

## Who Should Run the Universities?

by H. Bruce Franklin

The question Who should run the universities? is not academic, for American universities are not academies. They are essential sources of power within our society, and thus throughout the world. The battles to control them will widen and become more fierce in the next several years and decades. The universities are not even independent entities, for they need huge and growing amounts of capital, and both their tools and their products are highly socialized and interdependent. Our question is not academic but historic.

Presumably none of us is here to deal in utopian speculation. If we were, we could consider the verb "should" in all its dimensions, trying to find some proper hypothetical mixture of justice, legitimacy, efficiency, creativity, and so on. We could then run down some of the following propositions, among others:

The rich should run the universities because only they have the political and economic power to do so.

The poor should run the universities because they have the greatest needs for the educational and research facilities.

Faculties should run the universities because they are so intelligent and creative.

Students should run the universities because they have the most at stake.

The Department of Defense should run the universities because of the threat of communism and national liberation movements.

Administrators should run the universities because they are disinterested professionals, standing above the sordid struggle of the other groups.

I suppose that when President Howard and I were chosen to be antagonists

in this rational d. etc, it was tacitly assumed th he would argue for the power of administrators and I would proclaim all power to the students and faculty. I haven't as yet read his lecture, but I wish to make it clear that I believe the slogans "Student Power" and "Faculty Power" to be increasingly misleading. These existing groups--administration, faculty, and students--are not the actual protagonists in the struggle. These groups--a more accurate word would be groupings-- represent a kind of false consciousness; and they fracture under the impact of events, revealing the real struggle behind these forms--class struggle.

In order to understand how this struggle takes place in this arena, and why it does at this particular time, we have to understand the historical development of the modern American university, who now actually controls it, the class character of both its faculty and its student body, how all these interrelate with each other and with the rest of society, and how they are all rapidly shifting.

I would like to distinguish three stages in the history of the university: the medieval or feudal university; the university of the bourgeoisie; and the future university of the working people. Each of the first two stages has contained the preconditions of the emerging subsequent stage. That is, what we are now witnessing is an institution in the process of transcending itself, being revolutionized, turning into its opposite at the very moment it is developing to its own extreme.

In the medieval university, student and faculty power was total and devotion to the humanities was complete. It was a feudal institution, unequivocally servicing the church and the aristocracy. The medieval university bequeathed to its successor a legacy at once rich and reactionary, precious and dangerous. The ideal of contemplation outside the struggles of society; the fraternity of scholars; the quest for philosophic, as opposed to practical, truth; the purity of the academy--all these are still present to some degree in the

university. And, strange as it may seem, the university is the last stronghold of that central medieval concept--so completely shattered by the Renaissance, the rise of capitalism, and modern science--the ideal of timelessness. The medieval university still exists in the minds of many academics, who occasionally resent the intrusions of the war machine almost as much as they resent the protest demonstrations against it. Periodically, from Cardinal Newman's 1852 glorification of a dead institution, "The Idea of the University," to S. I. Hayakawa's recent wistful claim that "in another time I would have been a priest,"<sup>1</sup> that ideal is resurrected to serve as a shield against the dynamic forces reshaping a far different university.

The university of the bourgeoisie has itself developed stage by stage. In America, the colonial university--most typically Harvard and Yale--on the surface seem to have been the most advanced form of the medieval university. Totally under the control of the New England theocracy, and totally committed to an orthodox religious view of experience, it would seem the bastion of conservatism. But its religious orthodoxy was Puritanism, American Puritanism at that, and just as American Puritanism provided an ideological base for the rising merchant class, the colonial university, only superficially transformed, became a main base of political and economic power for that class.

In Europe, the demands of dynamically developing nineteenth-century capitalism brought a radical innovation to the idea of the university, the German model, stressing scientific research, scientific method in all fields, and graduate instruction. This model reached America at a crucial time, shortly after the Land Grant Act of 1862 and the radical changes in class relations brought about by the Civil War, and during the powerful westward expansion of youthful American capitalism. The Land Grant university, rather than the New England college, was to be the prototype of the university of the future, though that was to include the graduate and research faculties imported by Johns Hopkins University.

The next qualitative changes came with the Depression and World War II, when the federal government became increasingly involved in the universities; this represented part of the process of the collapse of private enterprise capitalism and its replacement by monopoly and state capitalism. In World War II the university was recruited directly into war research, and the Cold War, together with the increasing demands of monopoly capitalism at home and abroad, has fused what is now commonly called the military-industrial-educational complex, which may be understood as an early stage of state capitalism.<sup>1</sup> In this stage the medieval university, a cosmos fused by a single purpose, has become completely transformed into its opposite, what Clark Kerr has aptly named the multiversity, where the central value is the bourgeois ethic of competition. Competition reigns supreme at all levels and in all activities. The community of scholars has been replaced by the academic marketplace; grades and class standings determine the course of life, and, for many young men, whether they will live at all; departments and schools are pitted against each other; the faculty, student body, administration, and board of trustees struggle against each other and against their counterparts in other universities; the competitiveness of football teams, fraternities, and departmental hiring committees is only an outward manifestation of the battles for money relentlessly waged in, through, and by every segment of the multiversity structure. For, as Clark Kerr has put it, the multiversity is "a mechanism held together by administrative rules and powered by money."<sup>2</sup>

To illustrate the archetypal multiversity, Kerr offered this description of his own (this was in 1963) University of California:

The University of California last year had operating expenditures from all sources of nearly half a billion dollars, with almost another 100 million for construction; a total employment of over 40,000 people, more than IBM and in a far greater variety of endeavors; operations in



agricultural and urban extension centers, and projects abroad involving more than fifty countries; nearly 10,000 courses in its catalogues; some form of contact with nearly every industry, nearly every level of government, nearly every person in its region. Vast amounts of expensive equipment were serviced and maintained. Over 4,000 babies were born in its hospitals. It is the world's largest purveyor of white mice. It will soon have the world's largest primate colony. It will soon also have 100,000 students--30,000 of them at the graduate level; yet much less than one third of its expenditures are directly related to teaching. It already has nearly 200,000 students in extension courses--including one out of every three lawyers and one out of every six doctors in the state.<sup>3</sup>

This multiversity, comparable to a small nation, is only one of the giants, even within California. Surely nobody would argue with Kerr's contention that the multiversity "has become a prime instrument of national purpose."<sup>4</sup> And when we realize that "six universities received 57% of federal research funds in a recent year, and twenty universities received 79%," that the knowledge industry as a whole constitutes 29% of the Gross National Product and is growing at a rate twice that of the rest of the economy,<sup>5</sup> when we realize all this, we must recognize that the slogans "Student Power" and "Faculty Power" are, to say the least, inadequate. The only adequate slogan for control over an institution this central to our society is "Power to the people."

The multiversity is at one and the same time the highest form of the university of the bourgeoisie and the developing form of the university of the masses of the people. Like the other economic institutions of over-developed capitalist society, it is in the process of shifting from control by private enterprise through control by monopoly capital to control by the state. Though this state calls itself a public state, it is in fact an

Its internal contradictions, however, do indeed prepare the way for a true government of the people. The multiversity presents the contradictions of this stage of development in striking form. Of all the major institutions in the society, it perpetuates the most frankly elitist values; yet it does so behind a totally egalitarian facade. It is the wellspring of articulate bourgeois liberalism and the seedbed of the most outspoken radicalism. Its virtually all-white and overwhelmingly male faculties profess the most democratic of bourgeois ideals to a student body now one-third female, becoming racially mixed, and rapidly widening in class origin. It is an essential bulwark of the status quo and a source of fundamental social, economic, and political changes. And the question who should run the universities? is seriously debated at a time when it should be perfectly clear that no group can control the universities without controlling society as a whole.

Who now actually does run the universities? As far as ultimate power, the answer is very simple: the owning class runs the universities, much as they run the rest of society.

In capitalist society, power comes from ownership, and ownership comes from power. The owning class not only owns the means of production but also the means of communication. All major political candidates must therefore either themselves be members of the ruling class or be directly selected by it.

One must understand this power historically. When commodities were typically produced by a man who both owned the tools and did the labor, there was no question as to who did or should own the product. The great historical question who should own the product? arose when one man owned the tools and another did the work. That question was neither posed nor answered in abstract ethical debate; it was merely answered by power: because there were more workers and fewer tools than were needed, the man who owned the tools had the power to claim sole ownership of the product. This is, of course, the central premise of capitalist society. Its consequences are obvious.

more one owns, the more power one has; the more power one has, the more one can own. Two of the central ethics that follow from this are: the person who does own something is the person who should own it; those who have power are the ones who should have it.

Now of course there are antitheses to all this. The actual work of capitalist society is not done by the owning class, and the working class knows this, dimly in prosperous times, acutely in periods of economic stress. Work, as well as ownership, is at least a potential source of power, and the working class recognizes this in practice: its main effective tactic is withdrawing its labor. By challenging the legitimacy of the power of the owning class, the working class makes possible a challenge of the source of that power--private property.

In the university, useful labor is performed by students, faculty, administrators, and non-teaching workers, both blue- and white-collar. Some of the tools are physical, such as books, classroom buildings, equipment, etc.; these are made by the interdependent labor of intellectuals and industrial workers, both directly and by using capital created by other workers. The main tool and the main product is knowledge, which in its totality is nothing less than the most important product of all previous humanity. There are at least three distinct kinds of knowledge used and produced in the university. First is useful knowledge or "know-how," which creates, among other things, factories, industries, power, and empires. This kind of knowledge can be owned, at least temporarily, a fact attested to by the patent office, by the laws governing ownership of industrial research, and by the security classifications of the Department of Defense. The other two kinds may be called ideological knowledge and cultural knowledge; these belong to the class that produced them and serve the interests of that class. Ultimate power and legal control over all the physical tools and products of the university lie in the

Institute's Director Jesse Hobson:

This nation occupies 6 percent of the land area of the world, has 7 percent of the world's population, but it now produces 50 percent of the world's goods and possesses 67 percent of the world's wealth.

Research must be the heart, the foundation, the life blood of our present defense economy if we are to maintain this position.<sup>7</sup>

Stanford is the proud home of Professor Eugene Staley's strategic hamlet plan for Vietnam, as well as the ill-fated MacNamara Line, whose sophisticated electronic components were to be produced by firms represented on the Board of Trustees—Hewlett-Packard, Watkins and Johnson, General Telephone and Telegraph. The School of Engineering and the School of Business are integrated directly with the Stanford Industrial Park. The Electrical Engineering Department, which provided the provost while aerospace and electronics were ousting the railroads and shipping from domination of the Board, has more faculty members than the departments of History, Classics, Anthropology, and Philosophy combined. The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, which has open connections with the FBI and CIA, is one of the world's main centers of Cold War propaganda. It was founded explicitly "to demonstrate the evils of the doctrines of Karl Marx . . . thus to protect the American way of life"; according to the Wall Street Journal (June 2, 1967), it now has "a network of agents around the world."<sup>8</sup>

The Board of Trustees has direct and interlocked financial interests in Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Australia, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Venezuela, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, Mexico, Korea, Taiwan, and Japan; in the latter two Stanford has graduate campuses.

Stanford is doing research on counterinsurgency in twelve of these countries. Yet when faced with a non-violent demonstration against CIA recruiting on campus, the administration and much of the liberal faculty hold up the medieval image of the university as a sacrosanct place of tranquil and

Columbia is a strikingly similar institution, whose power structure has been comprehensively analyzed in Who Rules Columbia? I shall not try to summarize this research, but merely point out a few of its more interesting disclosures about the Board of Trustees.

The mass media have heavy representation on the Board, including top officers of the Columbia Broadcasting System, The New York Times, and the Whitney communications empire of television, radio, and publishing. Columbia's own huge real estate holdings have been involved in apparent conflict-of-interest transactions with the real estate and construction empire of Uris Buildings Corporation, which has four representatives on the Board; the man who would be involved in investigating such conflicts of interest, District Attorney Frank S. Hogan, is also on the Board. The usual giant international corporations are represented not only by some of their own officers but also by officers of CIA front organizations: ex-president Kirk, like ex-president Sterling of Stanford, played a crucial role in the Asia Foundation, which was both founded and funded by the CIA; altogether at least six trustees are prominent in organizations secretly funded by the CIA.

Who Rules Columbia? tightly documents just how the physical and educational resources of the university have been consistently used to serve the material interests of its rulers. For those who would like to see this documentation, I have brought along a few copies.

In the case of the private universities, the usual argument employed to justify the fact that only the wealthiest and most powerful can sit on the board of trustees is that only they can financially support the university. With over half of the large "private" university's financing coming from public funds, this argument may be somewhat open to question, even on its own terms (forgetting the larger question as to whether they should be controlling higher education simply because they are rich and powerful). But

If the people as a whole pay for the public university, and if the presumed purpose of this university is to provide higher education and research for the people as a whole, and if, as Clark Kerr says of the University of California, it has "contact with . . . nearly every person in its region," then surely all social classes and major interest groups should be represented on its controlling board. But the Board of Regents of the typical public university is made up of precisely the same sort of person who sits on the private boards--the most powerful owners and executives of monopoly capital. The only substantive difference is that usually some politicians who belong to that same social class sit with them.

The University of California Board of Regents has eight ex-officio political members, and sixteen members appointed by the governor for sixteen-year terms (which are, because of the advanced age of the average appointee, in effect lifetime appointments). Every one of the present sixteen appointed members directly represents the state's large corporate interests. There is no representative of labor, organized or unorganized. There are no Blacks, who constitute 10% of the state's population, or Chicanos, who constitute between 15% and 20%. The closest resemblances two academic appointees are two of Governor Reagan's latest, both from the Stanford complex: Dean Watkins, once an electrical engineering professor at Stanford, now president of Watkins-Johnson Corporation and a trustee at Stanford; and W. Glenn Campbell, Director of the Hoover Institution.

Like Columbia's board, this one includes heavy representation from the corporations controlling the mass media, notably the Hearst publishing empire and the Times-Mirror Company. This board includes the major groupings found at Stanford: finance and construction, oil, aerospace, and electronics. But a very important addition is California agro-business, represented chiefly by Hunt Foods and Industries and several real estate holding corporations.

University of California is intimately involved with all aspects of the state's agriculture. The Board of Regents consistently allocates the university's resources, that is, the people's money, to increase the profitability of the large farms, but the only efforts made to help the people who do the labor on these farms come from the campus radicals, taking the form of direct action, either in the local supermarket, in the university cafeteria, or among the farmworkers themselves. In fact during the Delano strike, now in its third year, the University of California's Extension Service extends help to the struck ranchers. The role of the board is best displayed by Allan Grant, an ex-officio member, as Reagan's appointee to head the State Board of Agriculture:

Grant is a member of the National Right to Work Committee; he has stated publicly that his farm workers come to talk to him at the back door on his 2,000 acre Visalia ranch, and he would feel he had failed in his Christian duty if they should tell him they wanted a union.<sup>9</sup>

The University of California Board of Regents conducts almost all its business in secret executive sessions, contrary to a basic principle of state law and to its own bylaws. It goes along with the academic freedom of all those who do not effectively challenge capitalism, but it sponsors loyalty oaths for its professors, tries to prevent spokesmen for the opposition, such as Eldridge Cleaver, from lecturing in their university, and whenever possible limits the rights of speech and assembly of the students.

California has another huge public university, the State College system, which has recently, and for good reason, been making more news than the University of California. The reason is that its student body is drawn much more from the working class, because its entrance requirements are, in bourgeois terms, "lower." The State College has its own Board of Trustees, which is infinitely more democratic and representative than the University's Board of

a union leader, supposedly a representative of working people. But this sole exception to white ruling-class rule, Edward O. Leo, has been systematically excluded from the Board's deliberations on the crisis at San Francisco State.<sup>10</sup>

It has been argued that merely sitting on the governing board of a university does not necessarily equal having effective control over it.

Those who make this argument point to the power within the universities that the faculty has, through its own senate, on tri-partite committees, and within departments, over hiring and firing procedures, course content, academic regulations, etc. If it is true that the governing boards do not have the real power, one wonders why the representatives of monopoly capital fight so hard and so successfully to maintain their complete domination of these boards.<sup>11</sup>

The answer is simple: the oligopoly interests who constitute the boards of trustees and regents make the fundamental decisions from which all day-to-day decisions flow. By having ultimate control over hiring, they have effective self-perpetuating control. If you doubt this, imagine SDS and the Black Panther Party appointing a university faculty; it would make no effective difference whether the original organizations or their chosen faculty were to be in charge of subsequent hiring and other decisions. The trustees and regents decide how resources will be allocated, what new schools or institutes will be created, what will be the relative size and strength of the existing schools and institutes. At Stanford, even departmental control of its own finances is actually used as a means of control over the department. The administration, acting as the agent of the trustees, says to each department, "Here, fellows, is your pie for next year. Divide it up any way you want." What this means, of course, is that if one professor gets a raise, it must come either out of the pocket of one of his colleagues or out of his department's academic or research program. Totally beyond question is the new business school building, the new athletic pavilion, the doubling of the facilities of the Hoover Institute or the quadrupling of those of the Stanford



Research Institute. The concrete evidence of real faculty impotence stands revealed in a single fact: the detailed university budget is a closely-guarded secret from everyone but the Board of Trustees and a handful of top administrators. No one else is even allowed to know the relative allocation of resources, much less have anything to do with determining it.

The agents of the trustees' and regents' power are the administrations of the various universities. Of course their role is a good deal more complicated than that. University administrators are rather Janus-headed figures, with one face that looks like a corporate industrial manager and another that resembles the pure academician.

In the most typical nineteenth-century industrial enterprises, there was no question who ran the show. The owner was the boss. He either ran things directly or hired managers to transmit his directives. As we all know, that typical enterprise evolved into a joint-stock company, then into a huge complex corporation, and now into a labyrinthine structure of many corporations, interlocked with each other and with the state. The corporate conglomerate is, like the multiversity, a characteristic form of the military-industrial-educational complex of developing state capitalism. As this evolution has taken place, the role of owner and the role of manager have become redefined. The managerial function has gained increasingly independent power, while, at the same time, it has become increasingly dependent on complicated objective conditions. It is not the owner who tells the manager what to do; both of them take their orders from the internal dynamics of the bureaucratic and mechanical labyrinths they "run." And although some large and important decisions are still made by the owners, the day-to-day operating decisions are made by the managers. Does this group constitute, as some have argued, a distinct new class, the managerial class, having fundamental contradictions with the owning class? Clearly this is not so in corporations, where the big

university, this does not totally apply. Is there a class distinction--and therefore a fundamental contradiction--between the administration and the board of regents or trustees? I think not. First of all, though the administration runs the university in the sense of managing or administering it, that is, making the day-to-day operating decisions, it is thereby implementing purposes over which it has no control. In practice the administration cannot question the premises of the multiversity, and to do so would be--quite literally--unthinkable for most administrators. They draw their identity, like the salary, from the class they serve and into which they merge. They are not merely the surrogates of the owning class, for as nineteenth-century private enterprise capitalism evolves through corporate capitalism into state capitalism, the owning class as such becomes superfluous. Managing increasingly becomes the effective equivalent of owning and finally substitutes for it.

No contradiction between present managers or administrators and owners or trustees is a class contradiction, any more than contradictions between the management of Ford and General Motors are class contradictions, or, for that matter, any more than contradictions between the state capitalist managers of the Soviet Union and those of the United States are class contradictions. The class enemies of all these are their own working class and the peoples of the Third World. This is why the administrators of the American multiversity are as eager as their boards of trustees and regents to throw the full might of their institutions against the forces of what they call instability in the world and at home.

But the administration has limits placed upon it from other directions. Caught between the trustees or regents and the forces in rebellion against that very class, it often finds itself in the position of attempted mediator or buffer in class struggle. This is complicated by the fact that most administrators have their immediate origin in the faculty, a group itself

torn by internal contradictions.

The faculty of the multiversity includes powerful businessmen, professional military officers, would-be medieval humanist scholars, scientists with independent contracts and dependent research teams, doctors, lawyers, and bohemian writers. According to some New Left theorists, the faculty belongs to the "new working class," but surely this might be true of only parts of the faculty, relatively small parts at the so-called "top" universities.

Even those that do belong to the working class represent one of its most privileged and highest paid strata, and the other end of the spectrum shades off into the managerial and owning class, particularly in the schools of engineering and business. The salaries of professors are directly proportional to their contribution to production, to profit, and to the ideological and material defense of monopoly capitalism. But even professors of the humanities are now well paid in comparison to most of the working class; in the San Francisco Bay Area, in fact their starting salary is almost as high as that of a policeman. (After doing my graduate work and teaching at Stanford for five years, my own take-home pay equalled what it had been as a lieutenant in the Air Force.) Extremely few faculty members at the prestige universities consider themselves members of the working class, but in the state colleges and junior colleges there is often a substantial minority who do so identify themselves, as evidenced by the rapid growth of trade unions among them.

Most professors, however, are both objectively and subjectively members of the middle and petty bourgeoisie. As such, they share a very common idea of their class—that class struggle, if it exists at all, involves other people and springs from their irrationality. Hence the liberal idea that conflict comes from people not communicating well enough. As a sub-class, professors fervently cling to the belief that they, perhaps alone of all groups, are above that sordid field of confused struggle. This belief justifies their very reason for existence, for they believe that they alone

other classes, of the history of their struggles, and of the culture which springs from this history and gives it comprehensible form. Their pursuit of such pure truth incidentally commits them to lives where they associate only with other members of the middle and petty bourgeoisie, particularly other "professional" people. Though they may advocate integrated schools and housing, they live in all-white ghettos and send their children to tokenly integrated schools. Though they may be sympathetic to workers in the abstract, they probably do not know a single blue-collar worker personally and therefore lament that the industrial working class is "content with their cars and TV sets."

Only inside the university do the professors act on what they understand as class relationships, their relationships to the students and, sometimes, to the administration. Toward the upper level of the internal university hierarchy, professors are in a somewhat ambiguous position. There is a good deal of mobility from the faculty into the administration. In many universities administrative labor is spread out among the faculty. Professors do not generally question the premises of the university, and therefore do not object to having little or no say about fundamental decisions. There is commonly a simmering resentment against administrative control over salaries, but the faculty gets most upset with the administration when it permits their security and privileges to be exposed to the onslaught of the unwashed masses of the students. For one thing all faculty members have in common, whether they sit in the highest councils of Washington or whether they are struggling humanist scholars straight out of graduate school: they have more direct power over more people's lives than exists almost anywhere in our society, with the possible exception of the military. Jerry Farber, who teaches at California State College, Los Angeles, has described this relationship in his aptly-titled essay, "Students are Kiggers".

member "Sir" or "Doctor" or "Professor"--and he smiles and shuffles as he stands outside the professor's office waiting for permission to enter. The faculty tell him what courses to take . . . ; they tell him what to read, what to write, and, frequently, where to set the margins on his typewriter. They tell him what's true and what isn't.

The saddest cases among both black slaves and student slaves are the ones who have so thoroughly introjected their masters' values that their anger is turned inward.<sup>12</sup>

Farber says that if he takes students into the faculty dining room, his "colleagues get uncomfortable, as though there were a bad smell." At the Stanford Faculty Club, there is an exception to this, because my colleagues seem comfortable when their students are there as their waiters. In many buildings at Stanford, like at Cal State, the rest rooms are marked "Faculty only."

With one foot in the working class and the other rubbing against the ankles of the ruling class, ambiguously under administrative rule and clearly ruling the students, completely dependent on the system but often outraged by what the system does, the faculty behaves as might be expected--it vacillates in its loyalties but in a crisis tends to line up with the party of order. All this so far is really nothing new, and the faculty of the multiversity as a whole tends to behave like its historical predecessors. Here, for example, is the faculty's response to a student strike called at one university and spreading to others:

. . . the professors lament and snivel, imploring the government not to take the road of reaction and to make use of an excellent opportunity "to ensure peace and order with the help of reforms" in "a country exhausted by convulsions"--imploring the students not to resort to unlawful courses which can only play into the hands of reaction, etc.,

This is not a description of Columbia University in 1968. It is Lenin's description of St. Petersburg University in 1903. When Lenin describes even earlier events, it sounds like the 1964 Free Speech Movement at Berkeley and its aftermath: The liberal professors join with the students to gain student freedom of assembly and speech, but when the students invite revolutionary off-campus speakers to their meetings these same liberal professors run around denouncing outside troublemakers; then they waver and dash from one side to another, "urging the revolutionists to desist from revolution, and the police to desist from reaction."<sup>14</sup>

More important than the similarity between the behavior of American professors in the 1960's and Russian professors before 1910 is the similarity between the behavior of each of these groups and the social class to which they belong. Lenin raises the key questions: "Indeed, was the liberal professors' behaviour before and during the Moscow events fortuitous? . . . Does this behaviour express the individual peculiarities of a given group of the liberal bourgeoisie, or does it express the fundamental interests of this entire class in general?"<sup>15</sup> Anyone familiar with the American liberal left in the 1960's must realize that the liberal faculty--and most faculties are now, as they were in Russia sixty years ago, overwhelmingly liberal--represents, and speaks for, a larger . . . class within our society. This was well understood by Eugene McCarthy, who was the candidate of this class. (In France, this class has its own party, the *Partie Socialiste Unific*, which successfully ran Mendes-Franco as a peace candidate to settle its war in Vietnam.) Some portions of the faculty are actually part of the ruling class, or consciously identify themselves with its interests. These are the faculty-administrators, the corporation lawyers who act as professors in the law school and the businessmen who act as professors in the business school, the research entrepreneurs, and many of the other hirelings of the "defense" department. But most of the faculty feels alienated from power, both within

the university and in the society at large, and indeed they are. These are the middle-class professionals whose fate Marx and Engels accurately saw in 1848: "the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science" become converted into "paid wage labourers."<sup>16</sup> As such, they are alienated from both the ruling class and the industrial working class, both of whom they fear and sometimes despise. This is the liberal faculty.

But there is a new ingredient in the faculty. Until fairly recently, only a few people without independent means of support could see their way through graduate school and join the professorial elite. But the demands of advanced capitalism for a highly educated labor force, the population explosion within the generation reaching college in the sixties, and the vastly expanded financial support from foundations, industry, state and federal government have all combined to change the internal class composition of the faculty. There has been wide recruiting of young people who before could not have been able to afford degrees, much less been able to penetrate the country-club faculties. The wider class basis of the younger faculty creates new contradictions. Why, many of us do not even consider ourselves gentlemen. And some of us are beginning to identify clearly and openly not only with the American working class but with all the peoples of the world most oppressed and exploited by American imperialism. On the surface this looks like a generational gap. Last month at the annual convention of the Modern Language Association, which consists of college and university teachers of all the modern languages and literatures, a serious rebellion took place. It was a rebellion against the establishment, against tradition, against the prevailing ideas of what a professor should be, and against American imperialism. Louis Kampf of MIT was punched by a hotel detective and he and two others were arrested by the New York City police, who brought an entire busload of their forces to the main hotel. We not only had a sit-in to force the dropping of

plans the program next year's convention and the following year will become president of the entire 28,000-member organization. We passed a number of resolutions, including one denouncing the U.S. war against the Vietnamese people as "illegal, immoral, and imperialistic," and demanding the immediate withdrawal of American and puppet forces. All the votes, both on Louis' election and on the rebels' resolutions, were standing votes; all therefore seemed glaring evidence of a generational conflict, with old and young now standing, now sitting. But all those who think that this conflict is primarily between age groups and that we will outgrow our present ideologies overlook two things--the past and the future. For such a rebellion is without precedent, and the forces behind it are growing each year. I do not support "faculty power" because it is abstractly legitimate, but only because and only insofar as it represents the power of the exploited and oppressed.

Trying to determine the class relations of college students is extremely difficult and complicated. First we must recognize the substantial differences among students at different kinds of schools. Carl Davidson makes these distinctions:

The traditional Ivy League schools shape the sons and daughters of the ruling class and old middle class into the new ruling and managerial elites. The state colleges and universities develop the sons and daughters of the working class and petty bourgeoisie into the highly skilled sectors of the new working class, the middle sector white collar workers, and the traditional middle class professionals. Finally, the new community and junior colleges serve the increasing educational needs of, for the most part, the sons and daughters of the working class.<sup>17</sup>

This is generally accurate, but there are even more distinctions. Certainly in California there is a noticeable difference between the class backgrounds of those within the university system and those within the state college system, and the state tacitly and practically recognizes this difference,



allocating for each student within the university several times the amount of money allocated for each student in the state colleges. Then there are small colleges and even junior colleges that cater exclusively to the children of the rich; there are the Negro colleges of the south and urban north; and there are programs to bring a token number of the poor, particularly poor Blacks, into the most prestigious schools.

Sometimes overriding all these class distinctions is that role of student as nigger, combined with the rosy future lying before each student who can win out over his fellows. In a sense students are temporarily declassé, living in a limbo between their wealthy or working-class past and whatever careers they are being channeled into. Although physically and psychologically capable of working and childbearing, indeed more energetic and sexually motivated than many "adults," though often among the most intellectually alert and best informed members of society, they are branded by that society as immature parasites. They are generally not permitted either to sell their labor or to own property. Although they may work extremely hard in school, they are told this is not real work, that they are not working for a living, and that therefore they have essentially no rights. The used-car salesman thinks of the pre-medical student as a chiseler living off his hard-earned money. Neither workers nor owners, students share some of the experience of the more clearly classless elements of society, the true lumpenproletariat. Presumably this experience has some effect on their consciousness. At least they know what it is to be considered a parasite. Their class loyalties weaken. The sanctity of both work and private property is questioned. Of course they are still in part products of their natal class. But because their class position is now ambiguous, many of them pass as naturally into the lumpenproletariat as back into the class roles for which they supposedly were being trained. The sons and daughters of some of the wealthiest capitalists

of life. Many identify with the life style and consciousness of the most oppressed, and take as their heroes Malcolm X, Huey Newton, Ho Chi Minh, Che Guevara, and Mao Tse-Tung. And for many this is not some youthful aberration or fad, to be outgrown as soon as they realize that these values are not as attractive as suburbia.

To some extent, this has been true of students for a long time, and accounts for the essential role they have played in all twentieth-century revolutionary struggle. Students acted as a catalytic agent of consciousness in the Russian, Chinese, and Cuban revolutions, as well as in the various wars of national liberation (even the Yugoslav partisans had strong student leadership). But advanced monopoly capitalism, by making huge quantitative changes, increases the role of students qualitatively. Its demands for highly skilled manpower, and virtually only highly skilled manpower, force it to educate unprecedented numbers of students to unheard-of levels of proficiency in understanding and manipulating abstract knowledge. And the demands of managing and rationalizing a world-wide empire create even greater needs. In all previous societies, university students were a chosen elect, the sons of the ruling class plus the most able sons of the professional and middle classes. Now university students are the sons and daughters of all classes except the lowest, which in the United States means racial minorities. And at this moment, of course, even the sons and daughters of Blacks, Chicanos, and Indians are beginning to move into the universities. When we are talking about "students" we are now talking about a significant portion of the entire population. The number of college students now approximately equals the country's total armed forces plus its three largest unions (Teamsters, UAW, and United Steelworkers).

The widening class background of the younger faculty is amplified several times over among the students. So the most significant development now taking

professors are members of the working class, whether students themselves are, whether the concept of the "new working class" defines the roles of either.

Graduate student labor organizing, particularly into militant APT chapters, is growing rapidly. Students are exploring labor history and beginning to participate directly in strikes and organizing, particularly of the non-teaching employees on campus. A small but swiftly increasing number of students is going into industrial work in a conscious attempt to forge the missing link in a worker-student alliance. The slogan "student power" is being progressively rejected, except insofar as it represents an early form of the power of those without property and privilege.

On the campus there exists another group, rarely if ever thought of as a possible co-ruler of the university--the non-teaching employees. The lower strata of this group--janitors, gardeners, maintenance men, kitchen workers, maids, clerks, typists--include a far higher proportion of racial minorities, live in neighborhoods removed from the faculty and administration but often shared with students, particularly graduate students, and are the most direct representatives of the super-exploited. Generally these people are looked upon by all other groups within the university--administration, faculty, and students--as not being a part of the university. In fact, they come close to being invisible. As they organize, one demand that they will raise is that the educational facilities of the university be made available not only to their children but to them. If they were to win this demand, the effects would be extremely radical. Their presence in an economics class or a history class would force a change in the content of the course. Or take my own field. Most students at any one time are in classes on the novel, for good reason.

The novel is the main art form of the bourgeoisie, rising with that class and mainly concerned with individual class status (from Richardson, Defoe, Fielding, and Jane Austen through Henry James to Faulkner, Malamud, Bellow, and Styron).

seen merely objects to be escaped could actually participate in the discussion of these novels. And now suppose that the class to which these people belong had control over the resources of the university and thus determined the class content of its courses.

In the final analysis, there can be only one radical position: the overwhelming majority of people, that is, the working class, must run the universities. Very few students have reached the realization that only by struggling for workers' control of the university can they form a valid worker-student alliance. But they are getting there, as San Francisco State dramatically shows. And they will be increasingly influenced by the fact that all this has already happened for one quarter of the world's population. In the Cultural Revolution in China, students began by struggling for increased admission of workers and peasants to higher education, different class content in the courses, radical changes in testing and grading, and student power as opposed to faculty and administration power. As that struggle advanced, they closed down the schools and went to the workers and peasants to learn from them. What they learned was that only the workers and peasants had the power to make the changes they sought. The result is that the universities are now run by the workers and peasants and are totally at the service of the needs of the people, there is no longer a distinction between students and workers because everybody both works and studies, and the old Mandarin system of competitive testing has been eliminated and replaced by collective learning and collective evaluation.

The American course of development to the people's university will of course be quite different from the Chinese. This is how it will probably happen: The interpenetration of the university and the state will increase, rather than decrease. The present supposedly radical, but objectively reactionary, demand for university autonomy will be dropped by students and

retained, if at all, only by liberal arts professors. The present supposedly conservative, but objectively progressive, demand for more control over the university by the political apparatus of the state now being made by the ruling-class politicians and press will soon become a middle-class demand, and it will then be implemented. The revolutionaries will gradually realize that this university-state synthesis contains the potential to meet all human material needs, and they will fight for a new form of this giant, to be under the control of the working people and poor people. Meanwhile the class composition of student bodies and faculties will continue to shift. This will be most noticeable in the form of an influx of racial minorities, who will increasingly identify themselves, as they have just started to do, as Third World people. The ruling class will escalate its present attempts to get white working class support against the students. Present examples of this in California are Reagan's overt appeals to the workers, and the administration of the College of San Mateo, which is forced to use an offer of increased admission of poor whites as a weapon against the Third World Liberation Front. But this ruling-class tactic will be self-defeating, for any substantial increase in working-class participation in the universities will weaken ruling-class dominance in the society as a whole. And the Third World people will increasingly recognize the fact that they are the vanguard of the entire working class, and they will build a growing alliance with white workers. If all this sounds far-fetched, go to San Francisco State and watch the white truck drivers pull up to the picket line, raise a clenched fist, and turn their trucks around.

FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>San Francisco Chronicle, January 2, 1969.

<sup>2</sup>Clark Kerr, The Usos of the University (Harvard University Press, 1964), p.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 7-8.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 87.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 88.

<sup>6</sup>On Stanford, see David Ransom, "The Stanford Complex" in "The University at War" issue of Viet Report (January, 1968) and Through the Looking Glass: A Radical Guide to Stanford, put out by Stanford SDS in 1968.

<sup>7</sup>Ransom, p. 19.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Marvin Carson and Ken Blum, The Regents (Berkeley, 1967).

<sup>10</sup>San Francisco Chronicle, January 7, 1969.

<sup>11</sup>See the recent survey of the nation's trustees conducted by the Educational Testing Service. The survey reveals that the typical trustee is white, Protestant, in his 50's, and occupies a prestige position in business. He favors loyalty oaths, thinks that the faculty should not have major authority in appointing their academic dean, and wishes to share his decision-making power only with the administration. (San Francisco Chronicle, January 12, 1969.)

<sup>12</sup>Jerry Farber, "Students are Niggers," reprinted in Stanford Daily, October 8, 1968.

<sup>13</sup>Lenin on Youth (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1967) pp. 103-104.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., pp. 131-134.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 135.

<sup>16</sup> Manifesto of the Communist Party in The Essential Left (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1963), p. 17.

<sup>17</sup> Carl Davidson, "The Multiversity: Crucible of the New Working Class" (SDS, n.d.), p. 7.