

A great deal of misunderstanding about student protest activities, it is argued, results from various kinds of misunderstanding about causes. It is therefore necessary to "demythologize" the student revolt. It is also necessary to distinguish the various facets of concern that underlie the reactions of students.

These do not, indeed, involve a consistent ideology. But they do tend to explain, if not entirely to justify, many of the phenomena associated with student protest activities, and to suggest why modern youth have a strong predilection for "praxis" as opposed to mere moralizing. The underlying commitments are, it seems, more closely in touch with those of enlightened adults than has heretofore been recognized.

STUART LANGTON*

Revolution, Ideology and Youth**

It has become somewhat banal to be told that we are in the midst of a student revolution in the United States. The reminders appear almost daily through various student protest activities which are given wide publicity through the mass media. Student rebellion makes good copy and the press and public eagerly consume every tidbit of information about student unrest. In the midst of massive publicity new protagonists gain instant notoriety. Names like Professor S. I. Hayakawa, Sam Wood, Mark Rudd, Peoples Park, Woodstock, etc. have become symbols that perpetuate interest in student unrest.

Despite the wide notoriety of student protest activities, there exists scant understanding among the general public of the causes and issues behind student unrest. Further, there exists much distortion and ignorance among those who work with students and should know better. Oversimplified explanations, inability to listen, and fear of change have been frequently demonstrated by many teachers and educational administrators. In a mood of defensiveness there have developed among educators and the public at large a number of popular attitudes that deny the possibility of mature understanding and perpetuate a gap between generations. To be sure, such a situation is neither entirely intentional nor irreversible. Nonetheless, it is pervasive and intense, and if not reduced it can lead to rash uses of adult power that can be extremely destructive to students as persons and to academic communities.

*Assistant Professor of Education, Boston University.

**A shortened version appeared in the June issue of *Phi Delta Kappan* under the title, "Demythologizing the Student Revolt."

If a more enlightened understanding is to prevail, there are some widespread popular myths about the nature of student unrest that need to be dispelled. In particular, there are two kinds of myths that must be challenged. The first kind of myth has to do with the structure and motivation of student revolt. It is often suggested that there is a unified movement of student revolt that is attributable to a single cause and is basically negative and destructive. I will maintain in the first half of this article that there are multiple student revolts attributable to multiple factors, and further, that these revolts are essentially constructive responses to some of the most critical issues of our time. The second kind of myth has to do with the ideology that underlies student unrest. There are two popular attitudes about the ideology of student revolt that will be challenged in the second half of the article. One of these attitudes is that student unrest is primarily dominated by Marxist ideology. The other view is that student unrest is devoid of any significant ideological basis. I will however suggest that there are some specific ideological convictions that underlie the various student revolts and that the influence of Marxist ideology is limited.

One of the misleading and hazardous features of the myths identified here is that each manifests a slight resemblance to reality. Each outlook contains a modicum of truth. Thus, a superficial appearance of validity along with popular acceptability of these views contributes to their mythical quality. What is needed in our time is continuous demythologizing of views such as these in order to avoid prejudicial attitudes and acts. What follows is a modest attempt to demythologize two kinds of myth that hinder the achievement of a more enlightened and creative relationship with this generation of students.

I. MYTHS CONCERNING THE CAUSE AND STRUCTURE OF STUDENT REVOLT

A common and frequent response to the well publicized activities of student protest is to speak globally of a "Student Revolt." Student unrest is thus portrayed as a monolithic and singular movement and, usually, a common motivation is ascribed to its participants. There are several superficial analyses of this kind. One such view is that students have been "spoiled" by excessive affluence and that their protest activities are to be dismissed as the tantrum of *enfant terribles*. A second popular view is that the present generation has been raised in a spirit of permissiveness (due to the influence of Dr. Spock), and therefore resents and resists any kind of authority. A more sophisticated variant of this view has been developed by Lewis Feuer in his recent book, *Conflict of Generations*. Feuer suggests student rebellion is a result of unresolved oedipal conflicts; it is a latent, unconscious expression of a desire to overcome the father. A third popular myth is that student unrest is a result of the conspiratorial efforts of international Communist agents who are manipulating students to challenge and weaken values and authority in American life.

Perhaps the greatest shortcoming of these simplistic theories of student revolt is that they overlook and oversimplify the many diverse themes of student unrest. They err in the assumption that student protest is a quasi-unified, monolithic "movement" with a common theme and motivation. Such a view eschews serious consideration of the variety of themes of student unrest. Student unrest is highly pluralistic in nature, and it would be more accurate to speak of student revolts or revolutions rather than a singular student revolt. Although there may be some similarities between happenings of student unrest at such diverse places as Columbia University, Peoples Park in San Francisco, Woodstock, New York and the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, there are significantly different issues involved in each case. If what is happening with the young is to be understood, it is vital that the different concerns of their protests be distinguished and weighed on their own merits.

There are at least three kinds of concern that predominate in various student protest activities. In a sense, these three kinds of concern represent three interrelated but distinguishable student revolutions. The term revolution, it must be confessed, is used here in a very loose sense. In the context of this discussion the terms student revolt, unrest, protest, and revolution are used interchangeably to signify activities that seek to bring about significant change in the policies and procedures of social institutions. To be sure, there are *some* students who would define revolution as the use of violence to overthrow the government. But this is but one view among a wide spectrum of outlooks. It is a view that does not have wide acceptability. The more widely accepted concerns of student revolt are considerably more positive. In fact, what I will refer to as the three revolutions of youth are responses of conscience to the most fundamental concerns of contemporary man.

The three revolutions among students can best be described as unique responses to three fundamental questions of human existence in our time. The most basic revolutionary question has to do with the very survival of mankind as a species. It is concerned with such issues as the destruction of man and his world through thermonuclear weapons, chemical and biological warfare, and the pollution of the biosphere. The attempt to protest against and overcome these problems will be referred to as the "Revolution for Survival." The second revolution is concerned with the question of survival in a different sense. It is a response to the misery and suffering of the majority of the human race threatened by poverty, starvation, disease, and ignorance. This revolution, which will be called the "Revolution of Equitability," responds to the tremendous disparities and inequities in the distribution of the world's wealth and opportunities. The third revolution is primarily a response by the children of affluence. This revolution repudiates the present style of a life of overabundance and seeks more meaningful alternatives

to existence. This revolution, which will be called the "Revolution of Meaning," aims at expanding the range and quality of human experience.

As a prelude to examining each of these revolutions it must be acknowledged that they are not mutually exclusive. The issues involved in each revolt are among other things reflections of the limitations of the technologization and super-bureaucratization of modern world culture. The threat of annihilation is an ultimate consequence of man's perfection of the machine. The inequities in the distribution of resources, opportunities, and responsibilities is a consequence of the predominant hierarchical and rigid forms of contemporary social organization. And both of these features of modernism are what so many of the young repudiate as the "System." They desire a more meaningful existence than has been offered in the reward system of a mechanized and over-programmed social order. Despite the highly vaunted successes and benefits of the "System" a large portion of the student population reacts to its essential weaknesses. The three revolutions of the young, therefore, can best be understood as protests against three of the most prominent failures inherent in the present stage of civilization.

The Revolution for Survival

Nearly a decade ago while attending a world youth convention in Tokyo, a Japanese student confronted me in front of our meeting hall and began shouting "Stop Nuclear Testing! Stop Nuclear Testing!" Although American students reflect less passion than this today, they do reflect a sober concern over nuclear armaments and the threat of annihilation. The most prominent attitude I have observed among students is that the development of nuclear weapons is absolute folly perpetrated by slightly demented politicians and businessmen as projections of greed, guilt, and paranoia. "Incredible," "ridiculous," "stupid" are terms often used by students to describe the nuclear arms race. As one student put it recently, "What in God's name can one's life as a whole mean in a world of such lunacy? I can either revolt against this insanity or blow my mind every day."

The apocalyptic sense of annihilation has become a permanent categorical feature of the world view of today's student. An ontological consciousness of non-being as extinction pervades the thinking of many people, young and old. The fragile and contingent nature of a man's life is one thing, but the conditional existence of mankind and all other species of the biosphere is an entirely other matter. In myriad ways today's generation of students reacts to and protests this state of existence. The dynamic and diverse programs and activities referred to as the "Peace Movement" is one reaction to this condition of the world. Opposition to the war in Vietnam has become more than a protest against an unjust war and an unscrupulous squandering of resources; it has become a vehicle by which many students are able to express

their opposition to a metaphysics of annihilation. The "Movement" is at once an opposition to an incredibly immoral war, the concept of war in general, and to forces of ultimate destruction in the world. Thus, for many student protesters, a passionate opposition to the Vietnam War is a way in which they can affirm a metaphysic of survival and affirm the forces of life in the face of all powerful forces of destruction. It is not surprising, therefore, that some commentators have noted that there is a decidedly religious quality to student protest activities. The revolution for survival is an ultimate affirmation of life forces and a defense against barbaric assaults upon creation.

In the last year, it is interesting to note, the defense of creation has come to include more than humanity. Many student publications have reflected increased concern with the destruction of the natural environment. Increasingly, student activists are becoming conservationists. This indicates an even wider opposition to forces that destroy man and his world. There is a growing concern among the young for the preservation of natural resources, the restoration of cities into more life-sustaining environments and an end to ugliness and the pollution of the environment.

The revolution for survival is fundamental and profound because it indicates a new sense of consciousness in man. It amounts to a repudiation of the predatory tendency in man. It is a refusal to kill, plunder, and destroy. This attitude is not so much of an unalterable opposition to the forces of technologism and modernism as a deeply insightful response to them. A large segment of the student population believe that the perfecting of technological skill has made destruction and exploitation unnecessary. In an age of super machinery and problem-solving technology, there is absolutely no need to kill and destroy. War and pollution are not only immoral but archaic and inefficient. Therefore, destruction and exploitation are all the more immoral because there are no reasonable economic or procedural justifications for them. This is what students mean when they refer to the arms race, for example, as "stupid," "incredible," and "ridiculous."

In the long run, this kind of outlook may signify a substantial alteration in man's behavior. As more and more persons become educated perhaps fewer will see any reasons for participating in wars and other acts destructive to the life of this planet (or other planets for that matter). This view was an article of faith for the late Catholic Paleontologist, Teilhard de Chardin. During his life it seemed like a rather naive and utopian outlook. Yet as one observes and listens to the present generation of students it appears to be a matter of common sense for many of them. If this revolution of consciousness can survive and flourish, there may be an alternative to poisoning or blowing up this planet.

The Revolution of Equitability

The very success of technology which makes the revolution for survival seem all the more reasonable and possible also lends sustenance to another revolutionary movement among the young. That movement, which will be referred to as the revolution of equitability, is a demand for a more equitable distribution of wealth, opportunities, and responsibilities. It is a deeply humanistic and impassioned protest against injustice, suffering, and exploitation. At the heart of this revolutionary outlook is the belief that if institutions were organized differently, then such problems as poverty, hunger, disease, racism, and ignorance could be overcome. The "System" has the technological ability to provide sufficient food, clothing, shelter, educational, medical, recreational and legal services for all persons. It is crucial to acknowledge that many students understand that for the first time in history it is possible to eliminate the major common social ills of mankind. The potential of our affluent civilization to solve major problems is immense, and students recognize this. Students also realize that there are terrible injustices perpetuated by and within social institutions. They are extremely sensitive to the fact that many men in positions of institutional power are insensitive, unresponsive, incapable, and unethical. This is not to say that they believe all men in positions of power are like this. However, the mass media have constantly advertised abuses of power and authority that were little known to previous generations. Further, this generation of students has grown up in a highly bureaucratized social order that has made exposure to stupid and dehumanizing acts by authorities not uncommon to them. Therefore, it is not at all surprising that they distrust and refuse to passively accept authority. Student suspicion of and challenge to authority is not so much a matter of unresolved oedipal conflicts as it is a response to their own experience and knowledge of bureaucratic power. Thus, the revolution of equitability has a high degree of trust in technology, but an even higher degree of mistrust of the institutions and institutional men that control technology. Very few students are like the 18th century Luddites who attempted to destroy machines. A far greater proportion of students are interested in radically changing the institutions that determine how the machines and its products are to be utilized. This revolution is a matter of re-establishing priorities and applying technological resources to them.

The revolution of equitability takes the American Dream and Democracy quite seriously. Student rebels are acutely aware of the disparities between the democratic ideology and the practices of institutions of our culture. Next to the Vietnam war there is nothing that gathers more revolutionary support than issues of institutional hypocrisy. This has been particularly evident on college campuses where students have demonstrated that such long espoused liberal doctrines as freedom of speech and inquiry, student involvement, community service, and equality of opportunity for all races and classes was based on words rather

than acts. Much of the revolution for equitability on college campuses is an attempt to see if institutions of higher education will abandon a phony tokenism and take their own propaganda seriously. This challenge, of course, is not limited to academic institutions. Students have challenged similar inequities in political, social welfare, and religious organizations.

Among the more prominent credos of the revolution to achieve equitability is the significant participation of persons in the development and decision-making process of democratic institutions. Significant participation, or "participatory democracy" as it is sometimes called, exceeds the commonly accepted notion of representative government. Representative governing in a bureaucratized society has led to the disenfranchisement of some minorities and the special treatment of other minorities. With a strong sense of populist conviction, most students believe that only when there is a more equitable process of participation and representation can there be a more equitable distribution of goods and opportunities.

The Revolution of Meaning

The revolution of meaning also is a response to the affluence and successes of the existing "system" of social organization. In particular it is the children of affluence who have rejected some of the more accepted modes of their society. What they have proclaimed is that the experiences and opportunities open to them in their institutional environment are dull, non-fulfilling, unimaginative, and degrading. The reward system of the existing social order is crudely materialistic and devoid of spiritual sustenance. The pattern of life, as Herbert Marcuse suggests, is terribly "one dimensional." Tastes, attitudes, behaviors, and life styles have become routinely homogeneous, and significant diversity is effectively curbed or assimilated into the popular culture of the "System." What many of the students who have experienced the good life of popular culture desire is to create new styles of living that give their life a sense of adventure and meaning. The revolution of meaning is both a protest against bland acceptability and an excursion into new realms of experience.

The revolution of meaning is very much engendered by the material affluence and success of the existing social order. It is a revolution that emerges from and is underwritten by the super-economy of the West. Those who do participate in this movement of social change, and so many of the young do in one way or another, are able to do so because they are confident of sufficient wealth and abundance to have their basic material needs met.

The revolution of meaning is essentially a new posture toward experience. It consists of a diverse number of forms and activities that aim at expanding the quality of human experience. It rejects the excessive rationality of technological man and asserts the value of emotive and

physical dimensions of existence. Spontaneity, physical affection, basic communication, aesthetic sensitivity, and bodily awareness and excitement are all features of this revolution. Among the more prominent expressions of the movement are smoking pot, listening to rock music, and experimentation in groups and in new forms of dress. What many youth desire are greater quantities of qualitatively different experience. They are seeking new forms of behavior and activity that will give them new insights into themselves and the world. Theirs is a wholistic approach to life in which the parameters of existence can be expanded. There is a concern with exploring the body and feelings as well as the mind, and expanding the potential of each.

It is at this point that a number of sympathetic critics of the young (Lewis Coser and Paul Goodman, for example) fail to grasp the centrality of the revolutionary attempt to put one's life into some kind of a whole. To free the mind, body, and feelings into a new kind of a unity which gives life a new sense of direction is what many of the young seek. Central to that quest is the resurrection of their bodies (this is the point where Norman O. Brown "turns on" many of the young) into more effective and satisfying extensions of themselves. I think Goodman has missed this point when he assumes that it is merely the benign presence of other persons which perform some kind of religious magic for the young.¹ Their presence in good faith before one another is basically a condition for experimenting with new forms of relating and communicating. It marks the possibility of new meaning. The same thing would be true of T-groups, which Goodman has uncritically lumped together with group therapy and rock festivals. The real meaning of such experiences is not merely the close presence of others, but the possibility of new kinds of experiences and behavior that such an environment makes possible.

II. MYTHS REGARDING IDEOLOGY

When one hears and reads of the wide variety of student protest activities a question arises as to what, if any, ideology underlies them. Many critics of the Left have tended to chide students for a lack of ideology, while many critics of the Right have claimed that student revolt is based upon Marxist ideology. To an extent both claims are true and false. It is true that there is no coherent, comprehensive, and commonly accepted ideological position among students in protest. In part this is a reflection of a general condition of our time which Daniel Bell has referred to as the "End of Ideology." People generally have come to distrust systematic ideological positions. They know enough history to realize that men have done terrible things to implement their ideologies. Therefore they are interested in various insights, be they a part of an ideology or not, which makes sense of the human predicament. However, despite

¹See Paul Goodman's article, "The New Reformation," *The New York Times* (September 14, 1969), p. 32ff.

the lack of a comprehensive ideological system among students in revolt there are some clear ideological convictions that are widely accepted. These general ideological concerns are often implicit in the attitudes and behavior of students. At times they are stated rather explicitly. It is important for adults to understand these views because they may well discover that they are not at odds with many of their own concerns and convictions. In fact, I would suggest that these ideological convictions are more indicative of generational solidarity than generational conflict.

Before examining three of these ideological convictions, it should be acknowledged that to a limited extent the writings of Marx do provide an ideological influence on students. However, it needs to be pointed out that what it is most of all in Marx that influences students are insights which support and confirm their own experiences. In particular it is Marx's general proclamation and analysis of the deficiencies and abuses of capitalism, and his notion of the alienation of workers under a capitalistic system that influences students. And yet very few students accept his design for revolution or the notion of a communist state. Thus, most students like what makes sense to them in Marx.

The Liberal Spirit

There is much talk among students about the decline and ineffectiveness of "Liberalism" in American politics. In place of the "liberal" attitudes reflected by their parents and politicians many students speak of "radical" alternatives. What is meant by "liberal" and "radical" is not always precisely clear; however, the shortcomings of "liberalism" cited by the young usually refer to methodology rather than ideology. For example, many of my students say that they have no "hassle" with their parent's open and liberal views, but they are disappointed that they never have done a damn thing about them. In discussing American politics students point out that habitually well intentioned liberal rhetoric becomes crippled by status quo politics. To be sure the criticisms of the liberal "System" offered by students is more penetrating than I have suggested here. However, the general thrust of it seems to be that the liberal procedure of "working within" existing social institutions has led to public apathy and inactivity and to the manipulation of those institutions by those privileged by wealth. And yet, a very large segment of the student population is still seeking to work within institutions as well as to provide external challenges to and confrontations with these institutions. Behind student dissatisfaction is the view that many of the canons of liberalism have been severely violated. Although a few students do question the ideological basis of liberalism as provided by Locke, Rousseau, Jefferson, Madison, and FDR, for example, a far greater proportion assume the basic liberal assumptions that have always guided the American experience. These students are in fervent opposition to absolutism and demand as "natural

rights" personal liberty, meaningful consent in their governance, right of property, and equality of opportunity. Their protest is not with the substance of liberal thought but with the failure of it in practice and experience. They have come to experience what Louis Hartz (in his *The Liberal Tradition in America*) pointed out a generation ago: that there has been an irrational and tyrannical unanimity of popular outlook supported by quasi-liberal slogans that have, in effect, undermined the essence of liberalism. Thus liberalism has become "Americanism" and "Americanism" has led to the denial of its basic principles of justification. The sin of liberalism in America, as experienced by the young, is therefore the failure and hypocrisy that has accompanied its application. The call to radical reform that grows out of this recognition, for the most part, is an attempt to find ways of seeing that liberal principles are effectively implemented and honored.

The liberal ideological assumptions and values that underly the various forms of student unrest are seldom stated as basic principles. They are rather implicit articles of faith that have common acceptability among a large portion of the American population. The crucial issue in student protest is the applicability of liberal values. For example, personal liberty is assumed as valid, but the question is whether or not it includes smoking pot or using "filthy" language in public gatherings. The consent of the governed is commonly accepted as a cultural value, but the question is whether the election of white politicians to govern black persons, the appointment of educational administrators to govern students, or the drafting of young men who cannot vote into the military service excludes consent of the governed. Equality of opportunity is an article of faith in America, but is it not a sham to assume that poor and black persons have equal opportunities in the existing socio-economic order? These liberal values are very much at the heart of student revolts. The real antagonist of student rebels is not so much "liberalism" as the liberals who have failed to make it work.

The Sense of Alienation

It is the very failure of liberalism and the itinerant eruption of a massive and impersonal social system with interlocking controls over man that has led to a deep sense of what is popularly referred to as "alienation" among the young. "Alienation", to be sure, means many different things to different people. To students in protest "alienation" has a plurality of meanings. It may refer to their sense of powerlessness, depersonalization, normlessness or a lack of opportunity for meaningful fulfillment. Among more literate students the early writings of Marx, Weber, Durkheim, and Marcuse are sometimes seen as a relevant description of their experiences and feelings.

The very frequency with which the term alienation is used among students in protest suggests that it performs a significant, symbolic,

ideological function. The symbol represents an important assumption which is commonly accepted by students and has been continuously confirmed in experience. The assumption is that the very structure of the existing social order separates them from meaningful relationships to it. There is a conviction among the young that the normal and preferable state of man's social existence is to live in a community that is both tolerant and responsive to human needs. By alienation students mean that they are separated not only from an ideal sense of community but from any significant relationship to society. Among the important ideological assumptions lodged in all of the "alienation" talks are these: the existing social order is hypocritical in that its behavior contradicts its ideals; the "system" consists of far too many procedures and attitudes which are unacceptable to students; the "system" cannot tolerate diversity and punishes the deviant; one-dimensional thinking (Marcuse), bureaucratization, and depersonalization must be overcome if there is to be any significant sense of community. Some students believe that alienation is an inevitable consequence of capitalism (as did Marx); others see it as a consequence of bureaucratic forms of social organization (as did Weber). But no matter how different their ideological inspiration, their social *Weltanschauung* remains the same — they see themselves as separated from the social order. Their concern is not with what they will do (what function they will perform) within the "system," but rather what they can do to change the "system." In that sense their outlook is revolutionary. And yet, their concerns are very much in touch with the deepest values of society. Students are very concerned with the recreation of community, the transformation of an impersonal and crass society into a qualitatively sustaining and satisfying community. Already there are many experiments among students to create living models of meaningful community in which toleration of individual differences and responsiveness to human need prevail. In addition to creating such models among themselves, there is a deep realization that that will not suffice to change the social order from which they are alienated. Therefore, among students, an examined sense of alienation leads to considerations of methods for change.

III. YOUTH AND "PRAXIS"

In the last two years something of great significance has happened to the American student population. In the midst of their sense of alienation and powerlessness they have discovered a new sense of power. A number of historical forces have converged to create a new sense of consciousness among students. Among some of those forces are the predominance of the young in the population at large, the extension of youth into adulthood due to the demand and opportunities for higher education; the emergence of a youth dominated culture of leisure as a result of affluence and the prominence of higher education, and the absorption of youthful styles into the culture in general. In the cultural

arena the young cannot help but be conscious of the fact that adults often emulate their styles of dress, leisure, and language; that they are aware of and often influenced by their ideas and attitudes.

In the political arena a crucial event occurred in 1968 in the dumping of President Johnson and the more or less successful campaign of Eugene McCarthy. Perhaps the most profound significance of this political development was that it was primarily conceived and carried out by students. In retrospect that event may mark a turning point in American politics. The 1968 presidential campaign made it clear that students could exert considerable influence in national politics, and the behavior of many young people at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago demonstrated that the young would not limit their attempts at political influence (to establish party and electoral activities). As a result of the events of 1968, in particular, students have developed a new sense of potency. There is now a marked difference in the outlook of this generation and the so-called "silent generation" of a decade ago. Many young people today are gaining an awareness that they can manipulate rather than be manipulated by social and political institutions. Consequently, there is an emergent ideological conviction among them that they must be actively involved in the determination of social and political issues. To be sure there is considerable difference among students as to what methods they will adopt. Nonetheless, there is widespread ideological agreement that *praxis* is the essential ingredient of conviction. It is this belief, students point out, that separates them from their elders in so many cases.

Although there is a rather high degree of unanimity regarding the centrality of *praxis* among students in protest, there is little unanimity regarding methods of implementation. Methodological strategies range from the overt use of violence of the "Weathermen" of SDS to the reorganization of representative student bodies on many college campuses. Unfortunately, the mass media have given a disproportionate amount of their attention to methodologies of violence and confrontation. In fact methodologies of subversion or collaboration are seldom reported. As a result the general public tends to perceive the *praxis* of student unrest as destructive and violent. This is most unfortunate because there is a great amount of creative, methodological experimentation among students to bring about change. Nonetheless, it should be acknowledged that there has been frequent utilization of tactics of confrontation and public demonstration. The primary reason for reliance upon these methods is simply that there have not been other avenues of influence open to the young in our society. But this condition, it seems to me, is and will continue to be subject to change. Students are increasingly gaining confidence in their ability to bring about change and are growing beyond an alien sense of consciousness. In colleges and universities (and many high schools) educators realize that they must make way for significant student involvement without delay. Many educators who have assumed roles as Masters

(the old term "Headmaster" is not entirely fortuitous) to alienated slaves suddenly realize that they must develop a new sense of consciousness and style to survive. They must learn to serve and represent rather than rule.

Despite the tensions that have emerged and will emerge as students and adults achieve these new levels of consciousness, there is an exciting dimension to this important historical moment. It marks the beginning of a period of reassessment and rearrangement of cultural values and organization. To continue this process with humane sensitivity to persons will require the creation of methods and strategies heretofore unimagined by students and adults alike. In their dedication to *praxis* students reflect their commitment to this process, but continued questions of methodology will offer still further challenges to their commitment and creativity.

In concluding I would like to reassert a point that was made earlier. The themes of student unrest that have been discussed are not exclusively the concerns of the young. They are the concerns of our culture at large. However, students as a group have developed greater sense of consciousness of the pervasiveness of alienation, the hypocrisy of liberal institutions, the inequities of the social order, the threat of annihilation, the bland quality of so many of our cultural practices, and the inescapable need for commitment to *praxis*. But these concerns certainly are not manufactured by students. They are the basic problems of our culture at this time in our history, and students are responding to them rather than creating them. It is absolute folly to believe that students are somehow manufacturing these problems. They are seeking to cope with profound and complex problems of bureaucratization and technologism that mark this historical epoch. Many adults in various ways share the revolutionary concern of the young that have been identified. The unique condition of this generation is to have been raised in the midst of excessively bureaucratic and depersonalizing technological forces. Therefore, understanding their response to these forces is a precondition for grasping the essential dynamics of the present and future as history. The roots of the young today are in a present that many adults find difficult to grasp. And yet, like the young, many adults are seeking a sense of meaning and understanding in this present historical period. Perhaps among students in revolt there are some commitments and understandings that are not entirely out of touch with the values of many enlightened adults. It seems to me that that is the case, and that the quality of concern and commitment that is reflected in the unrest of students is cause for hope rather than fear or despair.