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preface

This volume explores the many-faceted relationship of today's college student with his university and in his endeavors to come to grips with society. The contributors are diverse: a sociologist, a professor of higher education, a dean of a liberal arts college, a former university president, a philosopher, three student activists, two currently practicing college administrators, and a man who is both a trustee of one college and a professor in another.

This diversity of viewpoint was deliberate. A topic as complex as the one discussed in this monograph touches on so many different areas of specialty and there is such profound disagreement among the specialists that the only tenable approach at this stage of understanding is to reach for as broad a spectrum of opinion as is obtainable.

Immanuel Wallerstein, Professor of Sociology at Columbia University, sees the particular university crisis of the last few years to be the consequence of the coming together of three strains in our society: the Vietnam War; the role of Blacks in our
society; and the growth in size of universities, their role in the lives of a large percentage of the population, and the demands which have arisen from the relative democratization of their structures. In his paper, Dr. Wallerstein explains how these strains operate, and how they affect the university system.

He sees the university to be more politicized today than it was five years ago. There has been a certain amount of short run social change as a result, as well as repression. The various issues current now are more likely going to be chronic than transitional. While there is going to be a reasonable amount of turmoil in society in the next ten or fifteen years, the university will neither be the core of this turmoil nor will it be totally irrelevant and a haven from the turmoil.

Lewis B. Mayhew, Professor of Higher Education at Stanford University, has contributed two papers to this collection, one on the role of students in governance, and the other on the fruits of the academic revolution. In the first paper, he reviews the areas where students have demanded change. Student protest has resulted in a political and public disenchantment with higher education. In his judgment students have been most productive as committee members when the topics concerned the regulation of student life, campus judicial activities, and developing cultural events. Students were least productive when dealing with critical decisions of institutional life. Students do not have a central role in academic governance given the present central objective of colleges and universities.

In his second paper, Mayhew states that college faculties have indulged themselves in a variety of old and new vices which need to be restrained. Of the old vices, faculty conservatism regarding education is the most endemic and hurtful. Others include preoccupation with unimportant detail and intellectual narcissism. More newly acquired vices include an intrusion into institutional governance beyond their capability, demanding less of their students than they would of themselves, excessive pride approaching an almost arrogant sense of personal worth, excessive influence over the next generation of leaders through the power of recommendation, substituting methodological elegance for thought about reality, and a tendency toward being impervious to the explicit needs of society. These vices are serious because higher education has become so significant in the life of the nation.

Burton Wheeler, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Washington University, addresses the topic of students and the shaping of the curriculum. The need for urgency in reform is sharpened, in his view, by the fact that there is a marked similarity between the rhetoric of college radicals and college catalogues. There is a profound sense of confusion about the purposes and proper directions of higher education, and student and faculty expectations have never been at such great disparity.

He discusses the serious controversy about whether the university is an instrument of society to produce trained manpower or whether both society and the university are instruments for man's survival. The implications of this controversy are explored for students, for those outside the university, for relationships with the government, for faculty, for student participation in curriculum reform, and with the nature and problems of undergraduate education.

Student contribution is initial: our educational vision is hampered by habits and fears which need a new perspective. As Dean Wheeler noted, "if we are not as yet prepared to draft the blueprints of a new society or even a new university, we cannot delay in preparing a citizenry which can envision, plan, and implement a saner and more just society."

Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence, begins by noting that for the 1970's we are facing a situation in which the regular institutions of authority have lost their power of control. Students of today are no longer rooted in the traditions and institutions which controlled the lives of their parents. Taylor traces the development of the world student movement and describes three main groups of radical students. He sees the center of gravity for the student movement to be in the areas of social and educational reconstruction, attempting to do necessary work which has been left undone. Taylor sees this generation of students as the most willing and able allies of educators, as new coalitions become possible. The secret, as he sees it, is in "using the resources of students to educate
themselves and in the use of the university as a liberating environment to which all the resources of the American community can be brought."

Lewis Feuer, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Toronto, offers a thoughtful historical analysis of student movements. On the basis of his inquiry, he found that "every student movement, though they were born in part of idealism and heroic motives, almost without exception became a self-destructive force in human history." He differs fundamentally from many of the other contributors in that he does not see the problem as new, or as the fault of the curriculum, nor does he believe that new methods of education will solve the problem.

In Feuer's view, what a student movement does is to impose irrational means on the presumably avowed ends. This puts the participants under tremendous emotional compulsion to choose violent types of means. The central issue confronting the modern university and society in regard to students is the tremendous energies of generation rebellion, or as he titled his paper, the "strife of generations."

Carole Remick, a student activist, believes that the university is failing, and that people on all levels of society are not satisfied with what they are receiving from their institutions. There is a tremendous gap between the focus of higher education and what is happening in today's world. Universities can no longer remain aloof from the problems that wreck society. They must take definite stands on societal issues. She is sad and frustrated by the fact that most students have been so indoctrinated by the existing pattern of education that they are unwilling to assume responsibility for trying to obtain a more responsible educational system.

Dennis Winkler, a student activist, believes that white middle class students are the new "niggers" in an America which is bankrupt, imperialistic, materialistic, and racist. The corporation enslaves their workers and the people of the world. America is going to smother in her own decadence and students will assist the suffocation. Within the university students have been like Black capitalists, wanting a bigger piece of the pie, and attempting to be more comfortable in their surroundings. Universities are political institutions, but do not have to voice political positions to be a political force.

The struggle in America is a class conflict, where class is a state of mind, with the Blacks, working class, and middle class white youth all fighting a common enemy. Many young people see no future for America and have decreed death for the state. The only question is how to cause that death. It is the job of young people to sabotage the machine of society, with tools cast in anarchy.

Sherman Teichmann, a graduate student, sees a major disaster in terms of the way the university confronts larger society. The university, to be effective, must be a politicized institution. It must, by consensus of its body, take stands on its most urgent problems, and its problems are society's problems.

The power within the university has aligned itself with the power within society. The nature of the university's social action concerns Teichmann. Service is most often given to those who need it least. At this point the university can no longer produce for others to affect; it itself must do the affecting.

Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr., Executive Vice President of Evergreen State College, has written an analysis of the relationship between the culture and the university. He reviews the historic categories of the function of American higher education and notes that in the United States college has become more of a prerequisite for societal advancement than a liberating, developmental experience.

Viewing knowledge as power, Dr. Shoben believes that if power is not governed by moral considerations, the probability of its direction for evil is high. Criticism, as an important function of the university, must assume a major role in the educative process. When the educational atmosphere is criticism rather than either socialization or professional training, there is a greater chance that the learning community will work together on problems of common significance. And criticism is essential at a time when the culture of the United States is in jeopardy from the logic of its technological and managerial nature, and policies which are too short-range in their vision.

C. Gilbert Wrenn, Distinguished Professor and Trustee at Macalester College and Visiting Professor at Arizona State University, considers some current dimensions
of higher education, including whether it can be both efficient and democratic, the location of power, the college and the public at large, the student issues of participation and relevance, the research function and the appropriate role of the teaching professor, the campus as a sanctuary, and the changing face of student personnel work.

On this latter topic, Dr. Wrenn indicates the need for a sense of realism regarding the time needed for changes to become effective, the need which students have for adult support as they undertake involvement in university affairs, the problems of within-college communications, and the roots in high school of some behavior problems of college students. He concludes by offering some penetrating and sensitive observations on the problems of the student personnel worker as a person.

In the final paper, John M. Whiteley, a counseling psychologist and apparent habitual administrator at Washington University, attempts a commentary on several issues regarding students in the university and society, and the problems of achieving constructive change within the framework of a university community.
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John M. Whiteley
St. Louis, Missouri
Let me start by giving you my assumptions as a student of social change and social movements. First; widespread unrest, whenever and wherever it exists, is always a sign of something amiss in the structure of the system in which it occurs. It means, essentially, that there are significant groups in the system who find, in making their calculus of pluses and minuses within the system, more minuses than pluses. That includes, of course, the calculus of what would happen in terms of repressive action if they were to protest.

Secondly; whether you are interested in the problems from the point of view of social melioration, that is, in terms of preservation of the society, or whether you are interested in them from an analytic point of view, you've got to take a social movement seriously as a rational movement. It is rational in the very simple sense that it is motivated by a set of considerations which can be analyzed, and which are relatively conscious to the participants. The participants have a set of objectives which they could define, although perhaps not as clearly as one might always wish.
The most dangerous thing to do, either from the point of view of an analyst or from that of someone who is interested in meliorating the situation, is to try to ignore the social content of a social movement by interpreting it in psychological terms. Psychology never explains social change or a social movement, if for no other reason than the reasonable assumption that the range of psychological responses to a social system is relatively constant over time. If one is to explain, therefore, why you have disruption at one point in time and not at another, the psychological motives of the individuals involved are reasonably irrelevant.

The particular university crisis of the last few years in the United States and, not only in the United States, but in much of Europe and in Japan, was the consequence of the coming together of three strains in our society, no one of which might have been enough to cause a crisis of the proportion which has occurred. However, the three of them coming together was rather overwhelming. One strain was that of the Vietnam War. The second was the role of Blacks in our society. The third strain was the growth in the size of universities, their role in the lives of a large percentage of the population, and the consequent demand that has arisen for relative democratization of their structures.

How do these three strains operate and how do they in particular effect the university system? Let's just take them one by one.

Vietnam

In order to understand the strain that I think the Vietnam War is causing, we have to put ourselves back into the picture in American universities between 1945 and 1960. During that time a cold war was going on in the international scene; the United States and the Soviet Union were defined as relative enemies. Everything in both societies and in allied societies was described and defined in function of this particular international conflict.

That had two impacts. One impact was on the intellectual climate of the United States. To summarize it very briefly, I would say that one basic effect of the cold war was to relatively suffocate left political thought within the American scene. Left political thought had played a large role in the Thirties and in the Forties, but in the cold war climate it became very apologetic and more or less died out as a significant thrust. What happened was that centrism as a political ideology became more or less the national ideology. It was a centrism with which right-wing thinkers felt much more comfortable than left-wing thinkers, but, as I said, left-wing thought largely died out.

The second impact on the university was very simple. The Second World War had established a working alliance between universities and the Federal Government, really for the first time in the history of the American university. Because of the war situation and because of the feeling of professors and the university administrations that they should contribute to the war effort, it became in the climate of the cold war, not a single momentary crisis relationship, but a continuing normal relationship. The universities began to feel that they ought, as an ongoing matter, to cooperate with the Federal government as a research institution and engage in all sorts of applied research. Of course, these research projects were also of great benefit to the universities. From them, they got considerable amounts of money which aided them in the expansion which they were undertaking. So the cold war left us with the suffocation of the left and the normalization of a link between the university and the Government.

The picture changed between 1960 and 1970. First of all, the international scene itself changed. From 1960 to 1970, we have increasingly seen a detente between the United States and the Soviet Union, symbolized by the Test Ban Treaty in 1963. This detente raised a problem of hypocrisy in the minds of many Americans, curiously enough. If you put yourself back into the frame of mind of the early Fifties, it was not at all conceivable that the United States and the Soviet Union might consider themselves anything but deadly enemies. That they would now see each other as simply differing powers on the world scene who would cooperate in many arenas of activity, and would often find themselves working together in the United Nations against other countries who had previously been thought to have been their friends, was an impossible thought in the Fifties. All of a sudden, in the Sixties, it became not only a possible thought, but
increasingly a common occurrence. And our students, brought up in high school on the
ideology of the fifties, suddenly noticed certain kinds of discrepancies between the
kinds of extreme statements that were made in the Fifties and the practices of the Sixties.
This led to a considerable debunking of official ideology as being inconsistent.

Slowly, very slowly, there came about the reemergence of a left political analysis on the
American scene as a legitimate form of political analysis, for the first time since about
1945. One consequence for the university was that people began to take a new look at the
relationship of the university and the Federal government. They began to call for the
disaffiliation of the university from the government, the cessation of the university as
a research arm of the Federal Government.

The university community reacted to this argument in several ways. Professors at the
universities moved leftward from wherever on the spectrum they had been in the early
Sixties and in the late Fifties, as did the majority of the American population. Even
members of the political center began to say, “Well, we ought to reappraise our links with
the Government and perhaps reconsider whether we should be quite so automatic in
our willingness to be a research arm.” This process of slow intellectual reappraisal was
greatly aided by the fact that there had begun to be a reduction of Government funds due to
the increasing cost of the Vietnam War. It is very easy to reanalyze situations when you
have to anyway. Another factor was the increased use by the U.S. Government of
independent research agencies outside the university system, thus relieving, so to speak,
the university of the kind of role it was playing.

Blacks

Let us now look at how we got to where we are on the Black situation. Again I
want to go back to the Thirties and the Forties. The Thirties and the Forties were a
time of great political compromise in the United States in terms of the enormous
conflicts that had gone on between labor movements and industry over the previous
fifty or seventy-five years in the country. This compromise, known as the New Deal, was
essentially a mechanism by which the Federal Government intervened in the labor-industry
relationship to throw some weight on the side of labor movements, both by legitimating
their role and by using the Federal System as a mechanism of some partial re-allocation of
money, through the social security system, unemployment insurance etc. That compo-
promise ended a period of long conflict in American society. At the time the com-
promise was made, it was assumed that, of course, this was a compromise between, let’s
say, two-thirds of the American population on one side, one-third on the other, and that, of
course, within that larger two-thirds of the working class, however broadly defined,
American Blacks were one subsegment there-
of. Actually, if you analyze it very closely, the compromise benefited American Blacks
very little. The compromise was, as has been historically the case of such social compo-
nromise, a compromise between the industrial class and the working class element from the
dominant ethnic group. Blacks were largely left out. They weren’t unionized and were
therefore outside the workings of large amounts of this system.

Now after the second World War, the cold war did lead to one great benefit to American
Blacks. That was the sense on the part of the Federal Government that if we were going to
be involved in this very strenuous conflict with the Soviet Union, there ought to be some kind of political advantage to American
Blacks. The Civil Rights Movement got its legal thrust from that, beginning with the
many things that President Truman did through the 1954 Supreme Court decision.
From 1954 to 1964 there was an effort to implement that ruling. This seemed to be an
effort that slowly but surely was gaining steam, and therefore most people who were
involved in it were reasonably optimistic and satisfied with the situation. I think that
around 1964 and 1965 the thing turned sour in very specific ways. The law of diminishing
return began to operate and the pressures fell off.

A series of incidents occurred almost simultaneously which led people involved in
the Civil Rights movements to feel that they weren’t going to get anywhere pursuing the
kind of line that they had. I think that three incidents which occurred in 1964 and 1965
were terribly significant. One was the Watts riot, which indicated that within the Black community there was a smoldering discontent which had not been adequately reflected, up to that point, in their leaders' position, not even in their radical leaders' positions. The second was the assassination of Malcolm X, demonstrating to people that a man who had both his charismatic skills and his leadership potential didn't somehow survive. And the third, not the least important of them, was the treatment of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party at the Democratic National Convention, and the role of a lot of liberal Democrats in what amounted to the side-stepping of that effort. This had been the most serious effort of the Civil Rights Movement to work within the framework of the Democratic Party, and it clearly did not get anywhere. Out of those three incidents came the shift in sentiment. Soon thereafter we began to have the theme of Black power and a total realignment of the frame of mind, the way of thinking of the thrusting forces within the United States.

Now how did the universities and the students get involved in all of this? Originally, of course, they were involved through the students' participation in events outside the university. Students were, after all, the leading figures in the famous sit-ins. Students were the people who went on freedom rides. Students were the ones who went to Mississippi in the summer. And, of course, out of that frustration that occurred in 1964 and 1965, students, along with everybody else involved, said, "Boy, this has been a waste of time and we have to look elsewhere and to other means to resolve our problems." Now the problem was, up to then, that there had been both white and Black students involved. When the Blacks turned to Black Power, the whites could no longer participate in the same way that they had previously. So they returned to campus, dropping Black issues for the moment. They turned to Vietnam-related issues and university organization-related issues. The Black students returned to the campus and began to look at it in terms of Black issues.

There are really two central ways in which the university is directly at issue. One is in terms of the educational process, in terms of somebody suddenly saying, "We've been talking about integration for ten or fifteen years and there are still almost no Blacks at white Northern universities." So there suddenly started to be crash programs, really only dating back three or four years at the most, to admit large numbers of Black students. And then people said, "We don't have any faculty or administration to speak of, who are Black, and we'd better start doing something about that." Then some people started talking about Black Studies and adjusting the curriculum to the reality of the Black world. That's one way. This has been a very obvious way that most people are aware of.

I think the other way is just as important to the university, and this has to do with the changing structure of the American city. Here again I have to go back in order to explain where we are now.

Since the Second World War, American cities have been changing their fundamental structure in the following simple ways. If you look carefully at what's been happening to land use and residential patterns, you will see that in the city, the middle class has been moving out to an outer ring. This means that the area that we now define legally as the city has become in its entirety an inner-city, with the outer ring in another political jurisdiction. The city itself has been left with a certain number of industries, but slowly businesses have also begun to move out to suburban areas.

Two groups are increasingly left in the cities. First of all, there is a network of non-profit institutions: universities, hospitals, cultural centers, religious organizations, etc., all of which, without exception, have been expanding in size since the Second World War and expanding at a rather phenomenal rate. As a result, they have been needed to build, and therefore have been expanding in literal physical size as well as in numbers of people participating in the institution. Secondly, we've had an immigration of the genuine poor, which means in our society, Blacks, and, in some areas of the country, Mexican-Americans, and others who have been filling up the interstices of the inner city. Their sections of town have been expanding correspondingly. The two expanding land masses, the non-profit institutions and the lower ethnic groups, have met and just pushed right into each other; they are both trying to fill out the total space of the inner city. Thus we get a conflict over land, a conflict which has
been unrecognized by the non-profit institutions. They have never said to themselves, "This is what is going on," and many of the people involved have never been aware, analytically aware, that this, in fact, was going on.

It has not only been a conflict of the land but a conflict over federal money. Where, after all, have the non-profit institutions been getting the money with which to expand? They have been getting it through grants that have come largely from the Federal Government, at the same time that the urban poor have been putting demands upon the Federal Government for new federal expenditures, poverty programs, etc., that would alleviate their particular conditions. The two groups come as conflicting demanders before the Federal Government, conflicting because of the limit on the amount of money available. Again, however, they are unaware of this conflict and of the fact that there are alternative expenditures. When I say unaware, I must say that the poor, the lower ethnic classes, have not been unaware. They have been screaming for ten years, that, in fact, their great enemies, their great rivals, have been these great non-profit institutions, all of whom claim to be liberal in ideology and to be for the dispossessed ethnic classes in principle. In practice, however, as institutions, these liberal institutions have been the rivals of the poor for both land and money.

On this issue of land conflict in the larger cities, there's been a glimmer of recognition in the last two years on the part of universities that this is indeed a social conflict, that it has to be analyzed as such, treated as such. Largely, this glimmer of recognition has come out of some respect for the political power of the ethnic poor in the cities. They have indicated a certain amount of political clout, and that has made the universities, the churches, the hospitals, etc., sit up and take notice. Also, as a consequence of this change of structure in the cities, the university employees, the people who run the elevators, who do the cleaning, etc., have been increasingly drawn, and since the second World War, from precisely these lower ethnic groups.

So that you see the university or the hospital, etc., as the exploiter, indeed, doubly the exploiter, because under our legal system up until now, universities and other non-profit institutions have been largely exempt from a number of the provisions of the law which demand certain things of the employers, on the grounds that they are non-profit institutions. In fact, then, universities, hospitals, cultural institutions, and churches have treated their employees worse than U.S. Steel, General Motors, or even the local grocery store. Thus you get a multiple relationship in which, up until two years ago at least, the university has been a nefarious institution from the point of view of its environment. And if you say, "Its environment?" it is increasingly its environment, because as you know urban universities are surrounded by the lower ethnic groups.

The principal reaction of the university to the series of the problems has been the following: In the last couple of years they have, in effect, set up a quota system for Black students. Black is shorthand here for Black, Mexican-Americans, etc., for all those from lower ethnic groups. They haven’t said it’s a quota system, but in fact it is, and that’s the way they have handled that problem. They have been unwilling to set up a quota system for the faculty, largely because the faculty itself has been unwilling to accept the concept that there should be quota for Blacks. So they’ve handled Black faculty by tokenism. They’ve made efforts to get a minimum number of Black faculty and administrators in order to say that they have Black faculty and administrators, but have refused any concept of getting a larger number per se as being illegitimate, although they have been using that system for students.

Black curriculum and Black studies have been adopted with a certain amount of reluctance and foot-dragging, but generally universities have been willing to go along with these ideas. There is an interesting thing to note here; the administrators of universities have been generally less reluctant to adopt Black studies programs than has the faculty. I think we have to get out of our minds the image which comes out of some of the early student controversies, that there’s the students on the left, the administration on the right, and faculty in the center somehow mediating. That’s true on certain kinds of issues but not on others. Quite clearly for
example, on Black studies, you've got the students on the left, if you will, the faculty on the right, and the university administration in the middle mediating between the two — an increasingly common phenomenon in the coming years.

Changes in Universities

How did it come about that there is this great demand for the democratization of the university? The very phrase would have caused many shivers a few years ago. I think one fundamental consideration is that, up to 1945, when all was said and done, the university was a rather minor institution in American life. It involved very few people, either as students or faculty or administrators, and it involved them very small portions of their life. Of course, it involved faculty for all of their lives, but the students generally were involved for a rather short and transient period, as in summer camp. But the university has changed. First of all, it now involves enormous numbers of people. I don't remember the latest figures, but something like forty to fifty percent of the college age group now enters college, and these figures are projected as in an upward climb. In the last five years the numbers that have gone into graduate and professional schools have also escalated enormously. It is no longer an insignificant institution in terms of the number of people within the society that are involved, the expansion of students and of faculty, and an even more incredible expansion of university administrators. Thus the university now involves a large number of people, and even the students are involved for a longer portion of their lives. A very simple phenomenon in occurring. If an institution is a minor thing and it involves a transitional period for students, well, then, you don't pay too much attention to its rules; you grin and bear it, and you get through it. But if it's going to absorb a large portion of your life, then you're going to begin to worry about the quality of life as lived during that time. And you're going to begin to say, "I would like to control many aspects of my environment."

Historically now, we've gone through this a number of times in the Western world, and it all started with the State. People said, "If now we're going to have a national state, and the national state is going to be fairly centralized and fairly powerful, and therefore fairly important in our lives, then, by God, we want to be able to control it." So a thrust for the democratization of the state has been going on for two or three hundred years and has been reasonably successful. When it was first put forward, people threw up their hands in horror. The people in control said, "How can we have a situation in which the masses, the majority of the population, would actually make decisions on things about which they know nothing and have not the competence to be concerned with, like space craft? It will be disastrous if we do it." It was a typical conservative reaction, but we did do it and it hasn't been disastrous. The masses have not been that ignorant nor that radical, once they got the relative amount of political power they have under the present system.

The second arena in which there has been democratization over the past one hundred years has been the work arena. We had the same kind of situation a hundred years ago when employers said, "How can we have a situation in which workers who are ignorant and have narrow limited interests, could have any say in the larger issues of managing the structure of the work place?" In point of fact, we've had unionization, we've had all sorts of controls put over management, limiting management, involving workers in one way or another in one kind of decision or another, and the results have neither been as disastrous nor as radical as people argued in the beginning that they would be. A point of course, if you look at other institutions, is that the family has also been considerably democratized in the last couple of hundred years. Among Christian churches, many Protestant groups represented historically such a democratic thrust. In the last ten or fifteen years the Catholic Church has been going through a new process of Reformation, this time within the framework of the Church itself. All you're getting in the university is this same basic thrust. The same basic reaction takes place in the university where people in authority say, "How can the masses," in this case, the students, earlier even the faculty, "have anything significant or useful to say in the governance of this institution?" A point of fact, very simple to
predict, is that it will be relatively democratized over the next twenty, thirty or fifty years. As a consequence, it will be neither as disastrous nor as radical as people are saying at this point. The faculty have been demanding more control over their life situation for a long time, and of course, they have been getting it, under the name of "academic freedom" in the United States. Academic freedom has been essentially a faculty demand for control over their own environment, free from control by those defined as higher in the hierarchy—trustees or presidents; student demands are called "student power." Faculty have had their "ins" since 1900; the students are only getting their "ins" now.

Of course, even faculty have not exhausted their demands. First of all, academic freedom has a subdistinction called "tenure" and "non-tenure." People with tenure have far more rights than people with non-tenure. Thus you're getting another thrust of so-called "junior faculty" for their rights, which they will eventually get. And, of course, as every group gets in, it becomes relatively conservative vis-a-vis groups coming in behind them, who are also demanding. Obviously, as the tenured faculty gets power away from the president, which is what they have been doing for fifty years, they don't want to simply give it up, then, to the junior faculty or to students. But as with all these things, there will be compromises. The reactions of the universities to these demands for democratization have also been relatively simple. They have begun to shed the role of in loco parentis. In my own university, only five years ago it did not allow women in the dormitories after 7:00 P.M. any day of the week; next year we'll probably have co-ed dormitories. I think that's a rather rapid shedding of in loco parentis. I'm sure you can match it for any university you're involved with.

Universities have begun to take the first ginger steps toward accepting the concept of student power. They have begun to say, "All right, there may be some areas of general policy-making subject to multiple involvement, particularly when the university acts other than as an educational institution, on larger issues on its relationship to the outside world. For example: Should we have secret research or not?"

Maybe students may be allowed to be more involved. But universities have thus far resisted any serious student involvement in either curriculum or appointments. Here again, it's been faculty, more than administration, that has resisted this, for very clear reasons, because it's the faculty who presently have the power in curriculum and appointments largely, and it's they that would be

Now what has been the role of what has been loosely called the "student movement" of the last few years? I feel the student movement has been trying to do three kinds of things. It emerges as a rather diffuse broad-spectrum movement. The very use of the phrase "movement" as a self-description is already defining both a looseness of the structure and a changing of the structure. Certainly SDS has only been a part of that student movement, but in many ways, only a small part. It played a significant role for only a year or two in the history of that movement.

First; it's been trying to politicize the university. What does that mean? It means that it wishes to say that it is illegitimate to argue that there are two kinds of decisions; administrative decisions and political decisions; or two modes of decision making, an administrative mode of decision making and a political mode of decision making. It tries to argue that all modes of decision making and all decisions are always and forever political. Ergo, if one would openly recognize that this is so, those people who have less power would have more chance of getting their voice heard. It has tried to suggest that the decisions of the university are public decisions and that they really reflect the meeting of various interest groups, rather than the carrying out of a certain technical wisdom. That's the first thing it has tried to do.

The second thing it's tried to do, which I think one must keep separate from politicization, is to achieve radicalization. That is to say, it has been concerned with the recreation of the American Left, as a political movement, as an ideology, with a long-range theoretical analysis, hoping to push people in the center leftward, hoping to create cadres of a left movement. This has been an objective in terms of the larger society as well as within the university.

The third thing attempted, which I think
you must keep separate from politicization and radicalization, is to achieve social change, actually to change the institutions. Here, however, one has to say, “What kind of change, short-run change or long-run change?” And the answer has been that the movement has been very ambivalent. Different strains within the movement have pushed toward different ends. They’ve been ambivalent about the whole business of short-run change, because they’ve been afraid of being “co-opted” by the system. There is a theoretical assumption running through the analysis of some members of the student movement, that short-run change equals no long-run change. And so on those grounds, some, not all, have said no short run change, in order to preserve the possibility of long run change.

Now where has the logic of the student movement led? On politicization, I think it has been successful in part. There’s no question that American universities are more politicized today than five years ago. In fact, it’s had a certain number of consequences which are also clear. First of all, I think there has been reforms and a certain amount of short-run social change as a consequence of this politicization. Whether or not that has been the desired consequence, it has been the real consequence. There has also been repression. Without question, the politicization of the university has led to administrations being repressive of a number of things within the university, and there will be an increasing amount of that. It has also led, incidentally, to a good deal of tension within the faculty. Any institution like Columbia, who has gone through a crisis, now knows that one of the outcomes of that is increased tension within the faculty, far more than between faculty and students. I think that has been the experience of all the major institutions that have gone through major crises.

How about radicalization? Have they succeeded in radicalizing American students and American universities? I would say, only partially. They have radicalized a certain number of people, they have moved left people leftward and the center people leftward, up to a point. The logic of this radicalization has begun to push some off campus. If you read through the history of SDS debates, over four or five years, it’s very instructive. It builds up very slowly; they go through a whole series of analyses: first, totally oriented to the university, and one by one, one faction of SDS after another begins to see that the logic of their position is pushing them towards moving outside, if they are serious about radicalization.

As for social change, as I say, short-run, we’ve had a certain amount of social change. It’s a little early to say whether we’re going to have long-run change.

I entitled this talk “The Transitional or the Chronic.” I haven’t talked about that at all, but I haven’t because I think it’s now fairly clear to see, in terms of this analysis, what is transitional and what is chronic.

War and war-related issues, Vietnam and Vietnam-related issues are, in my opinion, chronic, in the sense that I don’t think that the United States’ relationship to the world scene is going to change that fundamentally over the next ten or twenty years, so that these issues will disappear. On the other hand, increasingly, they will be debated off the campus and not on the campus, if for no other reason than that the campus is, in effect, in response to the pressure, shedding itself of its moral responsibility for these things and is cutting its ties. There’s no question about it. Secret research is being banned on lots of campuses. Professors are reluctant. The idea of working for the CIA is now so horrendous. And it is a rare professor who avows that he would consult with the Defense Department, even with the State Department, even with AID. A lot of people are getting very touchy about any involvement. Some people are even getting touchy about getting involved in municipal government. In so far as that happens, I think the reality of the situation is that although the issue is chronic, it’s not necessarily a chronic one for the university.

The Black issue is chronic in the sense that it’s also not going to just disappear, or automatically be resolved in the next ten, twenty or thirty years. I would say, however, that the educational issues are to some extent transitional; I think that we are going to admit enough Black students to the university to make that a non-issue. Also I think the curriculum is going to be changed in enough ways to make that a non-issue. I see only the question of Black faculty as a serious political
issue on universities. I think, in effect, the fight is going to be a very simple one. Blacks are going to demand a de facto without using the phrase, "a de facto quota system," of the same kind universities have been willing to accept, without admitting it, for the students. The present faculty, the white faculty, is going to resist that very strongly, and it's going to be a major battle. I'm not sure how that's going to end. But other educational issues I see as transitional.

The urban issues and their relationship with the ethnic poor and the surrounding community is not a transitional issue, but is a chronic issue. Nothing is going to happen in the next twenty or thirty years in American cities that is going to end this land conflict. And what it means is that universities, if they want to handle it, are going to have to be prepared for constant political negotiations with whatever forms of representatives emerge of the ethnic poor in the city, negotiations that will occur at City Hall, in the City Council, and in all sorts of other arenas. This is going to be a source of constant conflict and it will be a university-related issue in which there will be turmoil on campus as to what the appropriate stand of the university ought to be.

I'll show you some very simple ways. There's going to be a very simple kind of conflict of interests on two issues which have been kept rather separate. One of the issues that relates the universities to the surrounding community is that of new buildings. If they build new residential buildings, should these buildings be open only to the university personnel, or should they be mixed with the community? And, then, of course, one answer is, "All right, mixed." And that will resolve that conflict. It will be a half-way house, will it not? But there's another issue within the university, it's called "faculty housing," or how do we attract the guy from "Podunk" to come to our lovely campus, when our salaries aren't enough, and this isn't enough? We'll give him nice faculty housing. But he's heard about the horrible conditions in the big cities, and he wants to know about nice faculty housing. But when he learns that that housing is mixed, all his latent prejudices are going to surge right forward, and he may not think that that is such a happy solution. And he may vote, this Mr. X from Podunk, to stay in Podunk and not come to Big City U. And then the university is going to find themselves in an interesting conflict of interests, between attracting Mr. X from Podunk and relating to the external community. That's the kind of ongoing chronic crisis that makes this thing very real and very central.

Now how about organizational change, change of the structure of the university? Now here I think it's going to be chronic too, although it may take a less radical form. My image of how these social conflicts arise is that the initial conflicts are the most anarchic. The initial labor-management conflicts were the most anarchic. The initial student-university conflicts were the most anarchic. Initially, the underclass has to establish the legitimacy of being in conflict; the initial stance of the authorities is that this is so absurd, so out of the question, so unreasonable, that you have no legitimate claims whatsoever, and to establish the legitimacy, you have to go to very extreme action. One day the legitimacy will be acknowledged and the university administration will acknowledge, for example, that students have not only some role in university administration, but also some role in institutionally negotiating with them for the expansion of the campus, or whatever particular issue might emerge at some point. Once that is legitimated, the students will no longer have to engage in extreme actions; they will turn to bargaining. It doesn't mean that you won't have any kind of what I might call "direct action," but the forms of the direct action are more limited, more constrained, as one sees, for example, if one compares strikes as they are conducted in 1970 in the United States and as they were conducted in the 1930's. So here I think the issue is chronic, but the severity of the issue is transitional.

What then does this add up to in terms of turmoil? Of course, it's not an issue that the university can settle all by itself. The amount of turmoil in the university depends a bit on the amount of turmoil in society. I think there's going to be a reasonable amount of turmoil in American society in the next ten or fifteen years, but I think it's fair to say that the university will neither be the core of this turmoil, — the turmoil of the American society will not take place centrally on American universities — nor will it be totally
irrelevant and a haven from the turmoil. It will not be, so to speak, on the periphery; it will be rather somewhere in between. The university will be a significant part of society and will be an arena of conflict for some of these issues of conflict within our society, although for other issues it will not be a central arena. That will mean, in a sense, we'll have our ups and downs in terms of the amount of turmoil. But I think that those who are radical pessimists about the future of the university can be assured it will survive. The university is not about to go under, and it's not about to disappear. It's not about to be fundamentally displaced by other institutions to perform these functions. As long as we're in the middle of it, it's very heart-rending and very difficult; we will look back on it with more aplomb and calmness, I think, thirty years from now than we do now.
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By the end of 1970 campus tensions may have eased. Issues which once inflamed no longer exert their old appeal and new issues have not come into focus in ways to mobilize large active student support. Institutions have made some reforms and perfected judicial and police procedures to protect themselves from violence, for example, the use of the injunction and of campus-wide judicial bodies. And the end of the academic bull market also contributed to this lull.

There is considerable question as to how central to the life of the nation higher education really is. During the 1960's James Perkins expressed the dream that the university had become the pivotal institution of society. But this dream has not materialized and this very fact may have contributed to a lessening of campus tension. If the university is not so influential, why bother with reforming or destroying it? During this calm, be it temporary or of somewhat longer duration, such issues as the proper role of students in academic governance can be examined and some conception of the future evolved. Tranquility can
allow for a more objective and realistic view.

A primary consideration is what students have been demanding and whether or not some degree of actual involvement in academic governance could actually meet those needs. These student needs have been expressed, analyzed, criticized and subjected to probably too much publicity during the last half of the decade of the sixties. But they remain and must be responded to. First and foremost, college students have wanted greater personal freedom and control over their private lives. Next in order, students demanded the free exercise of their civil and political liberties, including the right to plan on-campus political action to be taken elsewhere and, of course, the right to hear speakers regardless of persuasion. Then, uneasy and concerned about the great moral dilemmas of the society, they wanted their colleges and universities to help them do something about those uncertainties and to become part of the quest for a moral society. Especially in the largest institutions, but even in the quite small, they wished for less impersonality. They were irked by bureaucratic procedures and being treated as numbers and wanted somehow to count as individuals. Gradually they came to demand some voice in deciding institutional goals and priorities, although the vast majority remained relatively unconcerned about the matter. And equally gradually, and for the most part inarticulately, students began to ask for improved education, a more relevant (defined as contemporary) curriculum, and even better teaching. A small minority of more radical students, of course, claimed more. These wanted participatory democracy (meaning frequently a rule of a new elite—theirselfs), control of the university, use of the university as a major instrument of social change and revolution, and destruction of the university as a first step in the destruction of the entire society. Out of these desires, yearnings and aspirations was born the notion that institutions would become responsive only if students could set rules, view budgets, sit on committees and have a say in selection of faculty.

If student demands were all that were involved, a system of accommodation could be quickly suggested. But there are other factors. There have evolved a number of significant changes in higher education which make the problem of academic governance much more complex than ever before. As a result of student protest, student control over their private lives has increased in even highly protective institutions so that even the courts are beginning to recognize that in loco parentis is dead and that equality of the sexes is a reality. Whether or not they will like the honor five years hence after the euphoria of revolutionary times has faded, students do sit on faculty committees, are consulted about presidential candidates, and, on occasion, are elected to boards of trustees. And the examples of successful student use of force, aided for obscure reasons by some faculty, and given an intellectual rationale by some apologists for youth, have forced presidents to yield some power and authority, if not directly to the students, at least to the faculty. This may be one of the most profound results and one which students may one day come to regret. In many institutions presidents have yielded so much that they no longer have the power essential to govern. With the loss of that power students lost a powerful ally against their real, but unrecognized enemy, the professionalized entrenched and syndicalist faculty. Lastly, student protest has resulted in a political and public disenchanted with higher education and a climate of opinion which will make needed resources much more difficult to obtain. As the decade of educational affluence ends, students will find many of their demands resisted as institutions discover they can no longer afford the luxury of uninformed student dictation of policy. In 1969, for example, students at Stanford, with considerable faculty support, demanded the economically unsound resolution of a defense research controversy resolved by bringing Stanford Research Institute directly into the institution. In 1970, in spite of warnings of student protest, the institution sold the Institute with no restrictions placed on the kind of research it could do.

But other changes have also taken place. The lay board of trustees, an essential genius of American higher education, has really lost the power to govern since control over information essential to decision has been assumed by the complex bureaucracy which even quite small institutions have created. Boards do, of course, appoint presidents and assign legitimacy to decisions, but the substance of decisions lies in the recommendations various offices prepare. Then, too, in the public sector, statewide
systems of coordination or control are a reality and have assumed powers over budgets, programs and processes which can be touched only with difficulty by presidents, bureaucracies or boards of individual institutions. These agencies are equally impervious to student influence and probably react negatively when students attempt to influence them. Relatedly, systems of institutions and institutions themselves have finally embraced the concept of long range planning based on complex bases of data. Decisions to be ratified increasingly must be consistent with the goals and benefits established by long range plans. This, of course, creates inflexibility antithetical to the spontaneous demands of students for changes which one student generation can actually see accomplished. Another inflexibility has come with the successful academic revolution which gave faculties such enormous power over themselves, the fruits of which must be protected in a period generally regressive. This hegemony of faculties was made possible because of the high demand for professional services during the 1950's and 1960's and allowed faculty members to be somewhat tolerant of demands of students for some privileges, so long as they didn't ask too much. But market conditions have changed and professors occupying positions can be expected to be less charitable toward those who would threaten the status quo. As one liberal professor remarked, who three years earlier had encouraged various student protests but who saw cuts in his own research empire, "I have come to hate student activists for having destroyed my style of life." Then, there is the steady growth of unionism among college faculties. While the ultimate significance of the union movement is unclear, it seems logical that a union contract, oriented toward the economic well-being of professors, will not accommodate student demands for professional services above and beyond the call of duty. Reduction of impersonality will not be served by a contract calling for nine hours of teaching, three office hours per week, a graduated salary schedule based on tenure, and insured tenure appointment under threat of grievance committee proceedings to support those not granted this security.

Perhaps the greatest change of all, and implied by these other changes, is the loss of public regard for higher education. Actually three periods can be identified since World War II. The first from 1947 to about 1957-58 was a period of courtship, when colleges and universities, having seen a vision of significance through successful war-time research performance and accommodating veterans, promised the society much in return for support. The period from 1957 to approximately 1967 was a honeymoon during which the entranced society judged education as the chief instrument of national policy and offered up support in the largest outpouring of favorable legislation, both state and national, in the history of the country. Then came disillusion. Higher education did not produce the good life, but it did seem to produce a generation of revolutionaries which was not what adults had had in mind. And so from 1967 onward higher education has experienced curtailment of support, greater political control and a climate of opinion generally unfavorable to intellectuals. Reactionary times are not favorable to the expansion of democratic or egalitarian ideals.

Another element in the equation is evidence of how well students have performed when given some responsibility for academic governance. Unfortunately there is little systematic evidence available. However, on faculty committees, unless the student is espousing a particular radical cause, students have been silent, speaking rarely, and then in tones of the establishment. In half dozen institutions during the fall of 1969 in which students sat as members of committees, students adopted a self-imposed role of junior member responsible for the menial tasks of keeping minutes and ordering coffee. Students seem to have been more productive concerning regulation of student life, campus judicial activities and developing a richer fare of cultural events. And students seem to have been least productive and, too frequently, most destructive when dealing with critical decisions of institutional life. On such grave matters as tuition increases, restrictions of graduate enrollment, changes in tenure policy, genuine curricular reform or deficit financing students do not seem to have made critical decisions. There is, of course, testimony that students have made interesting and insightful observations, but for the most part these matters are decided elsewhere, with the wise precaution of counseling with or informing student groups. Unfortunately there have been some destructive performances as
when student leaders try to make public information of stolen confidential personnel records, or leak to the press the names of candidates on the list of presidential search committees.

The very nature of academic governance is also involved in determining what role students should play. Corson points out that colleges and universities, in common with other organizations, exist to accomplish something, require resources, must have processes to enable people to work together, and as an enterprise moves either forward or backward. But colleges and universities uniquely exist to serve a multiplicity of purposes, and are more dispersed as an enterprise with responsibility for decisions more widely diffused. "The central objective of a college or university is the translation of the talents and capacities of its faculty into significant educational results." If students are to have a role in academic governance, their contribution to this central mission must be unmistakably clear and explicit. And the role must have a power valence of relative strength but of different quality from that of the faculty and administration. Otherwise, while students might be involved, it would not be central to the life of the institution.

In the American system of higher education faculties have generally been conservative with respect to educational and institutional matters. This conservatism regarding curricula, innovation, status and the like insures the stability of the institution, which otherwise could be shaken to pieces by too rapid development encouraged by the administration, which is the dynamic agent for change. It is the administration which seeks innovation, change, progress, growth and new missions, and the faculty which generally thinks otherwise. Much of the history of academic governance is the history of the search for ways to bring these two forces into some kind of creative tension. Institutions in which the faculty is too strong tend to atrophy while institutions in which the administration is too strong tend to over-expand and move toward rank, uncontrolled growth.

Now student demands imply a creation of a third force, but the abstract nature of such an element is unclear. Students could, consistent with the balance of power theory, side first with administration and then with faculty against whichever of the two seemed to be growing stronger but such an attempt would put students in the peculiar position of acting against their own interests. Joining with faculty against administration would strengthen faculty syndicalism which emphasizes faculty needs and desires, while opposing faculty would strengthen the power of bureaucracy against which much of the protest has been directed. Governance is ultimately the process of resolution of conflict brought about by differing needs of individuals and groups dependent on the institution. And for the stability of the institution someone or some element must have the legitimate power to resolve supreme conflict. In the American system of collegiate education this power belongs to the board of trustees and is exercised, although increasingly imperfectly, over such matters as allocation of financial resources, setting of institutional goals and relationship of the institution with other legitimate institutions in society, e.g., military, business, government, and labor. Students, to become a truly third force, should have the information, the legitimacy and the resources to precipitate supreme conflict over such matters. Students would, for example, need a power equal to that of administration over the budget, or of faculty over the curriculum, to precipitate board conflict resolution over institutional priorities. They do, of course, have the negative power to go elsewhere and during the 1960's the negative power to bring an institution to a halt. But use of these powers is against their own interests as students at San Francisco State have discovered. Since neither faculty nor administration can really perform their essential role without the power they now have, at least in theory, it does not seem likely that they will yield these to students — presidents cannot yield power over administrative appointments without jeopardizing their effectiveness nor can faculties surrender their power to select their own members. Thus, the very nature of governance suggests that if students have a role it must be a minor and subordinate one.

The complex of factors, the nature of student demands, the changes which have taken place in higher education, the evidence of student performance in governance and the reality that legitimate power is essential to government implies that students do not have
a central role in academic governance given the presently recognized central objective of colleges and universities. However, there is also the implication that since collegiate institutions do exist to serve students, as consumers, these students should have a voice to indicate, and with some force, whether their needs are being well or poorly met.

First among the factors to be considered is the fact that the governance of even a small college or university is a complex undertaking requiring enormous data, little of which can be comprehended by students who presumably have an education to acquire. Consider, if you will, what is required to decide whether or not to expand the University of Hawaii's medical school from two to four years. First; Nationally, there is a need for more doctors, but should Hawaii, with only a million population, be asked to provide them? Second; Hawaii needs to develop, but along which lines: sugar, pineapple, tourism, or what? Then: Since it has a two-year school, is it better to ship students to the mainland where medical schools are already overflowing, or expand advanced capacity? And: If this is done, what is the greatest cost-benefit advantage -- a four-year medical school or an expanded East-West Center? These are complex questions. The spokesmen for youth say the young clearly cannot answer them, but they can answer questions of broad policy. This is fine in rhetoric, but broad policy to be meaningful must answer detailed questions which, in turn, require detailed knowledge. And to acquire detailed knowledge requires detailed study. But if detailed study is undertaken, can the young who already complain of the frantic pace of academic requirements be expected to do it? The answer is obviously no!

But the young who would govern say, "We can set priorities then let the administrators work out the details." Consider another example. A college, to remain financially viable, must maintain an adequate cash flow. To do so an amount is budgeted each year for building replacement. This then provides the security to underwrite periodic loans from a bank. The man who developed this scheme has spent twenty years requiring the insight to make it work. Can a student, with four years to spend on an education at his parents' expense, really hope to comprehend this relatively simple problem and still acquire the skills of language and number which have become so important in a post-industrialized society? Several other examples: To develop a scheme to improve admissions requires the full time of five professionals for three years. Can the insights of a young Negro, conditioned as he is by racial injustice, provide the sheer technical expertise needed for such a problem? Or: An institution is running a deficit of over 2 million dollars a year. A change in investment policy can rectify at least part of this. What changes will the youth, whose allowance of $50.00 a month comes from his school teacher father, make?

But, then, there are broader questions. Students desiring to govern say, "But if we have faith in people, such details will be unimportant. Participatory democracy will allow the wisdom of the race to prevail."

However, this notion runs counter to another fact of life. Because of the condition of modern university life, constitutionalism is the wave of the future. To insure reasonable working conditions for people in a large scale enterprise, it is necessary for there to be constitutions, by-laws, handbooks and quite specific codes of behavior with penalties listed for this, that or the other offense. And this is contrary to the beliefs of students that if people simply get together and talk and feel, all will come out all right. Large scale enterprises require a bureaucracy. Universities are large scale and will grow larger. It is logical to assume that bureaucratic process will become more significant requiring many people, each with a specialized skill. No matter how much the young may complain, decisions for large scale institutions must be made through bureaucratic means and these will frequently irk those who want instant solution to complex problems. This is all well illustrated by some of the young who have experienced complex educational processes and who want to change it all. They at once seek a program in higher education assuming that once they have a degree they can become dean or president and change the world. Their goal in itself is revealing. They want to become the new elite so as to remake an imperfect world in their own image. Actually with constitutionalism, which does protect rights of persons, the processes of change are slowed to a rate which can be assimilated by human beings. The four or six or eight years of a bachelor's program are not long enough
to see major changes take place. Militant young want instant solutions to problems which have long vexed — and so would we all. But if the rights of all are to be preserved, instant solution must be subjugated to the slower process of constitutionalism which says “before appeal to the agency to resolve ultimate conflict, recourse must be had to administrative solution and lower courts.”

A third fact having considerable implication for student involvement in academic governance is the still remarkable diversity in kinds of institutions. Pleas for participation have a somewhat global quality which overlooks the differences between San Jose State and a large public junior college in which most students come on to the campus for courses and then leave at once. In many public junior colleges the evening enrollment is double the size of the day enrollment, composed of people taking one or two courses after work. To suppose that there would be logic in such a group either participating actively in governance or being happy to be represented by a minority of students who attend the day session strains the credulity. Actually the few institutions having long and successful experience with students in a central role are relatively small liberal arts colleges in which a sense of community developed in response to very real and pragmatic needs — as was true at Antioch when it faced financial crisis during the depression of the 1930’s. In view of the fact that most students will attend large complex institutions having large numbers of commuting students, the problem of some significant representation in the central administration seems insoluble. If there is student participation, it most likely would come from a minority of resident students, which would be as contrary to democratic ideology as would presidential rule alone.

Size also is related to another development antithetical to significant student participation in governance. That is the increase in privatism and the significance of quite small primary groups in the lives of students attending large, and for the most part, impersonal institutions. Increasingly students cope with the personal neutrality of daily campus work — attending classes, library work and laboratory exercises — by being members of small intimate groups seeking to preserve their own unique interests. While these groups are maintained by some form of tacit democratic effort, they are not structurally organized to be a political basis for campus-wide representation. For example, at Stanford, students who attended an overseas campus at the same time appear to form such a primary group regardless of where they live. Or, graduate students living in the same married student housing units seem to form such a group regardless of the fields of concentration. Now this does not mean that some system of representation could not be created — living units, classes, registration status and the like. But it does suggest that such an organization would be artificial and without real political significance.

However, there is another factor which also must be considered and which does require, in spite of difficulty, students to have a greater voice in at least some parts of the conduct of institutional life. That is the expectation of a generally older student body on campus caused by such things as students returning to college after various sorts of interruptions — war, work, marriage — or the steady growth of graduate enrollment. This means that there will be on campus large numbers of students who are physically, sexually and legally adults— but who have not yet achieved full adult status which comes with economic self-sufficiency. Such individuals wish and need considerable voice regarding their lives and conditions. The questions are which parts of their lives, and how can this opportunity be insured in light of these other facts and forces.

It is possible to conceive of a structure of campus governance based upon principles which will maximize the chances of achieving the goal of governance, i.e., conversion of faculty skill and knowledge into educational results, and which at the same time will safeguard individual rights whether they be student, faculty or administration. The first one of these principles is that a system of checks and balances is necessary to insure that the tendencies of one branch or constituency encounters opposing tendencies of others in such a way that a creative rather than destructive tension is produced. Thus, the conservatism of faculties should encounter the dynamism of central administration in such a way that the institution neither dies for lack of change, nor changes too rapidly. No action of one branch should be exempt
from review by the other.

Such a structure also requires definite constitutionalism which provides for a rule of law rather than of men. Increasingly this constitutionalism will be expressed in written documents — faculty constitutions, by-laws, grants of power to students and the like which will specify the domains over which each constituency has responsibility, processes and procedures, and the various steps which must be taken in decisions affecting individuals. In times past institutions could be governed with few rules partly because of the homogeneous quality of most campuses, insuring a shared set of common values, and partly because institutions were not overly complex. There could be general agreement as to what “conduct as a gentleman and scholar” should mean. But conditions have changed and the significant common culture must be expressed in writing with the implication that all matters not covered are of no institutional concern.

A third principle is also essential although it has been seriously challenged in the 1960s. This is the principle of legitimacy which means that some agency must be generally recognized as supreme. The United States assigns legitimacy by declaring the constitution as the supreme law of the land. Colleges and universities have been assigned legitimacy through the sovereign power of states to create corporations with an indefinite tenure and to lodge responsibility for those corporations in boards of trustees. As the legitimate agencies, boards of trustees have been given the right to make whatever decisions they wish for the conduct of an institution, limited only by the stated purposes of the charter and by appropriate laws of the state. Now many of these powers can be delegated, but not finally, for some agency must retain the legitimate power to make final decisions and resolve conflict within the institution. Were there no boards of trustees some other agency would have to be created to wield its powers, gaining legitimacy either through force, general acceptance or documentation. Without a legitimate agency to resolve conflict, any institution would destroy itself through the efforts of different constituencies to gain their own ends.

The fourth principle is that information, authority and responsibility cannot be separated. No one should be assigned responsi-

bility without direct access to the information essential to the task. For this reason purely faculty committees can’t work because they don’t have direct access to the information contained in appropriate administrative offices. No one should be given authority without definite responsibility which ultimately leads to the legitimate source of power. Thus, no faculty committee for the curriculum should be given authority over course offerings without responsibility for insuring that its decisions do not jeopardize the life of the institution. Thus, it would be proper for a president to return a curricular proposal to a committee on the ground that acceptance would jeopardize the financial security of the institution. To apply this principle to the question of student participation in governance, consider such an issue as a university investment policy which is developed as one means of achieving the end of governance. Students would first need information (and this is highly complex), then they would need to be responsible and accountable that exercise of authority did not weaken the institution. Only then could they participate significantly in such a decision.

The next principle is really implied by several others. It is simply that no person or office should have the right to make decisions about people, without the explicit provision for review. No dean nor president should decide alone, and without provision for review, to expel a student, terminate prematurely a faculty contract or reclassify a clerical worker. Actually, of course, if decisions are made consistent with established and written policy, the act of review would rarely happen. But the right and procedures for review should always be insured.

The sixth and last principle accepts the existence of conflict and postulates that governance can only function when some agency has the power to resolve conflict finally and completely. It is a power which rarely should be used if institutional checks and balances and guarantee of procedural rights operate. But ultimately a board of regents or trustees must be able to say, “This institution must not offer this or that program.” Without this power, especially in times of high emotion, conflicting desires of faculty, students and administration over the employment of a controversial professor, when pushed ultimately, would result in the state in the
exercise of its sovereign power, resolving the conflict by its political arm — an event not to be desired.

In light of these principles, the nature and purposes of colleges and universities and the conditions of large size and complexity, the rights, duties and responsibilities of various elements can be suggested. First, especially in public higher education, there have evolved coordinating agencies of various sorts. These have been created to insure better statewide planning, better utilization of resources and better achievement of state educational policy. These really exist as a buffer between institutions and the state’s political arm. In general these should not be given power of ultimate decision because they are not sufficiently close to the necessary information upon which responsible decisions must be based. Rather, they should be given a role not unlike the House of Lords in the English constitutional system. That is, they can debate and make public broad educational decisions and postpone but not stop actual decisions. They should be composed of distinguished laymen but not include representatives of institutions since these would tend to be self-serving in critical matters.

Boards of trustees should clearly have the power to appoint chief executives, assign legitimacy to critical decisions and resolve ultimate conflict. But in general they should not attempt to make decisions for they cannot be in possession of essential information, which is lodged in the administrative bureaucracy. As a general rule board action should be to ratify proposals made by a responsible administration with, of course, the right to change the administration if it sees fit. Boards can, of course, discuss issues and help keep an institution informed of social needs as they see them. And they should help interpret the institution to the larger society. But boards generally should not attempt such administrative tasks as revision of tenure policy, faculty appointments or regulation of student conduct.

Presidents and central administration should generally have the power over budget allocation and control, administrative appointments down to and including department heads, certain veto powers and the power to represent publicly the institution. In the exercise of these powers administration, of course, will be bound by procedures, policies and actual checks. Thus a president should not announce that a new concentration in Italian studies would be created without the prior approval of the faculty, for that is in the province of faculty power. However, a president could veto a recommendation for a tenured appointment on the ground that the institution could not sustain financial investment of that magnitude.

The faculty should have almost irrevocable power over its own membership, the curriculum and the conditions of student entrance to and exit from the institution. These seem essential if the purposes of governance are achieved in view of the nature of collegiate education. Thus the faculty could refuse to approve an appointment to a faculty position no matter how strongly urged by central administration and could, within the limits of relevant law, decide which students could and could not enter and what conditions students must meet in order to graduate. Faculty exercise of such powers, of course, are checked by the opposite powers of administration — for the most part through persuasion and discussion but finally through an absolute check. A faculty appointment cannot be made because the administration will not approve the funds.

And now students. First they should have power over their private lives subject only to the limitations imposed generally on people of that age and limitations made explicit in college catalogs, ratified by boards of trustees and applied universally to all students. Thus, if an institution wishes to serve only those of a particular religion or insure that all students live in college residence halls, it may do so. However, it may not make exceptions nor may it go contrary to existing civil law. Then students have the insured right of due process and should have access to courts if their civil rights are invaded. They also should have procedural rights approximating due process for matters peculiar to institution life. In addition they have the right to be consulted as to the effectiveness of the educational services they receive. Students may participate in actual governance but not as any warrantable right. Rather, participation can be suggested as one additional educational experience which the professional faculty judges will help individual development.
This is conservative doctrine but it is arrived at after pondering such issues as representation, complexity, volume of information and long range planning. For none of these matters do students seem especially appropriate repositories of governing power.
FRUITS OF ACADEMIC REVOLUTION
LEWIS B. MAYHEW
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The successful academic revolution, which allowed higher education to become a major growth industry and faculties to gain virtual hegemony over their institutions, has produced impressive gains. The public supports higher education better than at any other time, faculty salaries have risen and public regard has elevated the university into a pivotal position in American society. But this same revolution has tempted college faculties to indulge themselves in a variety of vices, some traditional and some newly discovered, which could, unless restrained, reverse the outcomes of the revolution and render higher education in America redundant. Vice here implies a moral fault or blemish ultimately detrimental to health or usefulness.

Among traditional vices, faculty conservatism regarding education is the most endemic and hurtful. College professors don’t like educational change and won’t undertake it unless forced by external power (e.g., students), bribed by changed financial inducements, or persuaded by powerful leaders. The great innovations in higher education of the
past were all generated outside the faculty and imposed over faculty opposition. The free elective system, general education movement, reform of medical education, and adoption of the strategies of German graduate education are reforms associated with the names of Eliot (president), Hutchins (president), Flexner (foundation official), and Gilman (president). Persistence of outmoded practice on the other hand is associated with faculty action; meaningless language requirements, awkward academic calendar and archaic entrance requirements.

To this is added the equally bothersome, even if less hurtful for reform, vice of pedantry or preoccupation with unimportant detail. To the professor who spent years discovering a fact, that fact becomes all-important, regardless of whether it contributes to student development or not. Pedantry accounts for a semester course in Sociology devoted to the first few pages of Plato’s Republic, taxonomic lectures in the biological sciences, or endless recounting of biographical data about authors rather than consideration of literary works themselves. Pedantry is no place more fully revealed than in the critiques professors make of each other’s writing, well exemplified by the critic who rejected a manuscript submitted by a colleague for publication because: “On p.2, line 2, the use of the word ‘behooves’ is not justified by Webster.”

Intellectual narcissism must also be judged a vice which permits a professor to judge as philistine anyone not sharing his own esoteric knowledge. It is reflected by the professor who reads his mail during oral examinations but who expels students who sleep or yawn or knit in his classes. Its most virulent form is expressed in the syllogism: “I am a specialist on Joyce; I am an educated man; anyone wishing to become educated should know almost as much (never as much) as I do about Joyce” — virulent because it is the reasoning which lies behind the inflated curricula from which students must select their courses and programs.

Although scholarship ideally stresses tentativeness and willingness to change opinions in the light of new evidence, much professional practice suggests distinct feelings of infallibility. Lectures from decades-old notes imply a belief that there is nothing new to be added, and professional anger at student interpretations different from his own indicate considerable conviction of correctness. There are of course forces which reinforce these feelings of infallibility. The lecture platform does give a sense of power and sycophantic students persuade the teacher that he really does have most, if not, all the answers.

To these relatively innocuous vices the academic revolution has added some which are potentially destructive. The decade of the 1960’s with its undersupply of college teachers saw faculty members first improve their financial conditions and then demand and receive greater voice in academic governance and control of institutional destinies. Presidents and boards of trustees, fearful they could not hold faculty denied power, accepted faculty associations, senates and the claim that the faculty was indeed the essence of the university. Fearful of the prospect of an investigation by AAUP, grown influential with its report card on faculty salaries, presidents yielded to faculty demands for revised tenure procedures until the power for leadership which comes with appointive power had in some institutions almost eroded away. In some state institutions tenure almost comes with appointment. Sensing complete victory faculty then contended that it was quite capable of governing an institution — without the detailed knowledge or experience which had accumulated in the college presidency or finance office. Particularly when this newly-won power was directed toward financial matters did it take on the characteristics of a serious vice. In one institution, reliant on tuition for operating funds, the vice president for finance had each year budgeted $200,000 to $500,000 for capitol expansion or replacement. From these funds the institution managed to provide the needed facilities to enter the decade of the seventies relatively free from debt. The faculty, feeling in control after having produced a new senate and constitution, wanted to redirect those funds to what it considered to be much more important, continuation of increases in faculty salaries at 5% to 10% a year. The faculty of course was unaware that without an adequate cash flow the credit of the institution with the banks would end and with that an end to its flexibility. When a major university announced a policy of curtailment of expenditures rather than face an increasing annual deficit, faculty groups want-
ed to use the powers implicit in a senate to force a less prudent policy in spite of available evidence that extramural funds for higher education were declining.

A second vice derives from several different phenomena associated with the academic revolution and the past World War II era, but is probably characteristic of a minority of faculty. College students in the 1960's frequently came from highly permissive homes but still were in need of parent surrogates to help in achievement of full adult role and identity. Although these students rejected the notion of in loco parentis they still sensed a need to relate rather intimately with an adult. Some faculty members also had the psychological need for the self-perpetuation which could take the form of disciples. This need had probably always been present but in earlier times was satisfied through the protectiveness the institution and their officers assumed over student lives. But in the 1950's and 1960's some professors came to view students almost as their children who could do no wrong. Frequently, in order to gain the love of these children surrogates, faculty would pander to the basest sentiments of a student mob. Thus there were professors who with straight face would contend that the American middle class college student, inheritor of the greatest material and intellectual largess the world has ever known, was as much victimized by his college as were the Jews in Nazi Germany or Negroes in a Jim Crow South. These middle-aged apologists for youth, such as Harold Taylor, Paul Goodman, John Summerskill or Edgar Friedenberg, exemplified the vice of demanding less from the young than they would from themselves. Those faculty who reveled in the mob violence at Columbia, who urged amnesty at Harvard or Stanford or who joined a student strike at San Francisco State in support of Negroes in pursuit of unobtainable and unjustifiable goals revealed vice, not just venal but mortal.

Then too the academic revolution, by placing faculty members in demand by government, industry, the international community and by other institutions, stimulated the vice of pride. If someone were asked to advise on million dollar appropriations, on the conduct of foreign policy or on new industrial products, that must indicate personal superiority. And if one is superior in some things then the chances are he is superior in most, if not all things. Thus the biologist expected to be taken seriously as a professional in espousing a political view. He expected his demands for support to be granted over all other claims, because he knew best what was good for society. Nowhere is this almost arrogant sense of personal worth seen more clearly than in prestige universities, whose faculties judge it but their right to have decreased or non-existent teaching loads so they can get on with what is really important, i.e., their own work. At such institutions faculty lunch conversations revealing who had been in Saigon the day before, who in Paris, and who was called to the President's Task Force on Education seems much more gamesmanship among the anointed than serious intellectual conversation.

But in at least one domain faculties have gained absolute power and it is as corrupting for them as for political leaders. Through the power to evaluate, judge and recommend students for jobs or advanced training faculty have enormous influence. Before World War II this was not of great significance because the middle class youth who attended college were not that concerned about opinions of their professors. A gentleman's C could be obtained with little work and would still qualify one for Wall Street or medical or law school. But as the pressures of numbers allowed institutions and organizations to become more and more selective the significance of professorial certification became more and more critical. A low grade or a mild letter of recommendation could deny a student a degree, a chance to enter medical school or a position at a desired institution. Grades became the legal tender of the academic subculture and professors the bureau of engraving which regulated the flow of currency. Since education had become the principal point of entry into the higher vocations and callings, and since professors controlled entry through flow, they found themselves in position to determine the character of the next generation of leadership. And since they tended to favor their own sort it would be likely for the next generation to resemble professors — a not altogether happy thought. It is true that by 1969 some of this power over persons had been reduced through student demands for revised grading standards and less permanently damaging forms of appraisal. But the power is likely to be regained during the
decade of the seventies when colleges and universities will produce more trained people than can be used effectively by the work force. Then the Ph.D. who gains the most desirable post will be the one most praised and rewarded by his professors who once again can become arbiters of the nation’s professorial life.

A vice difficult to describe but potent in its effect is the tendency, particularly among younger faculty trained in research-oriented universities, of substituting methodological elegance for thought about reality. Statistics has replaced theology and philosophy as queen of the sciences and for them a tight design for a study of insignificant phenomena is preferable to a looser, but more searching exposition of serious questions. Unvalidated organizational theory substitutes for knowledge of a field; bibliographical critique, rather than clear analysis of intellectual trends, is the chosen instrument for intellectual history; the single star of reinforcement theory guides the lives of younger scholars who do not trust the multiple sorts of evidence which interpretation of human behavior warrants and requires. There is a corollary to this preoccupation with method — awkwardness with language, especially spoken language. Having learned to trust a borrowed theory, formula or cryptic citation to esoteric, but undigested literature over first hand experience with reality these younger scholars have not forced themselves, nor do they force their students, to deal verbally with complex and serious issues. Thus one young philosopher argues with his hands and assumes comprehension through the repeated injunction to his hearers of “You know.” The danger of all this is that methodological elegance and verbal inarticulateness are inadequate to cope with either the needs of society nor even the educational needs of students.

The last vice directly attributable to the academic revolution is really the essence of the revolution itself. This is the tendency for faculty and institutions, as they succeed in currently accepted terms, to grow impervious to explicit needs of society. Thus prestige institutions, assuming a steady increase in research funds cease preparing people to practice a profession and concentrate on finding support to allow the faculty to do what it wishes. Courses are designed not with a view to educational development of students but simply an elaboration of the intellectual interests of professors. And professors adopt a mandarin style which views professional development a higher ideal than the development of those who seek their services. And those in lesser institutions aspire to follow the same route. This desire stands behind the struggle of state colleges and even liberal arts colleges to enter graduate work, to conduct research and to become centers of academic excellence — which really means faculty syndicalism enthroned.

These vices would not be too serious were it not for the fact that higher education has become significant in the life of the nation, it has become the source to which people look for solutions to vexing problems and it has become essential for people living in meritocratic society. Further this institution is expensive and will become more so in the years ahead (an increase in cost from 2% to 3% of the GNP in a seven year period). The extent that these vices jeopardize essential functions or contribute to unnecessary increase in cost of higher education and whether these vices are significantly involved is an issue which must be explored.

First, there is the well-documented fact that faculty members do not seem to have much significance in the lives of students. Student performance on the Graduate Record Examination seems much more related to the traits and abilities they brought with them to college than what a given institution did for or to them, regardless of the prestige of the college or the quality of its faculty. (Astin and Panos, 1969) Students attach little importance to getting to know their professors or getting recognition from them outside of gaining a desired grade. (Katz, et al., 1968) “Most students seem to be moderately satisfied with their colleges, though with no great sense of enthusiasm or excitement; perhaps inevitable processes of adaption lead to taking things for granted. Their attitudes toward faculty members are somewhat similar; students typically report little personal contact with them, and many students are often reasonably content to have it so. In certain limited roles, however, faculty contact is both wanted and influential; teachers are appreciated more as experts than as persons... Faculty members are often remembered for
their contributions to the making of career choice and plans, and sometimes (especially in the case of prospective teachers) they serve as adult models. . . .” (Geldman and Newcomb, 1969, 257-258)

Secondly, faculty continue to resist innovation and change, with the exception of creating new programs to meet expanding vocational needs, even when the need for it can be reasonably demonstrated. (Lon Hefferlin, 1969) Martin points out that there has developed a generally accepted norm of institutional excellence and that as institutions approximate that norm, there is a reluctance to change or even tolerate suggestion of change, “... a school’s educational philosophy as well as any efforts at innovation and change are made to support the Standard. The academic revolution of the last fifty years is now a revolution become counter-revolutionary, bent on crushing rivals and blocking further change. Deviation from the norm is not tolerated because it would be a challenge to the supremacy of this new behemoth.” (Martin, 1969, p. 228) Even B. Lamar Johnson, who usually can find positive evidence for both junior colleges and professors, finds innovations attempted on junior college campuses only when clearly-defined faculty self-interests are served and when some powerful or respected figure serves as an agent of change. (Johnson, 1969).

From 1964 to 1969 student protests disrupted American college campuses, especially those campuses on which faculty had gained a high degree of professionalism and of personal prerogative. The faculty role in those episodes has not been particularly creative nor helpful. At Columbia a strong central administration encouraged faculty to perform almost as independent professionals, each attending to his own work, and required or expected to contribute little to the central purpose or unity of the institution. Faculty thus had led a pleasant detached life and had created no mechanism to cope with crises when they happened. Faculty detachment was part of the cause of student unrest and part of the failure to deal with revolt when it happened. At Stanford in 1968 a majority of the faculty of Humanities and Sciences, which prides itself on being the highly departmentalized heart and soul of the university, voted in favor of amnesty for students who sat in at the Old Union and brought about a defeat for both administrative policy and the recommendations of a legitimate committee on reform of campus judicial affairs. The combined votes of that faculty and that of the School of Medicine swung the close total vote of 54.3% to 45.7% and quite directly paved the way for even more serious confrontation campus politics the following year. (McEvoy and Mutter, 1969) At Duke, a faculty seeking professional excellence became “segmental participants,” absent from the campus a great deal and teaching what concerned them rather than what might interest students, was part of the cause of student outbreaks. Then the action of the faculty itself and an ad hoc faculty senate undermined the power of the central administration to deal with emergencies and eroded the influence the president previously had with the several publics concerned with the university. (McEvoy and Mutter, 1969). By yielding to demands of Negro students and granting amnesty to those who occupied the administration building, the faculty may have convinced students that “mass action no matter what it entails is likely to prove effective. . . .” (McEvoy and Mutter, 1969, p. 119). There are those, of course, who contend that the students engaged in direct protest were right and that faculty support of them against administrative action was justified. At this time, however, this is far from established.

As faculties have been able to concentrate power over appointment, to secure and use extramural funds in departments and to create senates with definite grants of power even over budget preparation and have either sided with dissenting students or at least denied support to central administration, they have weakened the ability of presidents to deal with both ordinary and extraordinary processes of administration. The extreme form, and clearly a pathological one, of this process is the Black Studies Division of San Francisco State which has so obtained power of self-determination that the central administration could have professors attend meetings only through the threat of withholding salary checks. But in less pathological situations, faculty assumption of power has also been hurtful. At one institution a reform of the undergraduate curriculum is refused by departments un-
willing to provide needed faculty. At another the deans have even lost the right to do other than pro forma approve new appointments recommended by departments. At still another the faculty tenure committee threatens the president with a confrontation which will require board of trustee intervention unless he agrees to accept, without question, all recommendations of faculty tenure which the committee wishes to make. And at still another institution the faculty is trying to create a new administrative post, that of Dean of the Faculty, which will be responsible solely to the faculty, and responsible for such things as appointment and tenure. Once again there are those such as Galbraith who believe that complete faculty power is the only valid form of academic governance and who, to prove the case, point out that in most of the prestige universities, faculties do possess considerable power. What they overlook is that until recently, while faculties were afforded great independence in some matters, notably to do their own work, central administration maintained power over budgets and appointment great enough to govern with some stability. Even at Berkeley, which Professor Galbraith values so highly, much of the distinction which that institution earned during the 1950's and 1960's was possible because the president and chancellors did retain considerable power.

Then too there is the matter of the rising cost of higher education which has now reached a point at which sources of finance are beginning to rebel. Some of this increase is because of needed salary reforms, rising costs generally and increased demands made on colleges and universities. But some at least can be traced to the successful academic revolution and the power faculties have obtained over their own affairs and over the governance of institutions. One can hypothesize that governance by consensus generally has inflationary tendencies as each constituency gains support for its demands in return for support for the desires of others. One can also hypothesize, although clearly the needed evidence is not yet available, that rate of increase in cost is correlated with rate of increase of faculty direct involvement in governance, whether that be through senate or a union. Faculties have demanded and received lighter and lighter teaching loads at the same time the number of courses in the curriculum has been increasing. As faculty members have obtained extramural support for their research, institutions have been forced to expand the number of tenured faculty just to maintain essential teaching services. As departments have demanded budgeted funds for departmental research they have also expected the number of tenured positions available to them to be increased. All of these financial demands add to cost and all could have been limited by more direct monitoring from some centralized place.

All of this sounds rather bleak, and it is. Faculty members have generally not been very influential in the lives of their students, have not been particularly innovative, have made governance considerably more difficult than it need be, have contributed to student protest and complicated outcomes of dissent, and may have contributed to unnecessary increases in cost of higher education. But there have been some positive things. Faculties have produced and made work such useful innovations as cluster colleges and cooperative work-study programs. The academic revolution has resulted in increased capacity to prepare research workers and future college teachers to the point that there even may be overproduction. In some institutions a self-restraining faculty has produced a balance of power between itself and a central administration, which allows the institution a stable and balanced growth. Departmentalism has created curricular riches so great that in a large university a real diversity of educational offerings is available to students who want it. However in balance, academic vices and their implications seem sufficiently overwhelming as to demand remedy — but remedy which will allow faculties those essential rights and freedoms essential for their roles as teachers, scholars and critics.

The most needed reform is a return of legitimate power to the central administration. This does not mean a return to the time of the autocratic presidents who ruled their empires with guile and an iron hand. There have been too many presidents in the past who acted without consultation with faculty and who sought to implant their own image on their institutions. Rather it is to argue that if a president is to administer he must have the power to allocate and control financial
resources in such a way as to serve the best interests of the entire university. Only one
viewing the total institution can weigh the relative worth of conflicting needs and make
decisions among them. It also argues that the
president must have the power to appoint his
own administrative associates, probably ex-
tending down to and including department
heads. It is really through these associates that
a president best exerts his administrative
leadership. The appointment of deans, for
example, should be of as much concern to a
president as the appointment of cabinet mem-
bers to the President of the United States. It
further urges that presidents need the free-
dom to act, within established policies, in the
face of emergency, without fear that they will
be subsequently repudiated by their faculties.
Thus, when policy is established as to what
constitutes intolerable campus disruption,
presidents should feel free to act when they
have satisfied themselves that those condi-
tions prevail. And it also argues that a
president must maintain a unitary system of
administration according to which he and he
alone reports directly to the board of trustees.
A dual or multiple system in which such
people as the vice president for finance or the
president of the academic senate report
directly to the board places boards in the role
of administration, for which it is unsuited,
and makes responsible administration impos-
sible.

A second reform involves the concept of
tenure. Tenure is an important protection for
teachers and scholars who must deal with
controversial ideas in the presence of young
and impressionable students who need ex-
posure to controversy but whose parents may
wish to shield them from it. As such it must
be defended. But tenure is not a civil right,
granted automatically to all who enter college
teaching. It is a right to be earned through
demonstration of judgment, maturity and
competency. It is granted by an institution
which establishes, through appropriate pro-
cesses, that an individual has those particular
skills and traits which an institution needs at a
given point in time. Tenure should be granted,
as a definite act by a board of trustees only
after a number of different people make
appropriate judgments. Members of a depart-
ment judge a professor's professional com-
petence and whether departmental needs will
best be served through a tenured appointment
for one with those skills. Deans should judge
whether a recommendation from one depart-
ment is of comparable quality to recommend-
ations of other departments and, in addition,
whether the school or college wishes to
expend the money which a tenured appoint-
ment entails. A university-wide faculty com-
mittee should serve as a quality control group
and make the broad judgment of colleague-
ship — i.e., do we want this person as a
long-time colleague? Then the president must
judge as to whether the institution can afford
the quarter to half million dollar investment
which is what a tenured appointment means
in financial terms. For the sake of balanced
institutional growth probably no institution
should have over 50% of its faculty on tenure
thus insuring that tenure not only protects
the individual but institutional needs for
growth as well.

Thirdly, there probably should be a re-
trenchment in graduate education. If present
plans materialize there will be a severe over-
supply of holders of Ph.D.'s and Masters
degrees by 1980. Estimates run from 50,000
to 100,000 Ph.D.'s produced each year by
1980. Many of the evil effects of the academic
revolution are traceable to rapid expansion of
graduate training and research. Now this does
not mean a total halt. But it does mean that a
number of developing institutions which plan
to enter graduate work in a major way should
be discouraged from doing so. It also means
that a number of institutions already have
large capacity for graduate training should
restrict that somewhat. Here the graduate
School of Arts and Sciences at Harvard is
setting a good example with its announced
plan to reduce graduate enrollment by 20%
within five years. Without heavy involvement
in graduate work college faculties might find
the time and inclination to try to improve
undergraduate education. Further it might
remove some of the invidium felt toward the
simple undergraduate college. In states in
which there are coordinating boards for
higher education the initiative to reduce
graduate training could start at that level. In
other states and in the private sector the
appeal must be made to enlightened self
interest. Colleges and universities simply can
no longer afford rapid expansion of graduate
programs.
There are other possible correctives, but these seem most crucial. If they are followed the fruit of the academic revolution may yet not turn bitter.
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When I write on a topic as controversial as the present one I am tempted to try to summarize all that I have ever said on the topic. The temptation springs from a certain cowardice, I suppose, from the fear of being misunderstood. In order to treat a bit more adequately the specific topic I have been assigned, however, I am determined not to yield fully to that temptation. My views on the causes of the crisis besetting higher education or the sources of student radicalism and dissent you may attempt to deduce. My fears of what may lie in store for us all, you may sense. My values may be all too apparent. However, I do hope to remain something of an enigma, for as Dean of a college of arts and sciences I have come to recognize that unless one learns to savor the paradoxical and enigmatic he has little chance of appearing wise. Like some of you, I have at times reached that point of agony where even the appearance of wisdom seems a blessed state. Perhaps all of us foolish enough to speak or write on “The Student in the University” are merely insignificant imitations of Kafka.
striving to state with great clarity and precision the incomprehensibility of the incomprehensible.

As a preamble to my comments on students and the shaping of the curriculum, I should like to recall a passage from Charles Dickens’ *Hard Times*, surely a suitable title:

“Now, what I want is, Facts. Teach these boys and girls nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else. You can only form the minds of reasoning animals upon Facts: nothing else will ever be of service to them. This is the principle upon which I bring up my own children, and this is the principle on which I bring up these children. Stick to facts, sir!”

The scene was a plain, bare, monotonous vault of a schoolroom, and the speaker’s square forefinger emphasized his observations by underscoring every sentence with a line on the schoolmaster’s sleeve. The emphasis was helped by the speaker’s square wall of a forehead, which had his eyebrows for its base, while his eyes found commodious cellaring in two dark caves, over-shadowed by the wall. The emphasis was helped by the speaker’s mouth, which was wide, thin, and hard set. The emphasis was helped by the speaker’s voice, which was inflexible, dry, and dictatorial. The emphasis was helped by the speaker’s hair, which bristled on the skirts of his bald head, a plantation of firs to keep the wind from its shining surface, all covered with knobs, like the crust of a plum pie, as if the head had scarcely warehouse room for the hard facts stored inside. The speaker’s obstinate carriage, square coat, square legs, square shoulders—nay, his very neckcloth, trained to take him by the throat with an unaccommodating grasp, like a stubborn fact, as it was—all helped the emphasis.

“In this life, we want nothing but Facts, sir; nothing but Facts!”

The speaker, and the schoolmaster, and the third grown person present, all backed a little, and swept with their eyes the inclined plane of little vessels then and there arranged in order, ready to have imperial gallons of facts poured into them until they were full to the brim. (*Hard Times*, I, I)

In the slightly more than one hundred years which have passed since Charles Dickens described this wretched scene, in the steady march of progress we have improved our classrooms and have changed our dress and pedagogical styles. We have split the atom, broken the sound barrier, explored the moon and computerized registration. Seats of higher education have proven themselves to be organisms capable of parthenogenesis. As colleges and universities have multiplied, so have facts. And until recently still the vessels were arranged on inclined planes ready, we assumed, to have gallons of facts poured into them.

It is easy to satirize American higher education, and perhaps easier yet to enjoy such satire. The rhetoric of college catalogues has always seemed a bit hyperbolic when compared with pep rallies, Greek sings, or multiple choice examinations. We have long been accustomed to recognizing that between our aspirations and our achievements stretched mile after mile of arid plains. We have experimented, innovated, renovated and accommodated, but never with a very real sense of urgency.

That a sense of urgency has arisen among academicians in the late 1960’s, few would dispute. That sense of urgency is, I think, sharpened by the fact that the rhetoric of college radicals has a marked similarity to that of traditional college catalogues acclaiming the commitment of the institution to liberating the whole man, and advancing society toward perfection. Nor have we been comforted by the fact that the distance between the stated aspirations of college radicals and their achievements is as great as that between our own aspirations and achievements. Higher education in the United States has reached a crisis stage and there are many outside our universities who indicate that they are prepared “to set it in order.”

The nature of the crisis, however, is rather different from that which catches the fancy of the news media. It is not long hair and beards, minis or maxis, sit-ins or arson. It is not even drugs and sex which certainly pose serious problems in their own right. Rather, it is a sense of confusion about the purposes and proper directions of higher education. The disparity between student expectations of a university and faculty expectations has probably never been so great. Further, both faculty and students are divided into those with a professional or preprofessional orientation and those who are principally concerned with the quality of liberal education. There are those who see the university as an academy and those who see it as an instrument for radical action. We have talked of communication and community in the belief that given time we not only could but
would agree about goals and objectives. Now I sense that there may not be time, and even if there were, there may not be agreement.

One of the more serious and perennial controversies is that between those who see the university as an instrument of society producing the trained manpower to maintain that society and the few who see both the society and the university as instruments for man’s survival, means of enabling the individual to attain his fullest potential as a human being.

Quotations from recent publications illustrate the controversy. The first statement is that of Richard F. Rosenberg, Chairman of the Oregon State Educational Coordinating Council.

I think that one thing that must be understood is that the public has an interest in higher education because higher education contributes to the progress and growth of our society. Our educational institutions endeavor to prepare the professional people who will provide leadership for, and participate in, an advanced technological state. Virtually every economic, social and cultural endeavor is dependent on higher education’s production of this skilled and informed manpower. (Richard L. Rosenberg, “Higher Education: The Public Interest,” Value Change and Power Conflict, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1969, p.48.)

A similar view, expressed by Admiral Rickover in his book Education and Freedom, “We must upgrade our schools in order to guarantee the future prosperity and freedom of the Republic,” led Professor Wayne Booth of the University of Chicago to comment:

In Admiral Rickover’s statement, the schools must be upgraded in order to guarantee future prosperity, that is, we improve education for the sake of some presumed social good.

I seldom find anyone putting it the other way around: we must guarantee prosperity so that we can improve the schools, insure the development of certain kinds of persons, both as teachers and as students. (Wayne Booth, “Is There Any Knowledge That A Man Must Have,” The Knowledge Most Worth Having, University of Chicago, 1967, pp. 16-17.)

Do our colleges and universities exist for the society and its self-propagation, or to enable its members to become fully human? Is the problem posed simply one of semantics and emphasis or is there a significant distinction between the language and intent of Mr. Rosenberg and Mr. Booth? I think there is and that the difference lies precisely where campus radicals express their concerns. Are students raw material to be shaped to the purposes of an intractable system, small machines which enable the big machine to function smoothly? Or are they individuals with inalienable rights, who participate in a society which exists for their well-being and the well-being of all its citizens and which must continually be re-shaped to meet changing needs?

Campus radicals are easily lampooned because they are of a privileged class. Their parents often are prosperous and prominent. If they really knew what it’s like to earn bread by the sweat of the brow, runs the lampoon, they wouldn’t have time for marching, picketing, and trouble-making. Since I have already lapsed into biblical prose, let me cite a proverb, giving it a contemporary reading: “The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.” Products of a depression and several wars, the fathers set out to achieve success which could be measured by income and/or position. They now have their suburban homes or luxury apartments, positions of importance, and often wealth beyond their fondest expectations of some thirty years ago. But too often the wealth has not brought happiness, and the fruits of their labors seem of no real value. For what promotes real value is not that which hastens and expedites consumption but that which introduces some qualitative difference into the life of a person. How often have our students heard their fathers or mothers speak with joy and pride of their work? Even as educators, I fear the impression we give of our endeavors is one of frustration, futility, and sheer busyness. Is it surprising that the children’s teeth are set on edge and that even when they do not have an alternative, some of them set themselves stubbornly against following similar routes and assuming similar roles?

In spite of the rhetorical questions with which I have flailed you, I trust the relevance of the problem to my subject is clear. For some decades, universities and colleges have given their primary attention to fulfilling the demands laid upon it by society. If more scientists are needed because of Sputnik, we produce them. If fewer Ph. D’s are needed
because of the glut on the market, we will cease producing them. If research is needed for various departments of government we will do it, for a price. If it is no longer needed, we will cease doing it, but complain because the oh-so-helpful funds are also terminated. A Secretary of Defense was once ridiculed for proclaiming, “What’s good for General Motors is good for the country.” We have behaved as though “What’s convenient for the government is good for the universities.” Obviously I am not at all convinced that doing what is convenient for the government is necessarily in the best interest of the country, or its citizens. Student concern for discovering themselves and doing what is meaningful to themselves certainly has its absurd excesses. Nevertheless, their desire to assert their right to decide how they will spend their futures rather than submit to channeling is surely a healthy one. Our problem is convincing them that they have a future.

In a recent article in the College Board Review (Winter, ’69-70, No. 74, p. 7), William Boyd cited evidence that 90% of freshmen entering midwestern colleges in the fall of 1969 believed that they should “help design the curriculum.” Although my own impression is that this figure is rather high and certainly does not represent the number who would actually work at such a task themselves, there is significant evidence that students are both disgruntled with what they are getting in our current curriculum and dissatisfied that they do not play a more active role in shaping alternatives.

Perhaps no privilege is more precious to the faculty than control of the curriculum. In many cases, faculties have wrested control of the curriculum from arbitrary administrations or boards of trustees. They also have cause for some pride in what they have created, particularly if the criteria used for judging success are derived from professional and disciplinary concerns. Although I think it would be very difficult to prove, we possibly do produce better trained and more competent chemists, psychologists, historians, literary critics or physicists than the colleges of thirty or forty years ago.

Whenever the issue of student participation in curriculum reform is raised, the opposition can be expected to express itself in two distinctive ways. The first is rational argument which justifies faculty control in terms of rightness, propriety and the best interest of all concerned. The second form of opposition is entrenchment. Possessing control of the curriculum, the faculty, at least in a university setting, can with some confidence assume that student activists have neither the organization nor the staying power to successfully mount a frontal assault on their Fortresses. There may be momentary difficulties and perhaps even calculated losses, but over the years attrition will tell more heavily on student activists than on the faculty. If this general assessment of the situation is essentially accurate, it follows that sustained and creative involvement of students in curriculum planning is likely to occur only if there are major changes in the attitudes of faculties.

Thus far I have proceeded as though student participation in curriculum planning were so obviously a desirable goal that it needed no defense. I may also seem to have implied that only an overly paternalistic and entrenched faculty stands in the way of so desirable an objective. I am not so simplistic. There are costs and risks, as well as potential gains in greater student participation. But there are also costs and risks to denying student participation.

Students do seem more immediately susceptible to fads. A steady diet of encounter groups, “I Ching”, and women’s liberation would assuredly not be in their best interest, but the fear that students are interested only in the ephemeral relates seems groundless to me. Courses spawned in “free universities” or introduced into the curriculum at student instigation are intended to supplement, not supplant more standard offerings. In large part they represent a striving for another format for learning than the lecture course.

When students strive to participate in curriculum development, rarely do they evince much concern for courses which constitute their professional training. In discussing curriculum revision, we should distinguish between courses which are professional in their orientation and those which are part of the general curriculum related to “liberal education.” The major difficulty is that professionalism has become so dominant in our departments, and our departments are so autonomous that few courses on most campuses are genuinely designed to meet the
purposes of "liberal education." Even introductory courses most frequently serve as stepping stones for the potential major. Beyond such freshmen courses, I would venture to say, 90% of university offerings are implemented, if not designed, to discourage those not inclined toward or capable of such specialization. This, it seems to me, is the travesty of higher education.

I have no intention of developing a case for the elimination of forms of specialization from the undergraduate curriculum. That a student should become competent in a specific area of study or in a particular discipline is defensible on several grounds. To function effectively or to function at all, this complex society requires large numbers of highly trained scientists and technologists. I would add a further point. There are students who will obtain their greatest joy from the successful pursuit of these areas. In terms of social needs and the needs of some individuals, specialization can and should be defended. The desire of many students to move as early as possible into their specialized fields is a feature common to most campuses, and not one that need be discouraged. A physicist or microbiologist must pursue a rather carefully structured course of study to become proficient. Normally such students recognize the propriety of faculty control of that sequence. I see no serious difficulties in this area.

On the other hand, rarely do even the most ardent faculty proponents of specialization contend that more than fifty percent of a student's four year academic load must be devoted to his professional training. More frequently, in the humanities and social sciences, no more than 25 percent of a student's time is demanded for his preparation in his major field of study. Thus by our present system, we reserve between fifty and seventy-five percent of the curriculum for general education. To what end?

Since the surrender of the classical curriculum and the introduction of the elective system at Harvard in the late nineteenth century, faculties have struggled with the concept of "General Education." Daniel Bell's *Reforming General Education* surveys the attempts over a number of decades at Columbia, Harvard and Chicago to resolve the problem. While such debates have continued, however, the emasculation of general education has proceeded apace by virtue of the dependence upon disciplinary divisions to offer virtually all courses. By the very nature of things, departmental courses tend to drift toward specialization.

Much of our difficulty with General Education derives from our reluctance to surrender the belief that there is a particular body of knowledge that every educated man should know. Perhaps only the tremendous advances in scholarship and the nearly unbelievable constriction of our planet could lay that belief to rest. In this age, we cannot successfully argue that a course in Western Civilization is more essential than a course in Eastern or African Civilization. Is knowledge of a foreign language more essential than knowledge of advanced mathematics, economics or psychology? And when we move to the humanities, the choices are equally difficult--Bach or Rembrandt, Dante or Kant? In the article alluded to earlier, Professor Booth notes: "...a man can be ignorant even of Shakespeare, Aristotle, Beethoven and Einstein and be a man for a' that--if he has learned how to think his own thoughts, experience beauty for himself and choose his own actions." (Booth, p. 27) But this is precisely where we have failed and are failing. No matter how many facts a student learns about any of the masters in whatever field, he is but a container of facts--one of Dickens' pitiful vessels -- until he has developed a capacity to speculate, discriminate and assimilate.

While defending the prerogatives of the faculty with regard to curriculum planning in the fields of specialized, preprofessional training, I contend that we must involve our students in working out effective ways of accomplishing the real objectives of liberal education. It is generally recognized now that students can move from virtually any undergraduate field in the humanities or social sciences to a related field at the graduate level and perform quite successfully, although a very brief period of remedial studies may be necessary. Certainly law schools, and graduate schools of business and social work, have long recognized that it was to their advantage to recruit widely from various undergraduate majors. What is necessary is not encyclopedic knowledge of a particular field, nor even a highly particularized disciplinary competence,
but rather the capacity to think independently, to know how to go about answering a question or resolving a problem, and to make value judgments that rest upon a coherent understanding of the interdependency of men in modern society.

There are five secondary reasons why we must turn to student participation in curriculum planning to accomplish the objectives of liberal education:

1) While the faculty is well trained and well suited to make curriculum decisions in the areas of their specialties, those who have worked on curriculum for liberal education soon discover that nothing in their training has provided them with skills special to this problem. Although they are more knowledgeable of the ways of academia, they are as uncertain as undergraduates about the best way to effect a liberal education. One notes that the models which most professors bring to bear on their attitudes toward curriculum have a startling resemblance to the type of program common to their own undergraduate college.

2) Faculty members and administrators have a distressing habit of solving curriculum problems by adding more courses. The proliferation of courses may be one of our major problems already. Few students could be convinced that the solution to the ills they are conscious of in our present curriculum are subject to correction by the addition of more of the same.

3) Faculty members have set assumptions about what is academic and what is non-academic that are often unacceptable to students. As you know from your campus, those areas which may be described as extracurricular are likely to receive short shrift from the faculty and hence the administration. Although faculties are prepared to admit that the total college experience of students ought to include extracurricular experiences, they generally disclaim responsibility for such areas and rarely, very rarely see in them opportunities for education.

4) We forget that the word curriculum is derived from the Latin word "to run." Even the phrase "course of study" rarely conjures up the vision of a physical course to be traversed. But for the student, whether or not he is an etymologist, there is always the awareness that he is being asked to run, and run. But he would like to know where he is running, what the objectives are and what else he must give up before he can decide realistically whether the race is worth the running. I think too highly of my faculty colleagues to assume that they really expect their students either docilely to run the race because their drill instructor assures them that it is good for them or to react any other way than with antagonism if they are warned of the dire consequences of not running. They have run to the whistle of the drill instructor in high school and the joy of running for its own sake is rarely in them, particularly if the course appears suspiciously like an obstacle course designed to maintain a meritocracy.

5) Although it is true that very few students are likely to participate actively in curriculum planning, the experience and insights gained by those who do readily become part of the student culture. Partially because students do have better access to other students than members of the faculty, there is great potential for dissemination of educational objectives through student participants. One of the striking features of the contemporary scene is the extraordinary degree of peer identification among most students. Although they may distrust particular student leaders or particular student governmental structures, they overwhelmingly support the principle of student involvement in decision making and are generally willing to accept decisions where they believe student points of view have been fairly represented.

The primary reason for student participation in the shaping of the curriculum is more complex and difficult to state. In short it is this: we do not know how we can most effectively get where we wish to go. Our educational vision has been hampered by our habits and our fears. To effect our desired ends, we need student contribution. We must first convince students that our universities and our society are dynamic rather than static. Secondly, we must explode the Phoenix myth. The rather pervasive belief among some students that if we can but destroy this society a beautiful new bird will arise from the flames is ahistorical, apolitical and inhumane. However, the view that today's student is merely suffering the pangs of adolescence and will develop an uncritical acceptance of the status quo is potentially
suicidal. Our students sense, probably more acutely than do we the dangers that lie ahead in the destruction of our environment, the heightening of racial tensions, the continued creation of weapon systems that we may not be able to control, and the increasing disparity between the "haves" and "have-nots" of our world.

If we are not as yet prepared to draft the blueprints of a new society or even a new university, we cannot delay in preparing a citizenry which can envision, plan, and implement a saner and more just society. To do so, we must bring to the task of re-shaping the university all the imagination, energy, and creativity at our disposal. These qualities do exist among many of our students. Conjoined with the experience and deeper awareness of history possessed by our faculty, the idealism and drive of students may enable us to break through the patterns which presently stultify both students and members of the faculty.

Surely there are ways now that we can proceed toward the transformation of our academic patterns. If we dispense with the concept that there is an established body of knowledge which every educated man must have, if we rid ourselves of the notion, surely spurious, that one introductory course enables a student to see how a discipline operates; and, if we accept the premise that our energies must be directed toward the development of clarity of thinking and a clearer, more cohesive system of values, certain tasks appear inevitable.

We can no longer rely as heavily as we have in the past on the standard course structure. The lecture system with infrequent discussion groups, usually expected to arrive at a predetermined point, has been the primary vehicle of our system, reinforced with tests, term papers, and occasional recitation. Too frequently tests, term papers and recitations have existed only for the purpose of establishing a grade rather than as a vital part of the learning process. For example, students rarely receive a detailed critique of their final examinations. Nor does it occur to them that they should, for they, too, see it principally as an instrument for establishing a grade. Yet here of all places is a need for careful evaluation by student and instructor of the quality of performance, the sources of strength and the causes of error. We have simply allowed our system of course credits and marketable transcripts to dominate us and distract us from our educational objectives.

Until we recognize that the lecture system is too frequently a form of spectator sport, we are unlikely to produce students who possess the intellectual independence that we profess to strive for. Even in seminars, as instructors we too confidently and easily dominate the situation. Our students remain passive and dependent, not because we intend it, but because we are not sufficiently devoted to enabling them to achieve complete, critical independence. Recently in reading the research paper of a graduate student, I became so conscious of dependence upon authorities that I finally felt compelled to say, "Whenever you are afflicted with the urge to quote authority X, Y or Z because he has said it so much better, consider finding something better to say." Although we give lip-service to the concept almost daily, we have failed to convey successfully to our students the need for them to think for themselves.

Perhaps one of the reasons we find our students in so passive and dependent a role is linked to another failure. One of our greatest resources for effective teaching is almost completely untapped — the students themselves. Anyone who has experimented with student criticism of student papers knows how quickly they become critically perceptive — in dealing with someone else’s work. With experience and supervision, they can also become extraordinarily effective as discussion leaders. We have not tapped this resource because to do so is time consuming, but it may be one of the ways to establish the confidence and independency toward which we must strive.

I detect one other serious difficulty in our formal course structure. On most campuses there are relatively few courses that deal explicitly with values. As faculty members we assume that values are implicit in the entire structure of our fields, but rarely do we make them explicit and invite challenge. With the erosion of religious commitment in the Judeo-Christian context, with the turning of departments of philosophy to analytic philosophy many students confront a void. It is instructive to consider the sequential popularity among undergraduates of Salinger, then
Golding, then Camus and now Hesse, novelists who deal expressly with values. By means of departmental courses or through supra-departmental offerings, we must turn explicitly to issues of values, to the grounds of idealism, for one of the tragic things we are witnessing on our campuses is the death of the American dream.

But surely courses are not the only means available to the university to improve the educational process. In a colloquium on the purposes of education on our campus some sixteen months ago, I argued for a reduction of the standard course load with the substitution of tutorial equivalents which would not be limited to academic subjects. I shall not repeat the details of that proposal or attempt to justify the plan, for each campus must strive to determine what is most effective in its particular setting. The substance of the proposal, however, is simple. Students have often contended that their most valuable experiences on campus have arisen from extra-curricular activities. As a faculty member I have winced before the claim and generally refused to believe it. Yet for some students going into fields which are not dependent on the structured sequence of course work it may be so. One must wonder how much more effective such activities as campus newspaper work, social organizations, community action programs, and campus government might become if we recognized that they are learning situations and attempted to bring to bear upon them some of the resources now limited to the classroom. The possibilities for assisting a student to think through his objectives, to periodically review his procedures, to challenge his goals and to evaluate his accomplishments are extensive, yet largely untapped.

Particularly with regard to student involvement in social action programs have we failed to give the guidance and support requisite to satisfactory learning situations. By stipulating that these are extra-curricular activities, we have made it clear that they were of lesser importance than course work. Although there has been some tendency to expand work-study and field experience, we are, as a national system of higher education, still far short of utilizing the potential either of the existing situations or of our students.

Perhaps the most effective statement of the necessity of community involvement has come from our black students as they have worked toward clarification of their objectives in the various Afro-American or Black Studies programs. They sense the necessity of involving themselves in the communities from which they come as a corollary of their academic work, a means of testing the relevance of their learning and a reminder of what they are training for.

Another reason has been set forth by Dr. Rosemary Park:

Is it indeed enough to study and present? Does the university not have a responsibility to sensitize and encourage its students to action in the cause of social justice? Should not its educational program demonstrate its own concern, for instance, exerting all its capacities to provide education for disadvantaged minorities?

Unless the university proves by such actions that it is concerned about justice, all its talk about truth may be mere rhetoric, too. Perhaps it is not that the younger group so much denigrates truth and rational process, though on occasion they appear to, as that they see the requirements of justice so much more clearly. (Rosemary Park, "Value Change and Power Conflict: The Administrative Interest," Value Change and Power Conflict, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1969, p. 120).

A third reason, perhaps more compelling than either of the other is the strong desire of students today to gain experience outside the academic womb. We occasionally must remind ourselves, particularly on campuses where the great majority of students are from upper middle class suburbia, of the extraordinary limitations of such students. Their apparent sophistication too easily blinds us to the fact that such sophistication has come largely vicariously. Few have ever profited from the experiences of paper routes, clerking, and all the jobs we have traditionally associated with American adolescence. For many, counseling at summer camps is the only non-school responsibility they have had. They sense the need to test themselves, to discover whether they have the competence to cope with the real world. Both their need and their desire are justifications for extending the educational program of the university beyond the formal classroom. Although raw experience in and of itself is educational, that is not what I contend we must provide. Rather, we must encourage
types of experience which can be subjected to the reflection and inquiry for which an academic community exists. I think it obvious that no satisfactory pattern is likely to develop without extensive student participation in the planning.

What I have said thus far reflects my conviction that new institutional patterns must develop on our campuses which can bring faculty and students into active cooperation in shaping the future of colleges. Virtually every college I know of has taken at least token steps along these lines with varying results. On some campuses such steps have exacerbated the student’s sense of powerlessness and inequality. On others, constructive action has begun. You are fully aware, however, that I have made no reference to deans of students, student activity personnel or counselors. That omission had to be deliberate in an address prepared for such a conference as this.

Quite frankly, I am not at all certain what role you can best play in the current crisis of higher education. I do not profess to have extensive familiarity with the roles you now play or envision for yourselves. My limited experience, however, convinces me that you have already recognized that you must redefine your expectations and redirect your energies. Perhaps by enumerating some of the problems I see in implementing a program of student participation in curriculum planning, I can suggest some of the possibilities open to you.

1. Exceeding the militancy of the few is the confusion, self-denigration and despair of many. Our campuses are full of hopeless students who do not feel they can materially affect their present or their future. The danger that this pattern will continue beyond their collegiate years should frighten us all.

2. Students are even more notorious than faculty for becoming entrapped in their own organizational patterns. When they find representative or democratic structures frustrating and cumbersome, withdrawal is the common response.

3. While asserting their complete independence and freedom, the majority of students continue to be very anxious for approval from adults. Even the most militant, anti-authoritarian students seem to be engaged in a quest for adults they can trust.

4. The sense of impermanence hovers constantly over student groups. The fear that what isn’t done today won’t be done at all is pervasive. Year after next is inconceivable to freshmen, too late for sophomores, and a never-never land for juniors and seniors.

5. Faculty members are, for the most part, too intent upon their own work and careers to have gained more than a random impression of the student culture. They are generally unfamiliar with current innovations in higher education and with the research presently being conducted. And it may be that their time is too limited for systematic inquiry.

6. Faculty members, students, and administrators are prone to lapse into adversary proceedings when dealing with one another. Each tends to be so encapsulated within his own world that he has little familiarity with or sensitivity to the problems of the other.

Particular talents are necessary for dealing with these problems: skill in counseling, skill in organizing, skill in listening, skill in displaying supportive attitudes. As I understand it, these are skills you are supposed to possess. Recently with one of my classes I was studying a novel of Saul Bellow’s. I am inclined to enjoin you with the title of that novel: Seize the Day. That does sound like high school oratory, but I prefer it to the plight of the protagonist who finds himself at the funeral of a total stranger, weeping copiously for his own mortality.

I do not assume that the reasons I have advanced for student participation in the shaping of the curriculum will be convincing to some members of the faculty or to all of you. The possible consequences of failing to involve students in that process, however, include heightened antagonism, increased dissent, and continued ignorance on their part of the complexities of academic decision making as well as the survival of a curriculum addressed too frequently to the needs of the faculty rather than those of students. The problem of increased dissent can, of course, be dealt with; but in our concern to maintain order, we may destroy the very idea of a university. The other possible consequences cause me equal concern, for students do need to discover for themselves vying conceptions of education and they must have a curriculum addressed to their own needs, needs which differ sub-
stantially from those of students of the thirties or forties. Not only can I envision members of this professional association making contributions to the solutions of these problems, I see that as a necessity. You will make such contributions only as you see yourself as integral to the educational process rather than on its periphery and convey that conviction to the members of the faculties and administrations with whom you work.
At Columbia University, on a day of celebration of the university's centenary in 1954, Robert Oppenheimer said, "The unity of knowledge, the nature of human communities, the order of society, the order of ideas, the very notions of society have changed, and will not return to what they have been in the past. What is new is not new because it has never been before, but because it has changed in quality... so that the world alters as we walk in it, so that the years of a man's life measure not some small growth or rearrangement or moderation of what he learned in childhood, but a great upheaval." Oppenheimer went on to say more specifically what is involved in the upheaval.

In my judgment, any serious discussion of the place of students in society must begin somewhere in the area indicated by Oppenheimer's prophecy. What has been happening is not simply a step in some of the arrangements and re-arrangements of society. What we are facing as we move into the 1970's in the United States has to do with the world upheaval. At the center of the upheaval is the
fact that the regular institutions of authority—political systems, religion, family, schools and universities—have lost their power of control. The first World War shook everything up; the years between the two World Wars saw the development of authoritarian societies exerting control, while the central powers of colonialism were losing their grip on the colonial peoples. The Second World War changed everything and shook up all relationships between all nation-states. We are now in a transitional period of incredibly rapid change in which the youth of the world, having been born into a world society in such a state of change, are no longer rooted in the traditions and institutions which control the lives of their parents.

Now that a larger and larger segment of world youth are in institutions of education, we find thousands of students assembled together on the world’s campuses where they find persons of like interests and common attitudes who are capable of forming a new political and social force which was never before possible. There is a student movement on a world scale and an attitude which from country to country varies in intensity, from skepticism, resistance to authority, to rebellion, and revolutionary action. In one sense the world student movement represents a movement which makes its own news, news which is then reported back to the world student population and confirms the reality and legitimacy of student activism. The students in Czechoslovakia in 1968 knew about the students at Columbia and Cornell, just as the Columbia students knew about the French student revolt, while the French knew about the Japanese and the Indonesians.

From country to country, the attitudes and actions of students are of course quite different, but it is possible to make a set of generalizations about the general pattern of action and attitude of this generation of world students. On the whole, they are anti-bureaucratic, anti-war, and are critical of the structure and content of university education in a wide range of objections, from the examination system and the admissions programs to the role of students in the decision-making connected with university policy and government. In some instances the students are using their campuses as bases for political action and organization.

One ironic example comes to mind in the case of the arrangements some of us had made for a world conference on the role of the universities in the quest for peace, to be held at the University of Rome in January of 1968. Chancellors, university presidents, faculty members and administrators from a representative cross-section of the world’s universities were to come together to deal with the problems of the new generation and the role of the universities in meeting their duties in a revolutionary world, particularly as these apply to the university’s influence on behalf of peace. The conference had to be cancelled at the last minute because the Italian students had taken over the buildings of the University of Rome, and were engaged in organizing a political base to form a coalition with the farmers and workers in an effort to overthrow the Italian government.

The students in the United States are part of a world student movement. We find here in this country some of the same social conditions, including the gap between the rich and the poor, the problems of racism, an erosion of belief in many of the political and social institutions, and a generalized resentment against the university in its present institutional form. The two most frequent generalizations made by the liberal and radical students in the United States are, first, that the universities are instruments of white middle-class society, providing services to industry, government, the military and to the existing social and economic order; secondly, that students are given little opportunity for joining in the political, educational and social decisions which govern their lives both on and off the campus. Students are therefore arguing that they must be given the rights and responsibilities of all American citizens, and an equality of status with the faculty and administration in making decisions about educational policy. Those in this audience who have been student-watchers over these past ten to twenty years will have seen the growth of these two attitudes in an extraordinarily rapid transition from student acquiescence during the 1950’s to growing intensity of political and social effort, organized around issues of civil rights, university reform and the anti-war movement.

The start of the new movement can be seen in the latter part of the 1950’s in the lunch-counter sit-ins those courageous deter-
mined young blacks began in the South on behalf of what is surely the most primitive of all American rights — the right to be seated at that emporium of democracy, the American lunch-counter and to be served Coca-Cola or a cup of coffee.

It was then that the younger generation saw more precisely how their black brothers and sisters were being treated in the South. The TV, the radio and the press produced pictures and stories of the young black demonstrators. The white generation of the young saw before their own eyes demonstrators who were dragged off to jail or brutalized by the police, set upon by dogs and cattle-prods. At that point, a strong and energetic civil rights movement began on the campuses and for the first time a student movement of black and white together formed itself around the moral and political principle of equal rights for all.

The generation of the 1950's had been identified by journalists as the silent ones, when in fact the young were merely silent publicly while quite articulate in private. The spokesman of that time among the sophisticated young whites was J.D. Salinger and *The Catcher in the Rye*, whose hero or anti-hero, Holden Caulfield, expressed the general skepticism of the young toward the older generation, and accused it of hypocrisy. Caulfield's favorite word to apply to the older generation was that it was "phony," and his declared search was for authenticity, sincerity and honesty in personal relations and social custom. The internal values of authenticity and honesty then began to be externalized in social and political action through the civil rights movement of the early 1960's.

As the student movement grew from the events of Berkeley in 1964 to Columbia, Cornell and Harvard in 1968, it was marked by an intensification of political, social and educational action using many of the tactics of the labor movement of the 1930's, especially the technique of the sit-in and the mass demonstration. As we look at the social problems of the 1970's in the relation of students to their own society, we find a much wider variety of radical thought and action, and the inclusion of larger and larger numbers of liberal and moderate students, both in the high schools and the colleges, in the world of student activism. The generation of the 1970's is the second one to have been educated in the mass culture by the information available to its members from the mass media. Those of us who were educated in the 1930's and 40's had little opportunity to gain access to information about the society at large. In the 1970's, everyone, young and old, has access to the same news reports, the same social commentaries, and the same images of contemporary society as it presents itself to itself in the mass media.

In the field of radical student thought and action there are now three main student groups. The first is the fragmented set of white radicals from the former S.D.S. movement, in which the present Weathermen along with several other groups have adopted violence as a political strategy. The Weatherman posture of revolutionary action, coupled with the political strategy of violence, has reduced the political influence of that part of the movement to a point close to zero. The end-point in that mode of political action is represented by the blow-up of an entire house in New York where rebel members of the student movement had been making bombs.

The second group within the white radical movement is represented by some of the students whom I came to know directly during residence as visiting professor at the University of New Mexico during these past weeks. I found there a small group of students who identified themselves as radical — ten to fifteen of them in a student body of 14,000 — and operating separately from the Black Power movement or the Third World students. Their chief characteristic was to be found in their negativism and their posture of continual attack on the United States as an imperialist power which oppressed its minorities and had designed a foreign policy based on military conquest. They condemned the entire system of American capitalist democracy as fundamentally corrupt and held that the system could not be reformed and must therefore be destroyed by whatever means possible.

Two examples of their mode of political action can be taken from the events of this past semester — the disruption of a speech which was to have been made by Strom Thurmond and was cancelled before it got started, and the disruption of a basketball game between the University of New Mexico and Brigham Young University, as a gesture against alleged racism at Brigham Young
University and in the Mormon Church. In the latter case, the black students had organized their own demonstration which was to have taken place at the basketball game but which was called off when the white radicals took their own action by throwing a mixture of salad oil and kerosene on the basketball court, thus preventing the game from starting.

The effect of this action was not only to arouse the anger of a basketball-loving student body and citizenry, but to prevent what could have been a dignified demonstration by the black students on behalf of the equality of the races. The effect of the disruption of the Thurmond speech was, in a similar way, to anger the moderate and liberal students and faculty members and to turn the state against the radical student movement as a threat, not only to the civil rights of those who believe in free speech but to the orderly process of education at the university. Again, the effect of this branch of the radical movement as was the case with the Weathermen, was to cut away any possible political support for the radical movement by students, faculty members, the blacks or anyone else.

It is within a third group of serious radicals, concerned with the reconstruction of the university and direct action on the problems of society, that the greatest strength now rests. The center of this part of the movement on most campuses is to be found most often among graduate students who have had experience in political action as undergraduates and whose purpose in entering graduate school is to develop their own powers as young intellectuals and to use their education as a means of improving their ability to function as agents of change. They are radical in the sense that they reject the standard norms of American political and educational behavior, both on and off the campus. Whether black or white, they are not interested in destroying the university in order to bring down the social system. They wish to use the university as a social instrument, as an arena for social action designed to solve practical problems in the social order. It is from these students that the forms of militant action have been taken to develop black studies programs on the campuses, to work on problems ranging from air pollution to the removal of military research from the universities and to organize new courses in free universities and in the regular curriculum, courses dealing with issues and problems rather than historical and cultural surveys.

There are also movements underway within the conventional structure of student government where in the past very little action could be seen in the field of educational and social reform. Now, in university after university, students are working with faculty members to reconstruct the internal relationships between the student government and the university community at large. As recently as three to five years ago, the concerns of the members of student governments were confined to the regular and comparatively unimportant details of college life, ranging from decisions about which rock band to hire to how to hold the annual election of a prom queen. As you know, in more than 600 colleges and universities students are now active in faculty committees having to do with educational policy. In some cases students are serving on boards of trustees; in others they are working directly with political parties in their states in efforts to elect anti-war candidates and state legislators with an interest in educational reform and improvement.

There is also a heightened intensity of concern on the part of student newspaper editors who in some cases have turned their newspapers into forums for the discussion of political and social ideas, and in others have exerted strong editorial influence in pressing for a solution to the university problems according to a progressive or radical or liberal philosophy. There is also a strong movement in the underground high-school and college newspapers where articles about politics and the arts, poems, literary criticism, and other articles having to do with sexual emancipation and the rock culture are published on the campus and for sale in the campus community.

It seems to me that the center of gravity for the student movement as we begin the 1970's lies in these areas of social and educational reconstruction. The students are using what they have learned in the mass culture and their own enclaves within it to produce alternate forms of education and political action. The most common and direct target for the movement at large is something which could be called Agnewism. Since Vice-President Agnew has become the spokesman for a hard-line against students and dissenters,
he has become identified in the student mind as spokesman for a government which wants to hold the status quo instead of taking the necessary actions to improve the quality of life in contemporary society. This has meant an increasing polarization between the students and the government. The leadership in the student movement has become too well informed and too sophisticated not to see that there is a direct connection between the policies of the Attorney General’s office and such enterprises as the Chicago Conspiracy trial, Mr. Agnew’s public statements about students and liberal commentators in the mass media, and Mr. Nixon’s war policy. This has meant an increase in the skepticism and antagonism on the part of the students for the policies of their government, and an increase in student feeling that they are the one who are going to take political and social action on their own, both to protect themselves and to raise the quality of life in their society.

This phenomenon is to be found not only on the campuses but in the youth culture at large. In an interview with a New York Times reporter a few weeks ago, Arlo Guthrie was asked some questions about the attitudes of his generation. “We’re not a whole group of people involved in a plot,” said Guthrie, commenting on the diversity within the youth culture. “Some look strange. They act strange. . . Some look ferocious. Some look really gentle. They do things that seemingly are paradoxical, that make no sense at all. It’s only by making no sense that you can make some sense, by having no self-gratifying goal that you can ever really fulfill yourself. Until everyone finds that out, there are still going to be uptight, upset, popping-uppers, downers, drinking booze, smoking dope. Instant glory!”

“There’s a lot of kids hanging around with nothing to do, that are brought down, that are hungry, that ain’t got money — unless they want to go home and get it. They are not doing anything. But I think that’s great. Why should they do anything? I mean, there’s nothing for them to do except to do nothing, which is a good way to learn what you want to do — like doing nothing. You’re your own obstacle. If you can get by yourself, you can get by. A lot of kids are fed up with this and that and twelve years of education, and what are you going to do with it? If education is not worth anything, then you should buy nothing with it.”

Guthrie, who happens to be fully employed and well-to-do, can indulge himself in sentiments of this kind, although he speaks for a large number of the sons and daughters of the middle class who feel that without a goal for life which is truly one’s own there is no point in submitting to the ordinary conventions of life provided by middle-class America. Guthrie was answered in a subsequent letter to the Times from a young man who announced himself as follows: “I am an aging kid (oh God, twenty-one years old and hair receding), once dropping out of college, twice dropped out, and currently coping out, working 42 hours a week for $80 (after taxes). Though I regret the ever-increasing commercialism of Arlo Guthrie as an Establishment product to be sold to alienated kids and concerned adults, I am hopeful that Arlo himself can escape unharmed. . . We shudder in revulsion and suddenly remember the murders of the Kennedys and King, we see the blood in ‘Medium Cool’, hear the shotgun blasts in ‘Easy Rider’ and see Alice standing alone and lonely at the close of ‘Alice’s Restaurant’. So our hopes turn into despair, our faith into bitterness. Too tired for thoughts of suicide, we don’t bother any longer to say ‘Help’ or ‘Please’. We will continue to leave reality behind, to search for our own thing, for our own forest of peace, love and serenity, if only because there is nothing else left for us to do.”

This young man has gone part way in his own search for love and serenity in announcing that there is nothing else left for him to do. He speaks for one part of the youth culture which has adopted a common posture and which considers that to do anything conventional within the organized society is a sign of coping out. But the answer to him and to others like him is to remind everyone of the things that have been left undone, not through any malicious design or through a conspiracy on the part of adults, but because of a general lack of awareness of the strength and seriousness of the social disorders which plague America in the 1970’s. So much has been left undone that the necessity for swift and deep-going change has become an issue of
the utmost importance.

The answer given by black students to the things that have been left undone is to take militant action within the society and within the university to establish a new kind of education which includes the right of minorities for an admission to the advantages of higher education and to assert in a variety of ways that the university has an obligation toward black students which goes much beyond the limits of present academic programs. The black students are saying that they are going to change the society by actions on and off the campus, and that if the society does not yield to the pressures they are putting on it, then the society will suffer from violence and social disorder which will make the disorders of these past five years seem like a Sunday school picnic. The black students and their brothers and sisters outside the universities and schools mean what they say.

In a similar way, the Chicanos in the Western states are now organizing themselves for action designed to change their place in the society. They are saying that the universities belong to them just as much as they do to the white middle class, and that it is now time to develop a curriculum which makes sense to the Spanish-speaking families and to the members of their culture. American Indians on the campuses have developed a militancy of their own and they are in search of the same rights to education and to the support of their own cultural values as are the whites and the blacks.

In other words, a student movement is doing things which have been left undone. The student, as teacher of the society, has moved himself into the work of planning the university curriculum, both in the communities around the university and inside the university itself. The free university movement and the student experimental colleges are developing new talents among undergraduates and graduate students. They are also injecting new life into the curriculum and in my judgment are the major resource for educational change in the contemporary university. They are combining forces with new coalitions of faculty members and community leaders. They are organizing off-campus programs of teaching and learning for the benefit of the children and high school students. In doing so, they are developing their own style of teacher education, one which joins together experience in organization and social action with new materials in the social sciences and humanities. These are young people who are interested in working inside the system and who, like Sam Brown and the other young activists who organized the October and November Moratorium, have learned how to persuade members of the older generation to join them in their endeavors.

It is here that we who are educators can find our most willing and able allies. In their search for alternate forms of education and social action, these undergraduate and graduate students no longer make sharp distinctions between the age groups. They seek allies within the faculty, they create student-community organizations, they furnish a flow of ideas and energies which can have direct effect in the improvement of the cultural, political and social life of their country. At the University of Colorado for example, students have created a student-community college in which 600 persons, some high school students, some drop-outs, some housewives, businessmen, schoolteachers and other members of the community have come together to teach each other whatever it is they wish to know.

The student in high school and in the university is the link between society and its educational institutions. We owe the contemporary student a debt of gratitude for having brought the problems of his society so directly into the campuses, and for the new energies and ideas which he has injected into the life of the school and the university. It is time to consider the student as teacher and to reorganize the school and the college in ways that use his teaching talents to the full. This will mean radical modification in the lecturing, examining, grading and academic accrediting system, and a willingness on the part of administrators and faculty members to work with the students in partnership.

Anything which can be learned by the students themselves, through their own individual or group research, through direct experience in social action, through student-initiated courses, should be done that way, and anything which can encourage the individual initiative of students and of faculty members in inventing their own educational styles should be done immediately. At the present time very few students who have
come through the regular system of American high school education have the capacity for taking initiative of their own. Faculty members in the colleges very often cite this fact as the reason for not making the reforms in the educational system which could put more responsibility into the hands of students. But this is like accusing a patient of dying and of refusing to be healthy. He would not need medical care if he were not ill. Having created the condition of intellectual apathy in high school and college students by the system through which we put them, it is, to put it mildly, grossly unfair to continue that state of apathy by refusing to give them the responsibility in college for living their own intellectual lives.

It is in the nature of the present structure of higher education that those who work in the field of counseling and student guidance are insulated from a direct part in making educational change because so much of the educational policy is in the hands of the faculty. But at this stage in educational history new coalitions have become possible, and some of these are to be found in the student personnel system, among those educators who wish to work directly with students and with faculty colleagues on alternative forms of education, community life, residence, off-campus studies and the free university movement. Its secret lies in using the resources of students to educate themselves and in the use of the university as a liberating environment to which all the resources of the American community can be brought. If we continue to act as if the student protest movement is the result of the influence of a few hard-headed dogmatic nihilists who wish to overthrow the system, we will miss the whole point about the student movement as a strong developing force for educational changes which should have been made years and years ago.
We know we are facing important problems in current educational systems, and I think we all ought to make an effort to understand the problems of student unrest. To do so we have to allow ourselves to examine facts which may offend our own feelings and our own emotions; this is very difficult for most of us to do.

Back in the year 1960, when I first proposed to the University of California that I be allowed to take a half year off to study the student movement, I recall that the chairman of the committee asked me why I wanted to waste my time on such an unimportant subject. And looking at the evidence of that time it did seem rather peripheral in the United States. The question of the student movement had, however, long interested me. I found myself in 1960 almost the sole survivor in academic life of the student movement of

*This paper is the edited version of the talk given by Dr. Feuer. The transcription was difficult and the paper necessarily reflects this, a fact beyond the author's control.
the 30's, of that time when it was not yet fashionable to be suspended or expelled. What then was the contribution of student movements? What really did they fulfill or rectify? Karl Marx had written a great big book about class struggles, but there was nothing about the student struggles, nothing at all really in the literature about the generational struggle.

In 1960, I began on my first trip to Japan to study the student movement there; it had just succeeded in preventing President Eisenhower from visiting the country. Later as a guest of the Soviet Academy of Science, I went to Moscow to spend five months; there too I came in contact with the underground student movement. Under conditions of great hardship, students were showing tremendous courage in trying to do something in a country where no student group was allowed to use freely a mimeograph machine. Imagine a student movement without mimeograph machines! The Soviet secret police did not like foreigners to listen to the truth from student dissidents. They held me prisoner for four hours before allowing me to leave. Studying the student movement in the Soviet Union was a hazardous research venture.

On the basis of my study of the history of student movements, I made certain predictions in 1964 and 1965 which were rather denounced at that time; unfortunately my predictions have been fulfilled since then. I found that every student movement, though they were born in part of idealism and heroic motives, almost without exception became a self-destructive force in human history. This was a great shock to me, but as the evidence accumulated, it seemed to point to this conclusion.

I'd like to present some of the highlights so that we get beneath the notion that this is a brand new problem, or that it's the fault of the curriculum, or that new methods of education will solve the problem. I don't believe that for a minute, with all due respect to other presenters.

Last year Sarah Lawrence College had a sit-in. Sarah Lawrence College has had innovative leadership for years, and, under this leadership, it's been a marvel in fulfilling and achieving every reform that the so-called multiversities like the University of California have been aiming at. At Sarah Lawrence they have small classes and they know their pro-

fessors extremely well; new subjects are initiated by the students, and so on and so forth. Nevertheless they had a sit-in. I examined the literature of the Sarah Lawrence College students to find out why they had staged their sit-in. Every one of their demands were the opposite of the Berkeley demands. They said, "We are tired of these small classes; we don't like these small intimate seminars; we don't like the situation where the professor knows our family origin, our sexual habits, and starts psychoanalyzing us from the first day. We want our own free personalities. We want more impersonal lectures." This was Sarah Lawrence College. Furthermore, when I look at the record of what the student movement has come up with, in terms of educational reforms and, of new courses they have started, there is a virtual blank. Some of the old courses have been refurbished with new titles, which make them sound a little bit flashier; at Berkeley a student did get a Bachelor of Arts degree in magic.

In the last analysis, however, we have to do the job as teachers, we have discussions, we listen to students, we work with them. There are certain ultimate invariants concerning the teaching process; there must be logical thinking and hard work with facts. There's no magic role of student participation that is going to overcome the need for hard work. In the end one must show the love and joy in hard work so long as it is finally creative; the virtues of the so-called Protestant ethic are those of all civilization. The student movement, however, has begun to move toward anti-intellectualism, a kind of regression to infantilism. But leaving that aside, let's look for a moment at the historical record of the student movement.

Let's start with the beginning of the 19th century when the student movements came along, though there'd been generational movements before that. But the student movement did emerge right after 1815, right down to 1914. What was the record of the student movement? The first one was born in Prussia. The Napoleonic War had ended and the students were coming back to the university. When they went off to fight they had been promised a constitutional monarchy and they wanted to see that demand realized. The universities back in those days were not multiversities. There were about seven thou-
sand students in all Germany put together; Russia, which had the greatest student movement of all times, had about ten thousand students in the entire country at its height. Those who think that the student movement is something born of mass education and is related to this phenomena are simply fooling themselves; they don't know the record and the history of student movements. These universities were located in villages with simple ways, away from the metropolis. Yet the Prussian students were disillusioned, resentful of the existing authority.

Then a student leader appears, the first in modern history; if you read his description, it sounds just like later student leaders, Mario Savio and others, not quite Jerry Rubin, however more like Mario. The name of this student leader was Karl Follen, described as very romantic looking with his hair flowing, inspiring, young. He went around from one university to another, organizing group circles, or "burschenschaften". He gave speeches saying that the end justifies the means; anything should be done to achieve their sacred goal of a Christian republic.

The students met and in 1871 embarked to work hard for a great festival. All of Europe was amazed by this great festival, it was like Woodstock of 1870, a great spectacle of youth gathering. There were only men however, there were no co-eds at that time. They threw the books they didn't like into the fire. They made a great big fire in the dark, they swore eternal friendship, they would change the social order come-what-may, and so on.

Naturally, there's always one student who takes seriously, really seriously, what leaders say; people like Herbert Marcuse talk about blowing up the social system in a verbal way. Then comes his disciple, an Abbie Hoffman for instance, who boasts of the fact that Marcuse was his teacher at Brandeis. Still others come along who make real bombs, where the professor is only making verbal ones, with the benefit of the American Philosophical Association. In 1819 a student came along, a young fellow, Karl Sand, 19 years old. His age is important to remember, because one theory of student movements said that all derives from the fact that graduate students multiply and get their degrees at the advanced age of 35, for instance. Karl Sand came along and decided he had to assassinate somebody. Without exception, every student movement, including the American, I regret to say, has followed this pattern. They always veer finally toward the tactics of assassination and, by the way, suicide also. Karl Sand looked around; the great enemy of liberty, the Russian Czar, wasn't there but there was another reactionary, a playwright. Karl Sand went to this man's house to cut his throat and did so, though the man's little son tried to stop him. Sand was tried and convicted. The students gathered to watch his execution, then treasured the wood of his gallows. Every year they gathered together with his executioner for a kind of blood ritual.

What was the effect of student violence on the avowed ends of their group? Did they achieve a constitution? What a student movement, however, does is impose irrational means on the presumable avowed ends. They are then under tremendous emotional compulsion to choose certain types of means. They can't escape this compulsion to choose violent types of means to achieve their end; thus there ensures a self destruction for their goal and for themselves. Hardenberg, the great liberal of Prussia at that time, when he heard of the assassination, said, "Now our hopes for a constitution are over." The great student movement of Germany, as well as liberalism generally, was suppressed.

Thus we get the age of Metternich, lasting from 1819 to 1848, when universities were put under surveillance and censorship; the historians tell us this was largely provoked as a reaction to the tactic of the student movement. Karl Follen got out of Germany, came to the United States, and in the course of time, became the first professor of German literature at Harvard University, and married a Cabot; his neighbors later were to wonder: "Was this the man who had led the German student movement into assassination"? It was.

Now let's jump a bit to another student movement, in the year 1914 in a village of Bosnia. Bosnia was under the rule of Austria-Hungary. It had some home rule; they wanted, however, to be independent, to join the Serbians. The young students felt angry with the older generation. They said the older generation was just a bunch of liberals who ought to be more violent in their tactics; then
they'd really get independence quickly. The students became extremely active; soon they adopted the method of assassination. Pamphlets circulated among them were concerned with the cult of assassination. All of this, by the way, is very real; Jerry Rubin has been talking for some time about the great contribution that assassinations have made to the American history. This is something which attracts the leading activists of the student movement. Naturally, young students read this material.

One of them, again 19 years old, Gavrilo Princip, disliked his father very much; we knew a great deal about him because while he was held prisoner, a psychiatrist used to visit him everyday; the psychiatrist's recorded notes are the first psychiatric testimony we have on a student activist. His dreams and fantasies were filled with imagery of prejudice against his father and of compassion for his mother. With two other students, one of them recently expelled, Gavrilo undertook direct action. The Archduke Franz Ferdinand happened to be visiting that vicinity; they decided he would be their target. They chose a place, Sarajevo, for the assassination of the Archduke. This was one assassination among a whole series that Bosnian students had actually carried out and wasn't an isolated incident at all.

Europe, of course, had been in an unstable situation; I'm not saying that the assassination was the cause of the World War; there were nationalistic and imperialistic rivalries among the nations. Nonetheless, there had been a tremendous hope in Europe through 1914, the age of Bernard Shaw and H.G. Wells; if nationality were maintained, people might look forward to an era of progress; the Socialists and the Social Democratic Party was rising in power in France and Germany. In the midst of all this came the irrationality of the students. Gavrilo, of course, remained holier than thou, self-righteous about his motives, his high purpose to achieve the independence of his native land. He refused to consider, however, what was involved in his actions or what his real underlying motives were, and why he had chosen to assassinate a man. A student activist started Europe veering to its catastrophe in 1914 and it hasn't recovered since.

The most heroic student movement in the world was the Russian student movement. They had more student martyrs and more student idealists than any other country. And the role of their assassins is a famous one. Karakazov trying to murder the Czar, then Zhelyabov killing him in 1881; Alexander Ulyanov, Lenin's brother, trying to assassinate the Czar with student friends in 1887, and so on. Kalinov, Karpovich and Sazonov all murdered different Ministers, Ministers of the Interior and Education. The students everywhere had pictures of the assassins in their rooms. The assassins came from very fine families generally. Sophia Perovskaya, for instance, had a father who was a Governor General of Moscow. The father treated the mother brutally, the daughter hated the father, and refused to see him ever.

Out of all of this, the ordeal of the youth, came the momentous assassination in the year 1881 of Czar Alexander II. It was a very strange day, the day of that assassination. That very morning the Czar had signed a decree for the convening of an assembly of notables. He said, "I know this means now that Russia will get a constitution." Then as he drove toward the Cathedral, there waiting for him was the student group, who called themselves the Disorganization Committee; they were literally for disorganization, disintegration. They dynamited him and killed him. Kropolkin, the great anarchist, wrote an article about this whole thing, and said, "Never was Russia so close to a constitution as it was on that day in 1881 when the Czar was assassinated." Instead reaction, repression, and so-called polarization were provoked.

Universities in 1905 became the center of organized revolutions; the student movements flourished but created the atmosphere of pro-violence, and of contempt for liberalism and democracy which paved the way for Bolshevism. The young Stalin joined the student movement claiming he did so because academic freedom was being interfered with. But when Stalin got power, after liquidating all the other factions, there was a complete end of academic freedom, literally, in the Soviet Union. None of the liberties that the students presumably sought for and committed crimes for, longed for, were achieved. They now have a situation where there is no academic freedom in the Soviet Union, where
student groups cannot organize, and men like Sinyavsky and Daniel who oppose the dictatorial policies of the Soviet Union, poets, writers, critics, are sent to Siberia to so-called labor camps. This was the final outcome; this was the outcome of the way the student intellectuals chose, the method of assassinations and violence, terminating in self-destructive events.

These are some of the facts about some of the foreign student movements; others are even more horrible to speak of. The origins of the student movements always had an extremely idealistic component with thoughts of overcoming alienation, the favorite word of the student movement today. In Germany, of course, they went over, nonetheless, lock, stock and barrel, to Adolf Hitler and chased out liberal professors and writers, like Herbert Marcuse. Some of them came to the United States to repeat the same mistake; others perished in Germany.

So let's turn to the United States. Americans had been blessed, on the whole, with not having had a student movement. One of the strange things of American history is there has been virtually no student abolitionist movement. It is often said that when society is in great poverty or changing rapidly, this causes the younger generation to become restless. Yet while our society was in the process of a great social change, during the period leading up to the Civil War, the colleges were virtually devoid of any kind of student abolitionist agitation.

On the whole, there was something like a generational equilibrium in the United States. If you were discontented with your country and your family or if you did not like your university, you would go to another college or you went West or to the big city or some such place. But there was, on the whole, a generational equilibrium. There were uprisings in some colleges, but they did not become ideological movements. The period of generational rebellion has not congealed as an ideological movement unless the older generation suddenly finds itself in a de-authoritized kind of situation, the sort of thing that exists in Japan. The older generation in Japan has been blamed for having led the nation into a losing war. Thus we find the generational animosity congealed into a spirit of ideological rebellion. This did not take place in the United States.

Before the American Revolution there was a big riot at Harvard College, over the bad food and conditions of the college, led by David Dunbar, the great grandfather of Thoreau, under the slogan, "Behold, the water stinketh." This does not make an ideological movement. Although almost a whole Harvard class was later expelled, the students were not taking part in an ideological episode. There were more troubles in American colleges in the 1880's and 1890's than there are now, in proportion to the number of students involved; every college virtually, along the East Coast, had a great deal of trouble; they would force the president to resign, in favor of someone in support of the movement, but you find this did not make an ideological pattern.

The leader, for instance, of the Amherst movement, Harlan Stone, who later became Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was a very strong student. At home he was brought up as a strict Calvinist; his Calvinist father used to whip him, and although Stone said he didn't resent this, I'm sure he did at the time. He went to Massachusetts Agricultural College and he was rebellious against compulsory chapel; there was a physical altercation in which young Stone, fighting physically with the college chaplain, threw him down the stairs. Thereupon he was expelled from the Massachusetts Agricultural College, got into at Amherst with some difficulty, and continued to make life difficult for the president of Amherst. During the time that he was at Amherst, he also was the Chairman of the local Republican Committee, the student committee, in the town there; with fellow-students such as Calvin Coolidge, he led a crusade on behalf of the Republican candidate.

These were not ideological movements. The students involved all looked forward to their careers in the system; the system, on the whole, was doing well and the older generation didn't need to be ashamed of anything.

Then we come down to the Thirties. In the Thirties we had a little bit of a student movement, but it didn't amount to much in America. There was a will toward social reconstruction but, by and large, it had negative and self-destructive consequences.
The student movement is somehow always fighting a generational battle trying to choose means which will humiliate elders in some way, and, at the same time, work toward avowed goals. In those days they said, “The older generation had supported the imperialist war of 1917; the young would never make that mistake again.” With great indignation, they said that the older people had failed in their liberalism. In those days students charged the older generation with having “sold out” (the favorite metaphor in those days was “selling out,” now it’s “copping out.”) You get the sense of time staying the same behind this. The characters are almost the same, the words are a little bit different, but each one thinks it is brand new. It isn’t so.

And of course, across the ocean there was Adolf Hitler. He was very outspoken about what he was going to do. He had written a whole book that anybody could read, outlining his domino theory. It was all set forth. But the students said, “No, we will never fight in another war,” and in my old Alma Mater, I regret to say, one day in 1936, the students decreed a strike. In the City College of New York, which was then 90% Jewish, several thousand Jewish students rose, raised their right hand and took the so-called Oxford Oath, that they were never going to fight for the United States, their own government, in any war abroad.

Winston Churchill said that all of this played right into the hands of Adolf Hitler. Hitler said, “Look, liberal democracy is degenerate, weak, declining, and on the way out; the system doesn’t work; even their young people refuse to fight for them.” And there you had the spectacle of the Jewish students confronting the greatest menace of anti-semitism in history by repeating the oath of generational rebellion that they would never go to fight. Of course, they did go to fight when the time came; they fought very well. But that was the student movement and its particular contribution to the world history at the time. The regrettable fact is that then it was a contribution which was negative and self-destructive. I mention the word “self-destructive” because a large component of the student activist involves this type of self-destructive feeling. The Russian student assassins that we were talking about, for instance, often tried to commit suicide; they were death-seekers. They would write letters to their friends saying, “The most beautiful moments in our lives will be the moment when we are standing with the noose around our neck.” This is the highest achievement for some — the curious worship of death imagery.

The Japanese student movement was at its height in 1960. It was rather curious that the suicide rate among youth groups, among students, was then the highest it ever was in history. In a normal country, as you know, the suicide rate becomes higher in the older age group who have presumably less to make life worth living. But in Russia, around the year 1905, the suicide rate was highest among the younger age groups; very definite components of self-destruction were here involved. The London School of Economics had a tremendous stoppage two years ago and its leader was an American student who had gone to Amherst. He led the London School of Economics uprising that closed the institution down and later headed the Liberation News Service in New York; then he committed suicide just a couple of months ago. There have been others like this as well. Why this is so, again is a psychological problem. We have the ingredients of an abnormal psychological pattern in every student movement. I think that rather than get involved in what Henry Murray at Harvard calls juvenolatry, worshiping the young, as serious teachers, and as people who have dedicated our lives to working with students, we should realize that we wouldn’t be helping anybody unless we actually make an effort to get at the deepest force of motivation of the activist students and deal with them in a fully honest way. We’ve had enough of juvenolatry, and no one’s been helped much, least of all, the students. What we’re dealing with here is the tremendous energies of generation rebellion, which is simply universal. The question is whether these energies shall be channelized in a constructive way? Are we to stand by and give approval to any manifestation despite its destructive means, so long as it professes to some program of social reform?

The story of Albert Einstein, by the way, is an example of what can be achieved in the way of constructive channelization of energies of rebellion. Einstein was a student who found himself expelled from a Munich high
school; he was regarded as a bad influence on his fellow students. Later he went back to school in Switzerland and managed to enter the great Federal Polytechnic Institute in Zurich. A lot of foreigners were in Switzerland at this time. Einstein got involved with a little student group, which was affected with revolutionary philosophy. His best friend in those days was a young militant socialist who was also trying to prove himself. His name was Fredrick Adler and they were inseparable — a few years later, Adler, whose father was a famous Socialist, helped Einstein to get his first academic job. Einstein was denied a job in college on the grounds that he was disrespectful and troublesome and he was actually excluded from the university library because he was presumably a recalcitrant influence. But his energies of generational rebellion expressed themselves within the realm of physical science; he looked for new ways of thinking, new scientific insights, new laws, against the traditional physical theories. Under conditions of great privation, unemployed for a couple of years, without the benefit of academia, he managed to make such great contributions as the theory of relativity. His energies could be directed into constructive channels but his friend Fredrick Adler remained a student activist. Naturally, being a real student activist, Adler decided he had to assassinate somebody. When the World War broke out, he decided to assassinate the Austrian Prime Minister. The Prime Minister was having his dinner one day when Fredrick Adler shot him dead. Despite this shocking episode, which didn’t help anybody in terms of the world’s history, Einstein remained extremely loyal to his old friend. He wrote to Adler in prison that he was ready to be a character witness for him at the trial and testify on his behalf. Adler indeed had holy motives and righteous motives, but in terms of contribution to the actual betterment of mankind, what he did was extremely irrational. The contrast you see in the two different ways of generational rebellion, those of Einstein and of his close friend Adler, is almost melodramatic.

When we come down a little bit more closely to our present period, we find a certain acknowledgment of underlying motives on the part of our student leaders. Jerry Rubin writes quite openly that this is a generational battle. He says the old are trying to commit genocide against the young; of course, he speaks of “generational conflict.” However, he says, that this conflict is the progressive force of history, that we would not get changes and renovations unless the world was replenishing the energies. To this we reply that when you have a weapon which casts itself specifically in terms of student ideology, with a student’s secession from society, inevitably you have a self-destructive confrontation.

The Weathermen, in recent years, have been the chief example of this ideology. They arose directly out of SDS and Mark Rudd was their chief leader. With the Weathermen, you have again a typical totalitarian movement ethic that the end justifies the means and this always leads to the corruption of student idealism. I recall a very wonderful day in Berkeley in 1964, the sun was shining as it can only shine there, and on the platform in front of the Administration Building was Joan Baez with her hair dangling in the sunshine, strumming away on her guitar, singing songs of love; there was the student, Mario Savio with all his eloquence saying that he was being framed by the campus police. The ordinary truth was that the preceeding week Mario Savio had been asked to appear before some sort of faculty advisory committee with a psychiatrist as a member to discuss a charge which had been made. The charge made by a campus policeman was that Mario Savio had bitten him in the left thigh and that he had to have fourteen stitches as a result. Mario said, “It wasn’t really true; it was a frameup;” and then Joan Baez sang more songs. Mario spoke again of bringing the system to a grinding halt, a phrase that was used all the time, and many students marched on to the undefended Administration Building. Nobody was there; not even the administrators tried to stop them and it was a completely successful occupation. I was puzzled by Mario’s counter-charge. Had it been a frameup? What was the truth of this? Then two months later I found myself debating Mario in the Berkeley High School; he finally made his great confession which was printed in the San Francisco newspapers. As a matter of fact, he had bitten the policeman in the left side, but he said there were extenuating circumstances. The question, however, arose: Why had he misled the
students, on the great sunny day, into believing that the charges were all a frameup, that he was really an advocate of peacefulness and of Joan Baez's singing? Why hadn't he taken a little bit more responsibility for his act of violence?

This is the pattern of distorted dishonesty, justified by purity of motive. The militant feels so pure that any kind of dishonesty is allowed; this characterizes the leading student activists. Mark Rudd gave a speech at Harvard last year which was written up in the New York Sunday Times in which he said, "The issues on which we closed down Columbia University were completely fictitious." As he told the audience about this, he was rather proud of it. He said, "I didn't even know where the gymnasium site was, I had to go find out where it was, when we started all the trouble." He said the few issues were really meaningless but they were a way to get things moving; the police came and everybody got excited; there was fighting between both sides and all sorts of epithets; nobody knew what the real issues were.

Mark Rudd's movement has since moved over to the Weathermen faction, following the classical pattern of the psychological development of the confirmed activist. In this last convention Miss Dohon made her famous speech, often quoted, in which she said what a wonderful man Charles Manson was, out on the West Coast, the alleged slayer of actress Sharon Tate and her friends. She said, "Dig it, dig it, think of it, he actually drove the dagger into them and then into the actress's stomach, isn't this wonderful?" And then there's Paul Goodman, with his books, writing too with a sick adulation of violence.

If we take this proclivity of whole sections of student activists, their attraction to obscenities, we get the definite impression we are dealing with various irrational, psychological mechanisms, which have to be brought into view. And they will not be brought into view by just talking about student idealism. Idealistic and aggressive motives exist side by side. You have a motive of affection, love, and the reluctance to see one's world come to an end; you'd like to see a world in which friendship goes on continually. And there's also the element of destruction. Thus arises the terrible drama of the uprising of the younger generation against the older genera-

tion, in which these two factors intercept and interact in various ways. In the course of a student movement, the second factor comes into dominance for various reasons and it imposes its psychological self-destructive patterns on student movements. As I say, people like Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman are now quite honest about this. Jerry Rubin says that the kids must rise up and kill their parents. Abbie Hoffman, in his latest book, Woodstock, says exactly the same sort of thing.

There is a further factor in modern times. This is the first time that generational conflict has threatened in a situation where there is great affluence in society and where there are less material challenges to the young. We have had great victories in the last couple of years in the sciences. We put a man on the moon but there are very few men that can go to the moon, so it's not the same as the American frontier in terms of offering an outlet for youthful restless energy. When you don't have enough places for outward release of energy they turn inward on themselves; then they turn on against the system. In our time during the thirties, we were against the system because it wasn't working; there were so many of us out hunting for a job and we wanted a job. Now people are against the system because it is working. Paul Goodman doesn't like the system because it's eliminating the unskilled labor. H. Marcuse says there are so many administrative comforts that it corrupts everybody. As long as the system is stable and well-organized, they have a grievance against the stable and well-organized system; people who have restless energy become aggressive against the well-functioning system. Student leaders therefore attack the Protestant ethic, saying, "Let's not work anymore;" they rebel against the "performance principle," as Marcuse calls it; the interest in "communes" arises.

Yet these are very hypocritical alternatives for these Communists are not the kind of monkish Communists that you had in the Middle Ages. These Middle Ages monks supported themselves by their own work; they were agriculturists. The new monks, the new Communists, are in an ambiguous situation by virtue of the fact that they exist because society is so profitable that it can afford enclaves of people who secede from it and live
on the fat of the land. This, in turn, leads the student to become a "non-student," that is a student who doesn't want to give up his student status, so he remains a non-student all his life. The non-students feel all the more bitter against this ambiguous, parasitic situation. They have no program for social reconstruction; all they say is, "Let's first make a revolution, then you will see." If you analyze what does happen after a revolution, there is one sociological law which is confirmed, that when a revolution is made by an intellectual elite composed of a given number (N) of factions, then the equilibrium of the new social system requires the complete liquidation of N minus one factions. In other words, all factions except one will be physically destroyed. We can make the prediction that if the New Left of the student movement took power in the United States, within a couple of years, the Maoist, the Stalinists, the S.D.S. factions would execute Abbie Hoffmann, Jerry Rubin and others who get in their way, then the Maoist and the Stalinists concerned would execute the S.D.S.ers, and then there would be a final fight between these factions. We do know that when you get a conflict of this sort you find you end up with a totalitarian rule; this we can predict.

Meanwhile the student activist is in a position where he cannot quite come up with specific proposals, and this creates a great problem. What can we as educators, teachers, do about this problem of restless energy which can't find an outlet? Shall we begin to revise our system more drastically than has been proposed? Plenty of students that we know, like the Engineering students, do not have this kind of problem as compared to the tensions which are incurred by the humanities students, or the so-called social scientists. We've been acculturated to the traditional humanities of social science courses, but perhaps we should begin to think in terms of every student being able to do something in the way of making his living by the time he gets out of college. Nowadays, at the end of his four years, he says, "There is nothing I can do." Shouldn't he be at least committed by this time to teaching, law, medicine, or one of the other professions? He has had no pre-professional experience in the way of teaching the people who need teaching, or helping with medical care; the way our college programs are now set up, they leave the students hanging in the end, not knowing what to do.

The answer to that is not to run away, not to give credits to students for participating in demonstrations. There are cases today where academic credit is given for observation of demonstrations, the student never reads anything, he never studies; he simply goes and demonstrates, and then he gets a degree for this. In the end, he feels even more disoriented and disaffected than ever. What's he going to do, make a life's career out of making revolutions? I think we should start thinking in terms of a curriculum with a modernized concept of a life vocation rather than the hodge-podge general arts program. In the past you knew you were going to be a lawyer, or teacher or doctor; you could spend a few years getting a little culture, to learn to run the show when you finished. This has perhaps proved to be outmoded today.

Perhaps too we should break away from the notion that we simply have to train our students for the accredited universities. Suppose we allowed every high school student who wished it a grant of money equal to the cost of sending an individual to a state university, then let him go and organize whatever college he wants. There are not enough new kinds of colleges coming into existence in America, as there used to be. There ought to be Leon Trotsky colleges, Karl Marx colleges, and so on. There people like Marcuse, Paul Goodman could go, spend all their time, agitating and advocating their doctrines. You would find the students would stay a year or so at these places, work it out of their psyches, find it's a lot of nonsense, and then undertake to do real work. The birth of colleges of this sort would be a very good educational experience.

We did something like this in Toronto. A year and a half ago, a big building, eighteen stories high, was built and was dedicated as Rochdale College. The university had absolutely nothing to say about it. It was run completely by students and non-students. They ran it according to their own rules, or lack of rules; no one attends formal classes; a few students run seminars. It began a year and a half ago with a great deal of publicity; the Province provided the money and the rate of interest was low; people predicted great things for Rochdale college. But then the problems
began. All sorts of hippies and vagrants invaded the kitchen and took away the food from the residents; then other types of people got into the elevators and ran them up and down all day, making it very hard for residents to get to their rooms to work and study. Then all of the drug sellers of Toronto invaded this building; it decayed and was covered with dirt. All hygienic rules at Rochdale College broke down; there was real stink and utter filth. Finally the residents of Rochdale College got together; they tried to call a meeting, a democratic one to see what to do about it. They tried to do something about it but the outvoted minority shouted that this was tyranny, this wasn't real democracy, "bourgeois democracy," and so on; the meeting collapsed. Nobody could do anything about anything at Rochdale College. Finally, in desperation, at one of the meetings, they said they would give all the power to the night watchman; he would have the right to evict anybody whom he wished. This was the final outcome of a practical, active experiment, subsidized by the Government; the final upshot was the dictatorship of the night watchman — it was a very constructive experience.

This year they couldn't get enough people to go to Rochdale College; people had stopped paying their rent by this time. They demanded that the Government take them over, buy it back and give the non-students the profits to start another program. Rochdale’s most recent device last week was to announce that they would sell a certificate, either a Ph.D. or non-Ph.D., for $25.00. For twenty-five dollars, at Rochdale College, you can buy a degree. As I said, this sort of thing should be encouraged. This is the price we have to pay, and I think it's a small price. People should be able to go through this experience of anarchy, the kind of thing that Goodman and Marcuse advocate, ways like this, and learn the very elementary ways of organized society.

Still another proposal I'd like to make is as follows: In the old days, people used to go on a grand tour of Europe after their graduation. I think we should start something like this again. Any student, or non-student, who wishes to spend one year in any Communist country or any other Left Wing country, whether it be the Soviet Union, Communist China, or Cuba, should be subsidized by our Government, with all of his expenses paid for one year; he would live there not just for a few weeks but for one whole year to really experience what it is to live in a country which presumably has realized some of his avowed goals. I think it would be a healthy experience for him to live in a system where repression is really repression, where you cannot make your voice felt in any way whatsoever.

This would be very useful as a teaching experience to bring a sense of reality to our students. We could send fifty thousand people a year to other countries, but I think it would be a fine thing for us to know the Communist countries better. Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman could walk Red Square and have their encounters with the Soviet militia. If I might be allowed a little vanity — Fulbright had fellowships named after him — I would call these the Feuer Confrontation of Systems Fellowships. I think this would be very useful for educational studies. Along lines of this sort we can inculcate once more a sense about the reality of our society.
the university's response to society

Carole Remick
Washington University

As I prepared this paper, I had a few questions that I would like to pose, questions that had been bothering me since I was first asked to discuss this subject, questions I have not yet successfully resolved. The major question in my mind was: WHY? Why was I asked to speak? Why me, a student? Just whom do I represent to you to whom I now address myself? I get the feeling that I represent a certain segment of the population; I suppose that I represent the "student," and I put the word "student" in quotation marks for a very important reason. If this is the reason, this leaves me very uneasy and most uncomfortable — uneasy because I do not feel that I am a valid representative of "students," and uncomfortable because I feel that this is part of the problem of "Students in Society," that they are not individuals, not real people, but a class, a category, and a stereotype. As I view the situation, students are in society, are an integral part of it, and each student in his own individual way can influence his surroundings and does. The most complacent person yields as much influence as the acti-
vist; one takes a stand simply in remaining silent!

So my greatest fear is that my words may be taken to be representative of a larger group of people, of students. I speak only for myself (although I hope that there are others who share my feelings), and only from my own experiences within the university and within society. I can tell you what I have seen and know of my fellow students, but I cannot say that they would necessarily agree with me.

I know from experience that I am in a minority as far as my feelings about the university’s role in society, but I feel that this is because the vast majority of students, and most other people for that matter, have not really given much thought to this question. I am not a complacent person and I cannot cope with a system that I feel is desperately in need of change; I also may be in the minority in this area. So I ask that you consider what I have to say, not as being a representative point of view, but as the view of someone who has been involved, who has been frustrated by the university, the people within it, my fellow students, and yet someone who cares . . .

The University is failing. It is failing on many levels, and for many people. There is a feeling of restlessness and dissatisfaction that pervades the air around the universities. Like other forms of pollution, this feeling among members of the university community, among students, faculty, and administrators, is largely ignored. Perhaps it will just go away? I think not. I feel that it will take a real explosion among those who feel this discontent most strongly, in order for this feeling to actually surface and be dealt with. People on all levels of society are not being satisfied with what they are receiving from “societal institutions” (including the institutions of higher education), and yet we have been taught to cope, and we do. We have to “fit in” in order to exist today. Supposedly, once one has an “education,” then and only then can one start to change things. So we put up with a system that we may not believe in so that we will be able to do something to change it! But once we reach the point of moving outside of that system, we find that we have not been prepared to do much more than fit in; this, for me, is one of the greatest failures of our educational systems. Education is not helping people to meet the needs of society today but is basically teaching them to cope, to maintain the status quo, so to speak. It is on this level that the universities and institutions of higher education are failing.

There is a tremendous gap between the focus of higher education and what is happening in the world today. Some rather worn-out and tired concepts come to mind when I say this — the university as an “ivory tower” and the question of “relevance” of what is learned. We live in a chaotic society which, quite often, gets so involved and complex that no one, no matter how expert, could deal with it. And yet it is those of us who are privileged enough to afford the costs, in both time and money, of a university education, who are supposed to help straighten out this messed-up world . . . This is a very frightening situation for me because I cannot draw much of a connection between what is happening outside of my university and what I am dealing with, within it. This not only leaves me uneasy and dissatisfied, but angry as well!

The university, which for the sake of definition I will use to refer to institutions of higher learning, has a definite responsibility to the society in which it exists. Society refers not only to the community in which a given institution is situated, but also to the thousands of people who will be touched in some way by the people who come through that institution. This means that the universities cannot continue to turn out people who are not prepared to face life outside of the confines of its bounds. It also means that the university can no longer remain aloof from the problems that rack and wreck society. It must recognize that these things surround it and fester within it and therefore, the university must respond directly to them, not deal with them only on a theoretical, analytical level. This then means that the university must take stands on issues.

By remaining silent, we do indeed assume a position; the idea of the silent majority is a very real thing and can be extended to the university. By not committing itself on such issues as the presence of ROTC on campus (while ROTC classes continue), by not saying that students should or should not be members of the Board of Trustees (while the Boards continue to perpetuate themselves),
by talking about open admissions (while universities remain a racist and elitist institution), by not divesting itself of investments in slum properties and war industries, and the list could go on, the university sets itself up as the proponent of all of these things, in much the same way that Nixon is supported by all people who do not protest, do not vote, and do not take stands. By committing itself to a definite stand on issues such as these, the university could move closer to the “outside” or “real” world. But this is only a beginning and the responsibility of the university to the society extends much further.

If the universities are to meet the needs of all of those who are influenced by them, then a “university education” and degree (with all of the implications therein) should enable a person to assume a role in society. What has happened, however, is that students leave the university, having existed there for four years, with little more than a body of knowledge that they may or may not have gotten from their education (depending on the student). The answer to the question of “What will you do after you graduate?” almost has to be “Go to school,” because four years of higher education is not preparing students to face the world outside of the classroom.

It seems as though undergraduate school is a beginning toward some sort of professional training which can only be attained after a B.A. or B.S. The kind of experience that many of us get as undergraduates only serves to frustrate us further and drive us further from pursuing education beyond undergraduate school. Why? Because so much of the material and matter that is covered in undergraduate school is meaningless to the kinds of problems that scar society (the draft, the war, poverty, racism, overpopulation, pollution, the cities) and the kinds of lives that many of us hope to lead. One can only talk about these things for so long before one feels the necessity to really attempt to deal with them. In this area the university is a very unreal experience. Each university or institution is an integral part of a larger community, and yet, sadly, in most cases the school is isolated from it.

Once more, the university is not flexible enough to allow for those students who seek the broader type of educational experience, such as a program that would allow a student to involve himself in a community experience, which would move him off the campus and out of isolation and into a real experience and give him the opportunity to see and feel those things and issues that concern him so deeply. I include in this everything from community development projects to a 9-to-5 job in a lab or factory. . . . These sorts of things are incompatible with what has been and continues to be the view of higher education. It does not seem to be the university’s responsibility to deal with such things and to suggest that it do so is to tread on sacred ground.

The essence of what I am saying is that the university must be flexible enough to respond to the needs of society, a society populated by students and by academicians, but also populated by people who are not a part of the college environment and yet seek something from that institution. There can be no set program for learning on any level and to specify what is necessary at the supposedly highest levels of education is ridiculous and ludicrous. This varies with each person, and we do a disservice to the individuality that we are supposed to value so highly when we over-specify and refuse to bend to the feelings and frustrations that are being verbalized and demonstrated by students all over this country and all over the world.

But I must pause here for a moment; there is more to this situation than I have considered thus far. What I am calling for is a rather drastic revision of the entire nature and scope of higher education in order to meet and deal with the problems of living in this world today. These kinds of changes call for a great deal of responsibility on the part of everyone who is involved in them, and I realize that not everyone, particularly students, seek that responsibility and are willing to assume it. I am saying that each person must be willing to take on the responsibility to aid in making higher education respond to the needs of society and the problems that we must face in order to survive today.

Unfortunately, the outlook for this is rather dismal to my mind, and this leaves me sad and frustrated. Most students have been so indoctrinated by the patterns of education, taking what is given to them and fitting into their own little niche, that they not only are unwilling to assume a greater responsibility for their education by trying to push for a
more responsive educational system, but they probably would not assume that responsibility if it was handed to them. We are consistently socialized toward maintaining the status quo.

It will take a push from both ends, both from the students and other members of the academic community, and from the universities themselves to achieve a responsive situation to the societal needs of today, but this will not be an easy achievement. It has been my experience that while most students are discontent in many ways with their education, they will do little, if anything, to change it. Institutions are so overly protective of their standards and reputations, that to crack through this is a near impossibility. The picture as I see it is a dim one indeed, and it leaves me frustrated and unhappy; I can see how this kind of feeling might and has led to protest and demonstration. As I see the situation, society is in a state of crisis and the institutions of higher education are doing little to help to solve that crisis and much to perpetuate it. The situation is explosive on all levels; the vocal kinds of discontent and dissent that has predominated on the campuses all over the world is seeping down into the high schools and even into the elementary schools. I view this as a good thing for it will be these students who will help to move the educational institutions on all levels, if they can stand to remain within them long enough.

Personally, I am tired of working for changes that most students seek but are not willing to assume responsibility for. I am tired of dealing with a university with an archaic outlook as far as education is concerned. I am tired of talk and no action. I am frustrated as well. I am frustrated by four years of university which seem to have little meaning or connection to what I see happening in the world today. I am frustrated by people who have been so indoctrinated that they can complain and then be content with that. I am frustrated with the irrelevance and hypocrisy of the institutions of “higher education” in this country. I am tired and frustrated, and yet I must continue to work for those values and that responsiveness that I feel will move the universities and students toward a closer relationship with the “real world.” At this point, for me, it all comes down to a matter
the student as a revolutionary: why student power is not a viable issue

dennis winkler
washington university

We students present America with a most difficult problem. For America to burn innocent countries abroad is no problem. For America to commit genocide with blacks within itself is no problem. For America to kill her children, that is the problem. White middle class youth with their life style, drugs and politics are fast becoming the new “niggers” of America. America is bankrupt. There is no need to polemicize about imperialism, materialism, and racism. We know that a country with only 6% of the world’s population controls about 55% of the world's natural resources; we know about imperialism. We also know about racism. All black people in prison are political prisoners.

More kids every year are finding out that there is no place for them in American society. They are refusing corporate jobs because they see the corporation enslave all their workers and the people of the world. They are refusing jobs as petty bureaucrats in a social system which can be likened to a burnt-out computer.

This, in part, is what the revolution is all
about. It is not a revolution of guns and armies. It may never need to be. America may smother in her own decadence, and we will help smother her. As Babylon and Rome fell, so will America, not from an outside invader, but a slow, decaying death, and the children of the world will dance on her grave. Bob Dylan put it this way when talking about growing up as a white youth in America:

"Get born, keep on, short of pants, romance, learn to dance, get dressed, get blessed, try to be a success. Please her, please him, goodbye, have kids, don't steal, don't live, twenty years of schooling, and they put you on the day shift."

Twenty years of schooling and they put you on the day shift. Right on! Just what does the future hold for the average college graduate? Graduate school, and eventually a position in the academic pinball machine, doctor, lawyer, businessman, with all the crap that goes with these positions: a home in the suburbs, two cars, 2.4 children; at age thirty-five you have ulcers, a $30,000 income, $30,000 dollars worth of debt. Many kids are now objecting to this prospect for their future. They are becoming self-appointed niggers, outlaws in the eyes of America. All generations have rebelled against their parents; however, we are the first generation to grow up nursed on T.V. sets, jet planes, computers, space travel. We are the product of the American dream, or is it a nightmare?

At some point, the argument may arise that the problem (what problem?) is a matter of communication. Children don't communicate with parents; students don't communicate with administrators; blacks don't communicate with whites, etc., etc. We can touch each other and talk about it and resolve everything! I think we understand each other pretty clearly. The dilemma is a state of mind. The value orientation which I oppose is the one which in a discussion many adults would either defend or at least put up with.

Our parents were children of the Depression, possessing little and aspiring to possess a great deal. We grew up in affluence and rejected it as exploitative and degrading. We can communicate about these value references for years, and never reach a viable agreement. It should also be mentioned that although I emphasize the difference between youth and adults, the struggle does not have to be intergenerational war. The chronological age has little to do with identifying what people have feelings of oppression, or of contempt for the oppressor. Dave Dellinger and Bill Kunstler are more attuned to what's going on today than many twenty year olds I know, and they are but a couple of examples.

After this short scenario on youth, I would like to briefly focus on the university.

Starting in the early 1960's the cry arose for more student power. In the space of a few short years, that cry was echoed from campus to campus across the nation. Students had developed a real penchant for assuming roles of responsibility in the university community. Students wiggled themselves onto a thousand paper-shuffling committees, that rarely accomplished anything, yet still the shout rang out for more student power. We were like black capitalists; we wanted a bigger piece of the pie. But what were we really doing? Were we being productive? No. Were we making the world a better place to live in? No. Were we affecting anyone except ourselves? No. We were really demanding our middle class rights, to be more comfortable in our surroundings. We got liberalized dormitory policies, so we could fuck and smoke dope in our rooms. We got educational reforms which made our existence more palatable; namely, fewer classes to attend, less idiotic tests, and more time to "do our own thing." However, the point in fact is that we were making ourselves more isolated and more deeply entwined in the ivory cocoon.

At the same time we were isolating ourselves in the university, we became politicized. We protested the war, racism, poverty, and pollution, but always within the confines of the university. There is nothing wrong with waging political battles within the university, as long as you treat the university as a political entity.

To spout off about student power in one breath and imperialism in the next is only self delusion. The university is not a neutral institution. It does not have to voice political positions to be a political force. Defense research is done on campuses across the
nation. For example, the University of Illinois is housing a twenty million dollar defense computer. Universities invest in corporations that do defense contracting, or have foreign branches which exploit underdeveloped nations. Some of the largest defense contractors in the nation have representatives sitting on university Boards of Trustees. The universities provide facilities for ROTC and have a direct influence on community politics. The most publicized case of this is Columbia University’s involvement in Harlem.

Perhaps I can best outline the debate between student power and revolutionary politics by examining a specific case, that of ROTC. As an academic or student power issue, the argument goes either: (1) ROTC should be allowed on campus because of academic freedom; or (2) ROTC should not be allowed because it does not maintain an academic standard for people who serve the rest of the departments of the university. As a political issue, however, the matter comes down to the fact that ROTC produces 85% of the Army’s junior grade officers and the U.S. army is the enemy of the Vietnamese people, therefore, ROTC should go.

I think that basically covers my argument with student power, and I should like to now move on to the students, and more appropriately, youth and the revolutionary force.

As I have said before, my generation grew up in the wake of a technological and media explosion. Because of this, we identify quite easily with people around the world. French and Japanese students, the Cubans and the Vietnamese are all readily identified as comrades. The battles waged in this country are done not only to free America from oppression and decadence, but also in the name of the oppressed peoples around the world. We are striking a blow of love at the heart of the monster. White radicals identify with black freedom fighters, not simply as allies in the black man’s fight against racism, but also as comrades in arms, fighting the same enemy. More and more black radicals are now accepting white youth as comrades, especially in the Black Panthers. At this point I should like to clarify that I view the struggle in America not as a race struggle, but as a class conflict where class is a state of mind. The blacks, working class, and middle class white youth are all fighting a common enemy. Although, it may be nearly impossible to organize the established working class along Marxist lines, it may not be a revolutionary necessity to do so because the children of the working class are organizing themselves. They are the future revolutionaries. The corporate elite must take notice and watch in fear as black, Puerto Ricans, and white ghetto gangs call a halt to war among themselves, and get organized to wage war against their common enemy, the state.

People in the business community, especially large corporations, would be the first to admit that they view youth as a class, thereby making it fair game for economic exploitation. Practically every major business magazine, in the last year, has run an article on capturing the youth market; examples are shown in what you see and hear: the hip cliches, the psychedelic art, long-hairs doing pimple commercials, and gold-plated peace symbols. Gold plated peace symbols! Wow! Capitalism can make a buck on anything and if they can’t do it in the war culture, they do it in the peace culture. (Saks 5th Avenue selling thousand dollar hippie outfits.)

American society can assimilate almost anything. Record companies profit from rock and roll bands singing about sex and revolution. Join the Pepsi Generation, and the rest of the crap that is being laid down now. When pot is legalized, it will be a multi-million dollar business. It has been noted that one of the signs of a decaying culture is its language becoming dull and lacking in emotion. Look, for example, at a “revolution in detergent,” or a “revolutionary new floor wax,” or better yet, picture having a woman on television telling you that you’ll love your new Ford, and then turning to your wife and saying, “Darling, I love you.”

Let me explain what I’m driving at. Many of us see no future for America. We feel that merely changing policies is not the answer and easing our present policies is not enough. We’ve declared death to the state. It becomes a question of how to cause that death. It should be obvious that armed struggle in the streets against an army would only mean death for millions of people and would most likely be a losing battle anyway. In order for a large bureaucracy like ours to work, it must function like a machine does. If parts of that machine are not working properly, the whole
machine breaks down. It is our job to sabotage that machine and our tools are chaos and anarchy. Street demonstrations and window smashing are fun activities but they are only sporadic and cannot be sustained over long periods of time. However, the more people who become committed to the movement, the less people the Man has to work with. We are breeding a generation of drop-outs. Without a new crop of pencil pushers, businessmen, workers and technicians being constantly fed into the system, the less efficient that system becomes. Eventually the system runs down and becomes entangled in its own mess.

What is the student’s role in society: his role is that of a non-functioning part, functioning within his own community and culture, but not producing for the ruling class. When I speak of dropping out I do not mean retreating from reality. The age of the flower child dropout is over. Haight-Ashbury died when it was found that it could not isolate itself from the larger society. But one can refuse to produce for that society. Dropping out means living as a political entity. One does not make revolution by working during the day and attending meetings in the evening. A person’s life style must be part and parcel with his politics. We are fighting for our lives and the stakes are high. The price is jail, and eventually, perhaps, death. But the goal is freedom, and the price must be paid. And when Babylon falls, the children of the world will dance on their grave.
Preface: This paper represents the author's response to the previous presentations on the in-depth program, The Student in Society. Mr. Teichmann had prepared a more structured address but decided during the program to react to the tone of the discussion.

My mood, as I responded to the previous papers, was sort of ugly and I was tired. I actually wanted to clear the air somewhat.

I had retooled this on the podium about nine o'clock in the morning and I retooled it again in response to what has been said. Essentially, to Mr. Feuer I responded with something from a gentleman he mentioned several times in derision and that's a man named Goodman, maybe Hawthorne's proverbial "Good Man." I think he sort of expresses a little of the futility and frustration I felt then — frustration seemed to be a much-used word then — when he said, to paraphrase him, that in the face of irrationality, it is irrational to act rational.

On the way to the program I was treated to a few little poignant bits of news. We were supposed to admire the honesty and forth-
rightness of the Nixon administration in stripping away the fact that, indeed, we were fighting a war in Laos; that's incredible. The honesty involved was that three planes were shot down — it's hard sometimes to hide death.

Mr. Feuer was very selective in the quotes he utilized, in the events he chose. To respond to his point on Marcuse, the point is that Marcuse did survive. He survived an irrational period in Germany, yet he may not survive the "rational" period here.

In a book by Ringer called "The Decline of German Mandarins" which I recommend to you in terms of the university's current maelstrom, Marcuse talks about the phenomena of the university in response to the by-and-large situation. It's not a very heartening picture at all. If indeed the terminology is repetitive in terms of much of the student rebellion, terminology on behalf of our intellectual guiding lights is also very very repetitive. Marcuse was an admitted emigrant. There were, however, really many people who went through a different process of emigration, "internal emigration" in Germany — people who could not understand the necessity to stand forthright, people who could not understand the urgencies involved in that period, some of these people that we study in our sociology courses, some of these people that we study in our political science courses, people who were duped by myths in the first months and then found too late that the trap had been set.

I originally wanted to talk in terms of what I call the "border clash" between the university and society. I think that at this point I find myself to be a victim of a type of system and of the unmeasurable amount of years that I have spent in an academic environment. I am not able to speak totally negatively of all that does not satisfy me. At the same time I am not able to call the confrontation between society and the university a "boundary maintenance problem," in political science terminology. I call it simply a "border clash," that is become much more desperate.

We have spoken often of the multiuniversity, Clark Kerr's vision of our universities as feeders into our society, the great pluralism evoked, the great capacity of each university to respond to the many types of technological and technocratic needs of our society. These days, I think the nature of political pressures confuses what I feel are the demands that are articulated by the elite of this country with what are the needs of its people. If the multiuniversity, as it is envisaged, is to be the instrument of the society which engenders in itself such beautiful simple words as racism, things that can be heard time and time again until they no longer have an impact on us, if the university becomes solely a feeder instrument then it can no longer serve as a source of truth. This is where I see a major disaster in terms of the way the university confronts larger society.

I am able to say that I am majoring in modernization of society; in African studies. And I go through the phenomena of watching my own lecturers and professors, watching Biafra disappear. We know how the university refuses to allow self-determination; we see how it refuses to take a stand on any issues which might indeed endanger the possibility for further research grants. There is a possibility that understanding what actually is justice as opposed to the status quo is something which is unthinkable because of the sort of turmoil that would cause in the inherited arbitrary boundaries. A human problem becomes an intellectual problem. Sartre said it's Jews into soap, Biafrans into political fodder, the offerings of the political environment.

I really don't know what rationality there is in hurling bricks through flower shop windows, but I also don't know the rationality of a person thinking that there are no truths in what he feels and yet attempting to work in a particular system that, at times, I have, to my satisfaction, found proven inadequate in dealing with the truth of the matter in terms of the dramatic issues that are raised. We call for a resurgent university and immediately we are reacted to as visionaries, non-programatic people, anarchists, luddites, Poujadists, anything. Essentially what we're asking for, when we face our society, is an understanding of what it means to deal with arbitrary power, what it means if you believe in the open sanction of law in the society and take a look at the Supreme Court in terms of the current attempted composition or if you take a look at the political trials of this country, evoked for the response of a few votes, a few demonstrations at the Justice
Building, without precedent really being taken to heart, without any real understanding of the environment. In essence it is virtually coming down to exactly what the fulcrum of political power is.

What am I supposed to say when I look at the dossier of a person living in my apartment building who says, “I am not looking into the nature of the ARVN society: I work for the Rand Corporation, and these are our secret classified documents.” What am I supposed to say when I begin to see the alternatives that follow from the control of the media, when I see how independent companies are being bought up by conglomerates? What am I to say when I remember Stoneybrook and its drug busts? What am I to say when I hear on the radio that 16 of our students were busted at 2:00 in the morning for “illicit drugs,” as the phrase goes, and they were 17 to 26 years old, they were black and white, and they were male and female? I ask myself: How long can the university retain its own freedom?

Kenneth Boulding has stated that the tension between the community and the institutions of the university is derived from that fact that the university arose from the folk culture and yet ascribed to be a superculture. What he means by super-culture is a culture for chosen people. What is needed is a culture which attempts to determine the needs of all people, not satisfying only parochial needs, and one defining education’s main purpose as the intellectual liberating of the individual beyond his personal confines.

I was asked to talk about this clash between the university and society. Let’s take a look at it from its most manichean form. You hear and have heard, not only in Hitler’s Germany but today, that the university has a “right” to be irresponsible, that it has no higher end other than to do research for its own rewards (Clark Kerr). And you hear the statements of Professor Pusey at Harvard, prior to his retirement, that Harvard only articulates on policies that affect her and that Harvard only offers its investments in places that are solely good for Harvard, even if this does mean they turn out to be discriminating to places in the South. Where is the constitutional problem? We hear from the university professors and from the Administration that the university conscience is a matter for individuals, not for institutions, that to politi-

cize institutions would lay them open to manipulation. I would rather risk the manipulation of society, such as a university, if it were given first a vigorous chance to try to articulate its expertise in terms of social programs, rather then to see it manipulated as it is now by a few people for their own ends.

We must abandon as quickly as we can, and that may mean now, as many of us have, the supposed veil of disinterest. We can’t endure or afford “purity” any longer; we just can’t. What is needed is knowledge with conscience.

To be effective, the university must be a political institution; it must be politicized. What I mean in terms of politicization is that the university, by consensus of its body, must take stands on its most urgent problems. And its problems are society’s problems — I don’t see the boundary any longer.

I accept the concept of the humanistic professor, that man is put on earth to live as though each day were his day. I like to think that each man has a chance at solely his own liberation, but I also wish that the university would motivate itself so that its use does not become educated to obsolescence, so that its use is not for control, but rather to fight for the people that founder because of the inequities of society.

Right now the university refuses to acknowledge that it is a political entity. I think this may be one of the greatest myths that we have allowed ourselves to accept. We are a political entity by the fact that we exist in society, by the fact that we are serving established needs or organizations, by the fact that Southern Illinois University and Wesley Fisher see the university as the environment for a Vietnam Studies Institute. The university, while refusing and rejecting the notion of leadership, still must acknowledge that it produces data and knowledge. It must begin to become responsible for this information and for the application of this knowledge. The university’s task is not simply to produce but to effect, not simple to make proclamations that become pages and pages of dusty archives but to act upon their knowledge.

I fear that the day of the private universities is fast coming to a close, except for a very few institutions. The financial pressures, bankruptcies, the ratio of mergers are going to
spiral, particularly when federal funds are reduced, when their critical function is going to be denied by a government which demands that they spend more on their war programs solely. J.F. Stone has managed to delineate where our money is going, although Nixon has tried very hard, and successfully so far, to obscure the actual cost accounting. Fifty-three percent of our revenue now goes for war. In his putative popular area of pollution and ecology, Nixon, with all his great bravado, has allocated four-fifths of one penny. Robert Hutchins, at one time president of my alma mater, the University of Chicago, said simply that the university must fashion the mind of the age and not be fashioned by it. The university is failing to do this in this age.

Virginity cannot be defended unsuccessfully more than once. If it is defended successfully too long, further development is arrested. When I hear the university defended as a social inactor, this is what comes to my mind. The university has been raped, actually, by the society in which it operates. The power within the university has aligned itself with the power within the society. It is purely "academic" whether or not the university should be engaged in social action; it already is. Unfortunately, the nature of this action is what disturbs me. The Livermore, the Lincoln and the Argonne laboratories, the Ordnance Ballistic laboratories at Johns Hopkins University, my undergraduate school, were very well-insulated and protected units. Barton Hall rose on the Hopkins campus in six months, outstripping all other building in its urgency. It had no windows and had armed guards and ironically stood opposite one of our humanities buildings. We never knew the nature of its classified research.

I think students are asking that the university practice what it preaches in terms of its meaning to men. I think what they are asking concerns the content of its free, independent inquiry and actions. Service is most often given to those who need it least and can pay most for it. If we really are neutral and apolitical, why is it that we are not supporting the same type of equity, per se, to the Black Panthers, to reform them or encourage them or whatever you wish, as we do to the city of Oakland? Where is the real balance? Legitimized organs and interest groups have the power to do the sanctioning. New groups find it hard to gain access to any power. The center of gravity in the university is not its objectivity but society's open deception of Eve. The center of gravity is really putting the lid on. If we have Department of Defense involvement, where are these interests?

I think we can say at this particular point that the university can no longer produce for others to affect; it must itself do the affecting. If the climate of repression continues in the same way as the present, it is a sure thing that private universities are going to go under, because I don't think many of the students are going to simply stand by. I didn't realize until I saw the film interpretation of Shirer's book on the Third Reich that there was such violent street fighting between the left and the right in Weimar.

I'm beginning to think that with the university's being squeezed for money that it should adopt some of the suggestions made by a man named Carl Smith in a recent Center magazine. He calls for the confederation of universities; he calls for the entrance of universities into the field of mass media; he calls for the university to produce a newspaper to go out nationally. He calls for education projects to go into the ghettos and to go in on the primary levels. These are some feasible goals.

I wish that the picture that Mr. Feuer painted was not of disdain, not one of derision, not one of Freudian masturbation. I think there are many movements among student activists, whether they are the CADRE or others, that are worthy of recognition and understanding. Indeed the efforts of our university, in terms of analyzing student movements as they have done, show us indeed that permissiveness is rampant. There is a necessity for people such as Mr. Feuer to come up with something constructive other than facetious recommendations. The people who are running our war in Vietnam and Laos and have now involved us in Cambodia, people who are systematically turning black nationalism into the reason for all the evils of the country, people who sanction the political trials of this country are not children, unless you extrapolate that they are filled with rebellion, if you want to make that dichotomy. Because of the bereftness of
the Oedipal generational refuse, often used to explain everything away, much of the analysis has often hindered examination of the true crisis in society. In order to determine what social change is all about we have to take a look at the nature of society as it is. I don't find that at all pleasing, and I find it impossible to believe that others do.
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Far more than the ongoing processes of biological evolution, the dynamics of culture-building account for the human condition. Alone among the planet's animals, man copes with his environment by adapting it to his needs. Into his relationship to the world, he intrudes the vast array of artifacts and ideas that only he can fashion. If most life-forms survive by adjusting themselves, slowly and at a great cost in individual members of the species, to the demands of their natural surroundings, men surmount environmental limitations by transforming them through the construction, revision, and transmission of cultures. As a consequence, they can live anywhere on earth, essentially uncabined by climate or the character of a natural food supply. Indeed, the highly technologized cultural achievements of the 1970's demonstrate that men can maintain themselves off the earth — in space and on the moon.

*Reprinted with the permission of the Editor of Daedalus. This article and others on the topic of "Rights and Responsibilities: The University's Dilemma” appear in the Summer 1970 issue.
And yet the ironies of our essentially ironic age include two observations that must give us pause. First, the civilizations of the West, especially the civilization of the United States, have reached a point in the history of their culture where that capacity to surmount environmental limitations — that capacity to conquer nature — threatens to befoul the ultimate terrestrial nest from which man cannot escape and to poison the envelope of air from which he draws his basic breath. It is as if the very power and flexibility of his cultural capabilities have brought the human animal to the threshold of self-destruction. And that melancholy irony dovetails with the second: The massiveness of the modern plight is novel; its fundamental character is not. Cultures before ours have lost their vitality and effectiveness and have died. One need not become a partisan of cyclic theories of history to accept Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* as illustrative evidence here. The central point is a relatively simple one. For all their marvelous intricacy, for all their strength and agility in overcoming the constraints of the environment, the ways of life that cultures define rarely contain within themselves the mechanisms of critical review that significantly insure their continuing viability as conditions change. This dark generalization seems to hold (at least to a degree that makes it merit consideration) especially for those cultures that have been, by one set of criteria or another, most successful; and the changing conditions that have fatally undone successful cultures have been primarily challenges arising from within the cultural system to which the overall structure could not adequately respond. Again, it is quite unnecessary to beat Professor Toynbee’s theoretical drum to be impressed by the record examined in *A Study of History*.

Cultures, like the animal that creates them, are imperfect things. Among their imperfections is a tendency to be lulled into complacency by the signs of success and a bland conviction that the rewarded ways of an hour will last forever. Like a corporate Faust, they and deliver themselves into the hands of a Mephistopheles of their own summoning. And as it is with cultures, so it is with the institutions that they comprise. Locked into an integrated system, they find it exceptionally hard to respond in new modes, particularly critical modes, to the challenges which the system, obedient to its own unchecked dynamics, produces. Higher education in American — the institutional network of colleges and universities — is a special case in point.

Like colleges anywhere — in China, and the Soviet Union, in Cuba and North Vietnam, in Nigeria and South Africa — the enterprise of higher education in the United States is maintained and supported by the society of which it is inevitably a part. Its function, again as is true all over the world, is to provide valued services to that society; and its distinctiveness lies in the generally intellectual character of those services. In general, the historic categories of American higher educational service have been five:

1. The socialization of young people or the transmission of cultural tradition, the insuring of the culture’s continuity by passing its central ideals and ideas from one generation to the next;

2. The training of specialized manpower to meet national needs — the development of a learned ministry to bring the gospel to the New World’s wilderness, of the technicians and engineers to serve the expanding agricultural and industrial components of the mid-nineteenth-century economy, of the scientists demanded by the anxieties evoked by Sputnik, of the technical experts and managers of our emerging post-industrial society, etc.;

3. The research and scholarship that clarify and renew a tradition and that supply the new knowledge on which an increasingly technologized culture feeds;

4. The providing of technical expertise to the central agencies of the culture — primarily governmental departments, businesses, and school systems — through consultation and contractual arrangements; and

5. The critical analysis and evaluation of the culture’s trends and dynamics.

One can cogently argue that in recent years, increasingly since the end of World War II, the second, third, and fourth of these purposes
have been strongly and progressively emphasized in comparison to the first and fifth and that technical and technologically relevant research has become more and more dominant over the kinds of scholarship that throw new light on an intellectual or moral heritage or that generate new ethical or social syntheses.1 These alterations in patterns of institutional service have occurred as aspects of major shifts in the larger society, and the much-spoken-of crisis in our colleges is a complex but intimate reflection of the more pervasive crisis in our culture.

As life in the United States has become increasingly subject to influences that are technical, technological, and managerial, college has become less a privilege or an opportunity for a personally liberating, developmental experience and more a necessary prerequisite for a place in the occupational and economic sun. Indeed, the possession or lack of a baccalaureate degree has become the best single predictor of a young man or woman's overall financial fortunes, and higher education operates as a kind of colander through which youthful talent is sieved into the personnel rolls of industry, government, and the professions. Imperceptibly but rapidly, the service of socialization has been taken over by the service of training, and the examination of a cultural heritage has become lost in the development of manpower. This tendency has been markedly accelerated by the professionalization of the academic disciplines themselves. As society has become ever more dependent on specialized knowledge of virtually all kinds, graduate schools have concentrated with greater and greater intensity on the development of technical skills in the various domains of scholarship. It is not that every Ph.D. produced is likely to make an original contribution to his particular field; rather, it is a matter of turning out sufficient Ph.D.'s, all of whom are essentially committed to the values of such an effort, that the probability of such contributions is kept at a high level and that support for the professional enterprise of creating or discovering knowledge is maintained through the visibility and influence of highly trained men who are deeply invested in it, even when they do not directly participate in it. There is a real sense in which the non-publishing professor is the promoter and public relations man to undergraduates for his publishing colleagues. In any case, because faculty members are drawn almost exclusively from the graduate school, their college-level offerings tend to reflect the technical character of modern scholarship and the professional thrust of the disciplines somewhat more than the liberalizing, socializing service obligation of the institution. In consequence, even courses in English literature or philosophy slight the critical examination of our cultural traditions in favor of introducing a potential professional career. The recruitment of bright youngsters to one's own domain of scholarship, it has been found,2 is among the major motives for a professor's acceptance of undergraduate teaching responsibilities. With no one's quite intending it, this movement toward specialized professionalism has geared higher education ever more tightly into the machinery of American culture. One result may have been a reduction in the availability to that culture of significant sources of critical review that are essential to its self-renewal and to its continuing vitality.

Similar processes seem to have been at work within the realm of research. Stimulated by national funding patterns, the American academy has invested a high proportion of its scholarly talent in the natural sciences and technology and in those aspects of the social and behavioral disciplines that have appeared useful in the prosecution of U.S. policies as defined by the country's political leadership. As for the arts and humanities, those fields of inquiry in which cultural criticism is in some degree inherent, the short and impoverished history of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities is only one index of the low priority commanded by aesthetic concerns and the long, normative perspectives that historical and philosophical studies can provide. The central point is a crucial one. There is certainly nothing "wrong" in the serving of either government or industry by academic men or academic institutions; only the broken quality of our time necessitates this reminder of the inescapable and integral relationship between the university and the larger society. But for that relationship to be productive, it must provide room for significant evaluation, thoughtful judgment, and normative assessments that are not only permitted but encouraged and heeded. Encouragement is not
provided by national policies and practices that richly reward intellectual and technical service to established patterns but that merely tolerate or that absorb without answering the intellectual criticism of those patterns. What currently disturbs many people is the credibility of a proposition like this one: Government, the military, and large corporations have captured (some would say "bought") the research capabilities of our colleges and universities, ablated their potential critical power, and separated the quest for knowledge from the quest for values; culpable villains have not brought us to this state, but a cultural system that has cut itself loose from its ethical base and the moral constraints and proddings that criticism supplies.

At least three points need underscoring in any considerations of this view of the contemporary academy. First, it is a perception that is widely shared by large numbers of students, faculty members, and people outside the ivy-covered walls, not all of whom can be discounted as extremists or latter-day Bolsheviks. If the perception is an erroneous one, it has yet to be corrected by well-documented and forcefully-stated positions from within the community of universities and colleges. The longer that challenge goes inadequately answered, the more probable is the spread of attitudes of suspicion and of doubts about the intellectual independence and educational autonomy of our institutions. Meanwhile, more of us could profitably ponder the decision of Federal District Court Judge John L. Smith, Jr., in his finding for the plaintiff in Marjorie Webster Junior College's suit against the Middle States Association because the latter had refused accreditation to the institution on the ground that it is profit-making. "There is a commercial aspect," he wrote, "to the sharp competition for government and private contracts and the quest for research grants ... Higher education in America today possesses many of the attributes of business. To hold otherwise would ignore the obvious and challenge reality." From quite different angles of regard, observers as ideologically opposed as Clark Kerr and John McDemott have agreed that the dominant functions of higher education in the contemporary United States is the production of knowledge and the training of skilled manpower for an increasingly technocratic society. If, as may be the case, this submerging of colleges and universities in the ethos of industry applies primarily to the fifty or one hundred most visible and research-productive institutions in the country, it is twice open to question: once on the ground that our most distinguished houses of intellect have other and more distinctively contributory services to perform, and again on the basis of their being bellwethers that significantly determine the shape and color of the academic procession and from whose large and prestigious graduate schools come the most influential bulk of the professors whose attitudes and values define in considerable degree the character of the great majority of our nearly 2,500 institutions in the United States.

Second, despite its hardly justifiable stridency and the a priori paranoia of many of its inferences, James Ridgeway's The Closed Corporation is only one of the available accounts of academic involvements in governmental affairs, commercial activities, and real estate transactions that, at the most generous, represent dubious investments of both professorial and institutional energies and talents, and that raise serious questions about the sensitivity of universities to the temper and interests of their constituencies as well as of their surrounding communities. In a related way, governing boards modally combine the outlook and values of the upper middle class with a social conservatism that imperfectly dovetails with the concerns on campus or in the neighborhoods of urban colleges, of such aspiring groups as blacks and the poor, that often clashes with the notions of academic freedom most cherished by faculties, and that sometimes opposes on doubtful grounds the forces of social change. In any event, the interlocking directorates of corporations and the academy, the composition of boards of trustees and regents, and the methods of their appointment all suggest, in a manner that is hard to ignore, a pattern of institutional relationships that affects the focus of the critical intellect and a marked underrepresentation of societal sectors which colleges and universities can properly be expected to serve.

Finally, the policies of our academic institutions are peculiarly vulnerable to culture lag. In many ways, our colleges and universi-
ties are admirably geared to the world of 1945, which, washed by the huge comers of technological and social change since then, has been in a fundamental fashion dissolved. The contrast between the spirit of World War II and the spirit of the Vietnamese war is painfully cogent here. So are the very different dimensions of concern and conflict in interracial affairs, and so is the altered relationship of the greatly enlarged and more sophisticated youth culture to public life in the United States. In a post-Malcolm X age of Chinese A-bombs and a planet quite literally in peril as a supporter of human life, it seems at least reasonable to consider some root-deep alternatives to the methods by which higher education has traditionally served the nation and the species.

Institutionally, the implications of this situation are many and complex. The concept of institutional neutrality holds that a university as a university takes no position on controversial issues except one — that the people who compose its official personnel are entirely free to pursue knowledge wherever the pursuit may lead them. But that classic idea of Lehrfreiheit does not assume that the academic efforts enjoying its protection will be free from argument or critical questioning; it only insures that the proponents of those efforts will be free from undue harassment and intimidation and from dismissal because of their beliefs. Further, the principle of academic freedom neither entails nor does it easily accommodate massive differentials in the financial underwriting of some intellectual ventures as opposed to others. When a university lends its institutional apparatus and the force of its reputation to a faculty member’s search for project money, when it provides space to house the project, and when it proudly lists the enterprise in its public information materials as an indicator of its own institutional solidarity and vitality, then it is doing far more than protecting a professor’s right to follow the gleam of truth. Under such by no means unfamiliar circumstances, the university is perilously close to proclaiming a policy that actively supports the kind of research that the project in question represents, and the investigator is protected by a good deal more than tenure. Obviously, such forms of inquiry are likely to be those congruent to the needs of what it is now fashionable to call the Establishment, and it is hard to contend seriously that they are no more secure or “free” than those who question the deleterous effects of marijuana, that report economic stability in Castro’s Cuba, or that display the relationship of corporate profits and commercial expansiveness to increases in pollution.

It can be reasonably argued, of course, that research and thought that lie outside Establishment interests or that cross the grain of the dominant order must necessarily take risks and make their own way by their persuasiveness and soundness. Their only entitlement is to the minimal but firm security of academic freedom’s guarantees. Such a position stumbles, however, on a faulty implicit assumption and on the rejection of one of higher education’s most fundamental functions. The assumption is that there is a completely free market in ideas. There is not. The premium paid for the resources of intellect that are relevant to technologized science and the ongoing concerns of American industrialism far exceeds the support available for their criticism; and that premium includes not only money but more convenient routes to publication, easier access to persons and organizations of large influence, and a general superiority of status that reinforces the weight of the knowledge and notions generated in behalf of the currently ascendant values of the culture. But why not? That question brings us to the overlooked function of our institutions of higher education — the function of criticism.

If the college and the university ever defined the only serious and large-scale knowledge-producing institution in society, they do so no longer. Laboratories in government and business, independent research institutes, and big museums and art galleries abound. From one centrally important point of view, they are still insufficiently plentiful, and it is probably true that the network of major universities remains the basic and most vigorously throbbing engine of research in the United States. At the same time, their research capacity and commitment do not make our academic institutions intellectually distinctive. What makes them distinctive is their capability for cultural criticism. Obligated by its educational mission to examine and to re-examine our fundamental traditions, pro-
vided with the leisure and with the stimulation that encourage habits of informed reflectiveness, and free of the deadlines and the requirements of immediate timeliness and mass audience appeal that prevent the press from serving as a genuine intellectual agency, the apparatus of higher education is, in many ways, ideally fitted institutionally to serve as cultural gadfly, and to furnish the necessary opposition to the stubborn complacency, the adherence to old ways, and the resistance to change that produce from the inside the devitalization and the decay of cultural systems. Intellectual criticism is neither a safety-valve through which literate malcontents can blow off steam nor an adornment that societies can wear as witness to their own security; it is a condition of cultural survival. It is for this reason that the more unpopular fruits of intellect merit some special nurturance in our academic gardens.

Again the irony of the human condition on the eve of the twenty-first century presses upon us. In general, when a culture is relatively homogeneous and strong — when its basic values seem widely shared and when its moral and political center holds securely — then the practice of criticism tends to be somewhat easier. It is never entirely welcomed, of course; all men are heir to some degree of deep-seated resistance to the critical probing of their practices and principles, and there is regularly some official embarrassment or hostility aroused by the “thinking otherwise” that is one of the obligations of intellectual institutions. But when a culture cracks and dissension runs high, societal leadership hardens in proportion to its sense of threat, and it moves to restrict and to inhibit criticism at the very time that it may be most needed. Under these conditions, the element of trust becomes corroded, and what may have been a community divides into opposing camps contending for power. In such an atmosphere, criticism loses some of its subtlety and much of its crucial concern for the complexity of basic problems, and the acuity of the ears to which it is directed declines. In consequence, the critics become more shrill and more harsh, and those criticized lash back with controls, countercharges, and a determined inattentiveness.

One immediate issue here has to do with a seeming contradiction: It is quite obvious that intellectual criticism is a widely practiced function of the American university; yet it is the most neglected form of service that higher education is called upon to provide. What light does this state of affairs shed on the nature of higher education at a time when it — and the culture of which it is a part — is in extremis to a serious degree?

The sheer fact of academically-based criticism in the United States shows itself, of course, on every hand. Newspapers, the magazines of opinion, and radio and television are filled with accounts of student dissent and the oppositional stance of faculty members toward national policies. Campus protests have become standard cocktail-party talk, and the central core from which the mounting criticism of the war in Vietnam has emanated has been, quite typically, the college classroom and the professorial study. On the other hand, most discussions of the critical function are absorbed in considerable measure into three categories. One is an essentially successful effort to play down its significance and to minimize its extent. It is here that one hears the characterization of the majority of students as socially apathetic and career-oriented and of faculties as inherently conservative. A second is an explanation of criticism as a consequence of defects in educational practice. Student dissent is a function of the impersonal qualities of a rapidly expanding enrollment; faculty hostility toward public policies results from improperly low salaries made mandatory by ungenerous budgets. And finally, criticism is weakly defended as the price paid for the more valued services of higher education — socialization, training, and the generation and application of useful knowledge. The illustrative comments in this context are that academic freedom includes the freedom to be wrong and that the right of critical expression is one of the odd but inevitable epiphenomena attached to the necessary processes of instruction and research.

To understand this strange ambivalence toward the critical services of the college and university, one must be clear about the nature of the critical act itself. Intellectual criticism implies the analysis and assessment of culture. Its focus is on an evaluative appraisal of our society's goals and directions, its institutions, its impact on the character of its diverse
people, its ideals and its practices, and its meanings for whatever future may be open to us. It not only describes the past and the present and attempts to predict what lies ahead; it makes judgments about what we have been and are becoming, prescribes alternatives and new options, and advocates certain directions while opposing others. The element of judgment is what sets intellectual criticism apart from scholarly analysis, which it may encompass and include but to which it is not limited. The critic not only describes the field of his concern; he praises and blames, condemns and extols, according to some framework of values of his own. In one sense or another, he makes commitments to both his valuational base and to the proposals and recommendations to which his evaluative analysis leads him.

To behave critically, then, involves judgment, values, and commitment. Their natural entailment is passion; their natural outgrowth is action. There is little point in discussing "objective" as opposed to "biased" criticism. All judgments, values, and commitments are "biased" in the eyes of those who do not share them; but without judgments, values and commitments, there is no criticism. Bias, emotionally colored convictions, and at least incipient action are inherent in critical thought, and none of these characteristics is well received, except by some students, among the plural constituencies of higher education. A variety of reinforcements have installed cognitive rationality as the dominant style of the academy, and too copious a flow of the affective juices is regarded as bad form among dons. Because our historic means of financing colleges and universities has been through private philanthropy or government, and because the distribution of wealth and the actions of public officials are often the objects of criticism, there is an awkward and embarrassing appearance of the academic critic's biting the hand that feeds him - and of the bitten hand's not incomprehensible tendency toward vengeance. The general public finds little joy in being chivied by intellectuals pressing the case for social change in ways that sometimes border on the uncivil and that occasionally erupt into the extracampus life of the community; and when official spokesmen for the gown are harried by questions from the town, they tend to excuse rather than to justify the existence of the critics within the academy. Even more importantly, the impulse toward action threatens the institutional neutrality that is traditionally the condition of academic freedom. When the cultural critic moves from statement to behavior, he unavoidably implicates in some measure the college or university of which he is a member; the possibility of reprisals affects the institution as well as the man, and the foundations shake a bit under the structure of protection that the American college has built for purely intellectual adventures. Finally, when bias, emotion, and action are linked, the probability of error is by definition significant; the means for choosing between two or more conflicting critical positions is inherently unsure, and the translation of ideas into action when tempers are running high can tragically subvert the critical process and substitute the politics of might for the persuasiveness of authentic morality.

And yet, such is the imperfect and paradoxical condition of man, that that elusive but profoundly valued thing called wisdom is no more than knowledge tempered by judgment - that is, knowledge shot through with bias, passion, and commitment, the very components of uncertainty. And no one can blink the dark fact that exalting the persuasiveness of morality over the politics of sheer power has all too often been a tactic for denying rights to the disenfranchised and for continuing to exclude pariahs of some kind from full membership in the community of men. There is a tension, then - and a strong and frequently painful one - between criticism as a never fully satisfied quest for contemporary (and therefore unconventional) wisdom, the danger in which is desiccation and academic aridity, and criticism as a source of precipitate, damaging, and even self-defeating action. There are few problems as serious or as central for the American college as the management of this tension in order to realize and enhance its potentialities in two directions. One is toward a great fusion of thought with commitment, of knowledge with judgment; the other is toward the closer linking of wisdom and action, toward basing action both in deeply explored ideas and in conceptions of moral accountability.

The importance of this issue lies in large part in the ways in which the conditions of
contemporary life erode the classic model of higher education’s first function, the socialization of youth. Although the variations on this educational theme are many, the basic idea is summed up in the phrase, “the transmission of the culture.” On the assumption of a fundamental historical continuity and of relatively slow processes of cultural change, young people best fit themselves for tomorrow by learning yesterday’s and today’s values, techniques for solving problems, methods of analysis, and understandings of the natural and social worlds. In these last decades of the twentieth century, we live in a time of change more rapid, more massive, and more intimate in its effects than history either records or predicts. Who foresaw a generation ago — even ten years ago — the societal dilemmas, the international complexities, the revolutions in moral values and behavioral standards, or the altered material circumstances that are our daily fare as we cross the threshold of the 1970’s? And who can foresee the technology of next year or next month and the impact that it will have on our self-concepts or on our inter-personal relationships? Occupationally, what jobs are about to burst into economic existence, and which ones are even now turning obsolescent? In an order in which such questions are so compelling, the legacy from the past must prove its utility. That is, it must be subjected to intensive criticism if it is to yield guidelines of any validity to a future so unpredictable, so discontinuous with previous experience, as ours.

But even if American society were not changing so turbulently and at such a fast pace, the old conception of socialization would be inadequate. Our social structure has a hundred different and shifting facets. Instead of a single and homogeneous society, ours is stratified and organized to accommodate somehow a bewildering variety of classes, regional groupings, and subcultures, all reflecting a diversity of values, folkways and norms of conduct. The patterns of life once regarded as modal in “the American way” have been sharply challenged from within our own boundaries and are not nearly so broadly shared as has been thought. Virtually every generalization about the culture of the United States requires qualifications; there are few rules without significant exceptions, and values clutched ardently by one group are noisily repudiated by another. When such heterogeneity is an inescapable fact of life, there is no widely credible justification for socialization; education can only enlarge the field of informed choice as students become increasingly familiar with the array of possibilities that society presents. That process of widening options implies criticism, the informed analysis and evaluation of the groups and the normative patterns that America rather uneasily comprises.

Perhaps most important of all, the national experience of the past 25 years can be read as undermining the legitimacy of not only many of our primary public policies and most common social practices, but of the enterprise of intellect itself. “We are a people of this generation, bred in at least modest comfort, housed in universities, looking uncomfortably to the world we inherit — Our work is guided by the sense that we may be the last generation in the experiment with living.” This opening from the Port Huron statement of 1962 was among the first clear symptoms of how deeply intertwined are the crises of culture and of college, of how deeply suspect in important quarters are the institutions of intellect in relationship to the institutions of power. It is always ominous when youth, especially educationally and economically favored youth, express anxious and hostile doubts about the basic acceptability of the heritage that is willy-nilly theirs. Yet few of us paid attention at the time; and many of us now, often caught up in the disruptive confrontations and the atmosphere of unease that pervades our campuses, still fail to comprehend the significance of the student revolt for our colleges and universities as integral parts of the country’s social apparatus.

One way to approach this angry suspicion of the intellect’s modern working is through the observation of Albert Szent-Gyorgy: The human nervous system was evolved to meet the conditions of primitive life of some 10,000 years ago. At that time, “fight or flight” was the rule of survival and tenet of adaptation; and it was successful because circumstances changed slowly, giving men ample time to accommodate to shifts in their surroundings. Today, with essentially the same neural equipment, men must cope with processes of change that are both extremely
rapid and almost unbelievably extensive in a world that is so crowded and so systematized that to “right” is to court wholesale disaster and “flight” is virtually impossible. Has man’s creativity, Szent-Gyorgy asks, brought him into an environment of his own making that exceeds his capacity for adaptation?

Man’s creativity has indeed been increasingly marked by an element of bitter irony. Perhaps the greatest triumph of human ingenuity and human intelligence is the solving of the riddle of the atom’s vast stores of energy. Yet this startling achievement has left us so far with little to increase our happiness and the great fear of a genocidal weapon that hangs, a contemporary sword of Damocles, hair-suspended above all our heads.

A similar bitter irony shows itself in the accomplishments of agriculture and nutrition and of medicine and public health. Thanks largely to new improvements in prenatal care and pediatrics, to new antibiotics, and to improvements in food production and preservation, we currently have a population of slightly over 200 million in the United States and more than 3.5 billion in the world. A quarter of all the human beings who have ever lived walk the globe today, and their numbers presently double every 35 years. According to the Committee on Resources and Man of the National Academy of Sciences, the most intensive and technologically efficient exploitation of both the land and the seas can produce no more than nine times the amount of food now available. If this maximum food supply can be evenly divided, if the great majority of people will accept only subsistence diet, and if huge numbers of people will move into areas of the world that will make the task of distributing food feasible, then a world population approximating 30 billion can be minimally sustained with respect to both calories and protein requirements. This ugly possibility is only a century in our future. Meanwhile, the National Academy’s report argues that if the society of tomorrow is to be a decently livable one, world population must be stabilized at well under 10 billion. “Indeed,” it warns, “it is our judgment that a human population less than the present one would offer the best hope for comfortable living for our descendants, long duration for the species, and the preservation of environmental quality.”

Such are the fruits, as some conceive of them, of the expansive application of technologized intellect—the threat of genocide from nuclear weapons, the threat of genocide from overpopulation: It is not hard to move from these profoundly troubling concerns to highlight the catalogue of associated worries that distress more than the young: Once the atomic bomb was created, (a) it was used; (b) it was dropped not on white Germans but on yellow Japanese, and (c) it destroyed not a clear military target but two cities crowded with women, children, the elderly, and the militarily unfit. To refer to the ruin of Dresden here neither answers the implication of racism in the Hiroshima and Nagasaki drops nor provides evidence of gentler, more civilized constraints on the application of a lethal technology. In the present decade, both the gross national income and the gross national product of the United States are projected to exceed one trillion dollars, but the squalor of both urban and rural poverty is all too evident in America while we continue to invest $30 billion a year in Vietnam. More than a century after the abolition of slavery, black people are only beginning to escape subordination and exploitation, partly through an organized militancy that surprises more by its lateness in coming than by the accumulated rage that powers it. Our intrusion into Southeast Asia seems mainly compounded by a pathological fear of communism as a different cultural style and of the necessity for ever-expanding markets to sustain an economy that depends as much on the destruction of products as on their creation; and nowhere does our involvement in Vietnam (or elsewhere) convincingly support our rhetoric of national self-determination and respect for the cultural variety of the world’s peoples.

There is more, of course—much more. The point is that to increasing numbers of our youth and to a significant proportion of our informed older members of society, these issues are symptoms of a cultural system gone amok. In their view, refined and highly developed intellectual talents lie very close to the source of the disease; and the university, the basic home of the intellect, is deeply and intrinsically implicated in the system’s psychosis. Knowledge is indeed power; and if that power is not restrained and directed by
moral considerations backed by effective mechanisms of enforcement, then the probability of its being put to sick and evil purposes is too high to be tolerable. The politics of might is not so much on the horizons of higher education as already evident in its institutions, and one of its undergirdings is a hostile mistrust of the intellectual enterprise when it is not harnessed by normative analysis and when it is not subject to searching and open criticism.

There are at least three compelling reasons, then, for arguing that criticism must assume a new and major role in the educative process. The rate and nature of social change largely invalidates older models of socialization; the diversity of American culture makes it impossible to define meaningfully the values and the groups for which young people can be appropriately socialized; and the growing mistrust of intellect demands that virtually all ideas and all domains of inquiry be deliberately winnowed for their moral and political implications and assessed in the light of explicit values. Such a formulation goes further than suggesting a basic change in the context of higher education, although there are still many who deny the necessity for any sweeping curricular revision. It implies a sizable shift in the basic conception of the undergraduate experience and a very different notion of a proper balance of functions within the American college.

Put briefly, that conception holds that whatever else it may be, a college is a place where any issue of human significance can be examined intellectually without limitation. Such a defining notion is by no means without its historical precedents. For example, the quod libeta of the medieval universities provided an opportunity within the curriculum of the time for controversial social problems to be considered by faculty and students. In this framework, Stephen Langton, lecturing at Paris in the twelfth century, worked out the "theoretical justification for the opposing of tyrants" on the basis of which he later, as Archbishop of Canterbury, confronted King John. Indeed, much of the history of academic freedom (in the sense of Lehrfreiheit) revolves around the establishment and defense of just this principle of unfettered critical exploration as the definiendum of the university. If the battle for liberty in inquiry, in study, and in the evaluation of ideas and values is almost surely a never ending one, an index of its victories to date is reassuringly available in the Supreme Court's Keyishian decision of 1966. In Justice Brennan's majority opinion in that case, academic freedom, characterized as "of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned," is for the first time regarded as "a special concern" of the First Amendment.

That acknowledgment, however, of a Constitutional base for academic freedom applies primarily to the intellectual liberties of individual faculty members. What we are discussing here is unhindered criticism as the main business of an entire institution. For such an enterprise to proceed in a manner marked by the rules of fairness among contending partisans and by that kind of orderliness that is simply a condition of productivity, a number of points must be considered, some of them bearing on broad curricular issues, others on the nature of the academic community.

Much, for example, has been said recently about the question of "relevance" in the undergraduate experience. With the college conceived as a critical forum, the problem largely disappears. From the educational arguments of the past five years, one can identify four basic dimensions of relevance. One is the dimension of society — the meanings of the great social issues that the modern world and its inhabitants currently face and that are unlikely to disappear in the immediately foreseeable future. Second, there is the dimension of personhood — the difficulties of developing self in a highly unstable culture and of finding and creating a core of secure individuality in a community that is increasingly crowded and that affords fewer and fewer opportunities for privacy in the midst of burgeoning intrusions of noise, information, and other people. Third, the dimension of man-nature relationships has to do with the changing concepts of our natural environment and of man in interaction with it, focusing particularly on the ways in which that environment has been altered with momentous consequences for the human beings who live in it and on the implications for men of the strategies by which they have coped with the natural world. Finally, there is
a dimension of expression — the effectiveness with which a person can articulate his own experience, understand others, and enter into communicative interchanges with his fellows. Given an opportunity to formulate issues of concern within such categories, students are likely to find the processes of study intrinsically motivating and rewarding; professors must mobilize their intellectual resources along critical more than purely professional lines, and the engagement of the college with its culture becomes less subject to the systemic elements in society that restrict and subvert the processes of widespread critical review that are so urgently called for not by the time, but by the state and character of our changing world.

At the same time, the burdens that colleges can properly carry are far from infinite, and our institutions of higher learning would be well advised to make clear that their emphasis is on the intellectual development of students. Commitments to relevance must be disciplined by commitments to the life of the mind. Educationally, ethically, and even politically, this recommendation means that, whenever choices must be made, a college must be guided by Apollo rather than by Dionysius, that although it recognizes and honors the noncognitive components of personal development and respects men’s passions, its primary (which is not the same as saying its sole) concern is with the roles played by knowledge, reason, and taste in both individual growth and the endless search for more humane forms of civilized corporate life. From the standpoint of both its limitations and its obligations, the college can be neither family, commune, mental hospital, secular sanctuary, nor revolutionary fortress. Although it must make every effort to serve personal needs, to provide the widest possible latitude for human growth, including the opportunity for mistakes and failures on which growth sometimes depends, and to create and maintain an environment in which a great diversity of life-styles can flourish, its attempts in these directions must also be understood as necessarily subordinate and instrumental to the furthering of intellectual goals. In so stressing the intellect, higher education cannot legitimately play down the normative, the judgmental, the valutational. Neither can it afford to fall into the trap of an antiquated exclusiveness; the intellect is a universal tool among men, not the special possession of an elitist group of skillful manipulators of complex symbols. But the college can put a fundamental stress on the relationship of thought and informed rationality to the analysis of values and the formation of judgments.

In this kind of context, it is probable that little would be taught but that a great deal would be learned. Outside the special domains of technical and professional training, there is ample room to doubt both the meaning and the effectiveness of what is called teaching, and the past few years have seen the breakdown in some degree on undergraduate levels of the traditional model of masters and apprentices. When the educational atmosphere is chiefly one of criticism rather than of either socialization or professional training, there is a greater chance for a community of learners to form, for people to think, work, and struggle together on problems and issues of common significance. Some individuals may be more widely experienced, better informed, and more constructively provocative than others, but all are concerned with a quest for new ways of formulating questions and for new alternatives among the answers. Teachers, like books, films and recordings, and computer terminals, become resources for learning; and the job of teachers becomes that of managing the conditions of learning — their own as well as their students’.

The process of managing the conditions of learning — not the context, not the outcomes, and above all not the changing bases and nature of judgment that learning evokes, but the conditions — provides an opportunity for a far more integrated educational experience than one grounded in the formal disciplines can supply. Concerned with an unresolved issue of intrinsic significance, a student can be exposed to materials and to intellectual processes that engage and challenge his aesthetic response, his logical and information-processing capacities, his moral sense, and his awareness of himself as a member of the only species that binds time — that is both determined by and acquires flexibility from the past and that has expectancies of the future. There is a rough equivalency here (although only a rough one) in the proposition that a student’s learning, when his focus is a critical
one, can include, unified by the substantive problem of his choice, ideas and techniques that are artistic, scientific, normative, and historical. Such a translation, however, can be at least as misleading as it may be clarifying. The aim is to provide opportunities for students — and for faculty members and for all members of a genuine learning community — to develop as persons capable of addressing themselves meaningfully to issues that are to them puzzling and important. It is not, except in the most incidental of ways, to facilitate their discrimination of art, science, philosophy, and history as ways of knowing or as specialized approaches to formalized knowledge. One can honor that kind of discrimination and that type of specialization and still leave them to graduate schools and the apparatus of the academic professions.

If such a critical function, already widely practiced by American higher education, is to supplement in sufficient degree the models of socialization and professional training for undergraduates, if it is to color strongly the ways in which the university serves the culture, a distinction may be useful in our understanding of the academic community. If we take the term “the university” as our symbol, it has at least two referents. One is the generic social institution, like the family, the church, or the government. The other is particular academic organizations — Harvard, the University of Alabama, Kenyon College, or the College of St. Benedict’s. In the generic sense, the institution of higher education, capitalizing on its record as a cultural critic, needs to justify and to explain indefatigably to the supporting public the necessity for criticism as a core purpose. In justifying the critical service, it must also be prepared to justify its concomitants — judgment, commitment, and action by the various proponents of very diverse views. To do otherwise is to make criticism “academic” in the most derogatory sense and to undermine the traditions of a vital pluralism in American society. The responsibilities of criticism include, of course, the vehement defense of the past and the present as well as the vivid expression of dissatisfaction and, most of all, the responsible and imaginative exploration of new options. Whether in defense or on the attack, however, criticism entails biases, and the productive inevitability of bias requires constant explanation. That explanation is rarely forthcoming from the national associations that most directly represent U.S. higher education as a social institution. It is only a slight overstatement to characterize these agencies as primarily addressed to Congress and the executive branches of the federal government, as chiefly concerned with the funding and management of colleges and universities, and as most responsive to their most prestigious institutional members although most students are enrolled elsewhere. They invest relatively little of their money, their imagination, or their leadership in the quality of the educational experience; they tend to take for granted the current relationships between higher education and other segments of society, and although they work seriously at the anticipation of future financial needs and manpower requirements in our colleges, they are essentially unconcerned with exploring potential changes in the substance of education or with considering or encouraging others to consider alternative ways of dealing educatively with the nation’s youth. Least of all, with some significant exceptions, do they depart from the apologetic pattern in accounting for the critical impulse from within the academy — perhaps because the critical function is so foreign to their own style as it has been developed since 1918, when the American Council on Education was created to mobilize and coordinate the efforts of our colleges and universities during the first World War.

The particular academic organization, in contrast to higher education as a social institution, carries a somewhat different burden — that of creating, protecting, and promoting an atmosphere within which the critical spirit can flourish. It cannot as an organization align itself with specific critical positions because its ability to safeguard the overall critical function would then be undermined. Were an individual college or university to assume the posture of a lobby or a pressure group with respect to some special issue, it would be declaring itself the opponent of those who dissent from its stance and therefore the opponent of an environment in which a critical forum can genuinely thrive. Whether the issue is that of transforming America into a people’s democracy or that of escalating the war in Southeast Asia
is beside the point. (So, although they are too infrequently recognized for what they are, are the university's feebleness as a political agency and its shakiness as a platform from which to mount a direct political program.) The central task of a particular academic organization is to keep itself institutionally dispassionate, institutionally objective, so that its students and faculty members can formulate the biases and arrive at the diverse normative judgments which are part and parcel of critical thought. The obvious exception is those matters of public policy that may affect its own survival or the conditions of its educational operations, including, most importantly, its critical operations: appropriations bills, measures touching on questions of intellectual liberty, the impact of conscription on college-age youth, etc. In such instances, individual colleges and universities, despite their defects and weaknesses as political bodies, must persuasively make their concerns known in the community and in the country.

One implication of this view is that academic organizations must be prepared to deal swiftly and with whatever help may be necessary to check those who would stifle the critical enterprise. Whether such interferences come from demagogues in the external polity, authoritarians in the faculty or institutional bureaucracy, or ideologues in the student body, they are destructive of the critical spirit and tend to divert it into channels of hostile defensiveness rather than to facilitate the conditions under which criticism becomes the constructive identification and promotion of social and cultural alternatives. Genuine criticism cannot flower in a climate of intimidation even though it may require a degree of noisiness and an engagement of differing and passionately held convictions. This point has two important implications. One is that because the content of unpopular ideas changes both radically and rapidly, appropriate protection must be given to all entries into the critical lists. The events in response to Jensen's recent study of the racial genetics of standard intelligence is a case in point where one effort to pursue truth - conceivably wrong, certainly debatable, and arguably ill-timed from the point of view of social policy - has been subject to a degree of vilification and extra-intellectual threat that pollutes the critical atmosphere. On the other hand, academic organizations, for the same reason, cannot accept the job of enforcing the standards or even the laws of the community. It is quite clear that the members of a college or university are also members of the larger society and are fully subject to its rules, just as they are entirely free to work for the alteration of both law and custom. But if the university acts as a substitute for law enforcement agencies, it identifies itself with extant values and shuts its doors on those who would reject them and seek new alternatives. It is also true that if the university as an organization depreciates or attacks the values of the community, it barricades itself against those whose critical posture is firmly supportive of them. A straightforward extension of this principle of dispassionate objectivity demands that academic organizations be clear in their policies and prepared to defend them with respect to such matters as classified research, its stance toward ethnic minorities, the on-campus use of alcohol or illegal drugs, the sources of its funds, and the nature of its relationships with such other institutions as the military, industry, and the departments of government. Wide variations in decision are possible here; ambiguity and unreadiness of plausible explanations are not. Like any organization, a college must have reasonable standards for judging itself and the capacity to regulate itself according to those standards. It has an obligation to demand honesty and civility from its members because honesty and civility are the conditions of effective criticism, but that obligation is badly discharged if it fails to resist all efforts to limit the ease with which students and professors as individuals examine, judge, and attempt to change the culture which is theirs. Its essential bias is in favor of unencumbered criticism.

That bias is justified on the most urgent and serious of grounds. The culture of the United States, like many cultures before it, is in jeopardy. The hazard comes not from without but from its own massive momentum, from the inner logic of its own technological and managerial nature, and from policies that are too short-range in their vision to accommodate the overwhelming magnitude of their efforts. In the past twenty to thirty years, it has become desperately apparent that the processes of social change, so magnificent in some ways, have left us with a debris of
avoidable, dangerous, and even tragic ruin: the exclusion from affluence of American minorities, the deterioration of our major cities, the defacement and erosion of our countryside and wilderness areas, the poisoning of our air and water, and our much too frequent involvement abroad in support of political administrations whose values are in direct opposition to our own professed ones. The check of criticism and especially the stimulus of thoughtfully conceived new alternatives and deeply considered new conceptions have become mandatory for cultural survival. If civilization is truly a race between education and catastrophe, education has never before needed so stringently the wings of the critical spirit.

Footnotes

1. There is no implication here of halcyon days: when the groves of Academe were an Eden. All that is noted is a trend which can be measured in dollars invested, degree of prestige accorded, or numbers of people involved — by virtually all indices, in other words, except decibels of utterance. Obviously, there are influential works of first-rate scholarship coming out of the minority camp. Historians like Barrington Moore, Appleman Williams, and Eugene Genovese, economists like Milton Friedman, and sociologists of the stamp of Irving Horowitz and Jules Henry illustrate the diversity as well as the solidity of scholars deeply and critically concerned with the ethical state of contemporary culture. In a more polemical vein, the work of such men as Louis Kampf, Theodore Roszak, Henry David Aiken, and Christian Bay is also relevant.


4. The phrase is David Riesman’s. The idea of the academic procession was first and more fully developed in Constraint and Variety in American Education. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1958. It is echoed in several contexts in his later volume with Christopher Jencks, The Academic Revolution. Garden City: Doubleday, 1968.


9. Szent-Gyorgyi’s remarks were included in an address at Bard College, Annadale-on-Hudson, N.Y., on 25 January, 1967.


11. The issue of the graduate schools — and, indeed, of the academic professions themselves — in their relationship to the kind of undergraduate education envisaged here is a complicated and thorny one. Although the question deserves and demands a full-scale airing, space mercifully precludes any attempt at this point to undertake such a difficult task.

I must also acknowledge a debt here to an unpublished manuscript, "Who Speaks for Higher Education?" by Frederic W. Ness, currently president of the Association of American Colleges; he bears, of course, no responsibility for my inferences and extrapolations from his ideas and observations.

REFLECTIONS AND DIRECTIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

C. GILBERT WRENN
MACALESTER COLLEGE AND ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

I currently am leading a double life in higher education, one in a “liberal” Liberal Arts College and the other in a professional college of a state university. My dual function is not unpleasant but it is at times unsettling. At Macalester College I have an appointment as a kind of educational consultant, a prober and a prodder of ideas, sometimes serving as a bridge between different parts of the college community. It is a student-oriented college, changing rapidly and sometimes painfully, and is certainly more contemporary than most Liberal Arts Colleges with which I am acquainted. My second appointment is not demanding, but Arizona State University is a young university, lusty and growing. Most of the Counseling and Educational Psychology Department staff are on the growing edge — some people call them “way out.” This semester I have an unexpected doctoral Seminar in Professional Writing and Professional Ethics but, generally, I have no “duties” in this Department. It is the yeasty condition of the University in general that keeps me stirred up!
I keep wondering as I look at this University how a university can be both efficient and democratic. How can a department be democratic, which ours is, and also be efficient? Does it lose efficiency because it is democratic? These are the questions which keep coming up as I move between college and university and from the department setting to an attempt to see the university as a whole.

I must also read widely these days — from The Chronicle of Higher Education to The Center Magazine, from Daedalus to Avant Garde, from The Intercollegiate Review to Change. From this varied background of activity and reading, superficial at times, I think, but with wide boundaries, I want to reflect with you on three areas: (1) some current dimensions of higher education, (2) the changing face of student personnel work in higher education, and (3) the student personnel worker as a person. What I shall say will be highly selective, entirely subjective, and full of biases!

Some Current Dimensions of Higher Education
The Location of Power

For the past ten years I have been a Trustee at Macalester College and have been reading Trustee literature. Frankly, I see Trustees in the current national scene as shaping up or shipping out. In the years ahead, Trustees are going to change their assumptions of “governing” an institution, and are going to change them materially, or they will be emasculated of any power which they now have. I think that Trustee Boards that are vitalizing themselves with appointments to membership of student representatives (often as observers), young alumni, women, or minority group representatives, the Boards that are opening up the channels of communication so that what they do is no longer shrouded in mystery until a decision is made — these may survive but others may not.

Being a Trustee is literally a “trust” and I take such responsibility seriously. I believe, however, that I see a movement away from the focused power of an institution in the President and in the Board to a power shared quite literally with students and with faculty. This movement is a reflection of the distrust of focused power in our society generally. The day of the President as an autonomous, final authority is passing. So is the day of the Trustees as being the sole authority in matters of policy, even though they are the only legal representatives of the institution. Years ago I had difficulty in convincing students in higher education that the Trustees are, legally, the institution. Everything else is delegated unless the constitution of the state or the Charter of the University delegates certain powers to the President or the faculty (the University of Minnesota has this constitutional delegation, but few universities have). The Trustees are the university, are the college. But this legal interpretation is not the whole story and it will be less meaningful in the future unless Boards of Trustees modify their membership and their operation.

I think that in this struggle in the immediate future there will be more arbitrary focusing of power on the President, on the Trustees, even on the legislature as they relate to state universities. There will be a move in the direction of more power, more authority, more dogmatic, arbitrary action, until that breaks down. Reflecting a little, I can predict that it will break down and that the “now” generation will invade the Board of Trustees and will invade the faculty and there will be an inevitable movement away from the arbitrary focusing of power. This will change some of our top administrative relationships. George Leonard, in an early 1970 issue of Look, has an article on the changing concept of power and the power status, and Margaret Mead, in her Culture and Commitment, has considerable discussion of the attitude of the younger generation toward power.

The College-University and the Public

The role of the university and of the college is attracting more public attention than it ever has before for at least two reasons. Education has now become a prerequisite to occupational and social success to a greater degree than ever before in our history. So more people are threatened by what the university and the college are doing or not doing because they and their children’s lives are affected. The public is therefore involved in a critique of the college and of the
university and will continue to be so long as education remains this important to their success — either in terms of prestige or in terms of vocational opportunity. There is a second reason for public concern — the tendency of the faculty of some universities and colleges to believe that the university and the college should become agencies of social change, responsible for change in public policy. The public has a definite concern for social change, or more obviously, for maintenance of status quo. This brings them into a dialogue with the college to a degree far beyond anything in the past.

In a recent issue of Change, Steven Tonser speaks about the shift from the professor’s function as being primarily that of conservation (the transmission of the social heritage) to one of innovation and the initiation of social change. He cites Robert Hutchins as a prototype of the current emphasis. Hutchins’ concern with innovations in education (in his days at the University of Chicago) now has become a concern with changes in social institutions and political institutions (in the Center for Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara). Tonser is very critical of this emphasis. I am not critical — perhaps because I do not know enough about it to be critical. But I am concerned that the college and university becomes much more vulnerable to public pressure (or much more responsive to public need, as you choose) than ever before in history.

The very nature of the university or the college, as we understand them, means that they are vulnerable to attack and are less effective than they should be in times of confrontation and turmoil. You have heard numerous stories of confrontations on the college campus. Confrontations certainly lend pressure to change, often desirable change, but it is obvious that the university is not particularly good at handling them. The traditional academic freedom of an institution of higher education in the best sense of the word, says that all voices should be heard. And, of course, the more violent ones are the loudest. Yet they must be permitted to speak or we deny our freedom of speech heritage — we are damned for doing what we should be damned for if we didn’t do (permitting freedom of speech).

In the second place, few faculty, or anyone except top administrators, can visualize the institution as a whole. Few, therefore, have any perception of what is happening to the institution in terms of its public image; few appreciate—or apparently care—how this image is affected by confrontations, turmoil, and protests. Most faculty are concerned with department matters and what is happening in their own field of knowledge and do not see far beyond. They are almost as provincial as the proverbial fraternity brothers who are loyal to fraternity first and the university second. It is equally true that staff also seldom see beyond their particular functions to an awareness of the total institution.

I think that all of us — personnel workers as well as faculty and staff — talk a good line on freedom of choice, of speech, of living, until our own values become threatened, or until the institution becomes threatened. Then there follows restrictions of choice and of the freedom of action. Please understand that I do not deny the need for some control. I do not see how an institution can survive without it, but I dislike our hypocrisy in not freely admitting it and in talking less about the university being free in toto. Total freedom does not exist in our society or in the university. We have only degrees of freedom in any situation and we might be more honest about that.

Relevance

College students have two war cries these days, “relevance” and “participation.” Their life in college and what they are exposed to in the classroom must be “relevant,” at least in part, to their “now.” Beyond this, they want to “participate” in the making of policies that affect their lives. These are reasonable and constructive expectations — under certain conditions. Steven Halleck, a psychiatrist at the University of Wisconsin, in a 1970 issue of Psychology Today, talks about “Going to Hell in Style.” This is a provocative title and I am sure that many of you have read the article. He reports his impression of many young people today who are so desirous of being relevant that they become neurotic over “keeping up.” They must be up to date each day, they must be “in style,” and this intense preoccupation with relevance develops for them their private neurotic hell. Relevance
standing alone has little meaning. It requires "perspective" to round it out. These two terms must develop a better respect for each other on the college campus.

I have thought often about the "sense of direction" that seems most characteristic of students and of faculty. The direction of the students is heavily toward the contemporary scene, the present, the "now," while the direction of the faculty is most often toward the past — learning from the past, cherishing the heritage of the past, calling upon the experience of the past. Each of these two directions has its own significance; but if one denies the validity and the significance of the other, then both institution and student will lose. A figure of speech in this connection might be to contrast rowing a boat with paddling a canoe. When you row a boat where do you face? Toward the rear. When you paddle a canoe where do you face? Toward the front. So the students paddle their canoe — looking forward, and the faculty row their boat — taking their bearings from where they have been. Somehow these two orientations must become more compatible, must become complementary to each other. Certainly there is need for both padder and oarsman, each "doing his thing" but with full awareness of the other. Perhaps the oarsman needs a lookout up front and the paddler needs the steady thrust of the oarsman from the rear.

The Research Function

The challenging of the research function of the university raises not only an ethical issue in terms of the kinds of research done, but also a question about the appropriate role of the teaching professor. What is his job? He must keep up with research — but must he do research in order to teach well? I think the answer has to be a doubtful "no." There are other ways of keeping up with research besides doing research as a part of your major function. Ralph Tyler recently talked about research as a major function in contrast to research as a function parallel with teaching. Research institutes can be developed where the major research is done, not as part of the teaching program but as an adjunct to the total university setup.

Professors can also take time off from teaching to serve as research associates.

During this time they would be engaging in research full time and not pulling water on both sides of the boat by trying to balance teaching and research. When this latter is attempted, one oar is almost certain to get a stronger pull than the other. The professor can also do simple research in cooperation with students so that students get some feeling for research as part of their learning process and the professor sees research thinking as part of the teaching process.

It seems apparent that the research function in higher education must be examined quite critically, and we have just begun to face it. We are facing it unwillingly for we give up the money and the prestige of subsidized research with great reluctance. We are being forced into it, we are being threatened into it, and we are not very graceful in the process. Universities may be more successful than colleges in engaging in research which seems relevant to the higher education scene for their vocational curricula demand research which is contemporary and socially meaningful. But it is these same universities that are tempted by large research opportunities that will contribute more to industry, government, or the military than to the educational effort of the institution. The research of a professor in a Liberal Arts College may well be more contemporary than his teaching — but I am afraid that the students of such a professor are not impressed! What about the research done by student personnel workers? Is this research also more contemporary than the student personnel structure within which they operate?

The Campus as Sanctuary

This is a highly emotional issue with strong convictions upon both sides. I believe the tide has turned, however, and that the sanctuary concept is pretty well discredited. It seems almost vicious to encourage students to believe that their citizenship is of a different order on the campus than off the campus, particularly as it relates to violence against people and property.

Although this is a very touchy subject I must report my belief that this "no-sanctuary" concept applies also to the violation of laws involving drugs, regardless of how unjust they may seem to be. I see no way of
handling the drug problem except as you would handle law violation problems of any kind. This does not mean that we seek out violations and become official snoopers. It does mean that once violations are brought to public attention we do not offer the campus as a sanctuary. The laws may be wrong and should be changed, but until they are changed, they are the law.

We may well recognize that, for example, marijuana is not a narcotic, that pot smoking is not addictive (although a serious deterrent to any motivation for achievement), and that illegal pot is undoubtedly less dangerous than legal alcohol. But as important as these points may be, they are merely distractors when one considers observance of the law.

I see us in this connection facing a very real problem of sympathy and concern for the student. At this time we have to think very carefully as to how much we really believe in the sanctity of our societal structure — not the stability, not the crystallization, not the elevation of status quo, but the sanctity of the societal structure under which we live. How we handle the seeming unjustness of some of our current laws, such as those on marijuana and abortion, within the framework of the present democratic process, may have much to do with our survival as a nation. I think we ought to stop holding students’ hands and treat them like the adults they want to be, which means that they take responsibility for their actions.

In a discussion of the situation at Stanford University, I recall four conditions proposed by a professor of law for what he considered an appropriate use of civil disobedience. He said that civil disobedience has an honorable history in our country — it has led to many of our freedoms. Civil disobedience is different from law violation and has moral justification if it meets four criteria: (1) If the civil disobedience involved is for a principle and not for a person; (2) If it is for something, not merely against, and proposes something to replace the object of the protest; (3) If it avoids violence against person and property; and (4) If it admits the willingness to pay the penalty for law violation. This is a crucial area; one about which we are not too clear as yet, but we, as student personnel people, are at the heart of this kind of a problem.

I see all of us in higher education facing a lot of student challenges to value assumptions of various sorts. Students are questioning the value of implicit authority, the question of legal drugs vs. illicit drugs, the major function of sex as propagation or sex as pleasure and propagation. They question the virtue of work and the downgrading of leisure — does one need to justify leisure as something that has to be worked for? What about science as “a way of life” — are we born to this end only?

Students question many assumptions but, on the other hand, they are in search for a sense of commitment. Their search for commitment is very real, a search for a commitment to something which is more than a commitment to an occupation. At one time a student went to college in part to prepare for a specific vocation, and in part to secure a generalized college degree which would get one into many kinds of jobs. Today, for many (not all) students jobs are not enough of an excuse for going to college, and their search for a more meaningful life goal is a serious search. Margaret Mead, who has made many bold pronouncements, recently made another one — do not worry about the commitment of youth — they are searching for something which is in the future. Worry instead about the commitment of adults who are over-committed to the past and frozen in their commitments.

The Changing Face of Student Personnel Work

When I began to reflect upon student personnel work in particular, I quickly realized that I was probably out of date, that I must seek current, grass-roots information. So I wrote to a number of thinkers and doers in the field whom I knew well enough to impose upon them (my former students!) — Chuck Lewis, Paul Bloland, Walt Johnson, George Thompson, Kaoru Yamamoto, Clyde Parker, Bob Kamm, Jack Rossman—and perhaps others. I got help from them in terms of ideas, sometimes in papers, sometimes in letters. I also talked extensively with such colleagues as Bill Blaesser. From these people I have gotten a few ideas about current developments in student personnel work which I think are significant.

You and I have heard a great deal about student personnel work during this con-
ference, but one point that I have heard little about was brought up by Paul Carroll several years ago. This has to do with the dual function of a personnel worker, that of both helping and controlling. He wrote that the control function of student personnel workers is likely to be swept under the rug because we do not readily admit that we have this function. We very likely have entered the field in order to “help” others, to give service to students, to contribute to their development. Often to our dismay, we find ourselves in situations where we have a control function that operates more for the sake of the institution than for the student. This, Carroll says, we tend to deny, stressing that we are counselors, in spite of the fact that students see written across our foreheads, by our very title, practically everything but counseling.

This conflict in assumptions is illustrated by Harold Hodgkinson, who spoke at this conference on the topic, “Is Student Personnel Work on the Way Out?” Hodgkinson, who is at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley, based his remarks on a study of university student governments. He turned up particularly keen animosity toward two officers in universities and colleges, the Business Manager and the Dean of Students. The President is accepted as a “good Joe,” pretty far away, about whom no one knows much; but the other two staff officers they know much more intimately. Perhaps it is significant that these men are not a part of the direct teaching function of the institution but affect students’ non-classroom lives in many different ways. Perhaps more significant is the fact that they are distrusted for very different reasons – the Business Manager because he is too definite on everything, and the Dean of Students because he is not definite enough. “Very interesting,” says Hodgkinson, so he raises three questions which he says students are asking of the personnel worker: (1) Which ball park are you in – the students’ or the institution’s? (2) Do you know what you stand for? (3) Are you leader or servant?

From what many of you have told me, or have implied, students may well be looking for innovative options to be suggested by personnel workers on matters about which they, the students, are deeply concerned. They are looking for ways in which you can be a leader. They hope you will suggest the kinds of things that might be done, the various options open to them. All too often they see only one option, and, lacking leadership from you, act directly upon that one. The time could be found to do this, I think, if you could only break away from some of the brush-fire activities which seem to dominate so many administrative scenes. Perhaps you need to get someone on your staff who is a thinker, a planner, an innovator, to provide you with ideas – not action but ideas. These you can feed to students saying, “I have something that bears on a concern of yours. Here are some ideas that might help you to move in this direction or that direction. Here are some options that you may not have considered.”

Time – and Change

Recently I have pondered over the need for a sense of realism regarding the time needed for changes to become comfortable or effective. An important dimension of change is that one must get accustomed to the fact of change before you can evaluate the quality of the change. Any change is painful and you cannot evaluate the quality of the change immediately because you are still immersed in the fact of change and the painfulness of moving in a somewhat different way. So there has to be a time lapse before one can evaluate the goodness of the change. In many campus movements we have not given ourselves that kind of time and we must; we must ask for students’ help in giving us time. For example, I think if a campus is trying to achieve an improved racial balance and equality we ought to be honest with everyone and say that we can achieve equality, to a degree, not completely, within two to four years, not this year. There are too many crash programs going on in which students are pushing us into action. And if results are sought too quickly, before the faculty, the administration, or the majority of students get accustomed to the fact of change, you cannot really evaluate the change. In this particular illustration, results depend also upon the minority group members moving appreciably in the direction of being comfortable with the majority group – and this is not achieved within even one year.
At Macalester College we have a fairly large number of black students, about 140 in a student body of 1,900. Sixty-five or so of them are subsidized almost completely from endowment funds. We have a Black House where they congregate, have their own social life, some of their own seminars, etc. In a recent Board of Trustees meeting I defended Black House as a transition point for black students who are new to our campus culture. Any minority group coming into a campus feels isolated from the rest of the group. The rural student, for example, coming into a city university feels out of place. He ought, too, to have somewhere where he can get with his own kind for a while until he begins moving out and feeling comfortable with the sophisticated city kids. Any minority group goes through this very important transition. We hope that in two to four years more and more of the black students at Macalester, who now may have most of their social life in the Black House, may feel comfortable with activities generating throughout the campus. If that does not happen then our College has failed them. But time is needed for them to feel comfortable with people and with the campus.

There also must be a time lag to permit the public to accept the changes taking place in our colleges. Some of the public and some faculty never will accept the changes taking place — and we must expect this. On the whole, however, expect that the faculty and the public need time to get accustomed to changes which may look strange to them but very reasonable to student personnel workers. We are much closer than they to student life.

There is a time factor also with students. It is expecting the impossible of students that they should immediately live up to delegated responsibility. They will falter over accepting responsibility and they will fumble when they act. All of this is a part of the learning process. When we delegate responsibility it seems to me important that we follow up. Time-tags are needed with someone calling a student a week before something is due to say, “Look, Joe, next Tuesday you are going to report back to the Community Council on this. Can I help you any? How are things going?” Perhaps this student has gotten himself into a jam and is ashamed to admit it — he does not know quite how to come to you and say, “Look, I am stuck. I have made a butch of it so far.” But when you take the initiative and say, “How are things coming along? Can I help?” he is freed to face reality. Your awareness of what the student is facing, your offer to help — these are essential aids to him even though he is held responsible for what happens.

*Smart Communications*

Often communications are intended for within-college reading; then they get out to the public, and there is an uproar. Anything put into print (or as dittoes or mimeographed material) for presumed within-college consumption only should be written with the idea that it will get into the hands of a reporter or some public agency. How will it look to them? I have seen more than one tragedy occur because of the assumption that a within-campus communication will stay within the campus. It should be written under the assumption that it will not.

We do not have too good a general press because many are disturbed about the changes taking place — or the changes backward that are not taking place! So the college or university must interpret the college to the public. Student personnel workers are in a very good position to do just this. In my book the student personnel workers are a good link with the community. They are close to students who are living at home; they are close to a student’s life as he comes from the high school; they are concerned about jobs for students in the local community, etc. In any such assumption of responsibility for interpretation take it for granted that the public does not see it our way! Paul Bloland wrote that the public has a “frozen-campus syndrome;” the campus ought to be the way it was when they were there. Expect that, but expect to change it — that is our job.

Student personnel workers are sometimes under attack and sometimes merely ignored; both of these situations bother me as I am sure they bother you. Chuck Lewis, in a recent letter, said that a good job is being done in such areas as financial aid, health, placement, and international student services. I would add counseling in all of its aspects — educational, vocational, marriage and pre-marital, older adults. *These* are not under
attack. You could add other services from your particular campus which are not under attack. These are assets and you should play them up instead of allowing the few that are under attack to get full attention such as student behavior, regulations, student government, etc. And here is our old problem again, the things that you are doing for students directly to help them are not under attack, while the control — or the lack of control — functions are. We are slipping if we allow our liabilities to overshadow our assets. The communications problem involved here is a crucial one.

The High School

Two troublesome areas of student behavior are drug usage and student protests. I think we make a mistake in assuming that these activities originate in the college because increasingly students have their first experiences in high school. A former student of mine, Shirley Schwarzrock, and I have written a small book called Facts and Fantasies About Drugs. This first book of a “Coping With” series of twenty or thirty books on problems students face, is written for the junior high school and upper elementary years, not the college. We think the problem starts at this level, yet here they are tragically unequipped to handle the decisions facing them. (A more advanced paper book of some hundred pages, Mind Benders, is for the high school and early college years: American Guidance Service, Minneapolis, Minnesota, Summer of 1970.)

The same thing is true of student protests. Recent studies indicate that some eighty per cent of the urban high schools of over 2,000 students have had serious student protests during the past year — most often regarding the curriculum or teaching. All of this suggests that college and university student personnel workers must know the high school as they have never known it before if they are to have any understanding of the input of students coming to their university or college. In many ways the college and the high school are no longer as far apart as they once were. More behaviors which were formerly thought of as belonging to the college or the adult age period are now available at the high school age — student protests, use of cars, liquor, sex, drugs, what have you — the high school is open to all of this. One disgusted freshman girl said about college dormitory and living regulations, “We are being thoroughly protected in college against temptations to which we were thoroughly exposed in high school.” One can see the implications of this immediately. Student personnel workers, in order to know their input of students, must become acquainted with the high schools. You must appraise your customer before you sell. The high school is the key to this. If you stick to your own campus you will be consistently flooded with new inputs unknown to you, variables with which you will not know how to deal.

Sensitivity Needed

The one emphasis that must be pre-eminent in student personnel work (a personal opinion, to be sure!) is the quality of human relationships of all sorts. Books and computers and laboratories are resources for learning, and so are residences and student organizations and the laboratory of the community itself. But the thing that makes these appropriate to the humanness of the student are people who are aware of others as persons, not as students or teachers or colleagues. That should be us — student personnel workers. Can you look at a person and see what is behind him, what is hurting? That is our job, our interpretative job.

Something sent to me — the author is unknown and by this time the person who sent it to me is lost to memory, so I can give no one credit — is most pertinent at this point.

Please Hear What I’m Not Saying

(Author unknown. Condensed and rearranged by C.G.W.)

“Don’t be fooled by me; don’t be fooled by the face I wear.
For I wear a mask, I wear a thousand masks,
Masks I’m afraid to take off, and none of them are me.
Pretending is an art which is second nature to me,
But don’t be fooled, for God’s sake, don’t be fooled.

I give you the impression that I am secure,
That all is sunny and unruffled with me, within as well as without.
Confidence is my name and coolness my game,
The water’s calm and I’m in command and I need no one.
But don’t believe me, please don’t!
My surface may be smooth, but my surface is my mask,
My varying and ever-concealing mask.
Beneath lies no smugness, no complacence.
Beneath it dwells the real me in confusion, fear, and aloneness.
But I hide this; I don’t want anyone to know.
That’s why I’ve finally created a mask, to hide behind it,
A nonchalant, sophisticated facade to help me pretend,
To shield me from the glance that knows.
But such a glance is precisely my salvation, my only salvation;
And I know it.
That is, if it’s followed by acceptance, if it’s followed by love.
It’s the only thing that can liberate me from myself and from my own self-built prison walls,
From the barriers that I so painstakingly erect.

I idly chatter to you in the suave tones of surface talk.
I tell you everything that’s really nothing,
And nothing of what’s really everything, and what’s crying within me.
So when I’m going through my routine, please don’t be fooled by what I’m saying,
Please listen carefully, and try to hear what I’m not saying,
What I’d like to be able to say, what for survival I need to say, what I can’t say.

Only you can call me into aliveness, each time you’re gentle and encouraging.
Each time you try to understand because you really care,
My heart begins to grow wings, very small wings, very feeble wings, but wings.
With your sensitivity and sympathy and your power of understanding,
You can breathe life into me, I want you to know that,
I want you to know how important you are to me;
How you can be a creator of the person that is me if you choose to.
Please choose to; do not pass me by. It will not be easy for you.
A long conviction of worthlessness builds strong walls.
The nearer you approach me, the blinder I may strike back.
It’s irrational, but, despite what the book says about man, I am irrational.
I fight against the very thing I cry out for.
But I am told that love is stronger than strong walls —
And in this lies my hope, my only hope.
Who am I? You may wonder. I am someone you know very well.
I am every man you meet; I am every woman you meet.”

The Student Personnel Worker as a Person

Here are some things which we face in this business of deciding what to be and what not to be. I dreamed this one out one night while listening to some Rod McKuen records. So there is something of McKuen in this, and something that is almost fantasy.

Let me ask first: Whom do I represent most faithfully as a student personnel worker, the institution or the students? You say, “Both.” That is an easy answer, but it does not really answer anything. Such an answer does not give you the kind of unity and integrity which you can hang onto through thick and thin. A related question might be: Whom do I represent to my colleagues? What is my role with them? Do I accept token
belief in the right of the student to participate in policy making? Do I accept acceding to student demands in a manner which permits manipulation of them? “How much do we dare give in to these students?” Do I accept this or do I express to them my belief in student potential? Do I really believe in a student’s sense of responsibility? Dare I represent students directly? If I were in your position I would be troubled and I do not know what I would do. But these are the questions that McKuen and I dreamed up.

Another question: Where am I personally in value conflicts? How do I look at some of the conflicts that students have and how do I react to them personally? How do I react to the student’s frequent resistance to the acceptance of recognized authority, “constituted authority,” as we call it? Toward leisure as being legitimate without having to work for it? Toward security as the goal of life, which seems pretty immature to them? Toward dreams and poetry as being as important as science and facts? Where do I really stand on these things? And if I know where I am, do I believe that others have the full right to believe differently?

What do I really believe? Cross my heart, do I believe it with my emotions, my actions? What I believe in deeply must represent a tree that's rooted, rather than a windmill that shifts with the wind. I must have some deep-seated beliefs or else I will be a windmill. A windmill develops power from whatever source but it points “as the wind listeth.” A tree bends in strong winds, but if the roots are deep enough, it stands firm. It is always there. Where am I?

A third point: How wide is my knowledge of the range of student subcultures in our student body? My experience in dealing with both professors and administrators is that each of us has a considerable degree of insulation. Student personnel workers are insulated from a very wide range of student cultures because they are concerned with that portion of the student body that presents urgent needs or issues. Please be warned – there are certain subtle risks in setting out to say, “I must develop some contact and feeling for each of the several subcultures in my university or college community.” One risk is that you may become very uncomfortable because your image of yourself and your function may be threatened by widening your range of knowledge. You may discover that you have been assuming that your dedication was to all students, but you may discover that you know nothing of many student groups. And what are you going to do about it?

The second thing you risk is that you can no longer generalize about “most students.” You will not be comfortable around faculty and colleagues who want a firm answer to the question of “How are things going?” You would like to be able to generalize and say, “Well, most students are doing very well,” but if you have done your “roaming” and listening you can not really say that. You would have to bear down and talk about this group of students and that group of students, and the first thing you know others will think you do not have “the answers,” or that you have a different answer for each student group. Enlarging yourself is a risk. It may be a risk that you must take, particularly since you must live honestly with yourself for a long time as well as with an increasingly diverse student population.

I have talked a bit recently with people about changing titles to represent services given from titles that show your place in the hierarchy. The title that means “service” to you may mean “establishment” to students. Does your title suggest that you are concerned with student reception of it or college reception of it? This may be an embarrassing question. Some professors are called by their first names and they find this difficult. A professor has thought of himself as a professor but the present-day student likes to think of him as a person. So I am “Gil” to many people these days to whom I was formerly “Dr. Wrenn.” Once in a while I get a mild shock when the difference in age is 40 years or so, but I realize that this is an attempt to say, “Let’s ignore this function which means little to me, but as a person you mean something to me.”

So what about the titles of student personnel workers – and the titles of a whole range of administrative people? Walter Johnson told me recently about a college in which he has been working. He asked a group of students, “What is your image, if you just gave it in one word, of student personnel
workers on your campus?” They came back spontaneously, “Policemen.” After talking with them for a while he got to the president and vice president to say: “How about making your Dean of Men and Dean of Women into something like ‘Deans of Student Development?’ Are they really here to develop students? Or are they here to be deans?”

The stage is set for student personnel work in some of its present structure and with some of its present titles to go out of business. But the functions will endure. Paul and Chuck and I were talking about this recently and they were saying that if you did away with the “Dean of Students” it would not be long before the president would have someone in there who provided liaison with students, by whatever title he or she would be called. Perhaps student personnel workers should take the initiative in changing titles before they are forced to do so. Will the ego needs of members of our profession stand a change of title? We are, I fear, title conscious and in that title consciousness we may be blind to what this does to our relation to students.

Hodgkinson describes a study in which he made a study of students who went to various people for help on personal problems — grounds men, janitors, nurses, etc. He taped some of their interviews and in doing so obliterated the identification of the “counselors.” He then submitted these tapes to three or four professional counselors and said, “Evaluate these. How good is the counseling, and what is the background of the people who did it?” Uniformly the reply came back that these were skillful interviews, done by people who were obviously well trained! Where does the title “Counselor” come into the picture? Is this a function for many kinds of people while we are worried about the title?

A Personal Conclusion

Yes, Rod is still in there so the questions that I ask about myself are partly those that fanciful, non-rational, but intensely contemporary McKuen is asking as he looks at me. Nor can I separate what is happening to me from what I think might be happening to you. So when I say “me” I mean me but may be thinking about you.

Do I have anything that makes me interesting to others – besides my professional life? Am I a “person” as well as a professional? Can I talk something besides shop? Do I have something besides my job from which I get satisfaction? And what kinds of satisfactions do I get out of my job — pleasure out of order and structure or pleasure out of something which is intangible, on the growth side? Do I get personal satisfaction from staff growth with no credit to me? Do I like to dream – and to plan or do I have a program so tight that I have no chance to plan and therefore have no feeling of guilt about not planning?

As I pondered these questions I became increasingly certain that there is a need for some kinds of beliefs and satisfactions outside of the job. If enough satisfactions do not come from the job, there must be something outside of the job which leads me to believe more deeply in myself. I thought, of course, of music and the crafts, of the outdoors and the mountains that Paul climbs, of the gardens that I dig in, of the indoor variety of satisfaction that Chuck used to enjoy — of the many kinds of satisfactions available to us outside of our jobs.

One satisfaction for me is not to be idle. Yes, I am a work addict, obsessed by the old Puritan ethic of work. So I am talking to me when I say, “What, outside of my job, do I get satisfactions from?” Certainly at my age I ought to be able to find much satisfaction in my work, but it is not good for me as a person to be too work-addicted. Over the years I have come to believe in some things very deeply. These beliefs, and hopefully, the behavior that flows from them, are very much me as a person. This presentation of beliefs is highly personal and I hope you accept it with my apologies for that fact. Perhaps it is something that is appropriate only for friends. But some of you are that — and the rest of you could be.

My Creed

“I do not have many answers, but I have some sense of direction, and this much I can say:

I believe that my behavior, my attitudes, and my life itself are, in themselves, significant.

I believe that to live one must care;
must care deeply for others.

I believe that the love and service of others is the most sincere form of worship that I know.

I believe that every person must make decisions and must live with their consequences. But I also believe that the dawn of each new day is an all-sufficient demonstration that the past is behind me and that my new life is ahead of me.

I believe that the old experiences of life can prepare me to meet the new with courage and with strength, confident that tomorrow will find me able to love both myself and others with greater depth.

I believe that the purpose of worship is to remind me of my unseen resources and to equip me to travel uncharted seas.

I believe in an emerging God whom I will never fully find, for life is for seeking. When I have stopped seeking and think that I have found fully, then I am dead.

What I need to live in these days is humility in the face of great ignorance, love for others in the face of their great need, courage in the face of my never fully knowing.”

These comprise my dream for me. Thus believing, I am a person and I cherish this sense of high estate for both you and me.
If the university is viewed as one of the few institutions left in our society which can meaningfully assist in the achievement of equality of opportunity, the alleviation of human misery, and the realization of enhanced personal dignity for all its citizens, then it is imperative that those who make their home in the university concern themselves with its vitality as an institution. What was viable in the past needs to be continually reassessed, and systematically replaced with the new in order that the university as an institution continue to fulfill its purposes in society.

For the decade of the 70's, the process of institutional refurbishing is going to be complicated by continued and profound disagreements about university purpose, its involvement in the present day problems of the world, the adequacy of the curriculum to the problems of the time, student and institutional political involvement in the community, the extent to which the university should serve national purpose and, finally, the substantive difficulties in achieving construc-
tive change within the current structure of the university.

The university is not the only institution in society which needs periodic self-assessment and reasoned modification in light of changing circumstances. But its role is becoming so central to humane social progress and, consequently, such a subject for politicized contention that all facets of its functioning have come under increased critical scrutiny. The consequences of the pressure from this politicized contention are essentially static: a curtailment of financial support prevents innovative programs from going beyond the planning stage, the consistent political attack both from within and without brings a natural defensive retrenchment.

The values of an institution hospitable to all manner of thought, with truth as the ultimate test of an idea, are under attack from two sources. One group aiming toward a politicized university wishes to impose popularity instead of truth. Another group aiming toward a sanitized university wishes to substitute the conservatism as a criterion for the acceptability of an idea. In the face of this frontal assault, necessary change is all the more vital but all the more difficult to achieve. Leadership under attack is less likely to take the venture in institutional renewal, the experiments in new structures which are a vital part of constructive change.

This paper will explore the various issues raised above, centering around the complex relationship between the student and society, the student and the university, and the problems of achieving constructive change. In so doing, the writer will highlight the areas of difficulty in the hope that it will alert the reader to the most compelling problems which require critical attention now, and effective solution in the very near future.

Most who think and write about the purposes of a university agree that among its functions in society are the transmission of our historical, cultural, and scientific heritage, and the discovery of new knowledge, both about the past and about the world as it will become. The major disagreements begin, particularly between students and the rest of the university community, over the extent to which the university should be involved in trying to solve the present day problems of the world.

Consider medical care as an example. The United States, and our urban areas especially, ranks well below where it could in the prevention of infant mortality. Infant mortality is a problem on which much basic research has been done. The knowledge gained from such research needs implementation in order to get more women to have prenatal examinations, to eat adequate foods, and to reduce anemia. The university does have on its staff professional medical personnel who have the capability of leading the drive to implement what is known, thereby reducing the incidence of infant mortality. Yet to allocate their time and energy onto even such a compelling problem as implementing what is known about the causes of infant mortality is to reduce the efforts they can make in advancing medical knowledge on the problem of infant mortality, as well as in other areas where not enough is known, such as the causes and prevention of cancer, birth defects, and multiple sclerosis.

The judgment which the university must make is the proper balance between the service function of implementing what is known, and the research function of advancing knowledge. By an allocation of resources to community service functions, the university can assist those persons who receive help to lead more productive lives. But the need for essential medical services far exceeds the capacity of a university to provide, for the meeting of those needs in a service capacity alone. And by diluting the energy and skills of their staffs, it keeps them from being able to advance basic medical science.

For this generation of college students with their lively social conscience and concern for their fellow man, a university decision not to help eradicate illness where it can, or to help staff community clinics or city hospital emergency facilities when they are without physicians and allied medical personnel borders on the immoral.

Students see practical areas such as medical care — and the list of potential university services could be broadened into almost the entire scope of critical urban problems — as something which can be done on a practical basis to produce tangible results.

Universities have not done enough to explain, particularly to students, how they can most effectively help society solve its
compelling problems, or what would happen to a university in terms of fulfilling its essential functions if its energies were siphoned off into surrogate functions. This is not to say that a limited, finite commitment to community service is not a proper university undertaking, or that essential university functions such as teaching and research won't benefit from community involvement, for they certainly will. The life of the university has been and will continue to be enriched by an interaction with the community—from the infusion of ideas of a different and frequently critical perspective, and from the opportunity to test ideas in practical situations.

The conflict between the students on the one hand and faculty and administration on the other is likely to continue over the role of the university in relation to the community so long as some human suffering could be ameliorated by a service oriented involvement. The reasons for this are several. First, given the idealism which characterizes this generation of college students, they are likely to feel more acutely the human misery which is to be found in too much abundance in our society.

Second, this heightened sensitivity is coupled with an impatience for practical action and a desire for the realization of tangible accomplishments. The usual university bill of fare as embodied in its curriculum does little to satiate this latter desire. In fact, the exposure to the extent of society’s problems only heightens the feeling of futility at not being able to do something themselves or at least participate through formal university action in lessening in some way the urban agony with its debilitating and dehumanizing impact upon their fellow man.

Finally, advancing knowledge, which when coupled with dissemination of the information and appropriate government action, provides the university with an important contribution to the solution of society’s problems. But this lacks immediacy and relevance for students. Since the problems are complex and solutions are frequently elusive, advancing knowledge is a burdensome, time consuming, and usually quite unglamorous undertaking. It is not likely to appeal to the bulk of students as a worthwhile substitute for action. Advancing knowledge is usually quite myste-
rious, and takes place in out of the way places, such as a scholar’s den, the cloistered cubicles in the library, or in a scientist’s laboratory at all hours of the day and night. In order to advance knowledge, it is usually necessary to have devoted time to acquiring far more by way of background on a problem than is obtainable from the typical undergraduate survey courses. Hence, most undergraduates, at least, cannot participate in what the university offers as its primary contribution to solving society’s problems, advancing knowledge.

Closely related to the issue of the university’s role vis-a-vis the resolution of current societal problems is the student concern with what the graduates of universities have been contributing to these societal problems. Students have noted with alarm that the major decisions which have caused many of the problems of our society have been made by persons who have benefited from the finest educations. Two recently rejected nominees to the Supreme Court of the United States had received the finest possible legal educations, yet the weight of evidence appeared to indicate that one man did not keep his business activities sufficiently separate from his judicial, and that the other man did not keep his personal opinions about civil rights from interfering with his deciding cases on their merits. If this is the result of the finest legal education obtainable, perhaps the curriculum needs changing.

Or consider the graduates of our leading business and engineering schools. As authorities on property rights and technical accomplishment, they are seen by many of this generation of students as short on property responsibilities and concern about the interrelation between technological advancement and environmental preservation. Students look at those who are the major polluters in this country, the companies which systematically follow policies designed to maximize profits while pouring chemical wastes into the rivers, the companies that make better and faster cars with minimal attention to fouling the air with exhaust. Students see that the men who direct these companies are the graduates of our finest business and engineering schools.

As one reflects on the sad performance of university graduates in terms of social concern
as compared to their outstanding technical accomplishments, it is clear that universities have done a more adequate job of transmitting the cultural heritage and advancing knowledge than they have of assisting students to integrate their cognitive development with their character development and with the acquisition of a socially aware value system.

While the university isn’t the only institution in society which ought to be concerned about the interrelationship of property rights and societal responsibility, of values and intellectual development, of character development and scientific accomplishment, it does have young people for a sufficient period of time to make a major contribution. But universities are largely failing in preparing young people for socially responsible performance as adults.

If we view the university as a potentially powerful institution in creating a more just and socially aware and concerned society, then it is vital to assess what it has been doing to renew itself, to determine how it needs to change in order to better meet its obligations, and to modify its curriculum to be more responsive to the needs of today’s students and tomorrow’s world.

But the university seems singularly adept at resisting change and at avoiding significant curricular modifications. University educators allocate an inordinately small amount of their resources to studies of how an institution they can do things better and more efficiently. The basic mechanisms of governmental structure by which a university operates, for example, are mechanisms set up in 1890 or 1900.

It appears to students that their faculty and administrators are so enamored with how they are doing things, so enamored with the structure of the institution as it exists that they are failing to look at what modifications are necessary if the university is to be able to respond effectively to the changing circumstances in society. Students are frustrated, and rightly so, at the apparent unwillingness of the other members of the university community to respond to attempts at reform within the system.

Political action is another area which is enormously frustrating for students, and one which brings them squarely into the complicated relationship between the university and society. The tax-exempt status of universities forbids their taking part in partisan politics. As an institution, it cannot support candidates for office or become a lobby group.

For students desiring to bring change, the avenues open are narrow. Denied the right to vote, they lack political muscle. Where they do have influence, within the university, they find an institution which is limited to the role of critic and adviser or else suffers the loss of its tax status.

In 1968, thousands of students ventured into partisan politics on behalf of Eugene McCarthy. When his candidacy proved unsuccessful, the majority of young people found themselves without a political outlet.

The anti-war effort reverted to being largely a radical endeavor until in 1970 the killings at Kent State and Jackson State and the invasion of Cambodia mobilized moderate sentiment anew, and sent a new group of young people, largely well-groomed, well spoken, into the community seeking non-violent means of changing a national policy they felt to be tragically wrong.

In the community they found, however, even greater resistance to change than had been found in the university, causing a disheartening loss of confidence in the viability of our basic institutions to respond to constructive, non-violent action.

One group of students had printed up posters comparing the costs of military weapons to urgent domestic needs such as hospitals and schools. Going to a local airport, they were putting the posters up when they were arrested without warning by the airport police, called criminals by the airport manager, and booked in the municipal jail on an obscure, never previously invoked section of the municipal code.

While ignorance of the law is no excuse, the arrest without warning and jailing overnight until a judge could set bond was hardly in keeping with the spirit of what the students were trying to accomplish. In their haste to make the arrest, and in the midst of the airport manager’s denunciation of the students as criminals, the students were never informed of their constitutional rights. As these students were being released, the manager of a shopping center was having six more arrested on similar charges. He only agreed to
drop the charges when assured that those involved were not “dirty hippies.”

As each generation of Americans comes of age, whose responsibility is it to demonstrate that constructive change is possible within the system? Can we afford as a society not to listen carefully to the critical insights of our ablest and most informed young people?

The extent to which the university should serve national purpose and the proper relationship between university and government represents another area of acute disagreement between students, faculty, administrators, and trustees, as well as within each of the respective groups. An issue in university-government cooperation which has aroused more tension and conflict than any other in recent years is the proper role of the Reserve Officer Training Corps in relation to the university.

It is beyond the scope of a paper such as this to attempt a thorough assessment of the ROTC question. Rather, several issues which arose out of the ROTC debate will be considered which give perspective on the broader topic of the university and how it should relate to government, as well as the problem of effecting constructive change.

The first issue, widely misunderstood, has to do with academic credit. The basic enabling legislation for ROTC, Public Law 88-647, specified that ROTC courses should receive “appropriate academic credit.” This has been interpreted in various ways by the Pentagon, but is limiting only to the extent that ROTC has to be “within the curriculum” of the university, though even what that phrase meant has never been precisely defined.

Yet academic credit has managed to become a battleground for the various components of the university community. For some members of all sectors of the community, to deny credit for ROTC courses is to approach the unpatriotic. Somehow proper progress toward the military commission has become intertwined with proper progress toward the academic degree. Support of country or criticism of its foreign involvements often became the hidden agenda when academic credit is discussed.

Some faculty give greater critical scrutiny to the content of ROTC programs than they would ever have considered giving to courses taught by a departmental colleague. Other faculty voted for ROTC credit without any professional scrutiny, or without considering the basic question of whether credit toward work for a military commission had any conceivable relationship to progress toward an academic degree.

Faculty have been obviously much more deeply involved in the credit issue in a substantive way, as theirs is the traditional responsibility for determining course credit. Administrators typically have stayed out of credit disputes. For students and trustees, the credit issue was seldom substantively discussed, and became either a referendum on patriotism or foreign policy.

Nationwide, there have been such diverse happenings as state colleges in the southwest increasing academic credit while private institutions in the eastern seaboard were dropping the program altogether, if not the credit.

A second ROTC issue on which there has been minimal rational discourse has to do with who should bear the costs of the program. Under the usual agreement, the military paid the salaries of the officers and enlisted men assigned to the program, as well as stipends for the students participating, some of which amounted to the full cost of tuition, room and board, books, etc. The university was to provide space heat, light, telephones, clerical assistance, and a variety of minimal miscellaneous expenses. The controversy arose around the university’s financial contribution.

One line of argument was that the university should contribute to the defense of the country by providing direct financial support for expenses and clerical aid, and indirect financial support by providing space and utilities. To do less than provide this direct and indirect support was to fail a patriotic duty, and to undercut the national effort by reducing the input of civilian officer leadership for the armed forces. The counter position, no less firmly held, was that as a citizen an expectation that a portion of tax dollars was expected to go toward national defense, and ROTC was a defense enterprise. Again, as citizens, there was the expectation that financial contributions to private education would go to support the educational mission, not the defense of the country.

As the allocation of finite resources has
become an ever present university problem, this issue became quite heated. Students opposed to ROTC and all it symbolized for them resented what they saw as their funds, i.e., tuition, going to partially support ROTC. Many faculty, ever strapped for funds, seeing areas where the money could be spent to greater educational advantage, preferred to see the Department of Defense support the program in its entirety. People in the community, many trustees, and a minority of faculty and students, however, perceived the amount of money involved as inconsequential. They viewed the raising of the financial question as only a slightly veiled version of the academic credit issue, in substance an attack on ROTC, an attempt to discredit it, and a disservice to the country.

Perhaps the bitterest debate within the university has arisen when institutional changes have been proposed either just preceding or following violence or destruction of property. This has occurred even though the perpetrators of the vandalism were not necessarily connected with the institution. This situation evoked the most difficulty for administrators, the most intransigence in ROTC supporters, and the most frustration for students and faculty who had worked hard for constructive change.

Consider the following as an example. After an exhaustive study of the many facets of the relationship of the university to ROTC, a broad based student-faculty committee made a series of recommendations for change. While guaranteeing the availability of ROTC to students, the recommendations called for major modifications, including full financial support of the program by the Department of Defense. A campus referendum overwhelmingly supported the committee recommendations. Before the desired changes could be approved by the Administration and negotiated with the Department of Defense, persons unknown burned portions of the ROTC facilities. Almost immediately the proposed changes were attacked by the conservative press and members of the trustees as rewarding violence, and retreating under pressure.

What was the outcome to be? The proponents of change saw their recommendations as being as sound as they had been before the arson, and couldn’t see why what was intelligent action should not be taken anyway. Persons who might have otherwise acquiesced to the changes were now staunchly opposed to any changes that might give the appearance of rewarding violence.

It has become increasingly difficult to bring constructive change when those on the far left and far right have mobilized, particularly in the area of university-government relations. The consequence is that often intelligent action cannot be taken, with an increasing sense of frustration for those, particularly students, who try to accomplish things through the established system.

Another area where constructive change is essential as well as difficult to achieve is in the ability of the university community to discipline itself. As the courts and the politicians have demonstrated a willingness, if not an eagerness, to interject themselves into university affairs, the possibility of the establishment of a permanent adversary system looms large.

An atmosphere of learning is not possible within an adversary system. The inspiration of students to involve themselves in their studies simply doesn’t occur when the university community is being torn asunder by battles arising out of radical disruption and pressure for immediate summary expulsion.

There are several reasons why universities have been unable to discipline themselves internally. The dominant faculty response has been one of deeply regretting the broken windows and the fact that students were forcibly denied access to company recruiters. The faculty emotional reaction has been a wish to let bygones be bygones, and a desire for everyone to get back to work with the hope it won’t happen again. The dominant response of students has been inaction. Since the disruptors were talking such moral goals – ones they claimed to base on a philosophy of peace and civil disobedience designed to change an immoral university and an immoral society – students find themselves deeply conflicted. This conflict is based in part on the fact that they are in the process of working out their own values. While they feel that window breaking is wrong, they wonder if destruction of property for high moral purpose isn’t somehow acceptable, or at least tolerable. Not wishing to personally engage in destruction but also not wishing to be a
participant in punishing such behavior, inaction is the solution they have chosen for their dilemma.

The situation confronting the administration of a university is that the dominant faculty and student sentiment is one which sees discipline as distasteful. It is distaste, not indifference. If a disciplinary hearing is open, attendance is heavy. Even faculty come, though in smaller numbers than students.

Paradoxically, it is the faculty — the single group with the greatest long range stake in the university — which is the least involved where they should be the most involved. When others — especially the trustees and the outside law enforcement and court officials — become involved, they cannot make the sensitive qualitative judgments about a university community which a faculty can. And it is the sensitive, qualitative judgments about students, curriculum, and faculty selection which distinguishes the great university from the average.

If this evaluation is correct; namely, that judgments about internal matters by other than members of the university community invites a pattern of decision making which will reduce quality, then an unwillingness to participate in developing and administering a viable disciplinary system invites ultimately the intrusion of those whose judgment will lead toward academic mediocrity.

Coupled with the unwillingness of students and faculty to participate in discipline is unusual pressure from outside the university, from alumni, townspeople, and trustees, to purge the nihilists and destroyers immediately. Just as the nihilists have usually violated people’s civil rights through disruption and physical damage, so the people on the outside would deny them basic civil liberties and demand that they be expelled summarily and immediately. The outsiders ask that the university administer swift, immediate, certain justice, offering the civil courts as an implied model. They ignore the fact that cases drag on in the courts for months, and that there are endless appeals.

What happens is that the university becomes a battlefield for two groups both of whose efforts would have the effect of interfering with the civil liberties of others. Both groups see the university as important to attack — the group on the left largely because the university is providing the men to man the military industrial machine; the group on the far right because they don’t want any interference with the supply of manpower to operate the military-industrial machines and because the radicals threaten their own basic values.

The university finds itself in a cycle of physical violence and interference with civil liberties. There is pressure by many people within the university community to deal with the moral issues involved. The moral issues themselves get ignored as the pressures from the far left and the far right mount.

The obvious problem in this area in achieving constructive change is that two major groups within the university — the faculty and the students — effectively absent themselves from real participation, and it is from them that most participation is needed. From the groups outside the university, particularly the courts, the police, the politicians, the alumni, and the townspeople, comes the pressure for change which gives more retribution than understanding. The absented faculty and students must acknowledge that if they don’t develop fair, careful procedures guaranteeing due process and fair play for all, others from the outside, using inaction as an excuse, will capitalize on the situation, and insert themselves into what otherwise would be internal university affairs.

It is in our public universities more than the private universities where one can see most clearly the inimical effects of those from outside the community of the university being deeply involved in institutional change. The California State College system is illustrative of this. It is a creature of the California Legislature. If something doesn’t appear to go well, a legislator can call for an investigation of the college and its leadership. This makes headlines. Months later, the results of the investigation are reported in a small story buried deep in the paper. As long as politicians can use internal university affairs for personal partisan gain, the popularity of positions — not their truth or fairness — will be the focus of concern.

Budget appropriations will be dependent upon the sanitized condition, not the educational quality of the institution. When matters of faculty appointment and promotion become the actual rather than the delegated
concern of the trustees, their basis of judgment cannot possibly be based upon direct educational merit.

How can constructive education change take place in such an environment? The following are basic to constructive change. Truth must be asserted as the criteria for judging an idea, not its popularity. Concern for the welfare of the institution, not partisan personal gain, must be the only reason for legislative intervention. The extent of financial support must be determined by the educational needs of the students and the necessity for maintaining faculty and facility quality, not the extent to which unpopular people have been punished or purged.

The thrust of this paper so far has concerned issues in the complex relationship between the student and the university and society. Several internal issues have been discussed relevant to the problem of achieving constructive change: the extent of university cooperation with the government, using ROTC as an example, and the problem of campus disciplinary procedures.

In this closing section, there will be an analysis of the difficulties which each of the main campus groups — the students, faculty, trustees, and administration — face in contributing to constructive change. This analysis is offered in the spirit that the noted difficulties must be overcome if the university is to realize its potential.

With students, there are several difficulties which limit their contribution to achieving constructive change. The first and most obvious is their comparatively brief tenure within the university community, as well as the periodic heavy demands on their time. It is much harder to work when the deadlines are set for one — especially when four or five different instructors set examination and paper deadlines without respect to each others’ course. Student time is simply too limited for broader university involvement if studies are taken at all seriously.

Another difficulty with student participation is their need to acquire a tremendous amount of background information about the areas which need change if their contribution is to be effective. Much committee work must of necessity be oriented to educating the students about the background of the issues involved and their many nuances.

Finally, a factor which limits student contribution is that the other members of the university community too easily reject what they have to offer. This is especially regrettable as student analysis of institutional problems is frequently astute. That the solution they offer is not as astute as the assessment of the problem is what becomes the basis for rejecting both.

Grading reform has been one of the most vivid illustrations of this. Students will document with eloquence the problems of the grading system under which they work, pointing out how it fosters ruthless competition, a focus on what they think the graders are looking for rather than on the subject matter, a stifling of initiative and creativity for fear of the penalty of being off base, and the fostering of academic provincialism by discouraging taking courses outside of their personal areas of competence for fear of having a bad grade on their transcript which could interfere with scholarships or getting into graduate school.

The astuteness of their assessment of the problem is forgotten by the faculty as they rather pedantically shoot holes in the alternative proposals for grading put forward by the students. The fresh insights and reservoir of good will toward improving the institution is lost. Since faculty often display a looseness but certainty of thought in faculty meetings that they never would display were the subject related to their own academic discipline, the rebuff is apt to be both impolite and overstated.

There are difficulties which impede the faculty contribution to constructive institutional change. The first is that for many, their ultimate loyalty is more to their academic discipline than to the institution in which they happen to be working. The recent increase in migratory behavior by faculty is evidence that many of this generation are institutionally fickle.

An institution may look with enthusiasm on faculty participation in governance, but the reward system for salary increases or promotion is seldom based on citizenship as much as scholarly productivity. Particularly in the junior ranks of the faculty where time has so many demands upon it, the added burden of active participation in institutional change can further dissipate productive efforts.
toward scholarship.

If a faculty member gets involved in changing the institution, he may well find that his usual anonymity disappears to the point where his telephone rings at night, and students and administrators continually interrupt what otherwise would be unbroken periods for scholarly reading, contemplation, and writing. While participation in the institution does not necessarily mean a reduction in involvement with one’s academic discipline, the added strain of dual involvements is real.

On some problems of institutional change, the experience of a faculty member well qualifies him to work on the dimensions of the problem without particular need for background information. Other problems will give him the same handicap as students: namely, the need to devote extensive time to acquiring an understanding of the many facets bearing on the issues involved.

The fact that the faculty, more than any other group, have the greatest long range stake in the viability of the institution is a counterbalancing incentive for participation. They are the group whose working conditions will be most deeply affected by the obsolete consequences of unthinkingly maintaining the status quo, or by the chaos or institutional detriment which can result from ill-considered and precipitous change.

Some limits on trustee contribution to constructive change are similar to common problems of students and faculty: namely, a limited amount of available time, and the need for extensive background information on some problems.

While the management of a university requires many business and commercial skills, the essential problems of governance are foreign to the usual direct line authority and profit-influenced decision making. There is little a chancellor can order a faculty to do, and wide areas of faculty prerogative — the curriculum, course content, appointments. There are likewise increasing areas of student prerogative — their newspaper, personal conduct off the campus, on campus parietal and other social rules, etc.

Further, the university has few tangible products, and does not lend itself to a cost accounting analysis. Some of its most costly ventures, such as clinical training in medicine, dentistry, and the other professions are among its greatest teaching contributions.

Another limitation of trustees is brought on by administrators involving them where they don’t belong. This occurs when the administration excuse to either faculty or students is a buck-passing of responsibility to the trustees as the reason why some change can’t occur, when in actuality the administration doesn’t favor it. When the issue comes to a head, the trustees find themselves embroiled in an issue for which they are unprepared, and over which there is rancor toward them for holding a position they hadn’t taken.

Finally, trustees sometimes involve themselves where they don’t belong, either out of genuine conviction that changes must be made, or in response to their social friends, many of whom may either be quite conservative, resenting what they view as liberal excesses, or else be quite uninformed and lacking any understanding of what institutional quality is, or why academic freedom is so essential to maintaining a vital and viable educational enterprise.

As the national trend is to involve more diverse groups in the composition of trustees, it is hoped that this portion of the discussion will be increasingly leavened by the addition of the perspective on institutional change and its thoughtful guidance which will be gained from some manner of student participation, faculty from perhaps other institutions, young and old alumni, and leaders from institutions of our society other than business and industry.

Administrators have a series of difficulties in contributing to constructive institutional change. Their background is one potential problem area. If they were recruited from outside the ranks of the faculty, a common pattern these days with the need for specialized business and management skills, then they may well lack an appreciation of the nature of the academic undertaking. If they were recruited after having worked their way up through the ranks of the faculty, the academic specialization which that process implies has almost by its very nature ill-suited them to participation and leadership on broad questions of institutional change. Also, the artificial barriers between academic disciplines and schools will be the constraints within which they will be accustomed to operating.
A second difficulty is the suspicion toward authority, leadership, and power with which students and faculty sometimes view persons with administrative responsibilities. While this attitude toward leadership as being essentially untrustworthy is endemic to all of American society at present, it is particularly acute in the university community.

A third reason for administrative difficulty in constructive change is the simple burdens of the role at this time. The increase in the number of persons with an interest in a university, the polarization of attitudes mirroring the polarizations in society, the complexities of fund raising and government relations, dealing with the intrusion of the civil authorities, particularly the police and the courts, parrying the thrust of nihilistic attack, as well as working with increasingly active and vocal students and faculty all combine to make the time necessary for long range planning and institutional self-assessment scarce indeed.

The aforementioned difficulties in the administrative contribution are also the source of some of greatest potential contribution. Administrators, if they are doing their jobs properly, are in constant touch with all the universities various constituencies. They should be familiar with the nuances of the problem areas which require institutional evaluation and change, and they should have the background documents and information which are needed by the students, faculty, and trustees if they are to be enlightened participants.