The connection between knowing the truth and some version of how men should live has always guided those who would lead the university. Walls around a campus or geographic isolation cannot prevent social pressures from affecting the institution. Colleges and universities have always been politicalized. The danger lies not in that fact but in the sharp new exposure of the misuse and abuse of the substantial power these institutions now possess at a time when higher education has become essential to economic, political, social and spiritual survival: The character of the new knowledge and the technologies available for getting access to it have reduced the qualitative gap between those who teach and those who are being taught. Today's students want to consult the original sources of knowledge. Therefore, the institutions must be prepared to share the process of academic lawmaking with those it expects to govern. New mechanisms must be found for integrating the new knowledge into the curricula and new efforts must be made to answer to the needs of the environment, particularly the cities. To break down the walls of the academic monopolies it is necessary to (1) eliminate the old demarcation line between college and high school (2) transfer a substantial amount of power from white to black in the urban communities (3) eliminate the superblock campuses and integrate them into the city (4) find new ways to honor the experience of those we seek to educate (5) improve the whole educational system and (6) create the best possible environment for learning in our institutions. (AM)
In November of 1965, Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, said:

The responsible student knows that a university would suffer irremediable damage if it allowed itself to become embroiled institutionally in a partisan fashion in any subject of current controversy... If any university becomes politicalized in this fashion, it will have lost its soul.

In December of 1968, Sidney Hook, distinguished professor of philosophy at New York University, said:

We cannot believe that the mission of the university is to lead mankind to a new Jerusalem. Any attempt to do so would destroy, among other things, the university's role to serve as intellectual sanctuary when the winds of popular passion blow... The goal of the university is not the quest for power or virtue, but the quest for significant truths...

Mr. Kirk now spends most of his time raising money for a university which, apparently, has "lost its soul"; and Mr. Hook is now passionately blowing around the country organizing the troops in behalf of his own New Jerusalem.

"Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make Ye Free." The connection between knowing the Truth and some version of how men should live has always guided those who would lead the university. In behalf of such a connection self-righteous men established Harvard, Thomas Jefferson argued his case for a new university in Virginia, Congressman Morrill persuaded the national legislature to create a whole new breed of educational institutions, and every university in this country today, which is "politically" realistic, reaches out for its nearest urban base.

When the early Medieval scholars broke through the walls of the monastery to flee to the streets of the cities, the Church must have issued a press release warning against lost souls. Bologna, whose colors march first in our academic parades, was originally a storefront operation, housed in rented halls and cold lofts through which the winds of popular passion certainly blow. The retreat from the streets of the city into the Oxonian superblock campus was no retreat from the politics of the time. The enclave campus, purposely designed to disrupt the orderly flow of city life, was but one expedient version of the connection between the quest for
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Truth and how men should live. The reconstruction of the monastery's wall around Oxford's superblock was an attempt at party discipline, a redevelopment act as politically charged as the Model Cities Program. It is this counterpoint to Medieval politics that we Americans, as skillfully imitative as the Japanese, replicated in such absurd places as the remote prairies of Southern Indiana or the inaccessible Adirondack foothills surrounding Ithaca. From embattled parapets overlooking the plains of Harlem or the Southside neighborhoods of Chicago, ancient knights cry out in behalf of their souls, beset by the motley hordes wanting in, searching for souls of their own.

Other brave knights have stoutly defended their special privileges and vested interests before. The walls did not keep the sciences out. The walls did not keep the technologies out. The walls did not keep the tradesmen and the farmers out. The walls did not keep the new professions out. The walls did not keep the immigrant masses out. The walls did not keep the Manhattan Project out. The walls did not keep Hitler out. The walls did not keep the GI's or the Fulbright Program out. The walls did not keep the trade unions out, or the industrial recruiters or the ROTC credits. The walls will not keep the poor, the black, out.

Our colleges and universities stand in no clear and present danger of becoming politicalized. They always have been politicalized. They are now. The clear and present danger is a sharp new exposure of the misuse and abuse of the substantial power they have come to possess. Not only the brick-and-mortar walls are crumbling—the archaic versions of how we should build the university in the modern city—but also under attack is the credit hour version of law-and-order; the outmoded versions of due process represented by oligarchical curriculum committees and self-perpetuating boards of trustees; and the doctrine of segregation upheld by politicalized academic departments and culturally biased admission thresholds. The qualitative gaps between those who teach and those who are taught have been markedly reduced by the character of the new knowledge and the technologies available for getting access to it. About all that can be said now about the college student and his teacher is that one of these adults is younger than the other, that each knows something the other doesn't, and that both are in deep trouble. The sheer quantity of what there is to know now magnifies the ignorance of both. They share a new kind of equality, and it is the reality of this equality which now shakes the walls to their very foundations.

Monopoly power is the antithesis of egalitarian and democratic politics. The essence of monopoly power is the control of the production of the goods and services essential to a people's survival. To survive in an economy based on the technology we have developed, now requires for most some kind of education beyond the twelfth grade. To survive effectively in a political state of the kind to which we subscribe, now requires some kind of education beyond the twelfth grade. To survive spiritually and culturally in an affluent middle class society of the kind our wealth and technology promise for all, now requires some kind of education beyond the twelfth grade. For better or for worse, what we call higher education in this country virtually holds monopoly power over the production of educational goods and services beyond the twelfth grade. Indeed, the colleges and universities exercise what amounts to a monopolist's influence over educational production below the twelfth grade.

Under the circumstances of the new knowledge and the urbanization of America's people, the link between education and survival is irrevocably political. Admissions policies (decision-making about who will be kept out) have political consequences.
The quality of what happens to the people who get in has political consequences. The act of granting a degree (the terms of which one may get out) is a political act. Freedom itself is a political concept. It means, if nothing else, a particular distribution and use of, and access to power. The adjective "academic" when placed in front of the word "freedom" merely specifies particular purposes in behalf of which some of the power is to be mobilized. From Jefferson to Horace Mann, from Dewey to Robert Hutchins, our Establishment's leaders have always talked about Education for Freedom. It is no longer possible to educate the youth of this nation for the life of free men in institutions which organize and use survival-power in keeping with antifreedom principles. The antique traditions, naturally, no longer make sense to city-bred youth, exposed earlier in life to the messiest problems of a citified adult world. Resist the power of the Church or of the State? Autonomy, sanctity, objectivity, neutrality? What do these slogans mean now when uttered by an institution which has itself become one of the principal power centers on the American landscape, without whose active collaboration the military, government, industry, and the professions cannot shoot off their rockets, make the peace, produce the cars, or heal the sick?

At a much earlier time, perhaps the best defense of academic freedom required the organized centers of learning to build walls between themselves and the worldly arenas of action. But the science laboratory compels a new relationship, intimate and friendly, between thought and action. The modern city compels a new connection between thought and action. The new knowledge converts both the city and the urban center of learning into imperative action laboratories, without the use of which no significant learning can be produced. This is the meaning of "relevance" now. Pot, sex, Vietnam, ghetto, choice, crime; our students now, respecting the ancient traditions we teach them, consult the original texts, the original sources of the knowledge. What shall we say to them as we form our own unions to enlarge our paychecks and reduce our teaching hours, as we accept the royalties from our own books and the honoraria from our own consulting sorties? This is the meaning of "relevance" now. Students and laymen, taxpayer and newspaper reporter, poor black and middle-class white, politician and churchman, all see through the hypocrisy now. Knowing for sure that we have the power, the red-blooded American thing for them to do is to challenge the terms on which we use (or misuse) it. Trying so hard to play the game themselves, they understand very well the game we are playing. The best defense of academic freedom is no longer an unrealistic assertion of an impossible autonomy, plaintive cries of a tattered slogan about neutrality. The best defense of academic freedom now is intelligent participation. This is the meaning of "relevance" now.

As the walls come tumbling down, the citizens of the New Bologna will undoubtedly complicate life inside our academic places. More frequently than ever before we will be compelled to venture forth into the streets of the New Bologna. They are not safe streets. University presidents and professors may get mugged there, or even worse, shot down. But our educational institutions, finally being but frail human creations, finally depend upon what we frail humans decide to do with them. We must expect change, and honor change by the way we think about it and feel about it in our hearts. If we expect to reduce the academic crime rate and restore academic law and order, we must be prepared to share the process of academic law-making with those we expect to govern. If we are sincere in our invitation to the new masses to play the old American game, we must respond sincerely to their plan for a participatory role in the redefinition of the ground rules according to which the game is to be played now. If we really mean an integrated America, we must
invent fresh mechanisms for integrating the new knowledge into the curricula, and think afresh about the kind of segregation we enforce on the campuses between two-year and four-year undergraduate students, between the teachers and the taught, between the dead-ended career and vocational programs, and the open-ended professional and graduate ones, between black and white, between the governed and the governors, between the academic monastery and the secular city.

Finally, we must stop fighting the environment our incredible intellectual achievement has produced. Because we must live in the cities, because the cities are essential to our continued intellectual progress, we must restructure our institutions to honor and understand the mentality required for successful city life, a citified mentality. To do this we must methodically break down our own walls, and launch vast new programs aimed at the disruption of our own un-American academic monopolies.

First, the old demarcation line separating the jurisdictions of the higher educational system from the lower makes less and less educational sense. It is no longer at 17 or 18 that the demands of the post-school, adult world begin to take hold of urban youth. The process of education must correspond more realistically to the process of growing up in the city. Growing up in the city respects the reality of human biological development, the significant psychological and cultural events which begin to occur when a person crosses the line from childhood to adolescence. "College" and "high school" are no longer viable educational categories.

Second, the rejuvenation of the decaying urban communities requires a substantial transfer of power from white to black, from the more powerful to the less powerful. This transfer must engage and involve the deployment of our best and most sophisticated intellectual, technical, and administrative talents. The confrontation between the experts and the people in the context of a power transfer is the most important event in the life of both the campus and the city. This event must be enacted democratically, if education for freedom is really among our higher purposes.

Third, the superblock campus is a physical representation of monopoly -- insular, monolithic, and exclusive. It centralizes buildings, activities, and power for the purpose of its own defense rather than disperses and diffuses its resources in order to equip the people with the power to defend themselves. The urban campus must be in the city. The city itself is the relevant place for learning.

Fourth, people work in places of learning, and learn in places of working. We must find new ways to honor the experience of those we seek to educate. The reorganization of our curricula around problems magnifies the importance of the student's experience in the educational process. As Aristotle said: "What we have to learn to do, we learn by doing." The city and the new knowledge invite doing as a part of learning, acting as a necessary part of thinking.

Fifth, the differences between the upper and lower ranges of performance on the tests we use to admit students are far greater than the actual genetic and biological differences among the same sample of humans. We have not begun to educate people to the outer limits of their capacities. Educational systems, not human beings, are failing. We must confront this reality.

Finally, the most squandered, underutilized, misused, and abused educational resource in our colleges and universities is students. We must ask ourselves: What setting, what network of relationships achieves the best environment for learning? The
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authoritarian, patriarchal response to this question is now untenable. Student
freedom is an essential educational methodology.

Jacques Cousteau concludes his brilliant documentary film on the life of sharks with
a sequence showing a brave diver on the floor of the sea holding out bait in his
hand to attract the sharks. At first, a few come and nibble cautiously at the bait.
They become bolder and more aggressive, and then more come. Then more, until scores
of sharks are dashing and slashing at the bait. Of course, the bait is not enough
to feed them all, and soon there is a frenzied competition in which the sharks
widely strike at each other, at anything which moves or crosses the path between
them and the bait. The turmoil is vicious. The diver is hastily drawn up to the
surface to escape the deadly, primitive chaos.

We are encouraging cannibalism on the campus. Our ancient methods are devouring our
present, urgent purposes. The Columbia's, the NYU's, the San Francisco States, the
Chicago's have descended to the bottom of the sea. They hold out the bait. It is
not enough. No mother-ship floats on the surface of American life now ready to haul
the brave academic divers back to safety. Are we lost souls, or fearless explorers?
One thing is for sure: The Truth is hidden somewhere there at the bottom of the
sea--where we are, with the sharks.