DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 016 HE 000 363

By-Peterson, Richard E.

Reform in Higher Education--Goals of the Right and of the Left.

Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 15 Jan 69
Note-16p.; Paper presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, January 15, 1969.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90
Descriptors-*Activism, Community Attitudes, Educational Change, *Faculty Organizations, *Higher Education, *Political Power, Power Structure, *Student Organizations, Student Subcultures

In the late 1960's, especially after the 1964 Berkeley movement, numerous power blocks joined in the struggle for control of US universities. The range of demands on the higher education system serve to separate the competing groups into 4 general categories. The Anarchist Left, or radicals, comprises about 5% of the total college student population. The highly intelligent students demand a voice in determining policy and course content, and seek to replace the present university with a new institution characterized by academic and personal freedom. Some segments of the Reformist Left, or liberals, include black and white reformist-minded students and faculty. Student activists in this group press for limited reforms in academic, non-academic and governmental matters, frequently in an abrasive way, and faculty demands involve higher salaries and better working conditions. The Nostalgic Right is composed of older professors and alumni who oppose any functional changes or innovative programs, and make demands only when their institution veers away from the "status quo." They maintain that teaching and scholarly research are proper univeristy functions. The Upright Right, or far-right group, are citizens from off campus who consider themselves to be morally strong and righteous, and advocate the preservation of law and order as well as the protection of everyone's "public decency." Their demands are essentially counter-demands. (WM)

Association of American Colleges 1818 R STREET, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C. 20009 ● TELEPHONE (202) 265-3137

55th Annual Meeting
Pittsburgh Hilton Hotel
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Summary of Analyst's
Paper for Discussion
Group IX
Wednesday
January 15, 1969
9:00 a.m.

Group IX-Reform in Higher Education--Goals of the Right and of the Left

By
Richard E. Peterson, Research Psychologist and Chairman,
Higher Education Research Group, Educational Testing Service

American higher education is presently experiencing a period of turmoil and change probably unparalled in its history. Rather than the consequence of deliberate design, however, the change we are witnessing in the late 1960's tends to be the result of accommodations struck among a host of competing power blocks. We can say, can't we, that at one time, say before World War II, authority in the colleges and universities was generally firmly in the hands of administrators and trustees. After the war, especially in the prestigious universities, there began a mounting of faculty power and entrepreneurship, as the marketability and mobility of the professors grew. Then came the great watershed, the 1964 rebellion at Berkeley, and activist students around the country saw that they could have an impact on the shape of the university.

Authority in higher education, then, has been seriously eroded; control of the university is up for grabs; and everybody is jumping in for a piece of the action. While these overstatements don't contribute much to our analysis, they do suggest the kind of environment in which governance through tradeoff of demands is taking place.

One wonders whether authority in higher education hasn't always been essentially arbitrary. From where I sit, as an educational researcher, I'm impressed by how little we know with any certainty about the outcomes of various educational treatments; for example, do we really know whether a liberal education makes people better human beings? But that's another talk. What we need is a theory of higher education, or better still, a theory grounded in facts, to serve as a basis for authority. But we can't even pin down the purposes of higher education, and probably won't be able to for some time, until the pace of social change in America slows down a bit.

Assuming, then, this notion of an "authority vacuum" or near-vacuum in American higher education, the purpose of this paper is to outline some of the demands on the total system as well as on individual colleges that are being pressed by groups of people looking for a piece of the action. I will not be talking about all the people who are not making demands: the politically apathetic great majority of students, all the faculty who have come to expect change as part of the natural order of things, but who expect the process to be orderly, and all the administrators who just want to keep the ship moving ahead on a fairly even keel. To come to grips with the great range of demands--from the most radical to the most reactionary --I've boiled the range down into four general categories; in keeping with the title I was given, the four analytic types are labeled: the Anarchist Left, the Reformist Left, the Nostalgic Right, and the Upright Right. As you will soon see, I've defined the words "Left" and "Right" very broadly, and the other words--"Nostalgic" and "Upright" and so on--are not exactly going to make for a breakthrough in scientific political analysis.

The Anarchist Left

I have come to the view that the radical youth movement in the Western World (and Japan) is best understood in terms of loss of confidence in the traditional forms of authority. In America the Movement is comprised mainly of college students, accounting for something on the order of five percent of the total student population. Highly sophisticated intellectually, these students have managed to learn through the mass media and other teachers that the human condition leaves a very great deal to be desired. They blame the older generation for either creating this condition or acquiescing to it. They have come to reject authority for being, as Paul Goodman has put it, "not only immoral but functionally incompetent."

In response to the realization of "no-confidence," some students have become activists in the New Left, others have become passivists in the hippie culture, a few prefer the put-ons and mockeries of the Yippies, and there must be other ways of reacting as well. Despite these differences as well as the absence of organization, the Movement is a movement in which many things are shared in common. One thing is a style, by which the middle class niceties can be rebuked on a day to day basis. Another shared value can best be summed up in the words "participatory democracy"; and participatory democracy is the essence of the "Anarchist social order" (Goodman's phrase), as it has been put forward in the 20th century.

In the colleges and universities, the New Anarchists want an end to the customary patterns of authority which they regard as illegitimate, and they want a voice in creating the new arrangements.

The New institution these students envision will be characterized not only by decentralized decision processes but also by very great freedom in their academic and personal lives for all the individuals in the college community. People in the Movement speak of "human liberation." But they don't expect it all at once; they don't expect a "revolution" in that sense.

Instead, issues of a more limited nature are raised, demands for changes are made, a sufficient number of students are temporarily activated, and some sort of change eventually results. Agitation of this sort toward eliminating institutional controls on the personal lives of students has been mounting steadily over the past five years or so. It has happened faster at some types of colleges than at others--specifically, faster at the independent and public institutions than at the church-related and career-oriented colleges. The general demand is for end to in loco parentis, leaving the students free to live the way they want to--to dress, wear beards, have sex, smoke pot, and the like, according to their own dictates. Judging from a survey of organized student protest we carried out last summer, protests over various dormitory and living group regulations occurred during the previous academic year at one third of all the accredited four-year colleges in the country; dress regulations were protested at one in five colleges.

While relaxation of in loco parentis in the colleges must seem incredibly slow to the student activists, from a five or six year perspective the shift seems to me quite remarkable. But then so is the rate of change in American life generally. Just six months ago I wrote about the coming confrontation between students and administrators over the use of marijuana. I now think that if there is going to be a confrontation at all, it will be between the students and civil authorities (and various "upright rightists"). The colleges, I think, can see the futility of trying to make rules about pot stick, and besides, there is new medical evidence that the stuff does no particular harm to the smoker. It won't be as easy for the public institutions to stand aside, however.

What about demands from the student anarchists for changes in academic affairs? Serious interest in education reform on the part of students in the radical Movement began to pick up only in the past two years or so. Their efforts to work within established structures, however, have seldom led to more than token gestures, for at least two reasons. First, the radicals have been less successful in mobilizing moderate students around educational issues; our survey data show this. Secondly, of course, the faculty can normally be counted on to resist most all demands for reforming instructional practices, course offerings, and so forth.

What the anarchist-inclined students have typically done, then, is to work outside the established structures to build so-called "parallel institutions"--the free universities and experimental colleges,

which currently operate on the edges of something like 60 to 70 colleges and universities. The Experimental College at San Francisco State is presently in its fourth year.

It is as important to understand that these students want to have a say in determining the nature of their academic experiences as it is to understand the specifics of what they want. Unless authority in academic planning is shared meaningfully with students, the anarchist five percent are not going to be happy.

This said, what kind of learning experiences do they want? As regards course content, they mainly want courses in which they can consider radical analyses of the country's and the world's great social problems, and courses in which they can consider themselves--existential psychotherapy, varieties of sexual response, Zen, encounter group of all sorts. When possible, they want opportunities for direct work in the real world--as in the ghetto. On campus they want intensely personalized classes that allow the students, through interacting with each other, always to learn about themselves as well as the content of the course; they want no ritualistic requirements such as required attendance, periodic examinations, and other appeals to presumed competitive motives; and they would prefer not to study within the confines of specialized disciplines. As Kenneth Keniston has noted, the young radicals are anti-academic, not anti-intellectual.

In sum, we have a small but growing segment of the national student body, comprised of both New Leftists and the nonpolitical hippies, which wants to replace the present university with something which makes for greater community, human freedom, and personal growth. You may say that the anarchy these kids want will mean disorder, violence, the jungle. Yet, to what extent have you found that when you remove controls from your students, responsible self-regulation ensues, not chaos? Or even if you could count on ethical behavior, you are likely to dismiss the whole Anarchist bag as totally impractical, given the complexities of our time and place. And you may be right.

Nonetheless, there currently is something of a revival of interest in Anarchist thought which, by the way, does not emphasize insurrection, throwing bombs, etc. A collection of anarchist writings entitled Patterns of Anarchy, edited by Krimmerman and Perry, was published not long ago. Paul Goodman's article that I've referred to was in the New York Times Magazine this summer (June 14). And finally, the autobiography of that classical anarchist-activist Prince Peter Kropotkin entitled Memoirs of a Revolutionist, originally published in 1899, has just been republished. I can see Kropotkin taking his place among the Movement's deities alongside Guevara and Marcuse. Kropotkin is described in my 1955 Britannica thusly:

"Kropotkin has a singularly gentle and attractive personality, and was much loved and respected in England. He desired the minimum of government, and the development of a system of human cooperation which should render government from above superfluous."

The Reformist Left

Under this heading I will touch rather briefly on a number of sources of pressure for more modest changes in the structure and function of American colleges and universities. Often these demanded changes represent further extensions in patterns of change that have been underway for a decade or longer, such as foundation interest in higher education, or the university's involvement in public service. Generally these reforms are not addressed to basic authority relationships on the campus, which was the chief burden in the previous section. The reformists on the Left--perhaps they can be called liberals--are usually satisfied with piecemeal changes; the New Anarchists, on the other hand, are not likely to be pacified until the bosses and the rules are gone.

The Foundations. With seemingly unlimited funds at their command, the great non-profit foundations in the country, as we all know, have now come to assume a position of very large influence on American higher education. The general thrust from the foundations has been increasingly progressive and activist, providing a variety of goads for colleges to break out of old molds and experiment with new ways of doing things. Ford gives money to the Columbia Students for a Reconstructed University and to the National Student Association's Student Power Program. Kettering allots thousands for studying Institutional Vitality. The Hazen Foundation assembles a prestigious committee and issues a report calling on the university to place the student at the center of its concerns. Danforth sponsors seminars on The Identity Crisis of Higher Education. The Esso Foundation underwrites a new journal called Change. A foundation wants to give a large sum to San Francisco State's Black Studies Institute.

Perhaps of greatest significance is Carnegie's Commission on Higher Education. Last month it issued its first report calling on the federal government, not to dole out money to all the country's colleges and universities, but to put money into the pockets of poor youths, and let them pick their college. The Kerr proposals appear to have a decent chance of becoming law; support for earlier plans for direct-aid-to-institutions seems to have died, and Carnegie president Pifer has become Nixon's chief education priority-setter. (Or if the Kerr proposals are not enacted into law under Nixon, the chances ought to be better

under Edward Kennedy and a more populist political climate.) At any rate, in the event the Carnegie recommendations become public policy, I for one would fear for the survival of those colleges that fail to develop programs that meet the needs of this new kind of college student. And we are only just beginning to hear from the Carnegie Commission, which has three more years to run.

One begins to appreciate the immense foundation influence, which tends to operate not so much in direct ways on individual colleges, in the way that student and faculty groups press demands, but through the sweet reason contained in research reports, annual reports, presidential speeches to educational associations, and the like. When, for example, McGeorge Bundy tells the colleges to be more venturesome in investing their endowment, they will. The "foundation will" so to speak, slides almost unawares into the mind of the academic planner, greased perhaps by the latter's vision of all that money.

Students Right now it is chiefly the black students (with many white sympathizers) who are making demands--demands which seem rather limited in view of the total work of the institutions involved, but demands which are being pressed in a most abrasive, impolite way. The black militants, it seems to me, have got their colleges buffaloed. The problem is that they (the blacks) are not playing by the rules we (white administrators) are accustomed to. They make demands that are non-negotiable (or so it happened at San Francisco State). What does one do in the face of such demands? Generally you fall back on your rules; you appoint a committee or call for a study, and hope that time will take care of things. But before long, playing by their rules, the blacks have got you locked in your office, or have burned a building, called for a strike, or whatever. And a full-scale confrontation is on.

Black activism in behalf of programs of black studies and more black students and faculty, according to our survey this summer, occurred at 18 percent of all the institutions in the sample, and at 41 percent of the independent universities and 38 percent of the public universities in the sample. And there appears to be little let-up this year. It is ironic that it is on the college campus, the presumed home of rational people, that race relations in America presently seem most nearly bankrupt. I wish I could better understand how militant black separatism on the campus is going to lead to a time of real racial harmony in the U.S.A.

Besides the black activists, almost every college today has a contingent of reform-minded white student activists. Often

they are elected student leaders; frequently they work on the campus newspaper; generally they identify with the NSA. They are articulate, polite and relatively disinclined to long hair and pot. They are popular and respected by their fellow students. We call them responsible and moderate because the kinds of demands they make usually don't seriously threaten our positions of authority and can usually be met in piecemeal fashion.

The demands of these student reformers, however, are both intensifying and expanding into areas hitherto the exclusive provinces of other constituent groups. They speak with increasing firmness about student power, meaning they intend to be taken seriously, seriously enough to be included in the total decision-making structure at the college. Not just in decisions about student life outside the classroom, which students at most colleges by now at least <u>think</u> they control. Students are and will be seeking some share of the authority in such <u>academic</u> matters as: creating and eliminating courses, grading practices, examinations policies and practices, assessing faculty teaching competence toward pay increases and tenure, selecting new faculty, establishing degree standards, establishing admission standards, selecting a new president. According to our survey, during the academic year 1967-68 there were organized protests about poor quality of instruction on 13 percent of the campuses; over systems of testing and grading at 12 percent of the colleges and about curriculum inflexibility at 15 percent of the institutions in the sample. Protests aimed at a larger student role in campus governance were reported at 27 percent of the colleges, contrasted with a 19 percent figure from a comparable survey in 1965.

Depending on whether or not the country is at war in Vietnam or somewhere else in the coming months, we may expect a continuation of student demands, chiefly from the Students for a Democratic Society, that the university end its "complicity" with the war effort. There will be harrassment of military and war-related industrial recruiters. There will be "exposes" of classified defense research projects at the campus. Last year there were demonstrations against military recruiters on one in four of all the campuses, with the figure rising to over 40 percent at the independent and public universities. Harrassment of recruiters from firms like Dow and CIA were reported at one in five colleges overall, and at more than half of the independent and public universities. So let's all try to get the war ended.

<u>Faculty</u>.What about the faculty? There must indeed be a radical faculty, since Professor Kampf is delivering of himself on that topic in one of the adjoining rooms. I'd say there may even be a few anarchist professors, in the nonviolent sense that

I'm using that word, perhaps at the several small widely respected "progressive" colleges around the country that operate on near-anarchist principles.

Last spring we heard of the establishment of the New Universities Conference (NUC), a league of young radical professors-mainly alumni of SDS, which was to serve as a base from which radical faculty and graduate students could critique the role of the university in American society, press for educational reforms, and promote their own job security. Is NUC still alive, or have its once-idealist members been lured into the kind of academic careerism that predisposes so many professors from any kind of concern for the welfare of their institution as a whole?

What about the AAUP? With its 1125 chapters and traditional concern for academic freedom, tenure and decent salaries--all of which is now pretty standard in all but the most backward colleges, much to the credit of AAUP--does the Association now exist mainly as a kind of benign presence within the higher education establishment? In fact, there are signs of new forms of life from this august body. Not unexpectedly, AAUP has become interested in extending faculty participation in campus governance. It is my understanding that AAUP has funded a man over the past several years to develop a system for rating colleges in terms of amount of faculty participation. The idea is then to publish these ratings in a way similar to the faculty salary ratings. Some of the implications of a move along these lines are obvious and rather interesting, not the least of which is the likelihood of some lively confrontations when AAUP-spurred Faculty Power pits itself against SDS, BSU and NSA spurred Student Power. (Bear in mind that AAUP dogma has it that the faculty must have primary authority for basic academic decisions at the college.)

Also, as most of you know, the AAUP has come around to supporting the principle of collective bargaining, and at its annual meeting last spring took the position that faculty strikes may be necessary, as a last resort. This brings us around to the AFT.

The San Francisco State chapter of the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO), as you may know from the newspapers, has emerged from the battles on that campus smelling like a rose. It was largely through the union apparatus in San Francisco that a "renowned" mediator was brought in and the State College trustees agreed to talks with the various other parties to the dispute. During the escalation of hostilities the membership of the SFS chapter grew like never before; as every good radical now knows, a good confrontation politicizes people,

faculty as well as students.

The AFT has chapters at some 110 colleges around the country, about half of which are public junior colleges. AFT locals tend to be found in urban areas where they can be in touch with the broader AFL-CIO bureaucracy (which helped get the campus locals started in the first place). Also the AFT manages to have networks of chapters working in fairly close coordination, most notably in New York City and in the State of California. Thus AFT strike threats at a half dozen other California state colleges added to the pressure on Reagan and the trustees to begin talks at San Francisco.

Typically, college AFT locals have been chiefly interested in obtaining a position to bargain with college administrators and trustees, "to negotiate a binding agreement" regarding salary and other working conditions. Such collective bargaining agreements have been negotiated at about a dozen two-year community colleges, several coming after strikes. The union seems destined to achieve bargaining status in the fairly near future in both the California State College and the City University of New York systems. These would be real milestones, especially if the unions succeed in winning substantial pay increases.

Although the SFS local has reiterated its concern for the student demands, and you hear lip service given to educational reform, it seems to me the main interest of the teacher unionists is to get theirs--better pay, fewer teaching hours, more time for research, etc. I wish this judgment were unfair.

Faculty radicalism, of course, gets expressed in other, less organized ways. There are almost always active faculty supporters of student protests; most of these faculty would themselves be recent graduate student activists.

Finally, and you may be less aware of this, there are young Turk radicals, especially in the social sciences at the large universities, who are giving the older men in their departments and professional associations fits about what their discipline should be all about. The new men want to make their professional work--their teaching, researching, writing--relevant to the great problems of the day, instead of reworking the great theories of the past, the "permanent" truths, or whatever it is the older generation of academics is occupied with.

Trustees. Last but not least there are the college and university trustees around the country about whom there are stereotypes aplenty, but almost no "hard data," as they say. And does it make any difference: do trustees for the most part merely rubber-stamp their administrators? For the most part, that is

what they do. I say this on the basis of a survey of over 5000 trustees conducted last spring by Rodney Hartnett, my colleague at ETS. His report is due early next month. To what extent can we expect college trustees, if not to press for changes themselves, to at least support others in their demands for reforms? Let me give you some of Hartnett's data from which you can draw your own conclusions: 16 percent of the trustees regard themselves as "Liberal" rather than "Moderate" or "Conservative"; 11 percent said they are both "Liberal" and "Democrat" (rather than "Republican"); 16 percent said their views are "very similar" to those of Nelson Rockefeller; 12 percent reported views "very similar" to Eugene McCarthy; to the late Martin Luther King, 7 percent; to both John Kenneth Galbraith and the late Robert Kennedy, 6 percent; and to the late Norman Thomas, 2 percent.

So much for demands from the Left, with that word defined broadly enough to include pleas for abolition of traditional patterns of authority in higher education as well as pressures for more modest changes in structures, functions, and, yes, faculty salaries.

I will have less to say about the Right, mainly because, as I view the situation, sources on the Right are making relatively fewer demands, and the demands that are being heard from the Right are more in the nature of counter-demands, that is demands that the colleges stand firm against the pressures for change coming from the liberals and radicals.

The Nostalgic Right

My meaning for the word "nostalgia" is in part the same as Webster's; a yearning for return to some real or romanticized period or irrecoverable condition or setting in the past. I want, however, to extend the meaning of the word to include not just satisfaction with a bygone era but also satisfaction with the college in its present form. The first, the yearning for an older order, is to be found at institutions that have undergone change in the last twenty years or so; the second brand of nostalgia, which is really status quoism, would reside at colleges that have not changed appreciably in recent years. Manifestations of these two forms of nostalgia are probably about the same, and I'll not have anything more to say about the distinction between the two.

We're talking here, of course, principally about faculty members and a kind of collective sentiment which abides at almost every college (indeed, in almost any kind of enduring

organization). It can be seen at most faculty or department meetings--in the faces of men in their 50's and 60's who have devoted a lifetime to work in their field or to serving their college. It is when the college is considering some new program or function, i.e., an innovation, that the nostalgia surfaces, in whatever form--shock, outrage, disbelief, disgust, horror, stupefaction.

Only occasionally it seems to me, do conservative perspectives on higher education get expressed in public any more; they are just not fashionable these days, Jacques Barzun and George Kennan notwithstanding.

Let me, however, take a few moments to try to distill out the main themes of nostalgic rightism, of which I see three: (1) the functions of higher education (or of a given college) ought not to change, which usually means expand; (2) the process of higher education, that is, of teaching, ought not to change; and (3) student activists ought not to be taken seriously.

In response to demands from the liberals that the colleges and universities assume new functions, there is the counter demand that the university restrict itself to the ivory tower--to teaching or perhaps teaching and "scholarship" or "scholarly research". Barzun in his recent book The American University no doubt speaks for many faculty in the traditional academic fields when he denounces the university's increasing involvement in public service activities, likening, as he does, the modern university to a "public utility" and "a firehouse on the corner answering all the alarms". Barzun's judgment is that "The new functions it (the university) has taken on and the new methods it has improvised in a decade-and-a-half have torn apart the fabric of the former single-minded, easily defined university." Certainly the words of a purist.

In addition to "ivory-towerism," most individual colleges have their own particular traditions, adherence to which on the part of faculty serves to counteract various demands for change. Harold Hodgkinson has pointed out how what he calls the "myth of uniqueness," the belief among faculty that the college is in some way truly distinctive, can be an especially strong factor working against institutional reform.

Regarding the second theme, that of instructional process or method in higher education, Barzun's nostalgia rings loud and clear. His book is indeed an elegantly articulated proposal for turning the higher education clock back 20 years. He stoutly defends the lecture system -- properly, formally executed--and the master-pupil authority relationship in general. Barzun would also resist reforms in traditional course examination and

grading systems. In arguing for preservation of traditional instructional procedures, I would guess that Barzun speaks for a majority of faculty members in American colleges and universities; and here, it seems to me, lie the seeds for a real battle in the 1970's: reform-minded students standing against tradition-minded faculty--to settle on what will be learned and in what ways the learning will take place.

Finally, there is the nostalgic academic's longing for students who come to the college to study, not to get involved in radical politics, or to reform the campus, or to smoke pot, or whatever. Mature scholars tend to regard students as immature, certainly not mature enough to share authority with adults in determining academic policy and practice. Attendance at the college is considered a privilege; troublemakers should have the privilege revoked. Rational men also fault the student activists for their enthusiasm and emotionalism, their "transports of passion," in George Kennan's words. In his book Democracy and the Student Left, Kennan upholds such campus virtues as calm, detachment, order, and "good form." And last, proper academic men are affronted by the personal styles and manners of the student hippies and radicals--their beards, flowing hair, outlandish costumes, public impulsivity, poor hygiene habits, lack of proper respect for age, and so forth.

In talking about nostalgia, at least a few words must be said about the alumni, who came to love their college, as they knew it. How can they help but be disappointed on knowing the college plans to go coed, or abolish compulsory chapel, or join a consortium of colleges thus enabling sharing of faculty--one or all of which steps may be necessary if the college is to survive into the 1980's. No doubt a few college presidents, nostalgic themselves, are trying to stake the future of their nostalgia on the generosity of some number of nostalgic alumni. We should certainly wish them every success. Nicholas Von Hoffman in the October Atlantic quotes a member of the Harvard class of 1943:

> "Youth! Agito ergo sum! That's what they believe. Activist youth, short-sleeved shirts, open collars and closed minds; hobnailed boots and we shall overcome. All over the world it's the same, the same exhilaration of riding the wave of the future. These nineteen-year-olds need a good reaming."

Nostalgia, yes; but also hatred. Perhaps so strong as to preclude support for any enterprise intended for youth.

Group IX-12

The Upright Right

The far-right critics of higher education are first and foremost distinguished by their essential uprightness, their sense of strong moral rectitude, their strict regard for the right and the resolute. In contrast to many people across the land who are either uncertain about what is right and wrong or who are simply oblivious to common moral conventions, there is no doubt in the mind of the upright rightist about what is right, wrong, good, and bad. Among the "goods" are old-fashioned Christianity, patriotism, law and order, parental authority, free enterprise and low taxes. Among the "bads" are Communists and other similar people, black activists, permissive college presidents, high taxes, and sex.

But there is more to it than moral certitude. People on the far right seem also to be frightened by nearly every new idea and event on the socio-cultural scene, believing that the values that they know to be right are being corrupted. More so than most other people, their minds are closed, paralyzed; they are indisposed to even <u>considering</u> the validity of alternative beliefs and behaviors. In short, the upright right is also uptight.

How and where is pressure from the upright right finding expression these days? It is coming, of course, mainly from people and groups of people from off campus, especially from politicians, newspaper editors and writers, and patriotic organizations. Most college presidents, I'm sure, will also attest to sizeable reservoirs of uprightness among the parents of their students as well as among their alumni. Trustees? Again data from Hartnett: 22 percent regarded themselves as "Conservative," rather than "Moderate" or "Liberal;" 40 percent believed the administration should control the contents of the student newspaper, 69 percent believed all campus speakers should be screened, 53% supported loyalty oaths for faculty, and some 13 percent said their views are very similar to those of Ronald Reagan (less than 2 percent reported views like either George Wallace or Robert Welch).

To my knowledge, the far-right has no systematic programs for reconstructing higher education. Their demands are invariable counter-demands.

One recalls the events at Berkeley in late 1964 and the pressure put on Clark Kerr by the governor of the state, various state legislators, and the editor of the Oakland Tribune; two years later, on the heels of Reagan's election, Kerr was ousted.

More recently the Eldridge Cleaver affair has stirred many of the forces on the California far-right. The Regents of the University have censured the members of the newly created Board of Educational Development, under whose auspices Social Analysis 139X was set up, and they have also required that all plans for outside speakers who will speak more than once be cleared through President Hitch. Governor Reagan has proposed stricter controls on the authority of faculty to create new courses. The state legislature is reportedly becoming interested in defining or redefining academic freedom and its limits, including tenure provisions. Max Rafferty threatened every public school superintendent in the state, which would include the junior colleges, with loss of state aid, if Cleaver were ever allowed to speak on their campuses.

Elsewhere around the golden state, the events at San Francisco State College have been described by Governor Reagan as an "insurrection," going on to say that "organized society cannot back down without giving up our rights; as long as I am governor we will not give up our rights." Reagan and the State College trustees only with great reluctance have agreed to share authority with faculty and students in working out solutions for that battle-scarred college.

In San Diego, the American Legion and the (only) two conservative local newspapers have been calling for the ouster of New Left theorist Herbert Marcuse. Nameless others have threatened his life.

At California State, Fullerton, a controlled attendance presentation of the anti-Puritan play called "The Beard" touched off a furor that culminated in a hearing conducted in Fullerton by a committee from the State Senate. State College Chancellor Dumke has said "that a number of legislators have said flatly that they will not tolerate outrages to the public decency" and "we've had it freely said in California (that) if they're going to put on plays like 'The Beard' ...we just won't teach drama in the public institutions and more (and) if we're going to have assaults on accepted standards of public decency in our student publications... there won't be any more student publications."

Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty publicly charged that student demonstrations everywhere in California are being led by Communists, and he called for an investigation of radical student organizations by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Therewith a sampling of the working of the uptight-upright mind in one state. It is at work throughout the country, as

you well know. George Wallace, with his attacks on "pointy-headed professors," captured the deep south and ran shockingly well elsewhere. There is nothing particularly new in the thunder from the right. I imagine most college presidents accept it as one of the natural phenomena on the political landscape. It grows louder as the forces for change grow bolder.

One development that is new however, and which must be of immediate concern to college administrations, is the legislation that will deny federal financial assistance to any student "who has been convicted by any court of general jurisdiction" of a crime involving forceful disruption of a higher education institution. If I'm not mistaken, at least two states, Michigan and Ohio, have also passed laws having a similar intent. Can this sort of "reprisal legislation" be a portent of something rather more serious ahead?

Summary and Conclusions

In attempting an overview of demands being made on American colleges and universities by the political Left and Right, I have sorted the spectrum of competing parties into four categories which were labeled the Anarchist Left, the Reformist Left, the Nostalgic Right, and the Upright Right.

I used the word anarchist because I think it correctly describes the kind of socio-political order sought by the people in the radical Movement, or in what Theodore Roszak calls the "counter culture." These "New Anarchists," which include New Leftists, hippies, and others alienated from established authority, seek a revamped university in which the students, acting communally, can determine the nature of their educational and personal experiences. The counter culture appears to be expanding rapidly--out from the suburban centers, up to affluent style-conscious people in their 30's and 40's, and down into the teens and subteens.

Under the heading of Reformist Left, a number of rather disparate power blocks were considered, not all of which would themselves choose to be identified with the Left. Certain of the factions such as the black student groups and the AFT locals are making demands of a quite limited and self-interested nature, frequently employing disruptive tactics and other methods to which most academic professionals are unaccustomed. Reform-oriented student activists of all races, on the other hand, are and will continue to be pushing for reforms across a wide range of campus affairs--academic, nonacademic, and campus governmental. We will have to wait to see whether AAUP's move to further extend faculty

participation in campus governance proves to be creative and maybe even magnanimous, rather than an effort to counter the growing strength of students in academic affairs. The influence of the great foundations seems now to touch on almost all the work of the university, and it is felt at many levels, up to and including the federal government. The "foundation will," made known in civilized and convincing ways, is most certainly on the side of democratization and renewal throughout the higher education system.

The Nostalgic Right was said to be composed mainly of older professors, whose demands tend to be heard whenever the college is planning for an innovation. Their nostalgia for an earlier condition, often in the shape of an ivory tower, or their desire to maintain the present status quo typically takes the form of opposition (1) to new functions for the institution, (2) to reforming the educational (teaching) process, and (3) to giving students a meaningful voice in campus governance.

Finally, I depicted the Upright Right as spirited citizens and groups from off the campus--strong in moral certitude yet frightened that their values are being threatened--who can be counted on to demand that the college use all available means to preserve law and order, put down the revolutionaries and conspirators from the far-Left, guard the students from subversive ideas, and protect everybody from affronts to their "public decency."