

A PAMPHLET FROM THE SIXTIES

The following piece of writing was published in pamphlet form during the beginning of the Free Speech Movement, in 1964, in Berkeley. It was the sixth (and only remaining) pamphlet that the author had published in the two years preceding the Fall 1964 rebellion. Student politics had been increasing in intensity since its beginning in 1957, with the founding of a student political party named SLATE. This organization was the ground of two kinds of student politics - non-sectarian student politics and sectarian, or Marxist student politics. This pamphlet is an example of the non-sectarian sort. The two sorts of politics actually mingled for seven years, until 1964, when the rebellion which occurred saw a revision of history. The sectarian politicians won in what became a sort of competition. Since 1964, non-sectarian political viewpoints have had little chance of expression in effective actions; and more recently, it is taken completely for granted that Berkeley has always had a decidedly "left" cast or tendency. That is, since 1964 in Berkeley, it has been a standard kind of rendition of Berkeley history to say that most of the student political intellectuals were "obviously" leftists who have "joined in struggle with Marxists the world over to fight oppression." This pamphlet is an example of clearly non-Marxist rhetoric and argument. Its author sees it as "Yankee American Radicalism," his roots being in New England.

The pamphlet was republished in a book entitled "The Berkeley Student Revolt," by two leading political intellectuals in the U.S. - S.M. Lipsett and Sheldon Wolin. Lipsett has been associated with various academic institutions since the sixties, and is now at the Hoover Institute. Wolin is at Princeton and has recently published the political journal "democracy," in which he has called for political renewal in the U.S. During the sixties they were the sharpest of intellectual adversaries.

EDUCATION, REVOLUTIONS, AND CITADELS*

BY BRADFORD CLEAVELAND

It is the *revolutionary character* of the present American educational situation which is least mentioned. The following discussion attempts to define elements in American education that distinguish it as revolutionary and insists that there is a desperate need for recognizing it as such. Urgency in this matter proceeds from the fact that education, as never before in history, is becoming a political issue. Shifts in the alliance between education and authority have produced a variety of deep and politically explosive disputes in history, but never has education emerged in the political arena so ill-defined, confused, and with dimensions so immense as today in American

* Written and distributed in mimeographed form, September 1964.

life. While this occurs, the intellectual dialogue concerning education suffers from evasiveness; actions toward improvement are timid ploys for minute change. The primary source of responsibility for the chaos in American education is not the citizen but the intellectual. In the present world of revolution, there is an evasion by intellectuals of the one worthwhile revolution, the only "necessary revolution" . . . the revolution in education. Ironically, present American citizen support for education, albeit innocent and vulgarized, can be characterized as springing from a revolutionary proposition. Our attempt will focus on this matter first. Secondly, we will turn to a major cause of intellectual evasion of regarding education as revolution. Finally, we will examine one of the results of advancing education in a form contrary to education itself, by assessing that recent reality in American life so penetratingly labeled the "multiversity" by President Clark Kerr of the University of California.

Education As Revolution

There are two elements in American education that distinguish it as revolutionary. Both are contained in the proposition *state education for all*. The first of these two elements represents a revolution already accomplished. It is best expressed in the words of Alexander Meiklejohn:

From church to state! In three centuries we . . . have transferred from one of these institutions to the other the task of shaping the minds and characters of our youth. Do we realize what we have done? This is revolution. It is the most fundamental aspect of the social transformation which has brought us from the medieval to the modern world. As compared with it the changes in the gaining and holding of property, the making and enforcing of laws, even the expression in literature and art, are secondary and superficial. In the transition from the medieval to the modern form of human living I doubt if any other change is as significant as the substitution of political teaching for religious. We have changed our procedure for determining what kind of beings human beings shall be.¹

The second element is a recent revolutionary ideal. The noble character of that goal and the desire for its implementation has seen Americans place a deep public trust in educators and politicians. This ideal is best stated in the words of Robert Hutchins, in his book *Some Observations on American Education*:

¹ Meiklejohn's words are taken from his book *Education between Two Worlds*, Harper, 1942, page 4.

I have selected as the central theme of the book the question of whether it is possible to have true education in a country that insists on something called education for everybody. I believe it is. I believe the doctrine of education for all is America's greatest contribution to the theory and practice of democracy.²

The first element in American education which distinguishes it as revolutionary is, then, education by the state; the second, education for all. Unfortunately, it is not a truism to say that the proposition of state education for all contains two revolutionary goals, one accomplished and one recently undertaken. The truth of that proposition is neither obvious nor well-known. The accomplishment of transferring education from church to state is a revolution for the simple reason that the state, in spite of generations of counterclaims, became heir to moral education. In a way more profound and complex than readily acknowledged, the state is now the repository of morality. The notion of education for all is likewise revolutionary, having come into its present form as an ideal in American life after centuries of struggle in the West for man's liberation through freedom from ignorance. Even if we accept the qualification of education for all as meaning educational "opportunity" for all, the commitment is nonetheless to a revolutionary ideal. It is revolutionary because widespread education which is meaningful would include knowledge not only of principles of justice and the moral ambiguities inherent in political life, but knowledge of the uses and abuses of power, and this in turn would be inimical to the traditional uses of power. No state or political authority in the past has undertaken the task of educating its constituency in this sense. Past regimes have especially avoided any serious commitment to educating those who suffer most from the various dislocations which occur in a political order. But in the United States we have committed ourselves, in public policy, to educational opportunity for all; especially to those who are in greatest need!

As mentioned earlier, after centuries of struggle in Western tradition, it is possible to say that the American people have demonstrated their desire and willingness to use their wealth for supporting the proposition of education for all . . . which is to say education for themselves. If there is a consensus in modern American life, it must be said to rest in large part

² Hutchins' book *Some Observations on American Education*, was published by Cambridge University Press, 1956. His words are taken from the introduction to the book, page xiii. It is time for both Meiklejohn and Hutchins to receive credit for their heroic gestures in American life. Their lives have included long and impassioned efforts to persuade professional scholars and intelligent citizens to attend to the complexities of a qualitative assessment of higher education.

upon the matter of education: the citizens accept education as "necessary for survival." But the proposition of state education for all, as we shall see, has not proceeded in substance. It would seem that the revolutionary proposition of state education for all would arouse no small amount of enthusiasm in public men and educators. Such an enthusiasm would include the conviction that educational revolution calls for discussion which leads to action of a radical variety as opposed to mere reflection and occasional minor manipulations of the present system. In place of decisive action we seem to be continually submerging ourselves more deeply in "understanding"; we *know* that education is of radical importance for reworking our moral, political, and economic concepts, and in an all too casual manner we thoughtlessly proclaim that education is fundamental to the immediate revolutions in civil rights, unemployment, and automation.

Everyone knows a great deal, we all know which way we ought to go, but nobody is willing to move. If at last someone were to overcome the reflection within him and happened to act, then immediately thousands of reflections would form an outward obstacle. Only a proposal to reconsider a plan is greeted with enthusiasm; action is met with indolence. Some of the superior and self-satisfied find the enthusiasm of the man who tried to act ridiculous, others are envious because he made the beginning when, after all, they *knew* just as well as he did what should be done—but did not do it. Still others use the fact that someone has acted in order to produce numerous critical observations and give vent to a store of arguments, demonstrating how much more sensibly the thing could have been done; others, again, busy themselves guessing the outcome and, if possible, influencing events a little so as to favor their own hypothesis."³

Kierkegaard's words, though written in 1846, are devastatingly appropriate to large numbers of American intellectuals in mid-century American life. Rather than taking up the proposition of state education for all and using it as a means for concerning themselves with the world in revolution, they are permissive and indolent. For it is true that while intellectuals have abdicated discussion leading toward action by passively reflecting on the matter, politicians and high-level educators are using the proposition of state education for all as a political myth in the most noxious sense, while educational institutions themselves are undergoing a major transformation which is destructive of education itself.

* Soren Kierkegaard, *The Present Age*, Oxford, 1949, p. 60.

Education As Cold War

The notion we use to designate our contingencies on the level of generality is "Cold War." The ideological, economic, and technological revolutions which are occurring are placed in that general political context. Before we proceed to a description of what the Cold War is "doing to education," by turning to that citadel of training called the "multiversity," it will be necessary to meet a major objection to regarding education as revolution.

It is an objection which is said to emanate from the nature of the Cold War itself. That is, education in the humane sense is not possible during "war." But this is an objection which comes from a mistaken view of the Cold War. It is a view which places an excessive emphasis on the warlike aspects of the Cold War and consequently calls for an implacable expediency. The extensive national sacrifices, it might be said, demanded by the Cold War in the realm of education means sacrifice of serious and extended liberal learning in favor of extensive training for specialized excellence. Just as in all-out war, this will serve two vital functions. First, it will provide for national survival through weaponry, and long-range superiority in technology. Secondly, it will reduce the potentially schismatic and divisive effects which are always claimed as emanating from liberal learning. Consistent with this expedient of displacing learning with training is the use of political myth after the fashion of wartime propaganda. "Education for all" is such a myth, and its accoutrements are all of the rich symbols of Western civilized educational tradition. Vital parts of this tradition are notions of man's historic struggle for liberation through knowledge, freedom from ignorance, and the search for wisdom. In addition to the use of these inspiring notions from history, the state must adopt the pretense of benefactor of the fruits of learning for all; the doors of learning must appear as having been heroically thrown open to all citizens. This viewpoint is found in its deadliest form in reactionary American "political philosophers" who call for the extinction of liberal learning along with "liberalism." Conservative writers support them somewhat vaguely, and liberals stand resigned, in reflection, to the temporary postponement of learning.⁴

Lacking space, we will state only the essential points in retort. Generally, by placing the emphasis on the "war" aspect

⁴ Willmoore Kendall, Leo Strauss, and Eric Voegelin are leading reactionaries; conservative writers such as Russell Kirk and William Buckley appear regularly in the *National Review*. The liberals are entrenched en masse "inside" educational institutions and maintain a passive control from within while writing slick and evasive articles for numerous journals outside the academy.

of the Cold War, vital distinctions between demands placed upon intellectuals and educational institutions during all-out wars of massive violence are mistaken for the challenges facing us during a Cold War. The use of the concept of *détente* is an example in this confusion. *Détente*, in the context of the Cold War alone, is hardly capable of definition and is in continual dispute. The *real* *détente* came into being in the transformation of massive wars of violence into Cold War. It is blindness to ignore the fact that massive violence has been pervasively exchanged for ideological warfare. Moreover, economic and technological strife has also taken some of the burden away from mass murder and helped to make the predominating mode of violence not all-out war, but revolutions and counter-revolutions. The expected duration of the Cold War, as a factor in itself, should make us pause from the temptation of suspending liberal learning, for such suspension might, for all practical purposes, mean destruction of liberal learning.

On the level of ideological conflict, it would seem insane to engage in that conflict while destroying the source of our raw material: freedom of thought and intelligence. It is only through the massive application of liberal learning that the "freedom," for which we claim a monopoly, can exist. This is made clear by considering the mode of violence in the Cold War. Repeatedly, the United States is being forced into the role of counter-revolutionary power clothed in excessive moral pretensions. This is indeed new clothing: for it is true that we do not employ simple terror—the only means of extinguishing revolution—as traditionally used. We are using terror in the name of human freedom! Traditional counter-revolution, as ugly and villainous as it has been, has never seen the use of terror in such a grotesque manner. Confused citizens follow this grisly process through the press. It is a sad irony to hear intellectuals decrying an immoral press—"disinterested" intellectuals; some withdrawing into privatism, others gingerly snuggling up to the seats of power and venturing out after a little *Realpolitik* as "hardheaded realists."

During the Cold War the protagonists of education and intellectual honesty face a challenge which is immense: the challenge of discussion and action to bring authenticity into the revolutionary proposition of state education for all. It is a necessary revolution made essential by the nature of the Cold War itself. The Cold War is a "war" which is itself in dispute; it is a highly controversial and unique political situation because controversy as such has become a condition for survival. War *cannot* be declared, as it were. Nuclear stalemate itself has caused a diffusion of war into modes other than massive violence. The world political scene is so inundated by strife derived from moral, economic, and technological dimensions,

of the politics of modernity, that if the United States continues to pursue a foreign policy in which power alone is axiomatic, the result will be disastrous. If the United States continues to conduct counter-revolutions through terror in the name of freedom, we will establish only our own irrevocable barbarism. The controversial character of the Cold War, as distinct from wars of massive violence, is made poignant even on the floor of the U. S. Senate, where it is possible to solicit a public audience in opposition to the present policy of careening down a path of counter-revolution strewn with the mutilated populations of countries such as Korea and Vietnam. But the tragedy of the twentieth-century intellectual will not be his absence from the floor of the U. S. Senate, nor even his abstinence from genuine criticism in matters of public policy. The Cold War is a diffused conflict of long duration, and the main tragedy of the educator and intellectual will be their silence of "long duration" in the proximity of American youth in the colleges and universities where they not only wish to know about the problems of the Cold War, and terrific domestic problems, but wish as well to learn the art of thinking about them.

The Cold War détente from all-out war emerged abruptly and crystallized in American consciousness with the jolt of Sputnik. At that point, American education had nearly finished giving birth to the revolutionary proposition of education for all. Simultaneously, "Education for All" became one with "Survival," and closing missile gaps became the aim of education.

Nonetheless, characteristic of the distinction between World War and Cold War, the transformation from one to the other brought great relief to the American people. On the educational scene, the end of World War II saw the departure of hundreds of thousands of enlisted and officer military personnel from campuses. But temporary war buildings, dorms, and barracks began refilling rapidly with civilian youth who brought with them more than the simple pressure of numbers. The creation of massive technological training centers on the level of higher education, through the use of "education for all for survival of the human race" as a propaganda slogan, brought tremendous wealth to the academy. At the level of the college, or undergraduate learning, it spelled disaster.

Clark Kerr's Citadel of Training

The "multiversity" has arrived. More than a year has passed since it appeared in full regalia in the public spotlight. Since the Harvard Godkin Lectures of May 1963, by President Clark Kerr of the University of California, in which he defined the multiversity, there has been an almost deadening silence. Aside from a few flippant allusions to Berkeley as

the "L.A. of the intellect," or "Brave New World arrived," there has been no serious discussion. It is as though we must all postpone debate, and liberal learning as well, until the end of the Cold War, or until the arrival of some "new philosophy" from Providence, which will solve the contradictions of an American "democracy" which is opposing democratic revolutions within her own borders, and catastrophically losing counter-revolutions because of a pathological view of our "mission" in the world. The multiversity is the most recent arrival on the American scene to assert that attempts toward basic unities in social and political life are illegitimate. It is an institutional attempt to deny moral dimensions in politics, economics, and social life. Most important it has severed learning at its source: it has eradicated any semblance of education in the one area where we most expect it to reside—undergraduate learning.

The state of California appears to have undertaken, more nobly than any other state, the aim of education for all. At the present time, close to fifty per cent of the college-age youth in California enter some institution of higher education. The impressiveness of this figure is obliterated by the attrition rate: over fifty per cent. However, the California Master Plan for Higher Education (engineered into existence by Kerr) dominates the entire educational apparatus of the state. Due largely to Kerr and the Berkeley model of the multiversity, California has the most highly planned and rational system of education in the nation. Kerr, the former chancellor of the Berkeley campus of the eight-campus university system, is now a national power image in higher education. As a public system of higher education, the University of California surpasses all others in the illusive sphere of "prestige." It seems to surpass all others as a center of raw political power, second only to Harvard and competing only with Yale as a brain center for waging the Cold War; the Washington-Berkeley circuit, as the Ivy League-Washington circuit, is heavily trafficked. While Kerr's multiversity commands such attention, it has no substantial educational policy, and Kerr's position, as expressed in the Godkin Lectures, is a posture inimical to openly confronting the issues we have raised or the complexities of educational philosophy. To whom is Kerr responsible?

In answering this question all of the worst characteristics of what might be called the "bureaucratization of life" emerge. Is Kerr responsible to the state legislature, the governor, the people? All of these, but only by way of diffuse influence. He is actually the appointee of the traditional body of trustees, or Regents, as they are called in California. This body of men, almost wholly unknown to the public, are appointed by the governor for terms of sixteen years. They hold the power of the multiversity and determine the broadest dimensions of its

educational policy, or lack thereof. But on the other hand they have theoretically delegated the matter of educational policy two steps down in the bureaucracy, past the president and chancellors of the eight campuses, to the level of the faculty's so-called "Academic Senates." At this point the determination of educational policy remains an unused fiction.

Of the sixteen Regents who run the multiversity (eight more are ex-officio members), fifteen are men of enormous corporate wealth and power. They own major proportions of western United States interests in petroleum, mining, banking, the press, and transportation. There is one representative from organized labor. The one Regent "educator" is an ex-officio member of the board, Kerr himself.

Kerr, the most publicly "visible" of those who run the multiversity, considers himself a liberal. He has publicly joined with politicians and educators in the advocacy of the noble aim of educating the people. His public speeches, with those of other educators and politicians, have left a common understanding with the people of the state that the University of California not only provides opportunity for economic ascent, but that it provides something more fundamental and ennobling under the designation of education. An example is the annual Charter Day ceremony. All of the accoutrements of glory are present in this state-wide celebration: solemn music, processions, colorful robes, and impressive ritual. Attended by thousands of students, a well-polished public of celebrities, with major coverage by the press, the ceremony is elevating and beautiful. The speeches are confident gestures of power and rather traditional majesty. The over-all purpose of the ceremony is a mixture of exaltation of statesmen and education. The podium is always shared by Kerr with figures such as Stevenson, U Thant, Kennedy, and Dean Rusk. The University of California is placed in the widest context—the world—proudly portrayed as a vanguard of freedom of thought and intelligence, and is seen as playing a major role in continuation of the rich tradition of Western civilized education. Participants in such a ceremony are overwhelmed with the feeling that only scoffers and detractors of the worst sort would dare criticize such a university. But the routine life of the University of California is inimical to anything we know of Western educational tradition, whether it be English, German, or American.

The salient characteristic of the multiversity is massive production of specialized excellence. The multiversity is actually not an educational center but a highly efficient industry engaged in producing skilled individuals to meet the immediate needs of business or government. It is a foregone conclusion that graduate schools should perform this function to a large extent but by no means exclusively. Moreover, it is only pos-

sible to totally eradicate education by destroying its traditional bulwark: undergraduate learning.

Undergraduate learning at the multiversity, under Kerr's regime, has come to an impasse. It is best characterized by quoting a statement by Bertrand Russell: "We are faced with the paradox that education has become one of the chief obstacles of intelligence and freedom of thought."⁵

Below the level of formal power and responsibility (the Regents, president, and chancellors), the faculty itself is guilty of a massive and disastrous default. More concerned with their own increasingly affluent specialized careers, they have permitted an administrative process to displace, and become an obstruction to, extended thought and learning for the undergraduate. Professors have made a gift of the undergraduate learning situation to the bureaucrat.

The bureaucrats have destroyed education. To give this charge substance it is unnecessary to appeal either to the "empirical data of the social scientist," or to the "finished product" of the undergraduate college and the effects of this "product" on the culture and politics of American life. It is sufficient to describe the procedural core of the undergraduate experience and the peculiar context into which it fits in the multiversity.

The process is a four-year-long series of sharp staccatos: eight semesters, forty courses, one hundred twenty or more "units," ten to fifteen impersonal lectures *per week*, and one to three oversized discussion meetings per week led by poorly paid and unlearned graduate students. Approaching what might be of more substance: reading, writing, and examinations, the situation becomes absurd. Over a period of four years a student receives close to forty bibliographies, ranging in length from one to eight pages, is examined on more than one hundred occasions, and is expected to write from forty to seventy-five papers. Reading means "getting into" hundreds of books, most of which are dull secondary sources, in a superficial manner. Examination is commonly known as "regurgitation." Writing is plagiarized in many cases; otherwise it is poor and generally superficial. In the sciences, courses are excessively rigorous in competition with the "soft" humanities. This process is the very core of the undergraduate experience. It is applied by administrators in large part by the use of computers. It is extracted by professors through the coercion of grades.

If the facts of undergraduate existence were solely determined by such a procedural core, the "incipient revolt," to

⁵ The author is at a loss in not being able to find the source of this statement by Russell, having carried it as a part of his intellectual baggage for a number of years; certain, however, that it comes from one of Russell's terse monologues on education.

which Kerr himself irresponsibly alludes in the Godkin Lectures, would probably have already occurred.⁶ But the greatest advantage of the multiversity concept is its inclusiveness. For the undergraduate this means the panoply of pain relieving ingredients within the context of the multiversity, but "outside the classroom." In this respect the campus presents the student with a magnificent *panem et circenses*. Emanating from the student "government," special adjunctive bureaucracies such as Berkeley's Committee on Arts and Lectures, and added to by more intellectual offerings from departmental and special grants lecture series, comes a plethora of exciting and highly intense stimuli ranging from the highly entertaining to the highly intellectual. Films, debates, art exhibits, athletics, drama (light and tragic), spirit groups, recreation, seductions of hundreds of social groups; this pyrotechnical explosion of *Kultur* represents something terribly "other-directed"; happily away from the nauseousness of the procedural core.

Need we say that it is insane to expect learning to occur in this two-sided situation of forced procedural performance inundated by dazzling stimulation? Extended thought cannot occur; it is either obstructed or dissolved in the grand spectacle. There is a cynical objection that pretends to dispel this view. It is said that the undergraduate "who really desires an education" can acquire one. This is patently false. It is the highly intelligent and sensitive student who suffers most. He is painfully aware that *there is no time to think*, few places to think, and fewer students interested or capable of extended dialogue. The view that the best education occurs when the student is challenged does not apply to the multiversity. The student is not challenged by the profundities of Western thought, its weaknesses and polarities, its relation to action, and the exciting prospect of a lifetime search for wisdom. On rare occasions the student only gains a paltry and meager view of that enormous challenge; the access to such challenge is itself obstructed by the procedural core as applied in an absolutistic sense by administrators and professors, and the confusion and frustration of meeting that obstruction is deflected into the dazzling bread and circus. Opportunity for manipulation of the program by the "bright student" is nonexistent. The number of students in honors courses is negligible, enrollment in them does not relieve students of require-

⁶ "There is an incipient revolt of undergraduate students against the faculty; the revolt that used to be against the faculty in loco parentis is now against the faculty in absentia," from page 103 of *The Uses of the University* (Godkin Lectures in book form), Harvard, 1963. Kerr's comments on higher education throughout the book are made from the vantage point of a sort of Eichmann-like third party, or almost disinterested observer, as though the president was really nothing more than a bureaucrat-employee of the Regents. Or, as Kerr himself prefers to put it ". . . he is mostly a mediator." p. 36.

ments, and since they are negligible in number and ineffective as a means of getting around requirements, they are insignificant as hopeful exceptions in the general situation. Furthermore, this objection that education is possible "in spite of the system" attests to an attitude of far greater importance in the multiversity. There is a cancerous cynicism which regards honesty, simple inquiry, openness, and the ingenuous response as stupidity. In this atmosphere the notion of education for all is discarded as pedestrian and passe. The fact is that the multiversity *has* devised a curriculum and a context in which the ingenuity of even the superior student is defeated, and the multiversity *has* used the noble banner of education for all while cynically overthrowing education in the name of training for the contingencies of the Cold War. The sole response thus far to this kind of criticism of higher education and the multiversity has been that professors have modified their courses by becoming either more dazzling in the classroom and adding to the stimuli of the undergraduate, or by "tightening up" courses and becoming more rigorous, thereby worsening the situation.

It is unfortunate that most students depart from the multiversity without sufficient awareness of the distinction between education and training. In the multiversity, they are unlike the superior student who at least becomes aware (usually too late) of the deficiencies of the situation. The great majority are diverted from seriously confronting their situation by the bread and circus, and by the prospect of a clean, "high-paying" job after graduation. And somehow, as a part of this non-political role toward which they are headed, most of them think of themselves rather casually as "future leaders."

Conclusion

The catastrophic effect of the multiversity phenomenon on human learning is informed not by its peculiarity in American education, but by the fact that the Berkeley and Harvard-MIT scenes are two giants moving forward slowly in definition of the form and substance of American education. These two giants seem to be fixed in their paths, and it is little wonder that the "revolutionary character" of the present American educational situation is least mentioned. But there are shoddy seams in the present educational establishment that will soon threaten to burst from assaults from without. A giant wave of moral indignation does not appear far off. It threatens to make McCarthyism pale in significance; is already stirring in conservative journals. Is it conceivable that the assaults will be met with a great moral courage, dedicated through education to arousing an apathetic American people who ignore the terrible problems of racism, poverty, and automation-unemployment, in the name of privatism; a moral courage directed

at destruction of the studied cynicism of American students in their regard for American foreign policy? Or will those assaults be met with the willingness of liberals to abandon their heritage totally through passive reflection, "tragic" pessimism, and their own special brand of privatism which is *not* ignorant of massive social injustice?

Privatism and political primitivism in American life in general can be seen as deeply related to the evasion of implications which followed the transfer of education from church to state. This is no small matter and is doubled in importance by the public adoption of the goal of education for all. Only by the willingness of those in centers of education to open debate on this issue, an issue which cannot stop short of a fundamental confrontation of the polarities in American political philosophy; only by such a confrontation and forthright debate can the two forms of privatism be overcome in a humane fashion. The timidity of intellectuals in and around the academy on this matter betrays itself in the aggressive response of those same intellectuals to their academic departments, to foundations, and to the federal government, by the establishment of morally and politically "neutral" careers of great affluence in research enclaves or institutes.

Education as revolution is an imperative which must express itself first at the level of undergraduate learning. It is not for want of plans or logistical arrangements that this matter will be postponed further, but for lack of courage and the will to sacrifice indolent reflection based on excessive greed. For the "sacrifices" of the Cold War have not been sacrifices in the usual sense within the academy. They have meant great material gains; the sacrifice has been that of conscience. Consequently, change can only come from redeemed conscience. The will to retain and increase the authenticity of the American experiment in civilized living through freedom with order, must be created by instructors and professors within themselves, and by themselves to begin with. Refusal to do this means the alternative of waiting for the flames of reaction to lick at their feet. The only other possibility is that of the students arriving first, having been aroused from without, and shaming the academy into drastic changes.