

# University Art Curriculums and the Discipline-Based Art Education Movement in the United States

Young Mok Chung

Professor of Fine Arts

Seoul National University

Although art has been a part of the curriculum at most universities for over thirty-five years, it is still not part of the mainstream of the university education in the United States. Artists often find themselves isolated from their colleagues in other departments and divided among themselves. Within art departments, curricular isolation is common, and minimum interaction occurs among the various studios and art history, art education, and art theory/criticism. The curriculum focuses primarily on traditional studio disciplines such as painting, sculpture, printmaking, ceramics, metalsmithing, and the new communication support areas. Art history and art theory/criticism are seen (at least, by studio faculty) as support areas. Art education exists in an ambiguous middle ground. Any curricular integration or continuity involving these various aspects of the visual arts is usually coincidental or a by-product of shared concerns between two/three areas of art department faculty members.

The art curriculum has not been perceived as being as comprehensive as those for mathematics or the sciences in the universities. Most of the university art departments have paid too little attention to integration and sequencing of content in the curriculum. Recently, however, there has been the concerted effort to develop comprehensive curriculum for the public schools and universities in the United States which has come to be called Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE). The single, overriding characteristic of DBAE is that its momentum runs contrary to the dominant direction of most American university art departments. Consequently, because artists and teachers are trained in university art departments, significant changes in higher education are necessary if DBAE is to be successful.

## Early Years of Modern Art Education

During the thirty-five years following the early 1950s, art education was guided by three dominant influences (a) the writings of Viktor Lowenfeld; (b) the art and theories of the Abstract Expressionism; and (c) the changing social climate within the dominant culture.

**The Influence of Viktor Lowenfeld.** Viktor Lowenfeld was one of the most important early art educators of the modern era in the United States. In 1947, he wrote his extremely influential book, *Creative and Mental Growth*.<sup>1)</sup> The book was destined to influence a generation of people who flocked to the universities after the war and during the 1950s. Lowenfeld died in 1960, but his influence on the art education community has continued through today.

In *Creative and Mental Growth*, Lowenfeld criticized the education that required students only to memorize isolated bits of information. He called for education that encouraged students “to question, seek answers, to find form and order, to rethink and restructure and to find new relationships.”<sup>2)</sup> He proposed that these activities, which he deemed necessary for creative and mental growth, were at the very core of art education, and he outlined the program by which they could be developed. He encouraged the student-centered learning process that developed from the internal needs of the student rather than from imposed external adult criteria. The development of enthusiasm for art education, especially in the public schools in the decades following World War II was largely the result of Lowenfeld’s ideas.

**The Influence of the Abstract Expressionists.** While Lowenfeld’s theories were establishing the toehold in the art education world, the Abstract Expressionists held sway in the New York art world. The image of Jackson Pollock swirling automobile lacquer onto his canvas in a gestural frenzy formed the romantic concept of the self-absorbed, intense artist of that era. The Abstract Expressionists are greatly influenced by affective theories of expressionists, especially those who emphasized drawing on the creative Jungian reservoir within oneself and mining that reservoir in search of both personal and

---

1) Viktor Lowenfeld and W. Lambert Brittain, *Creative and Mental Growth*, 5th ed. London: The Macmillan Co., 1970.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 3.

universal truths. Art and artist are one, as are art and the larger spiritual world. Artists found inspiration in the art of native Americans as well as in Oriental sources in support of their search for the largely spiritual art. This search for "the primal ground of creation" and "metaphysical understanding" was deeply felt, not only by artists of the period, but by art educators as well.<sup>3)</sup>

**Socio-Cultural Influences.** The "me" generation also had its origin in the 1950s and was to develop during the next two decades. The Hippies of the sixties were heirs to the Beat generation of the fifties. During that time, the dominant social influences on American culture had begun to shift from the East Coast to the West Coast where the looser, less-segmented life style dominated. It was quite natural that San Francisco would become the center of this life style, since many of the voices of the Beat generation had emanated from the North Beach area.

While the 1950s seemed particularly tame compared to what followed, the seeds of social and educational change for the next twenty years were planted at that time. This loosened societal control, and the new freedom of individuals to seek their own creative potential were clearly reflected in the dominant art world of New York as well as in the art education world. Following the Abstract Expressionists, the Pop artists opened the entire new world of source material for art. It has been argued that artists of the Pop art era elevated everyday objects to the status of high art. Others have argued that they reduced art to the status of everyday objects. The important point was the fact that art assumed the new role in the popular culture during this time and began its move into the center of the public realm. This trend has continued.

**Affective Messages.** The impact of these three main influences on art education—Lowenfeld, the abstract expressionists, and sociocultural trends—was affective and continued to stress the emotive message that formed the core value of each movement. It is not surprising that the rallying cry for incorporating art into the schools at that time was the need for development of "creative self-expression." Art teachers were charged with helping their students develop creativity so that they could express themselves more effectively. Most arguments of the time revolved around the assumed

---

3) W. Jackson Rushing, "Ritual and Myth: Native American Culture and Abstract Expressionism," *The Spiritual in Art: Abstract Painting 1890-1985*, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1986, pp. 273-95.

propensity of art to develop creative and self-expressive individuals who would be able to transfer the creativity developed in their art classes to all other aspects of their lives. Self-expression was viewed as the antithesis of the sciences and the necessary balance to them, but involvement in the creative arts was believed to render benefits to all aspects of one's life, including science.

For many teachers, developing creativity meant providing students with a wide variety of materials and leaving them alone. It was widely accepted that students had the inherent and natural creativity that could be corrupted by too much adult direction and guidance and that the art teacher should be primarily the stimulus and motivator in the process of learning. These attitudes conspired to limit the development of structured, sequential curricula with cognitive content, and they worked, instead, to foster the idea that individuals would develop their own "curriculum" based on individual needs.

While Lowenfeld and others were arguing for expression, intuition, and direct involvement as viable alternatives to the dominant rote method of learning, the British scientist and writer C. P. Snow was expressing his concern about the gulf between what he called "the two cultures."<sup>4</sup> It consisted of the literary intellectuals at one pole and the physical scientists at the other. Presumably, the literary intellectuals included all manner of other "creative" people, such as artists, poets, musicians, humanists, and others who were not of the science community. Snow wrote that

closing the gap between our cultures is a necessity in the most abstract intellectual sense, as well as in the most practical. When those two senses have grown apart, then no society is going to be able to think with wisdom.<sup>5</sup>

He proposed that people must look at their education "with fresh eyes" and find a means to bridge the gap. Since that time, there have been numerous discussions about finding ways to make the process of learning whole and integrated.

### Recent Changes in Art Education

The problems faced by art educators today, though, are different from those faced by the

---

4) He explored this topic in his Rede Lecture at Cambridge University in 1959. C. P. Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (The Rede Lecture), London: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

5) *Ibid.*, p.53.

educational reformers in the fifties, and the times call for different solutions. Among other things, the presence of art education is now becoming more common in the educational system of the United States. It is no longer unreasonable or suggestive of a counter-cultural attitude to say that art should be included in the curriculum. Art has become a part of the curriculum in most public schools and universities in the United States.

The National Center for Education Statistics for example provided the following figures for graduates in all the visual and performing arts during the school year 1984-85:

Degrees Awarded in the Visual and Performing Arts, School Year 1984-85

Bachelor's degrees	37,936	Master's	8,714	Doctor's	693
Women	23,430	Women	4,817	Women	286
Men	14,506	Men	3,897	Men	407

The number of Master of Fine Arts degrees awarded by American universities and art schools increased from 525 per year in 1950 to 8,708 in 1980.<sup>6)</sup> Together with these tremendous expansion in the numbers of individuals studying art and teaching art in the universities has come the need for greater clarity and focus in setting goals and objectives for the education in art.

**Recent Curriculum Projects.** For many years, art in the schools has been continuously reexamined through government and university sponsored research efforts in the United States. More recently, however, responsibility for these efforts has been assumed by the private sector, particularly the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. The Getty report, *Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools*, has had somewhat a strong impact on the art community.<sup>7)</sup> It represents one of the dominant movements in DBAE today. Going beyond creating and toward integration of the arts into the general education of every student has become the central focus of much research and writing on the visual arts today in the United States.

**Discipline-Based Art Education.** Support for DBAE has gained momentum over the last ten years. Its proponents suggest that art curricula focus on material from four major art disciplines; art production, art history, art theory/criticism, and aesthetics. Evaluation

---

6) Diana Crane, *The Transformation of the Avant-Garde, the New York Art World, 1940-1985*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1987, pp. 9-10.

7) Getty Center for Education in the Arts, *Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools*, Los Angeles: Paul Getty Trust, 1985.

emphasizes measuring outcome in each of the four disciplinary areas of art, and student's self-evaluation is encouraged as an integral part of the total evaluative process. It is a tremendously energetic and optimistic undertaking. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the goals of DBAE, the vision of the program must be admired.

Study in the visual arts is presented as a unique vehicle through which students can learn to see and respond to the environment, to understand what they see, to evaluate, and to create. The DBAE movement proposes that, through the four disciplines of art, students can develop kinesthetic and manipulative skills, perceptual skills, and reasoning skills as well as the sense of history and the course of human development. Finally, art can be more effectively used to internalize students' intellectual and emotional life than can other disciplines. As Elliot Eisner writes:

For Discipline-Based Art Education, this means that we do not wait for students to learn simply by providing art materials they can manipulate, but that we provide supportive and encouraging instruction that guides learning.... In sum, it means that those of us who share the ideals of Discipline-Based Art Education assume that students develop not only from the inside out, but from the outside in.<sup>8)</sup>

The change in concept regarding how students develop is embodied in Eisner's statement represents an important change in attitude about art education. It suggests that art can be taught; that there is a body of knowledge that can be described, defined, and presented to students; and that art education must incorporate both the private personal, internalized needs of the student and the externalized body of knowledge so called the visual arts.

However, there are serious concerns about DBAE. The most commonly expressed concern is that the DBAE will mean "more art history, art theory/criticism, and aesthetics, but there would surely be less art."<sup>9)</sup> Additionally, critics say that "art education is weak because it has tried to draw strength by identifying with other purposes and other disciplines; to borrow strength is to build weakness."<sup>10)</sup> And that DBAE "will result in greater rigidities and the more intimidating climate for the teaching of art."<sup>11)</sup> Yet other

---

8) Elliot Eisner, *The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools*, The Getty Center for Education in the Arts (Los Angeles: Paul Getty Trust, 1985), p. 15.

9) Thomas Ewens, "In Art Education, More DBAE Equals Less Art," *Design for Arts in Education*, 89, no. 4 (March/April 1988), p. 35.

10) Grant Lund, "A Call for Reasonableness in Art Education," *Art Education*, 39, no.2 (1986), p. 51.

critics say:

Good art teachers have always encouraged students ... to see and analyze the ways in which other artists have organized their thoughts in a work.... Such an approach causes art history, theory/criticism, and aesthetics to have direct meaning and application.... It is truly integrative and is rooted in the expressive technique of art itself.<sup>12)</sup>

These concerns are certainly genuine and deserving of consideration. Anyone who works with art students today recognizes that they are already burdened with far too many expectations to develop mastery in any one of them. Even those art education programs that result in the BFA degree, and thereby insure a substantial studio component, find that students' time is usually fragmented and they are unable to commit the same time to their studios as their friends who major in the studio area. Because of this demand on the time of art students, it is unlikely that they could also become well prepared in art theory/criticism and aesthetics as well as in studio production and art history. It is even more unlikely that they will be able to do all that DBAE proposes without the complete support and cooperation of the university art departments, and university art departments have problems of their own with which to contend.

### New Times in Higher Education

Until recently, the dominant focus of the university education in the visual arts was preparation for a career as a studio artist or teacher. A minority of students pursued careers in the design field; nearly all in graphic design, or commercial art, as it was usually called. Over the last fifteen years, however, this situation has changed so dramatically that it is not uncommon today to find art departments with 80 percent of their undergraduate majors in some "applied" design field, including, among others, graphic design, environmental design, product design, package design, industrial design, textile design, interior design, fashion design, exhibit design, and urban design.

In addition to the increased interest in design education, it can be also found students

---

11) Jerome Hausman, "Another View of Discipline-Based Art Education," *Art Education*, 40, no. 1 (1987), p. 57.

12) John Stinespring and Linda Kennedy, "Discipline-Based Art Education Neglects Learning Theory: An Affirmation of Studio," *Design for Arts in Education*, 90, no. 2. (November/December, 1988), p. 33.

pursuing degrees in art therapy, arts journalism, illustration, animation, arts administration, and museum/gallery-related occupations. This shift in emphasis and the resulting tensions between traditional fine arts faculty and the faculty in these newer "applied" areas have posed problems for many art schools. These problems are philosophical and pedagogical, but usually they manifest themselves in the areas of greatest concern, such as budget redistribution, lack of facilities, teaching loads, student advising loads, areas that are not being met by existing curricula.

Some schools of art and departments of art have changed their names to reflect a dual emphasis on fine arts and design. These new units are called departments of art and design or colleges of art and communications or schools of fine and applied art. The desire to reflect the new diversity and emphasis in art schools by changing the name is reasonable, but it also points to the problems that art educators in higher education have had with integrating the new design emphasis and the more traditional fine arts.

**Applied Arts versus Fine Arts: An Artificial Dichotomy.** Although the impetus to separate fine arts and applied arts is understandable, such a separation overlooks the reality of art education historically. An education in the visual arts has nearly always been "applied." Over the last thirty-five years, university and art school curricula have consistently emphasized professionalism over academism and training for a career over the more general liberal arts education. A painter was taught to paint and a sculptor was taught to sculpt. The rigorous research and writing requirements of art history were reserved for art history majors and not required as stringently of studio majors. Recent efforts to bring art theory/criticism onto the university curriculum as an area separate from art history have not been very warmly received in many schools because time would be taken away from studio courses and given to reading and writing exercises. Whatever general distribution requirements were established by the university for all students were grudgingly accepted and the least demanding courses were often recommended to art students. This portrayal is not intended to indicate that art students have been poorly educated or that they are poorly motivated. I only intend to say that the dominant emphasis of the education in the visual arts has been on the "applied" studio work and not on the academic aspects of an education.

The real difference between the design fields and the fine arts seems to be an issue of deeper significance than studio application. Art has been undergoing the process of change



from the basically private activity to more public one with greater emphasis on content than on methodology.

For the Abstract Expressionists and followers of Lowenfeld, emanated from the individual, individual needs, and individual self-expression. As long as art making was considered a private activity—the sole responsibility of an individual artist working alone in a studio on self-imposed visual/creative problems—discussions about the content of an art education were generally not as pertinent as were discussions of personal methodology.

In the world of the traditional fine arts, design was not regarded as a “calling.” Design is seldom an isolated and private activity, and successful designers must often work as part of a team seeking a set of solutions to particular problems. Designers must have some knowledge of how, in specific environments, human beings interact with each other and with the environments understanding of the biological, chemical, and physical environment as well as of the psychology and sociology of human behavior is often crucial to the success of a project. Designers must also know about the technologies of production and be aware of marketing possibilities and limitations. Individual creativity is important, but the intended outcome of the creative activity of designers usually must be more clearly defined than is the activity of the studio artist. The education of designers requires greater analysis, clarity of objectives, specificity of language, and comprehensiveness of approach than the education of studio artists used to require.

Design is much more public activity than are the traditional fine arts, and the needs of design education are clearly different. The interdisciplinary, integrative, multidimensional nature of the design process means giving as much attention words as to images and as much attention to outcomes as to process. In traditional art teaching, distinctions between methodology and content were not separated as nearly as they must be in today’s educational environment.

### New Prospect

The time is right for meaningful curriculum change. And, while there are many problems to be addressed, once again the arts stand to gain from the current climate of educational reassessment. The increased emphasis on design education in universities and the DBAE movement in the public schools have a great deal in common that might be effectively exploited and developed in the United States. Each seeks integration and

inclusion. Each seeks to bring art into a meaningful dialogue with people's daily lives. Each requires structure and consistency in curriculum design if it is to be effective.

The primary responsibility lies with university art faculties. The various studio courses, art history courses, art education courses, and art theory/criticism, if offered, exist side by side in the curriculum, but few efforts are made at integration or transfer. The predominant emphasis in higher education is still on the intuitive, expressive, individualized response to problems. Critiques in art classes generally still gravitate toward how a particular visual structure makes one feel or how the object was made, and the description of the art object is highly metaphorical rather than descriptive. Little attention is given generally to verbal analysis and virtually none to writing. Every art student still takes drawing from studio artists; painting, ceramics, sculpture, weaving, photography, and so on, from studio artists. This is as it should be. However, adequate preparation for the monumental task of DBAE implementation will not come from traditional studio faculty without significant changes

Some things are changing in America. It is acceptable these days for an artist to speak clearly and well without seeming pretentious or pedantic. Many do and many more are capable of it. Universities must assume vigorous leadership in creating a new environment if the visual arts are to be successful. The situation on the studio artist's natural suspicion of words still exists in America. That suspicion will be intensified in DBAE discussions where studio faculty, once again, will see the word-based art disciplines sapping time away from the image-based studio disciplines. Studio faculty and other art faculties will have to find the common ground where images and words can come together.

Although they are different forms of communication, words and images are not natural enemies. However, part of an education in the studio arts has long included the admonition, "Don't talk, painter, Paint! Let the painting talk for itself." DBAE proponents are trying to bridge the gap between image-based art production and art history, art theory/criticism, and aesthetics, which are primarily word-based. While there is no question of the primacy of the image in studio art, the situation is changing somewhat. New studio areas such as film and video, the multitude of design applications, and computer imaging are all helping to expand earlier definitions of what constitutes art, and these new areas often involve integration of images and words. As the definition of art has expanded, artists have found it increasingly difficult to retreat to the privacy of their own studios and their own private values. If university artists are able to resolve some of their

own ambivalence about the new studio areas in the midst, it may become possible to give attention to a cognitive dimension for the visual arts and to the issues surrounding DBAE.

It provides a format through which students will be exposed to all the art disciplines, which, in turn, involve all the domains of learning. It also provides an opportunity in higher education to examine the inter-relationship of artists, critics, art historians, and art educators. If DBAE is doomed, it can still serve an important function by opening the needed dialogue about the content of an education in art. With this aspect, in some degree, it is successful in the United States.

〈제2부 토론〉

**Ynhui Park**(Professor of Philosophy, Po-Hang Univ. of Science & Technology)

The papers presented by Professor Byun and Chung are impressive to say the least, and I don't think I have much to say about them directly. However, as for Professor Byun's paper, what I can say out of my twenty five years of teaching at American universities is that his presentation conforms with what I have observed. As for Professor Chung's paper, I am not an authority on the Fine Arts, so my comments will be limited. But I can say with confidence that in liberal arts colleges, historically, art and music is always a part of liberal arts education. Having said this, I want to say something in general terms about the issues pertaining to education in colleges, particularly, in regards to liberal arts education.

The main issue of liberal arts education is whether liberal arts education today, or humanities in particular, have been challenged in recent decades due to changes in society and changes in social need. The problem of liberal arts education has to deal with its status within the educational setting. The problems mentioned by Professor Byun are, for the most part, correct. Liberal arts education must deal with and consider the importance and values of education of humanities relative to the philosophy of particular universities. What is meant by this is, for example, how much time should engineer majors or physics majors spend in humanities classes given the importance of technical and professional knowledge? I am a firm proponent of the idea that students in these specialized fields must be better educated in the field of liberal arts.

Having said this, I want to ask the question whether the state of education of liberal arts in American universities is successful or satisfactory. My view is that, generally, the way humanities are taught is not structural or rigorous enough. A good example is the French model of liberal arts education. From my personal experience of studying in France, humanities in France is taught more structurally than the way it is taught in the US. But comparing the way humanities are taught in Korea, I would have to say that the US system is better.

Having said this, the purpose of liberal arts education is to cultivate or help students to develop their analytical abilities. The way to reach this is by formulating a systematical way in which humanities education receives greater importance within the context of the college curriculum. Liberal arts education has to do with responding to social demands

and adjusting to social demands. But I think that the function of liberal arts education is not just to meet the social demands, but to reform social demands. These are few points I wanted to make.

**Yun Jun Il**(Professor of Education, SNU)

As I understand and as explained by Dr. Devine, I know that higher education in the US is deeply affected by environmental changes. He explained that the advent of land grant colleges, GI Bill, and the launching of the Sputnik was all the results of crisis which led directly to education reform. Now delving into the papers, Dr. Byun describes professionalism in liberal arts. When Dr. Byun introduced four new approaches in liberal arts education, for example, departmental majors, interdisciplinary majors, standard majors, and standard design majors, three out of the four are considered to have professional focus, with the exception of departmental majors.

The transition in the US colleges and universities is similar to the Korean situation, and in particular, Seoul National University. We have developed a long term developmental plan to meet the demands of the future. As far as I know, SNU has introduced interdisciplinary majors in music, fine arts, and home economics. As it stands now, there is a lot of cooperative programs between departments. For example, in my department, we design specific programs for our graduate students. The graduate students can select their own course, and most of the times, they select what they want to learn. The main problem with this approach is that students select easy courses rather than intellectual or challenging courses. In this situation, it is up to the professor to guide the student. I think that in liberal arts education, we have to keep some rules. There should be core concepts or courses, and this kind of core courses should always be kept in the department. The goal of liberal arts is to prepare students for the future. But past knowledge is much important than the future. Knowledge based on the past should be emphasized because liberal arts education is a continuum based on the past.

**Michael Devine**(Fulbright Professor)

Most of the papers presented in this section present an excellent overview of the present situation in American colleges and universities related to liberal arts education and

education in the fine arts. The liberal arts programs in American colleges and universities, as well as fine arts program is attempting to respond to and, react to an increasing tight job market. Presently, American college and universities are revising their curriculums and experimenting with new approaches.

In his paper, Professor Byun observes the point of view that William Bennet and others present that liberal arts should be the best of our common heritage. Bennet's problem, however, is determining just who selects what is the best for the American heritage. In a nation as diverse, both culturally and ethnically, as the US, by focusing in on as narrowly as Bennet does as to what constitutes the best of a culture in akin to the ancient classics of the Romans and Greeks. I think Bennet's view of what liberal education is not going to be accepted.

I think the trend of teaching Western Civilization to freshmen and sophomores will be replaced by something called World History. And I think this is a reaction to not only the growing globalization, but also due to the increasing awareness of cultures other than those of Western Europe and America.

I think both papers present a good summary of the current situations and present some interesting points for consideration. There are some areas I would like to see looked at little more carefully. There is a lot of change taking place on American colleges and universities in the liberal arts core curriculum. The biggest change that is taking place now is what Humanities courses should be required of Business Administration majors? I think this is where the changes are taking place, and is going to take place in the future. And the argument is maybe going to be just as fierce, if not more fierce in the decade ahead over the place of liberal arts courses on the university campus. To provide you with an example, let me cite the University of Wyoming, where I am a History professor. We are the only four year institution in Wyoming. Our provost has determined that the College of Business can now offer a course entitled "Free Enterprise" and that this course can substitute what has traditionally been offered in the History Department as the American History course. I am inclined to believe that the College of Business course in "Free Enterprise" will have much academic integrity as the nursery rhyme of Mother Goose.

Another observation, without sounding too down on the American business community, is that I do think that problems in the job market, as referred to by both speakers, have developed over the past thirty years. I have seen this myself because I began teaching undergraduates in the 60's. In 1968, when I began university teaching, liberal arts

teaching and the major was held in high regards compared to today. The college of business was held in lower regards, where now the college of business on most campus have the biggest building. I find in talking to students in recent years, certainly in the 80's and the 90's, increasingly they feel that what they need to survive is a degree in business administrations.

They need the business degree to get hired in a businesses because these businesses are looking for people who fit into the culture of the particular business enterprise. In this sense, I have been told that it is better to keep one's talents secret from the recruiters for fear that they will not get the job. The paradox is that I have spent many hours working with CEO's of major corporations. Since I work on the issue of development and fundraising, I research their backgrounds. Interestingly, great many of the CEO's hold liberal arts degrees. This is odd since companies, when recruiting, look for people who fit into their perceptive business mold, but the people who rise to the top are, ironically, those who do not fit that mold.

Another observation has to do with the influence of American cultural factors on higher education. In this sense, the American approach to higher education is much different than nations of the Far East, and Korea in particular. In the US, throughout our history, there has been a tradition of anti-intellectualism. This is something we see throughout our culture, and it states that learning something that is not practical is a waste of time and money. We see this in legislatures on the federal, state, and community levels where they are responsible for funding their own schools.

The other aspect of culture that is different is this belief in the importance of what is pragmatic. This fascination with pragmatism have structured many of our colleges and universities. The idea of knowledge for its own sake, especially in the arts and the humanities, has some kind of benefit has never been a view that has been widely accepted in the US. To illustrate this point, I would like to mention three significant events in our history. The first was is 1862, with the creation of land grant colleges. This took place midst a national crisis, the Civil War, and it took place because the party of Abraham Lincoln dominated the legislature, and was able to pass through very enlightened piece of legislation to create these colleges and universities which would admit both sexes and all race. This would not have been possible if it had not been for the Civil War because the Southern Democrats would have voted against it. The second important event was the the GI Bill and the end of World War Two. World War Two was a tremendous boost for

American education. The last significant event was the National Defense Education Act of the late 1950's, which helped catapult American universities to the very top of universities for research and education throughout the world. This event only took place because of the Russians and their launching of the Sputnik satellite. The nation was suddenly terrified that the Russian's were getting ahead of us and, therefore, we were out to put some money in our education system to produce better scientists and technologists. Now with the end of the Cold War, American higher education is facing a very tough time once again and forces of pragmatism and anti-intellectualism have gained an upper hand, at least until we have another crisis.

I would like to conclude by saying that as we look at the American higher education in the liberal arts and fine arts, I think we need to look at why historically the US institutions have developed the way they have, and need to look carefully at current American higher education reassessment. Thank you.