

would avoid both perils, excessive security and excessive risk; for neither permits growth.

Within the university these two human endeavors express themselves in the concerns to conserve and to innovate. The university would preserve, keep safe the remarkable increment of knowledge, as a reservoir of enjoyment and as the foundation from which to advance. The university would also toy, experiment, adventure with the new—in method, content, goal—as the assurance of growth. The trick is again to keep

these two interests in fruitful tension.

Students, some of them, champion the finest interplay of conservation and innovation—perhaps, properly, with the accent on innovation—as the key to growth. Students, again some of them, realize that for those in whom the concern for excellence has taken hold, the present, good though it may be, is not good enough; they seek an added quality, style, perfection. And some students feature lesser interests—“the house-keeping of the university.” . . . And

who would gainsay an array of intentions among faculty as well?

Growth is an imperative. There is no hope for the university, or any institution, except it face straightway into the future with vision and daring, lively imagination, and careful planning, to let be what must be in the challenge of this complex century. There is no exit but the future—for persons or institutions.

A footnote: there is no future for the university without fine students; and there is no future for the university without fine teacher-scholars.

THE STUDENTS RESPOND:

Duane C. Draper

A vote against makeup for the measles

DISRUPTION! DESTRUCTION!! The red and black flags of revolution and anarchy flutter over the prostrate bodies of some of the noblest American institutions of higher education. In spite of the get-tough policies of some university administrations and the general outrage of public opinion at campus disturbances, the conflict continues unabated. In fact, many of those professionals who study the phenomena of crumbling universities tell us that the end is not in sight and, indeed, that the events of Columbia and Berkeley will spread in various forms from campus to campus across the nation.

Meanwhile, throughout the country we find ourselves asking, “Why?” Whether the answer to that question is considered in state legislatures or in after-dinner conversation, most Americans eventually decide the culprits are the “hippies” and “long hairs.” That many of those who actively disrupt campuses are unkempt or perhaps don’t bathe is a fact. But one reality seems to be escaping many of us. It is that these unwashed, unshaven few (the New York Times estimates that they make up no more

than 20 percent of the students on the left *who are themselves a minority*) lack either a coherent philosophy or established leaders. Their inter-campus communication is relatively primitive where it exists at all. In addition, recent events at San Jose State College (Calif.) indicate that when the mass of students really want to curb or oppose radical activities they can be an exceedingly effective force in suppressing those activities and lending support to established institutions. Yet despite this ability, experience indicates that the majority of the students are seldom motivated to action.

The indifference to campus rebellion which grips this mass of students (and particularly undergraduate student leaders) may take several forms. They simply may not care or, perhaps, even secretly sympathize with the rebels’ goals while denouncing their means. It may also be that some of these students no longer consider existing academic institutions able or willing to ameliorate grievances. A phenomenon, then, that deserves as much attention as the activists themselves is the general unwilling-

ness of moderate students to care enough about existing institutions to try to save them.

In seeking the causes for this unrest and apathy let us first consider what they are not. The building of a gymnasium, the firing of a popular professor, or being prevented from yelling four-letter words on campus are not the sort of deep-seated issues which cause students to sabotage a university or its administration. Such annoyances are rather the catalysts which bring to the surface a real and growing frustration with their education by students, many of them our brightest.

Most campus rebels, according to John Fischer in the August issue of Harper’s, are undergraduates majoring in liberal arts as are the majority of those student leaders who might oppose them. The underlying frustration with their education often felt by both these groups is, in many cases, one of uselessness.

The standard liberal arts curriculum is generally of such a nature as to arouse in the student a feeling for those human issues which often spark campus unrest. He is also less likely to feel that he is risking a career by demonstrating. In fact, he often has no idea whatsoever what he will or can “do” with his education. This feeling is accentuated by the fact that many liberal arts students come to college with no real idea of what they want to do in life. They thus are expecting not only preparation for the future but help in deciding what kind

of future they want—a situation which leaves them open to proportionally greater disappointment than those students who seek only or primarily specialized training, as in architecture or engineering. Many such students may not demonstrate a high degree of academic “success,” but even those students who have conquered the art of meticulous class attendance and accurate regurgitation of professorial notes (to be rewarded with high marks) often think or talk disparagingly of their education. They note that their professors actually teach few classes and that professionally their academic colleagues could not really care less. In addition, few interested undergraduates can escape the realization that most of their professors are immensely more interested in their apprentice scholars, the graduate students, than themselves. A department chairman told me recently that 90 percent of his time was occupied with “recruiting faculty and graduate students.” It seems somewhat incongruous that a department which takes the overwhelming majority of its enrollment from undergraduates should allot only some portion of 10 percent of the department chairman’s time to concern for their education.

Such observations make it difficult to escape the feeling that a great many professors take little interest in their undergraduate classes. Furthermore, professors are not evaluated professionally or otherwise in terms of their ability to teach, and themselves have little or no incentive to care. As Christopher Jencks and David Riesman note in *The Academic Revolution*, good teaching is “no help in getting a salary increase, moving to a more prestigious campus, or winning . . . colleagues’ admiration.” In fact, the printing press, which has made the lecturer almost obsolete, has become the literal yardstick by which one’s success in the academic world is measured. In some departments advancement beyond a certain level is impossible without publication (often without regard to the trash being printed). We find, then, by some ab-

surd turn, that in a teaching institution the worth of an instructor is literally being measured by the column inch of largely nonteaching material.

In addition, the teaching that occurs in the classroom is often unexciting and/or irrelevant. The relationship between Lord Ragland’s behavior in the Crimean War or the inception of Leontes’ jealousy in *The Winter’s Tale* and the lives we live is beyond the comprehension of most students. Combined with the sloppy and unexciting presentation of even this information, frustration is nearly impossible for the brighter student to escape. Four years of this is enough to convince many students that their years in higher education have been all but worthless.*

The dilemma in the classroom is really a three-fold problem centered around irrelevant subject matter and the anticipated and ineffective lecture system of teaching. Closely connected with the latter is the mind-stifling grade-reward system.

The problem of irrelevant subject matter must be attacked from two directions. In the first place, field-work courses should be added to the general liberal arts curriculum instead of being limited to such areas as sociology. Secondly, relevant course work should be substituted in every department. A meaningful English course might be titled: “The rise of the modern city as seen through its literature with particular reference to London.” But the mere introduction of such courses into the present structure of teaching is something akin to planting flowers in a trash heap—the trash may look nicer but the stench lingers on. It is therefore imperative to alter not only the curriculum but also the very method by which it is presented.

The lecture system of presentation has been largely obsolete since the widespread availability of low-cost books. Those few instances in which

* The percentage of liberal arts students who have no idea where to go with their education is to some extent demonstrated by the number who go on to law school simply because they do not know what else to do.

lectures offer us new insight into a difficult area, acquaint us with meaningful views which are not widely held, or open for us a new field of interest are so rare that they do not justify the maintenance of the lecture system. The preservation of the anachronism, as Martin Duberman points out in the November issue of *The Atlantic*, “typically inculcate sloppiness, omniscience, plagiarism, and theatricality in the lecturer, and passivity, boredom, resentment, and cynicism in the student.” As Alan Weiner further notes in a recent issue of the *Yale Alumni Magazine*, the present system results in a situation where “each student taking dutiful notes at lecture, produces by the end of the semester (and for exams) a paraphrased copy of the lecturer’s text, one copy differing from the other less in content than in penmanship.”

The grading system associated with these monk-like copying sessions by its very nature pits the student against the teacher in a senseless and mentally perverting shadowbox fight for academic laurels. This grading system often results in the cumulative effect of education suppressing or extinguishing, but certainly not developing an inquiring and critical mind. Such an outcome lends itself magnificently to a student’s ability to place in his exam book the undiluted vomit of words and ideas fed to him by his instructors but in no way improves his ability to reason.

Inadequate lecture style combined with a numerically and alphabetically oriented grading system suppresses every budding expression or originality, and often leads students, in their attempts to “take” the course, to the most fallacious methods of seeking academic “achievement.” In its flagrant form—called cheating by some and part of the game by others—it involves the theft of professors’ exams or the copying of test answers. Or it may involve copying a high-school term paper, one a friend has done, or, more profitably, an old thesis in the library instead of doing original work. In its “lesser” forms the game in-

volves the studying of old exams which a poor professor invariably gives from semester to semester. A student recently confided, "I took a chemistry course which I attended about a dozen times and managed a B in the course—an A would have been assured had laziness not overtaken my interest in even the old exams." Some students—particularly those who are members of fraternities and sororities with long histories of prodigious scholarship chairmen or are athletes—can count on a significant percentage of their college exams being on file. The higher grades which these students often record do not indicate that they have beaten the system, only that they have conformed to it.

The attempts to treat these symptoms are many, with some of them, such as the burning of carbon masters a la CIA, bordering on the humorous. But they are and will remain symptoms. We deal with academic dishonesty in the same fashion as the doctor who tries to treat measles with makeup in hopes that health will return if only the spots go away. The academic disease centers, not in the theft of exams, but in the reward system which we have adopted for education. The winner is the collector of the maximum number of letters possible from the top of the alphabet—regardless of how he gets them—pitting student against teacher in the race for graduation.

The general problems presented, then, are two: first, a largely irrelevant curriculum which leaves liberal arts undergraduates grasping frustratedly for a purpose to their education. Second, an obsolete and crippling lecture system coupled with a grading technique which make a game of the course work we do have.

The solution to these problems, as the problems themselves, go hand in hand. The nature of undergraduate liberal arts curriculum itself must be radically altered. It should be recognized that a relevant education means that a significant portion of the time at college must be spent at some distance from the cloistered

ivory towers of academia. A new reward system to replace the one which now pits the student in a struggle with his professors must be implemented. Such a program should be one which encourages student and professor to work together toward some common goal increasing academic interest and progress.

Perhaps, paradoxically, abolition of the system of final class grades seems the most advantageous route in this direction. To aim, however, to increase academic interest and at the same time abolish all competitive yardsticks and rewards is, under normal circumstances, hopelessly utopian. Furthermore, professional-graduate schools and business want some idea of where a student stands academically. In place of course grades, then, there might be substituted general exams every year or two testing a student's progress. A student should also be required to present a major paper at least every two years based on work in the field.

The most immediate result of the general exams would be to make clear to the student the advantage of working with his professors while freeing him from the concern that offending an instructor will automatically result in lower academic reward. Such a program as this might be instituted in a new and experimental residential college within the University. Such a college should be composed of students drawn by lot from the general student body to avoid affecting any conclusions to be drawn from the work.

The Students

Duane C. Draper is a senior in Arts and Sciences, president of the Student Senate, and 1968-69 Outstanding Senior Man.

Marjorie Clay is a junior in Arts and Sciences and a counselor in the Honors Dormitory.

Allan H. Keown is a junior in Arts and Sciences and a Glenn C. Couch Scholar.

Michael P. Wright is a senior in Arts and Sciences and former chairman of the OU chapter of Students for a Democratic Society.

Such a college might work as follows: An entering freshman would be placed in a highly structured but meaningful curriculum involving significant reading assignments coupled with discussion sessions and intense use of media teaching. Teachers would give and mark exams but no final grades would be awarded. A student who the instructor felt was having difficulty would, at least during his freshman year, receive outside aid from an upperclassman or graduate student who would be required to perform a certain amount of this type of work to meet his degree requirements. The summer between the freshman and sophomore year might be spent in field work (i.e., work in the ghetto, government, political campaigns, business, or rural poverty areas) with the student presenting a paper on what, if anything, he learned. The sophomore year could be structured much the same as the freshman with the first general exams coming at the end of the year.

Only those students demonstrating satisfactory progress at this point would continue the program, the junior and senior years offering the widest possible range of choices with a continuing emphasis on reading and performance. At least one of the remaining four semesters should be spent in field work with the last set of general exams coming toward the end of the senior year.

These suggestions are not meant as a panacea, but they or other alterations of the present fabric of undergraduate liberal arts education are necessary if we are to remedy what a growing number of interested and disturbed parties regard as the near hopeless state of higher education. The abolition of the present grading and lecture systems is an absolute must if we are to redirect the academic drives of students. The inclusion of field work and relevant curriculum is imperative if we are not to die of suffocation, wound ever tighter in musty, useless academic robes. Awareness of the injustice, if not more sadly the uselessness of the present liberal arts program, grows almost

daily; yet those who revere our present forms and practices warn ominously that the abandonment of tradition will bring catastrophe. They often fail to realize that education is the real thing, the substantial thing; it is the thing to watch over and care

for. Forms are extraneous, they are its mere clothing, and clothing can wear out, become ragged, cease to be comfortable, cease to protect the body from winter, disease, and death. To die of pneumonia because we like the rags we are wearing is senseless. Such

deaths have made the saddest and most frequent obituary on the pages of time, "We have always done it this way." It need not be the epitaph here. Liberal arts education is in its autumn. The winter will find us ill prepared.

Marjorie Clay

Learning has become an extracurricular activity

YES, THERE IS a counterrevolution. And whether by fact or wishful dreaming, I am convinced that its fundamental feature is a student mood dominated by constructive, creative concern for the unsolved problems of our age. But even so, the counterrevolution frightens me.

It frightens me because the situation which spawned it brings us inescapably to questions we have lived with for centuries but have never confronted fully; nor have we ever been asked to act, with any degree of finality, on our answers. It presents us with an almost endless range of choices and decisions; some good, others disastrous. It offers man a remarkable opportunity to shape his own future, but it demands that he create that future without much margin for error. In short, I'm frightened because I sense the urgency, the genuine need for change, and yet at the same time, I'm awed by the immense consequences of change not guided by value, planning, and responsibility.

There is, in fact, very little margin for error. Observes Robert Rankin: ". . . the colleges and universities of this country, as they confront and create the future of American higher education—reflecting and criticizing our society, shaken by its turbulence but stabilized by its values—sway between the possibilities and polarities of an intellectual and moral renaissance on one hand and a dark age of decline in mind and morals on the other." And John McHale adds a rather sobering thought: "Now, as never before, the level and quality of

formal education determine individual freedom, national prosperity, and, in the final analysis, the survival of human society."

So why counterrevolution? In spite of the overwhelming impact education ought to have on the future, students have the persistent feeling that it doesn't really count in the modern world, that liberal education has lost its capacity to create "free men," that the present level and quality of formal education destroys rather than determines individual freedom. They read Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and discover that "the ultimate end of education is not a perfection in the accomplishments of the school, but fitness for life; not the acquirement of habits of blind obedience and of prescribed diligence, but a preparation for independent action." And yet they know that blind obedience and prescribed diligence have become, if not the ultimate end of education, at least the measure of its success. They know, too, that independent study is all but excluded by the very structures which supposedly promote its growth, and they realize that learning has become an extracurricular activity.

Students read that the "liberally educated citizen will be a man who is defined not by the subjects over which he has a degree of objective mastery, but a man who has devised a method, or has developed a habit, of organizing his scheme of values." (Mason Gross) The student reads that and he laughs—unless he cries. For though the liberally educated citizen is not defined by the subjects

over which he has a degree of objective mastery, the good student often is. As Robert Hutchins notes: "The student is never compelled to put together what the specialists have told him, because he is examined course by course by the professor who taught the course. His IBM card must show he passed the requisite number of courses with the minimum numerical average, and that is all."

The student has heard, too, that the final goal of his education is the capacity to learn without a teacher, to continue his intellectual life on his own initiative and with his own resources. And yet he knows this simply is not true. As OU's Dr. Richard Terry points out, "The good student does everything that he is told, only what he is told, and exactly as he is told. He is not the initiator of his own activity and he dares not, if he expects a good grade, venture far from the well-outlined class behavior his professor demands." Students know only too well how accurate this is.

And then, thoroughly disillusioned and disappointed by "liberal" education as he has experienced it, the student discovers that "only education can preserve in human society the freedom of the people, for their freedom to think, their freedom to choose—and above all, to choose wisely—depends on their knowledge. And their knowledge must relate human power . . . to all their world of values." (Bentley Glass)

The counterrevolution is a student reaction to the disparity between what ought to be and what is. If liberal education is not extinct, it is definitely failing, and because students glimpse what kind of future that failure entails, there is and must be a counterrevolution. Our unyielding insistence upon change is nothing

more or less than a plea that education provide the wisdom and balance which the complexities of our time so desperately demand. In short, we want change, and with what our elders would undoubtedly call "characteristic adolescent impatience," we demand change—or at least the bare beginnings of a commitment to change—right now. We believe, with John Gardner, that man can change the world. We don't know whether he can change it into something better than it now is, but we glimpse the possibility of something much worse. And the failure of liberal education to provide the scope and direction of that change seems to us manifest tragedy.

Is there a solution? Can liberal education bridge the gap between the "ought to be" and the "is"? "The true function of the liberal arts," Richard McKeon explains, "is to liberate men. They have performed this function in the past by adapting themselves to the problems men have faced, and they have become obsolete and ineffective from time to time by elaborating old methods without consideration of new facts or problems. New liberal arts must be devised for the problems of the modern world." In a slightly different language, Robert Rankin notes: "We need new wineskins to contain the new wine of our time. We need new ideas about education and new educational structures which can contain and direct them."

What are some of the new wineskins students feel are necessary to free the liberal arts to their job of liberation? Specifically—and briefly—we want the university to abandon its compulsive concern with quantity at the expense of quality—in a very real sense to do away with its tacit "safety in numbers" syndrome. Contrary to popular belief, the clock, the schedule, the calendar, and IBM computers are not necessarily divine and may even be inadequate for the job of learning. At any rate, there hardly seems to be a necessary connection between numbers and wisdom.

Secondly, we want the university to recreate the freedom and function of educational structures. Structure is supposed to direct creativity, not destroy it. The discipline is a set of tools and methods by which changing subject matter can be explored, not a "no trespassing" sign posted on private property. That the university can effectively preclude all communication between and among its various divisions is perhaps the most curious contradiction evident in higher education, as well as a total violation of even the most lofty vision of university community. The failure of education at this point is both striking and tragic, for much more is at stake than a generation of dissatisfied students. Harold Isaacs sums up the matter rather succinctly: "In a great and tangled movement of men and

their ideas, the world is making itself over . . . and we have to reach for ideas big enough to grasp the magnitude of what is taking place." I suspect these big ideas which our age so urgently needs are not to be found within the confines of a narrowly conceived specialty nor limited by the restrictive boundaries of an isolated discipline.

Thirdly, students want more freedom to become involved in their own education. We have a persistent feeling that this involvement stands as the condition and fulfillment of what we call relevancy in our education, and anything less simply won't suffice. Such a freedom includes seeing that curriculum as it is now geared is responsive to subject matter but not always responsive to human learning by different human beings; it is the freedom to demand opportunities, to seek new adventures, and not to conform without protest to dead patterns of the past.

Why counterrevolution? Perhaps I can answer that question in no better way than by quoting Glenn Seaborg: "It has been said that man is now 'inventing the future.' If this is true, let us make the universities of the world the workshops of human ingenuity. And let us see that the tools we fashion are those which will serve the highest purpose of man. The time to do all this is not when the crisis of modern technology begins to overwhelm us. The time is now."

Allan H. Keown

Missing: a sense of humanity

MR. FISCHER HAS MISSED several reasons for student unrest by concentrating on only one of its aspects: that the *main* ingredient of campus foment is the liberal arts students' being deprived of a liberal education on account of augmented faculty power. Mr. Fischer is a good journalist and knows that to make an impression it is most fruitful to drive in only one

nail (using a sledgehammer) rather than secure an explanation by using several nails and a regular hammer.

My criticism of Mr. Fischer's article is not that he is wrong, rather that he has oversimplified a more complex phenomenon. Any discussion of Berkeley, Columbia, or San Francisco State must include such social concerns as the university's connec-

tions with the military-industrial complex (the Institute for Defense Analysis at Columbia), the relevance of curricula permitted by the administration and/or regents (Eldridge Cleaver at Berkeley), the role which the university assumes in the community (Columbia's real estate and gymnastic adventures in Morning-side Heights), and increasingly the university's relationships with its black students and the black people of our country (San Francisco State). These concerns are not "nominal issues" as Mr. Fischer would like for

us to believe. They are vital issues for a socially conscious generation of activist students.

Activist students no longer look for guidance to those faculty who have absented themselves from their role as undergraduate instructors. Increasingly they seek knowledge from people struggling and organizing the "real" world, from teachers who do not need to be told what are considered relevant areas of concern, and from fellow students who are well read and committed. In brief, many

of today's students are marching to the beat of drummers to whom the faculty is not attuned. It would prove interesting and sometimes beneficial for these marchers to be able to weigh the pros and cons of a situation or to discuss problems through the course of a semester with a Galbraith, a Lipset, or a Parsons. However, it is likely that these men are no longer (if indeed they ever were) actively concerned with student idealism, curiosity, and impatience in a society which can justly be labeled as "sick"

when juxtaposed with the ideas that are echoed every July 4th.

What I have tried to indicate in response to Mr. Fischer's article is that while the liberal arts students who are responsible for campus unrest could benefit from more liberal education in its best form, one of the roots of campus difficulties can be traced to social institutions which, in my opinion, lack much of what liberal education attempts to instill: a sense of humanity.

Michael P. Wright

An exercise in obfuscatory semantics

MR. FISCHER'S ARTICLE calling the student movement a "counterrevolution" is an imaginative exercise in obfuscatory semantics. An analysis describing this movement as such is obstructive to a basic understanding of what's going on among activist students in American colleges and universities.

Mr. Fischer has chosen to use the terms "revolution" and "counterrevolution" in a somewhat loose and imprecise manner. Not that the words themselves are so important. But the misunderstandings which follow from the misuse of the words are quite important.

Some clarification is necessary. Fischer claims that the student movement is a "counterrevolution" against the power which he thinks the faculty has gained from the administration. In fact, he thinks that the faculty now controls the university for the most part, instead of the administration.

This is incorrect for two reasons: (1) the faculty does not control the university; the professor's "revolution" is a creation of Fischer's imagination; (2) the student movement should not be directed against the faculty.

An abstract model of a revolutionary movement would be a use-

ful tool in effectively criticizing Fischer's article. A good place to start in the construction of such a model would be with a definition of revolution. A revolution may be said to be a restructuring of the fundamental power relationships in a society, accomplished by a sustained attack against the established institutional system. The revolution may be said to accomplish *not only a change in the rules but a fundamental change in the way rules are made*. The revolutionary seeks to establish a new system of rule-making, incorporating the interests and participation of those whom he perceives as dispossessed under the old system. The counterrevolution is simply the reverse of this; it is a movement to restore an overthrown institutional system, or to preserve a challenged one.

The revolutionary process begins with an insurgent movement against the established institutional system, which is perceived by the insurgents as fraught with contradictions and inequities. The revolutionary insurgents perceive themselves as dispossessed elements, or they identify with those whom they perceive as dispossessed. The term insurgency denotes more than just opposition to specific policies; it denotes opposition to the system by which policies are made. In-

deed, the insurgent seeks to abolish this system, even if it is necessary to employ means other than those defined and sanctioned by it as proper. In other words, the insurgent has transgressed the system itself, and has rejected the idea of limiting himself to working through "proper channels."

Responses of the established system to insurgency fall into three general categories: (1) repression, (2) cooptation/adaptation, and (3) obfuscation of issues and definitions. Repression is the simplest type of response and can occur in any number of forms with which we are all too familiar: kick out the troublemakers; throw 'em in jail; send in the troops; arrest the agitators; etc., etc. Cooptation and adaptation are more subtle and less easily recognizable. This is the more sophisticated approach to wiping out rebellion. Adaptation means adapting the potentially insurgent elements to the system and making them think that it serves their interests. This is often accomplished by deceit, such as was the case with the plantation church in the old South, which said, "Obey the master's law, slave, and you will have eternal salvation in heaven." Adaptation is often accomplished by short-term reforms. The New Deal, which was basically a set of reforms designed to make the capitalist system operative again, was essentially a set of adaptive structures. Talk about "black capitalism" is a contemporary example of adaptation.

Adaptation is often accomplished by cooptation, one form of which is to neutralize potential insurgent leaders by offering them positions within the established system. Often these positions are created to convince the potential insurgents that the system is "trying to do something about their problems." For example, Nixon appointed a young black to be his "special advisor on matters pertaining to black capitalism." That's one black you'll never see calling for socialism.

Obfuscation of issues and definitions is the most sophisticated of all the possible responses of the institutional system to a potentially revolutionary situation. To obfuscate is to confuse, or to make obscure. When the textile mill owner in the South tells his white workers, whom he pays extremely low wages, that it is the black man who is his enemy, he is obfuscating the matter. When he hires blacks to serve as strikebreakers when his white workers decide to organize a union, the whites are even more convinced that the blacks are the enemy. This is the old divide-and-rule technique wherein workers, whose interests would be served by uniting in a common struggle against the factory owner, are divided along a racial cleavage constructed by the factory owner.

In the above example a redefinition has taken place, wherein the black, who would be redefined as an ally of the white worker on the basis of objective economic interests, has been defined as an enemy. Such redefinitions are common in contemporary periods of crisis. For example, the urban uprisings which took place in 1967 were actually political insurrections, but they were redefined as "riots" and transgressions of legitimate "law and order." What was actually collective expropriation was redefined as "looting."

The model described above is accurate, so far as it goes, as a general outline of what occurs during a revolutionary period. It is, of course, limited in that it does not describe the completion of the process (for ex-

ample, there is no discussion of the consolidation of revolutionary power), nor does it reveal the complexities of real revolutionary situations. It is correct, though, in its general contours.

Using this model as an analytical guide, one can easily perceive the inaccuracy of Fischer's position. In the first place, the professoriat has not conducted a revolution, nor, for that matter, have they engaged in any insurgent activity to speak of. They do not control the university. Fischer thinks that the professors, having taken power from the administration, have abused their power by ignoring their teaching duties. He cites Jencks and Riesman's *The Academic Revolution* to support this contention. His mistake, though, is in assigning too much significance to Jencks and Riesman's work, which does reveal that a great number of professors have subordinated teaching to research. The authors do not, however, assert that their findings describe the *entire* professoriat. In their introduction, J & R admit that their work is "superficial at many points." They based their findings on their visits to 150 of the 2,000 campuses in the United States, and they do not claim that these 150 are a valid sample for statistical analysis.

Fischer is very appalled by the six-hour teaching load that many professors have. He quotes J & R's assertion that "few well-known scholars teach more than six hours a week." J & R do not, however, footnote this statement or offer any evidence to support Fischer's implied proposition that the six-hour teaching load is the norm on American campuses. Six hours is certainly not the norm at OU, where the regular teaching load is nine hours. To determine whether Fischer's description of the professoriat's working conditions applied to OU, five liberal arts department chairmen were interviewed. (Liberal arts was chosen because Fischer's "counterrevolutionaries" are mainly liberal art students.) It was found that the average teaching load among these departments is ten hours. In

some cases, the twelve-hour work load was divided between teaching and research, with never less than nine hours going to the former. In other cases, work loads were divided between teaching and administrative duties—both chores which Fischer thinks can be so easily "scamped." In these five departments, there are no professors who teach only graduates. The duty of teaching undergraduates is shared by all.

The chairmen were asked whether they thought that Fischer's assertion that "distasteful chores such as teaching or administration can easily be scamped or delegated" applied to their colleagues at OU. Four of the five disagreed outright. One chairman indicated moderate agreement, but he stipulated that these chores can be avoided if they choose to do so. He implied that most of his colleagues do not make that choice.

Fischer's description applies only to a minority of faculty members in the United States, not to all of them. It is true that the researchers who teach maybe a graduate seminar every other semester do wield a great deal of power in the university. The fact is, though, that these individuals should not be considered members of the professoriat; they do not perform the professorial function, which is to teach. The non-teaching researchers constitute a new class, entirely separate from the professoriat, both in function and relation to the university. To confuse them with the professoriat is, indeed, an obfuscation.

What about the so-called professorial "revolution"? What Fischer describes as a revolution was actually a gradual transfer of power from university administrators to a small segment of the senior faculty. There was no insurgency involved in affecting this transfer. Nor did any significant shifts in power relations within the larger society affect it. The acquisition of more power by small segments of the faculties was very much an evolutionary development within the established institutional framework. The postwar demand for faculty

(created in part by the GI Bill) and the corporate and military demands for research created, in Fischer's words, a "highly strategic position" which opportunistic professors began to occupy. The only difference is that they now find themselves accountable to their military and corporate contractors, instead of directly to their university administrations. Hence a power shift within the university did occur, but as a response to the machinations of the corporate and military conglomerates in the external society, not as the result of a faculty insurgency.

So much for the professor's revolution, and hence so much for the students' counterrevolution. The next

question is, what is the student movement really all about? Fischer is correct in that a lot of it is a reaction to the poor quality of undergraduate education, but he is incorrect in implying that this condition is a creation of the professoriat. Many student activists have begun to extend their analysis to include a critique of the corporate capitalist society, of which the university is an integral part, in their quest to understand the miserable conditions of American "higher education." And this seems to upset people like Fischer. So his response is to write an article which says, essentially, that, students, the capitalist system is not to blame for your problems—the greedy, autonom-

ous professors are to blame. Fischer, whether consciously or not, is attempting in this article to heighten the antagonism between students and teachers, whose interests would better be served by uniting to defend their common interests. Both groups have an interest in high quality, socially beneficial *education*, which is not the same thing as the *training* which is being dished out to prepare people to meet the needs of the corporate, administrative, and military elites which run the country. To achieve such a goal, activist students and professors interested in teaching must direct their antagonism not toward each other, but toward these elites. They must work to make a real revolution.

The Wallace Phenomenon

Continued from page 6

and fixed Alabama with the most unfavorable workman's compensation law in America.

He was a Populist, he said, and the "little man's candidate," objecting to the way government steals from pay checks and frustrates legitimate yearnings. Yet as governor he prevented any increase in income or property taxes while raising the sales tax to four percent and permitting Alabama's largest communities to hike it to six percent (which they have done). He boosted the beer tax and the tobacco tax; he doubled the cost of a driver's license and tripled the cost of plates. In addition, this candidate of the people seems to be in sympathetic communication with the same sources who have always financially supported right-wing or strongly conservative movements: wealthy businessmen, oil and wheat interests, and conservative lawyers and bankers. Moreover, the candidate of the small man has presided over the most wretched school system in the nation. Alabama's ratio of pupils to teachers is the worst of any state (28.1); the state spends \$403 on each pupil, which is forty-ninth to Mississippi's fiftieth (but Mississippi's new pay raise for teachers will give Alabama undisputed last place). All this simply means that the little men, who cannot afford to send their children to private schools, will see them suffer: of every 1,000 Alabama 9th graders, only 194 go on to college, and this is the worst record in America; only 607 of every 1,000 graduate from high school and forty-seven states do better than that.

He was, he said, the candidate for "law and order." Yet Alabama has the highest murder rate, per 100,000 of the population, of any state in America according to the FBI. There are 11.7 murders in Alabama for each 100,000 people—the national average is 6.1 (Oklahoma's record is

only 4.4.) Birmingham, the state's largest city, reported the worst murder record of any big city in the country (12.5)—second place Chicago boasted a considerably better record (9.5). For every assault which takes place in Oklahoma (per 100,000 of the population), two occur in Alabama.

He was, he said, the candidate of those who want to limit the power of the Federal Government to come into the states with its financial programs and take over the control of local institutions. Yet he was in the forefront of those who wanted every available dollar of Federal aid—he accepted \$2.50 of Federal money for every \$1.00 which Alabama paid into the national treasury. He promised, moreover, to make the cities safe after he was elected President, but precisely how he would have made cities safe while sitting in Washington, D.C., without, in some measure, exerting or introducing Federal influence, has never been made very clear.

He was, he said, the candidate who would stand for state authority against the attempts of the Supreme Court to alter state laws. Yet during the campaign it was Wallace who demanded that the Supreme Court strike down Ohio's election law and permit his name to go on the ballot. (Ohio's law was certainly a bad one, and we may be relieved to see it declared unconstitutional; but there is surely an inconsistency in Wallace's contention that it was proper for the Court to act that way in Ohio, while insisting that it is illegal to strike down election laws in Alabama.)

He was, he said, the candidate who stood for responsible spending, living within your means, and ending extravagance and waste. Yet during his four years as governor, he doubled Alabama's indebtedness from \$281 million to \$569 million. And in his wife's shortened administration, the debt shot up another \$232 million. Much of this total, moreover, was in revenue bonds which were issued without allowing Alabamans to vote on the question.