

IN DEFENSE OF THE UNIVERSITY

BY ALBERT SHANKER

*file Shanker
articles 4/26/78*

VICTOR HUGO ONCE WROTE THAT "NOTHING IN THIS WORLD IS SO POWERFUL AS AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME." TO THIS I WOULD ADD THE THOUGHT THAT THERE IS ALSO POWER, AS WELL AS PROVEN WISDOM, IN AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME AGAIN. THE IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY -- JOHN HENRY NEWMAN'S IDEA OF A SECULAR UNIVERSITY DEDICATED TO THE TRAINING OF THE MIND AND THE PURSUIT OF KNOWLEDGE -- IS AN EXAMPLE OF AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME AGAIN.

NEWMAN DEVELOPED HIS CONCEPT OF A SECULAR UNIVERSITY OVER A CENTURY AGO; A TIME WHEN HIGHER EDUCATION WAS STILL UNDER THE HEAVY INFLUENCE OF THE RELIGIOUS AUTHORITIES. THE PURPOSE OF THE UNIVERSITY, HE WROTE, WAS TO TRAIN THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT TO PURSUE KNOWLEDGE AND TO APPRECIATE THE PURSUIT OF KNOWLEDGE FOR ITS OWN SAKE; THAT IS, FOR THE SAKE OF DISCOVERING TRUTH. NEWMAN WAS AN EARLY ADVOCATE OF WHAT TODAY WE WOULD CALL A LIBERAL OR HUMANISTIC EDUCATION. HE BELIEVED THAT THE INDIVIDUAL SHOULD BE TRAINED TO SEE THE WORLD WHOLE, TO APPREHEND THE VARIOUS DISCIPLINES NOT AS SEPARATE AND DISTINCT ISLANDS OF STUDY, BUT AS PART OF A UNIFIED UNDERSTANDING OF THE WORLD IN WHICH

WE LIVE. IN SHORT, A LIBERAL EDUCATION SHOULD TEACH AN INDIVIDUAL HOW TO THINK. IT GIVES HIM, IN NEWMAN'S WORDS, "A CLEAR, CONSCIOUS VIEW OF HIS OWN OPINIONS AND JUDGMENTS, A TRUTH IN DEVELOPING THEM, AND ELOQUENCE IN EXPRESSING THEM, AND A FORCE IN URGING THEM. IT TEACHES HIM TO SEE THINGS AS THEY ARE, TO GO RIGHT TO THE POINT, TO DISENTANGLE A SKEIN OF THOUGHT, TO DETECT WHAT IS SOPHISTICAL, AND TO DISCARD WHAT IS IRRELEVANT."

THIS IS AN IDEAL TO WHICH WE WOULD ALL GIVE OUR ASSENT. BUT WHO AMONG US BELIEVES THAT THIS IS REALLY THE PURPOSE OF OUR SCHOOLS TODAY? NEWMAN'S IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY MAY OCCASIONALLY BE INVOKED IN A COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OR AT A CONFERENCE DEVOTED TO EXPLORING THE PURPOSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION. BUT ONE DOUBTS THAT IT IS TAKEN ANY MORE SERIOUSLY THAN THIS. IN AN ESSAY PUBLISHED IN THE CURRENT ISSUE OF THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR, EDWARD SHILS WRITES OF "THE NEGLECT OF THE ACADEMIC ETHOS, OF THE OBLIGATION TO TEACH AND LEARN AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF WHICH THE TEACHER AND STUDENT ARE CAPABLE." ACCORDING TO SHILS STANDARDS HAVE BEEN RELAXED, UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IS HELD IN LOW ESTEEM, STUDENTS ARE NOT BEING TAUGHT WHAT THEY ARE CAPABLE OF LEARNING, ACADEMIC CIVILITY AND INTELLECTUAL EXCELLENCE HAVE

DECLINED WHILE INVOLVEMENT IN POLITICAL AND PARTISAN CAUSES HAS INCREASED, DEVOTION TO TRUTH IS REGARDED AS ELITIST SELF-INDULGENCE WHILE SOME EVEN DENY THE VERY POSSIBILITY OF OBJECTIVITY IN SCHOLARSHIP, AND THE SCRUPULOUS CARE GIVEN TO THE TRAINING OF THE NEXT GENERATION OF SCIENTISTS AND SCHOLARS IS DISPARAGED AS A SELF-SERVING EFFORT TO PRESERVE A GUILD MONOPOLY. THIS IS A STRONG CRITIQUE OF THE STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY TODAY. CERTAINLY ONE CAN FIND EXCEPTIONS TO THE TRENDS DESCRIBED BY SHILS. SOME UNIVERSITIES AND MANY PROFESSORS ARE DOING AN EXTRAORDINARY JOB UNDER DIFFICULT CIRCUMSTANCES. STILL, THE TRENDS ARE THERE, AND THEY ARE DISTURBING.

WE HAVE, INDEED, COME A LONG WAY SINCE NEWMAN WROTE THE IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY. NEWMAN, AS I HAVE SAID, SPOKE OF THE NEED TO REUNITE WHAT HAD "BEEN PUT ASUNDER," TO SEE THE INTER-RELATEDNESS OF ALL INTELLECTUAL PURSUITS AND THE NECESSITY TO PROVIDE THE INTELLECT WITH A FIRM GROUNDING IN MORAL PHILOSOPHY. THIS CONCEPT OF INTELLECTUAL WHOLENESS HAS UNDERGONE A STRANGE TRANSFORMATION IN THE HANDS OF SOME CONTEMPORARY CRITICS OF THE UNIVERSITY. IF NEWMAN HAD WANDERED BY COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY A DECADE AGO, HE MIGHT HAVE PICKED UP A LEAFLET OF THE STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY CLAIMING THAT THE UNIVERSITY

IS A PLURALIST INSTITUTION ONLY IN THE SENSE "THAT STUDIES ARE DIVIDED INTO DEPARTMENTS, COURSES, WHICH IN TURN ARE CHOPPED INTO TESTS AND GRADES. PLURALISM, WHEREBY THE DOMAINS OF THOUGHT ARE ISOLATED FROM EACH OTHER, IS A METHOD OF CONTROL. THE UNIVERSITY IS CONSTRUCTED IN SUCH A WAY AS TO PREVENT COMPREHENSIVE UNDERSTANDING." SUCH COMPREHENSION, THE LEAFLET CONTINUED, WOULD REVEAL THE UNIVERSITY TO BE NOTHING BUT "A PROPONENT OF THE MOST VIOLENT SYSTEM THE CENTURIES HAVE CREATED -- THE SYSTEM OF CAPITAL."

I DOUBT STRONGLY THAT NEWMAN WOULD HAVE RECOGNIZED ANY OF HIS IDEAS IN THIS VULGAR-MARXIST RUBBISH WHICH PASSED FOR RADICAL CRITICISM DURING THE HEYDAY OF THE NEW LEFT. HAD HE BEEN AROUND TO FORMULATE A RESPONSE, HE MIGHT HAVE SAID THAT IT IS ONE THING TO SECULARIZE THE UNIVERSITY AND QUITE ANOTHER TO POLITICIZE IT, ESPECIALLY IF THE POLITICS IN QUESTION MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE TO CONDUCT RATIONAL DIALOGUE. IT WILL BE SAID THAT I AM SETTING UP A STRAW-MAN, THAT THE WELL-HEELED YOUNG REVOLUTIONARIES WHO WANTED TO TRANSFORM THE MODERN UNIVERSITY INTO A BASE-CAMP FOR A PEASANT UPRISING WERE NOT THE ONLY CRITICS OF THE UNIVERSITY AND CERTAINLY NOT THE MOST SERIOUS ONES.

WHAT, THEN, WAS THE MESSAGE OF THE "MODERATE" CRITICS? THE PRESIDENT OF A DISTINGUISHED CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, A MAN WITH IMPECCABLE LIBERAL CREDENTIALS, ATTRIBUTED THE CAMPUS VIOLENCE TO THE "MORAL CONCERN" OF STUDENTS ABOUT "WAR, VIOLENCE, RACISM, POVERTY, POLLUTION, HUMAN DEGRADATION ON A LARGE SCALE." THE ENTIRE FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION, AND STUDENT BODY OF AMHERST COLLEGE ISSUED A STATEMENT TO THE EXTENT THAT CAMPUS VIOLENCE WOULD CONTINUE UNTIL THE POLITICAL LEADERSHIP OF AMERICA ADDRESSED ITSELF TO THE PROBLEMS OF EXCESSIVE MILITARY SPENDING, AN UNEQUAL DRAFT SYSTEM, THE NEEDS OF THE POOR, AND RACIAL DIVISION. A PROFESSOR AT HARVARD, A NOBEL LAUREATE, OBSERVED THAT EDUCATION HAD "BECOME IRRELEVANT," AS INDEED IT HAD. FOR WHAT PLACE COULD THERE BE FOR EDUCATION IF A MINORITY OF THE CAMPUS POPULATION WAS PREPARED TO TERRORIZE THE UNIVERSITY INTO SUBMITTING TO ITS POLITICAL DEMANDS, WHILE THE MAJORITY WAS PREPARED TO OFFER MORAL JUSTIFICATION FOR SUCH BEHAVIOR? HOW COULD ANYTHING RESEMBLING NEWMAN'S IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY FUNCTION IF STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND ADMINISTRATORS WERE READY TO BURDEN THE UNIVERSITY WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOLVING ALL OF SOCIETY'S ILLS, BOTH REAL AND IMAGINED?

I RECALL EVENTS FROM WHAT NOW SEEMS LIKE THE DISTANT PAST. THE CAMPUS IS QUIET TODAY. THERE IS MORE STUDYING THAN PROTEST, AND STUDENTS ARE NOW MORE LIKELY TO WANT TO GET INTO "THE SYSTEM" THAN TO DROP OUT OF IT. STILL, THE UNIVERSITY HAS NOT RETURNED TO NORMAL, IF BY NORMAL WE MEAN A SITUATION WHERE TEACHING AND LEARNING ARE HELD IN THE HIGHEST ESTEEM, WHERE STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE ARE MAINTAINED, AND WHERE STUDY IS INFORMED BY ETHICAL VALUES. ON THE CONTRARY, THERE IS WIDESPREAD CONCERN OVER THE DECLINE OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND COLLEGE ENTRANCE SCORES. THERE ARE EFFORTS TO SUBSTITUTE RACIAL FOR ACADEMIC CRITERIA IN ADMISSIONS POLICIES. THE GOAL OF OFFERING ALL STUDENTS THE OPPORTUNITY TO RECEIVE A LIBERAL EDUCATION IS DE- CRIED AS IMPRACTICAL. INCREASINGLY, ADMINISTRATORS AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS ARE APPLYING CRUDE FISCAL STANDARDS TO MEASURE "ACADEMIC PRODUCTIVITY," AS IF HIGHER EDUCATION WERE NO DIFFERENT FROM STEEL PRODUCTION OR THE BUILDING OF HIGHWAYS.

THERE IS, I AM AFRAID, A DISTURBING CONTINUITY BETWEEN THE PO- LITICIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY DURING THE ERA OF VIETNAM AND THE AMORAL UTILITARIANISM WHICH PREVAILS TODAY. THE UNIVERSITY AS A RALLYING POINT FOR POLITICAL ACTION MAY SEEM LIKE A FAR CRY FROM THE

UNIVERSITY AS A VOCATIONAL TRAINING CENTER. BUT THEY ARE UNITED BY A COMMON DISREGARD FOR THE CONCEPT OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND A SHARED WILLINGNESS TO SACRIFICE ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND VALUES FOR EXPEDIENCY OF ONE KIND OR ANOTHER.

AUTHORITY ONCE SHAKEN IS NOT EASILY RE-ESTABLISHED. I SPEAK NOT OF THE AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATORS, OR PROFESSORS, OR OTHER LEADERS OF OUR SOCIETY. RATHER, I SPEAK OF THE AUTHORITY OF VALUES, OF STANDARDS, OF GUIDING PURPOSE. THE CRISIS OF THE UNIVERSITY IS ESSENTIALLY A CRISIS OF VALUES, A SYMPTOM OF A DEEPER MALAISE THAT AFFECTS THE WHOLE SOCIETY. THERE IS A FEELING THAT DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION CANNOT, AS JOHN DEWEY BELIEVED, GO TOGETHER. IT IS SAID THAT EXCELLENCE IS AN ELITIST CONCEPT, THAT STANDARDS ARE INHERENTLY DISCRIMINATORY, AND THAT TESTS CANNOT PROVIDE AN OBJECTIVE MEASUREMENT OF ACHIEVEMENT, LET ALONE OF APTITUDE AND ABILITY. THESE VIEWS ARE SOMETIMES DEFENDED IN EGALITARIAN AND DEMOCRATIC TERMS, BUT IN FACT THEY REPRESENT A FALSE EGALITARIANISM AND A THREAT TO DEMOCRACY. THEY ARE EVIDENCE THAT MANY OF US HAVE FORGOTTEN WHAT DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION ARE ALL ABOUT.

IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT WE CLARIFY THE MEANING OF FREEDOM AND

EQUALITY, AND THE RELATION OF BOTH CONCEPTS TO EDUCATIONAL POLICY. FOR MANY PEOPLE TODAY, FREEDOM HAS COME TO MEAN THE SAME THING AS "DOING ONE'S OWN THING." IT IS THOUGHT TO ENTAIL FREEDOM FROM ALL SOCIAL CONSTRAINTS, AND TO SANCTION THE INDULGENCE OF EVERY WHIM OR PLEASURE. THIS CONCEPT OF FREEDOM IS FUNDAMENTALLY ANTI-SOCIAL. IT VIEWS SOCIETY AS OPPRESSIVE BY ITS VERY NATURE IN THAT SOCIETY IS GOVERNED BY RULES WHICH LIMIT WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL CAN DO. THOSE WHO HOLD THIS VIEW ARE HOSTILE TO ALL SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS, BUT SCHOOLS ARE THE OBJECT OF PARTICULAR SCORN BECAUSE, AS ONE CRITIC HAS WRITTEN, THEY PREVENT "PERSONAL, CREATIVE AND AUTONOMOUS INTER-ACTION" AMONG LEARNERS AND TEACHERS.

CARRIED TO ITS EXTREME, AS IT HAS BEEN BY THE WRITER IVAN ILLICH AND SOME OTHERS, THIS VIEW CALLS FOR THE ABOLITION OF ALL FORMAL SCHOOLING AND ITS REPLACEMENT BY "SELF-MOTIVATED" LEARNING THROUGH VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION WITH THOSE WHO ALREADY POSSESS SKILLS OR KNOWLEDGE OR WHO WANT TO COOPERATE IN ACQUIRING THEM. INSTEAD OF HAVING TEACHERS DETERMINE THE CURRICULUM AND TEACH SKILLS, THE LEARNING OF THE YOUNG WILL BE GUIDED BY THEIR OWN SPONTANEOUS DESIRES. PRESUMABLY YOUNG PEOPLE WILL LEARN ALGEBRA, HISTORY, AND PHYSICS IN

THE SAME WAY THEY LEARN HOW TO WALK OR TALK.

WHAT IS REMARKABLE IS NOT THAT THIS VIEW HAS ITS PROPONENTS -- IN OUR FADDISH CULTURE, ALMOST ANY FAR-OUT VIEW CAN ATTRACT SOME BELIEVERS --BUT THAT IT IS TAKEN SO SERIOUSLY BY EDUCATIONAL REFORMERS AND HAS HAD SO MUCH INFLUENCE OVER EDUCATIONAL POLICY. THE TREND IN COLLEGES AND HIGH SCHOOLS IN RECENT YEARS HAS BEEN TOWARD REDUCING EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND INCREASING THE NUMBER OF OPTIONS FOR STUDENTS. IN PARTICULAR, STUDENTS HAVE BEEN OFFERED MORE "RELEVANT" COURSES - RELEVANCE HAVING MORE TO DO WITH TOPICAL INTEREST THAN ACADEMIC SUBSTANCE. ONE HIGH SCHOOL IN NEW YORK, FOR EXAMPLE, HAS A COURSE ON "AMERICAN HANG-UPS," AND THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE REPORTS THAT DEATH IS THE LATEST "HOT TOPIC" IN SCORES OF U.S. HIGH SCHOOLS. AS A RESULT OF THE INTRODUCTION OF MORE AND MORE OPTIONAL COURSES, A KIND OF GRESHAM'S LAW HAS FUNCTIONED: BAD COURSES DRIVE OUT GOOD ONES. STUDENTS FLOCK TO THE EASY, "RELEVANT" ELECTIVES AND SHY AWAY FROM THE MORE DEMANDING COURSES. NEEDLESS TO SAY, EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS HAVE DECLINED.

SOME EDUCATIONAL REFORMERS GO BEYOND SIMPLY OFFERING STUDENTS AN ARRAY OF ELECTIVES. THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, A

PRO-BUSINESS GROUP, HAS RECOMMENDED THAT GOVERNMENT FUNDS BE GIVEN TO STUDENTS, NOT TO THE COLLEGES, SO THAT COLLEGES WOULD HAVE TO COMPETE FOR STUDENTS BY DESIGNING PROGRAMS SUITABLE TO THEIR TASTES. THE WRITER CAROLINE BIRD THINKS THAT STUDENTS MUST BE LIBERATED ENTIRELY FROM "THE ACADEMIC YOUTH GHETTOS" (COLLEGE) AND RESTORED TO THE MAINSTREAM OF AMERICAN LIFE. SHE WOULD WITHDRAW PUBLIC FUNDS FROM COLLEGES WHERE "YOUNG PEOPLE ARE DemeanED BY THE 'MAKE-WORK' OF ACADEMIA" AND INVEST THEM INSTEAD "IN THE 'REAL' WORK AND LEARNING STUDENTS WOULD CHOOSE IF IT WERE AVAILABLE." THE "REAL WORK AND LEARNING" WHICH WOULD TAKE THE PLACE OF A LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION (DESCRIBED BY MS. BIRD AS "THE ESTABLISHED RELIGION OF THE RULING CLASS") INCLUDES CLEANING AND PATROLLING THE STREETS, TUTORING SLOW LEARNERS IN GRADE SCHOOL, ANSWERING CONGRESSMEN'S MAIL, PUTTING BOOKS BACK ON LIBRARY SHELVES, AND PERFORMING SIMILAR "ESSENTIAL SERVICES."

THESE IDEAS MAY SOUND A BIT FAR-FETCHED, YET PROPOSALS ARE NOW BEING CONSIDERED WHICH WOULD INFLUENCE PUBLIC POLICY ALONG THE LINES SUGGESTED BY MS. BIRD. SPECIFICALLY, THERE IS THE POSSIBILITY THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THROUGH THE COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACT (CETA), WILL GIVE HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE CREDITS FOR

OUT-OF-SCHOOL WORK EXPERIENCE. THUS, CETA WOULD BE USED TO REPLACE FORMAL EDUCATION AS A MEANS OF CREDENTIALLING YOUNG PEOPLE. THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS APPROACH FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY IN THIS COUNTRY ARE CONSIDERABLE, AND NOT AT ALL ENCOURAGING.

THE REPLACEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY BY A MASSIVE, FEDERALLY-FUNDED, UP-DATED VERSION OF THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS IS NOT A TERRIBLY INSPIRING IDEAL. IT IS NOT LIKELY TO APPEAL TO TAX-PAYERS WHO WOULD HAVE TO PAY FOR IT, OR TO WORKERS WHOSE JOB SECURITY WOULD BE THREATENED BY IT, LET ALONE TO STUDENTS WHO ARE IN COLLEGE BECAUSE THEY WANT TO BE THERE, NOT BECAUSE THEY HAVE TO. IT SHOULD ALSO NOT APPEAL TO ANYONE WHO FEELS THAT EDUCATION HAS SOME INTRINSIC VALUE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INDIVIDUAL'S MIND AND PERSONALITY.

INDEED, THE EFFORTS TO "LIBERATE" YOUNG PEOPLE FROM SCHOOLING ARE MOTIVATED BY A FIERCE BIAS AGAINST EDUCATION AS SUCH. THE REBELLION AGAINST EDUCATION IS TRACEABLE TO THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION OF THE 1960's WHICH SAW THE "GREENING" OF A GOOD PART OF AMERICAN YOUTH. THE SO-CALLED "NEW AND LIBERATED INDIVIDUAL" WHOSE PRAISES WERE SUNG BY CHARLES REICH, AMONG OTHERS, HAS TURNED OUT IN ALL TOO MANY CASES TO BE A RATHER CRIPPLED ADULT, LACKING INTELLECTUAL

DISCIPLINE AND A CLEAR SET OF VALUES, AIMLESS, AND UNABLE TO COPE WITH LIFE'S CHALLENGES AND DIFFICULTIES. CLEARLY WE DON'T HELP YOUNG PEOPLE BY DENYING THEM GUIDANCE, BY ABDICATING THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS, OR BY ENCOURAGING THE BELIEF THAT LEARNING IS SIMPLY A SPONTANEOUS PROCESS OF SELF-DISCOVERY AND HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE ACQUISITION OF SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE, AND MORAL UNDERSTANDING. THE QUALITY OF THEIR EDUCATION MUST INEVITABLY SUFFER IF THIS APPROACH IS CARRIED TOO FAR, AND SO WILL THEIR CAPACITY TO BE FREE INDIVIDUALS. FREEDOM, AFTER ALL, IS NOT THE SAME THING AS THE UNRESTRAINED ASSERTION OF ONE'S OWN WILL. IT REQUIRES A SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY INFORMED BY A MORAL AND INTELLECTUAL AWARENESS OF THE CONFLICTS BETWEEN DIFFERENT FREEDOMS WHICH ALL OF US, AND SOCIETY, MUST NEGOTIATE EVERY DAY.

THE INEVITABLE REACTION AGAINST THE ANTI-EDUCATION REBELLION IS NOW, FINALLY, TAKING PLACE. DEAN HENRY ROZOVSKY OF HARVARD, CONCERNED ABOUT THE "TENDENCY IN RECENT YEARS TO REDUCE REQUIREMENTS AND MULTIPLY OPTIONS," HAS PROPOSED THAT EACH UNDERGRADUATE BE REQUIRED TO COMPLETE A REQUIRED "CORE CURRICULUM." THE PRESENT HARVARD UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM, WHICH IS MARKED BY A PROLIFERATION OF SOME 1,300

DIFFERENT COURSES, NO LONGER EXPRESSES, ACCORDING TO DEAN ROSOVSKY, "OUR BASIC EDUCATIONAL AIMS AND IT DOES NOT ESTABLISH A COMMON BASIS FOR INTELLECTUAL DISCOURSE." NOR DOES IT ASSURE THAT THE STUDENT WILL BECOME TRULY EDUCATED. IN DEFINING WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AN EDUCATED PERSON, DEAN ROSOVSKY OUTLINES A SET OF STANDARDS BY WHICH TO MEASURE AN INDIVIDUAL'S INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT. THE MOST IMPORTANT REQUIREMENT IS TO BE ABLE TO THINK AND WRITE CLEARLY AND EFFECTIVELY. IN ADDITION, AN EDUCATED PERSON SHOULD HAVE A CRITICAL APPRECIATION OF PAST SCHOLARLY, LITERARY, AND ARTISTIC ACHIEVEMENTS, A KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER CULTURES, AND SOME UNDERSTANDING OF MORAL AND ETHICAL PROBLEMS. HE SHOULD ALSO BE ABLE TO REJECT SHODDINESS IN WHATEVER FORM, AND SHOULD HAVE ACHIEVED DEPTH IN SOME FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE.

THIS IS A VERY HIGH STANDARD. BUT I DON'T SEE WHAT WE ACCOMPLISH BY LOWERING IT, AS SOME WOULD DO IN THE NAME OF EQUALITY, OR BY ABANDONING IT ALTOGETHER, AS OTHERS WOULD DO IN THE NAME OF FREEDOM. MAINTAINING HIGH STANDARDS DOES NOT ENFORCE CONFORMITY, BUT IT DOES PROMOTE EXCELLENCE. STUDENTS WOULD STILL BE FREE TO DETERMINE THEIR OWN POLITICAL, SOCIAL, OR CULTURAL OUTLOOK, ONLY THEY WOULD DO SO IN A MORE INFORMED MANNER.

(WE SHOULD NOT FORGET THAT IT IS KNOWLEDGE THAT NOURISHES INDEPENDENCE OF MIND AND CHARACTER, WHILE IGNORANCE BREEDS WEARY UNIFORMITY AND MINDLESS ZEALOTRY.) STUDENTS WOULD ALSO, IT IS TO BE HOPED, BE ABLE TO EXPRESS THEIR VIEWS MORE CLEARLY.

THERE IS ALSO THE ARGUMENT, WITH WHICH WE ARE ALL FAMILIAR, THAT HIGH STANDARDS INTERFERE WITH EFFORTS TO PROMOTE GREATER SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EQUALITY. THIS VIEW IS BASED ON THE FEAR THAT THOSE WHO CANNOT MEASURE UP TO THE PREVAILING STANDARDS WILL BE PENALIZED IN TERMS OF THEIR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ADVANCEMENT. WE ARE CONFRONTED HERE WITH AN IMPORTANT QUESTION NOT JUST OF POLICY BUT OF SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY AS WELL. WHAT IS MEANT BY EQUALITY? DOES IT REQUIRE, AS TOCQUEVILLE FEARED, A LEVELLING OF ALL MEMBERS OF SOCIETY TO A SINGLE STANDARD OF MEDIOCRITY? OR IS IT POSSIBLE, AS DEWEY BELIEVED, FOR AN EGALITARIAN AND DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY TO PROMOTE EQUALITY AND MASS HIGHER EDUCATION WITHOUT COMPROMISING STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE? THE CONTROVERSIES RAGING TODAY OVER SUCH ISSUES AS QUOTAS AND TESTING ARE CLOSELY RELATED TO THESE QUESTIONS.

HOW WE ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS DEPENDS VERY HEAVILY ON OUR DEFINITION OF EQUALITY. THERE IS TODAY NO AGREED-UPON DEFINITION OF THE

TERM. INDEED, THE HEATED DEBATE ABOUT EQUALITY IS REALLY OVER TWO CONFLICTING DEFINITIONS: NAMELY, EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY AND EQUALITY OF RESULTS. THEY MEAN VERY DIFFERENT THINGS, AND IT IS BEST THAT WE BE CLEAR ABOUT THE DIFFERENCES.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY MEANS THAT EACH INDIVIDUAL SHOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO REALIZE HIS OR HER FULL POTENTIAL UNINHIBITED BY SOCIAL OR ECONOMIC BARRIERS (SUCH AS DISCRIMINATION OR POVERTY). IMPLICIT IN THIS CONCEPT OF EQUALITY IS THE BELIEF THAT INDIVIDUALS SHOULD BE REWARDED ACCORDING TO MERIT, AS WELL AS THE BELIEF THAT SOCIETY IS OBLIGATED TO LIFT THOSE WHO ARE SOCIALLY OR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED TO THE POINT WHERE THEY CAN COMPETE ON EQUAL GROUND WITH THOSE WHO ARE MORE PRIVILEGED. IN THIS CONTEXT, AFFIRMATIVE ACTION MEANS INTERVENTION BY SOCIETY TO ELIMINATE THE SOCIALLY-CAUSED OBSTACLES TO INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT.

OBVIOUSLY, THE ACHIEVEMENT OF EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY REQUIRES FAIRLY RADICAL FORMS OF SOCIAL INTERVENTION TO IMPROVE THE ENVIRONMENT (SCHOOLING, HOUSING, HEALTH CARE, ECONOMIC WELL-BEING, AND SO FORTH) IN WHICH CHILDREN GROW UP. TO USE THE METAPHOR OF A RACE, THE GOAL OF EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IS TO GET EVERYBODY TO THE SAME STARTING

LINE SO THAT THE COMPETITION IS FAIR. THAT, IN EFFECT, IS ABOUT AS FAR AS EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY GOES. IT REQUIRES THAT THE RACE BE FAIR AND THAT THE RULES BE APPLIED EQUALLY TO ALL, BUT IT DOES NOT GUARANTEE ANYONE A PARTICULAR PLACE AT THE FINISH LINE.

EQUALITY OF RESULTS IS NOT CONCERNED SO MUCH WITH HOW THE RACE BEGINS AS WITH HOW IT ENDS. AS CONCEIVED BY ITS ADVOCATES IN THIS COUNTRY, EQUALITY OF RESULTS REQUIRES THAT ALL ETHNIC GROUPS, OR GROUPS DEFINED BY OTHER CRITERIA SUCH AS SEX, BE REWARDED EQUALLY ACCORDING TO THEIR PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION, EVEN IF THERE ARE WIDE DISCREPANCIES IN THE QUALITY OF PERFORMANCE BY INDIVIDUALS AND, COLLECTIVELY, OF THE GROUPS THAT THEY FALL INTO. SINCE ALL ARE REWARDED EQUALLY, INDIVIDUAL MERIT BECOMES INSIGNIFICANT, IF NOT ENTIRELY IRRELEVANT. SO, TOO, DOES AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AS I HAVE DEFINED IT. FOR WHY IS IT NECESSARY TO EQUALIZE THE START OF THE RACE WHEN WE HAVE EQUALIZED THE FINISH? INDIVIDUALS MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE TALENT, THEY MAY OR MAY NOT WORK HARD AND TRY TO IMPROVE THEMSELVES, THEY MAY OR MAY NOT PERFORM WELL. BUT ACCORDING TO THE DOCTRINE OF EQUALITY OF RESULTS, ALL OF THIS IS LESS IMPORTANT THAN GROUP IDENTITY IN DETERMINING WHAT REWARDS WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO THE INDIVIDUALS.

CLEARLY THESE TWO DEFINITIONS OF EQUALITY ARE WORLDS APART. THEY ARE BASED, FIRST OF ALL, ON TWO VERY DIFFERENT CONCEPTS OF JUSTICE. ACCORDING TO THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY, JUSTICE PREVAILS IF ALL PEOPLE ARE TREATED FAIRLY, EVEN IF THEY ARE REWARDED UNEQUALLY. BUT ACCORDING TO THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY OF RESULTS, JUSTICE ONLY PREVAILS WHEN PEOPLE ARE REWARDED EQUALLY, EVEN IF THEY ARE TREATED UNFAIRLY. EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY DEMANDS THAT SOCIETY NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST ANYBODY. EQUALITY OF RESULTS REQUIRES THAT SOCIETY DISCRIMINATE IN FAVOR OF SOME AND AGAINST OTHERS, FOR ONLY IN THIS WAY CAN THINGS BE EVENED OUT.

THE KIND OF EQUALITY WE CHOOSE TO WORK TOWARD IN OUR COUNTRY HAS ENORMOUS IMPLICATIONS IN TERMS OF THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS, THE NATURE OF SOCIETY, AND THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT. IF WE CHOOSE EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY, IT MEANS THAT WE WANT A SOCIETY IN WHICH THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL ARE CONSIDERED PARAMOUNT. IT WOULD BE AN OPEN SOCIETY IN WHICH INDIVIDUALS ARE FREE TO FIND THEIR PLACE WITHIN IT AND ARE MOTIVATED IN THEIR EFFORTS LARGELY BY THE DESIRE TO SECURE REWARDS, IN THE FORM OF WEALTH, STATUS, POWER, OR SELF-FULFILLMENT. GOVERNMENT WOULD HAVE TO PLAY A LARGE AND ACTIVE

ROLE TO ELIMINATE BARRIERS TO EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY AND TO HELP THE VICTIMS OF PAST DISCRIMINATION OVERCOME THE EFFECTS OF PREJUDICE AND POVERTY. BUT THIS ROLE WOULD NOT BE OVER-BEARING, AND IT WOULD BE UNDERTAKEN TO DEFEND AND EXTEND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS. SUCH A SOCIETY WOULD PROBABLY BE VERY DYNAMIC.

UNDER EQUALITY OF RESULTS, THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS WOULD BE CONSIDERED LESS IMPORTANT THAN THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL REWARD FOR GROUPS. THE IMPOSITION OF UNIFORMITY WOULD REQUIRE THAT SOCIETY BECOME MORE CLOSED. INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS WOULD HAVE TO BE CURTAILED TO PREVENT SOME PEOPLE FROM RISING ABOVE OTHERS. MOREOVER, THE STATE WOULD HAVE TO ASSUME AWESOME POWERS, SINCE IT WOULD BE THE EQUALIZING AGENCY THAT WOULD TAKE FROM SOME AND GIVE TO OTHERS TO ASSURE THAT THEY ALL ENDED UP IN THE SAME PLACE. SUCH A SOCIETY PROBABLY WOULD NOT CONFORM TO OUR CONCEPT OF DEMOCRACY.

TO BE SURE, THIS IS A RATHER SCHEMATIC VIEW OF THE EQUALITY DEBATE, I DON'T MEAN TO IMPLY THAT THOSE WHO WANT EQUALITY OF RESULTS WOULD LIKE TO ELIMINATE ALTOGETHER EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY. AT THE SAME TIME, I DON'T THINK SUFFICIENT THOUGHT HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THESE TWO VIEWS OF EQUALITY, OR TO THE DIFFERENT

POLICIES THAT WOULD FLOW FROM EACH, OR FOR THAT MATTER, TO THE IMPACT THESE POLICIES WOULD HAVE ON OUR SOCIETY. THE DEBATE OVER QUOTAS, FOR EXAMPLE, HAS BEEN GROSSLY MISINTERPRETED AS A DEBATE BETWEEN THOSE WHO ARE FOR OR AGAINST EQUALITY FOR BLACKS, WOMEN, OR OTHER GROUPS WHOSE COLLECTIVE REWARD IS NOT PROPORTIONAL TO THEIR NUMERICAL REPRESENTATION IN THE POPULATION. THE DEBATE IS REALLY OVER WHETHER WE WANT TO HAVE EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THESE GROUPS, OR WHETHER WE WANT TO TIE GROUP REWARD TO NUMERICAL REPRESENTATION, REGARDLESS OF INDIVIDUAL MERIT.

AS ALL POLLS HAVE SHOWN, VERY FEW PEOPLE IN OUR SOCIETY, INCLUDING BLACKS, PREFER THE LATTER APPROACH, AND FOR GOOD REASON. FOR ONE THING, IT RUBS AGAINST THE GRAIN OF TRADITIONAL AMERICAN VALUES SUCH AS INDIVIDUALISM, FAIR PLAY, AND LIMITED GOVERNMENT. A SYSTEM WHICH TAKES FROM SOME THEIR HARD-EARNED REWARDS AND GIVES TO OTHERS UNEARNED BENEFITS WILL INEVITABLY CREATE FEELINGS OF RESENTMENT AMONG THE FORMER WITHOUT ENHANCING THE SELF-ESTEEM OF THE LATTER. IT WILL FOSTER AN ATTITUDE OF CYNICISM TOWARD THE RIGGED SYSTEM ITSELF, AS WELL AS A SENSE OF POWERLESSNESS IN RELATION TO THE OMNIPOTENT CENTRAL AUTHORITY WHICH WOULD DETERMINE WHO GETS

WHAT. IT WOULD, FOR OBVIOUS REASONS, BE SOCIALLY DIVISIVE, SETTING ONE GROUP AGAINST ANOTHER. IT WOULD ALSO TEND TO DAMPEN AMBITION AND DISCOURAGE ACHIEVEMENT, LEADING TO AN OVERALL DECLINE IN STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE AND, CONSEQUENTLY, IN THE QUALITY OF LIFE AS WELL.

QUOTAS, IN SHORT, GIVE THE CONCEPT OF EQUALITY A BAD NAME, AND IT DOESN'T SEEM WISE TO LINK THE FUTURE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE TO SUCH A QUESTIONABLE PROPOSITION. IT WOULD APPEAR TO MAKE LEAST SENSE FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE POOR WHO HAVE NOTHING TO GAIN FROM A DECLINE IN STANDARDS. INDEED, THE POOR WOULD BE MOST IMMEDIATELY DISADVANTAGED BY SUCH A DECLINE, SINCE IT IS IN THEIR SCHOOLS THAT STANDARDS WOULD FIRST BE ALLOWED TO DROP. THE REASON IS SIMPLE: IT IS THERE THAT STANDARDS ARE MOST EXPENSIVE TO MAINTAIN.

SOME PEOPLE ARE CONSTANTLY ON THE LOOKOUT FOR CHEAP SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE POOR, THEIR MOTIVE BEING TO GET THE POOR OFF THEIR BACKS AT THE LEAST POSSIBLE COST TO THEMSELVES. IF THIS CAN BE DONE IN A WAY THAT APPEARS TO BE "IN THE INTEREST" OF THE POOR, ALL THE BETTER. DURING THE CONTROVERSY A DECADE AGO OVER COMMUNITY CONTROL OF THE SCHOOLS IN NEW YORK, A PRESTIGIOUS FOUNDATION OFFICIAL WHO POSED AS A DEFENDER OF THE POOR WAS ASKED IF COMMUNITY CONTROL

WOULD ACTUALLY IMPROVE THE EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS OF POOR CHILDREN IN GHETTO SCHOOLS. IT PROBABLY WOULDNT, HE SAID, BUT AT LEAST WITH COMMUNITY CONTROL THE POOR WOULD HAVE ONLY THEMSELVES TO BLAME FOR THEIR FAILURE. AT THE TIME, SUCH CYNICISM MASQUERADED AS EDUCATIONAL REFORM. WE SHOULD KNOW BETTER BY NOW.

YET THE SAME PHENOMENON, CALL IT THE LIBERAL COP-OUT, EXISTS TODAY, IF IN A DIFFERENT FORM. MANY WHO OPPOSE STANDARDIZED INTELLIGENCE TESTS CLAIM TO SPEAK FOR THE POOR, BUT DO THEY REALLY? SUCH TESTS, WE ARE TOLD, ONLY MEASURE "MIDDLE CLASS" SKILLS AND, THEREFORE, DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE LOWER CLASS. THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION HAS TAKEN THIS VIEW - INDEED, IT HAS CALLED FOR A MORATORIUM IN ALL TESTING. BUT WHAT ARE MIDDLE CLASS SKILLS? ARE THEY THE ABILITY TO WRITE CLEARLY, TO THINK LOGICALLY, AND TO READ WITH COMPREHENSION? PERHAPS THEY INCLUDE THE MASTERING OF THE USE OF LANGUAGE AT SOMETHING ABOVE AN 8TH-GRADE LEVEL, OR BEING ABLE TO DEVELOP A COMPLEX THOUGHT. THESE ARE NOT MIDDLE CLASS SKILLS, BUT SKILLS THAT EVERY STUDENT SHOULD LEARN IN ORDER TO PREPARE TO FUNCTION AT A REASONABLE LEVEL OF COMPETENCE AS AN ADULT AND TO PARTICIPATE IN THE POLITICAL AND CULTURAL LIFE OF THE SOCIETY.

THOSE WHO SAY THAT THE POOR NEED NOT LEARN SUCH SKILLS BASE

THEIR VIEWS ON ONE OR MORE PROPOSITIONS: (1) THAT THE POOR SHOULD STAY IN THEIR PLACE, A VIEW WHICH IS BLATANTLY ANTI-DEMOCRATIC; (2) THAT IT IS MORE IMPORTANT TO REDUCE SOCIAL TENSIONS THAN TO EDUCATE YOUNG PEOPLE, A VIEW THAT IS CYNICAL; (3) THAT EACH THOUGHT OR USE OF LANGUAGE IS AS GOOD AS ANY OTHER, IN WHICH CASE ALL INTELLECTUAL STANDARDS DISSOLVE INTO A MIST OF MINDLESS CULTURAL RELATIVISM; OR (4) THAT TEACHING THE OFFICIAL CULTURE IS REALLY AN ATTEMPT TO "SOCIALIZE TO THE VALUES OF AN OPPRESSOR, "IN THE WORDS OF AN EDUCATIONAL WRITER WHO WON THE NATIONAL BOOK AWARD, IN WHICH CASE SCHOOLS SHOULD DISPENSE WITH EDUCATION ALTOGETHER AND, IN THE WORDS OF THE SAME WRITER, "TOIL FOR THE LIBERATION AND THE POTENCY OF THE OPPRESSED." SIGNIFICANTLY, SUCH VIEWS DO NOT EMERGE FROM THE LOWER CLASS WHOSE MEMBERS, GENERALLY SPEAKING, WANT TO GET AHEAD, BUT FROM THE MORE AFFLUENT ELEMENTS OF THE POPULATION WHICH WANT TO HOLD ON TO THEIR PRIVILEGES OR TO USE THE POOR TO PLAY OUT THEIR REVOLUTIONARY FANTASIES.

IMPLICIT IN THE NOTION THAT STANDARDIZED TESTS DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE POOR IS THE MISTAKEN VIEW THAT THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF TESTS IS TO DETERMINE WHO WILL GET AHEAD IN SCHOOL OR IN EMPLOYMENT.

THIS IS ONE PURPOSE OF TESTS, THOUGH THEY PROVIDE ONLY PART OF THE INFORMATION THAT SCHOOLS AND EMPLOYERS NEED TO DETERMINE THE QUALIFICATIONS OF APPLICANTS. BUT THIS IS NOT THEIR ONLY PURPOSE. "PROPERLY," SIDNEY HOOK HAS WRITTEN, "INTELLIGENCE TESTS SHOULD BE USED LIKE MEDICAL TESTS TO LOCATE PROBLEMS THAT MAY REQUIRE SPECIAL TREATMENT. THE POINT IS NOT TO COMPARE THE CHILD WITH OTHERS BUT TO DETERMINE WHETHER HE IS WORKING BELOW OR UP TO HIS POWERS, AND TO HELP HIM GROW." TESTING, THEREFORE, IS ONE TOOL TO FURTHER THE FULL REALIZATION OF EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY. ABANDONING IT WOULD BE AN INSTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT AS HARMFUL TO A YOUNG PERSON'S INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT AS THE ELIMINATION OF MEDICAL CHECK-UPS WOULD BE TO HIS HEALTH.

THE DEBATE OVER QUOTAS AND TESTING INDICATES THAT THERE ARE STRONG PRESSURES IN OUR SOCIETY TO SOLVE SOCIAL PROBLEMS BY CHIPPING AWAY AT EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS. I SUBMIT THAT CHEAP SOLUTIONS DON'T WORK; INDEED, THAT THEY HARM SOCIETY BY LOWERING PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND ALSO HARM THE POOR BY NOT PREPARING THEM ADEQUATELY TO FACE LIFE IN WHAT IS STILL A COMPETITIVE SOCIETY. MOREOVER, TO THE DEGREE THAT EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS ARE ALLOWED TO DROP, THE FEELING IS BOUND

TO SPREAD THAT SCHOOLING IS NOT SOMETHING WORTH PAYING MUCH FOR. WE SEE HERE A VICIOUS CYCLE: LOWER STANDARDS LEADING TO LOWER EXPENDITURES WHICH, IN TURN, CONTRIBUTE TO FURTHER DETERIORATION IN QUALITY OF EDUCATION. AT A TIME OF CONSIDERABLE PUBLIC PRESSURE TO CUT BACK ON ALL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES, THE TENDENCY HEREIN DESCRIBED COULD GATHER CONSIDERABLE MOMENTUM.

THERE ARE NO EASY ANSWERS TO THE PROBLEMS I HAVE DESCRIBED. IF, AS I HAVE SUGGESTED, THE PROBLEMS ARE ROOTED IN A CRISIS OF BELIEF IN DEMOCRACY, THEN THE BEGINNING OF AN ANSWER LIES IN THE REVIVAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC IDEA. IT IS NECESSARY TO AFFIRM DEMOCRACY NOT JUST AS A POLITICAL CONCEPT, BUT ALSO AS A MORAL CONCEPT MEANING, IN SIDNEY HOOK'S WORDS, "DEMOCRACY AS A WAY OF LIFE." IN NO FIELD OF ENDEAVOR IS THIS MORE IMPORTANT THAN EDUCATION WHERE CORE VALUES ARE TRANSMITTED TO NEW GENERATIONS IN A CONTINUAL PROCESS OF RENEWAL.

TEACHERS HAVE AN ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT ROLE TO PLAY IN THE REVIVAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC IDEA IN EDUCATION. FOR THEM, DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION ARE NATURALLY AND NECESSARILY LINKED TOGETHER. THEY, AFTER ALL, ARE THE ONES WHO HAVE CHOSEN THE TASK OF TEACHING THE YOUNG. FOR THEM, THEREFORE, QUALITY EDUCATION IS A MATTER OF PROFESSIONAL

COMMITMENT. MOREOVER, SINCE IT IS THEIR JOB TO EDUCATE ALL YOUNG PEOPLE, THEY WILL WANT TO BE SURE THAT THEY CAN PERFORM THEIR TASK THOROUGHLY AND WELL. EVEN A PARTIAL FAILURE WILL AFFECT THEIR PROFESSIONAL SELF-ESTEEM, AS WELL AS THE ESTEEM IN WHICH THEY ARE HELD BY SOCIETY. IT ALSO FOLLOWS THAT SINCE THEY ARE THE ONES RESPONSIBLE FOR EDUCATING THE YOUNG, THEY WILL WANT A VOICE IN SHAPING EDUCATIONAL POLICY. IF TEACHING IS TRULY A PROFESSION, AND IF TEACHERS WILL BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN OUR SCHOOLS, THEN THEY OBVIOUSLY MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE PROCESS OF EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING. FOR TEACHERS, DEMOCRACY MUST PREVAIL AT BOTH ENDS OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS - IN THE FORMATION OF POLICY AND IN THE PROVISION OF QUALITY EDUCATION TO ALL YOUNG PEOPLE.

INCREASINGLY, TEACHERS ARE SEEING THAT IN ORDER TO DEFEND THEIR PROFESSIONAL DIGNITY AS WELL AS THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN OUR SOCIETY, THEY MUST BE ORGANIZED. SO FAR, UNIONIZATION OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION HAS PROGRESSED MOST RAPIDLY IN SCHOOLS BELOW THE COLLEGE LEVEL. BUT IT IS NOW EXPANDING IN COLLEGES AS WELL, AT TIMES TO THE DISMAY OF ADMINISTRATORS AND OTHERS CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICA.

MUCH OF THIS CONCERN SEEMS TO BE BASED ON THE FEAR THAT UNIONIZATION AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING WILL DESTROY THE ENVIRONMENT OF COLLEGIALITY THAT IS NECESSARY TO THE SUCCESSFUL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNIVERSITY. THIS FEAR IS GROUNDLESS. COLLEGIALITY, AS I UNDERSTAND THE TERM, MEANS A SHARING OF AUTHORITY AMONG PROFESSIONAL COLLEAGUES WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY. COLLEGIALITY REQUIRES AN APPROPRIATE DIVISION OF LABOR AND AUTHORITY AMONG FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS, WHO TOGETHER SHARE THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAINTAINING THE WELL-BEING, INTEGRITY, AND INDEPENDENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY. FRANKLY, I DO NOT KNOW OF A BETTER METHOD OF ACHIEVING TRUE COLLEGIALITY THAN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING. WE SHOULD REMEMBER THAT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IS NOT SIMPLY A METHOD OF DETERMINING WAGES AND HOURS OF EMPLOYEES. IT IS A SYSTEM OF SHARED DECISION-MAKING, JOINT PLANNING, AND PROBLEM-SOLVING, A SYSTEM WHICH ENCOURAGES PARTICIPATION AND COOPERATION IN DOING THAT WHICH IS NECESSARY TO MAKE THE UNIVERSITY A HEALTHY, VIABLE INSTITUTION. THE ALTERNATIVE IS A SYSTEM WHEREBY DECISIONS ARE HANDED DOWN FROM ON HIGH BY A BUREAUCRATIC AUTHORITY AND RECEIVED PASSIVELY, IF SOMEWHAT RESENTFULLY, BY THE FACULTY. I CAN THINK OF MANY WORDS TO DESCRIBE SUCH A SYSTEM, BUT COLLEGIAL WOULD NOT BE ONE OF THEM.

THE VIEW THAT COLLEGIALLY AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ARE ANTI-
THETICAL IS BASED ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE FACULTY IS NOT, IN
MARTIN MORAND'S WORDS, "PROFESSIONALS WITH A STRONG VESTED EMPLOY-
MENT INTEREST IN THE EDUCATIONAL FUNCTION OF THE INSTITUTION." IN
FACT, THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT THEY ARE. ONE CANNOT SIMULTANEOUSLY
MAINTAIN THAT THE FACULTY IS THE UNIVERSITY, A WELL-ESTABLISHED
VIEW, AND THAT A UNION OF THE FACULTY IS FOREIGN TO THE UNIVERSITY
AND HARMFUL TO ITS BEST INTERESTS AS AN INSTITUTION. OF COURSE, IF
ONE STRONGLY ADHERES TO THIS VIEW, IT IS QUITE POSSIBLE THAT COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING WILL RESULT IN AN ADVERSARY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACULTY
AND ADMINISTRATION. BUT IF IT IS ASSUMED THAT THE FACULTY VITALLY
CARES ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY AND WANTS TO DO WHAT IT CAN, AS A PROFES-
SIONAL BODY, TO MAKE THE UNIVERSITY AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION OF
EXCELLENCE, THEN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SHOULD BE WELCOMED.

I SAY WELCOMED BECAUSE, IN MY VIEW, FACULTY UNIONISM IS NOT ONLY
INEVITABLE IN THE MODERN UNIVERSITY, BUT ALSO NECESSARY FROM AN EDU-
CATIONAL POINT OF VIEW. IF THE FACULTY, AS A PROFESSIONAL GROUP, HAS
A NATURAL DESIRE TO MAINTAIN HIGH EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS AND A HEALTHY,
PROSPEROUS UNIVERSITY, IT FOLLOWS THAT PROFESSORS WILL BE BETTER ABLE

TO REALIZE THIS DESIRE IF THEY ARE ORGANIZED. UNIONS ARE ESTABLISHED ONLY BECAUSE THEIR MEMBERS BELIEVE THAT IN ORGANIZATION THERE IS STRENGTH. I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYTHING THE UNIVERSITY NEEDS MORE TODAY THAN A STRONG, ORGANIZED VOICE TO SPEAK IN ITS INTEREST. FACULTY UNIONISM CAN PROVIDE SUCH A VOICE.

WE SIMPLY CANNOT RELY UPON THE ADMINISTRATION TO RESIST PRESSURES THAT EXIST TODAY TO WATER DOWN ACADEMIC STANDARDS. WHATEVER ITS PROFESSIONAL COMMITMENTS, AND I AM NOT QUESTIONING THEM, THE ADMINISTRATION IS FREQUENTLY TOO READY TO ACCOMODATE TO POLITICAL PRESSURES TO ENFORCE QUOTAS, OR RELAX STANDARDS, OR CUT BACK ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS. I SHOULD THINK THAT IT WOULD WELCOME A STRONG FACULTY VOICE WHICH SAYS THAT IT IS POSSIBLE TO EXPAND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL OUR YOUNG PEOPLE WHILE PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF THE UNIVERSITY.

THE STRENGTH OF FACULTY UNIONISM LIES NOT JUST IN THE FACT THAT IT IS AN ORGANIZED SOURCE OF ADVOCACY FOR THE UNIVERSITY. AS AN ORGANIZED FORCE, IT WOULD ALSO BE IN THE POSITION TO FORM COALITIONS WITH OTHER GROUPS IN THE INTEREST OF STRENGTHENING THE POLITICAL SUPPORT FOR GOVERNMENT POLICIES HELPFUL TO THE UNIVERSITY. THERE IS A SEEMING PARADOX HERE, SINCE I HAVE SPOKEN OF THE NEED TO KEEP

POLITICS OUT OF EDUCATION. BUT IT IS REALLY NO PARADOX AT ALL, FOR THE INTERVENTION BY EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS INTO POLITICS TO PROMOTE THE WELL-BEING OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IS QUITE A DIFFERENT THING FROM THE POLITICIZATION OF EDUCATION. TODAY IT IS NECESSARY FOR EDUCATORS TO DEVELOP POLITICAL POWER OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY IN ORDER, ON THE ONE HAND, TO RESIST THE INTRUSION OF POLITICAL POWER WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY AND, ON THE OTHER, TO SECURE FOR THE UNIVERSITY THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT THAT IS NEEDED IF IT IS TO DO ITS JOB WELL. CLEARLY THESE TWO OBJECTIVES ARE INTERDEPENDENT, FOR IF THE UNIVERSITY IS POLITICIZED AND EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS DECLINE, THERE WILL BE LESS INCENTIVE FOR THE PUBLIC, AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS, TO PROVIDE THE UNIVERSITY WITH INCREASED ASSISTANCE. THE UNIVERSITY MUST BE CREDIBLE AS AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION IF IT IS TO RECEIVE AND WARRANT PUBLIC SUPPORT. AN ORGANIZED FACULTY, WHICH HAS A PROFESSIONAL COMMITMENT TO ACADEMIC CREDIBILITY, WOULD SEEM AN IDEAL VOICE TO TAKE THE CASE FOR THE UNIVERSITY BEFORE THE PUBLIC.

MOREOVER, IT IS THE NATURE OF FACULTY UNIONISM TO SEEK THE EXPANSION OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES. IT IS, FIRST OF ALL, A PART OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT WHICH CRUSADED FOR FREE SCHOOLING IN THE 19TH

CENTURY AND HAS BEEN AND REMAINS TODAY A STRONG ADVOCATE OF MASS HIGHER EDUCATION. FACULTY UNIONS NOT ONLY SHARE THESE COMMITMENTS WITH THE LABOR MOVEMENT AS A WHOLE, BUT FIND IN OTHER UNIONS AN INDISPENSABLE SOURCE OF SUPPORT FOR POLICIES OF INCREASED ASSISTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION AND FOR PROGRAMS OF CAREER AND ADULT EDUCATION. SOME MIDDLE CLASS CRITICS OF EDUCATION IN AMERICA MAY WANT LESS FORMAL SCHOOLING AND MORE WORK EXPERIENCE. WORKERS, WHO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT WORK WANT MORE SCHOOLING. THEY HAVEN'T GIVEN UP ON THE SCHOOLS, AND THEY PROVIDE VALUABLE ALLIES TO FACULTY UNIONISTS IN THE EFFORT TO PROMOTE GREATER EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY.

MOREOVER, AS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FACULTIES OF PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, FACULTY UNIONS WOULD BE AMONG THE STRONGEST ADVOCATES FOR SUPPORT TO THESE INSTITUTIONS. THEY WOULD BE NATURALLY INCLINED TO VIEW HIGHER EDUCATION NOT AS A PRIVILEGE FOR A SMALL ELITE, BUT AS A RIGHT FOR ALL YOUNG PEOPLE. AS THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THOSE WHO TEACH IN THESE INSTITUTIONS, FACULTY UNIONS WOULD INSIST THAT PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION BE ADEQUATELY FUNDED, SO THAT EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY DOES NOT BECOME A EUPHEMISM FOR LOWERING EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS AND ACHIEVEMENT. AS I POINTED OUT EARLIER, EQUAL EDUCATIONAL

OPPORTUNITY, IF IT IS TO BE MEANINGFUL, WILL REQUIRE A PUBLIC COMMITMENT TO MORE AND BETTER EDUCATION FOR MORE YOUNG PEOPLE. IN THE PROCESS OF HELPING THE UNIVERSITIES DO THIS JOB WELL, FACULTY UNIONS WOULD BE BROADENING THE CONSTITUENCY IN THE COUNTRY THAT SUPPORTS INCREASED AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION.

THE COMMON INTEREST WHICH FACULTY UNIONS HAVE WITH OTHER TRADE UNIONS AND WITH THE BROADER PUBLIC IS EVIDENT IF WE CONSIDER THE DEGREE TO WHICH EDUCATIONAL POLICY IS INFLUENCED BY THE OVERALL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY. IF THERE IS HEAVY UNEMPLOYMENT, THE GOVERNMENT SIMPLY WILL NOT HAVE THE TAX MONIES TO FUND ADEQUATELY HIGHER EDUCATION. IT IS ESTIMATED THAT EVERY PERCENTAGE POINT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COSTS THE GOVERNMENT SOME \$16 BILLION IN TAX REVENUES. NO WONDER THE GOVERNMENT DOES NOT HAVE SUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR SOCIAL PROGRAMS, GIVEN THE OFFICIAL LEVEL OF UNEMPLOYMENT TODAY AND THE LEVEL OF HIDDEN UNEMPLOYMENT THAT NEVER GETS RECORDED. IN SOME RESPECTS, THE FATE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IS MORE CLOSELY TIED TO PREVAILING ECONOMIC CONDITIONS THAN IS THE FATE OF OTHER SERVICES REQUIRING PUBLIC EXPENDITURES. IF FUNDS ARE SHORT, CUTS ARE FAR MORE LIKELY TO BE MADE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION THAN FOR POLICE OR FIRE

PROTECTION. HIGHER EDUCATION IS NOT, IN THIS SENSE, AN ESSENTIAL SERVICE BUT WILL BE FUNDED ACCORDING TO THE AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES AND THE EXTENT OF POPULAR DEMAND. FOR THIS REASON, TEACHERS AND COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS MUST PARTICIPATE IN BROAD COALITIONS WHICH SEEK TO INFLUENCE THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC POLICIES OF GOVERNMENT. THEY CANNOT RETREAT INTO AN INDEPENDENT PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION, AS THE NEA ADVOCATES, BUT MUST BE ACTIVELY INVOLVED WITH THOSE OUTSIDE THE EDUCATION PROFESSION WHO SHARE WITH TEACHERS A COMMON INTEREST IN FULL EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH.

AS WE HAVE SEEN, OPPOSITION TO THE IDEA OF A DEMOCRATIC UNIVERSITY PROVIDING A LIBERAL EDUCATION TO INCREASING NUMBERS OF YOUNG PEOPLE MEETS WITH OPPOSITION TODAY FROM MANY SOURCES: FROM EDUCATIONAL CONSERVATIVES WHO WANT TO RESTRICT HIGHER EDUCATION TO A SMALL ELITE OF THE POPULATION, FROM FISCAL CONSERVATIVES WHO DON'T WANT TO PAY FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION, FROM SOME LIBERALS WHO FEEL THAT EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS MUST BE SACRIFICED TO ADVANCE SOCIAL CAUSES, AND FROM A HOST OF EDUCATIONAL REFORMERS WHO ARE CONVINCED THAT FORMAL SCHOOLING IS EITHER OPPRESSIVE OR A WASTE OF TIME. BUT IF AMERICA IS TO REMAIN A STRONG AND VIABLE DEMOCRACY, IT NEEDS A SYSTEM OF DEMOCRATIC

EDUCATION THAT ALLOWS ALL PEOPLE THE OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND TO DEVELOP THEMSELVES TO THE FULLEST. FOR TEACHER UNIONISTS, THIS IS NOT A GOAL RECENTLY DISCOVERED OR NEWLY ESPOUSED. THE FIRST ISSUE OF THE AMERICAN TEACHER, PUBLISHED BY TEACHER UNIONISTS IN 1912, CARRIED ACROSS ITS MASTHEAD THE WORDS: "DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION; EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY." THIS IS STILL THE GOAL OF TEACHERS: DEMOCRACY IN THE GOVERNANCE OF OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM, AND EDUCATION AS THE PREREQUISITE FOR A HEALTHY DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM. TODAY, THE QUESTION IS NOT WHETHER THE DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLE WILL BE APPLIED TO HIGHER EDUCATION, BUT HOW THIS WILL BE DONE. IT CAN, IN MY VIEW, BE DONE IN A WAY THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH NEWMAN'S VISION OF WHAT A UNIVERSITY SHOULD BE. THE POINT IS NOT JUST TO PRESERVE THIS VISION, BUT TO APPLY IT TO UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN A SOCIETY THAT IS TRULY DEMOCRATIC.

4/26/78