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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the past several months, the world of education has been shaken by several incidents. These have occurred in both schools and the university. In New York City alone, we have witnessed the takeover of Columbia University by some of its students and the picketing of public junior high schools in ghetto areas by both parents and teachers, not in agreement but in opposition to each other. Columbus, Ohio where this is being written has not escaped incidents. The Black Student Union at Ohio State recently occupied the administration building of The Ohio State University while white students sat-in on a lower floor in support of the demands of the blacks. These events and similar others, too numerous to mention, cry for analysis.

How has professional education responded to these events? The answer to this question is clear - little or not at all. When educators have responded, it has been in a form that in one way or another manages to avoid the issues. Educators who call for an end to negative criticisms of the schools in order to save the public school system can hardly be expected to consider honestly ideas that threaten their
institutional lives. The foundations of education area might be the one that would be expected to meet the challenge we have indicated. However, the reality is that the so-called "foundations area," history, philosophy and sociology of education has done no better.

The preponderance of disciplined study in all three areas to the exclusion of social and political considerations has not gone entirely unnoticed by those in the foundations of education. One philosopher has commented on the failing of her colleagues.

It is clear that considerations of the social and political dimensions of education has not (with a few notable exceptions) attracted educational philosophers in recent years. Various as our orientations are, most of us seem to have agreed . . . on the necessity to turn our attention to the teacher's speech and action in the classroom, leaving to the behavioral scientists events in the public realm.

This indictment is as applicable to historians and sociologists of education as it is to philosophers.

In effect, this study is an attempt to respond to the social challenge facing contemporary education. It is an effort to understand that movement of young radicals in the sixties that is known as the "new left." In an attempt to clarify the position of the "new left," it will be compared to contemporary American liberalism, or what we have chosen to call the "old left."

---

1For a discussion of this type of thinking and who it was directed against, see: James Cass, "Moratorium on Criticism," Saturday Review, (July 20, 1968), 41.

This latter movement has its roots in the events of the thirties and its radical origins will be discussed in the second chapter. The "new left" will then be described in terms of its origins and developments and the two positions will then be compared according to the way that each views the contemporary situation. The result of this will hopefully provide descriptions of these two positions that will enable them to be distinguished from each other in a somewhat systematic fashion. This is the prime task of this study.

Once the general nature of the differences has been established, the role of the movements in the world of education will be discussed. This discussion will be geared toward providing an understanding of the events described in the opening paragraph of this chapter. Educators must try and understand the nature of the critical events taking place in contemporary education in order to make some meaningful response to the events.

In studying education in relation to radical movements, it is important to remember that American education, as American society in general, has been reticent to establish contacts of any kind with these movements. Thus the problem which we seek to illuminate, how education can respond to radical movements, has not heretofore been successfully resolved. The radicalism of the thirties, as we shall see, spawned an educational movement that was in basic agreement with the parent. But this does not mean that this educational movement gained a large number of adherents in the educational profession. This was not true. At no time did George S. Counts or his successors in the so-called
Reconstructionist school of educational philosophy gain a significant amount of support from the educational rank and file. Radicalism, itself, has not been impressive in the amount of support it has been able to command in the country at large, even in the eras when it has assumed some significance such as those that we will study. Educators, as a rule, have been even more reluctant to support radicals than the population at large.

There are several possible explanations for this tendency away from radicalism among educators. One is that public education in this society as in most societies reflects the society's norms rather than movements at the extremes. As a consequence, it will respond to social movements slower than the society as a whole in order to conserve this normative function. Another explanation is that as education becomes more and more bureaucratic, it develops values of its own as a system. It is likely, therefore, to ignore movements which try to combat bureaucratic, impersonal institutions. Thus, to expect teachers who function in a large bureaucracy to support movements that threaten their institutions is unrealistic.

We might respond to this discussion of education's relation to radical movements by asking a question that might be answered in the study. Is the radicalism of the sixties of an order similar to that of its predecessors and thus will it be ignored by education as the other movements; or is this really a "new" radicalism, and if so, is it different enough to offer the hope that education will respond?
CHAPTER II

THE OLD LEFT

In describing the old left both generally and in the light of its bearings on education, one must start before the nineteen thirties when the position of the old left became crystallized by the depression. Malcolm Cowley, speaking of Greenwich Village in the years prior to the first World War states: "It contained two types of revolt, the individual and the social - or the aesthetic and the political, or the revolt against puritanism and the revolt against capitalism - we might tag the two of them briefly as bohemianism and radicalism."\(^1\)

Cowley goes on to relate how the radicals, or those in revolt against social conditions, were effectively silenced by the war," and especially the Draft Law."\(^2\)

If we examine the post-war decade, we find the radicals still rather effectively silenced by the triumph of a series of Republican presidents: Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. Educational thought, especially, was replete with emphasis on individualism and the


\(^2\)Ibid.
cultivation of each child's personality. It seems that not only in education was this individualism, or in Cowley's words bohemianism, dominant.

Granville Hicks describes the abandonment of political action by writers in the twenties: "For the most part, literary and artistic people in the twenties were not directly interested in politics; they did not join parties, even the left-wing parties, and they did not get up on soap boxes. But almost without exception they were against the status quo, against the regimes of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover." What Hicks seems to be saying is that the situation of the twenties, from the point of view of the radical writer, was hopeless, and he had no choice but to withdraw to a criticism of the "business civilization on cultural and moral grounds."

If, we can consider the situation of educators as analogous to that of writers and liberals in general, we would expect to see the reform movement in education dominated by the bohemian or individualist strain, with the radical strain in some nascent state. Both Cremin and Bowers support this contention, seeing the decade of the twenties as the heyday of individualism in the progressive education movement.

---


5. Ibid., 83.

The advent of the great depression and the continuation and deepening of the depression exerted a profound influence on the course of liberal or reform thought. By the early thirties, most of those who would fit Cowley's designation of radicals would have agreed with Hicks: "In nineteen thirty-two it seemed clear to some of us that this business civilization that we had been belaboring on cultural and moral grounds had collapsed."^ The New Republic, one of the leading liberal journals of the day carried the following: "I want to suggest that the present depression may be nothing less than one of the turning points in our history, our first real crisis since the Civil War."^ If this was true, it provided the social radicals at least a greater chance for a hearing of their ideas than they could have expected in the prosperous twenties. It seems that the radicals sensed an obligation to try and do something about the contemporary situation. Hicks, speaking again of the writers, remarks: "now that civilization had come close to collapse, they could not pretend that it was no business of theirs."^9

The radicals sensed that the depression showed inherent weaknesses in the dominant capitalist society and they deemed it their duty to do something more than criticize the society. The time seemed

---

^Hicks, As We Saw the Thirties, 83.


^9Hicks, As We Saw the Thirties, 84.
ripe for a new emphasis on political action. It is this stress on political action to remedy the weaknesses of capitalism, which were laid bare by the great depression, that is designated in this study as the "old left." The main contention of the present chapter is that the ideas and orientation of the "old left" apply both to the more general arena of politics and letters, and also to the educational realm. Specifically, it will be argued that the educational doctrine of the nineteen thirties known usually as "social reconstructionism" was in direct relation to and, indeed, a component of the dominant liberal ideology of the thirties.

Let us examine the proposals of one of the leading exponents of social reconstructionism in educational thought, George S. Counts. An analysis of Counts' published writings should help to support our argument. But, before undertaking this explication, let us cite what some might call circumstantial evidence in support of our contention. The New Republic from the year nineteen thirty-one to the year nineteen thirty-eight, reveals three articles by Counts, two favorable reviews of books by Counts, and three mentions of the attempts by the Hearst papers to brand Counts a "red."\(^\text{10}\) This content seems to establish the fact that the name and ideas of George Counts would not be unfamiliar to the readers of this liberal journal which had, at the least, a flirtation and more likely an affair with more than liberal social ideas during the thirties.

\(^{10}\)The New Republic, LXV-LXXIII.
Portraits of Counts appeared in *Review of Reviews*, *Fortune*, and *Literary Digest*, giving support to the contention that Counts was known in more than just the so called "educational circles." The contention that the figure of Counts was somewhat controversial is supported by an article appearing in *Time* entitled "Unmentionable Counts,"\(^1\) and his inclusion as an important figure in *The American Mercury's* article entitled "Class War on the Campus."\(^2\) That Counts would be known at least as a liberal, and perhaps as a radical, to the readers of periodical literature is obvious.

Clearly, Counts was at least acquainted with, if not in closer contact with, some of the leading liberals and radicals of the day. Counts served on the American Historical Association's Commission on the Social Studies with notables in fields other than education like Merle Curti and Charles A. Beard. That Beard had more than a casual influence on and friendship with Counts is noted by John Childs, an educational colleague of Counts at Teacher's College.\(^3\) *The Social Frontier*, a journal of which Counts was the chief editor in its first two years of existence, had articles and reviews by Beard, Curti, Earl Browder, Sidney Hook, William Ogburn, Paul Douglas, Eric Goldman, Granville Hicks, Harold Laski, and Norman Thomas. Authors whose books

---

\(^1\) *Time*, XXVIII, (July, 1936), 66.  
were reviewed in the journal include Joseph Wood Krutch, George Herbert Mead, Lewis Mumford, Bertrand Russell, Norman Thomas, Rexford Tugwell, and Sinclair Lewis.\textsuperscript{14} That the general orientation of this periodical was at the least liberal, and sometimes to the left of liberal, might be deduced from articles such as "Property and Democracy," "Education, An Ally in the Workers' Struggle," "Our Revolutionary Tradition," "Class Struggle and the Democratic Way," and "Karl Marx and the American Teacher."\textsuperscript{15} Additional evidence of the liberal and radical tendencies of the magazine is offered in the types of advertisements that appeared. Periodicals that advertised for subscribers in \textit{The Social Frontier} included \textit{The New Republic}, \textit{The Nation}, \textit{The American Collectivist}, and \textit{Common Sense}. Advertisements also appeared for the American Federation of Teachers, the American Civil Liberties Union, and a summer school in Moscow, U.S.S.R.\textsuperscript{16}

That the ideas of Counts and \textit{The Social Frontier} were not limited to education is illustrated in the following editorial taken from the first issue of the magazine.

\textit{The Social Frontier} acknowledges allegiance to no narrow conception of education. While recognizing the school as society's central educational agency, it refuses to limit itself to a consideration of the work of this institution. On the contrary it includes within its field of interest all of those formative influences and agencies

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{The Social Frontier}, I \& II (1934-35 and 1935-36).

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Ibid.}
which serve to induct the individual - whether old or young - into the life and culture of the group. It regards education as an aspect of a culture in the process of evolution. It therefore has no desire to promote a restricted and narrow professionalism. Rather does it address itself to the task of considering the broad role of education in advancing the welfare and interests of the great masses of the people who do the work of society - those who labor on farms and ships and in the mines, shops, and factories of the world. 17

One of the associate editors of The Social Frontier described the magazine in a letter to the editors of The New Republic. "This new journal represents a crystallization of so called left-wing thinking upon social and economic matters within the educational profession, and it is hoped that . . . The Social Frontier will become a significant medium for the discussion of the larger bearings of education." 18

This evidence points to the fact that George S. Counts and the ideas expressed in The Social Frontier were in direct relation to the ideas of the leading liberals and radicals of the day. The following explication of the ideas of Counts will divide his thinking into his general critique of the existing society, and his proposed remedies to be enacted by the educational profession. His critique of contemporary society as exemplified in his works and his journal, "reflected how close [his] social philosophy was to the liberal ideology." 19

17 "Orientation," The Social Frontier, I, (September, 1934), 4-5.
on this relationship, the social philosophy of Counts as embodied in his critique of capitalist society will be viewed as typical of the social philosophy of the liberals of the nineteen thirties. In short, his social philosophy will be seen as that of the "old left." Let us now look at what makes up that philosophy.

Counts saw the depression as the significant indicator of something deeply wrong in America. He traced the blame for the depression to the capitalist economic system. Not only did the depression show capitalism as cruel and inhuman, it showed capitalism to be wasteful and inefficient. Thus Counts saw a moral and an economic problem in the capitalist system. First, a look at the moral problem. "In my opinion the moral decadence of the epoch . . . is the inevitable result of the operation of the capitalist system with its apotheosis of individualistic gain-seeking and its correlative tendency to maintain a general condition of economic instability and insecurity for the masses of people."20

For Counts, it was obvious that the age of individualism had to end. If it did not, the country was on the road to a complete moral decay. He saw individualism as appropriate for an earlier, more rural, and decentralized society; but he could not see any relationship between individualism and the new, urbanized, industrial society. Individualism was anachronistic and it had to be replaced by a philosophy more in keeping with the current economic conditions. "The growth of science

---

and technology has carried us into a new age where ignorance must be replaced by knowledge, competition by cooperation, trust in providence by careful planning, and private capitalism by some form of socialized economy.\textsuperscript{21} Science and technology had thrust the country out of an economy of abundance which has altered fundamentally the conditions of living and working. "... To fight over material goods of life in America today is sheer insanity."\textsuperscript{22}

The main point of the economic critique of capitalism was that there were more than enough material goods to support the entire population. To do otherwise and maintain a situation in which a few have and the many have not is unjust and unnecessary. The problem for Counts was how to change the existing economic arrangement. It was indeed seen by him as a problem for he deduced, and rightly so, that the members of the "have" group would not willingly give up their privileges. There would have to be some kind of power applied to the situation to alter it.

"America is the scene of an irreconcilable conflict between two opposing forces. On the one side is the democratic tradition inherited from the past; on the other is a system of economic arrangements which increasingly partakes of the nature of industrial feudalism."\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21}George S. Counts, \textit{Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?} (New York: The John Day Company, 1932), 48.
\item \textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 53.
\item \textsuperscript{23}Ibid., 45.
\end{itemize}
problem, then, was how to democratize the economy. Democracy was the ultimate value for Counts and the economy of the depression was undemocratic in nature. Counts saw democracy in a light different from those who advocated freedom and individualism. "At the heart of American democracy is a great ethical conception that can be traced back to the beginnings of recorded history - the conception of the fundamental equality, brotherhood, and moral worth of all men."^24 Democracy would not tolerate economic exploitation of one man by another. Each human being, by virtue of his existence, is entitled to something from others. "The ordinary man is not to be scorned or despised, he is to be respected and to be encouraged to grow to his full status."^25

Counts saw early American democracy as fundamentally economic. The problem now was how to recover that fundamental aspect of democracy. Counts proposed to do this by forging a popular will among the non-privileged classes in the existing economic arrangement that would force the economic aristocracy to relinquish its ill-gotten gains. He envisioned this being done at the polls through the democratic process. Answering those more radical than he who advocated revolutionary change he stated, "It is (my) uncompromising position . . . therefore that the method of peaceful change must be neither scorned nor abandoned, that

---


25Ibid., 20.
it offers the only reasonable hope for a tolerable future."26 Democracy must be brought to the economic sphere but through the orderly means of the democratic process. Counts believed that political democracy could be used to bring about economic democracy. "An informed, determined, and united popular will cannot be thwarted long at the polls."27

"If democracy is to survive in the United States, the American people, besides desiring it, will have to become familiar with its meaning and history, the conditions under which it arose, its changing fortunes and prospects, and the crisis which it faces today."28 Counts often alluded to an original democratic impulse which had been lost by Americans and had to be recovered if America was to survive. The masses must be made to give up their complacent attitude and recover the power that is rightly their's in the American system. They must acquaint themselves with the realities of industrial civilization and put into operation a program that will reflect these realities. Industrialism must be manipulated in a way advantageous to the masses of the people.

Counts was, at times, specific as to the makeup of a political program for the industrial age. In one of his works, he advocated a nine point program:

26 Ibid., 110.
27 Ibid., 67.
28 Ibid., 10.
First, the professed friends of democracy must have faith in political democracy; second, the ordinary citizen must obtain the knowledge necessary for a free man; third, the masses of the people must be organized as completely as possible; fourth, government must carry out popular mandates quickly and honestly; fifth, government must maintain a complete monopoly of the military and police power; sixth, civil liberties must be guaranteed to the entire population without fear or favor; seventh, all major campaigns of propaganda must be systematically and thoroughly exposed; eighth, the temper of the democratic process must be conserved and strengthened; and ninth, war must be avoided.  

In order to achieve the above nine points and to repudiate individualism as a philosophy, it was obvious to Counts that "the social control of large aggregations of capital is essential."  

Certainly, this was socialism in some form, and Counts was denounced by many, including the Hearst papers, as a "red." Answering the typical objections to his ideas - namely, that they would restrict an individual's freedom, Counts stated: "Freedom without a secure economic foundation is only a word: in our society it may be freedom to beg, steal, or starve."  

Freedom and all civil liberties were to be protected by breaking the hold of property ownership and introducing democracy into the economic realm. If this was accomplished, freedom would become real and not rhetorical.

Counts seemed to be calling on democracy to adhere to the definition of George Herbert Mead. Mead saw democracy as a social and
political system which had institutionalized the process of revolution. Mead meant "that a democratic society was one in which drastic changes, including changes in the forms and the rights of property . . . could all be made through peaceful means through the regularly established processes for making social reforms." Democracy was being called upon to cash in for all the people.

The foregoing discussion of the political ideas of Counts, though brief, gives some insight into the central tenets of his political and social philosophy. This philosophy placed him in the heart of the leftist movement of the nineteen thirties, what we have chosen to call the "old left." The kinds of ideological disputes that Counts faced with other factions of the left are illustrative of the diversity in the "old left." For example, Counts was considered too radical by liberals who supported the Roosevelt program. At other times, he was attacked by Communists and others more radical than himself for his devotion to peaceful and democratic means and his repudiation of violence. These attacks indicate some of the divisive issues among the left of the thirties including the communist issue; but more important for our purpose, they emphasize just how much Counts and other educational thinkers of his persuasion were involved in the liberal politics of the thirties.

To conclude this section, it should again be stated that the social and political ideas of George S. Counts were part and parcel of

---

The liberal movement of the thirties as summarized by John Dewey:

Liberalism has to gather itself together to formulate the ends to which it is devoted in terms of means that are relevant to the contemporary situation. The only form of enduring social organization that is now possible is one in which the new forces of productivity are cooperatively controlled and used in the interest of effective liberty and the cultural development of the individuals that constitute society.33

The educational thought of Counts follows logically from his social and political thought. As already noted, the remedy that Counts envisioned for the evils of the depression and capitalism was a resurgence of democracy. Obviously, one of the main forces that would develop and apply this remedy was education. That, for Counts, education has a social purpose is an indisputable fact. Speaking of Counts, Child's states: "He thought of education not as a 'mystical essence' developing by 'its own inner laws' but rather as a social function inescapably conditioned by factors of time, place, and culture, and of the school as one of the real determining forces in the course of social revolution." Counts himself describes the relationship of education and democracy in the following:

The contemporary struggle for democracy in the United States comes to focus in the field of organized education. While the defense and advance of democracy cannot be completely encompassed by education... education is fundamental to the entire process... If the American people are not able to direct this institution to the service of democracy, then clearly they can scarcely hope to oppose successfully the further advance of the aristocracy.35

34Childs, American Pragmatism..., 215.
35Counts, Prospects..., 290.
If Cowley's distinction between individual or bohemian revolt and social or radical revolt is recalled, it is apparent that Counts is encompassed by the latter category. There were many in education who tended to the individualist reform strain and it was against these "progressives" that Counts was to make one of his famous speeches. Before describing the speech, let us re-examine the individual and social-oriented groups among educators. Both of these groups could claim descendence from John Dewey; and both, indeed, did.

The individual, or child-centered movement in education, was at a high point of development in the twenties. Exponents of this orientation chose to emphasize the experimental and democratic strains in Dewey's thought and built upon these a school which concentrated on the individual development of each child. Counts, on the other hand, chose to emphasize the achievement by the school of a social purpose and the development of the students in accordance with that social purpose. That Dewey was critical of the individualist strain of educational reform is made apparent in his *Experience and Education*.\(^\text{36}\)

Childs speaks of the relationship of the ideas of Dewey and Counts and he argues that the commitment of Counts to a social purpose in education is fully in the Dewey tradition and that both agree on democracy as the foundational concept of education.\(^\text{37}\) Without belaboring the difference between the two, it seems in retrospect that the social

\(^{36}\text{John Dewey, *Experience and Education*}

\(^{37}\text{Childs, *American Pragmatism* . . ., 142, 170, 219.}
emphasis of Counts was more appropriate for the post-depression American society than an individualist orientation.

Counts' own critique of individualist education, or "progressive education" as it was known at that time, is embodied in his pamphlet: *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* He argues therein that the greatest weakness in progressive education was its lack of a theory of social welfare. Counts saw that this weakness, while it may have meant that progressive education had no formal position in the economic crisis of the day, did mean that this movement by not dealing at all with economics, was thereby in support of the existing capitalist system. To support the existing economic arrangement was undemocratic and unprogressive. Progressive education was dominated by upper middle class elements who could afford an emphasis on the child and nonemphasis on society. What was progressive education to do to correct its weaknesses?

If Progressive Education is to be genuinely progressive, it must emancipate itself from the influence of this class, face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish an organic relation with the community, develop a realistic and comprehensive theory of welfare, fashion a compelling and challenging vision of human destiny, and become less frightened than it is today at the bogies of imposition and indoctrination. In a word, Progressive Education cannot place its trust in a child-centered school.¹³⁹

³⁸Counts, *Dare the Schools...?*

As indicated above, Counts was well aware that education had neglected social emphasis in the past. He saw that the school at the time he was writing on Progressive Education was in the grip of conservative forces that encouraged a child-centered emphasis. Nor did he see this situation as atypical. He argued that education usually was subservient to the dominant forces in society. But he did not see this as evidence that the school could not become a progressive force in society and work against the dominant forces. But how is the school to become a progressive force?

Unless it reaches down into the substratum of society and taps the deep flowing currents of social life, it can only be another pedagogical experiment, of interest to the academician but destined for an early grave. The founding of a progressive educational movement is as difficult as the founding of a progressive political movement and for much the same reasons. If it is not rooted in some profound social movement or trend, it can be but an instrument of deception.

The Depression had exposed the undemocratic character of capitalism and the thirties provided the conditions for a social, political, and educational movement to restore economic democracy. Counts envisioned the teachers as the group in education who would work for democracy.

The teachers of the country should have a special interest in the future of democracy. Their derivation from the ranks of the people, their relatively


disinterested position in society, their freedom from the ties of large properties, their tradition of loyalty to the popular welfare, and their whole outlook on life, tend to identify them overwhelmingly with the fortunes of the democratic process. 42

The teachers were the group in education who would represent democracy and society as a whole. They would not represent only class interests, but rather the common interests of the people.

Counts was placing a heavy burden on the shoulders of teachers. He had no illusions about the ease of the task he proposed and he did not want teachers harboring illusions of easy victory.

Under certain conditions education may be as beneficial and as powerful as we are wont to think. But if it is to be so, teachers must abandon much of their easy optimism, subject the concept of education to the most rigorous scrutiny, and be prepared to deal much more fundamentally, realistically, and positively with the American social situation than has been their habit in the past. 43

Previous to the era of Counts, teachers had been dominated by what he called a "slave psychology," and if they were to accomplish the purposes stated above, this slave psychology had to be thrown off. 44

If they could throw off this burden, Counts could envision the teachers as the creators of a new vision of America, a vision in keeping with the goals of a true democracy. But the next question to ask is how? How are the teachers to seek the new vision and the truly democratic society? The answer of Counts to this question gets at the heart of his educational position.

42Counts, Prospects . . ., 292.
43Counts, Dare the Schools . . .?
44Ibid., 30.
The only way for the teachers to have any effect is for them to "deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest."\textsuperscript{45} And the way for teachers to effectively reach for power - the only way - is to organize.

If the teachers are to participate effectively in the shaping of educational policy and programs - the central thesis in the present argument - they will have to become thoroughly organized. In a world in which organization is the order of the day, in which all influential groups are organized, it would be the height of folly for individual teachers to attempt to shoulder the burdens of the profession.\textsuperscript{46}

That Counts saw organization as being of prime importance is clear in that he would not be satisfied with local organization or organization by teaching level.

The desired goal will not be reached, however, until the entire membership of the profession from kindergarten to university is gathered into one great body fully equipped to fight the battles of teachers and to represent education in the councils of community, state, and nation. As the process of organization goes forward financial resources should be accumulated, the art of publicity mastered, ability to deal with government officials and bodies acquired, and a procedure for handling all cases involving freedom and tenure developed.\textsuperscript{47}

Not only did Counts advocate this large organization of teachers, he also advocated this organization's becoming an integral part of a comprehensive organization of all the working people in the country.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{45}Ibid., 28.

\textsuperscript{46}Counts, Prospects . . . , 312.

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., 315.
What Counts was asking for was a huge, powerful teachers union that would become even more powerful by being part of a national federation of labor. That Counts was very serious in seeking power is obvious. This push for organization and power-seeking by the teaching profession was supported, both editorially and in the articles and reviews of The Social Frontier.

Some years before the depression, Counts made a study of the social backgrounds of school board members. He found that the upper classes, business, and professional men claimed a representation on boards of education far in excess of the percentage of the total population they composed. In effect, boards of education tended to support the status quo in society and to resist any attacks on it by the educators. Counts advocated teachers working to make ordinary citizens aware of their non-representation on boards of education. He also wanted teachers to encourage citizens who were not members of privileged classes to seek positions on the school board. Until such time as this occurred, Counts encouraged teachers to resist the attacks of minorities upon the school, which possibly might be communicated through the boards of education.

One way in which the dominance of privileged minorities could be combated was through the universalizing of secondary education.


50Counts, Prospects . . ., 308-09.
Counts saw this as a means of providing leaders in every class as well as a more informed populace. He also had a description that would fit all opponents of universal secondary education: "any individual or any class depending on special privilege of any sort for its position in society has good reason for fearing the further extension of secondary education; all others may look upon such change with equanimity."\textsuperscript{51}

As was shown in the section on Counts' political views, he often could provide detailed plans of the reforms he wanted. In his educational ideas, he also followed this course. He proposed eight areas of knowledge that should be provided in a public school. These included the nature of man, democracy, industrial civilization, structure of American society, and the social ideas and philosophies in existence at the time.\textsuperscript{52}

He also designed an eight-point program for the higher learning. This program stressed the removal of economic barriers to higher education, the declassing of the student body, the social implications of advanced studies, and the need for more concern with the contemporary problems of American civilization.\textsuperscript{53} Both of these programs are worthy


\textsuperscript{52}Counts, \textit{Prospects . . .}, 330.

\textsuperscript{53}Ibid., 339-44.
of study for the specific proposals embodied within the, and their illustration of Counts' tendency toward designing and proposing specific programs to solve issues, large and small.

Another issue which might well be the subject of further research but which can only be touched on briefly here is that of indoctrination. He viewed indoctrination as inevitable in the teaching situation and since this was so, it should be indoctrination in "democracy" and "social purposes" rather than indoctrination in the narrow interests of a minority group. These views earned for Counts the animosity of the individualistic, child centered wing of the progressive education movement which was appalled at the mention of the word "indoctrination."

The importance of the emphasis on indoctrination for this study lies in its illustration of a kind of pragmatic toughness on the part of Counts and other social-minded educators.

Having now recounted both the political and educational ideas of Counts, a summary is in order. As stated previously, it is the position in this study that Counts represents, as well as any one person could, the general position which has been described as the "old left" and the educational views of those who might be viewed as an educational "old left." Some of the characteristics which apply to both groups and which will be important in terms of later sections of this study are: the viewing of the economic factor as a key in social analysis, the political orientation of the old left and its emphasis on political solutions for social problems, the emphasis on organization and power as crucial in obtaining reform, the praise of
the working class, or common American, and faith in this class as a progressive social force, and the tendency of all groups in the "old left" to define themselves at least partially by their relationship to the Communist Party.\textsuperscript{54}

Let us now leave the "old left" and the thirties and examine the sixties and the movement known as the "new left."

\textsuperscript{54}For the relation of the Communist Party to leftist thought in the thirties see Rita Simon, ed. As We Saw the Thirties. Counts also was involved in the Communist issue, leading a drive to remove the Communists from the American Federation of Teachers. The relationship of the left with Communists will be shown later to be one of the main factors separating the new from the old left.
CHAPTER III

THE NEW LEFT - THE SETTING

The setting in which the "old left" flourished was a direct result of the depression of nineteen twenty-nine. This cataclysmic economic disaster was the spark that ignited the feverish activity of the radicals.

The setting in which the "new left" exists is the subject of this chapter. The "new left" has not been sparked by an economic crisis. The setting for the "new left" is, at least on the surface, more complex than that of its predecessor.

To identify the conditions that are responsible for a new radicalism, an attempt will be made to describe the country as those in the radical movement see it. An obvious way to accomplish this would be to use the words and thoughts of the members of the "new left." But such an approach is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. The reason for this difficulty lies in the fact that members of the "new left" are short on theoretical and comprehensive study - precisely what would be required to delineate a setting for America in the sixties. For this reason, the thinking of others must be utilized to describe the setting.
C. Wright Mills, Herbert Marcuse, and Paul Goodman are the sources of the description of America in the sixties. These three are recognized by members of the "new left" as, at least, allies if not members of the movement. Young radicals draw heavily upon the works of these men for help in analysis of the society which the young seek to change.

What is the nature of this society? Whether one calls it a "technological society," an "overdeveloped society," the "fourth epoch," or a "one-dimensional society," the meaning is similar. The society is characterized by a high degree of technological development and an increasing level of material affluence. The society is also characterized by a kind of drift in the non-material realm.

Mills summarizes well the dominance of the material realm in what he calls the "overdeveloped society." This is a society in which "the means of livelihood are so great that life is dominated by the struggle for status, based on the acquisition and maintenance of commodities. Here, the style of life is dominated by the standard of living." What this means is that America has allowed itself to become a slave to technological and material advancement. It has become a betrayer of its own ideals. There is a crisis in the life of American society. Part of this crisis exists because "the ideas of freedom and reason have become moot: . . . increased rationality may not be assumed

---

to make for increased freedom." The assumption is that American society and its ideals are characterized by a concern for freedom, reason, individual and social progress.

The conclusion is that America has sacrificed these concerns in return for a concentration on societal goals that can be conceived and achieved operationally. "What is the condition of a society whose 'goals' are not implicit in its activity, but have to be sought out by a Presidential Commission and imposed?" The type of society that needs to delineate goals in terms which can be measured has made itself a slave to the quantitative realm. It will allow itself to feed on the data of statisticians and tend to exclude the reflections of sensitive individuals and groups as not significant enough to merit consideration.

The majority of the published works of C. Wright Mills deal in one way or another with the crisis of Twentieth Century society. For Mills, the "history of modern society may most readily be understood as the story of the enlargement and the centralization of the means of power." The key to the enlargement of power is found in technological development. Technology breeds centralization. The type of organization that is amenable to technology and centralization is bureaucracy.

---


Mills describes the effects of centralization on American political institutions as follows:

The center of initiative and decision has shifted from the Congress to the executive; the executive branch of the state has not only expanded mightily but has come to be centralized and to use the very party which puts it into power. It has taken over more initiative in legislative matters not only by its veto but by its expert council and advice. Accordingly, it is in the executive chambers . . . that many conflicts of interest and contests of power have come to a head - rather than in the open areas of politics of an older style.5

What Mills sees in politics is increasing centralization and decreasing democracy.

The increase of centralization and decrease of democracy is prevalent not only in the political realm. Mills sees it taking place also in the business world and in the military. "The trend within the corporate world is toward larger financial units tied into intricate management networks far more centralized than is the case today."6

The result of this centralization is a decrease in democratic conditions. Mills argues that democratic conditions cannot exist:

So long as the private corporation remains as dominant and irresponsible as it is in national and international decisions . . . so long as the ascendancy of the military, in personnel and in ethos, is as dominant and politically irresponsible as it is . . . and certainly they cannot be brought about without filling the political vacuum that is now the key fact of U. S. politics.7

---

6Ibid., 123.
7Mills, Causes of World War Three, 199-200.
In other words, increased centralization equals decreased democratic control.

Before examining the nature of the bureaucratic form this centralized society takes, let us look at Mills' description of the elements of the centralized society. At the top of this society Mills sees a power elite who hold an enormous influence over every member of the society.

What I am asserting is that . . . a conjunction of historical circumstances has led to the use of an elite, who severally and collectively, now make such key decisions as are made; and that, given the enlargement and the centralization of the means of power now available, the decisions that they make and fail to make carry more consequences for more people than has ever been the case in the world history of mankind.8

Another characteristic of the power elite is that changes in the membership are often more formal than actual. What this means is that the power elite is composed of a political, economic, and military part and changes in position are usually from one part to another rather than a new entry into the higher circles by a member of the lower circles. Thus in politics, key posts are most often held by political outsiders. There is a "decline at the political top of men who are professional politicians in the simple, old-fashioned sense of being elected up the political hierarchy and experienced in politics."9 What has happened is the rise of the political outsider.

---

8Mills, Power Elite, 28.
9Ibid., 231.
What the power elite has accomplished in the political realm "is the decline of politics as genuine and public debate of alternative decisions."10 The power elite has achieved similar accomplishments in the world of business. The power elite has cut itself off from the lower levels of society and made itself into a large closed corporation with little if any checks on its activities.

With the situation at the top levels of centralized society such as described above, it is to the middle levels that we must look for some notion of countervailing or balancing forces. The classic American notions of checks and balances do not exist at the level of top decision-making, but at a more intermediate level in a way that makes this level ineffective in policy making. The middle level contains many of the groups that Americans have been taught to view as essential in key decisions. The legislature has been reduced to a position at the middle level while the executive assumes greater and greater power.

The executive supremacy means the relegation of the legislature to the middle levels of political power; it means the decline of the professional politician, for the major locale of the party politician is the legislature. It is also a prime indicator of the decline of the old balancing society. For - insofar as the old balancing society was not entirely automatic - it was the politician, as a specialist in balance and a broker of contending pressures, who adjusted the balances, reached compromises, and maintained the grand equilibrium . . . But now the

---

10 Ibid., 274.
professional politician of the old balancing society has been relegated to a position among those also present, often noisy, or troublesome, or helpful to the ascendant outsiders, but not holding the keys to decision.11

The fate of the legislature is that of many other groups which at one time existed as an independent movement. The farmers, small businessmen, and workers, all of whom at differing times spoke with a voice that was heard by the powerful men and the country, have gone the way of the legislature. What each of these movements has accomplished is to become a vested interest in the expanded corporation and state. Mills describes these groups as "established elements of the middle levels of balancing power, in which we may now observe all those strata and interests which in the course of American history have been defeated in their bids for top power, or have never made such bids."12

And what has happened to the old middle class, the group that provided the farmer and small businessman? Mills sees the old middle class as one that has been replaced by the new middle or white collar class. The white collar worker has no ties to his land or his business that might give him some measure of autonomy. Nor has he even experienced the brief day in the sun that the blue collar wage worker enjoyed. The white collar workers are paid a fixed salary and their allegiance is primarily to their corporation or government bureau. Rather than this class assuming the historic middle class role of a

11Ibid., 259.

12Mills, Causes . . ., 29.
vanguard of social change, they have become a rear-guard who are not coherent or united in any political way. "Their unionization, such as it is, is a unionization into the main drift and decline of labor organization, and serves to incorporate them as hangers on of the newest interest trying, unsuccessfully to invest itself in the state."13

The difference between the old middle class and the new middle class is characteristic of what Mills sees in the transition from an agrarian, small business society to an urban, mass society. "The entire shift from the rural world of the small entrepreneur to the urban society of the dependent employee has instituted the property conditions of alienation from product and processes of work."14 The type of work done by the white collar class has, for most employees, a less than pleasant quality. The kinds of jobs that are performed by white collar people, clerical and sales, give little room for fulfillment in the work. "For the white-collar masses, as for wage earners generally, work seems to serve neither God nor whatever they may experience as divine in themselves. In them there is no taut will-to-work, and few positive gratifications from their daily round."15

The new middle class has failed even to achieve a place at the middle, balancing levels of power which rhetorically serve to illustrate our democracy. The new middle class has joined the bottom levels of

13 Mills, Power Elite, 261.


15 Ibid., 219.
society in which "there has come into being a mass-like society in which voluntary associations . . . hold the keys to power." The new middle class has joined the wage worker and other of the lower strata in society. They all are part of the mass society at the lower level of power.

What is the nature of this mass society and its democracy? "Mass democracy means the struggle of powerful and large-scale interest groups and associations, which stand between the big decisions that are made by state, corporation, army, and the will of the individual citizen as a member of the public." Members of the mass society have little or no opportunity for their voices to be heard in discussion of issues crucial to them. They are seldom a party or even a spectator to honest debate over issues. More often, decisions are made by those at the top of the centralized society and then sold to the members of the mass society through the manipulative mass media. Mills describes the relationship between masses and the media: "For as publics become masses, masses sometimes become crowds; and, in crowds, the psychical rape by the mass media is supplemented up-close by the harsh and sudden harangue."

Mills gives a caustic interpretation of the role of public education as another mass medium. He sees a shift in the purpose of

---

16Mills, Power Elite, 28.
17Ibid., 307.
18Ibid., 309.
public education from the original intent of education for a knowledgeable citizen to education for a better job. The shift of educational emphasis from the political to the economic has resulted in education becoming largely vocational. "Insofar as its political task is concerned, in many schools, that has been reduced to a routine training of nationalistic loyalties." Politically, education has become another means of manipulation available to the modern elite. Mills chooses to deemphasize the fact that education has, in many cases, accomplished the task of economic betterment for the lower classes of society; but, from his perspective, the people may have given up too much in the nonmaterial realm for their material gains.

Having seen Mills' description of the three levels in society and the varying importance of the three, it seems appropriate to identify what he considers as the key element in the crisis facing the society. Speaking of bureaucracy, the form of organization that the centralized society takes, Mills argues that once bureaucratic perspective is fully adopted, "there is much less moral choice available." In this particular example, Mills is referring to the bureaucratic perspective invading the academic world. However, it is not difficult to apply the maxim that bureaucracy lessens moral choice to politics or business.

19Tbid., 317-18.
20Mills, Sociological Imagination, 117.
A centralized, bureaucratic society that substitutes material for all other rewards seems well on the way to a moral crisis. "A society that narrows the meaning of 'success' to the big money and in its terms condemns failure as the chief vice, raising money to the plane of absolute value, will produce the sharp operator and the shady deal. Blessed are the cynical, for only they have what it takes to succeed."\(^2\)

The key crisis in modern society is a moral crisis. Mills speaks often of the higher immorality, by which he means that while knowledge is available in abundance in the modern centralized society, there is an absence of creative and critical uses of knowledge. The cheerful robot is the result of this society. The man with an abundance of rationality but little reason.

If we analyze Marcuse's picture of a one dimensional society, we find an argument essentially in harmony with that of Mills, but with a different emphasis. He concentrates on the ability of modern society to contain criticism of itself. One dimensional society, by emphasizing concreteness, suppresses the historical dimension of past and future which could be a negation of the present society if not suppressed. Modern technological society, by stressing operational thinking, encourages people to accept the society as a given and work on ways to "improve" it. "Contemporary society seems to be capable of containing social change - qualitative change which would establish

\(^2\)Mills, Power Elite, 347.
essentially different institutions, a new direction of the productive process, new modes of human existence."22 As an example of effective containment of alternatives, Marcuse cites bipartisan policy efforts, stress on national purpose, the decline of pluralism, and the collusion of business and labor.

Marcuse sees the classic freedoms, thought, speech, and conscience as cancelled in one dimensional society. Their cancellation is caused by their being institutionalized in the society. "Once institutionalized, these rights and liberties shared the fate of the society of which they had become an integral part. The achievement cancels the premises."23 Perhaps a clear illustration of what Marcuse is thinking of would be that once civil liberties are institutionalized and institutionally protected by an organization such as an American Civil Liberties Union, individuals may well come to be more concerned with the protection rather than the exercise of civil liberties. Marcuse sees the classic freedoms as essentially critical ideas designed to replace an obsolescent culture with a more rational one. However, once freedoms are institutionalized in a society, the replacement process may be halted.

The main villain in the repression of freedoms and alternatives is, for Marcuse, technology. "Technical progress, extended to a whole system of domination and coordination, creates forms of life (and of

22Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), xii.

23Ibid., 1.
power) which appear to reconcile the forces opposing the system and to defeat or refute all protest in the name of the historical prospects of freedom from toil . . ."24 Marcuse agrees with Mills in arguing that technology, by stressing material achievement at the expense of achievement in non-material realms, is responsible for most of the problems faced in modern society. A stress on concreteness and material achievement surely is easier in a highly centralized social system, such as that described by Mills. Those at the top of the system have ample ways and means of impressing the material achievements of the society on the majority of the members inhabiting the lower levels of the system.

Goodman also presents a view of American society that seems in basic agreement with Mills and Marcuse. He speaks rather than of one dimensional society, or of the overdeveloped society, of the organized American system. He argues in ways similar to Marcuse that the system, even though it protects individuality and individual liberties, has invaded people's personalities. "For the system has sapped initiative and the confidence to make fundamental changes. It has sapped self-reliance and therefore has dried up the spontaneous imagination of ends and the capacity to invent ingenious expedients."25

One of the ways, and perhaps the chief way, that this has happened is by the idealization, on the part of the whole society, of

24Ibid., xii.
modern science. By setting science and technology up as gods, other non-scientific criteria of achievement are overlooked. So far in his analysis, Goodman seems to agree with Marcuse, but a large area of disagreement may be seen if we look at Goodman's ideas of what true science and technology should be. It will be recalled that Marcuse seemed to accept the present state of technology as appropriate for this era.

Goodman disagrees with this contention. He sees true science and technology as a positive force for change and improvement. "Science, the dialogue with the unknown, is itself one of the humanities; and technology, practical efficiency, is a part of moral philosophy." The problem is that scientific technology has become subject to the modern empty system of power. Science has been co-opted by business as usual. The prime weapon that the system of power uses to dehumanize science is the doctrine that science is morally or value-wise autonomous and neutral. When scientists allow themselves to become involved in a corporate style of research in which they apply for research funds which, if granted, are usually for the solution of operational problems; they have abandoned humanistic, moral science in favor of the practical, bureaucratic alternative. "What is striking is that the doctrine of pure science and its moral neutrality always comes to the fore when scientists are assigned an official status and become salaried or subsidized, as in the German universities in the nineteenth century or

In America today. In the name of autonomy and neutrality, science has allowed itself to become governed by the principle of efficiency, and allowed itself to be placed under political, military, and economic control.

If science were able to free itself of the external controls that now weigh heavily on its development, the direction of scientific advancement would be significantly effected. "Working by its own morale, scientific technology should by now have simplified life rather than complicated it, emptied the environment rather than cluttered it, and educated an inventive and skillful generation rather than a conformist and inept one." If this improvement is to be accomplished, technology must come to be judged in terms of moral criteria appropriate to it as a humanity. Some of these criteria, as Goodman sees them are: utility, efficiency, comprehensibility, repairability, flexibility, amenity, relevance, and modesty.

A concrete suggestion, made by Goodman, that would provide at least an initial step in the freeing of science from external control would be the decentralization of research support. "At present as public policy - if only to increase the general cultivation - I would decentralize subsidies for science as widely as possible rather than, as we do, letting the money go to a few managers."

---
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The prostitution of science that Goodman describes so well is a theme that Mills applies to the realm of social science. A significant part of his *The Sociological Imagination* is devoted to tracing the external controls that modern society has placed on social scientists. He describes a style of research which he labels as "abstracted empiricism," in which the researcher chooses to treat subjects that have significance only insofar as they reinforce the *status quo* by manipulating individuals to conform to it. Mills sees abstracted empiricism as a bureaucratic development undertaken in alliance with the dominant social forces. Speaking of social science, he states: "I want to make it clear in order to reveal the political meaning of the bureaucratic ethos. Its use has mainly been in and for non-democratic areas of society - a military establishment, an advertising agency, an administrative division of government." Mills argues that the way for the social scientist to reassert his control in research is to regain control of the means of support and dissemination.

The problem seems similar in the sciences and social sciences. Mills and Goodman both offer solutions the nature of which we have hinted at previously. The pressing problem seems to be how to foster group action on the kinds of problems that are of central concern to these critics? The discussions of Mills, Marcuse, and Goodman of contemporary society agree that something is wrong, radically wrong. Goodman and Mills seem to offer a road out. But, as we shall see shortly, they do not consider it an easy way. Marcuse is perhaps the

---

most pessimistic of the three. He seems to see the present crisis of
society as an inherent attribute of the society and change, if it is
to come at all, must come in almost a cataclysmic way. Before
turning to a comparison of the way each of these three critics sees
change coming to society, an examination of the nature of the process
of social change and how it has operated in this country in the past
three or four decades is in order.

What are the possibilities, having described the structure of
modern society and the key element in its crisis, to change the situa­
tion? Mills devotes a great deal of his work to just these problems.
He sees the groups who are responsible for criticism of the existing
situation as those on the Left. For Mills, simply, the Right means
celebration of the existing society while the Left means criticism of
it. The Left is charged with criticizing and providing alternatives
to the existing social arrangement.

"These criticisms, demands, theories, programmes are guided
morally by the humanist and secular ideals of Western Civilization -
above all, reason and freedom and justice. To be 'Left' means to connect
up cultural with political criticism, and both with demands and
programs."32 The Left is the group to provide the society with
knowledge of its immorality.

One of the significant occurrences in contemporary American
society for Mills is the "decline of a left," or the decline of

---

liberalism. The decline of a left opposition has taken America from the decade of the thirties, which Mills calls a political decade; to the decade of the sixties in which politics is controlled by political outsiders. The essential reason that Mills sees the thirties as political, is that during that decade the power of business was contested, though not replaced, and supplemented. In the thirties, business was one of many power groups competing within a structure that was run by political men, not economic or military men who turned to politics. Groups that competed for power with big business included the farm and labor groups. All the competing groups existed in a structure in which decisions were made in a political manner. "These groups pressured, and in pressuring against one another and against the governmental and party system, they helped to shape it. But it could not be said that any of them for any considerable length of time used that government unilaterally as their instrument."33

The situation in the sixties, as described previously, is one that has reduced the competition for power within the political structure to the middle levels of power and has increased the use of arbitrariness of power at the top level. Mills sees several factors as important in explaining this change. All have to do with the decline of groups who were once on the left.

Organized labor was a new and important political force during the thirties. "For a brief time, it seemed that labor would become a

power-bloc independent of corporation and state but operating upon and against them."\(^{34}\) However this hope was not to be fulfilled and the reason, as Mills sees it, is that labor came to be dependent on the governmental system and thus lost their voice in major national decisions, becoming an interest vested in the state existing at the middle level of power. "The United States now has no labor leaders who carry any weight or consequence in decisions of importance to the political outsiders now in charge of the visible government."\(^{35}\)

The fate of the labor movement has been shared by other liberal groups. Liberalism, once it became institutionalized in the New Deal and later periods, lost its vitality. "The post war years of liberalism-in-power devitalized independent liberal groups, drying up the grass roots, making older leaders dependent upon the federal center and not training new leaders round the country."\(^{36}\) The New Deal incorporated liberalism within the framework of an existing party and the liberal coalition within that party quickly fell apart as far as liberal ideas are concerned. "Moreover, the New Deal used up the heritage of liberal ideas, made them banal as it put them into law; turned liberalism into a set of administrative routines to defend rather than a program to fight for."\(^{37}\)

\(^{34}\)Ibid., 262.

\(^{35}\)Ibid.

\(^{36}\)Ibid., 333-34.

\(^{37}\)Ibid., 334.
As liberalism becomes institutionalized and forced to defend itself, it loses the attacking and striving for change qualities that are characteristic of a genuine left movement. The McCarthy attacks of the fifties transferred the liberals to the defensive, made them defenders rather than attackers of the status quo. The result of all these developments is that Mills sees in the America of the late fifties a complete void where the Left once existed. "In our time there is no Left establishment anywhere that is truly international and insurgent - and at the same time, consequential." The liberals had even dreamed up a slogan to justify their reversion to a defensive role, they called the era in which they became proponents of the status quo, the "end of ideology."

Briefly, the end of ideology thesis is that in the modern society, the problems that remain to be solved are not susceptible to solutions grounded in ideological programs. The solutions are basically ones of maneuvering within the existing political system. Mills sees this movement as the ultimate development in the decline of liberalism and the decline of politics. "The end-of-ideology is a slogan of complacency, circulating among the prematurely middle-aged, centered in the present, and in the rich Western societies." This movement represents for Mills the default, especially by the intellectuals who propounded it, of the tradition of serious political reflection looking for solutions to the problems of the world.

---


Mills hits hard in his indictment of the end-of-ideology proponents and of liberalism in general at the group which bears heavy responsibility for these developments, the intellectuals. Mills describes the fate of the intellectuals from the thirties forward in terms that are similar to those he used to describe the development of labor.

In the thirties many American intellectuals made believe that they were revolutionaries. Came World War II, and rather suddenly they became patriots. To be sure, at this decisive turn in the history of American life and thought, they did grumble a bit, in a literary way, but, it was a grumbling about a society with which in actual practice they were well satisfied. Now, after the War, they have come to celebrate this society, but in reality they know very little about it, and they are not trying very hard to find out.\textsuperscript{40}

Mills is exceptionally scathing when viewing the plight of the intellectual because this is the group of which he is a part and which should be the catalyst of further change.

One of the reasons that the intellectuals have become an ineffective opposition to the status quo is that they have lost control of their means of communication. The means of communication have been expropriated from the intellectual. "The material basis of his initiative and intellectual freedom is no longer in his hands. Some intellectuals feel these processes in their work. They know more than they say and they are powerless and afraid."

\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Ibid.}, 223.

Another reason that partially explains the ineffectiveness of the intellectual is his reliance on his medium, namely, the word. He visualizes solutions of problems in terms of his medium and he tends to overlook or underplay the coercive power that is present in political decisions. His mind is involved with generalities such as justice and freedom and his model for solution of controversy is rationality rather than skilled violence or devious rhetoric. In some sense, he is blind to very real controversy that does not occur in ways easily understood by him. "The results of the writer's position, his work and its effects, are quite convenient for the working politician, for they generally serve to cover the nature of his struggles and decisions with ethically elaborated disguises."\(^{42}\)

These faults within the intellectual's make-up are not inevitable for Mills. In fact, their repairability constitute his greatest hope for reform in the future. Philosophies such as the end-of-ideology that provide a defense for the abdication of the intellectual of his role as critic are going. "The end-of-ideology is on the way out because it stands for the refusal to work out an explicit political philosophy. And alert men everywhere today do feel the need of such a philosophy. What we should do is to continue directly to confront this need."\(^{43}\)

\(^{42}\)Ibid., 304.

\(^{43}\)Ibid., 251.
The "we" of the last sentence includes for Mills, all the young and alive intellectuals whom he sees as those who will form a new Left. These will accomplish the liberation of knowledge and intellect from the shackles of irrelevance. "Knowledge and intellectual practice must be made directly relevant to the human need of the troubled person of the twentieth century, and to the social practices of the citizen."\(^{44}\)

Specifically for Mills, the members of modern society most apt to make knowledge relevant to human needs are young students and professors. These are prospective members of a "new Left" that will constitute the radical change agency of the sixties.

Goodman agrees with Mills in citing the young intellectuals as the group that may well be the social change agency. Goodman places particular importance on the prospects of an awakening on the part of university students. He hopes that they are becoming and will become aware of the historical role of the university. "The University is the bearer of our ancient culture, of pure science, of the universal community of mankind, of the disputation of the Middle Ages, the scholarship of the Renaissance, and the critical spirit of the Enlightenment."\(^{45}\) The university has allowed itself to become a granter of paper certificates and a step to an executive job. The students are the ones who hopefully will return the university to its classic purposes. Not only is Goodman hopeful that a student movement will arise, he sees it, in fact, occurring.


"The essence of the new spirit in the colleges is simple. It is awakening from the mesmerized conviction that nothing can be done because the organized system is overwhelming, and suddenly finding themselves in a manageable community of their own where something can be done."46 The students are finding out that social action, on their terms in their institutions and in society at large, may well be possible. The fact that they are beginning even to think in these terms is a hopeful sign for Goodman. If the students act on the basis of this possibility they will create "a new social situation in which they must be reckoned with."47 The student movement is characterized by a rejection of theoretical systems and large scale politics. Their concerns are close to home and directly relevant to them as youth and university students. "For instance, when they fight segregation, the motive is simple brotherhood with astonishingly little mention of abstract concepts of justice and Christianity . . ."48 But Goodman sees this practicality as a step which possibly can lead to far-reaching principles which will guide further action.

One of the reasons that the students are able to give birth to social action is the fact that they inhabit an institution, the university, which still provides them some chance for community organization. Goodman sees the achievement of community as essential

---

46 Ibid., 281.
47 Ibid.
48 Ibid., 284.
in dealing with the moral and political problems of modern technological life, we have to think of a new form, the conflictful community.\textsuperscript{49} The community must be conflictful, in order to avoid the historical attributes of community that make it tyrannical, static, and conformist. A community providing for conflict is the only way to deal with a thoroughly urbanized population. Many would argue that conflict destroys community but Goodman would disagree. "Conflict is not an obstacle to community but a golden opportunity, if the give and take can continue, if contact can be maintained."\textsuperscript{50} Goodman sees conflict ultimately representing better understanding and fraternity. The student population is one place in society where a conflictful community may be achievable and thus, Goodman's hope and trust in students.

Though Goodman and Mills agree that the hope for a "new left" lies with young intellectuals and students, ample evidence in their writings suggests that they do not see the new opposition coming into being automatically. The type of student who becomes aware of the concerns Goodman and Mills see as important is at best a small minority of the total student body. Goodman describes the university students as follows:

The conformists appreciate and learn to use the great resources available to modern man, but their goals are humanly pretty worthless. The dissenters, who are sensitive, ingenious, and idealistic, withdraw and become incompetent and socially worthless.

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid., 22.

\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., 21.
Meantime, poorly represented are the old spirited groups of the Center, the young idealists, the 'tough minded' young radicals, the literary clubs of genuises confident of their unique talents...  

Goodman and Mills have no trouble identifying the group that they see as change agents. They do not, however, establish the significance of the group, and they are lacking in providing methods that the group can exercise to achieve change.

Marcuse presents a picture of the groups and the methods for achieving change radically different from that of Goodman and Mills. Marcuse sees the impetus for change coming from those who exist outside the democratic process. These people, from non-white races and colors, the unemployed and unemployable exist in a situation in which their most immediate need is the ending of the intolerable institutions and conditions which are oppressing them. "Thus their oppression is revolutionary even if their consciousness is not. Their opposition hits the system from without and is therefore not deflected by the system; it is an elementary force which violates the rules of the game and, in doing so, reveals it as a rigged game."  

Marcuse does not rely on students and intellectuals for change. He chooses to rely on those who have little if any interest in the continuation of society as it is. Those with nothing to lose and everything to gain are the members of a "new left."

51 Ibid.

52Marcuse, One Dimensional Man, 257.
A qualitative difference in the make-up of the two groups that have been designated as change agents is quite clear. The group that Goodman and Mills favor seems to have some stake in the existing system. The group Marcuse identifies is composed more of outsiders, those separated from any benefits of modern society. The expectation might well be that this group would be more apt to require radical, extremely radical means for change. Marcuse offers evidence to support this expectation. "To liberate the imagination so that it can be given all its means of expression presupposes the repression of much that is now free and that perpetuates a repressive society."^3 This hints at the desperation that may well cause disfranchised groups to use desperate means to achieve change.

Goodman, Mills, and Marcuse have made, in the eyes of young students, an exceptionally perceptive analysis of modern, technological society and its prospects for change. As will be seen in the next chapter, the two groups that are seen as change agents, the students and the young intellectuals and the non-white disenfranchised are precisely the nucleus of the two main branches of the "new left" movement.

^3 Ibid., 250.
CHAPTER IV

THE NEW LEFT: THE MOVEMENT

Chronologically, the beginnings of the "new left" movement can be traced to the year nineteen sixty. Specifically, two occurrences in nineteen sixty signal the birth of the movement: the lunch counter sit-ins in the South and the sit-ins at the House on Unamerican Activities Committee hearings in California. Of these two, the former is probably more significant because it illustrates the close relationship between the student movement and the civil rights movement. This relationship is frequently acknowledged by members of the "new left," some arguing that the history of the student movement is the application of lessons learned in civil rights activity.¹

A description of just what individuals and groups comprise the "new left" is difficult since one of the characteristics of the movement is its amorphousness. One of the members of the movement sees it comprising three basic groups: the poor, the students, and middle-class insurgents.² The poor group is conceived of as having an interracial

¹Mitchell Cohen and Dennis Hale (eds.), The New Student Left (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), xxii.

membership but up to this point in time it has been largely Negro. The students in the movement are the radical minority, usually children of affluence who are upset by the hypocrisy of the system they were raised in. They devote themselves either to radical reform activity on the campus or community organizing among the poor. More will be said of each of these activities later. The middle-class insurgents are usually highly skilled technical workers who are dissatisfied with the uses that have been made of their talents and who are seeking more meaningful activity.

A more complete and detailed description of the organizations and individuals who make up the "new left" movement is given by Newfield in his book on the new radicals.

I define the New Radicalism to include organizations like Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC); ad hoc decentralized movements like the Berkeley Free Speech Movement (FSM) and the movement against the war in Vietnam. It includes idealistic Peace Corps and VISTA (domestic Peace Corps) volunteers and nihilistic Berkeley bohemians; new institutions like the Institute for Policy Studies and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party; new publications like Liberation and the Southern Courier; individuals like Bob Parris, Tom Hayden and Staughton Lynd; it even spills over into sociocultural movements represented by Bob Dylan, Phil Ochs, Dr. Timothy Leary, and Allen Ginsberg."

Probably the two organizations within the "new left" that have gained the most notoriety are Students for a Democratic Society and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. These two organizations are

---

prototypical of the "new left" movement as a whole. One is largely a black movement, the other mostly white. Both organizations are youthful. Both are active in organizing among the poor and SDS is active in organizing on the campus. A brief historical sketch of both of these organizations will help to describe the larger "new left" movement.

SNCC was founded in April, nineteen sixty and was composed of students from Negro schools in the south. Their activities consisted mainly of sit-ins at lunch counters and other all white facilities in order to bring equal treatment at these facilities for blacks. The basis for the movement in its early stage was the philosophy of non-violence. The founding statement of SNCC reads:

> We affirm the philosophical or religious ideal of non-violence as the foundation of our purpose, the presupposition of our belief, and the manner of our action.

> Non-violence, as it grows from the Judeo-Christian tradition seeks a social order of justice permeated by love. Integration of human endeavor represents the crucial first step towards such a society . . .

> By appealing to conscience and standing on the moral nature of human existence, non-violence nurtures the atmosphere in which reconciliation and justice become actual possibilities.4

In its early atages, SNCC was loosely organized and the primary focus was local action. In nineteen sixty-four, the organization entered a new stage in which it became more organized and sought funds for its activities through a national campaign. Non-violence was still a keystone of the platform of the group.

4 Tbid., 47.
In nineteen sixty-five and nineteen sixty-six, a new SNCC took shape. The primary reason for a new turn in the activities of the organization was the failure of the old tactics to win improvement in the day-to-day conditions of the southern Negro.

... This new nationalistic, revolutionary, independent SNCC, nurtured by pessimism and a hunger for manhood, was born in May, 1966, in Nashville, with the ouster of its gentle, religious chairman, John Lewis, and the ascension of brilliant, glib, complex, twenty-five-year-old Stokely Carmichael. Now the keynote phrases in SNCC are independent black power, race pride, black dignity, and the third world.5

An explanation of the switch in philosophy from non-violence to black power could well be the subject of a separate research effort. And yet, perhaps the kernel of the more militant, black power nature of this movement is well expressed in a statement by Carmichael.

"Look, man, I've been to seventeen funerals since 1961. I know I'm going to die, but that just makes me work all the harder and faster, dig?"6

An evolutionary pattern somewhat similar to that of SNCC can be seen in the history of SDS. The SDS of the early nineteen sixties was primarily a theoretical movement.

SDS came into existence ... because of a concern for the lack of ideological thinking in the developing civil rights movement and out of a reaction to the anti-ideological ideology of the universities and society.

5Ibid., 72.

6Ibid., 78.
Initially, its founders hoped SDS would fill the vacuum of thought for the new left movements.\(^7\)

From this early intellectual and loosely organized orientation, SDS moved into a more activist stage in the middle sixties. This included community organizing among the poor and protests, on and off campus, against the war in Vietnam.

SDS is now moving beyond the activist stage into an ideological framework to justify that action. An example of this more radical action is the draft resistance movement that is taking place on many campuses. Also, the sit-ins at the Dow Chemical and recruiting tables and the hooting down of pro-government speakers at many universities reflect the more radical turn taken by SDS. A recent article by a member of SDS in *The Nation* argues that protest, no matter how radical, is not enough. What is needed is an intellectual base out of which the protest and resistance movements can grow and appeal to non-student radical groups.\(^8\) Since protest against the war in Vietnam, including the huge nineteen sixty-five SDS sponsored March on the Pentagon, has not succeeded in stopping the war, SDS has turned to a longer range intellectual critique of the society along with more radical action geared more to obstructing than changing the present system.


A three-stage description of the "new left" movement seems to fit both SNCC and SDS and provides a capsule summary of movement activity in the sixties.

What began as a rebellion against affluence and liberal hypocrisy grew in a few years into a radical activism that protested injustice at the very core of society. But whenever this was tolerated by the structures that were under attack, some of the young radicals began to think about something beyond rebellion or radical protest. The movement now is struggling to develop an ideology that will guide them toward building an organization that can compete for political power.9

The development of the movement reflects a turn from an optimistic view of the capacity of the society to change, through a series of abortive attempts to achieve change, to a more radical, fundamental critique of the society's inability to change and the assuming of a responsibility by the "new left" to initiate and direct change in whatever ways possible.

The disenchantment of the "new left" with the American social system is well reflected in an excerpt from the SNCC rejection of an invitation to the White House Conference on Civil Rights in nineteen sixty-six. "Regardless of the proposals which stem from this conference, we know that the executive department and the President are not serious about insuring Constitutional rights to black Americans . . ."10

The society is corrupt and in need of drastic reform. A possible direction for reform is indicated by SNCC.

10Newfield, A Prophetic Minority, 77.
We reaffirm our belief that people who suffer must make the decisions about how to change and direct their lives. We therefore call upon all black Americans to begin building independent political, economic, and cultural institutions that they will control and use as instruments of social change in this country.\(^\text{11}\)

One example of the drive by the "new left" to build new institutions that will compete with those that exist within the system is the National Conference for New Politics which was held in Chicago in the summer of nineteen sixty-seven. This gathering of many dissident groups in American society offered a view of several events that typify the "new left" movement.

One decision that was made at the convention, the giving to the black caucus half of the total votes at the convention illustrated the determination to rectify wrongs perpetrated on the blacks. Commentators who might be described as liberal rather than radical looked on this move as a huge sellout and abandonment of rationality by the whites. Yet the sentiment of the youth who make up the "new left" groups is expressed by an SDS officer: "the movement is and ought to be led by blacks."\(^\text{12}\) This emphasis on black power by white and black is typical of the "new left."

Another occurrence at the New Politics Convention which offers insight into the "new left" movement was the debate over the issue of presenting a national challenge in the election of nineteen sixty-eight. The younger delegates to the Convention were against this tactic.

\(^{11}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{12}\text{Todd Gitlin, "The Left in Search of Itself: The 'New Politics' Convention," Christian Century, LXXXIV, (September 27, 1967), 1235.}\)
Even before the convention met, young white radicals had been disputing the utility of any national challenge in sixty-eight. Working on campuses and in ghettos, organizing draft resistance movements, heading up such community unions as JOIN, these activists were skeptical of the hoopla and veneer of all presidential campaigns . . ."13

This suspicion of large scale endeavors is grounded in a belief that these activities serve only to confuse the real issues facing young radicals. "They insisted that if America is to be changed at all it must be changed by commotion at the roots."14 It is important for purposes of this study to note that the young were, by and large, the group opposed to the national ticket while the older delegates were the main supporters of the ticket. This is one of the main differences between "old" and "new left" and it will be discussed in greater detail later.

Having looked briefly at the groups and events which comprise the "new left" movement, some summary seems in order. The "new left" is basically a two-pronged, radical reform movement. The two prongs are the young blacks and the students. The term "students" may be enlarged to include not only those formally enrolled in higher education, but also those youths who have either finished or interrupted their formal education but identify themselves with the radical students. With this overview of the "new left," let us address our inquiry to such questions as why it exists, where it intends to go—in short, the nature, or essence, of the movement.

13Ibid., 1230.
14Ibid.
The "new left" is a movement that is critical of American institutions: political, economic, and military. The thrust of the movement is directed against American institutions and policies rather than individual persons. What these institutions have been accomplishing is the dehumanization of the American people.

"We say . . . that good men can be divided from their compassion by the institutional system that inherits us all . . . People become instruments. Generals do not hear the screams of the bombed and sugar executives do not see the misery of the cane cutters." The institutionalization of our society has placed the organization between men and the consequences of their actions. Effective action seems to be something beyond the reach of individuals, something to be accomplished only through organizations. The "new left" seeks to recover grounds for effective action by people, not abstractions in the form of corporate entities. The problem is one of returning power to the people. "Power in America is abdicated by individuals to top-down organizational units, and it is in the recovery of this power that the movement becomes distinct from the rest of the country and a new kind of man emerges."16


The main enemy in the struggle of the "new left" is the liberal government. The liberal creates and maintains the institutions that keep power out of the hands of the people. People must be made to see the governmental system as the main enemy rather than the people who make it up. The government represents the super-institution, the top ranking abstraction, the real enemy.

What the "new left" is seeking is a real democracy that will replace the pseudo-democracy that is now in existence. "The American political system is not the democratic model of which its glorifiers speak. In actuality it frustrates democracy by confusing the individual citizen, paralyzing policy discussion, and consolidating the irresponsible power of military and business interests."17 The present political system tries to present itself to the people as one that has undergone three decades of meaningful reform that has led to a more equitable society. The "new left" sees this as a myth. They see little evidence to indicate that the reforms of the past years have improved the quality of American life. Many of the reforms are seen by them as illusions which serve mainly as vehicles to manipulate the people. For example, in the reform years we have seen pro-union legislation such as the Wagner Act but lately we have seen a decline in labor union membership figures. "The difficult struggle to enact even a token policy of public medical care, the hollow support for public education,

the stagnation and starvation of broader programs or health, recreation and simple city services - all this is evidence for a simple truth: the welfare state is a myth."18

The type of reforms that have been enacted in the past thirty years have served, in reality, to weaken the poor rather than strengthen them. The reforms have served the purpose of strengthening the governmental system by increasing the number and power of government agencies without providing meaningful aid. The government seems to exist to perpetuate itself rather than to aid the people. Government and business have reached a modus vivendi and they can make common cause in perpetuating the existing economic arrangement. The "new left" sees a need for new types of arrangements. Basic economic changes are needed.

An example of the conflict described above is provided by the recent "war on poverty" conducted by the Johnson administration. The view of members of the "new left" might best be described as one of indifference to this government effort. "The official poverty program does nothing to strike at economic stagnation or to reverse the generally regressive tax structure in the country. It will not rehabilitate the slums or build public homes or plan for human needs in any manner requiring basic changes in the political economy."19

18Tom Hayden, Dissent, XIII, 77.

The nature of the basic change desired will be discussed shortly, but the point to be stressed at this stage of the argument is the fundamental rigidity of American institutions to meaningful change. The United States chooses, rather than to change its institutions, to sell them to its own people and to the world. The United States is very greatly concerned with its "image." The President keeps an ear tuned to the public opinion polls. In the view of one radical student, America is a salesman.

America, to many people all over the world, is personified in the form of the Great Salesman, and her philosophy is best known as Salesmanship. These symbols ... have for so long enveloped her people, oozed into their pores and fogged their minds that it is difficult to hope that these detested things will ever be overcome.20

The concern of this nation with selling its image is also evidenced in the candidates for political office who tend toward projecting an image rather than discussion of the issues. Politicians become actors, or vice versa in the state of California. In this political system voting has become almost meaningless. "The possibility that I have made a good choice in casting my vote for an image depends on chance. When goodness or badness depends on chance, why bother?"21

An important corollary to the "new left" view of a rigid, institutional America which seeks to sell itself to people all over

the world is the view that if salesmanship fails, America will use any means available to dominate. America is seen by the "new left" as an imperial power, seeking to consolidate its empire at home and abroad. Consolidation is achieved at home by including the oppressed groups in the system without granting meaningful gains, as discussed above. Consolidation is achieved abroad by economic exploitation and military adventure whether it be in Vietnam or Santo Domingo. "I think that young people, particularly young black students, are concerned about the overtones of the entire foreign policy, the entire institution called America." 

The "new left" seeks to identify itself with the oppressed colonial people of the underdeveloped countries. This identification is more easily accomplished by the members of the young black wing of the "new left." It is also sought by the young white students, many of whom drop out of school to work with the ghetto poor. Even the young radicals who stay on the campus see the campus situation in terms of oppressed students and the "official" oppressors, administration and most of the faculty.

There is no lack of evidence to support the "new left" view of America as a colonial, imperialist nation. The most damaging characteristic of America, as far as the colonial description is concerned, is its position on the revolution taking place around the globe and the black revolution taking place at home. There seems to be no such thing for this nation as a "just" revolution.

Never mind that for two-thirds of the world's people the twentieth century might as well be the Stone Age; never mind the melting poverty and hopelessness that are the basic facts of life for most modern men; and never mind that for these millions there is now an increasing perceptible relationship between their sorrow and our contentment.23

America turns a deaf ear to the desperate in other lands and it also does the same for its own. Many in the "new left" see the only possible change in a revolution. "I say revolution because that's what is needed if freedom is going to mean anything in this country. It means people would be informed about things that affected them. There would be meaningful participation in the decision making process."24

The "new left" is seeking meaningful ways to combat American imperialism at home and abroad. Revolution is one way; as we will see later, there is at least one other.

There is more to the "new left" movement than the political aspects which have been delineated here. A large part of the movement is more than political protest against unrepresentative institutions. "New left" protest has much to say at the non-political, or "feeling" level. The "new left" involves a moral revolution against a corrupt society and an existential revolt against the impersonality of a mechanized society. The fact that many are left out of meaningful participation in the society is seen as an outrage. Unless this fact

23Carl Oglesby, Commonweal, LXXXIII, 397.

is seen and understood, it is difficult to understand the sense of urgency that the "new left" brings to politics. "It is clear that a politics apart from an existential ethic becomes increasingly manipulative, power-oriented, sacrificial of human lives and souls - it is corrupted."25

The inclusion of an existential dimension to its political program marks the "new left" as a movement which might bear the label, "humanist." The young radical seeks to change the corporate state in which he lives "not in the name of this or that blueprint or ism, but in the name of simple human decency and democracy and the vision that wise and brave men saw in the time of our own revolution."26 He seeks to add an existential, humanistic dimension to American politics. He seeks to provide an ethical politics.

The sit-ins in the South in the early sixties provide an example of the existential dimension that has been described. Rather than an economic or political protest, the sit-ins were mainly a moral action. They were "a spontaneous, unplanned activist contagion. They gave people something to do immediately to show their feelings about segregation. They required no ideology, no politics, and no scholarship - just one's body and a certain set of ethical values. Today, these remain the lowest common denominator among the young activists."27

26Carl Oglesby, Commonweal, LXXXIII, 399.
27Newfield, A Prophetic Minority, 43.
The humanistic emphasis in the "new left" is directed toward the poor, but it is also immediately present in the relations of the members of "new left" groups with each other. Those in the movement are searching for a kind of community in which they can define their own identity and establish personal relationships based on honest mutual regard. The ethics of personal warmth is one of their strongest commitments. There is a deep respect for the other individuals in the movement. People are accepted as individuals, including whatever personal oddities they may possess. This spirit is aptly described by a student member of a "new left" group.

How I wish I could explain the joy, the beauty, the warmth that emanate from the camaraderie we have. It's not the blind discipline of any dogma or ideology that brings us together. We're all searching for answers to the same old questions: Who am I? Why am I here? As people of the mid-twentieth century, we feel that cooperation among humans is the only road to survival. We've wrapped up our freedom with the freedom of all men. We enjoy being together because the spirit unleashed frees us to be fully human.28

The students seek to make love possible. They see society as presenting many obstacles to love. Poverty, racism, bureaucracy, affluence, anti-communism are all stifling to curiosity and compassion. They are basically a moral group of young people responding to issues in terms of rightness and wrongness rather than those of expediency or strategy. The type of politics that will be practiced by these

youth is what Michael Rogin calls the "Politics of Outrage." In modern society where immorality hides behind the bureaucratic mask of amorality or objectivity the students seek to remove the mask and to expose evil. They are willing to use this exposure tactic on themselves as can be seen in many of the self-reflective speeches and articles by young radicals. "For the new left conscience is the political arena, instilling guilt the political weapon. When the young radicals face the corruption in themselves, they force those in power to face it in themselves. That is the most political thing they can do."

The students and youth are searching for ways to get American society to condemn itself. A society that kills and bombs and maims, starves and segregates and represses in the name of liberty and democracy must be made to face itself. The "new left" seeks to provide a forum for the raising of these issues. The politics of outrage and exposure are a key in explaining why the young prefer the clear cut lines of conflict which exist in the South to the bureaucratic curtains of Washington and the North. The students openly fight blatant racism in Mississippi "but they save their deepest fury for the cool, gray way in which the Justice Department in Washington refuses to come to their aid." White racist Mississippi exhibits at least an honest bigotry not hidden by procedural technicalities.

30Ibid.
The politics of outrage and humanism, the anti-institutional bias of the "new left" seem to represent a new stand in American political development. The reason that this is so, if it is thus, is seen by sensitive commentators both in and out of the "new left" movement as a response to a qualitatively different society.

The "new left" has come into existence in the second half of the twentieth century. It has appeared during the atomic age, the scientific age, the time of the managerial revolution, the cybernetic age. These titles have been used to describe a new social era in human history. This era is different from the industrial era that preceded it. If one is interested in a definite date that separates the two, the year nineteen forty-five seems appropriate.

In that year man took it upon himself to liberate on earth the powers of the universe. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the significance of that event; man had become absolute, and because he was absolute, with the cosmic power to destroy himself, he had become all but totally alienated from his real self.32

This new era is one of extreme situations and thus is the milieu in which the "new left" is active. They are geared for extremes, the American establishment seeks to repel, negate, or absorb extremes. The establishment seeks compromise and adjustment, but these moralities are blind "to the fact that in affairs of life or death, of what Paul

---

32Earle, "Stake is a Chance for Survival," To Make a Difference, 101-02.
Tillich used to call ultimate concern, no basis for compromise and no room for adjustment exist. This is precisely the case in the age of nuclear weapons.

Along with the presence of nuclear weapons, the young are faced with an automated, cybernated, and computerized society. This is also seen by them as an ultimate concern for if the present trend is continued it leads to an alienating, depersonalized, and basically inhuman existence. The students seek a society that not only equitably distributes wealth and power; more importantly they seek a society that "does not act or seem like a machine, but is always and always looks like people." Peace becomes of the utmost concern for the youth because of survival but also because peace is a human, non-mechanical condition. The war machine is a machine and treats human beings like things. This is an evil that must be eradicated.

In the new age, the young are convinced that they can no longer work within the framework of accepted institutions to improve and perfect them. As seen earlier, they are deeply opposed to the existing institutions. "They do not see organized American society as something to be accepted, praised, loved and perfected. In their eyes, American society is on trial." It must adapt itself to the new social


34Waskow, Dissent, XII, 487.

conditions. It is doing a beastly job and the youth stand determined to correct this situation. "The movement tries to oppose American barbarism with new structures and opposing identities. These are created by people whose need to understand their society and govern their own existence has somehow not been cancelled out by the psychological damage they have received." What the new structures must do is meet the needs of the people rather than the need for perpetuation of existing institutions. The new institutions and structures may include community unions, freedom schools, experimental universities, police review boards, and independent unions.

All of these institutions will have as their basic purpose that of providing a means for meeting their own needs. This has not been the case. "This country has a way of not responding to needs till they think of what they call established sources, legitimizing it . . . people can legitimize themselves. You don't take an established source to give you legitimacy." Thus, some means of self expression must be found to enable the young and disenfranchised poor to speak out and be heard. The need is urgent, and an alternative appropriate to the present conditions must be provided.

The "new left" has made at least a start toward the provision of a meaningful voice for society's outcasts. The way that this is to be accomplished is through some system that will allow people to come

36 Hayden, Dissent, XIII, 81.

together in small and large groups and make basic decisions that affect the conduct of their lives. The approach that has been developed to meet the above goals is "participatory democracy."

Participatory democracy is briefly described in "The Port Huron Statement" of SDS:

As a social system we seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: That the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation.38

Participatory democracy is adamant on maintaining that individuals share meaningfully on decisions that affect them. Individuals have a responsibility for the actions of the institutions in which they exist, and the institutions have an equal responsibility to the men who make them up. Authority is responsible to those under it, and the basic idea is that "each man can and should be a center of power and initiative in society."39 The first priority in achieving this type of democracy is to win full political rights and representation for all sectors of the population.

38Jacobs and Landau, eds., The New Radicals, 155.

A system providing full political rights to all groups would provide:

that decision making of basic social consequence be carried on by public groupings;
that politics be seen positively, as the art of collectively creating an acceptable pattern of social relations;
that politics has the function of bringing people out of isolation and into community, thus being a necessary, though not sufficient means of finding meaning in personal life;
that the political order should serve to clarify problems in a way instrumental to their solution; it should provide outlets for the expression of personal grievance and aspiration . . .40

Economically, participatory democracy calls for a system of rewards for work that is more than that of survival or subsistence. Work must be meaningful, creative and self-directed rather than stifling, mechanical, and manipulative. The economy must provide for democratic participation and regulation of the allocation of its resources and means of production.41

The goals are rather clear cut, but the logical question is how do those in the "new left" see themselves involved in the establishment of a democracy of individual participation? The answer, in large part, is through the vehicle of what has come to be called "community organizing" among the poor. They are convinced that they cannot go to the middle class Americans because the object of community organizing is the creation of new political power. The middle class, in their view, rightly or wrongly, feels itself a part of the existing political system.

__
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Community organizing has been carried on in the North mainly by SDS and in the South mainly by SNCC. By insisting that the poor can make their own decisions, the community organizing provides meaningful gains that the poor have achieved on their own and also exposes the hypocrisy of a credential society with all its pretense, respectability, and hierarchy.

The main task of community organizing is to get the poor involved in the direction of their own organizations. Only if the organizations of the poor are and remain truly democratic, will they be able to survive the failûres that they are sure to meet when they confront the organized system.

The tendency in the "new left" to look to the poor for meaningful reform activity has been described as an attempt to "tap the vitality of the masses"\textsuperscript{42} and thereby transform America. These poor masses are not related to the sophistication of the system. They offer to the "new left" "The potential for something more spontaneous, more real, than the life of the respectable world."\textsuperscript{43} This type of dream recalls the Wobbly and Populist movements of earlier periods in American history, each of which shared with the "new left" a type of romantic trust in the masses who make up the lower layers of American society.

Perhaps an appropriate question should be raised regarding the sincerity of the "new left." Are these students and young people

\textsuperscript{42}Rogin, \textit{Commonweal}, LXXXIV, 101.

\textsuperscript{43}\textit{Ibid.}
really convinced of the integrity of the poor or are they merely using them to satisfy their own anger at the system. To find the answer to this question, we can look in several places.

First, among the poor themselves. Cesar Chavez is the leader of the Mexican-American migrant grape pickers in California. He described the students who came to help in his organizing a strike among the farmers and contrasted them to other groups of helpers. "These students are the first people who have ever come to us without a hidden agenda. They just want to help us - to be servants - and that's a really beautiful thing." This was the first group of people who had come strictly to help, not to propagate some ideology on the farmers. Chavez saw the students as people who exhibited a genuine concern for human values, and he was most appreciative of the authenticity of the students' commitments.

The second answer to the question of the sincerity of the "new left" in their relations with the poor comes from members of the "new left" themselves. "A SNCC worker should never take a leadership role in the community unless he is in his own community. A SNCC worker should give the responsibility of leadership to the community person or persons whom he has or is building . . . I think you first meet the people on their own terms, or you lose." Tom Hayden, an SDS officer


officer and a leader in the SDS sponsored Newark Community Union Project sees the de-emphasis on leadership roles as the only way to create group identity and counter the effects of society. "Power in America is abdicated by individuals to top-down organizational units, and it is in the recovery of this power that the movement becomes distinct from the rest of the country and a new man emerges."^6 If the student organizers were to provide leadership, they would only accomplish a minor variation of the existing arrangement. They seem to know that more than this is needed.

A final answer to the question of sincerity is provided by outside observers. In a book on the "new left," Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau, two older radicals, have this to say on the question of leadership: "Leaders mean organization, organization means hierarchy, and hierarchy is undemocratic. It connotes bureaucracy and impersonality . . . the fine line between leader and organizer must remain clear: an organizer does not impose his ideas on the community."^47

Another commentator goes so far as to argue that actually the SNCC or SDS organizer sees himself as inferior to the poor.

Recognizing himself as part of the society's sickness, the organizer inclines to regard the organized poor as purer than himself. There is an unstated assumption that the poor, when they find voice, will produce a truer, sounder radicalism than any which alienated intellectuals might prescribe.48

---


A noted psychiatrist who has conducted interviews among both the politically uncommitted students and the radical students sees the young radicals as trusting, anti-organization people, without guile and avoiding factions. He describes the young radicals as "a group that is essentially . . . unmanipulative and unsuspicous."^49

Thus, it seems clear that - at least in the nature of their intentions - the "new left" reflect a genuine commitment to the ideal of participatory democracy and a willingness to work in communities in conformity to that ideal rather than for reasons of personal aggrandizement. Even the critics of the "new left" who will be met in the next chapter do not question the authenticity of the movement.

And yet the complex question of a conflict in values between student organizers and the poor cannot be dismissed quite so easily. The conflict arises not in the early stages of community organizing, but rather, at the point where the organizing activity succeeds among the poor. In other words, when the poor are "liberated" from poverty through community organizing, are they not likely to pursue the values that the young organizer is fleeing? "Thus, SNCC workers seem to be less and less interested in individual progress toward better jobs or housing. The community is the critical factor, and building ties among its members by community organization is the main task if people are to be free to develop new values."^50

^49Kenneth Kenniston, "Young Radicals and the Fear of Power," The Nation, CCVI, (March 18, 1968), 373.

The question, with the poor, is whether or not they wish to develop new values. Perhaps they wish only an equal share in the fruits of the present society. Once equality is attained, will they be willing to go further, eventually culminating in a new way of life? The young radical would answer this argument by countering that it is precisely the existing system which prevents equality, and it is likely to continue doing this in the future. In other words, the exploitation of the poor is necessary for the continued success of the existing system. This does not mean that the poor may not achieve material gain, but it will be accompanied by some reminder of the hierarchical relationships in the society. The welfare state never fails to remind its recipients through some kind of human indignity that they are indeed recipients of benefits rather than collectors of that which is entitled to a human being.

The "new left" seeks to arouse in the poor a consciousness of their own worth and the power that they potentially can exercise. The poor, obviously, at least at the lower levels of poverty, are interested in basics. Can the "new left" take them beyond this interest? This question has yet to be answered, but it is a crucial one and it serves here to illustrate that the desires of "new left" organizers while certainly in fundamental agreement with those of the poor, may diverge at a critical point.

The reason for this divergence seems to lie in the composition of the "new left" groups. The members of these student and youth groups are composed mainly of the middle class. Even SNCC has a good many young college students on its staff of organizers. These young
people have come to question and reject the affluent society. Thus, a member of SDS is able to argue that participatory democracy, as practiced and advocated by members of "new left" organizations, does not stress the economic as the realm of principal concern. The "new left" organizers "have, rather, been struggling over issues of control, self-determination, and independence... Who makes the rules in the welfare bureaucracies? Who controls the ghetto?"51

These types of concerns and questions can be applied to groups other than the poor. The push for self-determination can be applied to ghetto dwellers through the use of "black power" and to high school and college students through the use of "student power." It is this concern which really serves to unite the two main strands of the "new left" movement, the students and the poor, especially the black poor. The students and young intellectuals experience a lack of meaning and honest concern in their educational institutions. They see, rather, a bureaucratic institution that strives to achieve goals set for it, not by the students and teachers who exist in it, but by the businessmen who possess the ultimate power in the institutional hierarchy and the government which finances "the beast." Most faculty have succumbed to the institutional ethos and treat the students as anything but students, choosing to instruct rather than to educate, to answer rather than to question, to flunk rather than to understand. It is this type of education that prompts articles such as "The Student

51Flacks, *Dissent*, XIII, 703.
As Nigger" to appear and thoughtful students and faculty see much validity in this analogy. This type of reasoning leads to the condition that "participatory democracy . . . speaks most clearly to the middle-class man, daring him to forsake powerlessness and act."53

Thus, the key thrust in participatory democracy can be seen as a reaction to the quality of the present society. The civilization that dehumanizes its citizens, differently in one class than in another, but striving for success in all classes. Success is achieved most in the groups that participate in the fruits of the society. This is why the "new left" turns to the poor. They are outsiders, and in a different and less immediate way, so are the students.

The "new left" argues against depersonalization; they choose to regard men as precious and possessed with capacities crying to be fulfilled. Human beings should not be allowed to be treated as things. "We oppose, too, the doctrine of human incompetence because it rests essentially on the modern fact that men have been completely manipulated into incompetence."54 Men can achieve much if they are given the opportunity. Participatory democracy is a principle of hope, of faith in people and their ability to make life meaningful. It seeks to establish the genuine human relationships that are absent

52Jerry Farber, "The Student as Nigger," This Magazine is About Schools, II, (Winter, 1968), 107-16.

53Lynd, Dissent, XII, 329.

in the present society. "Human interdependence is a contemporary fact; human brotherhood must be willed, however, as a condition of future survival and as the most appropriate form of social relations."55

The alienating conditions of contemporary society must be combatted. "Loneliness, estrangement, isolation describe the vast distance between man and man today. These dominant tendencies cannot be overcome by better personnel management, nor by improved gadgets, but only when a love of man overcomes the idolatrous worship of things by man."56 Love must be reestablished in the modern world. Love is possible in a community which seeks the restoration of personal freedom. This is what participatory democracy seeks to establish.

The concept of community is an important one in an understanding of the "new left." The distinction between community and society is one that has been used in sociological discourse for many years. Community refers to the more closely knit character of human relationships in the rural setting. Society describes the urban industrialized setting in which relationships become more abstract and impersonal. Basically, the "new left" would argue that relationships in our era have become much too societal and community must be regained if man is to survive.

55Ibid., 155.
56Ibid.
A noted philosopher used the concept of community as essential in a description of the black power movement. He describes his own understanding of the words of a black power advocate:

It was not at bottom a matter of power but of community . . . As I understood him, he was saying that there are, at the very least, two Americas, one white and the other black. These ideally form two distinct communities with different fundamental loyalties and obligations. He did not condemn the whites; such condemnation was meaningless. Nor did he deny a certain sense of responsibility for the whites. The point was rather that his fundamental moral being belongs, first of all, to the black community or, better perhaps, to a community of blacks who have discovered at terrible cost a sense of identity, mutual respect, and desire to be together, away from the alien whites with whom they were now entangled in a wholly abstract, unreal, and purely political society.57

The way to achieve meaningful community is what participatory democracy seeks, whether in the slum or on the campus. A pluralistic nation of viable communities is what the "new left" seeks to create. They seek to build local power centers that will help communities arise in the face of the centralized society around them.

People must begin to confer legitimacy on themselves and their own social arrangements and stop mimicking the arrangements depicted by Madison Avenue in the media. The "new left" is concerned with building up - "building up local bases of power where people are really committed to control and to make the decisions affecting their lives and to

control the money that comes into their areas and to prevent the administrators upstairs from abusing them or taking away their rights whenever they try to use them."58

The key clash is between the local community and the centralized society. This explains why much neighborhood organizing in the slums is undertaken to combat reforms on which the people have had no voice. The war on poverty must be decentralized in order to provide any meaningful assistance. New, local institutions must be established to combat the highly centralized national institutions that are exploitive and impersonal.

Perhaps the best way to summarize what has been said about the "new left" is an attempt to depict the style of the young people in the movement. A member of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement characterizes the members of the "new left" as exhibiting a concern for interpersonal relationships, seeing social change as taking place mainly in small groups, advocating a pragmatism of direct personal involvement and organizing with a conscious lack of structure in order to foster responsibility and initiative.59

These qualities are some of those which Kenniston sees as reflecting the style of what he calls "post-modern youth."60 Kenniston sees the important characteristics of this generation as


nondogmatic openness, identification with their own generation, personalism in their relations with each other, ability to enjoy life, anti-technologism, a need for participation, and antiacademicism. Kenniston sees these qualities as those possessed by the radical youth of the present generation which he chooses to label as post-modern. This description and deduction offers added support for the contention that the "new left" are reacting to and reflecting the social conditions and crisis of America in the sixties.

It is this age of crisis and the "one-dimensional society" that causes the "new left" to search for and find radically new means of expression and action, means that may be dubbed by their elders as utopian, romantic, or unrealistic. The point is, if one-dimensional, centralized, bureaucratic society is to be broken, it must be through utopian, unrealistic methods.
The thrust of the argument thus far can best be summarized in the statement that the "old left" is a movement that arose out of the social and historical conditions of the depression and post-depression years, while the "new left" is a movement that arose to meet the social and historical conditions of the mid-twentieth century. Since the two movements arose to meet different sets of conditions, it is only natural differences exist between them. This chapter explicates further the main differences between the two movements and identifies where the differences lead to significant clashes between the members of the movements.

The main point to bear in mind in this analysis is that the new radicalism is not the logical outgrowth of the old. The "old left" was built on the economic and political discontents of the thirties. The "new left" speaks of powerlessness, morality, the purposelessness of middle-class life; these are phrases which the "old left" has difficulty in understanding. What the "new left" is actually saying is that the "old left" is dead precisely because it is not in tune with the relevant issues of today. The "old left" fails to see the horror in the world today. Or, if they do see it, they fail to design
and carry through meaningful efforts to effect change. The "old left," the liberal, is the one in power who is fighting in Vietnam and failing to provide any real opportunity for improvement in the ghetto. As Mills argued, the liberal is now in power, and thus, he has turned into a conservative. He seeks to contain the radical change efforts of the "new left" by labelling their schemes "utopian." Utopian has become a derogatory adjective in modern America.

There is a decline in liberal America of hopefulness and utopian thinking. People have been desensitized by Dachau and Aushwitz, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Dresden and Vietnam. Anyone who calls himself an idealist is viewed with disdain. Americans are urged to live in the "real" world, to be tough minded, which means to the new leftist, to have no serious aspirations. The "new left" feels that the real world is rotten. It is dominated by a bureaucracy that has no feelings. The members of the "old left," who helped create that bureaucracy have become immune to the injustice perpetrated on the people. Through the bureaucracy, they have themselves advanced and seen material advancement on the part of a large number of American citizens. They fail to see why the remaining poor in the country cannot be brought into the system. What is needed is more legislation, more programs. But the new leftist does not see it that way. What they see as most needed is a fundamental change which will allow the remaining poor to benefit from the system without being engulfed by it. Also, they want a way in which the students can escape the engulfing arms of the bureaucratic system without having to "drop out," as the hippies have done. The "new left" mainly rejects and their rejection is almost total.
How does the "old left" react? In many different ways; but perhaps the most unfair, at least to the "new left," is the reaction that smacks of paternalism and benevolence. This is well typified in an article in a leading liberal magazine in which the author, an old liberal by his own designation, tells the "new left" that they'll learn the realities of life in due time. They'll learn that they were really wrong; wrong about the power elite, wrong about Vietnam, and wrong about current politics. A sensitive observer knows that you do not get the young to listen to you by trumpeting experience as your main qualification.

But there are other more cogent and meaningful criticisms of the "new left." Dwight MacDonald, a famous member of the "old left" argues that the "new left" is essentially a withdrawal from political life by a group who has given up on change. He is referring to the "new left's" emphasis on localism which we have touched upon briefly and will discuss in more depth later in this chapter. He argues that in its heyday, the "old left" was convinced that it could get meaningful national change. The "old left" saw historical forces on its side and was convinced of victory. It turned out to be mistaken. The "new left" now confronts a situation analogous to that which faced the old. But there is little to do on a large scale, "so therefore they make do with brighten the corner where you are, so to

---

speak. If you're a Negro, then you are only interested in the black power, black people and so on."² This is an honest criticism and it deserves a response. We shall see it a bit later.

Another critic of the "new left" is Irving Howe, editor of Dissent and a leading social democrat. Howe personifies the "old left" orientation and his lengthy criticism of the "new left" in his magazine is a catalogue of the vices of young radicals. He sees the "new left" as being extremely hostile to liberalism, impatient with the problems that concerned the older radical generation (communism and totalitarianism), possessing an unconsidered enmity to what they vaguely label the Establishment, harboring crude, unqualified anti-Americanism, and finally of being too quick to identify with radical movements in the third world at the expense of democratic principles.³

Having looked briefly at some of the typical arguments from both "old left" and new, the differences between the two merit some logical ordering for a fuller understanding. The differences seem to fall into three categories or revolve around three issues. The first of these is what might be termed the emotional and style issue. On the part of the "new left," this centers mainly on the matter of paternalism discussed earlier. The type of old leftist who can speak condescendingly to the young is looked upon in somewhat the same way as the

³Irving Howe, "New Styles in Leftism," Dissent, XII, (Spring, 1965), 295-323.
thoughtful slave sees his "benevolent" master, or in the way that an
exploited, colonial country sees the helpfulness of the mother country,
or in the way that the black American sees the "helpful" white man.
It is this attitude which may explain the penchant of members of the
"new left" to frustrate liberals at every turn, by refusing to go
through channels that led nowhere or turning his back on a committee
system that serves only to delay or hide real issues at the expense
of those that can be procedurally formulated and resolved.

The emotional difference seems to center on the notion of
urgency that is always present among the "new left." They are anxious
to proceed immediately and impatient with any delay. This sense of
urgency is also in operation in the style of the "new left." The
"old left's" critique of the style of the new may well be their
answer to the emotional charges made by the young. The "new left"
concentrates on community and consensus among the community, while the
"old left" leans toward a more give-and-take, or debate, style. In
order to maintain consensus, the "new left" will, at times, remain vague
on specifics or make large concessions for the sake of consensus.
An example of this is when the black caucus of the new politics
convention demanded and received half the votes of the convention.
The "old left" saw in this action, not the romantic attempt of the
"new left" to right the wrongs perpetrated on black men, but an
undemocratic takeover in a totalitarian fashion by a minority group.

The old leftist is critical of the attempt to shock the world
which is characteristic of the personal style of many members of the
"new left." This is seen as an attempt to make up for in style what
is missing in substance. The new leftist cannot effect change, so he will insult. He will supply an inner revolution for that external one which he is unable to effect. The shocking style of the "new left" covers up the lack of clear-cut thinking that so many of its members exhibit and also serves as a replacement for the lack of effect in the realm of power. The style of the "new left" is something that can be easily absorbed by the middle class without any other effect having occurred.

Both the emotional criticism of the "old left" by the new and the style criticism of the "new left" by the old point to the very real political differences that comprise the second major point of divergence between the groups. We mentioned before the desire of the youth at the new politics convention to avoid a national ticket and concentrate on local organizing. Conversely, it was the older delegates at the convention who supported the idea of a national emphasis is also characteristic of the dispute among Negro groups; the "old left" Southern Christian Leadership Conference advocating national legislation to achieve integration into society, and the newer Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee turning toward locally organized, independent black power movements that emphasize black dignity independent of the white man.

The view of the "old left" is based on the notion that problems exist at the national level. "We're a continental nation, and I don't

---
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see any attack on any major front that can be made except on the national one." If problems are national, the solutions should also be national. This is why the "old left" stresses the idea of coalition politics. What they mean is a union of liberal and radical groups in order to effect a liberalizing of the majority of the country through the Democratic party. Coalition is the realistic way to deal with problems, and it does get results.

The argument in favor of coalition politics points to legislative victories in the civil rights area as evidence to support the approach. Real change can occur "when the dominant social organism acknowledges the demanded right and incorporates it into some effective legal instrument." The recent civil rights legislation shows that change is possible within the so-called Establishment. Those who advocate localism may well heighten an individual's sense of participation, but it is doubtful that localism can effect institutional change without being infused with national resources.

The "new left" response to coalition politics is twofold. First, they argue simply that those gains achieved by coalition politics such as civil rights and welfare legislation are more transparent than real.


The benefits of these legislative victories have helped mainly the middle class, rather than the hard-core poor. Also, the passing of legislation is no guarantee of enforcement, and it is whether or not the Establishment provides the means of enforcement which is the key to its willingness to facilitate change. Thus far, their record on this matter is poor, and there is little reason to expect federal intervention in cases of white violence in the South or de facto segregation in the North or student grievances on the college campus. In short, it is up to the people themselves to organize and demand their rights.

Second, "the new left" refuses coalition politics on the ground of morality. One does not compromise a morally just position and coalition politics always seems to imply compromise. The "new left" adheres to the dictum that "morality and politics are indivisible." One does not deal and manipulate in the area of right and wrong. Justice is sought and nothing less is accepted.

A vivid illustration of the political conflict between old and "new left" took place at the nineteen sixty-four Democratic convention. The Mississippi delegation was a totally white delegation that could be expected to follow the segregation-oriented line of a typical Southern Democratic party. The "new left" organized Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party sought to displace the all white Mississippi

delegation at the convention and replace them with their own integrated and more representative group. Here was, in the eyes of the "new left," a clearly moral issue. A delegation that represented the oppressed majority of the state's population sought to replace a delegation of the oppressors.

To solve this impasse, several liberals including Martin Luther King and Hubert Humphrey worked out a compromise which would allow the Freedom Democrats two seats in the regular delegation. Much to the dismay of these liberals, the Freedom Democratic Party refused. They wanted what they felt they were rightfully entitled to and they would settle for nothing less. The "old left," with its orientation to reality and practical politics could hardly believe it. These people would forsake a partial victory because it was not complete. The Freedom Democrats answer was that a partial victory would never become complete, it would rather become absorbed within the party structure and be followed by other symbolic and meaningless partial victories.

The case of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is significant in other respects. For all the talk of the "old left" about coalition, the "new left" felt deserted when they sought allies among labor and other liberal groups and found little or no support. The fate of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party signified, in the eyes of the "new left," the bankruptcy of the "old left." They were presented a moral challenge and rather than meet and decide an issue on moral grounds, the "old left" chose compromise. The "old left" chose practicality and utility over morality and justice. This is the
heart of the political difference between the groups. Morality and justice are suited to the local level politics that the "new left" sees as important. Practicality and utility are appropriate at the national level where various groups are bargaining for power. At this national level, morality is something that is recognized rhetorically.

The final issue that separates "new left" from old is their relationship to and viewpoint of the Communist party. The "old left" is still very concerned with Communism. The social democrats along with most other liberal groups still see Communism as a distinct threat to democracy. They remember the Communist deal with Hitler in the thirties and how the American Communist party followed Moscow's direction. They remember Stalin and the liquidations that took place under his regime. They remember Hungary and the way Soviet tanks crushed the revolution. In short, they have lived with and fought against Communism for two or three decades, and they are still on guard against a Communist takeover.

The social democrats waged a battle in the thirties against Stalinist, undemocratic tactics. They see signs of these same kinds of tactics in the activities of the "new left." The seeking of unanimity by "new left" groups seems totalitarian to social democrats as do the harangues of Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown. These two men represent a dogmatic racism as reaction to whites. Social

Democrats agree with Dwight MacDonald when he argues "the objection to black power from my point of view is that it makes discriminations. I'm against any kind of racism." Also the rhetorical appeals to violence on the part of new leftists remind liberals of similar appeals that occurred not too long ago. The "new left" has also refused to repudiate Communist support for some of their activities, such as the SDS peace march in nineteen sixty-five. This leads liberals to suspect that the "new left" is being manipulated, if not taken over by the communists.

Why is it that the "new left" does not seem concerned about Communist influence? The main reason is that they did not experience the actions of the Communists which are so important in the thinking of the "old left." According to one writer of the "new left," the students and young blacks "believe the savage struggle between Stalinists and Social Democrats contributed heavily to the failure of the "old left" and they are determined not to repeat that chapter of history." The young see the fight against Communism as belonging in the earlier era and when they see liberals still guarding against Communists, they have an interpretation to explain this activity.

The "new left" sees liberal anti-communism as an ideology America uses to mask its conservative role in the modern world. Anti-communism is a way for America to keep itself rich and righteous in
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the face of the collapse of the European empire. America has decided to call all revolutions Communism and thus create a reason for imperialist activities. "Far from helping Americas deal with . . . truth, the anti-Communist ideology merely tries to disguise it so things may stay the way they are." American anti-Communism allows the country to try and play policeman for the world. If America is to forego this role and allow foreign countries to develop as they themselves see fit, "ultimately . . . you have to say . . . that Communism is not the worst thing that can happen to people, in fact . . . in some cases it may be the best thing, and, in any case, America is not going to be the Great Decider of that question for other people."13

It is not that the "new left" is pro-Communist, but they defend Communism from the irrelevant attacks of the "old left." Communism as it has developed in eastern Europe represents just as much of bureaucracy as the liberal state in the West. Insofar as this is true, Communism is just as much a target of the "new left" as liberalism. What causes the "new left" to defend communism is the attacks which the "old left" levels against them for not excluding Communists from their activities. Exclusionism is not characteristic


13Tom Hayden, "Confrontation; The Old Left and the New," The American Scholar, XXXVI, 579.
of the "new left." It "denies three of the root ideals of the New Radicalism. That human freedom and participation should be extended. That every individual is noble. That a new society based on love and trust must be created."\(^{14}\)

The "old left" sees Communism as a danger, but the "new left" views Communism in a way similar to the way they view liberalism. Communism is also a movement of the past and not in tune with the needs and conditions created by modern, technological society. To engage in a furious war to eradicate Communism is to fight a phantom enemy while leaving the real problems untouched. Communism represents the same technology and bureaucracy as capitalism. Economics has been transcended by a mode of organization. It is this way of organizing that is the main enemy.

---

\(^{14}\)Newfield, *A Prophetic Minority*, 144.
CHAPTER VI

THE NEW LEFT IN EDUCATION

Thus far in this study, we have dealt with the old and "new left" conflict mainly in general terms. From this base we shall now turn to a consideration of the educational ramifications of these movements. This chapter will view the educational problems from a theoretical perspective.

That there is a dichotomy in education which might be termed "old left" against "new left" is noted in a review article in the Harvard Educational Review by Maxine Greene. Professor Greene comments on Changing Education, a magazine published by a group of teachers and social workers and This Magazine is About Schools, a Canadian independent educational journal. The former magazine is seen as typical of the "old left" in education in that it is firmly committed to the proposition that "federally aided public schools can create a humane, and what John Dewey called a learning society . . ." The latter magazine is typical of the "new left" in its suspicion of the public school as a system which "has evolved to meet society's demand for a docile and uncritical youth."1


2Ibid., 671.

3Ibid.
This is the dichotomy crudely stated but the distinctions should become clearer with further explanation. Changing Education with its sister publication, The American Teacher are representative of the organized teacher movement which traces its roots back to Counts and the push for teacher organization in the thirties. This movement was described as it existed in the thirties in Chapter Two. An examination of these magazines clearly shows that the emphasis has not changed much in the sixties.

Professor Greene describes Changing Education in the following terms: "clean cut, outright, pragmatic - deals with subjects like 'teacher power', collective bargaining, and quality education for all children . . ."\(^4\) Further insight into the concerns of this particular group can be gained from some of the articles appearing in one issue of Changing Education: "Textbook Authors on Labor History," "Factors Which Influence Teachers' Attitudes Toward Union and Social Reform" "Union or Education Association: Which Will the Teacher Join?," and "Educational Opportunity: A New Fringe Benefit for Collective Bargaining."\(^5\) The March, 1968 issue of The American Teacher carried articles on themes similar to those in Changing Education, but involving a more "applied" focus. For example, two articles reported on the new outbreak of teacher militancy, while another urged changes in the bargaining laws for public employees.\(^6\)

---
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\(^5\)Changing Education, II, (Fall, 1967).

\(^6\)The American Teacher, LII, (March, 1968).
Both of the magazines are replete with references to teachers and the powers they do and do not, but should, possess. For example, one article in Changing Education is devoted to evaluation of teaching. After a cursory discussion of student and community evaluation, the article attacks the notion of administrative evaluation and argues, instead, for a system of evaluation by peers. The real issue is a struggle to take evaluative power away from administrators and give it to the teachers.

Teacher power is the main theme in both magazines, and it is seen as providing a cure for many of the institutional problems in education, including academic freedom. The teaching profession is the key to providing better schools for American children. Better teachers mean better schools, and a better organized teaching profession cannot help but produce and maintain a higher quality teacher. George S. Counts, whose earlier role was identified in Chapter Two, and who is active in 1968 in the American Federation of Teachers, gives a concise statement on the importance of the teaching profession.

"The conclusion seems to be warranted that in the years ahead, the teacher will play an increasing role, not only in deciding financial compensation and conditions of work, but also in shaping educational

---


policy." This seems to show that Counts is still confident that the teacher will have a prime role in building the social order that is needed in modern America.

And yet, Counts and the "old left" seem to have lost some of the urgency that was apparent in the writings of the thirties. The emphasis in the current writings is not on building a "new" social order but on improving the present order by substituting teacher power for administration power. The existing educational system is accepted as sufficient to meet the needs of modern society. What is needed is some rearrangement within that system.

The implication of such positions makes it clear that the "old left" in education has become part of the "educational establishment," just as the political "old left" is now a part of the political power structure. That the "old left" in education has come to be accepted by official America is well illustrated by the printing of a letter from President Johnson in Changing Education.

Changing Education is a timely addition to the roster of professional journals. It is a welcome tool in the development of a vital national investment. And I am confident that it will yield rich dividends in effectiveness.

Changing Education . . . reflects a long tradition of dedication to the vitality and progress of this country - a tradition in which the American Federation of Teachers may take justifiable pride.10


The emphasis on education as national investment and the progress of the country show how in education as in other areas, organized labor has been accepted as a full partner in the national enterprise. But by becoming part of the national enterprise, the "old left" in education seems to have lost some of its vitality. Professor Greene, in describing the American Federation of Teachers magazines, notes that many of the articles deal with relevant issues, but without really coming to terms with them on other than general and abstract levels. "The motives seem always to be unexceptionable, but what emerges is frequently reminiscent of 'front office' talk."\(^{11}\)

In other words, when dealing with the crucial issues in education in the sixties, the organized teachers, the "old left," fail to propose imaginative solutions. They are trapped in the same framework as administrators - namely, that of the existing school system. They cannot envision breaking out of this system. The educational system is tied in directly with the "Great Society" program of the political power of the liberal democratic government. "Education for the great society involves raising teacher salaries, building more schools, using computer and audio-visual devices to supply training and meet the manpower needs of the 'national interest.'"\(^{12}\)


The teachers and administrators share in their vision of the goals of education. They argue over what are the most effective means to achieve this goal. By accepting the precedence of national goals, the teachers seem to have joined the great society which, in the eyes of many, seeks to perpetuate the educational status quo. This status quo "accepts as given the premises that education is (a) formal schooling, operating as (b) a public monopoly, (c) modeled after the organizational structure and utilitarian values of corporate business." On this three part commitment teachers unions and educational administrators seem to be in agreement. The union tends to be as bureaucratic and organizationally-minded as management, and as teachers unions increase in size and power, this tendency seems certain to increase.

The "old left" in education, then, seems to share the same orientation as the political "old left": basic satisfaction with the existing American social system and the educational institutions in it. Change, educationally and otherwise, is needed; but, it should take place within the system. The public school movement which has achieved much in American society has the potential to solve the current problems that are facing the country.

Turning now to the "new left" we are confronted with a position quite opposed to that discussed above. The "old left" was described as clean-cut, pragmatic, and dealing in the national interest. The "new left" is much more romantic and critical of things as they are.

\[13\text{Ibid.}, 73.\]
This romanticism is very evident in *This Magazine is About Schools*. "Its writers are preoccupied with student protest, 'the defeat of the child' in the traditional classroom, the teacher who behaves like a 'petty official,' and the need for experimental private schools."\(^{14}\) These types of concerns appear impractical and irrelevant to many who have adopted the great society framework of technology and productivity, but they make sense to a few in the field of education. Speaking of the new romantics, Professor Greene argues: "their values are worth attending to; and it cannot be too debilitating - even for the toughest, coolest, most power-conscious bureaucrat - occasionally to contemplate the meaning of personal freedom, happiness (yes, even that), and joy of life."\(^{15}\)

Articles appearing in *This Magazine* . . . are much different from those one finds in the Federation of Teachers magazine. One issue of the former contained, among others: "Our Contemporary Hairdressers: Ceremonies of Humiliation in School," "The Schools and the Defeat of the Child," and "The Year They Taught the Telephone Directory."\(^{16}\) The emphasis here is much more on the student and his problems than on those of the teacher or institution.

How do these romantics view the teacher? They see him generally as a lower middle class person who has or is trying to achieve middle class status by joining a profession. He has picked the profession


\(^{15}\)Ibid., 673.

\(^{16}\)This Magazine is About Schools, I, (August, 1966), 82.
that has the shortest preparation time and one that he is relatively well acquainted with, as contrasted with the other professions. "A school teaching career provides the most status in proportion to risk; the teacher can be ninety-nine per cent certain that nobody will really get in his way so long as he is ambulatory and not an obvious grotesque." The teacher has settled for a moderate income because of its regularity and security. This is hardly the type of individual who can bring a dynamic approach and outlook to his students. "He is, in effect, a petty official in a bourgeois bureaucracy, a civil servant, a quiet and unadventurous man, precisely the kind least calculated to understand the adolescent children in his charge and under his thumb."

This orientation is certainly not likely to welcome with open arms a movement for teacher power and participation in educational policy decisions. The new educational critics have attacked the "old left" at the basis of their movement, the nature of the teacher himself. This type of criticism of teachers is not confined to "new left" journals and books. In established professional educational journals, one occasionally encounters statements such as the following description of teachers. "They make little effort to provide young people with out-of-class confrontations, confrontations in which students can test the concepts and generalizations under formal analogies."


18Norman Friedman, "The Schools and the Defeat of the Child," This Magazine is About Schools," I, (August, 1966), 82.

What the "new left" proposes as an alternative to emphasis on the teacher is emphasis on the student and the creation of an atmosphere in which the student may learn. The school exists not for the teachers but for the students, and therefore, it should be structured or unstructured for the benefit of the students. Rules and sanctions that tend to impede the students should be seriously questioned. If we remember in the general description of the "new left" how they were described as anti-bureaucratic and anti-technological, we can see that the description of teachers and emphasis on student freedom is directly related to those qualities. The teacher and the school exist as integral parts of the bureaucratic, technological society and what must be avoided is the attempt to make the students fit this mold. Students are the key element in the humanization of the school. Their freedom and individuality must be protected.

The school, as it exists now, is basically an inhuman environment. A way must be found to protect the young and allow them to develop. One of the key ways that the "new left" sees this happening is through the creation of schools that can compete with the existing educational system. This Magazine . . . is replete with articles and photographs describing various experimental schools and universities.

Why is it that there must be attempts at change outside of the existing educational system? "The basic reason why schools and colleges

20"The Principal's Authority," Interview with Edgar Z. Friedenberg, This Magazine is About Schools, II, (Spring, 1968), 48.
cannot cure our major social disorders is not . . . their lack of resources, it is that they are a part of the system which produces the disorders."21 This last point is made in a non-educational journal by an author outside the field of professional education. He is not directly related to the Toronto group that publishes This Magazine . . . but his argument follows lines similar to that of those we have called the "new left" in education. He asserts that education, higher, secondary, and elementary is controlled by the professionals in the field. Moreover, the total professional field is dominated by those at the top, namely, the professors in the graduate schools. It is these professors and graduate institutions who "have direct contact with the dominant institutions in the larger society and which therefore embody and symbolize the demands of the 'real' world."22 Thus the top universities will have greater influence on the rest of the educational system than it has on them. What this augurs is the increasing expansion of graduate programs and the structuring of all the lower schools in terms that suit the ends of the highest level in the system. The total system is becoming more centralized, standardized, and nationalized with graduate school criteria as the final standard. This type of system deals only indirectly, if at all, with the problems and concerns raised by the "new left."

21Christopher Jencks, "Who Should Control Education?" Dissent, XIII, (March-April, 1966), 147.

22Ibid., 154.
What is needed to counteract the trend toward centralization is much more diversity in education. A wide variety of specialized and distinctive institutions should be set up, each of which appeals to a specific constituency and makes use of the special talents of its staff. "Some of the institutions should be large, others small, but in each case the aim should be to determine size according to the needs of the teachers and students rather than on the basis of administrative convenience or logistic pressure."23

Such a system would be based on the principle that:

the needs of individual students have primacy over the needs of institutions, public or private, and that subsidies will be spent on the kinds of education parents and students want, not on the kind politicians want and control. This principle could be realized either by making all subsidies take the form of tuition grants or by paying public funds to schools and colleges according to the number, level, and perhaps the incapacity to pay of their students.24

This plan is in harmony with the "new left's" disenchantment with the public school as a progressive vehicle in modern society. The argument is that change will not occur within the present institutionalized school system, even if it is taken over by the teachers; for they, also, are institutionalized. Change is possible only if the students, the community, and the parents are considered. "The essential point . . . would be . . . to ensure that the allocation of

23 Ibid., 160.
24 Ibid., 161.
resources among competing schools and colleges was in the hands of students and parents."25 The only way to make the system flexible and responsive is to give power to those outside of it.

This type of dispersal has been attempted in the black ghettos of New York City. If Marcuse's designation of disfranchised blacks as change agents is remembered, its appropriateness shows in this instance. Black parents, disenchanted with integration attempts that promised much and produced little, demanded local control over their children's schools. The debate centered for a time around New York's Intermediate School 201. Black parents demanded a voice in the selection of principal and teachers at the school. This scene has been repeated several times in the past year in the ghettos of major cities. The key point for our purposes is that typically, in this type of situation, the parents and black militants line up on one side of the controversy with both the school system's administration and the teachers union opposed. Support for the teachers union and attacks on the blacks have come forth from social democrat or "old left" journals.26

A situation in which the unions find themselves allied with management against a group of parents seems to indicate the decline of the social conscience in the "old left" in education. The union and the administration often wage bitter battles over teachers' salaries and benefits, but when another group attempts to enter the area of

25Ibid.
decision-making, both join together to protect the interests of their respective organizations. The power struggle as it exists now is one between two middle class groups. When confronted by a lower class group seeking their own representation, the middle class will tacitly ally to keep out the intruder who may even want to alter the rules of the game. Thus, when the so-called Bundy plan for massive decentralization of the New York City schools is proposed in an effort to secure more involvement in the schools by members of the community, both the New York teachers union and the board of education register their opposition. The "old left" becomes an impediment to change instead of a progressive force. It has become a part of the organized, inflexible power structure. As a consequence, it must be circumvented along with the rest of the system by some method that will give power to those on the outside.

The push by parents for more control in the ghetto school is one attempt at circumvention, or clash, with the system. Other plans for accomplishing this have appeared, one in an educational journal. This plan argues that what the authors call the great society approach to education has failed. Great society education is that which considers education as formal schooling taking place within institutions that are a public monopoly. Any reform that takes place within this context does not get at the heart of the problem - namely, that great society education in the technological society neglects the fundamental need of man for community. The plan of the authors for the provision

of the "missing community" dimension will provide contexts other than that of the formal school for learning to take place. Through laboratories, studios, work experiences, and community seminars, the exploration of individual and community issues can be accomplished and, hopefully a start will be made toward establishing community. All of these devices will not be handled by professional educators. The push is for the involvement of as many people as possible in the planning, direction, and execution of the activities.

Goodman, referred to earlier in this study, who is well respected by youthful members of the "new left," presents in two essays on education an argument for the breaking up of what he calls the lockstep educational system. "Pouring money into the school-and-college system . . . is strictly class legislation that confirms the inequitable structure of the economy." The system can do little about the problem of poverty in the country for it is directly tied to the social structure which produces poverty. Moreover, Goodman notes that the educational system can do little about the problems of identity and meaning that he raises along with the students in the "new left." For Goodman, solutions come outside of the system. At the elementary and secondary level, he advocates the break up of large centralized systems and the substitution of what he calls "mini-schools." The mini-school is made up of approximately twenty-five children and three

---

or four adults, one a certified teacher. This type of school would be able to utilize the resources of a city and the members could move the learning situation to wherever significant activity is taking place.29

Goodman's plan for reforming higher education is for a group of scholars to secede from the institutions of higher learning "and set up where they can teach and learn on their own simple conditions."30 Yet the prospects of this happening are acknowledged by Goodman and others to be dim. College as well as high school teachers are reluctant to meet issues head-on. The issue of organizing college teachers stands as a good example of this reluctance. "In ordinary political theory, we would expect college teachers to form a union of the studium generale, since they are a community, and to include the students, the alumni, and the local learned public."31 This type of union might be expected to exert a real force, especially in the types of controversy that have arisen lately on campuses.

College faculty, however, have chosen not to follow this model for their organization. "Instead, the American Association of University Professors is a national craft union, largely of entrenched seniors, that copes with distant crises by dilatory committee work."32 Faculty are

29 Ibid.

30 Goodman, Compulsory Mis-education . . , 324.

31 Ibid., 253.

32 Ibid., 254.
bureaucratized to a point where they no longer concern themselves, as individuals or a body, with their students and the universities in which they are teaching. Their allegiance is to their discipline. To ask a college teacher to see poverty or alienation as human problems which they should be interested in dealing with, rather than as hypothesis formulation and testing situations seems remote to many, if not most members of contemporary college faculties. These concerns are laden with value judgments and, therefore, "unscientific" tends to be the stereotyped response.

The major point of what we have called the "new left" in education and those who sympathize with their principles is that the institutions of the school and the university are irrelevant in the contemporary society. Neither are the teachers at either level relevant. When we look at the "new left" in education, there is a notable absence of established professionals in this movement. Rather it seems to be composed mainly of students, parents, and a few dissident teachers, all interested in a return of meaning to the educational process.

We have specifically highlighted in this chapter the type of conflict between the new and "old left" in education that involves American ghetto blacks. When organized teachers fight the move of blacks for more control, we can say that the "old left" in education just as in politics is dead. In Chapter Three, we identified the change agents in contemporary society as being either disfranchised poor or disenchanted students. We have dealt with some aspects of the impact of the poor on education. Now let us examine the impact of students.
In considering the student power movement and its critique of the university, we will start with a description of the university by a noted philosopher who is not a member of the "new left." The description is in agreement with and sets the stage for the "new left" view of the university. Henry D. Aiken describes the modern university as "an educational monster, which devours its young, processing them into an all-purpose compost for refertilizing the great briar patch of the national society."¹ The classical conception of the university as the bearer of the culture and ideals of Western civilization has been forsaken for the role of handmaiden in the development of the industrial and technological society.

This conception of the university as handmaiden, or to be more descriptive, as accomplice of the prevailing social reality, is one that has been accepted by many administrators and faculty in the university. That this conception has not been accepted by a number of the young, radical students and a few of the faculty is the basic theme of this chapter. As Aiken sees it, there will always be this type of dissent in the university since: "it is impossible to bring

together so many minds and varied talents in one concentrated environment as the multiversity does, without creating a myriad of unanticipated educational situations rich in meaning and content.\textsuperscript{2}

Even though the university as an institution would wish to abscond its responsibilities as culture agent, educator of students, and social critic, there is a group within the institution who do not wish to see that happen. This group is the subject of the present chapter.

The university prefers to ignore the voice of this group, concentrating instead on the measurable, logical, factual, and statistical voices in the institution. It models its curriculum on these bases, emphasizing the scientific, and encourages the non-scientific areas to emulate the habits of the sciences. This emphasis leaves a large gap in the emotional, moral, spiritual, or value realm. These areas do not respond readily to objective treatment, and their considerations often lead to questions that deal with the bases of the commitments that people and societies make in their lives. The official university does not care to undertake these commitments, for to do this would subject the institution to an examination of its own rationale and purpose.

The university and the classroom have become agnostic in morality and the agnosticism of the classroom is not even principled. It rather, in principle, is unconcerned. "It is bourgeois Christianity all over again, to so great an extent that, in college, in spite of differences

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.
in belief, the behavior of agnostic and religious man is pretty much the same." Well-defined sets of values are of little importance in the University. The university is the world of articulation and the ideal in this world is tolerance. In other words, there is little connection between the real world and the university world when it comes to making ethical judgments about either or both.

Universities are organized in terms of "disciplines." These disciplines tend to involve totally the professors who work in them. As a consequence, these men develop a certain blindness to what goes on outside of their discipline. "The gap between the professional disciplines and the real world - where 'real' means of concern to living human beings - could grow to great lengths before professionals would notice." Professors are most concerned with accomplishing their professional tasks, and they advocate truth and objectivity in a way that lifts the burden of human relevance from their shoulders. "Their dignified phrases about truth and academic freedom could be claimed just as well by auto repairmen."  

All that has been said so far seems ably summarized in a description of the modern university as akin to the medieval church.

---


5Tbid.
In a rough way, the university is to society what the church used to be: its spiritual center, its source of guidance and legitimation. Its duly ordained experts are the clergymen of the new era . . . We have not yet devised ways of guaranteeing the separation of university and state.6

This analogy, when applied to the dissenting students in the university, sees them as the modern counterpart to the Protestant reformers. The reformers are seeking the separation of university and state. They are attacking the corrupt officials of the modern church with a vengeance characteristic of moral reformers.

The chief failing of the modern educational system, as seen through the eyes of young, militant students, is the ethical irresponsibility of the institutions of higher education and the faculty members who teach in them. Contemporary education has chosen to emphasize intellect at the expense of the non-intellectual. A young student states: "One of the things that distresses us most is the moral insensitivity of people in the academic world, who go their own way and haven't responded to things that we see as signs that the society is cracking up."7 The university professor instead of responding, acquiesces, often joyously, in the institutional pattern of avoiding moral choices.

The way universities are set up now, the whole idea is that a professor is not personally responsible for his ideas - that is to say, it's a free marketplace

6Ibid.
7Students and Society, (Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1967), 60.
of ideas and you can't beat up a professor if he has ideas that are obnoxious to you - that ethic, which in some respects is a very crude one, has led to the attitude that nobody is responsible for what he believes. Professors can say any old nonsense in class and never have to be held accountable.\(^8\)

Thought is totally divorced from moral action.

The university professor has become a functional part of the institution. Rather than participate in meaningful dialogue with his students about society, he chooses the route that is supportive of the university as it is. This leads the students to the assertion that faculty are not to be trusted. They have done little or nothing to fight the expansion of administrative power. They support expansion of the university, without considerations of purpose, other than the chance that they or their department might benefit financially from expansion. They either refuse or have been unable to organize themselves into bodies that will exert a profound influence towards their own autonomy and freedom. "Isolated cases aside, their record in the defense of civil liberties is abysmal. Until they overcome their past impotence, their destiny is simple. They will live in an organization, while dreaming ineffectually of a community."\(^9\)

What of the accomplishments of faculty? They have fought for and achieved the recognition of tenure; and yet this has failed to

\(^8\) Ibid., 39.

change the university significantly. It is still an undemocratic institution with little respect for the individuals who are a part of it.

The university teachers are not teachers, they are technocrats. They are devoted to the science of their discipline and the passing on of this craft to students. What has been achieved in modern education to a large extent is the removal of students from real men with ideas. How is this done? "One way is to make the university a place which is inhospitable to a learned man, a man who has some kind of vision of unified knowledge and is trying to make knowledge relevant to his life."10 This type of person is shunned by a university because he has no specialty. He is more than an intellectual technician. Instead of facing the challenge of this type of man in the classroom, students face the specialized, intellectual technocrat, likely to be uninspiring and dull. It is almost impossible for students to have real respect for these half-men who call themselves teachers.

The university and its specialist faculty have given up on producing whole men. They choose rather to try and duplicate the academic specialization and expertise that characterizes both the institution and the larger society. The university is producing scientists, social scientists, engineers, and professors of poetry rather than poets, or teachers of creative writing rather than writers.

10 Students and Society, 20.
From the point of view of the sensitive, militant student, his position in the academic community is that of second-class citizen. "The student is seen as someone no more able to recognize and distinguish his needs from his wants than a six year old."\(^{11}\)

The academic world is founded in a teacher-student relation analogous to the parent-child relation which characterizes in loco parentis. Further, academia includes a radical separation of student from the material of study. That which is studied, the social reality, is 'objectified' to sterility, dividing the student from life - just as he is restrained in active involvement by the deans controlling student government.\(^{12}\)

Important in the above for this study is the comparison of the faculty and administration. The student sees little distinction between the two when it comes to the issue of meaningful student participation. Though the faculty is usually liberal politically, they reflect a conservative position when confronted with ideas that question the nature of their institution and their own part in it. The dichotomy of students on one side and faculty and administration on the other is similar to the general position of the "new left" vis a vis the "old left." The liberal faculty are seen by the students as part of the university establishment and are to be trusted as much as the administration of that establishment.

The result of this general perception is that the student sees himself as alienated from his institution, its teachers and facilities. The situation for the student is that "the means, as given, do not

\(^{11}\)Ibid., 15.

\(^{12}\)"The Port Huron Statement," The New Student Left, eds. Cohen and Hale, 221.
support, and are in part even destructive of the proper performance of the student's role and, most importantly, are not under his control.\textsuperscript{13} The students are becoming aware of just how irrelevant they are to the present academic institution. They are just as irrelevant to the teachers. And, students are becoming increasingly resentful of this fact.

This resentment is patently obvious in the actions of radical students since the Berkeley demonstrations in 1964. Berkeley, the embodiment of the liberal university in the liberal society, was seen by Mario Savio and other students as the equivalent of Mississippi. The Mississippi poor black is oppressed by a powerful white minority. "In our free speech fight at the University of California, we have come up against what may emerge as the greatest problem of our nation-depersonalized, unresponsive bureaucracy."\textsuperscript{14} This bureaucracy has succeeded to a large extent in manipulating the faculty of the university to a point where they see their main allegiance as being to an abstract discipline rather than to the students or the university. This effectively diminishes faculty concern over the university structure and their places and the places of the students within that structure. Publication, promotion, and the academic marketplace comprise the reality for a faculty member. He is judged by his superiors

\textsuperscript{13}Timothy C. Earle, "At Stake is a Chance for Survival," \textit{To Make a Difference}, ed. Otto Butz, 106.

\textsuperscript{14}Mario Savio, "An End to History," \textit{The New Student Left}, eds. Cohen and Hale, 254.
and his peers, and the students have little or no part in this judgment. Publication and promotion are bureaucratic concepts that have little relevance to the lives of the students or the problems of society. Even in his classroom contact with students, the typical faculty member often is testing ideas that turn up in future publications. This, in and of itself, is not inappropriate, but when the content is examined, the total irrelevance of most of it to the lives of the students is apparent. Even where content is relevant, it should be explained to students and this seldom happens.

In short, contemporary education has become too intellectual, in the sense of contributing to the academic professions. "Too great a portion of the energies of colleges and universities is still devoted to the expansion of the intellect at the expense of the emotions."15 Similarly, too much time is spent on pure, abstract thought rather than thought as it relates to action. These indictments by the students are clear. Let us now examine their proposals for reform.

Obviously, from what has been said, students want higher education to be concerned with more than intelligence. The intellect must be considered in its relations with emotions. And, these two factors should be considered in their relationship to action. The university, by including emotion and action, should proceed to the task of

evaluating the foundations of the society in which it exists. It
should be aware of the rapid social change that is taking place in
modern society and be prepared to guide and take part in that change.

The university is much the worse for not integrating
the experience of social change into the curriculum, for
not dealing with the students as individuals trying to
understand themselves and the world in their own terms.
In effect they /Berkeley students/ were demanding the aid
and assistance of their professors (the university) in
interpreting and changing Mississippi, Vietnam, northern
slum ghettos, bureaucracy, the Brave New World, 1984 and
all the rest. In their own confused, rude, incoherent
and sometimes vulgar way, the Berkeley students were
demanding that their professors sit down with them . . .
and deal with these questions.16

Almost all the issues that students see as important are
described in the preceding paragraph. The author's plea was for
faculty response but as we shall see, this response was not forthcoming.

When the faculty do not respond to student requests, what are the
means of securing the requests? If faculty are unwilling to assist,
students must go it alone; and the means - student power. "What we
want is power per se . . . power for students for the same reason that
Negroes want black power. And this is because all people ought to
have control over their lives and the conditions under which they
live."17

The demand, then, is for student power, but what is student
power? "First, power is the ability to influence; second, power is

---

16Joseph L. Walsh, "What the Students Want," Commonweal, 83,
(November 19, 1965), 208.

17Students and Society, 30.
the ability to control; and third, power is the capacity for self-determination. If you talk about getting power, you are obviously talking about student organization."\(^{18}\) One of the ways to do this is to unionize the students. A student union could be a vehicle to voice student opinion on campuses where most means of communication are controlled by the institutional hierarchy.

What of the goals of student power? Student power will be geared toward making the university a place where education occurs. This indeed is a radical reform and, if accomplished, it will fulfill the legitimate role of university "student." What must be done for student power to succeed in making the university educational is to decentralize the decision making in the institution. More responsibility must come to students. "The basic change we have to make is to democratize the academic community. Only this really gets to the heart of the problem."\(^{19}\) Higher education must start meeting the needs of the students. The only way it can do this is to provide students an opportunity to say what it is they need. Students must participate in determining policies in the institutions.

This push for democratization by the students is not only geared to the level of the single institution. Democracy, as seen by the students, should also apply at the inter-institutional level.

\(^{18}\text{Ibid.}, 34.\)

\(^{19}\text{Ibid.}, 17.\)
"We must be concerned with the destruction of the whole concept of elitism. Students who go to Harvard are put in a class above students who go to other colleges. Now this should be impossible."  

This student push for democracy seems to be the "new left" principle of "participatory democracy" applied to the university setting. In addition to democratization and decentralization, student power, if it is to be effective, must demand an influence over how the university spends its money. If the university is engaged in exploitive or military ventures in this country or abroad, students must be able to voice their opposition, and in a meaningful fashion. "Then you are making a positive connection between the university, the student power movement, and the problems of the rest of society."  

Until the university decides to give students the voice they seek, various tactical moves have been advocated by the students to force the issue. Specific targets are the Reserve Officer Training Corps programs on campuses, defense research, and the administrative bureaucracy. Disruption of one or all of these activities is looked upon as helpful in making the desired point.  

Another goal of the student power movement is a change in the teaching process and in teacher student relationships. A consequence of student power will be the "rethinking of the traditional teacher/student roles . . . The role of the teacher as leader generates

---

20 Ibid., 19.
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passivity; this role will be attacked and attempts made to replace it with basic group learning situations that involve minimal, nominal, or no leadership." The kinds of relationships that exist between teachers and students will have to be broadened, diversified, and democratized. The hierarchical relationship will be eroded and the line between teacher and student will tend to blur. More dialogue will occur in the teaching process and students and teachers will work together in solving academic and social questions.

How do faculty, themselves, view the student movement and its calls for reform? Generally, the faculty, including specifically those on faculties who are considered liberal politically, have viewed the student movement with emotions ranging from alarm to disdain. Their criticisms of the students are many and varied.

Many faculty members have called into question the validity of the notion that students have of reconstructing the university as "a place where men of learning and research pursue their life's work. They may, or may not, share this research with their students, depending on their national prominence, their own tastes and desires, and the educational needs in the area." This line of criticism of the students also sees political action and social change as something


that should be left mainly to those who are professionals in these fields. Thus, those who argue in this way seem to stress the lack of qualifications on the part of the students to make pronouncements about their education and their society.

This theme of a lack of qualification is echoed in the remarks of Stringfellow Barr, member of one of the country's leading liberal institutions, after he witnessed a two-day seminar involving discussions of the university and modern society by several young, militant students. Barr argued that in the healthy university, the student should expect many choices to be made by those under whom the student chose to study. Faculty are usually better educated than students, and therefore, qualified to give substantial assistance to the students in obtaining an education. The keynote of the faculty and student contact is the "professional relationship" that exists between the two and implicit in this is the acknowledgment of the professional member's authority over his charge.26

Another failing of the student movement, at least according to one faculty member, is that the students are not really interested in education. The students react mainly to specific situations that are taking place on their own campuses, while offering no "detailed alternatives to present educational policy."27 The students prefer

26 Students and Society, 58-9.

ad hoc demonstrations which are relatively easy to organize in comparison with the difficult task of offering substantial reforms.

This line of criticism seems rather unfair since one of the objectives that almost every student demonstration seeks is a voice in control or policy-making at the university. One does not seem justified in criticizing students for not attaining that which they are trying to seek. In other words, students should not be criticized for failing to offer substantive proposals as long as they are in a position where they are still seeking recognition as members of the university community. When they achieve this recognition, they can then be expected to offer concrete proposals.

Another, and perhaps the most important critique of the student movement by the faculty is that which centers not mainly on the goals of the students but the strategies and tactics used to achieve them. The Berkeley incidents of 1964 have been described at length in several books and articles. Without repeating these descriptions, Berkeley can still be used as an illustration of the faculty criticism of the students' methods. The students at Berkeley used many radical tactics such as sit-ins and mass demonstrations to enforce their demands on the university. These tactics left many liberal faculty members aghast.

A member of the sociology department described the leaders of the student revolt as "Castroite." Although the students were not formal members of the Communist party, the designation "Castroite" implies agreement with Communist tactics and goals, on the local if
not global level. This professor described the militant student group as a totalitarian body. They wished to break the law to achieve their aims and they presumed that they could break the law with impunity.

The students described the issue as free speech but the sociologist did not agree. "In fact ... the real issue is the seizure of power. The guiding principle of the radicals leading the revolt is one of Lenin's favorite aphorisms ... 'Strike now, analyze later.'"\(^{28}\)

This sociologist was not the only one to level this type of charge at the students. Two of his colleagues described the demonstration as "collectivist and totalitarian and introduced motions to the Academic Senate condemning violence and praising peace and order."\(^{29}\) The students were also compared with Ku Klux Klanners.

The students are seen by these faculty and others as anarchists. The students give evidence of disdain for orderly procedures. "On the educational scene, demonstrations, interference with the right of others, and riots have become the order of the day, an established fact that permits no contradiction - all in the name of academic freedom, civil rights, and liberalism."\(^{30}\) The solution of the


professor just quoted is to formulate a set of rules and orderly procedures that will be explicit enough to prevent anarchy. Perhaps this is the solution of all those who see the students as some form of totalitarian. More explicit laws do not seem to be a realistic solution if the students' perceptions of the university are in any way valid.

The criticisms of the student offered so far are of a substantive and procedural nature. They have come from a variety of faculty, most if not all who can be described as "politically liberal." Hopefully, this points to grounds for comparing this faculty perspective to that political perspective we have called "old left." Sidney Hook, an eminent professor of philosophy who is indisputably linked with liberal politics and ideas, has commented on the Berkeley student uprising and other student movements. Professor Hook's comments are very similar to those of the faculty we have just discussed.

Professor Hook has made a variety of comments on the students at Berkeley. He sees the activity over poverty, discrimination, and other social evils as appropriate to the moral and civil areas. Moral and civil rights are not corollaries of academic freedom. To make them such "would make the university responsible for the entire state of society and its reform." The university faces enough of a burden in its task of developing thoughtful and knowledgable students. To ask it to do more than this cannot help but take away

from the achievement of its prime task. Following this line of reasoning, it is logical to argue that good works performed off campus are no substitute for good works on campus. "No service is done to students by flattering them or by giving them the impression they can acquire an education in any other way than by accepting the hard intellectual disciplines of the logic of ideas and events."32 The students' plea for connection between thoughts and contemporary activity is rejected. Thought must be developed first, and later, it will be applied.

Some students have argued that they have the right to political agitations and other controversial activities on campus because of student academic freedom. Professor Hook argues that this is nonsense. Students have no academic freedom. They do have a freedom to learn which is best protected by the academic freedom of their teachers. "When teachers are deprived of academic freedom, students are ipso facto deprived of the freedom to learn."33 However, this clearly does not mean that the students' freedom to learn is at the same level as a professor's freedom to teach.

As far as the student contention that the university is the equivalent of Mississippi in its oppression of the students, Professor Hook answers that the university is by far more liberal than most other institutions. Academic freedom in the institution is in its

32 Ibid., 442.
33 Ibid., 433.
stage of highest development in the modern university. To compare this situation with Mississippi is a demagogic act in Professor Hook's view.

Finally, Professor Hook has the same reservations about tactics that our earlier liberal commentators possessed. He is particularly alarmed by attempts to bypass official school channels including the existing student government. The results of this type of appeal are usually mass demonstrations or strikes which use the threat of force and violence or passive resistance to achieve their aims. These tactics are justified "only in extreme situations in behalf of basic principles of freedom. Except in such extreme situations, changes in the laws of a democratic community must be made by practices within the law."\(^{34}\) Hook here seems to be granting a degree of legitimacy to student demands but only if they are sought in an open and honest forum where freedom and democracy can triumph over all challengers. Obviously he sees the university as presenting that type of forum.

This seems to be a key point in the dispute between students and faculty, new and "old left." Does the university present an open and honest forum for students to air their concerns? The faculty, at least the ones we have seen, seem to think so. The students do not. The Berkeley students in 1964 just as the Columbia students in 1968 saw the situation as precisely that extreme instance where Hook justifies extreme tactics. The two sides see the situation in a totally different light. The question is which group is correct?

---

\(^{34}\)Ibid., 441.
If the description of the society of the modern technological world by Mills, Goodman, and Marcuse is correct, the students are correct. If things are not that bad and the university is at its highest stage of development, the faculty are right. The resolution of this dichotomy is not easy, but if the argument we have developed to this point is valid, the weight of the argument lies with the students. They seem to be more in touch with the present technological reality than their teachers. Their argument requires drastic means for change. And, if they are correct, drastic means are necessary.

A few liberal professors and intellectuals agree with this analysis. Responding to criticism by liberals of students for not providing some new idea of a university, one liberal argued that the student criticisms were most proper and it was the job of himself and his colleagues to listen and help the students renovate the university. This individual described his own experience in higher education as follows: "My years in college, in university, were years of terror, and my years of teaching were unrelieved catastrophe. I don't think the university for a student or a teacher has changed."35

Other professors support the students reputedly "undemocratic tactics" such as the hooting down of pro-administration and Vietnam war speakers and the disruption of Dow chemical recruiting sessions. These activities are seen by most critics as totalitarian. The professor in question sees the tactics as attempts to show the

35Students and Society, 57.
inadequacies of the present conception of freedom of speech in a technological society. The student solution has been to violate accepted standards of conduct and decorum in a way that will tag the targets of their demonstrations with that most hideous of labels in the modern world, controversial. The professor sees as desperately needed

a theory of free speech and tolerance which takes account of advances in technology . . . and in industrial wealth and power. We need defense against the owners, advertisers, and official users of the mass media, and against those who rely upon traditional decorum and the need for law and order to make effective public challenge impossible. Given television and affluence, a government no longer needs a brazen gestapo; it can win acquiescence by granting bread and circuses and announcing noble sentiments.36

From this point of view, the student tactics are seen as fighting totalitarianism rather than being totalitarian.

What do the students themselves have to say about the liberal criticism of their actions? Replying to charges of irresponsible and undemocratic use of coercion the students say that coercion has been necessary in bringing about nearly all of the country's radical reforms. "Without the Boston Riot of nineteen three, the challenge of Booker Washington's power by black radicals . . . would never have gotten off the ground."37

The students, themselves, see their faculty critics as reflecting an "insider" bias. They have a vested interest in the institution of

---


37Students and Society, 28.
the university and they see the problem as soluable through improve-
ment of communication within the institution rather than radical,
disruptive tactics. The faculty have not realized "that the problem
lies largely in the fact that students are 'outsiders', to whom being
listened to is as important a part of communication as hearing
accurately."\(^{38}\) The point is that while the faculty may have access
to the centers of power and decision it is certain that the students
do not.

This study clearly supports the contention that the students
and "new left" are more correct in their analysis of the present age
as one of crisis in which significant segments of our society are
unrepresented. The faculty "old left" speak from positions of
relative power. They have achieved many, even most, of their goals,
but they have erred in their appraisal of the student movement and
the "new left" in general. An example of one leading liberal who has
erred in his judgment is that of Seymour Martin Lipset, noted sociologist.

Writing of the Berkeley events of 1964 two years after they
occurred, Lipset states "it is clear that the Berkeley revolt was an
isolated event caused by very specific local factors, that it did not
foretell any national upsurge of student protest against the evils of
the multiversity . . ."\(^{39}\) Judging this statement by the events of the

\(^{38}\)Paff, Cavala, and Berman, "The Student Riots at Berkeley . . .," The New Student Left, eds. Cohen and Hale, 252.

past two years, by events at Ohio State, Columbia, Northwestern and many other campuses, it seems that Lipset and his collaborator were at least partially erroneous in their analysis. They also argued that while it is possible for the new student left to cause change in America, "it is much more likely that it is one of many unsuccessful attempts in the United States to create a radical movement in an essentially unfertile environment."40

Whether or not radical movement has been created is a matter of debate, but recent events such as the limited cessation of bombing of North Vietnam, the withdrawal of President Johnson from consideration for renomination, and the candidacy of Senator McCarthy seem to offer ample evidence for the assertion that Lipset has underestimated the students. Lipset shares his underestimation with almost all members of what we have called the "old left." What seems to be needed is a means to get faculty and the "old left" to recognize the validity of the student position and to offer their own participation in the movement. The nature of this means is a topic for discussion in the concluding chapter.

40Ibid.
This study has analyzed the relationship of education to two radical social and political movements. The movements, known as the "old" and the "new left," were seen as separate movements arising to answer the demands of different societies.

The "old left," was described as that movement which arose to combat the crisis that existed in American society after the Great Depression. This response was to an economic crisis, and thus, the thrust of the solution was in the realm of economics. The depression showed the economic inequality of the capitalist system in the country and the solution of the "old left" involved a drastic realignment of the property relationships in the country.

George S. Counts was described as one who was directly involved in these events in the thirties. Counts was involved in the larger political movement and also involved in the educational profession. Thus, education, at least in this man and his theories, was related to politics and reform. Counts advocated teachers acting to correct the undemocratic conditions that existed in the country. He saw education as having a social purpose, the perpetuation of a democratic system in the country. Teachers must work for democracy, and they were to do
this as a group. Teachers must organize into a cohesive and militant
group that would seek to democratize the economy and the country.
Through this push they would achieve the realization of a meaningful
professional status. The teachers group must then unite with other
organizations seeking economic and social democracy. As part of a
national federation of labor, teachers would be able to exhibit an
influence that they justly deserve to wield.

We turned from Counts to an examination of the social conditions
that we find existing in the 1960's, the decade in which the "new left"
rose to the surface. The society that we saw in this decade was not
the same as that which confronted Counts. The crisis of the later
decade was seen to be more organizational than economic. The
technological society of the 1960's is highlighted by an ever
increasing amount of centralization throughout all of its institutions.

Centralization was found to have permeated the educational
institutions of the society as well as other social agencies. The
undemocratic character of the society in the sixties was of such a
nature that new change agents had to be found. Two groups were
proposed as such agents; the young intellectuals and students, and
the non-white, disfranchised poor. These groups were not the same
ones that the "old left" saw as change agents nor were the new groups
to accomplish the push for change in the way envisioned by their
predecessors.

The young intellectuals and poor were described further and
their differences with the older radicals were noted. The new
radicals demanded what they considered a more fundamental change.
Their perspective called for a massive decentralization of power in the society. The older radicals wanted to substitute one power group for another but this was not adequate for the newer group. The welfare state, which the elders claimed as their accomplishment, was viewed as a myth by the youngsters. The new revolt was more of a moral and existential type than the economically-oriented one of the past.

The new movement sought to build a community dimension by creating new institutions since those that the elders had left had succumbed to the centralizing tendencies of the technological society. This push is best symbolized in the phrase "participatory democracy" which the new radicals advocate and the old radicals find difficult to understand. "Participatory democracy" represents a push for self-determination and independence and thus is applicable not only among the poor but among any group that is able to realize their lack of independence in the society.

The differences between the "old left" and the "new left" were summarized and divided into three categories. The first is a matter of style and emotion. The older movement was characterized by an intellectual orientation that emphasized give-and-take debate and the clarification of differences. The newer group, responding to a more qualitative crisis, emphasizes consensus rather than debate, and an emotional rejection of modern society. The second difference between the two groups involves politics. The older group, being more political in nature, emphasizes a national orientation and coalition between various interest groups. The newer group prefers local
activity as more meaningful to the people involved and exhibits a moral purity which prohibits coalition with "tainted" groups of any kind. The final group difference is that in regard to the Communist party. The older radicals remember the thirties when Communism was a key issue and for them it remained so in the following decades. The newer group cannot experience fear or love at the mention of the word Communism. It has few ideological connotations for them. Rather, Communism appears as just one more organizational irrelevancy in the over-organized world.

Once the dichotomy between "old" and "new left" was explored the study moved to the realm of education. The existence of an older and newer radical group was demonstrated, but it was noted that the older group was made up mainly of teachers while the newer group was made up of students and non-white parents in ghetto schools. The older educational radicalism resembled the "old left" in its push for teacher organization and power. It is a direct descendant of Counts and as such says little, or nothing, about the problems raised by bureaucracy in the technological society. If and when teacher power replaces administrative power, little change can be expected regarding issues significant in the modern society.

The newer educational movement exhibits a romanticism and an anti-bureaucratic attitude that was not seen in the teacher group. The new disenchanted see change as impossible within the existing educational institutions. From this perspective they advocate the starting of new, experimental schools and universities. If change is to come, it will take place "outside" of the present system.
The student movement in the universities was discussed as an example of new radicalism in education. The students were seen as moral reformers, analogous to these men who were involved in the Protestant Reformation. The university, as the medieval church, was seen as the corrupt cornerstone of a corrupt society. The faculty as part and parcel of this corruption were seen as unable to do anything about the crisis. Faculty choose to ignore the reasons for student rebellion. They choose to condemn totalitarian tactics which they see as applicable only in times of grave emergency.

The students obviously see these times as grave, but the faculty do not. This is seen as a result of the faculty's refusal to look at events in anything but an objective, scientific, intellectual perspective. The students inject morality into their view, and it enables them to see the seriousness of the situation. The faculty have become morally irrelevant, just as the university is perceived to be. Neither the institution or the men who teach in it exhibit understanding of what the students see as the crisis of their society.

In summary, our thesis is that the conditions of the contemporary American society are seen most appropriately by the young who make up what we have called the "new left." The "old left" is the result of another era. Its usefulness in this era is limited.

This is not to denigrate the "old left," for those in the newer movement learned much from the old. The push of the older radicals for involvement in and solution of their problems has been inherited by the newer radicals. The dichotomy that exists between the two groups and was emphasized in this thesis does not always have to
exist. Dwight Macdonald, in a recent appeal for support for the Columbia University SDS chapter, accepted the claims of the young for drastic measures to reform the university and society. Macdonald remarked that the tactics of the students "while unlawful and even, at first, statistically undemocratic, are the only ones adequate to the historical situation: "the kind of outrageous defiance of the Establishment which can shove it off its dead-center stasis toward basic reform."1 Perhaps this is a portent of a coming rapprochment or at least an attempt to understand each other on the part of the two groups.

And what of the prospects in the educational realm? The answer to this is not as promising. Stressed in the discussion of education was the demonstrated fact that the existing educational systems, both at the lower and higher levels, were on trial. A big part of the "new left" push in education is for alternatives to the existing institutions. However, this does not mean that those in the movement would not respond to the reform of present institutions. What this means is that no evidence has arisen to indicate that the new radicals are blind to accomplishment within existing structures. The mad rush of youth, including radical youth, to the candidacy of Senator McCarthy should indicate that there is some hope for those in institutions. But an important unresolved issue is what should those who are in educational institutions be thinking of doing to respond to the concerns of the "new left."

Schools and universities have to face the fact that if they are to survive in a meaningful way, decentralization is in order. Teacher organizations, especially, have a tendency to imitate administrators in fearing decentralization because they see a loss of some of their prerogatives. No specific plan of decentralization is offered here, but sure to be included at the university level is some attempt to combat the specialization of the department system and the sub-specialties that inhere within departments. Teachers at both the university and the school levels would be well advised to diminish the "old left" push for professionalization of their occupation. If they do not wish to hear of the evils of professionalism, they ought to find ways to humanize their profession.

At the lower levels, especially in the ghetto areas, faculty are going to have to find some way to accept the notion that the parents of these children have as much right to participation in the planning and execution of the educational process as the suburban whites have through their school board. Teachers must seek community involvement. They cannot avoid it through seeking the protection of a school board or a teachers' union bureaucracy. Human contact must be established with ghetto children and their parents. Bureaucratic contacts are notoriously inhuman. "Teacher power" may be effective in dealing with administrators, but its effectiveness in dealing with students and parents is not very great.

From the point of view taken in this study, the single most important reform necessary at educational institutions of all levels is the establishment of student-faculty relationships that differ
from the present. Though many of the students and parents in the "new left" argue that education as it now stands is unsalvageable, any teacher who has tried it knows how students will respond when given an honest chance to relate to a teacher as a human being. There can be little in the way of structure programs to increase student-faculty contact. The impetus should come from faculty members as individual human beings seeking to contact other human beings.

A final word is in order in response to a question that was asked at the end of the introductory chapter. The question was whether the new radicalism was different enough from its predecessors to indicate that it might have some appreciable impact on the educational world. The dissertation has given some grounds for hope in that radicalism now appeals to groups in education other than the teachers - namely, students and parents. Again in this case as in others, the numbers are not yet large, but there is some concentration in the case of ghetto schools which may force the schools to respond to radicalism. If radicalism makes itself felt in one section of the mass education system, the effect is likely to spread to other sections. The future is hopeful.
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