turn, created the need for higher education institutions to train them.

During the three decades following the Civil War the development and growth of the system of historically Black colleges and universities was generally funded by private monies and supported by private interests, especially Protestant churches. Missionary organizations, both those supported by African Americans and those supported by northern whites, founded many of the historically Black colleges between 1865 and 1890 (Bowles and De Costa, 1971).

Initially, some public support for African American higher education came from the federal government's Freedman's Bureau. The Bureau often worked with churches and did so to help found Howard University. However, as northern interest in the education of freed slaves waned, the Bureau ended its involvement with higher education in 1872 (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976). At the same time, southern legislatures, with the backing of industrialists eager for workers, appropriated money for vocational institutes for Blacks, but not for liberal arts institutions.

Public financial support for African American higher education during this period was meager; when financing did come it was in the form of the Second Morrill (land grant) Act. After Congress passed the original Morrill Act in 1862, states established land-grant colleges, but these were nearly all institutions from which Blacks were excluded. Before 1890, only Alcorn State in Mississippi, Hampton University, and Claflin University in South Carolina received 1862 land-grant funds (Humphries, 1992).

The 1890 Second Morrill Act confirmed the "separate but equal" philosophy that the Supreme Court would rule in *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896. By

1897, sixteen of the seventeen states that maintained separate systems of education had established a state-supported land-grant college for blacks. During their first few decades these institutions enrolled large numbers of secondary students and the institutions struggled to establish bachelor degree programs. By the 1950s, the colleges were still emphasizing teacher training and lacked resources to train students as researchers, engineers, and other professionals (Humphries, 1992).

Throughout the latter part of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, whites dominated Black college administrations, faculties, and boards. Many whites, having lost the zeal of Reconstruction, were domineering and paternalistic. Whites withheld or granted financial support as a means of institutional control (Berry and Blassingame, 1982).

Intensifying the impact of this control was a decrease in funding from the liberal northern churches which had founded and initially funded many of the colleges. During the latter part of the nineteenth century, the South's primary economic interest for cheap, docile labor merged with that of northern industrial philanthropists who were becoming increasingly important as funders of African American higher education. Like many persons in the South, the northern industrialists favored education that prepared African Americans for manual labor and undergirded the economy.

By the early twentieth century, African Americans began calling for control of Black higher education. These calls peaked in the 1920s with student demonstrations and strikes at Hampton Institute, Howard University, and Fisk. Only in 1925 did Mordecai Johnson become the first Black president of Howard (Berry and Blassingame, 1982).

Even as African Americans fought for control of the institutions where they were enrolled, they also sought access to all institutions of higher education. In the 1930s, the NAACP led the assault on segregated white universities, first targeting graduate and professional schools. In southern states that did not provide graduate and professional training for African Americans, the NAACP argued this lack of training was prima facie evidence that facilities provided by the states to whites and Blacks were not equal and therefore unconstitutional. In 1938, the Supreme Court ruled that the state of Missouri was denying equal educational opportunity by giving a Black person a scholarship to attend a law school in another state. In response, southern states began building graduate facilities for Blacks. However, in 1950 the Court held that a separate law school for Blacks in Texas was not equal. Although the University of Maryland Law School was desegregated in 1935 and West Virginia University admitted a Black graduate student without compulsion in 1940, in 1952 five states still barred Black students from their publicly supported universities (Berry and Blassingame, 1982; Brubacher and Rudy, 1976).

During the latter part of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, a debate raged within the African American community about the purpose of higher education. At issue was the thrust of the curriculum of the African American colleges. The two major figures in the debate were Booker T. Washington, who promoted an ideal of industrial education based on manual labor and self-help, and W. E. B. DuBois, who supported a liberal arts education.

Washington was identified first with Hampton Institute, from which he graduated, and then with Tuskegee Institute, which he built up. His primary goal was to teach people how to make a living, and the Hampton-Tuskegee industrial-education program favored practical skills like masonry with lesser emphasis on basic academic skills.

Though popular with some, Washington's industrial-education approach was rejected by much of the African American leadership. From the 1870s through the 1920s many African American newspapers, conventions, and writers fought against it. These groups felt African Americans needed to know more about themselves and acquaint whites with African American achievement. Thus, liberal arts colleges continued to dominate the education of African Americans, and colleges such as Fisk and Howard were viewed as institutions to impart the elite northern Protestant culture to African American youth. However, African Americans began to modify this philosophy to include the scientific study of Black life and culture, as DuBois had successfully inaugurated at Atlanta University in 1900 and as Carter G. Woodson initiated with the founding of the *Journal of Negro History* in 1916 (Anderson, 1988).

These diverse views of higher education held by Washington, DuBois, and their supporters were not simple differences in opinion. The educational approaches were tied to differing visions of the role that African Americans should play in American society. One vision emphasized the necessity for all African Americans to learn basic industrial or vocational skills. The other saw this vocational emphasis as too limited and maintained that education should develop the group's leadership. Furthermore, each vision was linked to specific sources of financial support in an era when northern philanthropists' funding of African American higher education increased while funding from the liberal missionary and Black church organizations decreased.

The northern philanthropists saw higher education as most appropriately an industrial education, exemplified by the Hampton-Tuskegee idea. They further saw it as an ideological force that would prepare teachers to help African Americans adjust to a subordinate social role in the South, a role favorable to their own economic interests. Beginning in the 1880s, northern philanthropy placed almost total emphasis on industrial training. In support of this thrust, the various foundation funds (General Education Board, Phelps-Stokes Fund, Carnegie Foundation, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund) cooperated on behalf of the Hampton-Tuskegee program.

In contrast, missionary leadership objected to the Hampton-Tuskegee model, which they viewed as undermining the democratic rights of African Americans. On this issue, the African American leadership and that of the religious organizations agreed: “Despite sharp tension between missionaries and black leaders over questions of Black participation in the administration and faculty of missionary colleges, the two groups shared a common conception of the appropriate training of Black leaders” (Anderson, 1988, p. 244). They both saw future leadership for the African American community being trained in a classical curriculum.

Throughout the development of the African American system of higher education, academic quality was a major issue. Many of the colleges evolved as institutions of higher education after decades as primary and secondary institutions. The separate system of public education for Blacks created a great demand for trained teachers, although not necessarily teachers with four-year college degrees. This demand for teachers—however badly they were treated and paid—drew students into the Black colleges. Thus, the colleges were at once part of the system of black education and also shapers of it (Bowles and De Costa, 1971).

The institutions faced significant structural problems when large numbers of students arrived lacking sufficient academic preparation for college-level work. The emphasis on production of teachers and other basic professionals needed by the African American community, rather than on the training of engineers, researchers, and other professionals, influenced the colleges well into the middle of the twentieth century. Moreover, the Black system was, on one hand, completely dependent on the white system for support—a system that blatantly discriminated against it; on the other hand, the Black system was completely separate, with standards determined internally and each system training its own teachers.

In the 1920s the first accreditation was made of Black colleges by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This began the removal of one barrier to graduates of Black colleges. But others remained, including the severe limits on the professions Black college graduates could enter. For example, into the 1950s the United States Post Office remained the largest employer of educated African Americans, reflecting the barriers in the nongovernment labor market faced by those who managed to attain a college degree in the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s.

Bowles and De Costa (1971) see significant improvements in the colleges from the early 1930s through 1953 in large part because of the regional accrediting agencies. Moreover, the accreditation process forced southern politicians to comply with court decisions. Legislatures realized that accredited white colleges and nonaccredited Black colleges would be judged as evidence of noncompliance with the separate-but-equal ruling.

Further improvements in the system came as a result of World War I, better economic fortunes in the South, and the growth of military bases in the South. From within the African American community came higher demand for education, calls for higher standards, demand for better-educated Black teachers, and the development of Black colleges. Also the children of persons who had migrated north became a source of students for the Black system as parents and children discovered the discrimination against them in the North and its institutions.

During the 1930s, the progress of African American higher education was mixed. Physical facilities improved but the dependence on northern philanthropy with its desire for conservative African American leadership continued. African American intellectuals in the 1930s began to talk about the miseducation of Black youth and the increasing distance between the educated Black youth and most Black Americans. The youth were seen as internalizing the social ideology of the industrial philanthropists. Black college administrators were caught in the middle, between the criticism leveled against them and the need for funding to survive (Anderson, 1988).

Throughout the second half of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century, limited numbers of African American students attended white institutions. African Americans' acceptance by Oberlin, Berea, and other colleges was one of the first steps in ending the proscription against Blacks entering higher education. However, for the small number who did enter white-dominated institutions, life was not easy. Berry and Blassingame (1982) emphasize the tribulations Black students faced, including financial difficulties, but also cite the students' perseverance and emphasize how success was a consciousness-raising experience that shattered forever their acceptance of whites' characterization of blacks as inferior.

This growing realization that even as formal segregation ended in higher education there remained a great deal of racism and many obstacles for African Americans became one basis for the protests of the 1960s and the founding of ethnic studies programs. It merged with long-standing concerns about the relationship of various educational approaches to the needs of the community and with early efforts to develop the study of the African American experience to contribute to the development of African American studies.

Native American Education

The preceding section showed the development of a separate system of higher education enrolling African Americans and the parallel struggle of African Americans for greater access to dominant-group colleges and uni-

versities, and linked this development to the emergence of ethnic studies. We turn now to another example of group-specific education, that of Native Americans. Their experience demonstrates how education has been used by dominant groups in the United States to devalue subordinate groups' cultures and then to reshape those groups' cultures, religious commitment, and national identification. On another level, the history of Native American education shows the almost complete lack of access Native Americans had to higher education—particularly to education they controlled—through the middle of the twentieth century. The response after 1960 has been both the growth of Native American studies and the establishment of tribally controlled community colleges.

Educational historian Joel Spring (1994) describes American government policies toward conquered peoples, including those toward Native Americans and Puerto Ricans, as ones of deculturalization and Americanization. Propelling these various policies, particularly in the nineteenth century, has been the superiority white European Americans felt about their country, its place in the world, and its future—its “manifest destiny.”

Spring sees these policies demonstrated in two massive education campaigns to replace Native American languages and cultures with English and European culture. One campaign was associated with the forced removal in the 1830s of Native Americans from the southeastern United States to west of the Mississippi; the second was the late-nineteenth-century removal of individual Native American children from their families to send them off to white-run boarding schools.

These campaigns were followed by a brief period in the 1920s and 1930s when the government supported restoration of native cultures; later, the policy turned to tribal termination and assimilation into dominant culture in the 1940s and 1950s. The demands of the 1960s and 1970s for Native American control of their own educational institutions grew from this history (Spring, 1994).

From the arrival of the first colonists in New England in the early seventeenth century, Native Americans were the focus of dominant-group pressures for cultural and religious change. The Protestant English immigrants sought to use schooling to Christianize and “civilize” Native Americans, as well as to pacify them. Included in these activities was the inculcation of English culture, with demands that Native American children adhere to many details of its standards of appearance and rituals of daily behavior. It was an approach that was based more on the colonists' sense of cultural superiority than on a belief in racial superiority.

This early approach of the New England Protestants established the patterns often repeated later in white-controlled Native American education: culturally intolerant goals which focused on a fusion of Christianity and Western secular values; a belief in the potential of Native Americans for “uplift”; a faith in the

schools as a means to carry out this process; an educational approach that combined physical labor, secular instruction, and religious instruction; and the separation of Native American children from relatives and culture (Coleman, 1993).

The colonists', and later the United States government's approach to Native Americans was based on a variety of motives. Some whites seemed genuinely concerned about the disappearance of Native Americans, particularly in the face of growing colonial expansion. By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, officials in the new United States government who held this view worked to protect Native Americans from the worst of what they saw as the inevitable onslaught of European civilization. Reflecting concern for a civilizing mission over a strictly pacifying mission was the transfer of Native American affairs from the War Department to a unit of that department, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), in 1824, and the BIA's transfer to the Interior Department in 1849.

Those who sought to keep Native American tribes from disappearing, while at the same time not challenging white expansion onto Native American lands, proposed to make Native Americans Christians and farmers through support for missionary schools. The result was an unusual alliance between church and state that continued throughout much of the nineteenth century. Even after the Civil War, the government continued to turn responsibility for Native American education over to churches until 1876, when government schools began to expand. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missionaries (ABCFM—founded in 1810 by Presbyterians and Congregationalists) provided teachers and the Civilization Fund Act (1819) and Indian treaty monies provided the financial support. The practical effect was that the government hired Protestant—and later Roman Catholic—churches to carry out the education of Native Americans.

However, despite apparent concern for tribal survival, the goal of the ABCFM schools was to rid Native American children of their traditions and to transform them into cultural copies of white children. The ABCFM schools' curricula totally excluded Native American culture and the ABCFM, like earlier colonists, viewed the situation as one of Native Americans either civilizing or perishing.

Prior to the educational efforts that emerged out of concern that Native Americans might be wiped out, some whites saw them as the subjects of dominant-group education, including the earliest higher education efforts in the colonies. A limited number of Native Americans attended colleges, including Harvard, Princeton, Dartmouth, and the College of William and Mary, from the seventeenth century. Some colleges were established with specific policies of admitting Native Americans.

These efforts were, for the most part, failures. For example, schooling of Native Americans was one of the first objectives of Harvard University according to its charter of 1650; the second building built on the campus was known as Indian College. However, only a few Native Americans lived in the hall and only one Native American graduated from Harvard in the seventeenth century (Oppelt, 1990; Stein, 1992).

Some support for Native American education came from abroad. Monies in the estate of Englishman Robert Boyle (founder of modern chemistry) were designated for the education of Native Americans, including funds to the College of William and Mary. By 1712, twenty Indian students were enrolled at the college. The Revolutionary War led to a cutoff of funds for these efforts (Oppelt, 1990).

Dartmouth was the first college founded for the education of Native Americans. Despite the statement in its charter that it was for the “education and instruction of youth of the Indian tribes,” it never enrolled many Native Americans. In fact, prior to 1793, fewer than one hundred Native Americans attended Dartmouth, and only eight graduated in the nineteenth century. In the century from 1865 to 1965, twenty-eight Native Americans enrolled at Dartmouth and nine graduated (Oppelt, 1990).

At another level, academies—a new form of school to prepare men for medicine, politics, and teaching—appeared in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Academies demonstrated the same pattern followed by the colleges, including openness to Native Americans followed by almost exclusive enrollment of whites. Several academies were founded for Native Americans. One of these academies, Oneida, initially enrolled Native Americans, but soon became Hamilton College, for whites.

The forced removal of Native Americans from the Southeast involved the tribes who eventually came to assume the most control over their own educational institutions. The Choctaw and Cherokee were forcefully moved from the southeastern United States to what was later to be the state of Oklahoma. Before and after the move, the Choctaw and Cherokee had high levels of tribal-run education, including schools and bilingual education efforts. However, illustrating the dilemma facing subordinate groups in an economy dominated by the values and technologies of others, their schools taught agricultural and domestic tasks needed to change to a white-style economy (Oppelt, 1990).

The Choctaws felt that education was vital to their survival; they also supported the idea of developing a written language. Choctaws established an educational system in collaboration with missionaries, in which the best graduates were sent on to college. For example, the Choctaw Academy in Kentucky was established using money from treaty funds. It was the most advanced formal schooling available to Native Americans in this period and

enrolled over 150 at its high point. For twenty years the Academy was the most significant Indian educational institution in the United States. The Academy had both church and government support and significant Choctaw leadership (Oppelt, 1990).

In Oklahoma, Cherokees used bilingual teachers and Cherokee texts to produce a literacy rate of nearly 100 percent. Western Oklahoma Cherokees had a higher literacy level in English than did the white population of Texas or Arkansas. However, in 1899 the government began taking over the tribal educational system and did so by 1901, turning its nearly two hundred schools into vocational training schools. Within twenty years of the takeover of their schools, the Cherokee literacy rate dropped to 40 percent (DeJong, 1993).

The Cherokees supported higher education. For example, the Cherokee National Council opened national male and female seminaries in 1851. These opened and closed periodically in the nineteenth century, graduating 382 men and 252 women from 1855 to 1909. These tribal institutions were eventually purchased by the state of Oklahoma. One became Northeastern Oklahoma State University. Other schools, church-related, were established for Indian education but became white universities—the University of Tulsa is an example.

The off-reservation boarding schools—Carlisle in Pennsylvania was the first and most famous—became an important instrument for whites to replace native languages with English, to destroy Indian culture among children, and to teach allegiance to the U.S. government. The schools had an English-only policy and flew the American flag to develop patriotism.

In perhaps the best known of the boarding school pedagogical innovations, Native American students worked for whites a few months each year to earn money and to learn about white life. The goals of this work were to develop students' individualism and in other ways enculturate them with the dominant-group culture by getting them away from other Native Americans. The schools also used extracurricular activities to develop model American citizens from members of various tribes. Carlisle, for example, maintained an extensive athletic program, regularly competing against major colleges in football and producing several Olympic athletes (Coleman, 1993).

In 1887 there were eight boarding schools enrolling 2137 people. The schools remained preeminent in federal Indian education until 1930, and some continued to operate into the 1980s. Although their goals were assimilationist, the boarding schools did not succeed very well. Most graduates returned to tribes with skills they could not use and with cultural values that put them outside both the Native American and the white worlds. Academically, the boarding schools were, at best, on level with a good vocational high school. In some cases, however, such schools had serious problems and inspectors found poor food and paramilitary types of organization.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, the concern for the survival of Native American peoples that had guided white supporters of Native American education was replaced by a more racially motivated outlook. Whites increasingly saw Native Americans as unable to learn and the curriculum moved more toward vocationalism. Less emphasis was placed on complex vocational skills and on anything academic. Racism and a concept of Native American inferiority became more prevalent.

However, within several decades of these discouraging developments came another swing in the approach to Native American education. In 1928, a national government report (the Meriam Report) was highly critical of Indian education. The report noted that Native Americans needed to have their own tribal, social, and civic life to use as the basis for understanding their place in society. In response, the BIA first tried to build a flexible curriculum that put positive value on Indian lifestyles. Native Americans, however, still did not control their own institutions. Immediately after World War II, the efforts to design education based on Native American's own institutions and values declined as the government emphasized the termination of tribes.

There was a small amount of federal aid for Native American higher education in the 1930s. By 1933, 161 Native Americans had enrolled in college with the aid of federal and tribal funds, and a few institutions offered scholarships to individuals. In addition, a handful of Native American-controlled colleges, mostly church-run, survived. Among these was Bacone College, the oldest Native American college in the United States. Founded as the Baptist University of Indians in 1889 to train teachers and preachers for the Five Civilized Tribes, Bacone produced significant Native American leadership and until 1960s was the only predominantly Native American college in the United States. Efforts such as Bacone would continue in the 1980s and into the 1990s, with the opening of a series of Native American community colleges (Oppelt, 1990). Until the 1960s, Native American access to higher education remained pitifully small with the number of Native Americans graduating from four-year institutions rising from sixty-six in 1961 to almost triple that number in 1968 (Szasz, 1974).

The experience of many Native American men during World War II when they left their reservations to serve in the military and the opportunities afforded by the GI Bill had a major impact on their attitudes toward participation in and control of education. Beginning with the Navajo Community College in 1968, tribally controlled community colleges were established in a number of states. Federal recognition and support for these efforts came with the passage of the Tribally Controlled Community College Act in 1978 (Stein, 1992).

Group Preservation Efforts

Group-specific educational efforts have been common throughout the history of the United States. Among these efforts have been schools organized by immigrant groups and ethnic groups to preserve their languages and heritages, as well as efforts to assimilate groups into the dominant-group culture and economy. German bilingual education schools, private and public, were some of the most widespread and longest lasting of the institutions organized by immigrant groups to retain their culture while also fully participating in the wider American culture and economy. German bilingual education also illustrates how religion was associated with many groups' efforts to provide their own education, how most ethnic educational institutions declined as members assimilated, how the growth in the number of immigrant groups in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century increased demands for access to schools for language and other instruction, and how events beyond the United States—particularly the World Wars—affected American's attitudes about assimilation and, hence, school enrollment. Carolyn Toth (1990) describes the history of German bilingual education with particular emphasis on the public German bilingual schools in Cincinnati, Ohio. This large bilingual program operated successfully for more than seventy-five years until halted by World War I anti-German hysteria.

German immigrants established schools in the United States to teach English and German with the expectation that students would use both languages for the rest of their lives. In this respect they were different from contemporary transitional bilingual education programs which seek to move students from their mother tongue into English as quickly as possible. It is also important to note that as a group Germans could not be considered as having subordinate status and did not have to contend with the racially based exclusion and slavery that African Americans experienced or the cultural exclusion and status as a defeated indigenous people faced by Native Americans. Like many group-specific schools, and unlike current public bilingual efforts, the German bilingual schools were founded for religious purposes. German immigrants saw that, in America, speaking English was often an economic necessity, but that English was used for ordinary, daily activities. In contrast, they knew that German was the language of the scriptures and its maintenance a moral imperative. With education equated with religion, virtually all German sects established parochial schools.

In the colonial period, one sect, the Moravians, was the most active in setting up schools, in part because it received support from Europe and in part because it was involved in Native American education. In 1749, Moravians established prestigious bilingual boarding schools for boys in Nazareth and Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Among other German groups, the German Reformed Church and the German Lutherans together founded hundreds of schools.

Throughout the nineteenth century, bilingual German-English schools spread among both Lutherans and Catholics. Lutheran parochial schools reached a peak of development in 1890 when they numbered almost two thousand, with the largest numbers in Wisconsin, Illinois, and Iowa. To provide teachers, the German Lutherans opened seminaries in Ohio, Iowa, Minnesota, and Illinois.

The German Catholics—who immigrated later, largely after 1870—were also active in bilingual education. The Roman Catholic Church initially lent support to retention of German. However, the Catholic hierarchy was Irish and less concerned about the language issue. This lack of emphasis was strengthened by a papal decree that children of immigrants could switch to English-speaking parishes when they became adults. Nevertheless, by 1886 there were 825 Catholic German schools enrolling 165,000 students in the United States. The Catholics also started German colleges and universities: St. Vincent College in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, opened in 1846, and St. John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota, in 1857.

The advent of public schools in the 1830s and 1840s altered, but did not stop, German bilingual education. In Cincinnati and other Ohio areas successfully pushed to get legal status for German in the state's public schools. As a result, in Cincinnati enrollment was widespread and the high numbers of students kept costs low, ensuring the program's survival. The number of German bilingual students in Cincinnati peaked at 18,000 in 1886, and in 1914 there were still 14,600.

Toth points out that many non-Germans received German instruction in the Cincinnati schools, including some African American students. To support the need for teachers, the German bilingual division of the Cincinnati Normal School was founded in 1871. At the outset, the Cincinnati program was truly bilingual, with an Anglo American teacher and a German American teacher splitting the instruction of each class. However, the amount of German language declined over time, and in the higher grades in 1870s only forty-five minutes a day was devoted to German.

Cincinnati was not the only city with German bilingual schools. In 1886, 150,000 students were enrolled in German bilingual schools in three hundred public school districts in twenty-five states. In Chicago, a majority of students in German bilingual schools were not German. By 1914, Germans were rapidly assimilating and the German language was being used less and less. Although six million Germans immigrated to the United States from 1820 to 1943, the largest number of any immigrant group, the number of arrivals dropped off after 1882.

The anti-German feelings that arose during World War I marked the end of the German bilingual education program in Cincinnati and had similar drastic effects on other bilingual and foreign language efforts. The Cincinnati program's enrollment plunged dramatically and the program closed in 1918 when Ohio

banned the teaching of foreign languages in its elementary schools. Although the Supreme Court overturned this law in 1923, it was not until 1959 that foreign language instruction (mostly Spanish and French) started again in Cincinnati elementary schools. Ohio was not alone. In Minnesota, which at the outbreak of World War I had more than two hundred ethnic schools teaching German, Polish, French, Danish, Norwegian, and Dutch, foreign language teaching was banned in 1919.

Conclusion

With rising group expectations, an expanding and seemingly wealthier higher educational system, and more strident calls for racial justice, the stage was set by 1960 for increased attention to previously subordinated groups in U.S. higher education. As the number of African American, Hispanic, and other subordinate-group students grew on campuses, group interest turned from increasing access to increasing power within the universities. The issues of group control over institutions, programs, and curricula, prevalent since the nineteenth century, merged with newer calls for group studies programs and greater links between their communities and the colleges and universities. Later, in the 1980s and 1990s, other groups would advocate for multicultural education.

In this first chapter we have shown some of the historical events that shaped the rise and formation of the developments of the mid-twentieth century. For nearly a century prior to 1960, African Americans had struggled in a society where they were regularly and legally denied admission to many of the nation's colleges and universities. The system of Black colleges that arose to meet their needs was controlled by whites and experienced great curriculum debates linked to different visions of African Americans' role in society. These colleges also initiated efforts to study African American culture and history and convey it to the rest of the United States. Native Americans had even more limited access to higher education than did African Americans. The lack of Native American control over educational institutions contributed to education's use to remove Native American culture and to reshape youth in alien ways. In testimony to the importance of group control over education, tribes who shaped their own educational institutions, such as the Cherokee and the Choctaw, had greater success with formal education than those tribes which lacked control. Native American control in higher education was eventually established in Native American community colleges.

From the 1960s and into the 1990s other voices called for more diversity in higher education, honoring multiple voices and valuing participation by more

groups. Here, the previous hundred years also showed examples of American educational diversity. Bilingual education, for example, thrived privately and publicly in major urban areas through the First World War. Catholics founded a large educational system that included colleges and universities throughout the United States. Asian Americans struggled both for the right of their children to attend integrated schools and for the right to maintain their own language schools. In chapter 3 we shall see how Intercultural Education sponsored programs and approaches in the 1940s and 1950s that valued diversity, and how they drew upon higher education for pedagogy, research, and theoretical underpinnings.

We turn now to some of these theoretical underpinnings, including the concepts of ethnicity, race, and social class.