

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Dissertations and Theses

City College of New York

2014

Atomic Education: The Cold War Effect on College Studentsâ€™ Education

Jonathan Smith
CUNY City College

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cc_etds_theses/233

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Atomic Education: The Cold War Effect on College Students' Education

By: Jonathan Smith
Thesis Advisor: Professor Mikhal Dekel
May 7th, 2012

“Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Arts of the City College of the City University of New York.”

1) Introduction

The Cold War is as an event in history that had wide reaching ramifications on society in the United States of America. Home life and gender roles took on new a meaning, which is explained in great detail by Elaine Tyler May, in her work Homeward Bound: American Families In The Cold War Era. Mass media was greatly changed, according to James Schwoch, in his work Global TV: New Media and the Cold War, 1946-69. Most aspects of daily life had been affected in some way by the Cold War, and academia was not excluded. Through an injection of large sums of money from outside sources—for research and the funding of special departments—(Lewontin 1) universities as a whole, as well as on a departmental level, took on the task of helping their donors rather than their students. Curriculum was revised and limited (Chomsky 171), and departments focused their talents on either only talking about the Cold War or disregarding it completely (The Cold War & The University; 73, 107,147, 195). The United States government and private foundations were funding research and professors in hopes of creating the information needed to win the Cold War, as well as the graduates that will do what is necessary to win. In essence certain universities became training and research facilities to help win the Cold War.

This paper will first discuss what the Cold War did to threaten national security and American culture, because this is the cause for the initial changes to universities. The United States government and private donors utilized a multiplicity of tactics to try and win the Cold War, and academia was by no means safe. Once I show why the Cold War

was a factor of change I will begin to show how it changed universities. I will start with the general shift—I am referring to the restriction of left-wing professors and speakers, communist witch-hunts, and a slew of other changes that encompassed whole universities—which allows for a better understanding of how and why specific departments changed.

Many departments were altered, but to talk in depth about each would require more than a single book. They changed in ways to help further the agenda of the national government and private donors. To try and exemplify the changes in all I choose to highlight two departments that were especially tied the Cold War effort: I will look at political science and economic departments. This will show that universities became training grounds where young adults learned different ways to serve national interest. Unfortunately some students ended up hurting people rather than helping.

In order to help better understand how the Cold War affected students negatively I will examine two extreme examples of what potential damages can arise from rearing students in a Cold War university. For the section I will look at the Chicago School of Economics—starting in the 1950s and going through the late 80s—and how they created what was later named the Chicago Boys. Naomi Klein accounts for this in her book The Shock Doctrine. What is learned is that the Chicago school trained South American students to implement laissez-faire economies in the respective home country. I will connect that with Graham Greene’s novel, The Quiet American—a fictional account of a young adult acting on the lessons he learned at Harvard in the late 40s. Fearing that if East Asia becomes communist the rest of the world will shortly follow, Alden Pyle goes to Vietnam and supplies materials for bomb construction to men who use them on native

citizens. Through these examples I will show that the students did not necessarily want the outcomes they were involved in, but that they were coerced through education to think they were doing something good. Graduates' intentions seem pure, but actions do not match up; evidence strongly suggests this is due to their education at United States universities during the Cold War.

I will examine how the new university climate helped to develop identities for their students, but my ultimate goal is to defend students who acted in reprehensible way as a result of their education. I do not mean to excuse their actions, but instead I want the reader to feel sympathy and disgust rather than simply disgust. That sympathy, I hope, will make the reader feel a need for greater justice than just the execution or jailing of young adults. I cannot excuse nor ignore the players and institutions that devised and implemented the education Alden Pyle and other used as their basis acting.

2) Cold War Culture: Living Under the Bomb

World War II ended leaving great conflicts between two super powers, which led to the fear of nuclear attacks on United States soil. This is evident in the United States and the Soviet Union's commitment to "rapid development of massive stockpiles of weapons, which they could exterminate each other" with (Montgomery xv). The United States and Soviet Union were drastically opposed in ideology of governance, and this difference was strong enough to make both think that only one of the two could exist in the world. The United States National Security Council Report 68: United States Objectives and Programs for National Security (NSC-68), lays out the problems between

the Soviet Union and the United States, which basically states that the two forms of structuring states cannot coexist. NCS-68 states that:

The complete subversion or forcible destruction of the machinery of government and structure of society in the countries of the non-Soviet world will be replaced by an apparatus and structure subservient to and controlled from the Kremlin. To that end Soviet efforts are now directed toward the domination of the Eurasian land mass. The United States, as the principal center of power in the non-Soviet world and the bulwark of opposition to Soviet expansion, is the principal enemy whose integrity and vitality must be subverted or destroyed by one means or another if the Kremlin is to achieve its fundamental design. NCS-68

This statement lets U.S. officials know that some people want to see an end to the U.S. American way of life. Citizens could not hide from the fact that their end might come with the flash of an atomic bomb landing on American soil, and this created a fear and anxiety in society, because at any moment life could be over.

2.1) Surviving Under the Fear of a Bomb

The looming potential of the A-bomb sparked a reaction in people, and the U.S. government and corporations felt a certain responsibility to fix the problem. The United States government and private donors began devising ways to ensure a victory for the United States and the global market, which resulted in a multiplicity of tactics. Plans of a victory over the U.S.S.R were dreamt up in hopes of preserving democracy both at home and abroad. According to NCS-68 if actions were not taken, and the world was left to develop without intervention, then communism will penetrate United States borders. The direct result of the collapse of democracy is a loss of individual freedom, so something had to be done in order to prevent it. NSC-68 continues on to give three objectives to accomplish, so that the above never happens.

1. Thus we must make ourselves strong, both in the way in which we affirm our values in the conduct of our national life, and in the development of our military and economic strength.
2. We must lead in building a successfully functioning political and economic system in the free world. It is only by practical affirmation, abroad as well as at home, of our essential values, that we can preserve our own integrity, in which lies the real frustration of the Kremlin design.
3. But beyond thus affirming our values our policy and actions must be such as to foster a fundamental change in the nature of the Soviet system, a change toward which the frustration of the design is the first and perhaps the most important step. Clearly it will not only be less costly but more effective if this change occurs to a maximum extent as a result of internal forces in Soviet society. NCS-68

Acting on these three objectives would help to defeat the Kremlin, but it would take the nation as a whole to achieve this goal. This plan of action found its way into United States universities, and it affected students who had dreams of changing the world. There was an unprecedented surge in focus on all components of higher-education. Certain public and private institutions acted in hopes of preserving the United States-American way of life from communism.

2.2) Children and the Bomb

Children growing up in the 1940s and after were introduced to a world that was filled with war and nuclear proliferation. As World War II came to an end the youth of the nation are made aware of the atom bombs capability and the rise communists who threaten to disrupt the very freedoms they enjoy everyday. Adolescents are introduced to potential threats and ways to protect themselves and their nation. This is done by adults across the nation, who actions are designed to inform and protect their young from the dangers of the modern world. Through education in many forms, including at school and

through cartoons on television, the youth of the nation developed identities based on the A-Bomb and the threats of the Cold War. Under these conditions one cannot say that the youth of the nation was not extremely informed of current world events.

Not being able to hide away from the fact that at any moment their lives could be over, children were forced to contemplate defense tactics, such as what to do when a nuclear bomb strikes. A cartoon character was created to help educate the young in an entertaining way. Burt the Turtle was the cartoon spokes person for the phrase “duck and cover,” and the concept was developed to in order to create a false sense of security for children. Burt advises that when an atomic bomb hits a person can seek shelter “under desks,” in “gutters,” or in “doorways” (Burt the Turtle). Knowing that a bomb could come at any moment, with or without warning, pushed some students to try and create a different world. An adolescent could not hide from the threats of their world. They did not live in ignorant bliss, and instead they contemplated war, peace and death from an early age. When those kids grew up, and they left for college and university, many had hoped to further study current issues of war—both cold and atomic. It seems they had big aspirations for themselves and the world through their college education, but instead of finding a campus open to all knowledge, they were faced with biased and limited materials. Unknown to those students was the fact that they were entering Cold War colleges. There the students would have to adapt, not visa versa.

2.3) Military Presence on Campus Prior Cold War

Before getting to the section on Cold War Universities I want to briefly mention that private and public funding to universities is nothing new. If one looks to find government agencies or private donors of some fashion, on United State university campuses prior World War II and the Cold War, one can easily do so. Both examples of physical presence and ideology can be spotted on college campuses before the shift brought on by World War II.

In the 1600s, 1700s, and 1800s, private donors funded the creation and maintenance of institutions, and usually those donors expected the university to be run in a specific way. Many early institutions were closely tied with various sects of religion, like protestant Harvard, and this is largely due to donors influence in the creation of a school. If you go back to the late 1600s and early 1700s one can see that almost all higher education institutions in the nation were tied to a religious education.

The clearest example of a pre Cold War government body on campus—one that seeks to educate students for their end goals rather than the students—is R.O.T.C (Reserve Officers' Training Corps), which was first established in 1862. This program was first designed to ultimately train future officers for later placement in all the branches of the United States military. On the other hand the United States also affected students by giving grants to schools—this will be gone over in more detail in the following section on public-money in universities. Prior World War II money usually did not go to military and national defense projects, but rather was almost exclusively tied to agriculture and expansion.

It is clear that before World War I the government of United States of America, as well as private donors, had interest in universities and a students' education; however, the

amount of colluding between university and outside sources is minimal in comparison to the shift taken as a result of the Cold war. Outside influences focused attention on universities and students in a more encompassing way. They had hoped to effect the creation of students' identities. What will be discussed in the pages that follow are the reasons why universities changed—as a result of the Cold War—how they changed, and what this ultimately did to students who tried to and did graduate.

3) The Cold War University

Despite the presence of private and public institutions on college campuses, prior the Cold War, what happens as a result of tension between two superpowers resulted in an unprecedented amount of attention and control over universities from outside sources. More money was being spent than ever before. More rules and regulations were being set into place in order to comply with national agendas. More and more monitoring of potential threats to national security made its way onto campuses. It seems that all this attention is directed at securing a specific structure that will eventually win the Cold War: of course in terms decided on by the outside influences, and not the university community or students.

3.1) The Rise of McCarthyism

The United States government came onto campuses for recruiting purposes, but

they also penetrated universities to stunt the spread on communism on American soil. This is most evident in the communist witch-hunts help throughout the 1950s, led by Joseph McCarthy, a former Republican Senator from Wisconsin. In essence he set out to remove all left leaning professors and administrators from Universities, while also stiffening all students' positive interactions with communism. The professors who were attacked and removed from their positions would have been the voices speaking out against military research facilities on campus, and the students, who were not allowed to organize with the intent of discussing communism, would have been the ones most likely to organize against research facilities. The former Senator implemented strategies against the freedoms of students, professors and administrators, and either someone would have to play along or else be removed. Former Senator McCarthy's actions helped to reshape how universities work and what students could or could not do and get out of them. It is clear that academic freedom has been compromised. An individual, who spoke out against the government or democracy, on a College campus, would always do so with the fear of being fired, expelled, and potentially even jailed.

3.2) Examples of McCarthyism Affecting Students Directly

As mentioned earlier, students under the thumb of McCarthyism were not allowed to congregate or organize over matters that contradicted the efforts of the United States' promotion of democracy and capitalism. The fear was that students would be able to organize in such large numbers that they would be able to make some communist revolution on campus—be it violent or non-violent. Those who promoted and

implemented McCarthyism across the country were aware of the fact the many schools had a student body that was politically active, and this is why they began to dismantle national student organizations. The students who were political “threw themselves into a flurry of causes: civil rights, peace, and above all, the presidential campaign of Henry Wallace” (Schrecker 85). Although not stated in Schrecker’s text, it is rather clear that the United States government, along with certain private donors, is cautious of students who get behind a cause that is counter to their causes. Despite an absence of many students involved in politics, actions were still taken to silence them.

Some universities had larger groups than others, but it was nothing compared to the mass population of universities. “It would be a mistake to exaggerate the amount of left-wing political activity during this period” (Schrecker 86). Ellen W. Schrecker is making this claim, because of the number of student membership she had discovered. “One Cornell unit in the late forties contained about two dozen people; one unit at Michigan had about fifteen. At Harvard, the small core of student Communists could mobilize almost a hundred sympathizers for rallies, demonstrations, speakers, and petitions” (Schrecker 85). As one can see, there really were not many students with memberships to Communist organization, but the actions taken by the government, and in turn the universities, shows that no matter how small the facet, all communist activity must be identified and destroyed. This fear that even a small group of people discussing Communism for the United States, while residing in the United State, can be the downfall of American Democracy as we know it, is taken directly from NCS-68. It states:

The fundamental design of those who control the Soviet Union and the international communist movement is to retain and solidify their absolute power... The design calls for the complete subversion or forcible destruction of the machinery of government and structure of society in the countries of the non-Soviet world and their replacement by an

apparatus and structure subservient to and controlled from the Kremlin... The United States, as the principal center of power in the non-Soviet world and the bulwark of opposition to Soviet expansion, is the principal enemy whose integrity and vitality must be subverted or destroyed by one means or another if the Kremlin is to achieve its fundamental design. NCS-68

According to this statement there is a group of people, living across the world, which think that the only way to maintain their way of life is to ensure no other contradicting form exists anywhere else. The United States of America is not the only target of the Kremlin, for the Soviets focused their efforts “toward the domination of the Eurasian land mass” as well (NCS-68). The United States, as the only real super power able to stand up to the Soviets, was the biggest threat to a communistic utopia. If the United States does not destroy all forms of Communism where it finds it then it seems those facets will grow and eventually be the demise of a Democratic United States of America.

This fear brought about the removal of many student organizations from college campuses. “The first target on most campuses was the American Youth for Democracy (AYD), a group whose affiliation with the Communist Party was no secret” (Schrecker 86). New chapters were not allowed to apply for charter, where at the same time already established charters were being revoked. The AYD was also put on the “Attorney General’s list of subversive organizations” (Schrecker 86). The attack on AYD, which latter focused its efforts against other student groups, such as Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), was a means to steer college students away from creating a self-identity that embodied Communistic ideals. The efforts of the government and the universities are wide reaching, touching almost every university in the nation. Regardless of what the students wanted, the option of joining a Communist counter culture was out of the question.

More so than just blocking the organization of students, universities and the United States government also wanted to stop the promotion of Communism. This manifested itself in many ways, including limitations on publications, the compiling of lists of Communist leaning students, and many more. “In 1947 the dean of students,” at Harvard “refused to let AYD put out its magazine, *The New Student*” (Schrecker 87). The claim he made was that “the format was too polished for undergraduates” (Schrecker 86). There are more examples of student publications being stopped, including Philip Roth’s own experience with censorship at Bucknell University.

When Philip Roth writes, as himself for his college’s student-run paper, he is cautious of what he is writing. There are consequences if Roth writes something the university deems is inflammatory. He does not fear recourse from his the student body, but instead from the powers at-be. “I would have assumed that it would violate the policy of the university Board of Publications” (Facts 64). When he resolves to break the rules and express his thoughts freely, his editor, the Board of Publications Censure, and the dean of men reprimand him. As a result of his actions he was not allowed to publish anymore at the university. The University did not want Roth or others students to speak out against their actions, so measures like this seemingly had to have been taken. Watching and repressing the voice of students was only one-way universities controlled students.

Students were not only censored, but also monitored. If a university had not completely eradicated it’s AYD or SDS than it wanted detailed lists of all its members. Radcliff College would only recognize an AYD chapter if they “submitted a membership list” (Schrecker 87). The claim was made that the list purposes was to keep track of

“students in academic trouble,” but considering the climate of the nation and university that becomes hard to believe. The AYD chapter at Radcliff College chose to disband instead of compiling a list, but not all schools chose death over conformity. “In the spring of 1947 an informal survey by the SDS revealed that many of the nation’s most liberal institutions were using membership lists to control the student left” (Schrecker 88). Under these conditions universities would know exactly who has Communistic thoughts and affiliations. These lists we recommended for dissemination to parents, fellow students, and faculty members, and as a result of this publication there are reports that “students have sometimes experienced difficulty in securing employment” (Schrecker 88). In fear of being ostracized, belittled—by peers, family, and faculty—and permanently blacklisted from the work force, students turned away from groups like AYD and SDS. This is exactly what the United States Government wanted.

3.3) Examples of McCarthyism Indirectly Affecting Students

McCarthyism attacked students’ ability to speak out for what they wanted. The ability to organize and publish materials was limited, if at all allowed, but these are both things that prevent students from helping themselves. As another means of creating students who do not sympathize or want Communism for the United States—or anywhere else in the world—universities limited outside help for students. Professors and administrators were no longer allowed to be left leaning, and also no left wing guest speakers were invited to campus—unless there was another speaker who would do nothing but try and refute the liberal speaker’s speech. If a student can not stand alone or with

peers, than the most logical thing for students to do is to ask for help in achieving their goals, and that is why the government and universities took actions to stifle that help.

One of the biggest potential helpers of students is their professor, but if professors are not free to cater to the desires of their students, then it seems they can be more of a detrimental figure than a beneficial one. The blocking of left leaning instructors affected students in two ways. One way is that students, who are unaware of Communism, and what are the issues between Communism and Democracy, are not given a fair representation, both through lecture and course work at the university. Due to the fact that Communist and Liberal educators were being removed from their positions for teaching Liberalism and Communism, course content did not accurately reflect the issues of the world in a fair and unbiased manor—if it even discussed it at all. The other way that this structure affected students is their lack of an option to bring up question of Communism in class. Any teacher who would give them an answer different than that of right leaning teachers would receive punishment, removal, and possible jail time.

The lack of freedom educators posed did not allow them to teach freely. Looming over them was the fear that at any moment some information they disseminate to their students could be misconstrued as Communistic, and as a result they potentially could be reported to the college authority figures. This made professors cautious or unemployed, while leaving students ignorant to various other forms of daily life and the structuring of society—most obviously in regards to Communism. In the early fifties “there was considerable pressure to rid the nation’s colleges and universities of politically undesirable teachers. The focus here was on individuals, on the supposedly subversive professors whose affiliation with the Communist Party disqualified them from academic

life” (Schrecker 93). In this climate both a student and professor suffer, and this is due to that fact that the nation already thinks it knows how to win the Cold War.

The prevention of left-wing speeches, delivered by liberal guest speakers, was enacted, so that students who believe in Communism could not hear words that strengthen their beliefs, while also keeping students who do not know about Communism in the dark. In essence the number of Communist leaning students would dwindle, while the influx of new Communists would remain stagnate. “During the late forties and early fifties college restriction against outside speakers intensified. Schools whose outside speaker policies had previously been liberal began to tighten” (Schrecker 89). Ellen Schrecker gives examples of Harvard, The New York City Municipal College, Columbia, and New York University. A former dean at Harvard wrote that if a German Communist, by the name of Gerhart Eisler, were allowed to speak again than “Harvard Students can be corrupted,” and if that is the case than “Harvard College had better shut down as an educational institution” (Schrecker 89). As you can imagine, Gerhart Eisler was not invited back to Harvard, and in fact the school went one step further by continuing to ban all speaker—not only Communists—whose speeches do not correlate with that of the nation.

The disallowance of certain materials and professors, coupled with restrictions put on students, helped to create the atmosphere of the Cold War College. What is discussed above is designed to give basic insight as to how outside influences and universities created an atmosphere that would strengthen student’s democratic ideals regardless of what a student wants. The reason discussing McCarthyism is important, is because it lays the foundation that students had little to no options or recourse on a Cold War Campus.

What I mean to say is that they could not assert their wants, and instead were subjected to almost a predetermined education. The materials given to students are singular, because left leaning professors were either non-existent or silenced; while at the same time students could not organize, publish freely, or ask for help. Lessons learned in this environment had to the potential to create students who embrace and defend democracy, and in some cases it did.

4) Money

Money was one of the coercive chips that brought about wide sweeping changes to universities. R.C. Lewontin says, “the Cold War was responsible for an unprecedented and explosive expansion of the academy” (Lewontin 3). This can be applied to many general expansions, but in relation to the rest of his work, The Cold war and the Transformation of the Academy he is referring to the federal funding of institutions. What he does not mention is that most of the funds from the federal government went to fund math and science programs where as private foundations we responsible for funding the social sciences and humanities (Lowen 88). In Rebecca S. Lowen’s book Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford, she accounts for the divide between public and private funding. Public money was solely focused on winning the Cold War; where as private funds were divided between self and national interest. Private investors, such as the Rockefeller or Ford foundation, and public donors, including the armed forced and CIA, tried to influence research and teaching methods in order to win the Cold War. Private investors, such as the International Telephone & Telegraph (ITT),

considered their share holds first and foremost. These investors commandeered academic freedom.

4.1) Private Funding

Money that came into higher education institutions from private groups usually went to funding social science departments.

In the first fifteen years after World War II, private foundations provided substantial support for the social science research. The end of the 1940s marks not the end of the foundation support for the social sciences, but rather the beginning of the Ford Foundation's massive program of patronage of the social sciences, and specifically, of behavioral sciences...at many universities, foundations were the dominant source of support for the social sciences. Lowen 195

When Rebecca Lowen refers to social and behavioral science she is referring to psychoanalysis, political science, area studies, anthropology and many more. There are two reasons that private foundations invest their money into social science departments: the first is self-interest and the second is nation interest. The money foundations pumped into universities came with a catch. Grants issued and institutes constructed, with private foundations' capital, were guided in the direction foundations saw fit. This becomes clear when investigating the Rockefeller Foundations connection with Harvard's Russian Research Center, or International Telephone & Telegraph's involvement with the University of Chicago's economics department. Outside funding manifested in various ways. "Patrons who funded the programs and even established them in the first place favored certain approaches to the study of society and politics and thus favored certain scholars over others" (Lewontin 192). What was being researched and taught, in the

classroom of universities and departments that accepted money from private foundations, was limited and biased. If a student is only exposed to this form of education then they cannot know that they are being cheated. Those students were progressing the goals of industry and the federal government, and not their own.

Corporations became interested in the university, because ever since the great depression the United States has begun to turn its back on free-market economics. As the years progressed governments around the world, especially South America, began to make even greater steps away from free-market economics. “The Keynesian revolution against laissez-faire was costing the corporate sector dearly,” and according to the heads of many corporations something had to be done (Klein 68). They turned to a man named Milton Friedman—the former chair of the University of Chicago’s economics department who had radical ideas. He preached about a form of laissez-faire that was completely devoid of any static, and to corporations this was invaluable.

The enormous benefit of having corporate views funneled through academic, quasi-academic, institutions not only kept the Chicago School flush with donations but, in short order, spawned the global network of right-wing think tanks that would churn out the counterrevolution’s foot soldiers. Klein 68

Scared that the world was turning away from a global free-market, corporations did what they could to prevent it. Naomi Klein, in her work The Shock Doctrine, accounts for ITT and their connection to the University of Chicago and the 1973 Pinochet coup in Chile. ITT did what it did solely for money, but its goal of free markets is directly connected with the U.S government’s plan to win the Cold War.

Not all foundations and corporations were infiltrating universities with selfish intentions. Some private donor’s efforts were concerned with American culture and the

outcome of the Cold War. In essence they were funding social sciences departments, so that they would solve the problems of the Cold War. They wanted to promote the United States democratic way of life both at home and abroad, and they thought they would be able to accomplish their task by training students in their ideals. Rebecca Lowen makes this clear when referring the goals of the Ford foundation.

The Ford Foundation's funding program, laid out in the foundation's 1949 study report, was based in part on concerns that war might produce "dislocations and breakdowns" in societies around the world and might lead to the questioning of "basic political moral principles." Foundation officials believed that studies of human behavior and motivation would provide information useful for averting such questioning, for preventing social unrest, and helping individuals to adjust to change. Lewontin 196

The Ford foundation, as well as the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations, concerned themselves with the fate of the nation and the world, and rather than doing their own research, they entrusted universities to do it for them. They would provide money for research, buildings, and professors. Usually the material covered in the classroom was focused on the concerns of the foundation. "Administrators and some professors were explicitly describing research and trained students" (Lowen 68). The encompassing grasp of certain social science departments private groups had only comes close to the money the United States government pumped into institutions.

4.2) Public Funding

The other side of private funding is public. During the Cold War the United States government, through various branches, began to put unprecedented amounts of money into universities. Robert Lewontin's essay shows how federal money influenced almost

every faction of the university— including “research,” “administration, “Land grants,” and “faculty” (Lewontin 1) He claims:

The income to colleges and universities from research and development funds represents only part of their subsidy. Student grants and loan programs administered by the institutions, fellowship, work study programs, funds for construction and other forms of subsidy beyond grants and contracts for research and development account regularly for between 40 percent and 55 percent of total federal and private expenditures in institutions of higher learning. Lewontin, 26

It seems from this quote that funding was meant to encompass the whole university. The figures he gives after this quote attest to his statement. Between 1970 and 1990 the total “expenditure” in higher education rose from \$3.24 billion to \$15.21 billion. In most cases about half the money went to fund “purposes other than research and development” (Lewontin 26). In order to do what the government needed to do—fulfill the three objectives set forth in NCS-68—this sort of money had to be funneled into universities on a fully encompassing scale.

Prior World War II the amount of money given to schools, and the various areas it went to, were greatly smaller. In 1940 the “total federal funding for research and development” happened to be “\$74 million” (Lewontin 13), and none of that money was devoted to the administration side of a university. At this time the money was not needed, because the purpose of the government’s involvement in universities does not need to be all encompassing. “Before World War II state support of research in institutions of higher education was effectively confined to individual state funding of the land grant universities” (Lewontin 13). This quote means that each individual state was to determine how and why they funded universities, and this is because there is no general goal set forth by the federal government. At this point in history the government was mainly concerned with agricultural research, and federal funding supports this claim. The federal

government “integrated state agricultural experiment stations into the university systems” and “40 percent” of the \$74 million dollars in 1940 went to agricultural research (Lewontin 13). Professor Lewontin points out the distinctions between the purposes for funding so that a reader can see how money helped to bring about change to university he talks about how few schools received most of the funding.

What Lewontin does not go over in much detail is the close connection between public money and the hard sciences. Concerned with bombs, the space race, and other modern technologies, the US government funded departments and schools that could do their research. Scholars recognize no the “disproportionate emphasis on science and technology and the neglect of liberal arts” (Lewon 192).

Military support for research in electronics at MIT doubled almost overnight, leading the creation of the Lincoln Laboratory for research and development of air defense and early warning systems for the air force. The budget for the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at Caltech, the locus of the army’s work on guided missiles doubled to \$11 million between 1950 and 1953. Military support for research in electronics at Stanford trip led between 1950 and 1952. The Stanford Research Institute, which had been slow to embrace government sponsored research, changed its priorities with the Korean War, accepting a large electronics contract from the Navy. By the late 1950s military sponsored research in electronics account for 25% of the institute’s contract revenue, compared to a mere 4 percent in 1949. Lewontin 120

Materials they thought they needed most were produced by the hard sciences, and as such funding was allocated in a specific way. The nation would be able to build better rockets that power bombs and spaceships than the Russians. The intention of the United States government was to produce technologies in order to win the Cold War.

4.3) Picking a University

A lot of money made its way into universities from various sources, but it did not make it to all. By no means did the federal government or private investors disseminate money and support to all universities equally. Ten universities accounted for 28 percent of all federal obligation for research and development in 1968, and “fifty universities received 68 percent of the money” (Lewontin 24). R.C Lewontin does not explicitly state why certain institutions remained in the top twenty slots, but it seems like there is a reason why the top twenty remained in place for fifteen years. On the list are schools like Harvard, Cornell, Yale, M.I.T, Berkley and the University of Chicago. Out of the top twenty schools I will be focusing on three: Chicago, Berkley, and Harvard. Noam Chomsky, in his piece The Cold War and the University, talks about changes at Penn State and other schools mentioned on the list of top twenty. Is it coincidental that a good portion of the schools, which had the most money directed at them, had been ivy leagues institutions? In both fiction and non-fictions, students who went to these schools during the Cold War later were being connected to murders and government overthrows. For the sake of an investor, who would like to see as much return as possible on their investment, it is safer to put money into smart students at established institutions.

4.4) The Hunt for Students

Outside interests made its way onto university campuses, which affected the fundamental purposes of many universities. In essence, certain institutions and departments became the training and recruiting ground for Cold War soldiers. The turning of certain universities came in obvious and subtle ways; like the recruiting for

work overseas, and the training of students in various departments. The CIA and State Department are major players in the practice of recruiting of college students on college campuses (Witanek 1989). A small scene, in William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick's novel "The Ugly American," depicts what a recruiting forum, led by government officials, looked like. The purpose of the forum is to fix the "shortage of trained people to work abroad", but the fact that it is held at a University suggests that students are the main targets (Lederer 77).

The forum in "The Ugly American" is heavily promoted to people both inside and outside a university. "Government offices, universities halls, Civil Service offices, boarding houses, and the cheap dormitories in which so many "government girls lived," displayed nearly 1500 flyers that in a bold print read "Employment Opportunities Abroad" (Lederer 77). The purpose of the event was to inform citizens about the work the government needed to have done overseas. Through two methods—both patriotism and rewards—government men persuaded citizens to put their current goals aside in order to help the government. The forum gives a reader a good overview of how the state viewed students and others who could potentially help them.

The first of two speakers—someone who looked "like traveling salesman" and was considered a "big man on campus"—started by informing his listeners that there comes in a time in history when the individual must be ready to do more than his/her everyday actions (Lederer 78). He goes on to say that "in times of such momentous crises, when our country faces challenges unlike any she has ever faced, we must also realize that we have duties as citizens" (Lederer 78). The listeners were being told the goals of career, friendship, and family should be put aside for the survival of those goals in the

future. As citizens of the United States—and the world—they are supposed to handle the problems facing the modern world. According to the United States government “we are beset by an evil world-wide conspiracy. We need our best people abroad to help contain this clever and malignant conspiracy” (Lederer 78). Basically the authors are replacing the word communism with conspiracy. The forum is all about telling citizens that they must act, while also giving them an outlet. Unfortunately, for the sake of the students, outside sources did not always make themselves known, and as such students were tricked into researching and enacting the will of investors.

5) Political Science

Certain academic theories became weapons in the United State’s arsenal to be used against the Soviets and communism. Social science expanded its realm of concern while narrowing its objectives in order to supply materials to the state. At the helm of this change were political scientists, who felt the duty to fill the role of guardian. Driven by fears and goals, political science sought to answer questions about preserving the United States’ way of life. In order to defend the nation from foreign attacks, some truly believed the field had to have turned their interests to be more in-line with the national agenda. The government tried to preserve liberal democracy with work produced by political scientists. New ideology was specifically designed to satisfy the objectives set out in NCS-68: these new thoughts ranged from a restructuring of the U.S citizen’s relationship with the federal government, to how Asia can be saved from turning communist. Political

science changed in order to win the Cold War, but in many cases the governments' agenda was more important than the students'.

5.1) The Way Things Were

In order to see how political scientist changed during the Cold War one must be able to distinguish between what it was and what it became. American political scientists had greatly altered the fundamental purpose of their field as World War II concluded. Founded in “the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries,” political sciences began with “questions of methodology and practice”(Katznelson 237, 256). How states and cities operated dominated the field of study, where as thoughts of how to preserve democracy were nonexistent. The relationship between citizen and government—on the local, state, and federal level—was being discussed amongst scholars and students. Writers like Arthur F. Bentley, who wrote The Process of Government: A Study of Social Pressures, and John Dewey, the author of The Public and its Problems are perfect examples of pre-war political scientists. Both these works are concerned with the role of government in America and how it affects the people of the nation. Portions of these works are on the responsibilities democracy has to educate its youth at home, with little to no mention of problems abroad. In this time a scholar's concern with the way in which government operates largely neglected the world outside their borders, and as such it limited the dialogue of America's role as a member of a global community. Isolationist thinking could not sustain itself through two World Wars, and so the field drastically changed to make up for the flaws of traditional political scientists.

5.2) What Changed: Liberal Guardianship

There is one reason political science changed, but this change manifested itself in various ways—this will be gone over in greater detail in the following paragraphs. Simply put it changed to meet the challenges of the world at the time. Scholars began to see political science in the role of “liberal guardianship” (Katznelson 233), and as such needed to address the issues of the modern world. The traditional isolationist focus was changed into multidisciplinary courses on issues and policies in far away lands. “Prewar political science restricted the discipline’s ability to advance and protect liberal democracy against the challenges of other regime types” (Katznelson 240), and it also failed to provide “information about far-flung parts of the globe” (Katznelson 236). As World War II concluded, American political scientists were at an epoch that required them to look abroad in order to ensure peace and prosperity for people of the United States.

The Cold War ushered in a perpetual state of fear that communism would corrupt the United States’ free and democratic way of life, and that at any moment a nuclear bomb could drop from the sky. Theorist and scholars were forced to acknowledge an interconnectivity of the world. The spectrum of analysis, from previous generations of political scientists, was widening as the Cold War progressed. With this understanding of the change in political science, the new approach can be likened to a defense mechanism against the Soviets and communism—but at times it was an aggressive defense.

They began to ask how to ensure democracy abroad in order to maintain their own democratic way of life at home. Their revised version of “political science would identify and deploy the mechanisms that makes effective, stable liberal democracy work as an appealing model geared to compete with its totalitarian adversaries” (Katznelson 247). This would lead communist leaning nations back to democracy. Research and curriculum was crafted to “assume the mantle of guardian of the liberal regime” (Katznelson 243), but what was produced did not always led to peaceful actions; sometimes it leads to war—including the Korean and Vietnam War. Both wars were waged in the name of preserving democracy. Non-violent and violent actions were taken in the name of democracy, and to help secure that goal became the chief concern of political scientists.

5.3) The Creation of the Power Elite

As the United States looked to preserve democracy abroad it also sought to do the same at home. In order to secure Democracy, political scientists reevaluated the power between the people and their government. Their idea of how much power citizen should have over their government can be boiled down to a term coined by C. Wright Mills: The Power Elite. This concept assumes that “rule by the people, moreover, is dangerous, because there is massive evidence against the rational capacity of the masses” (Katznelson 244). Because of this assumption there is a special role in society for elite figures who create and disseminate popular opinion to the masses. These elites would funnel into different professions, such as scholars, politicians, and researchers. Despite different professions, the future power elites were all at some point students being

introduced to the concept that it is their duty, as future elites, to direct society in ways that would preserve liberal democracy.

Other theorist closely lined with Mills went as far as saying “the role of the people be limited to the act of selecting a government every four of five years. Then they should get out of the way to let informed elites rule” (Katznelson 244). Elected officials would be referring to government-sponsored research, which was largely produced in affiliation with universities, when making decisions about national interest. These players, knowing more about the current political climate than the average citizen, would “enmesh the population in institutions and ideas” (Katznelson 243).

An important function of political science was to contemplate how to manage mass opinion that could harm a stable liberal democracy. This could be done through “institutions and ideas.” Under the notion that the masses are dangerous if left to their own devises, political scientists justified their actions of limiting the role of citizen in order to preserve liberal democracy.

The critical element for the health of a democratic order consists in the beliefs, standards and competence of those who compose the influential's, the opinion-leaders, the political activists...The responsibility rest here, not in the mass of the people. Katznelson 244

These authors are attempting to create the foundation for a class of people who would disseminate images of democracy, despite what the mass population actually wanted. Those images would be pro-democratic, and would try and lead the individual away from any “anti-liberal forms of political mobilization” (Katznelson 247). It would do so by narrowing the discussions had in the political sphere. The very theories they developed in their attempts to “secure a vibrant nontotalitarian politics” pushed subjects—such as C.

Wright Mills' "spirited analysis of the role of the armed forces in American Life"—"into a zone of silence" (Katznelson 252).

This "zone of silence" that Ira Katznelson is referring to is similar to a fortress. It also is very much like the closed off department of economics at the University of Chicago when the Chicago Boys attended (The Chicago Boy are discussed in much greater detail starting on page 55). Certain "key subjects" were not debated to ensure a "mass opinion" that would aid in the survival of liberal democracy (Katznelson 525). The theories—ones devised by the thinkers discussed by Ira Katznelson in his work the Subtle Politics of Developing Emergency—tried to satisfy their goals at the expense of open debate and research. In order to satisfy some of the goals set out in NCS-68 mass opinion would have to be very much pro liberal democracy. Under this condition it is not far fetched to suggest that while the thinkers Ira Katznelson refers too are writing about what takes place on American soil, other are doing the same, but instead with a gaze on the world outside U.S borders.

In fact the political scientists Ira Katznelson discusses mostly neglected the outside world and to a large extent "had nothing to say about the national security state" (Katznelson 255). Instead David B. Truman, Robert A. Dahl, and Thomas Kuhn tackled issues such as the power relationship between citizen and government and civil rights. They are more concerned with a citizen's acceptance of liberal democracy as the best way of structuring life. By affecting mass opinion these scholars thought they would be able to persevere the current American way of life.

Although Ira Katznelson is most concerned with scholars who do not take on problems in China or Russia, he gives background material, which allows the reader to

understand why certain scholars—ones who write about foreign lands—write and teach from a position of the power elite. Just as much as Dahl, Kuhn, and Truman want to shape mass opinion, so do scholars who look abroad.

5.4) Harvard and its Russian Research Center

I need to take the time to briefly discuss Harvard's affiliation with various government agencies and their centers for foreign studies. This is necessary for two reasons: the first to show that a reader can understand how a specific institute was effected by the government and the surrounding world; and the second is to provide background material for the novel The Quiet American. The novel, by Graham Green, shows the actions of a young adult educated at Harvard. Although not explicitly mentioned, Alden Pyle is more than likely a graduate of their political science department, although it could be an offshoot like area studies. Understanding Harvard's close ties with the government serve as supplementary information for a reader's understanding of how Alden Pyle, a Harvard graduate, can do what he does. The actions he takes, which are discussed at length below, are idealistic and based on the notion set forth in NSC-68: communism seeks to destroy democracy around the globe. Although Harvard claimed to be an institution of academic freedom there seems to be strong evidence suggesting it was not. Sigmund Diamond put it rather bluntly when saying, "Harvard University authorities were desirous of cooperating with the Bureau, and while the Bureau's interests and those of the university were identical" (Diamond 40).

The United States government funded a committee to monitor and stop un-American activity. One task for this committee was to watch who and what was taught at university. The most idyllic figure of this time was senator Joseph McCarthy, and according to him universities should not let communists teach communist material. When reading about this era one can find reports on firings, curriculum changes, research restrictions, and trials. Those chasing un-Americans in the university would make it much simpler to sustain liberal democracy on an academic level. Marvin Bressler said:

University administrations—and faculty luminaries routinely cooperated with the CIA, FBI federal and state legislative committees, foundations, and donors in the struggle against international communism and domestic subversion. Bressler 854

Those who ran universities acted in accordance with national interest. By universities favoring their partnership with governmental institutions more so than their relationship with students, the power balance between university and students shifted back in favor of the university. Just like when traditional universities limited curriculum and who taught in order to secure a specific version of a moral education, Cold War universities did the same to ensure a democratic education. Students could not design their own form of governments to unleash upon the world after graduation. What I mean to say is that students were not free to contemplate the surrounding world and come up with new solutions for peace. Marvin Bressler talks about many schools without mentioning Harvard, but it cannot be excluded from this group.

Harvard had set up small institutions that were more closely tied with securing the national agenda abroad. One of the largest and most influential of the centers was the Harvard Russian Research Center (HRRC). This center was designed to provide more than the “little information available on the Soviet Union” (Oppenheimer). One way in

which the Center fulfilled this duty is by going to “Germany to identify and interview Soviet emigres resident in West Germany who could provide information on the USSR” (Oppenheimer). The agents working for the HRRC went to obtain information, while also bringing home contacts to teach at their school. They would “recruit the most important of these "sources" that would be brought to the United States and given jobs at Harvard or other American academic institutions” (Oppenheimer). This information, though at times broad, was supposedly needed in order to defend the United States. Martin Oppenheimer, in his work Footnote to the Cold War: The Harvard Russian Research Center, gives evidence that suggests the actions of the HRRC were not done in a pure or free academic way.

Harvard was thought to be a good location for organizing and retrieving information about communist lands soviet interests. This is because of their deep ties with the United States government (Oppenheimer). A research and educational center set up and financed by the government and other private parties can, and in this case did, compromise the very essence of the scholarly work produced. Investors maintained a close contact with role the center’s activities. For the HRRC in the 50s the largest contributor was the Carnegie Corporation. The C.C. was “founded in 1911,” and “its primary focus on education allowed it to play a major, role in helping to define and carry out aspects of U.S. foreign policy” (Oppenheimer). In the early 50s this group help find a home for a Russian Research Center, and upon finding a home they continued to show support in both finances and ideology.

This support was big enough to keep the research and structure of the center in-line with national interest. It seems that Harvard only functioned as a party to give research produced at the HRRC validity. Martin Oppenheimer says:

Carnegie, not Harvard, determined overall research priorities, and even named the personnel who would operate the HRRC. Carnegie vetted the center's scholars who then pursued a research agenda largely funded and determined by government intelligence agencies, utilizing sources, the access to which was also provided by intelligence agencies. The core objective of the research, as determined by the U.S. Air Force, which provided principal funding, was to study the Soviet Union's various populations as potential bombing targets based on analyses of the psychological vulnerability of those populations, an approach derived from surveys of German and Japanese populations after the Second World War? Oppenheimer

Under these conditions one cannot say that Harvard acted as an independent and free university. Interests or concerns of professors and students seem to be neglected, and when considering this with the structure of the power elite, it is not far fetched to say that students in fact did lose power. In this new role they would have to blindly accept and perpetuate democratic ideals, regardless if that is or is not what they wanted to create. If there were a department concerned with preserving liberal democracy abroad under these conditions, it would not be implausible to conceive that departments can be militant.

Graham Greene gives a cryptic and open-ended depiction of Harvard University's social sciences during the Cold War. He is only using Harvard as an example, so his critique is meant to for universities on a much larger scale. In his work The Quiet American he gives facts about the main characters age and schooling, but only goes as far as giving clues about what department he graduated from and what sort of education he received there. When one wonders why Alden Pyle is where he is, or is speaking about saving democracy in the way he does, they can refer to Harvard's close ties to

government agencies, the interest in shaping mass-opinion to save liberal democracy, and the determination to stop the spread of communism abroad.

6) The Quiet American

The Quiet American is a story about Thomas Fowler's brief run-in with an American, while reporting on the French Occupation in Vietnam for the British. It is a romance novel, because of the love triangle between Thomas, his lover (Phuong), and the American. It is a political novel, due to its commentary on war, communism, and democracy. It is a critique on publishing and the role of the journalist. For the purpose of my study, I focus on Greene's commentary of American foreign policies and how they train their students to in-act policies overseas. I will be going over why I make that connection in further detail below, but in short I believe Alden is the product of his political science education at Harvard. I will argue that he had hoped for a better world and had no solutions. He went to college to learn, and because what he was told at University he went over seas and helped detonate bombs that killed Vietnamese citizens.

6.1) Political Science's Effect on the Social Sciences

It is not stated anywhere in The Quiet American that Alden Pyle was a graduate of a political science program. It does not mention that he graduated from a department, rather just the fact that he just graduated. The words he uses and the actions he takes strongly suggest he did finish a political science track, but it cannot be said for certain.

What is known about political science departments in this period is that they had a great effect over various social science departments. The Harvard Russian Research Center was not a political science center, but instead an area studies center that would supply the material to political scientists. Political science required information it had once never contemplated, and this manifested itself in a multidisciplinary approach in hopes of better understanding foreign lands. The creation of new fields, and the drastic restructuring of others, had been done in order to fill the void left by isolationist thinking. In 1943 the “United States had no regional specialists” and this is the “direct consequence of how social sciences were institutionalized in the period of 1850 to 1914 in five key countries of the process: Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and the United States” (Wallerstein 196). Social sciences sought to win the Cold War, and so fields of study had no choice but to broaden the scope of knowledge. Ira Katznelson writes:

Political scientists also played a role in shaping and directing the new multidisciplinary domain of area studies, created to provide information about far-flung parts of the global suddenly important for postcolonial great power competition. Katznelson 237

The information needed for political scientists to theorize on ways to preserve democracy abroad was absent from early American political science. Under these circumstances it seems certain fields of social sciences worked to supply political science with information about far-away lands and their strange people. The agenda of political science required this information, so certain social science departments began to focus on supplying materials for other departments to do work. It is possible that Alden Pyle came through one of these programs.

6.2) Mr. York Harding

York Harding is “an important offstage character” in this novel (Buckley). Despite his physical absence his name and works are continually brought up. Very little is disclosed about whom York Harding is and what he believes in, but what could be said for certain is that his words guided Alden Pyle to Vietnam and to the Third Force. It is not mentioned where Harding was educated, but he has done extensive work on Democracy in the Far East. Fowler claims that “he’s a superior sort of journalist—they call them diplomatic correspondents” (Greene 160). The reader does not know who did, but some organization published his material. His body of work at least includes: The advance of Red China, The Challenge to Democracy, and The Role of the West. It is known that he has traveled in Vietnam “more than two years ago”, but where Pyle calls his trip “courageous,” Fowler claims “with a return ticket courage becomes a intellectual exercise” (Greene 16, 87). Fowler feels that the little time Harding he had spent there is not enough to understand the concerns of the country and its people. It is however appropriate to help develop “isms and ocracies.” York “gets hold of an idea and then alters every situation to fit the idea” (Greene 87, 160). Knowing this should discredit what little words of his are known, while making the reader question why Pyle was so committed to him.

Pyle’s “loyalty to York,” fills in some blanks left by his absence in the story. A reader can assume whatever ideology preached by Pyle about democracy or the “third force” is verbatim from one of York’s works. It is hard not to see York Harding as being the principle base of knowledge for Alden Pyle. Alden has come to Vietnam to help the “third force” because “York wrote that what the East needed was a Third Force” (Greene

20). There is a continual mention of York in relation to actions Pyle takes and ideology he has embodied. Kevin Buckley recognizes that “Pyle owed much to York Harding.” Pyle’s small library suggests his education has come from a narrow source, and his lack of new learning once arriving in Vietnam only strengthens the notion that he came thinking he knew how to handle the situation. That is thanks to York Harding. Even after he witnesses the destruction of the second bomb he refuses to see anything except York’s words, and ultimately that is his demise. Late in the novel inspector Vigot asks Fowler who York Harding is. He replies; “He’s the man you are looking for, Vigot. He killed Pyle—at long range” (Greene 159). It was not York Harding who funded Pyle’s expedition overseas, but it was because of York he went. Even though his loyalty seemed to be with the general it was really with York, and he followed him to death.

I cannot help but make a connection between York Harding and Milton Freedman. Both men helped to train students in their “isms and ocracies” (Greene 87). This inevitably led said students to do things in the name of democracy and peace that do not resemble democracy or peace. By designing a curriculum meant only to support ideology tends to lead students to a more bias thinking process. In the case of Alden Pyle, his education was so engrained that even eyewitness accounts and counter arguments cannot shake him. Does knowing that Pyle is a surrogate actor for York Harding make Pyle less responsible for his crimes? I say no, but that it makes York Harding just as culpable. York’s writings were designed for the youth of the nation, and more specifically those who went to college to learn how to save the world from destruction. Alden Pyle brings bombs overseas rather than preventing their existence.

6.3) Pyle’s Crimes

Pyle is responsible for helping supplying bombs to an independent fighting force—in the novel this is referred to as a “third force,” which was “found free from Communism and the taint of colonialism”— that was later detonated in public places (Greene 115). Those bombs were responsible for death, injury, and the destruction of public/private property. The bombings helps the reader see the actual damages biased scholarship can provide: both in regards to the student and their environment. Each separate bombing develops a different sinister action of Pyle. The first establishes a connection between Alden and the General of the “third force;” the second gives an eyewitness account of the destruction done by the bombs. There is no third bombing that the reader knows of, but after having been in the square during the second bombing he pronounces his dedication to the General and the cause. Knowing the facts of the two bombings, plus the potentiality for a third makes Pyle a guilty party to crimes against innocent people. His intentions were pure and his education was limited, but that should not excuse his action.

The first bombing reads like a small and vague news article. It lists damages, but does not describe the scene or peoples emotions. All that is really known is that there were “ten explosions, six people slightly injured, and God knows how many bicycles” (Greene 134). Fowler even says, “ the whole affair, as it turns out, wasn’t worth more than a paragraph, and a humorous paragraph at that” (Greene 133). Fowler hears the information of the attack after the fact and so the reader does not get an eyewitness account of the damage done. The important parts about the first bombing are the parts surrounding it. The reader learns of Pyle’s connection with General The—the head of the

Third Force in Vietnam. It is even made clear how. “No, look at the pump. Does it remind you of anything?” (Greene 134). It takes a moment for Fowler to make the connection himself, but after he says to the reader, “I never even mentioned to Pyle what I had heard of his connection with General. Let him play with plastic moulds” (Greene 135). The General and Pyle are connected through the plastic moulds “shaped like a half-section of a bicycle” (Greene 134). The first attack is meant to establish connections between Pyle and the bombings, but the second bombing is designed to give a reader a first hand view of those bombs going off.

Thomas was sitting in a café when the second bomb exploded in a fountain in the square just outside. When coming to terms with what just happened he describes the scene outside the café.

The smoke came from the cars burning in the car park in front of the national theatre, bits of car were scattered over the square, and a man without his leg lay twitching at the edge of the ornamental gardens. People were crowding in the rue Catinat, from the Boulevard Bonnard. The sirens of police-cars, the bells of ambulances and fire engines came at one remove to my shocked eardrums. Greene 152

The scenes drama is heightened by the potential loss of Fowler’s mistress, Phuong. The explosion happened in the vicinity of a place she usually is at that time. Fowler says, “She always goes there. At eleven thirty” (Greene 153). For two pages Greene describes the rubble and Fowler’s concern for Phuong. A reader can sympathize more with this than a simple numerical death toll, but more so than that it allows someone to imagine other potential damages that could be done by people like the character Alden Pyle.

The end of this scene, when Thomas finds Pyle, is the precursor for their discussion about Pyle’s continued involvement with the General. Until this point Pyle had not seen anything that resembled a war zone. “He was seeing a real war for the first

time: he had punted down in to Phat Diem in a kind of schoolboy dream, and anyway, and in his eyes soldiers didn't count" (Greene 154). Seeing blood and death may be enough to show him that he might be on the wrong path. A reader sees that Pyle is not directly involved, but instead merely a supplier of goods that will be used however the General so chooses. It also becomes clear that Pyle has the upmost faith that the General is acting in the best way possible. The bombing was supposed to go off during a parade, so it could hit soldiers, but only the parade was canceled that day. Pyle knew there would be a bomb that day, and that is why he warned Phuong not to show up, but in the days leading up to it he had left town. This is because he had faith in the General. "I was out of town, they should have called it off" (Green 154). From his words it seems he does not like what he sees, but his action are what made this scene possible. Regardless of what he says at the moment, Thomas and readers can only hope that he mediates on what he has done and seen, so he may change his ways.

The third bombing is only talked about, and not even in much specification. Having had time to think about the second bombing Pyle resolves to continue his partnership with the General, and this continued partnership could only lead to more explosions and death. Thomas asked, "Haven't you finished with him already, Pyle?" Pyle responds calmly saying, "I can't" (Greene 168). Thomas and Pyle do not speak of a next attack that evening, but their conversation strongly suggests there will be one again. The next one Pyle claims will be done in his way. "I told him if he made another uncontrolled demonstration we would have no more to do with him" (Greene 168). Pyle "dealt with him very severely," and he "spoke like a captain of a school-team who has found one of his boys breaking the training" (Greene 168). He doesn't say that he wants

the General to change his tactics, but instead just to clear them with American backers. With this being the case it is only a matter of time before the next bomb goes off.

Knowing what Pyle has done is enough reason to arrest him for his crimes, but the pledge of future attacks makes his capture or kill so much more urgent. Knowing how Pyle found himself overseas should make someone want to blame the institutions that reared him, and financed that rearing, because if the conveyor belt remains intact, someone like Pyle will appear to take his place. When Pyle speaks of having to potentially do away with the General, he says “We,” which states that Pyle is not the only American devoted like him. Thomas also makes an observation prior the second bombing, which suggest that Pyle is not alone. When walking to the café he sees “two young American girls,” and he wonders to himself if they “were Pyle’s colleagues” (Greene 151). He over hears them say “We’d better be going, to be on the safe side,” and Thomas wonders “what appointment they had” (Greene 151). It is more likely they knew what was about to happen rather than leaving to make an appointment, but there is no proof of this. Even if these two are not here to help supply plastic moulds, the vague description and brief encounter suggests there is the possibility that they or others could be there for that reason.

6.4) A Partial Defense for Pyle

Is Pyle as naive as he appears? Are his professions of high ideals real or contrived? Does he take seriously the verities offered by York Harding in books like *The Challenge to Democracy* and *The Role of the West*? Or does he merely appropriate them to lend a veneer of respectability to a ruthless enterprise? When Pyle prattles on about freedom and democracy, does he mean what he says? Or is it just so much cant? Andrew J. Bacevich

There are so many ways in which the Cold War affected United States culture for adults and children alike. For the purpose of understanding Pyle's actions it is important to only note two: scholarship and the youthful hope of creating a better world. How political science departments changed is discussed in length above, and it will be used now as a lens to view Pyle's education—what little is known about it. To live in fear of an unannounced atomic bomb blast is no way to live, but this was one of the unfortunate results of the end of World War II. After the United States dropped two bombs their true greatness was recognized; however the United States and Soviet Union still continued stock piling these weapons. For some students—both in fiction and non-fiction—there is a clearly stated reason to go to school: that is to create a better world. Understanding this allows a reader to answer the questions that Andrew J. Bacevich poses.

The answers I am left with make me reject the idea that Pyle is overseas for personal gain. It makes me want to understand how he ended up the way he was. I, by no means excuse his actions. I want to raise the idea that Pyle is not alone in his crime. The people and institutions that raised him turned him into the character we experience. To stop Pyle is only stopping one man, but to stop the manufacturing of characters like him is solving the problem. The non-political elements of Pyle's character show that he is not heartless and does understand, to a certain extent, the concept of fair play. It seems other people poisoned his good intentions. I will argue that Pyle genuinely thought he was saving the world, regardless of what he actually did.

6.5) Thomas Fowler as an Objective Voice to Understand Pyle

Before exploring why Pyle did what he did, it is very important to first know the character traits of Thomas Fowler. The reader knows Pyle largely through the words of Thomas Fowler. From Pyle's true intention, to his character traits, and education, Fowler has something to say about it all. Without Fowlers words Pyle seems more like an undisputed villain. What Thomas Fowler says gives a deeper understanding of Alden Pyle. In order to defend Pyle it is important to know that Thomas Fowler is a reliable narrator. It is true that he has his character flaws; however, I argue that they do not conflict with his ability to be honest about Pyle, and that his non-engagement is the result positive character traits and not from spending too much time in a war zone. He is capable of lying, and by no means do I claim that Thomas Fowler is a man of high standing morals. All I claim is that his words about Pyle and his non-engagement are factual.

How can a reader trust Thomas Fowler knowing that he smokes opium daily? How is it that a reader can consider him unbiased, considering the conflict of interest between him, Pyle, and Phuong? I argue that these two things do not affect the words Fowler uses to describe Pyle. He is cognoscente of this whole issue, and makes a special note about it in the text. He attests to his neutrality both in war and judging character. Other critics, such as Miriam Allott or Francis Wyndham, but devote some of their works to clarifying his neutrality. When coupling Fowler and the critic's words it becomes hard to believe that Thomas' actions are driven by jealousy and or involvement.

His profession is a good indicator that Fowler has been trained to, and takes much pride in, being an unbiased viewer and reporter of conflicts. We do not know of his work done prior to Vietnam or his education, but the fact that he is there, and that his paper wants to promote him suggest he does a good job. When reporting on the first bombing

he says, “Bicycle Bombs made a good headline” (Greene 134). He continues on to briefly describe why the incident would not spark much interest. According to Fowler, the other reporters are arranging facts of the bombing to sell papers rather than to be accurate. “The General wasn’t news. You couldn’t waste space identifying him” (Greene 134). It seems that most reports were privy to this information and reported accordingly. He says they “all blamed the communists,” which as the reader knows is not true. (Greene 134). Fowler does not fall victim to this pit fall, and so it seems he stands at a higher point of reliability than his colleagues. “I was the only one to write that the bombs were a demonstration on the part of General The” (Greene 134).

What is learned from his standards of reporting is that to Fowler the truth is more important than what is commercially valuable. Fowler’s commitment to honest journalism, based on reporting facts, is more important to him than what his paper wants to publish. This is why they edit his word. He still feels the need to write what he sees regardless of how it will be changed and published. Fowler writes what he sees because he claims he is not “engage” (Greene 175). Throughout the novel, maybe three or four times, he attests to this quality. Even others make this claim on his behalf. When being asked to help stop Pyle, he is torn between doing what he thinks should be done—stopping Pyle—and what the non-engage would do. This struggle is clear because in one paragraph he speaks how Pyle should have already been killed yet he won’t act to help make this happen. He says, “He comes blundering in and people have to die for his mistakes. I wish your people had got him on the river from Nam Dinh” (Greene 166). Fowler says this, but his actions remain neutral. That is why the man asking for help finishes his plea by saying; “Sooner or later one has to take sides if one is to remain

human” (Greene 166). It seems that Fowler wants to act, but something in his character quashes his ability to move.

This non-movement is not only evident in his failed resistance to helping kill Pyle. It can be found in almost every facet of his life. When Pyle first begins to steal Fowler’s girl, Fowler sits back and watches them dance. He puts up little resistance throughout the rest of the novel. When facing death he stays put. He knows that his reporting will be altered before being published, but he does nothing about. He just accepts the ways things are. His drug of choice is opium, which does not really encourage much movement. It can also be said that he is more than an infrequent user. Miriam Allott says, “Fowler does not like being moved, and he goes out of his way to assert his lack of involvement” (Allott 194), and she has a lot of ground to make that claim. For those who do not pick up on his lack of action Fowler gives verbal confirmation of his stance: “I’m not involved. Not involved” (Greene 27).

This however is not the case at the end of the novel, because Fowler ends up sending Pyle to meet his murderer. He asked Pyle to meet him at a specific location at a certain time, knowing farewell that some people would be meeting Pyle as he made his way. Francis Wyndham proposes that he did what he did because Pyle had to be “eliminated before he can cause yet more damage” (Wyndham 24). Thomas knows the full extent of Pyle and the Generals involvement. He also understands that despite what has already been done Pyle will not quit. Against every fiber of his being he resolves that it is in the best interest to the people of Vietnam to get rid of Pyle.

After going through what he never wanted to do Fowler makes a declaration to himself. He wants to assure himself that he still has the ability to be neutral. He says,

“The human condition being what it was, let them love, let them murder, I would not be involved. My fellow journalists called themselves correspondents; I preferred the title of reporter. I wrote what I saw; I took no action—even opinion is a kind of action” (Greene 27). He tries to remind himself of his core principles, but he knows that “he betrayed” his “own principles” (Greene 175). He goes on to say, “I became as engage as Pyle, and it seemed to me that no decision would ever be simple again” (Greene 175). Before he commits to breaking principles, he seems to be a man who wants to tell things as he sees them. His recreational time, and very rarely his love life, make Fowler a questionable candidate for legitimacy. These are minor compared his qualities that make him a good reporter. One can believe Fowler, because the same truthfulness that he attempts to give the audience of his newspapers is given to the reader of The Quiet American. What he does in his daily actions compliment the position he takes in his work life, and that is why he can be trusted when speaking about Pyle.

6.6) Non-Political Pyle

When Pyle speaks he usually is discussing matters of Democracy, so his non-political side does not get as much attention. Through the words of others—especially Thomas Fowler—a reader can see another side of Alden Pyle. This side is non-violent and considerate, with a propensity for good manors. Kevin Buckley, in his work “The Graham Greene Argument,” makes this claim as well. He says these qualities give his character more depth. Pyle cannot simply be thought of as an emotionless murderer. Considering the time period in which Pyle grew and was educated, these qualities lead me to question whether or not Pyle would have done what he did having been educated in

a different manor. It seems that his characteristics suggest that things would have turned out differently.

From the beginning of the book, before there are any hints regarding his mission in Vietnam, Pyle seems like a respectful and idealistic young adult. Thomas says, “He’s a good chap in his way,” and that “he was very meticulous about small courtesies” (Greene 3,7). These words come to life with the way he treats Phuong herself, as well as the whole situation between her, Fowler, and himself. “Pyle was apologizing to Phuong in bad French for having kept her waiting,” and after his dance with Phuong he says to Fowler, “Forgive me for taking Miss Phuong from you” (Greene 36). This sense of politeness and honesty runs deep in Pyle. He is compelled to risk his life in order to remain true to those qualities.

A prime example is Pyle’s sneaking into a warzone only so that he could admit his feelings for Phuong to Fowler. Rather than taking Fowler’s time away as an opportunity to move in on his woman, Pyle is compelled to come clean, while also staying away from Phuong until Fowler gets back. Once making it to the base Fowler is at Pyle comes clean. “I had to tell you—I’ve fallen in love with Phuong. You might have been killed. It wouldn’t have been honorable. And then I don’t know if I could have stayed away from Phuong all that time” (Greene 49). When pressed about why he stayed away he replies with a question. “You don’t think I’ll tell her—without you knowing?” (Greene 49). This quote demonstrates that Pyle is aware of his politeness, and that he expected Fowler to see this by now. There are many more examples littered throughout the story, which help to solidify this side of Pyle. From his own words, to his actions, and

how people speak of him, he proves that when not aiding in civilian bombings he is a pretty stand up guy.

There is one more example of Pyle's non-political actions, which I feel is an altruistic act. Despite unfamiliar terrain, the fear of death, and repeated cries of no, Alden Pyle saves Thomas Fowler's life. Getting caught in a guard tower at night—which is the most dangerous time to be on the road—the two decided to flee, but Fowler is injured in the process. He is hurt enough where he cannot walk on his own. When Pyle begins to ask about the leg Fowler responds by saying, “Go away,” and “Go away, Pyle. I don't want to, it hurts too much” (Greene, 100). Pyle's disregard for Fowler's pleas can be likened to the actions of a hero. When not asked to, he jeopardizes his own life to save another. It was by no means an easy act to complete, but still he continued. “For the last twenty minutes Pyle must have almost carried my weight” (Greene 101). The weight he had to bear was coupled with the silence he had to keep. “Be quiet or they'll hear you” (Greene 101). The scene intensifies when they dodge bullets by hiding in deep mud, but even this is not too much for Alden Pyle. When Thomas asks Pyle why he saved his life all Pyle can respond with is, “Couldn't leave you” (Greene 101). This dramatic rescue is in direct conflict with the bombs he helps construct. He shows the capacity to be both a hero and a villain. Matters are much more complicated under these circumstances, but his actions are not contradictory. In both cases he does what he thinks is right, so I am led to believe that his evil acts are not necessarily his own.

One may not agree with what he does to Fowler and Phuong. His disrupting of their love affair can be seen as a malicious and mean act, but at the same time one can argue that he is saving Phuong from an old man who will and cannot make a long-term

commitment. Phuong is only looking for security, and Pyle wants to take her to the United States and marry her. Regardless of how this action is seen, the way in which he goes about doing it is open and respectful. It is important to recognize these qualities. The reason being that it demonstrates that Pyle is—to a certain extent—considerate and able to do the right thing in hard situations. Under these terms Alden Pyle should not be considered completely evil. It is clear he has the capacity for bad, because of what he did with the bombs, but that should not blind the reader from seeing a more complex character. If his non-political side is courteous and non-violent, then how is it his political side is? What occurred in Alden Pyle's life that made him think violence was the way to save the world? The historical context in which Pyle grew and was educated is a good place to begin looking for answers.

6.7) Political Science and Literature: More Than Alden Pyle

By understanding the changes in certain social sciences (i.e. political science, anthropology, area studies), one can understand the information given to Alden Pyle and his dedication to his studies in The Quiet American. This novel, although not explicitly about Alden's education, heavily critiques narrow and influenced curriculums. By connecting this story with the ways in which social science departments' changed gives the reader the how and why of what Alden Pyle did. Through this understanding a reader can begin to sympathies with Pyle. I want this sympathy to extend to any others who were conditioned like Alden Pyle.

This fictitious account is not meant to have readers trying to understanding only one type of student, but instead to raise the idea that this sort of schooling can produce various player, interested in many different regions, and with a wide range of concerns. Concerns for all departments should arise, because as Pyle studies democracy and the Far East, scientists study how to build bigger and more destructive bombs (the Manhattan Project), and Economists preach about laissez-faire economics (The University of Chicago's School of Economics).

7) Economics

Some have been mesmerized by the promises the United States government makes to those who work abroad for them—as can be seen from the description above—but other need no convincing that it is their duty to help their nation and the world. Many high-school students during the early Cold War did not like the world they inhabited, and they recognized their roles as the ones who can change things (Scheibach). Those students went to college with the intent of studying and researching ways to change the world, as well as ways to implement those changes. Some went directly into political science or economics departments not knowing that the government was training and recruiting through departments as well.

In Naomi Klein's work, The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism, she accounts for two radical thinkers, Milton Freedman and Friedrich Hayek, and how the U.S government and corporations funded and boasted their research and teaching. She gives a detailed history of the result of those men's influence on the University of

Chicago. Only briefly does she speak about actual effects on students, but then again that is not her concern in the work. The material she present gives enough information to make correlations with Graham Greene’s work, and the actions of Alden Pyle. Although in different fields of study—which were all affected differently—the same result is had: students, although thinking they are doing well for their homeland, actually bring about despair or turmoil.

The Chicago Boys (Chilean exchange student educated at U of C) are just like Alden Pyle of The Quiet American. The only main difference is an individual account rather than a group. The Chicago Boys, being a product of Freedman and Hayek, are idealistic and willing to go to extreme measures, in order to save their nation in the ways they have been taught. These students received an education that was counter to what their nation was doing at the time, as well as a decent portion of other countries, so to turn their theories in to policy would require nothing less than a revolution.

Teachers in the Chicago School of Economics, led by Milton Freedman, felt like they were “warriors in combat with most of the rest of the profession” (Klein 60). They proceeded to teach and do research based on a pure laissez-faire model of economics.

The school’s ideology can be summed up in three main points:

First the Governments must remove all rules and regulations standing in the way of the accumulation of profits. Second, they should sell off any assets they own that corporations could be running at a profit. And third, they should dramatically cut back funding of social programs. Klein 69

These thinkers are convinced that only a free market could achieve a sustainable and fair economy. According to the tenets of Chicago’s teachings, the ways in which the nation is heading will only lead to its own demise. The country needed a different way, and that is

one where corporations could be free to sell their goods without governments protection of local industries, rich and poor are taxed the same, and the market and not the government sets all prices—for both product and labor. These are just some of the results of what Freedman wanted, which were “deregulation, privatization and cutbacks” (Klein 68).

As Keynesian like ideologies found a home within the masses, Freedman’s ideas were brushed aside. The United States government with the help of higher education implemented a series of policies greatly extending worker rights. That trajectory seemed to be working fine at home and abroad, but Friedman claimed it was doing unseen harm. This led the Chicago School of Economics to demand that “whatever protections workers had managed to win, whatever services the state now provided to soften the edges of the market” they get back (Klein 69). The trend in government policy and their results suggests differently, but according to Friedman, “everything went wrong with the New Deal” (Klein 68). Because of the New Deal “so many countries, including my own, got off on the wrong track” (Klein 68). By not conforming with dominate theories the Chicago School of Economics became the black sheep of the economic community. Despite the benefits from regulated and nationalized industries seen throughout a good portion of the world, and a lack of concrete evidence suggesting Friedman is correct, Milton Friedman’s radical ideas became extremely influence at the beginning of and throughout the Cold War. They took hold in Chile and spread throughout the Southern Cone.

7.1) The Cold War Effect on South American Economic Policies: The creation of the

Chicago Boys

The U.S government and corporations tried two methods to instill what they believed to be the best economic policies. The first was done through democratic means, where as the second was not. The Chicago School of Economics, in the 1950s, had set up a student exchange agreement with Chile's Catholic University, and began teaching Chilean students Freidman's ideas of structuring an economy. At the time the Southern Cone—comprised of Argentina, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay—was following a developmentalists' path. The most advanced laboratory of developmentalism was the southern tip of Latin America, known as the Southern Cone" (Klein 66). This meant they wanted to nationalize many industries that Americans had large investments in, while also redistributing wealth to defeat poverty and foster a stable middle-class. The students of Chile's Catholic University came to North American and were being taught developmentism would make their country collapse, despite the clear indicators that developmentism can provide positive outcomes. This ranges from:

The workers in the new factories formed powerful unions that negotiated middle-class salaries, and their children were sent off to study at newly built public universities. The yawning gap between the region's polo-club elite and its peasant masses began to narrow. By 1950, Argentina had the largest middle class on the continent, and next-door Uruguay had a literacy rate of 95% and offered free health care for all citizens. Klein 67

Their form of economics has been set in place, and in practice it seems to give good results that will have lasting effects. The contradictions the students in the Chicago School of Economics are being taught are purely theoretical, with no real world experimentation, but yet they believe in what they are taught, and so they head home to try and implement the ideas of the Chicago School of Economics. Where the Christian

University thinks it is doing a benefit to its students, by having a bilateral agreement with the University of Chicago, the students merely become pawns in an experiment in unfettered laissez-faire economics.

The first institution that Chicago approached—the University of Chile, which was the premier institution in the country—declined the offer due to the fact that Chicago would not let the economics chair have input on “who in the U.S was training his students” (Klein 73). This does not seem like an unfair request, if one is worried that a limited range in study can produce poorly rounded student. The University of Chile was aware that the “goal of the Chile Project was to produce ideological warriors who would win the battle of ideas against Latin American’s ‘pink’ economists,” but unfortunately this is not the case for Chile’s Catholic University (Klein 73). Students, after boarding planes to live and study in Chicago, at the expense of the taxpayers, were taught to fix the economic problems of their homeland. “Students were taught disdain for” the ways in which “their countries “attempt to alleviate poverty, and many of them devoted their PhD thesis to dissecting the follies of Latin American Developmentalism” (Klein 75). The students were blinded by what seemed to be a great opportunity, and so they signed onto the program not knowing what Chicago had in store for them.

Not only was the University responsible for introducing as many students as possible to Friedman’s way of thinking, but also it was done so in a ubiquitous way. Jeffrey Puryear, a Latin American specialist with the Ford Foundation said, “although the quality and impact of this endeavor cannot be denied, its ideological narrowness constituted a serious deficiency” (Klein 75). Klein also comments on the fact that reading materials were limited and professors all taught the same ideology. The school truly was

a breeding ground “indoctrination” (Klein 74). Arnold Harberger, the head of the program, was responsible for setting up a workshop on Chile where University of Chicago professors “presented their highly ideological diagnosis of what was wrong with the South American country—and offered their scientific prescriptions on how to fix it” (Klein 76). This is what the students came to know, and as they became chairs of departments and professors, as well as diplomats bringing this school of thought through Latin America, the message spread.

Through this method of educating Chileans, the United States hoped to foster an army of radical economist, who bring about change through democratic channels. This, by no means, was done on a small scale.

“In 1956 the project saw one hundred Chilean students pursue advanced degrees at the University of Chicago”, and in “1965 the program was expanded to include students from across Latin America, with a particularly heavy participation from Argentina, Brazil and Mexico,” so these students became “one-third of the department’s total student population.” Klein 73

At home the recent grads of the University of Chicago held many positions in economic departments in universities. “Once they returned as professors, these “Chicago Boys” taught Chilean undergraduates the same neoliberal ideas that they had learned in Chicago” (Biglaiser 275). With the help of U.S agencies, these students were able to bring this school of thought across borders. They became the “regional ambassadors” setting up more “University of Chicago franchises in Argentina and Columbia” (Klein 75). All the while the new professors are trying to spread their message, developmentism is gaining more and more popularity. This made the presence and expansion of the University of Chicago virtually obsolete. The students that tried their hands in politics generally had little to no power. All the hard work, time, and money spent on a project

with one simple goal—“the U.S. government would pay to send Chilean students to study economics at what pretty much everyone recognized was the most rabidly anti-pink school in the world”—resulted in no democratic changes (Klein 76). Other methods would have to be implemented in order to put recent grads in positions of power.

Other schools in Chile taught against Friedman’s idea, such as the University of Chile, so it seemed there was no way to fully dominate the intellectual field. As such this method could not provide the outcome the U.S was looking for. A coup d’état was needed in order to bring about the change wanted. The U.S government, acting through various agencies, at first attempted to shock the South American economy so that they would not disrupt foreign investments in an attempt to prop up their own nation and people. The U.S. hoped to force president Allende to back off by “confronting him with economic collapse” (Klein 78). This, however, did not stop the president of Chile or his party members from following through with their original economic policy, and so Allende, like other leaders who would not cave to American foreign pressure, had to be removed by force.

This history of how the coup d’état happen, such as who was involved, or when specifically it happen, is not important for the work at hand. What needs to be focused on here is the level of involvement students and recent graduates had during and after the military over-throw. There are various accounts that students, who learned either at the University of Chicago itself or a school or department set up by Chicago, had a direct hand in helping to create new economic policies out of the ashes of their recently dismantled government. “In Chile, statist military leaders had to concede that neoliberal Chicago boys had solutions (Biglaiser 273). Naomi Klein also says that the “a Chicago

grad and his colleagues at Catholic University, began holding weekly secret meetings during which they developed detailed proposals for how to radically remake their country” (Klein 86). Students and graduates had been lead to believe that their countries current economic policy is not working for the people, and through their actions in the over-throw, they seem to genuinely believe in the good they are supposedly doing. Many freedoms were lost as well as lives, but these youths maintained a presence with the military forces. After the coup d’état they entered into government positions to enact their ideology. This is not necessarily the best policy for natives of Chileans, but the new open market is perfect for U.S. corporations.

The recent grads, with advanced degrees from American institutions, were able to put in place their vision of a perfect economic policy. Unfortunately it did not come through democratic means, but instead by force. The extreme measures resorted to have been done for what they believed to be the greater good and a prosperous future. In the course of accomplishing this the “Chilean military engaged in mass killings to consolidate the new regime”. “At least 500,000 people are believed too have been killed” (Gendzier 178). There was a “violent military coup d’état on September 11th 1973,” with a staggeringly high death toll as well (Gendzier 180). Students did not necessarily have hands on action in these take over’s, but they were absolutely connected to the economic structuring of their nation. The Chicago Boy’s crimes affected society in a wide sweeping fashion

The loss of life is not the only negative result of employing Chicago’s method of economics. Benefits seen from the days of developmentism, such as national health care and unions, were dismantled and most Southern Cone countries fell into economic

collapse and poverty. Chiles “largest financial institutions were on the brink of collapse and industry and construction slipped into depression” (Petras 1). James Petras also claims “in large measure, this crisis was caused by the policies of the Chicago boys” (Petras 1). Numbers began to rise and fall in all the wrong directions: unemployment was up and gross national product was down. They were “overdue or unrecoverable” to “bank loans totaling more than \$1 billion—half the banking system’s capital and reserves” (Petras 2). The new economic turmoil the country faced raised poverty and once again made a much clearer divide between the lower and upper class—something that was disappearing under old economic controls. The Chicago Boy’s policies were so detrimental that almost all support “for the Chicago Boys has now evaporated” (Petras 3). “The marked economic decline threw the Friedmanites into disarray, resulting in a rapid turnover in the top echelon of economic advisers” (Petras 2). Although the government tried to coop with the problem without changing the system, there is a clear admittance that their system has flaws, and has the potential too much more harm then good. What the Chicago Boys were taught brought about hardship to their nation and people. Although they seemingly wanted to help, they are partially responsible for the problems listed above. I am left to wonder if any scholar or teacher felt or feels remorse for the results of what they taught students?

7.2) Education at Home

In the late 1940s and early 1950 the University of Chicago, with the help of Milton Friedman, might have been the first to preach such an extreme vision of

economics, but as the Cold War advanced more universities and researchers shifted their ideological foundation closer in-line with Chicago—the same applies for political science departments across the country. This was apparently done to stop the spread of communism. Not only were foreign students being taught the importance of western development, but also so were those students born stateside. Chilean students in the 1960s only accounted for one-third of the department's population (Klein 69). The falling-out of developmentalism was almost ubiquitous across the nation, and what replaced it was design in hopes of “winning the Cold War” (Gendzier 71).

The Chicago Boys policies can only boast about its involvement in advancing profits of international corporations. The cause for this overwhelming shift in academic circles in the United States is a fear of Soviet Communism taking over the world. The Cold War helped to scare developmentism theories out of the class, because of its close ties with communist thinking. The idea was clear, that one should not “be fooled by the moderate, democratic veneer: Third World nationalism was the first step on the road to totalitarian Communism and should be nipped in the bud” (Klein 71). Thinking about how to stop this became the central focus of “scholars from diverse disciplines,” who “no longer concerned themselves with what is necessarily best for nations abroad (Gendzier 70). Some radical scholars, who preached counterinsurgency, found home in classrooms and journals that claim to be trying to win the Cold War. Lucian Pye, a member of The Massachusetts Instituted of Technology, is a perfect example of a radical scholar. Irene L. Gendzier says, “in a work widely cited in the literature of political development, Aspects of Political Development (1966), Pye offered an “unambiguous defense of counter insurgency and the role of the military” (Gendzier 77). The popular train of thought was

that the U.S model of economics could help to prevent the spread of communism, and the loss of nationalized benefits was nothing compared to what they could gain from following a western model of development.

8) To a Lesser Extent

My examples of The Chicago Boys, The Berkley Mafia, and Alden Pyle all have outcomes that result in death in some form. I choose extreme examples, but there is a wide spectrum of how students were affected by the United States government. Not all students went overseas and brought weapons with them, but many who didn't go—both knowingly and unknowingly—still helped the federal government to assess and win The Cold War. Some students who were not as militant as Alden Pyle, but shared the same passion for a different world, were helping to provide information to various government agencies.

I am specifically referring too CIA intervention at Rutgers University and the creation of the European Non-State Actors Projects (ENSAP). The ENSAP is a project where assigned students would focus on “one component of West Europe's political culture including disarmament, religious, labor, media, left, environmental, and various other groups. They were to produce data-intensive reports” for the CIA (Witanek 1989). Funded in the same way the HRRC and University of Chicago School of Economics was, as well as headed by close minded idealists, Rutgers' political science students were duped into helping the government in ways they did not decide.

Rutgers University's Professor Richard Mansbach was the brainchild behind ENSAP. Led by his own studies, and funded by government money, he assigned his students course work that would later be information handed to the CIA. On his own time Professor Mansbach was "examining whether political organizations in Western Europe are endangering U.S. geopolitical and military interests" (Ege 1989). Through ENSAP students began to gather the information needed to answer the questions Mansbach and the CIA wanted answered. Students were investigating "churches, the media, opposition parties, unions and women's groups" (Ege 1984). The CIA "would like to know how many members there are; who is in charge of their publications; what their known assets are" (Ege 1989). Through this information the CIA would know who was in close ties with them and who leaned towards more communist thinking. The students researching the material did not know the motivation that drove the studies.

What students did know was that in order to get credit they would have to do as professor Mansbach instructed. "About 100 students have been gathering information for ENSAP for academic credit. Most of the students don't know that they are working for the CIA" (Ege 1984). In this scenario students have the choice to enter into the field of study they want, but once in the department students are directed how the chair, professors, and donors see fit. Professor Mansbach is the director of Rutgers' political science department and, but ENSAP research is under the control of the CIA "The ENSAP questions apparently were changed at CIA's request. The CIA demanded "data-intensive analysis" (Ege 1984

While the academic researcher is relatively free to define a problem on his terms, our [CIA] research problems are greatly defined by the requirements of U.S. foreign policy. The academic researcher chooses a topic for which data are available, whereas it is often

new problems (or old problems defined in new ways) for which the policymaker requires intelligence analysis. Ege 1984

Students under professor Mansbach became weapons similar Alden Pyle or the Chicago Boys. Their good intentions were used to advance the agenda of donors. The hopes students had for independence at university was commandeered for national and economic interest, and for the most part they had no idea their pure education was compromised.

Mansbach did not tell his students what he was doing, and he also failed to “inform the university of their government work” (Joselyn 416). He had received a “grant of at least \$20,000” for his work in “enlisting unwitting student researchers” into the European Non-State Action Projects (Joselyn 416). For these actions against students Mansbach only received a letter “of reprimand, deposited in his permanent files. No other action was taken” (Joselyn 416). Is it this degree of punishment fair for professors who commandeer a student’s education for their own and others interests? When understanding why students went to college it becomes clearer that the actions of professors, donors, and administrators were not in the best interest of students.

8.1) Not Completely Oblivious

The relationship between donors, professors, administrators, and the government was not always kept secret, and even sometimes secrets could not be kept. Students could not miss obvious intrusions, such as ROTC, as something detrimental to their academic freedom. For some students the presence of the military on campus made them uncomfortable. The presence made them suspect of their university’s behavior and

affiliations. Examples of students confronting military involvement on their campuses can be found in both literature and non-fiction. Philip Roth, in his autobiography “The Facts,” accounts for the displeasure the students of Bucknell College had with military and governmental presence. Peter Jedick’s Hippies is the story of a few college students attending Kent State University in the late 60s. These students are aware and vocal about the separation of military and academia.

Philip Roth had long standing ties with his university’s literary magazine Et Cetera. In his time there he held various positions, including editor, but he was also a contributing member. The magazine had begun to criticize the way in which the college and military interact. When they had heard about a new inspection policy for all men’s dormitories, they published the slogan “down with the military or keep the fascista from our rooms” (Roth 62). The new policy was to be that “men living on The Hill will have their rooms inspected every week by the ROTC department”(Roth 62). Roth was in ROTC, but quickly quit “out of opposition to campus military training” (Roth 72). This disdain for military intervention on campus—ROTC, “department of military science,” and McCarthyism—was shared with the staff at Et Cetera. Philip Roth’s non-fiction account of military on campus is drastically similar to the way Hippies main character Matt Kubik describes the military presence at Kent State University.

Peter Jedick spends a lot of time, compared to Philip Roth, discussing students’ feelings toward the government being openly present on their campus. Matt Kubik makes one declaration that answers for the growing tension at Kent State. “It seemed the military and the university mixed even worse than city folk and the hippies”(Jedick 70). It is explained in the novel that this feeling is wide spread across the campus. “Kent State

is a powder keg, ready to explode,” and through the presence of students for a democratic society (SDS), the disapproval of ROTC, and protests against the Vietnam War, students in the novel Hippies demonstrate why and how the keg blew (Jedick 20).

The presence of ROTC and recruiting centers could not be missed, but at some universities the students knew about the hidden connections between institutions and government money. “Between 1965 and 1970 on at least eleven major college campuses, military-supported research buildings and laboratories were sites of antiwar protest” (Moore 109). Peter Jedick also briefly describes students’ anger with the connection of university laboratories and divisions of the government. “Graffiti sprouted around campus” calling for the end of “The Liquid Crystal Institute” (LCI) (Jedick 156). The LCI had been “associated with the defense industry, the military industrial complex. It was funded by the Department of Defense, using high tech to fight the Viet Cong” (Jedick 157). The only other information given about LCI is that students wanted to see the end of it. With the little information given about the institute the mind can reel about the how it actually operated and what sort of students it turned out.

Peter Jedick’s brief mention of the Liquid Crystal Institute greatly understates how immersed the university was in military affairs. Kent State University opened the institute in 1965, but this was only possible with “support from the air force and army and the DoD’s Advanced Research Projects Agency” (Heineman 37). Throughout the Cold War era the LCI continued to receive large sums of money for government research. They received a grant for “\$800,000 in 1968 to develop liquid crystal detectors for the army, and after that “the DoD became Kent State Universities major federal benefactor” (Heineman 37). Being this indebted to the military, “the research conducted there was of

a predominantly military nature” (Schwerdtfeger 2010). The students of Kent State knew of the government and university’s relationship, and in both Hippies and real life the students act out against the corruption of their academic freedom.

Nothing is mentioned in Hippies that describes what a student in the institute was doing or how they were taught. What can be said concretely about the LCI is that it created technologies that were used in War. The institute developed “motion detectors used in Vietnam” (Moore 109). The detectors were “placed along the Ho Chi Minh Trail by Navy Seals.” They were “designed to detect the presence, speed, and direction of North Vietnamese Army tanks and trucks,” This information allows the military to quickly and unsuspectingly dispatch “its strike force” (Heineman 37). Being an academic institution meant that students were being trained in laboratories like “Crime lab” (Jedick 157). In these labs and classes the academic pursuits were more than likely solely focused on government interests. The LCI is no different than Harvard’s’ Russian Research Center, or Milton Friedman’s department of economics, which all limited the range of knowledge to students in order to create graduates who shared similar beliefs.

The students of Kent State, in historical and fictional accounts, act out about the relationship of military and university. In the 60s and early 70s this tension climaxed with mass protests. In 1968 most protests at Kent State were directed at the LCI, and by 1970 “ students viewed their institution as perpetuating the militarization of American society in a way that was totally unacceptable” (Schwerdtfeger 2010). The most symbolic actions students take in protest of how their university is the burning of the ROTC building. Matt Kubik and his friends are not there to witness the sparking of the match that burnt down the ROTC building, but they quickly get to the scene to witness

the madness. “Flames were shooting out from its windows” and demonstrators were chanting “down with ROTC” (Jedick 201). The scene depicted in Hippies describes the burning of the building, but Jedick does not explain the significance of the building.

The destruction of the ROTC building was a way for the students to assert power s
In the face of overwhelming force in the form of United States imperialism, a strict s
university administration and, eventually, the Ohio National Guard.
Schwerdtfeger 2010

What proceeded after this event was a tragic run in with the National Guard. Hippies’ ending depicts Matt Kubik and his friends contemplating why they would hear firecrackers on campus. It reminded them of “the Fourth of July,” even though it was only early May (Jedick 302). This uncertainty of what went pop suggests strongly to the reader that the story ends with the first rounds being of the Kent State Massacre. Due to the protesting and burning down of the ROTC four students at Kent State were shot and killed by members of the National Guard.

The involvement of the military at universities that students knew about provoked anger and action from them. The actions taken at Kent state are not an anomaly. In fact Spencer Schwerdtfeger gives a detailed summary of the similarities between Kent State and Berkeley “in the spring of 1970” (Schwerdtfeger 2010). Unfortunately it is not always clear to the student when a biased source is influencing their knowledge and opinions. Alden Pyle, the Berkley, and Chicago boys all act not realizing that their desires for a better world has manifested into actions led by the interest of the United States government and corporations. Many who see the connections and realize its detriments act in some way to attack the system. Students in Hippies act, because they realize that their dreams for better world are under attack. From childhood they have lived in fear that a nuclear bomb could kill them, or that communism could take over their way of life, so

when the “military industrial complex” gets in their way of studying and implementing “revolutionary changes in all parts of society” they must try and “dismantle it” (Jedick 251). Some children growing up during the Cold War had dreams of peace and an end of war, which sparked a desire to go college and learn. They did not know they would have to burn down ROTC building in order to try and keep academia pure.

8.2) What the Youth Wanted and Why They Educate Themselves

The fact that these students had the motivation to attend college and graduate, some even traveling great distances, implies that they wanted something better for themselves. Their fields of study suggest they wanted something better for either their communities, cities, states, or even the world. The words of their younger peers, in high-school publication, wrote essays and poetry that would be the fuel for going college. These documents paint a character of youngsters who were hopeful of new world not at war. The fright they felt, brought on by an uncertain and potentially dark future, drove them to imagine a tomorrow that is not reminiscent of their childhood. Michael Scheibach, in his work Atomic Narratives and American Youth, says:

Coming of age during an era seemingly on the brink of oblivion, many postwar adolescents invested their hopes in a new world free of the violence and hatred that had resulted in the atomic explosions. Scheibach 190

Adolescents could not escape the climate of their culture during the Cold War, and they wanted to do something about it. Although there is a wide scope in what high school students were writing at the time clear trends arose. They wanted to create a peaceful world through peaceful means. They believed in the possibility of achieving global

community, and the creation of a world based on the ideas of the young. These students plot no specific methods out, but their concerns led them to higher-education intuitions. There they would study and discuss logistical ways to bring about peace in a peaceful way. Many high-school students, growing up during the Cold War, had the idea of achieving peace and freedom through world cooperation. “At the height of the Cold War Katie Shattuck” a student “of University High School in Urbana, Illinois, maintained her faith in avoiding war through world cooperation” (Scheibach 191) Katie is not alone in her want for a global community. Martha Ann Nichols, in *The East (High School) Echo in Kansas*, wrote a poem expressing these concerns. The poem is called “Transition” and the final stanza goes as such:

From crumpled shells of precious human life—
The bitter tragic fruit of fatal strife—
This silence will ring out, loud and long,
To halls of state where men of many nations throng,
To expiate this cruel age-old wrong,
To create one world, alert and strong!

Scheibach 178

She has seen that the world can go to war over differences and she is advocating that the world needs to come together to stop future wars. Martha Ann Nichols and her peers are asking for more than a united world. They want to achieve this goal through peaceful means, because they are tired of growing up surrounded by war.

Peaceful measures to ensure peace were an important facet of what the youth of the nation wanted. They recognized action must be taken, but they did not like the way previous generation went to war to solve their problems. Adolescents’ writings showed “unease with the government’s policies based on massive retaliation and mutual destruction” (Scheibach 189). They felt these policies were “bent on destroying the

country's nemesis, the Soviet Union," even though there is the possibility of "being destroyed in the process" (Scheibach 189). Eleanor Gibson of Kansas City's Central High School wrote a poem asking her fellow students if they will learn from the lessons of war and of self-interest. She wants to know if they will try and create a world of "peace and unity" without war. Below is the last two stanza of her poem "It Waits for Peace:"

Will students who here strove to learn
 Regard world peace with like concern;
Or will they think of their own good,
 Remembering not the things they should?

Oh, Spark, here lit in minds so young,
 Rekindle now and spread among
Our leaders so that the world may be
 A realm of peace and unity,

Scheibach 188

For these students peace could not be achieved with an atomic bomb, and instead of practicing the ways of their fathers, which led to the creation of the atomic bomb, they wanted to devise new methods of coming to a global community. The youth of the nation, basing their views of the future on what they have seen and the history they have been taught, wanted something different.

Some of these students even recognize the importance of adolescents as the future rulers of the world, and they call out to their peers to work for something different than the world their grandparents created and parents maintained. Dorothy Shearer, a Kansas City Student gives advice when writing, "Think ahead, and prepare now for the future" (Scheibach 180). She is advising her peers to prepare to reform what Joachim Ries, a high school student in 1947, calls their "elders' endeavors to preserve an almost-

destroyed world” (Scheibach 180). He is asking his peers to become ready and able to guide the country in directions they see fit. They will take the helm from the current order and later give it away as a younger generation rises. Joachim Ries goes on to say

Today’s youth does not wish to waive its responsibility. Time, of course, will not loosen his hold on us, and we in turn will step down in favor of tomorrow’s young men and women. But let us live for peace while we can! Scheibach 181

These two students, and others like them feel the need to be educated and in a position to take the world from its current captains, and to direct the world to peace how they see fit. This shows the “self awareness of postwar youth as the Atomic Generation becomes more evident” (Scheibach 181). Alden Pyle more than likely embodied the character of the hopeful higher schooler who thought they could make a difference, and tried to.

9) Something Different

The University of Chicago and other schools were caught up in the madness of the Cold War. In many ways the institutions that had been affected became restrictive and single-minded. This is not always the case, and it would be unfair of me to insinuate that all universities attempted to enrich their students by predetermining their college careers. Philip Roth liked his education at Rutgers, but he does not devote much time to it in *The Facts*. Philip Roth’s fictional character Marcus Messner enjoyed his time at public college too. David Montgomery, the Farnam Professor of History at Yale University, writes things about his education that is markedly opposed to the teachings at the university of Chicago.

It would be hard to imagine a better education than Swarthmore offered me between 1947 and 1950. Seminars were enlivened by veterans, who did not isolate their studies from their own experiences with life and death, Our discussions were oriented not simply towards understanding

the world, but toward changing it, in contrast to the celebration of 'cultural freedom' in the 1950s. We devoured books, stuffed many carbons into the typewriters on which we banged out papers late into the night, and argued incessantly about the economic planning, civil rights, labor's new power and the Taft-Hartley Law, the United Nations and the triumphs of the Chinese Army.
Montgomery xvi

David Montgomery, if being placed in one of two categories would more than likely be lumped in with institutions that promoted a liberal education, rather than being associated with Cold War styles of organizing universities. It shows that he was allowed to come to his own understanding of how the world does and can work, rather than being continually bombarded for four years of with what others call knowledge. Just as Alden Pyle acted on his education, we can say David Montgomery did too, but his education leads him to try and stop the creation of characters like Alden Pyle and the Chicago Boys in the name of world.

As mentioned above, the term progressive school encompasses many types of institutions, and that even includes public colleges. The purpose and direction of a progressive education is clearly stated in James. R Squire introduction to the work A New Look at Progressive Education. He writes:

Those educators who have combined the psychological principles of child growth with the moral principles of democracy and have developed the conception that the supreme aim of education should be the nurture of an individual who can take responsibility for his own continued growth have made an ethical contribution of lasting work. Squire 1

This theory of education requires that students be exposed to multiple fields of studies despite their specific major. In essence it tries to instill in its students a world-view that goes beyond specialization. This ideology was implemented in various ways, such as the opening up of curriculum or recognition of many student rights. Each school had their own way of implementing progressive policies, and results did vary across the states;

however, what these institutions did share is the desire to give its students academic freedom. There is no standard of progressive studies, but rather it “shares a common faith and trust and an experimental attitude” (Squire 10). Being nurtured in this way would hopefully “cultivate individuality,” which is the cornerstone of progressive education. (Squire 7)

9.1) Literary Representations of Progressive Schools

To better understand progressive schools I refer to Mary McCarthy’s The Groves of Academe. The novel is a good portrait of how an extremely progressive school focused its energy on students wants and needs. The Groves of Academe, written in 1952, is based on the campuses and faculty McCarthy encountered as a professor at Vassar and Sarah Lawrence in the late 1940s. Many of the characters in the book are directly based on academics she meets at her time as a professor. For instance Fred Dupee, of Bard University, for her story has his name changed to “Howard Furness” (Brightman 282), where as Mary is represented as “Domna Rejnev” (Brightman 285). Both those institutions had a long-standing tradition of breaking traditional molds of old institutions. What they perceived as flaws, such as limited courses or church attendance, have been rectified in their system. The actions of her professors/administrators are exaggerated copies of those who actually taught and ran schools, so her fictional accounts of students and professors can be attached to real life implications.

Throughout her the chapter Ancient History, McCarthy makes sure to differentiate between progressive schools, Harvard, and the like. She does not want there

to be any confusion as to what Jocelyn is and is trying to do. At one point she likens Jocelyn to a safe haven for progressive teachers fleeing from traditional schools and progressive schools that were not progressive enough.

Unlike the more established progressive colleges, which lived, so to speak, on the fat of their original formula, without questioning its content, Jocelyn had attracted to itself a whole series of irreconcilables, to whom questioning was a passion, who, in the words of Tolstoy, could not be silent. Beginning with the founder's time, Jocelyn had served as a haven.
McCarthy 69

The very nature of a progressive school is to allow questioning where questioning was not allowed before, and Jocelyn prides itself on being able to make the above statement—especially during the Cold War. The chapter is spent detailing the specifics of Jocelyn, which distinguishes it from other such schools of the time. There was no set structuring of progressive schools, because the concept of progressive schools was still experimental. Various schools attested to their “truer progressive orthodoxy” (McCarthy 69). Jocelyn had its own philosophy and methods of creating and maintaining a progressive school, which was different than other schools. It is however similar to the education that David Montgomery received at Swarthmore.

Students had certain freedoms at Jocelyn that other students at other universities did not have. Jocelyn was free from the “restraints of ROTC,” and students were allowed to study what they like (McCarthy 65). The students at Jocelyn did not have to worry about the military interfering with their academic freedom, unlike the students at Kent State. At Jocelyn “there had been no loyalty oaths” and “no violations of academic freedom” (McCarthy 66). Academic freedom was an important motive for the founder, as

well as donors, so a student's own interests guided research that they did. There was no LCI or HRRC on campus, so really students were free.

The way in which Jocelyn was set up gave a student much leniency in the structuring of their education. Unlike Milton Friedman's economic department, which taught a singular theory, students in departments at Jocelyn were free to explore many theorists. This climaxed for each student with something the college calls Major Project. "The choice of subject within the field was left entirely up to the students," and "they could concentrate narrowly on a single exemplar or range over an epoch." Literally each student was "at liberty to select any write period, movement, or phenomenon that struck personal fancy" (McCarthy 77). A lack of government presence allows for pure academic freedom. It seems that what students were looking for.

9.2) Early examples of wanting more from their universities

Authors have written about progressive schools both in fiction and non-fiction. They attest to the benefits of progressive education vs. a Cold War education. What I hope is clear now, is that a student's education was open and more conducive to their wants for themselves and the world. This of course only can come with the removal of private and public influence on university campuses. When that disassociation was not established certain students could not tolerate it, and as a result acted out in different ways—this includes publications, peaceful, and non-peaceful demonstration. It seems that the 1960s is the height of student discontent, but examples of revolt are found throughout the cold war.

Since practically the beginning of universities in North America students had grievances with their institutions, and they did not sit idly by and accept what they did not agree with. The way early universities were set up is not dissimilar to the structure of the Cold War: they both shared a limited curriculum, and students did not have much choice in their academic life.

Early institutions tried their best to keep a drastic difference in power between their students and themselves. They maintained this relationship so that all students would be educated in the same way. Giving students a unified education requires that curriculum and rules be set for everyone. Authorities at institutions genuinely thought that their method of nurturing an adolescent into adulthood was the best for their student and nation. To these institutions these rules and regulations functioned as a means of teaching a very specific moral compass in young adults. This sort of teaching would preserve a specific idea of society, for it would reproduce the same actors that helped to build it and currently maintain it; however, it comes at the expense of progress. “The passions that burned in the administrators and faculty of American Colleges had more to do with preservation and nurturing than discovery and advancement” (Levine 39). To preserve a way of life, universities maintained strict rules and a limited range of course work.

The creators of these colleges tried to create copies of copies just like the donors, administrators, and professors of Cold War Colleges, although their desired outcome for their nation was different. Certain students who finished their degrees in an early institution did not take on the identity their educators wanted. The cries of students during the 1960s are not an anomaly in student unrest. Documents can be found in history

books that recall student revolts in all forms since the beginning of Universities in North America. This historical trend in students, the fact that they demand and act for change that will cater to their needs and wants and no one else's, helps to strengthen the notion that students went to universities with the hopes of changing themselves and the world for the better. Unfortunately students had to fight, and are still fighting, for that right.

The structure of an early college does not allow a student many freedoms, both in regards to how they act and what they study. They could not stand for this, and since the late 1600s students acted to rectify this. Helen Horowitz Lefkowitz says, "college life was born in revolt" (Lefkowitz 23). She is referring to "collective uprisings in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century" against authority figures of universities (Lefkowitz 23). Elvin Abeles, in his work The Student and the University: A Background Book on the Campus, accounts for student unrest that goes back even further than the 1700s. Abele writes about the resignation of the Harvard's President Leonard Hoar in March of 1675. He did so after a walkout by students. They had the simple slogan "Hoar must go" (Abeles 42). The restrictions put on these students could have resulted in nothing less than a situation like this. It is fortunate for former president Hoar, because history proves revolts can be bigger and more violent. With each passing generation more and more power shifted to the students, but by no means was it enough to quash all revolts.

The revolts were extensive. Students rioted at the long-established colonial colleges and at the newer denominational ones. Some disturbances lasted only a few hours. Others place the colleges in a state of siege for weeks. Lefkowitz 24

These demonstrations were designed to combat curriculum and restrictive controls. There are many different methods utilized by students to act out their revolt such as, walkouts, sit-ins, petitioning, panty raids, vandalism, etc.

The exact tactics used by students in pre-Cold War universities are the same ones used once the shift happened—minus one or two actions. Students wanted control of their education, and their elders would not give them what they asked for. I gave two examples of students who were subsumed by their corrupted education, but that does not mean other students did not recognize and act against their universities colluding with outside sources. There are many examples littered throughout history and fiction. What can be learned from those texts is that students have always wanted control of their education and have always had to fight for it. This consistency in the history of student unrest and revolt proves that students have an understanding of what they want for themselves and the world, and it seems they want more and something different from what they are provided. As students knew of the detriments of a limited and corrupted education during the Cold War, students of the 1600s, 1700s, 1800s, and 1900s, knew as well. They did not want themselves, or their fellow students, to succumb to a fate similar to Alden Pyle, The Chicago Boys, or the Berkley Mafia.

10) Conclusion

The Cold War is responsible for compromising the academic freedom of various campuses, which led to a improper education for many students. Through obvious ways, such as ROTC and the dismantling of the student left, as well as less obvious ways, like

Milton Friedman's department of economics or Harvard's Russian Research Center, students were encouraged to reevaluate their desires and put aside their own goals for those of the nation and economic interest. Having grown up in a turbulent time, college students have contemplated war, peace, and the atom bomb for nearly their whole lives—this is clear from the words of high school and junior-high school students growing up in the atomic age, as well as educational material and programming designed to educate children at the same time. For some adolescents the desire to create a peaceful world, through peaceful means, was the main desire for attending college. There are some students who had hoped to be free to research and write about alternative life styles and governments, but unfortunately the U.S. government and private donors had different plans for a student's education. Many universities did not fight the outside intrusions, and some even created close partnerships with the government and private foundations. Though not the case on all campuses, many universities had been coerced by money, and as such their pursuit of academic freedom was compromised.

An influenced education led the intentions of certain hopeful youths astray, and that is why Alden Pyle and The Chicago Boys acted as they did. The Chicago boys were told the structure of South American economies would not last, and that they needed to bring to their countries a Western way of structuring the economy—they were looking instate unadulterated laissez-faire economics. The world saw how this turned out. Alden Pyle brought weapons to Vietnam, which later was used on civilians. Each of the steps that Alden Pyle takes, from the decision to study social sciences at Harvard, to his continued support of General The—despite the disgrace on what the General does—proves that Alden's heart was in the right place. What it does prove is that something

happened to his brain along the way, and that is his education and Mr. York Harding. All Alden wanted to do was to free the people of Vietnam from colonialism and communism. In both examples students come to universities, but rather than being the designer of their own education they are guided by people and institutions that think they know better.

My concern in this paper has been to bring to light to the biased and corrupted nature of certain student's educations while trying to stud on a Cold War Campus. My examples of Alden Pyle and The Chicago Boys are extreme versions of what could happen when Universities become impure and answer first to an outside parties. There is no telling what could come from other students, but evidence suggests that the student will fall closer in line with what they have been instructed is correct. In terms of the Cold War, a student is more likely to follow the guidelines set fourth in NCS-68. Actions taken by former students should be reprimanded, but they should not be only the ones punished.

The purpose of this paper is to invoke sympathy for former students who go out into the world—under false pretenses of a limited and biased education—and commit crimes in the name of freedom and justice. I argue that their actions are not wholly their own, that there is a puppet master or trainer who conducts their actions. From the words of adolescents during the atomic age it is clear that there is will and desire to bring about peace in peaceful way. After examining the actions of Alden Pyle and The Chicago boys it seems like that have the spirit to act to make a peaceful world. The professors that taught a limited curriculum, the researchers who researched biased materials, the institutions that forced their staff and faculty to follow along, and the government, which influenced it all, should be help accountable too. After reading this paper I hope that when you think of Alden Pyle's murder in Vietnam, or the military coup d'état that the

Chicago Boys help, you shake your fist and demand justice be brought to the players and institutions that reared these students. Knowing that our higher education system can function like this should make citizens want to safeguard it from those who want to remove academic freedom for personal interest.

Works Cited

- Abeles, Elvin. "The American Background: colonial period."
The Student and the University: A Background Book on the Campus Revolt. New York: Parents' Magazine Press, 1969. 29-45. Print.
- Allott, Miriam. "The Moral Situation in the Quiet American." Graham Greene: Some Critical Considerations. Ed. Robert O. Evans. N.p.: University of Kentucky Press, 1963. 188-206. Print.
- Bacevich, Andrew J. "Best Intentions: An Appreciation of Graham Greene." World Affairs. American Peace Society, 2009. Web. 29 July 2011.
<<http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/articles/2009-Summer/full-Bacevich.html>>.
- Biglaiser, Glen. "The Internationalization of Chicago's Economics in Latin America." Economic Development and Cultural Change Vol.50 No.2 (2002): 269-86. Jstor. Web. 20 Mar. 2011.
<<http://www.jstor.org.proxy.library.csi.cuny.edu/stable/10.1086/322875?&Search=yes&searchText=America&searchText=Internationalization&searchText=Latin&searchText=Economics&searchText=Chicago%27s&list=h>>.
- Bressler, Marvin. "Compromised Campus: Book Review." Rev. of Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities with the Intelligence Community, 1945-1955, by Sigmund Diamond. Contemporary Sociology 23.6 (1994): 853-55. Print.

- Brightman, Carol. "Truro/Bard/ New York/Paris/ Newport: 1945-1953." *Writing Dangerously: Mary McCarthy and her Words*. Wilmington: Mariner Books, 1994. 271-364. Print.
- Buckley, Kevin. "The Graham Greene Argument": A Vietnam Parallel that Escaped George W. Bush" *The Free Library* 22 September 2007. 04 October 2011 <[http://www.thefreelibrary.com/"The Graham Greene Argument": A Vietnam Parallel that Escaped George...-a0173644113](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/)>.
- Chomsky, Noam. "The Cold War and The University." *The Cold War & The University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*. Ed. David Montgomery. New York: The New Press, 1997. 171-94. Print.
- Diamond, Sigmund. "Harvard and the FBI: "A Most Cooperative and Understanding Association."" *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities with the Intelligence Community, 1945-1955*. Cary: Oxford University Press, 1992. 24-49. Print.
- Dressel, Paul L. "Some Historical Notes and Trends in Higher Education." *The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education*. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963. 1-19. Print.
- Ege, Konrad. "Rutgers University: Intelligence Goes to College." *Mind Control Forum*. N.p., Aug. 1984. Web. 3 Apr. 2012. <<http://www.raven1.net/mcf/rutgers-university.htm>>.
- Gendzier, Irene L. "Play it Again, Sam: The Practice and Apology of Development." *New Political Science* Vol. 20 No. 2 (1998): 159-83. Taylor & Francis Online. Web. 10 Apr. 2011<<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/>

10.1080/07393149808429820>.

Greene, Graham. *The Quiet American*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2004. Print.

Heineman, Kenneth J. "Bastions of Our Defense: Cold War University Administrators."

Campus Wars: The Peace Movement At American State Universities in the

Vietnam Era. New York: New York University Press, 1994. 13-41. Print.

Jedick, Peter. *Hippies*. Kindle. Los Angeles: Peter Jedick Enterprises, 2011. Print.

Katznelson, Ira. "The Subtle Politics of Developing Emergency": Political Science as Liberal Guardianship. *The Cold War & The University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*. Ed. David Montgomery. New York: The New Press, 1997. 233-58. Print.

Klein, Naomi. "The Other Doctor Shock: Milton Friedman and the Search for a Laissez-Faire Laboratory." *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Picador, 2007. 59-87. Print.

Lefkowitz Horowitz, Helen. "College Men: The War between Students and Faculty." *Campus Life Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present*. Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1987. 24-45. Print.

Levine, Lawrence. "The Clash Over the Classic Curriculum." *The Opening of American Minds*. Boston: Beacon press, 1996. 37-54. Print.

Lowen, Rebecca S. "Private Foundations and the Behavioral Revolution." *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1997. 190-224. Print.

Lewontin, R.C. "The Cold War and the Transformation of the Academy." *The Cold War & The University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*. Ed. David Montgomery. New York: The New Press, 1997. 1-34. Print.

McCarthy, Mary. *The Groves of Academe*. 1st. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1952. Print.

Montgomery, David. "Prosperity Under the Shadow of the Bomb" Introduction. *The Cold War & The University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*. New York: The New Press, 1997. xi-xxxvii. Print.

Moore, Kelly. "Political Protest and Institutional Change: The Anti-Vietnam War Movement and American Science." *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 199. 97-115. Print.

Mullinger, James. B. *The Earliest Colleges. A history of the University of Cambridge*. London: Longmans, Green, and co., 1888. 30-45. Print.

Mustich, James. "Philip Roth: Indignation." Barnes and Noble Interview. Barnes and Noble, 3 Nov. 2008. Abstract. Web. 2 May 2010. <<http://bnreview.barnesandnoble.com/t5/Interview/Philip-Roth-Indignation/bap/714;jsessionid=C13071A786AA85EF85ABD20916262370>>.

Nord, Warren. A. "Liberal Education, Moral Education, and Religion." *The Schooled Heart: Moral Formation in American Higher Education*. Ed. Michael R. Beaty and Douglas. V Henry. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007. 29-55. Print

"NSC 68: United States Objectives and Programs for National Security." A Report to the President Pursuant to the President's Directive of January 31, 1950. Federation of American Scientists. N.p., n.d. Web. 10 Mar. 2011. <<http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsc-hst/nsc-68.htm>>.

- Oppenheimer, Martin. "Footnote to the Cold War: The Harvard Russian Research Center." *An Independent Socialist Magazine* 48.11 (1997): n. pag. Academic Search Complete. Web. 11 June 2011.
 <<http://ehis.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.csi.cuny.edu/ehost/detail?vid=8&hid=121&sid=3224a890-841d-4428-9ad9-5b0a6fa9d3dc%40sessionmgr115&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWlhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=a9h&AN=9704163456>>.
- Petras, James F. Introduction. *The United States and Chili: Imperialism and the overthrow of the Allende government*. By Morris, H Morley. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975. 1-11. Print.
- Roth, Philip. *The Facts: A Novelist's Autobiography*. 1st. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1988. Print
- Rudolph, Frederick. Neglect of Students as a Historical Tradition. *The Student in Higher Education*. Washinton, D.C: American Counsel on Education, 1965. 17-20. Print.
- Schrecker, Ellen W. Schrecker "No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities." *A matter of Ethical hygiene: The Exclusion of Communists from Academic Life after World War II*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986. 84-126
- Schwerdtfeger, Spencer. "Kent State and Berkeley: Revolt and Re-appropriation of the Multiversity in the Spring of 1970." *Voces Novae: Chapman University Historical Review*, 2.1 (2010): 129-56. Web. 4 Mar. 2012.
 <<http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=schwerdtfeger%202010%2C%20%20%20research%20conducted%20there%20was%20of%20a%20predominantly%2>

omilitary%20nature”%20&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCIQFjAA&url=http%3A
%2F>.

Searle, John. R. "The Student." *The Campus War: A Sympathetic Look at the University in Agony*. New York: World Pub. Co, 1971. 10-30. Print.

Squire, James R. Introduction. *A New Look at Progressive Education*. By ASCD 1972 Yearbook Committee. Washington D.C: Washington, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972. 1-16. Print.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. "The Unintended Consequences of Cold War Area Studies." *The Cold War & The University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*. Ed. David Montgomery. New York: The New Press, 1997. 195-232. Print.

Wyndham, Francis. *Graham Greene*. Vol. 67. Essex: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1955. Print. *Writers and Their Work*.