of forces stationed in Western Europe. As Brandt put it in a recent interview, "if there is any chance during the next few years of our getting into serious negotiations with the East on reduction of troop levels and arms, then this would be endangered if there were premature unilateral moves by the United States or anyone else before serious negotiations between East and West even begin." Schmidt viewed "with great concern" what he called "a broad campaign" among the general American public "as well as in the published opinion of the United States" to bring about such a unilateral reduction.

I interviewed Willy Brandt in West Berlin in 1962, and again in Bonn in 1964. My own impression conforms with the general view: he is a very decent, if not a brilliant man. Like most Democratic Socialists and other left-of-center politicos, he has a generally optimistic view of human nature and of the prospects for historical progress. Brandt's outlook is sharply at variance with that of the pessimistic Konrad Adenauer on this score. The latter once said, "God made a mistake when he set limits on human intelligence but not on human stupidity." Brandt can be challenged on the basis that diplomatic action should be undertaken with serious regard to both timing and prospects of success. But the West German Socialists have only just come to power, and it is perhaps natural that their optimistic outlook and long period of frustration should lead them to attempt a "more dynamic" approach to Russia and East Europe. If the S.P.D.-F.D.P. coalition is unlikely to achieve much, it is also unlikely to give much away in its Eastern policy.

**SOME COMMENTS ON RELEVANCE**

_Bernard Murchland_

Towards the end of his tenure as president of Sarah Lawrence College, Harold Taylor attacked "the present system of lectures, textbooks, survey courses, standard requirements of subject matter, examinations and grades" for failing "to touch the inner consciousness of the student or to deal with his motivations, his emotions, his aims and his needs." It was a typical call for relevance in education.

What I want to do is examine some of the puzzles and hidden assumptions that attach to the relevance-in-education controversy. We need not raise such misty questions as: What is the relevance of relevance? (although this is sometimes done). But it does seem imperative to begin with the basic question: Relevant to what? Taylor's answer to that question would appear clear enough. Education must be relevant to "the motivations, emotions, aims and needs" of students; it must touch their "inner consciousness." But that requirement could be met by a college staffed almost entirely with psychologists and chaplains. Part of the problem here is that students often don't know what their aims or real needs are; but the greater danger lies in gearing relevance to emotional states. This, by any standard I can think of, would make of education a rather narrow undertaking. In other words, the stress on psychological immediacy in a stance like Taylor's does not bespeak a very comprehensive or profound theory of education.

Let us consider one or two further examples of this yearning for immediacy in education. As is well known, many students today are engaged in reformist activities. Their efforts are directed both toward society at large and the university community in particular. At this level, the criterion of education becomes the needs of society. The schools become a means for the solution of practical problems in the community. All knowledge is measured against a direct social gain, thus setting the instrumental value in a place of first importance. Social betterment is the ultimate fruit of knowledge. There is, of course, much that is convincing in such a view. God knows, society's problems are enormous and the idealism of the young ought not be discounted as a factor in their solution. But this kind of relevance conceals at least one very serious weakness: it ignores the fact that the educational process requires a necessary distancing and critical detachment; that it depends upon conceptual schemes and methods (analysis, classification, definition, abstraction, prediction, perspective, and so forth). Immediate contact with the environment or instant immersion in the flux of circumstance goes against these requirements by implicitly denying the need for theory.
Or, an instructor who tells his students that "we" have made a mess of things and that they must get out there and clean the world up is likely to win high marks for popularity. But he is more apt to inflame and confuse his students than instruct them. This tyrannical, brutish kind of relevance can do us much harm. And in any event we already have too much of it. Too much of education is already tied to narrow professional interests, to union card diplomas, to the view of education as a consumer product. Its present stifling instrumentalism would not be much improved by turning it to revolutionary ends. This would make of education merely another form of indoctrination (and who is more doctrinaire than revolutionaries?), that would subvert the best kind of education. Robert Brustein may not be right when he urges the university to get back to its monastic, other-worldly beginnings. But he does make good sense when he argues that the university ought not be used as a base for revolutionizing society. Even when we grant that revolution is a good and necessary thing, we should not confuse it with the educational process. Clarity on this point is absolutely necessary. Castro in the mountains of Cuba never pretended he was running a school. Similarly, students engaged in the strenuous work of restructuring society should not assume that this is what education is all about. To assume that education ought to have the same kind of immediacy, to give the same kinds of kicks, as revolution is to make a very serious category mistake.

Harvard's Israel Scheffler put it well in a recent address to the American Philosophical Association. Education, he said, requires "not contact but criticism, not immersion in the phenomenal and conceptual given, but the flexibility of mind capable of transcending, reordering, and expanding the given. An education that fosters criticism and conceptual flexibility will transcend its environment . . . by striving for a systematic and penetrating comprehension of it." And he added: "Education's primary task is not to be relevant but to help form a society in which its ideals of free inquiry and rationality shall themselves become chief touchstones of relevance . . . The responsibility of education is not only to serve but also criticize, enlighten, and create—its job is not only to provide persons with techniques but, more importantly, to provide techniques with critical, informed, and humane persons." Education has its own direction to follow.

With respect to student efforts to reform the university community itself, once again it must be admitted that they are more often than not on the side of the angels. Like any institution the academy tends toward the stagnate, the habitual, the routine. This runs into basic conflict with young peoples' sense of the new, and fresh, and, often enough, the important. When the academic old guard claim to know what's best for the student they are often claiming no more than the right to continue in the same old rut. The threat of change is as disturbing to a certain kind of professor as it is to the pope. Yet the academy must perpetually renew itself, experiment, make fresh beginnings, meet new challenges, etc. The rhetoric of change is by now all too familiar to us; but we ought not forget that it has roots in the reality of things. We admit today, in ways that would not have been dreamt of but a short time ago, that students do have something to say, that they have as much right to self-determination as any citizen. The battle that has been won against the in loco parentis concept (won in principle even though there are places where it is still in effect practically) is some evidence of this. Even more significant is the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students. (This remarkable document began in the American Association of University Professors' Committee in 1961 and was published in several educational journals during 1967-68. It was later clarified and adopted by a number of sponsoring organizations including the U.S. National Student Organization, American Association of Colleges, The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and, of course, the A.A.U.P.)

The Joint Statement is at once enlighten and moderate. It does not advocate student autonomy. The stress is rather on communal responsibility in which students are invited to join with faculty and administration to play a more determining role in the formulation of education policy—especially as it affects them. Thus it is becoming more and more accepted for students to serve on all relevant committees (up to and including the Board of Trustees) and so to exercise a direct voice not only on extra-curricular matters but on the curriculum and other questions, such as: admissions (students have already successfully pressured on behalf of Negro students and the poor), distribution requirements, and even the "touchy" issues of hiring and firing faculty, methods of evaluation, and so forth. There is virtually nothing students cannot have a voice in. But at the level of these "touchy" areas it seems to me that students would be well advised to be modest and not extend their "democratic rights" beyond the breaking point. Much of what they say and propose could in the long and/ or short run hurt their own best interests. For example, their proneness to violent protest. Robert Nisbet of the University of California had some reason to write in a recent issue of Encounter that the chief casualty
of the student riots has been academic freedom. The American University student, he says, "is and has been for many years one of the freest—and, at the same time, most carefully nurtured and cherished—beings in Western history." There may be some question about this last point. But there is little doubt that a backlash is setting in that will harm the student as much as the faculty and university in general. I personally do not think that any irrevocable damage has been done yet, but the time is short.

Another example of destructive proposals comes to mind. I refer to the clamor for unstructured, "free" universities. But getting rid of the old-fashioned requirements often means no more than eliminating standards for a kind of free-for-all in which any opinion goes and nothing is ever resolved. I have been involved in enough of these experiments to have ample reason to mistrust them. The assumption underlying such innovations is an unwarranted extension of the democratic principle of equality. As has been well said, if teachers and students are equal in the classroom then there is no need for either teachers or classrooms. The fact of the matter is, education is not a democratic process in any political sense of that term. David Schigman of Southern Illinois University (in Faculty Forum, October, 1969) makes a distinction that is, I think, of great help in trying to resolve certain problems relative to student demands for codetermination in the educational process. Schigman distinguishes between a person who is in authority and one who is an authority on. In a democracy a person is placed in authority by the consent of the governed. This is not the case with those who are authorities on a given subject or area. As Schigman points out, there is no implication in a democratic society, that the people are the authority on anything other than "the authority on who is the authority on the people, and to them they grant authority over themselves." But in a democratic society there is no implication "that the people are the authority on anything else whatsoever. It is no part of democratic theory that truth is determined by majority vote or that wisdom is conferred by consent of the electorate. . . . Indeed, it is only in the strictest forms of ideological totalitarianism that political authority creates or determines 'truth' and is, by virtue of its authority over everyone, the authority on everything." Well said.

The chief enemies of education today, as Dewey once said of art, are the humdrum; the slackness of loose ends; and submission to convention in practice and intellectual procedure. This is what militates against the objective of education as the fulfillment of life through the enlargement of human meanings. The problem for modern man—for all of us—is what to do with his life, how to create satisfying meanings beyond his place in a merely biological scheme of things and beyond the improverished offerings of the commercial complex, how to break out of the suffocating circle of a preprogrammed social fiction. Education is criticism, vision, discovery. In a dying society, education at its finest is revolution. Its final relevance is to the whole human person.

in the magazines . . .
(Continued from p. 6)

this question to Major State: Major State, how do you explain the word conversive being used instead of the word subversive? Major State suddenly realizing that only an idiot could make such a mistake said rashly that the lack of education on the part of his guards was the reason for such a mistake.

I can understand an EM [enlisted man] misspelling the words, but a Major overlooking that kind of mistake is unbelievable. Men like Major State may be today's leaders, but they are tomorrow's failures.

As for the judge, though he did look very similar to the pig drawn on many of our leaflets, in my opinion has a much lower I.Q. Aside from having a small vocabulary of merely two words which consists of overruled and sustained, he did seem to have an attitude toward the case of "I don't care if he is innocent, let's sentence him and go home."

Now here is the day that everyone has been waiting for, as Saturday is the day that they (The Board of Pigs) would tell us how long they would put Richard in jail. For we already know from past experience that they would find him guilty. After all a military (Kangaroo) court is set up to punish people not to see that justice is served fairly. . . .

We were informed a short while later that Chase was found guilty just like we told you the lifers would find him.

So now all of you blood loving, war craving lifers can sit back, but don't go to sleep as steps are being taken right now to appeal the case.

Richard was sentenced to two years at hard labor in the Leavenworth prison, loss of all pay, busted to Pvt. E-1, and given a Dishonorable Discharge. Well hear this and you can believe it, Richard will not stay in prison for two years! . . .

Help stop the lifers from destroying our rights. Together our support for Richard Chase shall gain his freedom. When Richard Chase is free we won't stop until all of the other Richard Chases in the world are free. Fatigue Press, Fort Hood, Tex., No. 20. Pamphilus 18 worldview