

EVOLUTION OF STATE POLICY IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND ENSURING THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY IN THE USA*

Boris NIKOLAEV**

Nataliia PAVLOVA***

Abstract. *The article considers the main stages of the genesis of US state policy in higher education. Based on legislative acts, judicial precedents, views of representatives of state authorities and higher education institutions, and scientific literature, the article examines the main stages of state policy development in higher education as well as legislation and law enforcement practice in this field. One of the most important directions in the development of the state education policy at an early stage relates to the provision of equal rights and opportunities to women, disabled people, and representatives of racial, national and religious minorities in the field of higher education. All this leads to the identification of seven periods in the development of state policy in American higher education.*

Keywords: *American higher education, history of education, state education policy, equal rights, educational law.*

Introduction

This article considers a rather complicated question of the genesis of state policy and legal regulation in American higher education. Higher education plays an increasingly central role in the American economy and society. It is believed that the state-level public policy environment in which colleges and universities operate must change in significant ways to meet the challenges of the rapidly emerging knowledge-based global economy, particularly the need for more Americans to achieve knowledge and skills beyond the high school level. To address these challenges, the regulatory framework of higher education issues in the United States has undergone a significant and, at times, complex evolution. On the one hand, this evolution reflects the development trends common to the entire North American legal system. On the other hand, the state and legal regulation of higher education is conditioned by the specific perception of this system by the American state and society. In this connection, the strengthening of the state's impact on higher education in some cases is replaced by the recognition of academic freedom, university autonomy and self-regulation in higher education. In addition, federal and

* The paper was executed within the assignment from Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR), no. 16-06-00201, *Contemporary Modernization of Higher Education in the USA and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*.

** Penza State University, Russian Federation; e-mail: nikolboris@yandex.ru.

*** Penza State University, Russian Federation; e-mail: nataliia.pavlova@inbox.ru.

state policies in this area have also been dynamically changing. A significant role in the establishment and development of this institution was played by the provisions of the US Constitution, the American Supreme Court practice based on those, and the development of federal legislation, from special laws regulating certain aspects of higher education to the extensive regulation of equality and financial guarantees within higher education in the twentieth century. The constitutional regulation of higher education at the state level is also developing.

For a long time, American higher education remained elitist and focused on the needs and interests of the upper classes of American society. However, the excessive development of American statehood, as a consequence of the Independence War and the Civil War, fought under the banner of slavery abolition, led to the importance of the idea of ensuring equality in American higher education. The milestones in the development of American higher education are related to the implementation of the principle of equality. The periodization of state-legal policy in higher education, in this regard, should take into account the key importance of the principle of equality in the development of legislation, law enforcement practice, and practical state policy in the field of higher education.

Methodology

The methodological basis of this study is the principle of a multi-faceted approach to the sources, combining the analysis of various sources, including the US Constitution, federal acts, subordinate law-making, judicial precedents, state constitutions and state legislation. In addition, the article analyzes official statements on education made by US statesmen, higher education policymakers and statisticians. The choice of concrete methods was influenced by the specific features of the selected sources. While researching the sources, the article used the methods of historical-legal and comparative-legal analysis, the analysis of abstraction, systematization, etc. At the first stage this made it possible to determine the main significant changes in the development of state policy while higher education was being developed. Next, we attempted to realize the exact time limits of each stage and determine their most significant characteristics.

Results

Higher education has always occupied a special place in the system of values of American society. The formation of the USA itself as an independent sovereign state was based upon Enlightenment ideals, and the Founding Fathers of the United States considered Voltaire's general slogan "ideas rule

the world” as a guide to practical actions. Benjamin Franklin believed that “only education can reconcile unselfishness with trade.”¹

While drafting the Constitution in 1787, a delegate from South Carolina, Charles Cotesworth Pickney, proposed assigning “the establishment of a national university” to the powers of Congress, in which he was supported by James Madison. However, on voting, this project was rejected.²

President George W. Washington defended the idea of the federal university in his inaugural speech in 1790,³ as well as in his last address to Congress in 1796, believing that the national university would promote the emergence of a “class of people free from the prejudices of provincialism and sectarianism.”⁴ In 1816 the project to establish the national university was approved by the House of Representatives Committee, but was subsequently rejected by the US Congress as a whole.⁵

One of the active propagandists of the importance of education for the new republic was Thomas Jefferson, who believed that it was the state’s responsibility to provide every child with the opportunity to receive a general education. In 1779, Thomas Jefferson produced a “Bill for the more general diffusion of knowledge,” which offered the most talented young men of Virginia a public high school education, and the best of them were enrolled in the College of William and Mary.⁶ He became the author of the bills that provided for “three distinct grades of education, reaching all classes.” In such a system,

[...] the first stage is the elementary school for all children, rich and poor; the second level is colleges for a middle degree of instruction, calculated for the common purposes of life, and such as would be desirable for all who were in easy circumstances; the third which is the final stage is for the teaching of sciences in general and in their highest degree.⁷

On his instructions, the first law department was established at William and Mary College⁸ and the curriculum was reorganized with the intention of introducing as many “practical and publicly significant” training courses as possible.⁹

¹ Poletukhin 2006, p. 50.

² Lapati 1975, p. 48.

³ Millington 1979, p. XVI.

⁴ Rudolf 1990, p. 42.

⁵ Finn 1978, p. 8.

⁶ Bowen et al. 2005, p. 14.

⁷ Jefferson 1914, p. 75-76.

⁸ Friedman 2005, p. 240.

⁹ Rudolf 1990, p. 40.

At the dawn of the War of Independence, colonial colleges enrolled 750 students, more than three-quarters of whom were in the four oldest colleges.¹⁰ The main tendencies of the revolutionary era were an increase in the number of higher education institutions and students, and the secularization of higher education, which had been created primarily as a confessional institution in the preceding period.

Although the US Constitution lacks references to education, it plays a large role (including in amendments to it) in creating the foundations for the legal regulation of higher education. One of the first and most significant decisions of the American Supreme Court on higher education, taken on the case of *Dartmouth College v. Woodward* (1819),¹¹ was based on constitutional provisions. The court session was characterized by extreme emotionality. The speakers repeatedly stressed the importance of the decision not only for the state and a particular institution, but for the nation as a whole in relation to various private corporations. Indeed, the decision had a number of fundamental consequences in US legal history. As applied to higher education, it supported the American model of an academic organization, based on a clear and increasing domination of the Board of Trustees but not the faculty. In addition, the decision of the US Supreme Court marked the beginning of an era of mass creation of religious institutions of higher education, confirming the independence of private institutions from the state authorities, but, on the other hand, according to researchers, delaying “the development of public state universities for half a century.”¹² This decision made an exact legal distinction between public and private institutions of higher education, which is of fundamental importance in modern legal reality as well. As part of a broader perspective, this decision became a “bastion of private property” that protected private institutions from legislative interference¹³ and confirmed the increasing role of the Supreme Court in overseeing and interpreting the constitutional provisions by the states. However, not everyone perceived the impacts of this case optimistically. For many Americans, it meant “undermining the principle of people’s sovereignty,” “depriving the people and their representatives of the ability to control a significant area of social and economic relations.”¹⁴ Broadly speaking, the case examined confirmed the general understanding of higher education back in the nineteenth century as a sufficiently separate social institution that, despite all the importance of its social functions, should act

¹⁰ Geiger 2005, p. 42.

¹¹ <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/17/518/>, accessed 10 February 2018.

¹² Rudolf 1990, p. 211.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

¹⁴ Friedman 2005, p. 136.

in an environment of some detachment from the direct influence of political and social passions, independently determining the issues of internal organization and activity. Such an “autonomy was like a Victorian club of gentlemen whose sacred limits should not be profaned by the involvement of external agents in the internal management.” In addition, it was believed that the unique environment of higher education institutions supported a particular virtue, and professors and administrators had much more knowledge and skills than the general public and carried out their mission with special dedication and often “financial sacrifice,” which gave rise to the view that “Evil will and personal partiality are alien to the academic circles and external control over its activities is inappropriate.”¹⁵

In the same period, the system of federal administration of higher education was consistently developing. In 1867, the first commissar of the Department of Education was appointed (not as part of the departments of the Cabinet), whose duties included collecting information for conducting research in education. Of particular importance in the history of the legal regulation of higher education in the United States are the so-called Morrill Laws, although they were adopted under the conditions of the already-existing legal practice. Single acts of regulation of educational institutions took place even in the colonial era.¹⁶ In 1787, the Northwest Ordinance was adopted, which established land grants for the establishment of educational institutions. Even before the adoption of the law, 26 of the 33 states had at least one state-controlled institution.¹⁷

In 1848, Congressman Justin Smith Morrill from Vermont expressed the idea that American colleges “must abandon a significant part of subjects established a few centuries ago by the European higher education model and replace them with disciplines that have practical but not ancient values.” In 1857, Morrill introduced this Bill to Congress, determining the leading direction of the reform on technical education, clearly emphasizing that the purpose of this bill is “to promote liberal and practical education of industrial classes in various professions.”¹⁸

This bill became law, only after its repeated introduction, in 1862, when the southern states had left the Union and President Buchanan had resigned, having vetoed the first version of the bill. The Southerners raised the question of the constitutionality of the law, calling it an “unconstitutional stealing of the treasury in order to bribe the states.” Many of them disagreed with the idea of improving the situation of farmers and workers in the north of the

¹⁵ Kaplin, Lee 2007, p. 16.

¹⁶ Liggio, Meiners 1989, p. 218-222.

¹⁷ Bowen et al. 2005, p. 22.

¹⁸ Rudolf 1990, p. 249.

country; but at the same time, raising the standard of living and facilitating the work of southern farmers was not connected by them with the general level of education of the population. It was also necessary to overcome the general hostility of the population of the North and West to higher education of any kind. Nevertheless, the law was adopted and provided for the support of at least one college by each state, whose main objective, along with other scientific and classical subjects, was the study of subjects related to agriculture and mechanics. Each state was given public lands or a land certificate of 30,000 acres for each senator and a state representative in Congress as of 1860.¹⁹ Over time, each state acquired its own fund of such lands, and seventeen of them had two such funds.

The Second Law of Morrill of 1890 provided for regular annual assistance to the respective colleges, and stipulated that this aid would not be provided to states denying access to education on the grounds of race until they provided equal opportunities for all individuals regardless of race, even if segregated. In the modern USA, almost ten percent of students are enrolled in institutions based on land grants. Six out of ten of the largest universities (in terms of student numbers) in the United States are of this type, and they award approximately one third of all doctoral degrees.²⁰

Throughout the nineteenth century, the American student population continued to grow rapidly in diversity. If initially the student representatives were almost exclusively wealthy white gentlemen, then the first revolutionary years saw an increased number of middle-class representatives. This diversification was promoted by the development of a system for financing higher education, both from private foundations and from federal and state governments.

Social and economic democratization was complemented by gender and racial issues. If Oberlin College was a “unique and heroic example” of the first college that accepted students regardless of race (1835) and gender (1837), by 1870, women accounted for at least 21 percent of the students.²¹ The number of students representing different racial and national groups of the US population was also growing. Specialized “female” and “black” colleges and universities were actively developing.

At the same time, the process of overcoming discrimination in American higher education proved to be very lengthy and controversial. Racial segregation would have disappeared under the influence of large-scale socio-political changes after the Civil War and constitutional and legislative innovations of the 1860s, but in the 1870s and 90s it was supported by the

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 250-253.

²⁰ Bowen et al. 2005, p. 22.

²¹ Ibid., p. 20-21.

courts of such states as Indiana, California, Missouri, New York, Ohio,²² and then the Supreme Court of the United States. One of the most significant and pivotal decisions on higher education issues was the 1896 decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, through which the doctrine of “divided but equal”²³ was finally approved. This, for almost half a century, conserved the policy of racial discrimination and segregation in the United States.²⁴ By 1906, in the *Berea College v. the state of Kentucky* case,²⁵ the Supreme Court was already applying this doctrine to higher education.

The end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century saw a gradual quantitative growth and qualitative development of the American university system. Researchers point to the process of moving towards “university standardization” which was largely performed under the influence of the German model.²⁶ From 1890 until 1905, all the main academic associations appeared in a modern form. In 1908, the Carnegie Foundation was established to promote teaching. In 1915, the American Association of University Professors was organized. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1918, which provided grants for training World War I veterans, became important for the American higher education legislative tradition, and this was continued through the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944. Thus, military years effectively contributed to an increase in the proportion of women in universities. Researchers talk about the twenty-year interwar period as a stage of transition from elite to mass education.²⁷

Despite all the positive trends in the development of legal regulation on American higher education from the end of the eighteenth century till the beginning of the twentieth century, this period actually revealed a conservative character. By the middle of the twentieth century, there was practically no comprehensive federal legislation related to the organization and functioning of higher education. Courts were the most active element of the federal government system there; however, they were held captive by the “contractual” doctrine that generated and supported a policy of non-interference in the relationship of universities on the one hand, and students and teachers on the other. Protecting universities against arbitrary interference by the public and the authorities, this doctrine, however, contributed to the development of socially inefficient trends in higher education, internal dictatorship by the administration and the boards of trustees, and legal insecurity for teachers and students. The courts’ support

²² Kern, Erwin 1972, p. 514.

²³ Kirp, Yudof 1974, p. 281-288.

²⁴ Kern, Erwin 1972, p. 515; Edwards, Nordin 1979, p. 475.

²⁵ <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/211/45/>, accessed 24 January 2018.

²⁶ Geiger 2005, p. 54-55.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

of racial segregation in higher education institutions up to the middle of the twentieth century preserved this vicious and shameful institution within American society. On the other hand, for more than 150 years, there had been a steady growth in the democratization, humanization and professionalization of higher education; its quantitative and qualitative growth; and the growth of its influence on public opinion and the political system. Legal regulation at both federal and state levels, in the form of constitutional amendments, legislative acts, acts of executive power and judicial decisions played an important role.

As such, the assessment of the development of higher education as one step forward, two steps back²⁸ in this case should, at least, be replaced by “one step back, and two steps forward.” In addition, the legal developments of the period under consideration prepared a legal, political and social basis for the future mid-twentieth century “revolution” in terms of both higher education itself and legal regulation of higher education.

It is widely believed in the United States that the new government education policy began during World War II, when the authorities announced further policy measures and additional federal budget allocations to boost university research and innovation and offered considerable scholarships to returning veterans. At the same time, large allocations to universities were not intended by the government to improve the university system, but only meant to ensure that fundamental sciences were mainly concentrated in universities. Funds for scholarships under the 1944 Veterans’ Preference Act were a result of the government’s desire to reduce unemployment, as the post-war American economy was unable to provide jobs to several millions of veterans. It is no coincidence that the appropriations for this program were the largest after World War II and the US military operations in Korea. By the early 1960s, they were gradually declining, although it was the very time when deficits and shortages in the qualified American workforce were clearly identified. In his 1944 State of the Union speech, Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized as one of the main priorities of his policy the development and adoption of the Second Bill of Rights.²⁹ In 1944, the first Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, better known as the G. I. Bill, was adopted, followed by programs that provided funds for veterans in further education.

Roughly 2.2 million veterans³⁰ used the G. I. Bill’s educational benefits to attend colleges or universities. As for the development of its own system of training the workforce, for more than ten post-war years, the federal government confined itself to studying this problem.

²⁸ Bowen et al. 2005, p. 14.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 30.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 31.

“Higher Education for American Democracy” was a report commissioned by American President Harry S. Truman on the condition of higher education in the United States. The commission to write this report was established on 13 July 1946, and it was chaired by George F. Zook. The report is significant not only for its six-volume size, but for the fact that it marked the first time in the history of the United States that a president had established a commission for the purposes of analysing the country’s system of education. The Truman Commission Report, as it is sometimes known, recognized the two main obstacles to the expansion of educational opportunities: namely, the inequality of educational conditions provided by different states and low levels of family income. The report pointed out that for most young people “the type and cost of education depend not on their abilities, but on the family or community in which they happened to be born, or, worst of all, on the colour or religion of their parents.”³¹

Seven years before the famous Supreme Court decision *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Commission condemned the doctrine of “divided but equal” and the quota system as “non-American,” stating that it “cannot be justified by any grounds compatible with democratic principles.”³² The Commission presented a generally adequate and bold report for its time, which, however, remained a mere statement of intent that would not allow its desired goals to be realized. And even ten years later, when the Joseph’s Commission, created by President Eisenhower, submitted to the US Congress a draft law on urgent and necessary measures to improve American higher education, it was not met with enthusiasm either in the House of Representatives or in the Senate. The debate dragged on for many months. Given the prevailing tone, it is doubtful that the results of the process would have ever been summarized and presented in any legislative action, had not the USSR launched the world’s first artificial Earth satellite on 4 October 1957.³³ The greatest sensation of Soviet scientific and technical achievements shocked the whole country, caused confusion in Congress and turned the subject of this rather sluggish debate into a burning national issue. The launch and orbit of Sputnik suggested that the USSR had made a substantial leap forward in technology, which was interpreted as an indicator of the advantages of the Soviet Union in scientific education. The education gap in space research was due not so much to the government’s insufficient attention to space programs, but to the low level of teaching and training.

In 1957 and 1958, the members of Congress examined about 1,500 bills, over 80 of which were adopted. Finally, Congress turned a large chunk

³¹ *Higher Education* 1947, p. 27.

³² Bowen et al. 2005, p. 34-36.

³³ *The Politics* 1996, p. 46-47.

of debate into a discourse on the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), adopted by Congress on 2 September 1958. The Act provided for additional financial assistance to state and municipal schools for the purposes of strengthening science, math and foreign language programs. It also included provisions for improving the work of education statistical services and the management of educational institutions. It highlighted the increasing importance of pre-university training programs and the need to implement testing programs to identify gifted students. The Act authorized the provision of student loans and provided terms by which they might be awarded.

Thus, the government considered this Act to be a way to ensure the strength of the nation, while linking national interests with the perspectives of higher education. The NDEA initiated the financing of higher education itself, but not in connection with other federal programs.³⁴ The “Satellite Syndrome” had a beneficial effect on the development of a coherent, conceptual government policy on higher education. However, it was not until 1960 that the government actively included higher education in its field of activity. This was due to the adopted policy of stimulating economic growth and under the influence of the general recognition of the key importance of education in economic development. It was the 1960s that represented the culmination of lawmaking in higher education. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 authorized federal funds to support residential vocational schools, vocational work-study programs, research, training and infrastructure (classes, libraries, laboratories). In 1966, the Law on International Education was adopted, which provided grants for organizing and strengthening the work of the centres that conducted research and training in this field. In the same year, the Law on Adult Education established grants that encouraged the expansion of programs for non-traditional American students.

The most important federal law in this area is the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA), a large part of which was intended to strengthen the financing of higher education in general and its individual elements (financial assistance to students, promotion of higher education for women and minorities, non-traditional-age students, innovative projects and research).³⁵ By 1980, taking into account the amendments of 1972 and 1980, the HEA authorized various forms of financial assistance to more than half of all students in the country (3.6 million).³⁶ In particular, the Education Amendments of 1972 provided enormous amounts of financial assistance to students and offered a model for the transition from elite to mass universal

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 49-52.

³⁵ *A Compilation* 1995, p. 1.

³⁶ *US Department* 1980, p. 2.

access in higher education.³⁷ The American researcher Roger L. Geiger considers the education amendments of 1972 as a “watershed” in the development of legal regulation of higher education. The introduction of the Pell Grants system and the protection of national minorities and women expanded state regulatory control over higher education.³⁸ The Higher Education Act of 1965 consisted of twelve titles and regulated a wide range of issues related to the financing of the higher education system. It played a significant role in the codification of US legislation on higher education in general and the financing of higher education in particular.

In general, the post-war thirty years were marked by revolutionary changes in terms of legal regulation, the standardization of higher education, and the quantitative growth of the student population (the number of students who received a university degree increased nine-fold).³⁹

Of particular importance in the system of higher education are the laws that established universal federal standards for higher education in terms of the cessation and prevention of discrimination. In general, the latest trend of the 1950-1970s was the intensification of the human rights struggle in American society and in the field of education, which, along with issues of electoral rights, labour and social security relations, became one of the main “battlefields” in this protracted campaign. The Civil Rights Acts were particularly in great request in the 1860s (primarily in connection with the Civil War and the elimination of slavery), as well as in the 1950-70s, and that period was characterized by massive legislative and jurisdictional efforts aimed at combating discrimination in various walks of public life.

In 1954, the US Supreme Court decision of *Brown v. Board of Education*⁴⁰ made the desegregation of American schools a constitutional imperative.⁴¹ A special Civil Rights Commission was created to implement Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,⁴² which prohibits discrimination under federal programs on grounds of race, colour and national origin. President John Kennedy and the subsequent administration of President Lyndon Johnson played a decisive role in providing legal support to the human rights movement.⁴³ The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (EOA) provided for job training, adult education, and grants to students from families with low incomes. In addition, the Education Amendments of 1972 (Title IX) prohibited

³⁷ Kerr 1982, p. 151.

³⁸ Geiger 2005, p. 64.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁴⁰ <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/349/294/>, accessed 10 January 2018.

⁴¹ Martin 1998, p. VII-VIII.

⁴² <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-78/pdf/STATUTE-78-Pg241.pdf>, accessed 10 January 2018.

⁴³ Rosenberg, Karabell 2003, p. 336-337.

discrimination on grounds of sex.⁴⁴ In 1974, Congress passed the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1974, aimed at eliminating discrimination and highlighting the importance of educational opportunities for disabled, special-needs and disadvantaged children. In 1975, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 came into force. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 required all public schools accepting federal funds to provide equal access to education and one free meal a day for children with physical and mental disabilities. In 1979, the Older Americans Act was passed, which prohibited discrimination, including that in education, based on age. The federal system of American higher education continued to develop. The United States Department of Education was recreated by the Department of Education Organization Act (Public Law 96-88) and signed into law by President Jimmy Carter on 17 October 1979; it began operating on 4 May 1980.

The most important law among those adopted at the beginning of the twenty-first century was the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001 (the USA Patriot Act).⁴⁵ Subsequently, significant changes and additions were made to the Act by further acts of Congress, which approved it as one of the most significant and representative laws of George W. Bush's administration.⁴⁶ This law caused considerable concern and some misunderstanding in American society, especially among supporters of the political opposition of the Bush administration and among the intelligentsia, due to its rapid introduction, adoption and enforcement, as well as the absence of a serious and lengthy discussion and analysis of its implications for the development of American democracy, civil rights and freedoms.⁴⁷ Such a discussion seemed necessary because of the particular fundamental importance of the problem outlined in this law, namely, the relationship between freedom and security. The famous words of Benjamin Franklin are to be recalled: "He, who sacrifices freedom for the sake of security, deserves neither."⁴⁸ The faculty of various colleges and universities adopted a resolution to protect students and university staff from encroachments on the part of the Law, which violates the right to academic freedom by requiring library workers and book suppliers to provide information about their clients

⁴⁴ <https://www.justice.gov/crt/title-ix-education-amendments-1972>, accessed 10 January 2018.

⁴⁵ <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ56/pdf/PLAW-107publ56.pdf>, accessed 10 January 2018.

⁴⁶ <http://uscode.house.gov/statutes/pl/109/178.pdf>, 12 January 2018.

⁴⁷ <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/4325-aaupacademic-freedom-and-national-security-in-a>, accessed 12 February 2017.

⁴⁸ Franklin 1956, p. 104.

to representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at their request. Information should be kept secret from other sources. The adopted resolution noted that it was the responsibility of university president or staff member performing his or her duties to take responsibility for providing information to the employees of the specified service. Concerned academics sent an appeal to Congress, protesting the potential violation of human rights enshrined in the US Constitution.⁴⁹ The public spoke in favour of at least a balanced approach to solving security issues, taking into account other, broader negative consequences, including the negative perception of the United States in the world and the loss of leadership in world educational processes.⁵⁰

The beginning of the twenty-first century was marked not only by legislative initiatives to ensure security. William J. Clinton and George W. Bush declared themselves “presidents in support of education,” emphasizing, therefore, the particular importance of this institution for the development of American society and the nation. Educational issues in general and problems of higher education in particular are invariably present in the State of the Union addresses, and progress in education is perceived as an indispensable condition of American leadership in the modern world.

This, in part, is typical for federal policy in general, and for the position of the American presidential power in the late twentieth - early twentieth-first centuries. A similar trend continued through the work of Barack Obama’s Democrat administration. In a speech on 14 July 2009, Obama said that by 2020 the USA should become number one in the world in terms of the proportion of people who have received a college education. In a speech on 6 December 2010, President Obama compared the present moment for American society and higher education with the situation half a century ago, stating that the “moment of Sputnik for our generation *has come*.” The central challenge of the American education development agenda is to ensure that education, its modernization and democratization become a positive force for present and future generations.⁵¹

At the same time, modern legal regulation of American higher education is experiencing some difficulties and demonstrates a certain inconsistency. Along with the aforementioned adverse effects of anti-terrorist legislation on the educational environment, it is possible to point to a growing crisis related to the legislation on the financing of higher education. On the one hand, this is developing dynamically, but on the other hand, the

⁴⁹ *Nota Bene* 2004, p. 4.

⁵⁰ Bowen et al. 2005, p. 34-35.

⁵¹ <https://www.energy.gov/articles/president-obama-north-carolina-our-generation-s-sputnik-moment-now>, accessed 12 January 2018.

compensatory credit component of student assistance and crises arising from the non-payment of educational loans periodically raise the question of the effectiveness of this system. The Supreme Court in 2003⁵² made a number of significant decisions regarding the doctrine and practice of the “affirmative action” program, which confirmed that universities could promote a compelling purpose based on granting additional benefits to representatives of racial and national minorities in order to overcome past discrimination, but created a whole system of additional conditions for such programs and limited this practice to a 25-year period. The case of *A. Fisher I (Fisher v. University of Texas, 2013)* and *II (Fisher v. University of Texas, 2013)* retains the incompleteness of the legal definition of the essence, content, framework and social significance of the institution of positive discrimination in the US higher education system.⁵³

Thus, the system of legislative regulation of American higher education is a complex, dynamically developing system that has a long, progressive though controversial history. Along with the specialized laws directly devoted to higher education, the laws that regulate civil rights and create guarantees for their implementation in education are of great importance. Legislation of a protective and, in particular, of an anti-terrorist nature, is becoming increasingly important. Constitutional and legislative regulation is supplemented by the US Supreme Court and subordinate federal courts, as well as by subordinate lawmaking.

The analysis of the development of the institution of legal regulation of American higher education makes it possible to single out the following periods. The first stage encompasses the process of developing legal regulation, mainly in the form of case law in federal courts from the time of the War of Independence, the creation of independent American statehood and the adoption of the US Constitution in 1787 until the Civil War.

The second stage (1861-1945) is characterized not only by the Supreme Court and federal courts’ cases, but also by the adoption of constitutional amendments (especially the XIV amendment, whose provisions on due process and equal protection of the law played a significant role in the development of educational law and human rights protection in higher education). Specialized federal legislation (especially the Morrill Laws) was also developing over this period.

In the post-war years (1945-1958) legislation (the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 and others) was aimed at helping military personnel and other categories of person to adapt to a new peacetime society and a new type of market economy by various means, including through

⁵² <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/539/306/>, accessed 15 January 2018.

⁵³ <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/579/14-981/>, accessed 15 January 2018.

higher education institutions. In addition, the USSR's success in scientific, technical and military-technical activities (the so-called "Sputnik Syndrome") can explain the increased legislative activity in education during the Cold War.

The fourth stage covers the years from 1958 to 1980 (beginning with the adoption of the National Defense Education Act and ending with the beginning of the Ronald Reagan administration) and is characterized by the culmination of the development of legislative regulation of American higher education, including the adoption of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the foundation of the Department of Education under the Department of Education Organization Act of 1979.

The fifth stage (1980-1992) is characterized by a significant restriction of federal participation in the development of American higher education in the context of the neo-conservative policy (during the Reagan and Bush administrations from 1980 to 1989) that sought to reduce government social security programs and delegate significant powers to states, while developing private initiatives and citizen participation in decision-making, including in matters of higher education. It was in this period that market mechanisms and methods were introduced into the higher education system. The policy of the Republican administration of that period should not be presented as one-sided; moreover, there was a sustainable tendency towards increasing appropriations, highlighting the importance of education in the system of priorities. So, on the one hand, there was an intention to liquidate the Department of Education and bring down federal financial assistance to higher education institutions; on the other hand, education was recognized as a top priority in the policy of the Bush administration.

The sixth stage (1993-2007) witnessed the transition from passivity in federal legislation in the 1980s to federal activism in the field of legal regulation of the higher education sector. Development of federal legislation, primarily in terms of ensuring greater transparency, openness and accessibility of higher education for representatives of various groups of American society, demonstrates the sustainability of the federal government's interest in higher education issues, especially in ensuring equal access to high-quality education for all American citizens. It was during this period that the idea of universal higher education was initially formed and proclaimed as one of the principles of state policy, first at the level of a two-year college (William J. Clinton), and then of a four-year college (George W. Bush).

The latest stage (2008 - up to the present) is connected with the recession in the USA (as well as in other countries of the world), which necessitated a more flexible and prudent economic policy in higher education. The main objective of this period is, on the one hand, a large reduction in public spending in higher education, and, on the other hand, maintaining the necessary level of state support for higher education institutions, students and

members of their families affected by the recessionary constraints and hardships. Aiming to implement its priority health reforms, the Obama administration moved away from education issues, especially in view of the serious contradictions in legislation between the Democrat presidential administration and the increasingly Republican Congress. That is why the administration's actions in higher education in this period are characterized by fragmentation, inconsistency and, therefore, a lack of positive results. Proclaiming the guarantee of equality and security as one of the most important tasks in higher education, Barack Obama did not provide either genuine security in American universities or real progress in equalizing the educational opportunities for black Americans and other racial and national minorities. His consistent promotion of the protection of sexual minorities' rights in higher education institutions does not enjoy such unequivocal support as the human rights initiatives of his predecessors, thus provoking resistance between the various political and social groups.

Discussions

There are various approaches to the periodization of the development of American higher education. Famous for his research on the contemporary challenges facing American higher education, Roger L. Geiger distinguishes ten stages in its development: the era of the Reformation (1636-1740); the appearance and development of colonial colleges (1745-1775); the formation of a new republican education (1776-1800); the final stage results of the republican education formation (1800-1820); the development of classical and denominational colleges (1820-1850); "new approaches" to the organization of American higher education (1850-1890); the period of growth and standardization (from the 1890s to the First World War); the hierarchical differentiation of higher education institutions between the World Wars and the transition from elite to mass higher education, i.e. the academic revolution (1945-1975); the period of the increasing role of legal regulation, primarily at the state level, in the organization and functioning of higher education.⁵⁴

Another authoritative American researcher, Clark Kerr, identifies three periods of special significance in the development of higher education in the United States. The first begins with the creation of the first universities in the colonial period and is characterized by the perception of higher education as a private enterprise, as well as the responsibility of the state authorities. During the second period (from the 1860s), the legislative regulation of American higher education becomes mainstream at the federal level, and the Supreme Court and other federal courts see legal disputes regarding higher education issues. The third period falls in the 1960s and is considered

⁵⁴ Geiger 2005, p. 39-61.

fundamental in the process of reforming higher education, both in terms of the quantitative growth of higher education indicators, and in terms of expanding the legal regulation of higher education, especially at the level of federal legislation and law enforcement practice.⁵⁵

In general, researchers agree that changes in American higher education across the second half of the twentieth century were so massive that they actually led to the emergence of an “absolutely new institution” in comparison with higher education institutions of 1945, both in terms of research mode, and in their transition from local to national scales of operation, to sustain reliable, effective and affordable services (at least at leading universities), which produced all the qualitative indicators of the social value of higher education.⁵⁶

The development of higher education and its legal regulation in the US is closely linked to the development of social and legal guarantees of freedom and equality in North American society. It was the second half of the twentieth century that witnessed higher education becoming one of the key institutions of American society and a symbol of the success of the American dream. That is why the periodization of the development of state and legal regulation of higher education in this period was given special attention.

Conclusions

The analysis of legislation, statistical data and scientific literature allows us to conclude that the importance of federal state policy in the development of American higher education is increasing. One of the most important directions of this policy was the provision of equal opportunities for higher education to representatives of various groups of the population: women, racial and national minorities, religious communities, disabled people, immigrants and foreigners.

The principle of equality has become one of the key criteria for assessing the effectiveness of federal educational policy, especially since the adoption of the Civil Rights Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965. This approach allows us to single out seven periods in the development of public policy and state and legal regulation of higher education in the United States. If the first stage (1776-1860) was defined by the absence of legal regulation of national educational policy (except for single court cases), then the next period was characterized by the gradual development of federal legislation and the rulings of the US Supreme Court. The key periods were the post-war years and the subsequent struggle for civil liberties in the 1950s and 1960s, characterized by unprecedented activity from the federal authorities in

⁵⁵ Kerr 1991, p. XI-XIII.

⁵⁶ Smith, Bender 2008, p. 1.

enacting education laws, expanding state funding for higher education and developing presidential higher education programs, as well as the intensification of judicial practice and law enforcement activities to ensure the principle of equality in the system. After some “calm,” the milestone of the new millennium was marked by the recognition of the paramount role of education and, in particular, higher education in the presidential administrations of William J. Clinton and George W. Bush. In recent years, while maintaining a leading position in the world, the American higher education system nevertheless demonstrates contradictory development trends which are primarily caused by a large-scale recession and an increasingly large US budget deficit. All these circumstances force the federal government to take more cautious measures in the field of financing higher education. In addition, the change of priorities in favour of protecting the rights of sexual minorities and the development of health care and social security issues does not contribute to a massive federal educational policy. The events of the last presidential elections and the first steps of the Donald Trump administration demonstrate the significant politicization and partisanism of American higher education, and the tendency towards a gradual shift of educational issues to the periphery of state policy, especially in view of the president’s new emphasis on implementing budget cuts, including to those for education purposes, along with increased attention to issues of immigration, arms development programs and energy issues. The withdrawal of education from the list of “top issues” on the official website of the White House only confirms the emerging trend. This trend is very undesirable, since it is precisely the higher education system that became the pride of the Americans in the last decades as a social institution that promotes the realization of the two basic values of American society – freedom and equality.

Bibliographical Abbreviations

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| <i>A Compilation</i> 1995 | - <i>A Compilation of Federal Education Laws</i> , vol. 3, Washington, 1995. |
| Bowen et al. 2005 | - William G. Bowen, Martin A. Kurzweil, Eugene M. Tobin, <i>Equity and Excellence in American Higher Education</i> , Charlottesville, 2005. |
| Edwards, Nordin 1979 | - H. T. Edwards, V. D. Nordin, <i>Higher Education and the Law</i> , Cambridge (Massachusetts), 1979. |
| Finn 1978 | - Ch. E. Finn, <i>Federal Patronage of the Universities: A Rose by Many Other Names?</i> , in Sidney Hook, Paul Kurtz, Miro Todorovich (eds), <i>The University and the State: What Role for Government in Higher Education?</i> , Buffalo, 1978, p. 7-50. |

- Franklin 1956 - B. Franklin, *Izbrannyye proizvedeniya*, Moscow, 1956.
- Friedman 2005 - Lawrence M. Friedman, *A History of American Law*, New York, 2005.
- Geiger 2005 - R. L. Geiger, *The Ten Generations of American Higher Education*, in Philip G. Altbach, Patricia J. Gumpert, Robert O. Berdahl (eds), *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges*, Baltimore, 2005.
- Higher Education* 1947 - *Higher Education for Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education*, vol. 1, *Establishing the Goals*, New York, 1947.
- Kaplin, Lee 2007 - William A. Kaplin, Barbara A. Lee, *The Law of Higher Education*, San Francisco, 2007.
- Kern, Erwin 1972 - Alexander Kern, Solomon S. Erwin, *College and University Law*, Charlottesville, 1972.
- Kerr 1982 - Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University*, Cambridge (Massachusetts), 1982.
- Kerr 1991 - Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980*, Albany, 1991.
- Kirp, Yudof 1974 - David L. Kirp, Mark G. Yudof, *Educational Policy and the Law: Cases and Materials*, Berkeley, 1974.
- Jefferson 1914 - Thomas Jefferson, *Autobiography of Thomas Jefferson 1743-1790*, New York, London, 1914.
- Lapati 1975 - Americo D. Lapati, *Education and the Federal Government: A Historical Record*, New York, 1975.
- Liggio, Meiners 1989 - L. P. Liggio, R. E. Meiners, *The Growth of Government Control of American Higher Education*, in R. E. Meiners, R. C. Amacher (eds), *Federal Support of Higher Education: The Growing Challenge to Intellectual Freedom*, New York, 1989, p. 218-222.
- Martin 1998 - Waldo E. Martin Jr. (ed.), *Brown v. Board of Education: A Brief History with Documents*, Boston, 1998.
- Millington 1979 - William G. Millington, *The Law and the College Student: Justice in Evolution*, St. Paul (Minnesota), 1979.
- Nota Bene* 2004 - *Nota Bene*, in *Academe*, 90, 2004, 5, p. 4.
- Poletukhin 2006 - Y. A. Poletukhin, *Pravo i priroda cheloveka v trudakh amerikanskikh mysliteley epokhi Prosveshcheniya*, Cheliabinsk, 2006.
- Rosenberg, Karabell 2003 - Jonathan Rosenberg, Zachary Karabell, *Kennedy, Johnson and the Quest for Justice: The Civil Rights Tapes*, New York, London, 2003.
- Rudolf 1990 - Frederick Rudolf, *The American College and University: A History*, Athens (Georgia, USA), 1990.
- Smith, Bender 2008 - Wilson Smith, Thomas Bender (eds), *American Higher Education Transformed, 1940-2005: Documenting the National Discourse*, Baltimore, 2008.
- The Politics* 1996 - *The Politics of Intervention: External Regulation of Academic Activities and Workloads in Public Higher Education*, in *Academe*, 82, 1996, 1, p. 46-52.
- US Department* 1980 - *US Department of Education 1980: Annual Report*, Washington, 1980.

LISTA ABREVIERILOR DE PERIODICE

- AB** - Analele Buzăului. Muzeul Județean Buzău.
- Academe** - Academe. The American Association of University Professors. Washington.
- ACNLU** - Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Upsaliensis. Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Uppsala 2009). Leiden.
- ActaHASH** - Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. Budapest.
- ActaMN** - Acta Musei Napocensis. Muzeul de Istorie a Transilvaniei. Cluj-Napoca.
- AÉ** - Archaeologiai Értesítő a Magyar régészeti, művészeti-történeti és éremtani társulat tudományos folyóirata. Budapest.
- AI** - Anale de Istorie. Institutul de Studii Istorice și Social-Politice de pe lângă CC al PCR. București.
- AIAC** - Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie Cluj-Napoca.
- AIIAI/AIIX** - Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași (din 1990 Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași).
- AIIN** - Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională. Cluj, Sibiu.
- Alba-Iulia** - Alba-Iulia. Alba Iulia.
- AM** - Arheologia Moldovei. Institutul de Istorie și Arheologie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași.
- AnB** - Analele Banatului (serie nouă). Muzeul Național al Banatului. Timișoara.
- Antik Tanulmányok** - Antik Tanulmányok. Akadémiai Kiadó. Budapest.
- AO** - Arhivele Olteniei (serie nouă). Institutul de Cercetări Socio-Umane. Craiova.
- Apulum** - Apulum. Acta Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii Alba Iulia.
- ArhSom** - Arhiva Someșană. Revistă istorică-culturală. Năsăud.
- ArhMed** - Arheologia Medievală. Reșița, Cluj-Napoca.
- Astra Salvensis** - Astra Salvensis. Cercul Salva al ASTRA. Salva.
- AT** - Arhivele totalitarismului. Institutul Național pentru Studiul Totalitarismului. Academia Română. București.
- AUASH** - Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
- AUMCS** - Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Sklodowska. Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Sklodowskiej. Lublin.

Lista abrevierilor de periodice

AUS	- Acta Universitatis Szegediensis De Attila József Nominatae. Acta Historiae Litterarum Hungaricarum. A József Attila Tudományegyetem-Bölcsészettudományi Kar. Szeged.
AVSL	- Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Sibiu.
Banatica	- Banatica. Muzeul de Istorie al Județului Caraș-Severin. Reșița.
BAR	- British Archaeological Reports (International Series). Oxford.
BC	- Biblioteca și cercetarea. Cluj-Napoca.
BCȘS	- Buletinul Cercurilor Științifice Studentești. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
BHAB	- Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Banatica. Muzeul Banatului Timișoara.
Boabe de grâu	- Boabe de grâu. Revistă de cultură. București.
Brukenthal	- Brukenthal. Acta Musei. Muzeul Național Brukenthal. Sibiu.
București	- București. Materiale de istorie și muzeografie. Muzeul Municipiului București.
Bylye Gody	- Bylye Gody. International Network Center for Fundamental and Applied Research. Washington.
Caietele CNSAS	- Caietele CNSAS. Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității. București.
CB	- Călăuza bibliotecarului. Biblioteca Centrală de Stat București.
CBAstra	- Conferințele Bibliotecii Astra. Biblioteca Județeană Astra. Sibiu.
Cărți românești	- Cărți românești.
CCA	- Cronica cercetărilor arheologice. cIMeC. București.
CEHF	- Cahiers d'Études Hongroises et Finlandaises. Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris 3.
CollMed	- Collegium Mediense. Comunicări științifice. Colegiul Tehnic „Mediense” Mediaș.
Colloquia	- Colloquia. Journal of Central European History. Institutul de Studii Central-Europene al Facultății de Istorie și Filosofie a Universității „Babeș-Bolyai” Cluj-Napoca.
ComȘtMediaș	- Comunicări Științifice. Mediaș (este continuată de CollMed).
Contimporanul	- Contimporanul. Revistă de avangardă, cu program constructivist. București.
Corviniana	- Corviniana. Acta Musei Corvinensis. Muzeul Castelului Corvineștilor.
Cumidava	- Cumidava. Muzeul Județean de Istorie Brașov.

Țitatel	- Țitatel. Matica slovenská. Martin.
Discobolul	- Discobolul. Revistă de cultură. Uniunea Scriitorilor din România. Alba Iulia.
Drobeta	- Drobeta. Seria Etnografie. Muzeul Regiunii Porților de Fier. Drobeta-Turnu Severin.
Drobeta. Artă Plastică	- Drobeta. Seria Artă Plastică. Muzeul Regiunii Porților de Fier. Drobeta-Turnu Severin.
eClassica	- eClassica. Centro des Estudos Clássicos. Lisabona.
EF	- Einband-Forschung, Informationsblatt des Arbeitskreises für die Erfassung, Erschliessung und Erhaltung Historischer Bucheinbände (AEB). Berlin.
EJCE	- European Journal of Contemporary Education. Academic Publishing House Researcher. Bratislava.
EJST	- European Journal of Science and Theology. Gheorghe Asachi Technical University of Jassy.
EO	- Etnograficheskoye obozreniye. Institut etnologii i antropologii RAN. Moskva.
EphNap	- Ephemeris Napocensis. Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei Cluj-Napoca.
EPK	- Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny. Akadémiai Kiadó. Budapest.
ER	- Exportgut Reformation. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Göttingen.
ESTuar	- ESTuar. Online. București.
Familia	- Familia (seria I: 1865-1906). Oradea.
FI	- File de Istorie. Muzeul de Istorie Bistrița (continuată de RB).
FM	- Europäische Zeitschrift für Mineralogie, Kristallographie, Petrologie, Geochemie und Lagerstättenkunde. Deutschen Mineralogischen Gesellschaft. Stuttgart.
Folklore	- Folklore. Centre de Documentation et le Musée Audois des Arts et Traditions populaires. Carcassonne. Montpellier.
Gazeta ilustrată	- Gazeta ilustrată. Literară. Politică. Economică. Socială. Cluj.
GeoJournal	- GeoJournal. Spatially Integrated Social Sciences and Humanities. Springer Science and Business Media (Netherlands).
GT	- Geographia Technica. Geographia Technica Association. Cluj University Press. Cluj-Napoca.
HE	- Historia Ecclesiastica. Prešovská univerzita. Prešov.
HHCT	- History and Historians in the Context of the Time. Academic Publishing House Researcher. Bratislava.

Lista abrevierilor de periodice

- HHR** - Hungarian Historical Review. Institute of History, Research Centre for the Humanities. Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Budapest.
- Hierasus** - Hierasus. Muzeul Județean Botoșani.
- Historica Carpatica** - Historica Carpatica. Zborník Východoslovenského múzea v Košiciach. Košice.
- HL** - Humanistica Lovaniensia. Journal of Neo-Latin Studies. Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae. Leuven.
- HQ** - The Hungarian Quarterly. The Hungarian Quarterly Society. Budapest.
- HS** - Historické štúdie. Historický ústav slovenskej akadémie vied. Bratislava.
- Hyphen** - Hyphen. A Journal of Melitensia and the Humanities. The New Lyceum (Arts), Msida, Malta.
- IJCS** - International Journal of Conservation Science. Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Jassy.
- IJHCS** - International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies. University of Gafsa.
- INT** - Istoriya nauki i tekhniki. Izdatel'stvo „Reaktiv”. Ufa.
- IV** - Istoricheskii vestnik. Moskva.
- IS** - Izvestiya Samarskogo tsentra Rossiiskoi akademii nauk. Samara.
- IYZGU** - Izvestiya Yugo-Zapadnogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Yugo-Zapadnyi gosudarstvennyi universitet. Kursk.
- Izvestiya ANKSSR** - Izvestiya Akademii Nauk Kazakhskoy Sovetskoy Sotsialisticheskoy Respubliki. Seriya obshchestvennykh nauk. Alma-Ata.
- Îndrumător bisericesc** - Îndrumător bisericesc misionar și patriotic. Episcopia Aradului. Arad.
- Îndrumător pastoral** - Îndrumător pastoral. Episcopia Ortodoxă Română de Alba Iulia.
- JBS** - The Journal of Baroque Studies. International Institute for Baroque Studies at the University of Malta.
- JIA** - Journal of International Affairs. School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University. New York.
- JSRI** - Journal for the Study of Religions & Ideologies. The Academic Society for the Research of Religions and Ideologies. Cluj-Napoca.
- Kniha** - Kniha. Matica slovenská. Martin.
- Knižničný zborník** - Knižničný zborník. Matica slovenská. Martin.
- LAR** - Literatură și artă română. Idei, simțire, formă. București.

Limba română	- Limba română. Institutul de Lingvistică al Academiei Române „Iorgu Iordan - Al. Rosetti”. București.
Luceafărul	- Luceafărul. Revistă literară (1902-1945). Budapesta.
MA	- Mitropolia Ardealului. Revista oficială a Arhiepiscopiei Sibiului, Arhiepiscopiei Vadului, Feleacului și Clujului, Episcopiei Alba Iuliei și Episcopiei Oradiei. Sibiu (1956-1991).
Magyar Nyelvőr	- Magyar Nyelvőr. A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelvtudományi Intézet. Budapest.
Magyarország	- Magyarország. Budapest.
MCA	- Materiale și cercetări arheologice. București.
ME	- Memoria Ethnologica. Centrul Județean pentru Conservarea și Promovarea Culturii Tradiționale Maramureș. Baia Mare.
MH	- Melita Historica. Malta Historical Society.
MK	- Magyar Könyvszemle. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Budapest. Irodalomtudományi Intézet Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Budapest.
MKS	- Magyar Könyv-Szemle. A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia - Irodalomtudományi Intézet. Budapest.
MLN	- Modern Language Notes. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore.
MN	- Muzeul Național. Muzeul Național de Istorie a României. București.
MP	- Magyar Pedagógia. A Magyar Pedagógiai Társaság. Budapest.
Muzeum	- Muzeum. Muzejní a vlastivedná práce. National Museum. Prague.
NLWJ	- The National Library of Wales Journal. The National Library of Wales. Aberystwyth.
Noema	- Noema. Comitetul Român de Istoria și Filosofia Științei și Tehnicii. București.
NNI	- Novaya i noveishaya istoriya. Rossiiskaya akademiya nauk. Moskva.
NP	- Novoe proshloe. Yuzhnyi federal'nyi universitet. Rostov-na-Donu.
NS	- Nasledie i sovremennost'. Rossiyskiy nauchno-issledovatel'skiy institut kul'turnogo i prirodnogo naslediya im. D. S. Likhacheva. Moskva.
NVBU	- Nauchnye vedomosti Belgorodskogo universiteta. Seriya Istoriya. Politologiya. Ekonomika. Informatika. Belgorodskiy natsional'nyy issledovatel'skiy universitet. Belgorod.
OK	- Orvostörténeti Közleményel (Communicationes de historia artis medicinae). Budapest Semmelweis

Lista abrevierilor de periodice

	Orvostortenetí Muzeum Es Konyvtar And Magyar Orvostortenełmi Tarsasag. Budapest.
Orizont	- Orizont. Timișoara.
ORP	- Odrodzenie i reformacja w Polsce. Instytut Historii Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Warszawa.
PA	- Patrimonium Apulense. Direcția Județeană pentru Cultură Alba. Alba Iulia.
PB	- Patrimonium Banaticum. Direcția Județeană pentru Cultură Timiș. Timișoara.
Pediatria	- Pediatría de Atención Primaria. Publicación Oficial de la Asociación Española de Pediatría de Atención Primaria.
PH	- Prace Historyczne. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie.
Poarta Inimii	- Poarta inimii. Alba Iulia.
Programm Mühlbach	- Programm Mühlbach. Programm des evaghelischen Untergymnasium in Mühlbach und der damit verbundenen Lehranstalten. Sebeș.
PS	- Protestáns Szemle. Magyar Protestáns Irodalmi Társaság. Budapest.
RA	- Russkii arkhiv. Academic Publishing House Researcher. Bratislava.
RAPPS	- Revista de Administrație Publică și Politici Sociale. Universitatea de Vest „Vasile Goldiș” din Arad.
RB	- Revista Bistriței. Complexul Muzeal Bistrița-Năsăud. Bistrița.
RE	- Revista economică. Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu.
REF	- Revista de Etnografie și Folclor. Institutul de Etnografie și Folclor „Constantin Brăiloiu”. Academia Română. București.
Revista Arheologică	- Revista Arheologică. Centrul de Arheologie al Institutului Patrimoniului Cultural al Academiei de Științe a Moldovei. Chișinău.
RFR	- Revista Fundațiilor Regale. Revistă lunară de literatură, artă și cultură generală. București.
RH	- Roczniki Humanistyczne. Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II. Lublin.
RHSEE/RESEE	- Revue historique du sud-est européen. Academia Română. București, Paris (din 1963 Revue des études sud-est européennes).
RI	- Revista de Istorie (din 1990 Revista istorică). Academia Română. București.
RJMH	- The Romanian Journal of Modern History. Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Jassy.

RM	- Revista Muzeelor. București.
RMM	- Revista Muzeelor și Monumentelor. București.
RMV	- Revue de médecine vétérinaire. Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire de Toulouse.
România literară	- România literară. Săptămânal de literatură și artă. București.
Rossiiskaya istoriya	- Rossiiskaya istoriya. Akademicheskii nauchno-izdatel'skiy, proizvodstvenno-poligraficheskiy i knigorasprostranitel'skiy tsentr Nauka. Moskva.
RRH	- Revue Roumaine d'Histoire. Academia Română. București.
RT	- Revista Teologică (între anii 1956 și 1991 a apărut sub denumirea de Mitropolia Ardealului). Mitropolia Ardealului. Sibiu.
SA	- Sovetskaya arkheologiya. Akademiya Nauk SSSR. Moskva.
SAI	- Studii și articole de istorie. Societatea de Științe Istorice și Filologice a RPR. București.
Samus	- Samus. Muzeul Municipal Dej.
Sargetia	- Sargetia. Acta Musei Devensis. Muzeul Civilizației Dacice și Romane Deva.
SCA	- Studii și Cercetări de Antropologie. Institutul de Antropologie „Francisc I. Rainer”. Academia Română. București.
SCIA	- Studii și Cercetări de Istoria Artei. Seria Artă Plastică. București.
SCIV(A)	- Studii și cercetări de istoria veche (din 1974, Studii și cercetări de istorie veche și arheologie). București.
Slavyanskii al'manakh	- Slavyanskii al'manakh. Institut slavyanovedeniya Rossiiskoi akademii nauk. Moskva.
SMIC	- Studii și materiale de istorie contemporană. Institutul de Istorie „Nicolae Iorga” al Academiei Române. București.
SMIM	- Studii și materiale de istorie modernă. Institutul de Istorie „Nicolae Iorga” al Academiei Române. București.
Sovremennik	- Sovremennik. Sankt Petersburg.
SPST	- Sovremennye problem servisa i turizma. Russian State University of Tourism and Service. Moscow.
SS	- The Social Sciences. Western Social Association. Dubai.
Studia	- Studia. Transilvania Express. Brașov.
Studii	- Studii. Revistă de istorie (din 1974 Revista de istorie și din 1990 Revista istorică). Academia Română. București.

Lista abrevierilor de periodice

- SUP** - Studi Umanistici Pieni. Istituto Internazionale di Studi Pieni. Sassoferato.
- Századok** - Századok. A Magyar Történelmi Társulat. Budapest.
- Terra Sebus** - Terra Sebus. Acta Musei Sabesiensis. Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica” Sebeș.
- TIIAE** - Trudy Instituta Istorii, Arkheologii i Etnografii. Akademii Nauk Kazakhskoy Sovetskoy Sotsialisticheskoy Respubliki. Alma-Ata.
- TNK** - Trudy NII kul'tury. Ministerstvo kul'tury RSFSR. Moskva.
- TR** - Transylvanian Review. Centrul de Studii Transilvane al Academiei Române. Cluj-Napoca.
- Transilvania** - Transilvania. Centrul Cultural Interetnic Transilvania. Sibiu.
- TS** - Theologiai Szemle. A Magyarországi Egyházak Ökumenikus Tanácsa. Budapest.
- TT** - Testimonia Theologica. Evanjelická bohoslovecká fakulta Komenského univerzity v Bratislave.
- Unirea** - Unirea. Alba Iulia.
- UR** - Ungarische Revue. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia. Budapest.
- VAH** - Varia Archaeologica Hungarica. Budapest.
- Valori bibliofile** - Valori bibliofile din patrimoniul cultural național. Cercetare, valorificare. Consiliul Culturii și Educației Socialiste. Muzeul Județean Vâlcea. Râmnicu Vâlcea.
- VChGU** - Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Chelyabinskii gosudarstvennyi universitet. Chelyabinsk.
- VE** - Vestnik Evropy. Sankt Petersburg.
- Verbum** - Verbum. Revista catolică. București.
- Vestnik Tverskogo** - Vestnik Tverskogo Gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya Istoriya. Tver.
- Vestnik VEGU** - Vestnik VEGU. Vostochnaya ekonomiko-yuridicheskaya gumanitarnaya akademiya. Akademiya VEGU. Ufa.
- VI** - Voprosy istorii. Institut russkoy istorii Rossiyskoy akademii nauk. Moskva.
- Viața românească** - Viața Românească. Revistă literară și științifică. Iași.
- VMKK** - A Veszprém Megyei Múzeumok Közleményei. Veszprém.
- Vox libri** - Vox libri. Biblioteca Județeană „Ovid Densusianu” Deva.
- VS** - Voennyi Sbornik. Academic Publishing House Researcher. Bratislava.
- VV** - Vestnik vospitaniya. Moskva.

- Zalai Múzeum** - Zalai Múzeum. Zala. Múzeumok Igazgatósága. Zalaegerszeg.
- ZfE** - Zeitschrift für Ethnologie. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde und Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie Ethnologie und Urgeschichte. Berlin.
- ZfhWK** - Zeitschrift für historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde. Dresdner Verein für Waffenkunde. Berlin.
- ZfTZ** - Zeitschrift für Tierzüchtung und Züchtungsbiologie: Organ der Reichsarbeitsgemeinschaft Tierzucht im Forschungsdienst (continua: Zeitschrift für Züchtung. Reihe B, Tierzüchtung und Züchtungsbiologie). Berlin, Hamburg.