Psychologists Reject Chicago Again

By a 79–22 vote, the governing Council of the American Psychological Association (APA) reaffirmed its earlier decision to move the APA's 1969 meeting from Chicago. The Council voted at its 5 October meeting in Washington, after hearing the plea of William H. Edwards, who represented the Chicago hotels. In his speech, Edwards made the unexpected concession that the Chicago hotels would free the APA from its contract to purchase hotel space for next year's meeting but expressed the hope that the APA would still choose to meet in Chicago. Although Edwards' gesture was appreciated, the council majority was unshaken in its desire to show its disapproval of Mayor Richard Daley and the Chicago police department for the widespread beating of demonstrators during the Democratic National Convention.

In an interview with *Science,* Edwards said that the Chicago hotels had not offered to free other professional associations from their legal obligation to purchase hotel space in forthcoming years, but that the hotels were treating each case individually. (In the wake of the August battles, several groups, including the American Sociological Association and the American Political Science Association, voted to shift their scheduled future meetings from Chicago.) Although it has not yet been publicly announced, the APA's next annual meeting will be held in Washington, D.C.—B.N.

traditional autonomy. The students see the exams as a key point of control over the nature of their education.

Likewise, they feel that a voice in the recruitment of new professors is essential to student influence within the university; but the law gives professors monopoly power in this area also. A student voice in making research commitments will be reserved to graduate students engaged in research. There are countless other seeds of potential contention.

The law prescribes neat formulas, but, in fact, neither students nor faculty has accepted any common ground rules for settling conflicts. Leadership rivalries and policy disagreements are part of "participation" politics. The question is whether such politics will lead merely to controversy or to open, disruptive combat.

What complicates matters is the emergence, first apparent last spring, of a new "student movement" roughly comparable to the American "new Left." Like its American counterpart, it is more a state of mind than an organization; and, again like its American counterpart, it has no central "leadership" and, thus, is not easily controlled by either the "old Left" or the government. In the view of many professors and students, this new force threatens the existence of the traditional "liberal university."

Raymond Aron, the political sociologist, has become the chief spokesman for this worried group. He conceives of the "liberal university" as a place where scholars pursue their research independent of political pressure and where teachers teach rather than indoctrinate. To him, May was a disaster. He has argued:

> The young and many of my colleagues [who cooperated with the students] destroy a precious institution because they weaken its moral foundation. There is no other moral basis for the university except reciprocal tolerance between teachers and the voluntary discipline of students. There will be no more higher education if the students utilize the university as a place for political agitation. That would signify the *Latin-Americanization of French universities,* the ruin of the universities. Whatever part the students take in running the universities, and particularly if that part is eventually large, the more the students' voluntary discipline is needed as the indispensable condition for the university's survival.

The new French Left is far from homogeneous. One large component, though it often mouths radical political goals and believes in tactical militancy, fundamentally aims at university reform. But another element has its roots deeper in the French political past. At the center of this second group are a dozen or so small political organizations, most with anarchist, Trotskyite, Maoist, or Castroite backgrounds; the government charged these groups with fomenting much of the violence last spring and, in June, officially disbanded them.

Because their aims are strictly political, these students care very little about the universties as such—at least as they exist in the present society. The universities, they say, inevitably reflect society, and it is impossible to change one without changing the other. To many of these militants the universities represent, at best, a fertile place to start agitation (last May proved that) or to demonstrate to workers useful lines of protest. Thus, last spring the students occupied the universities and the workers followed suit by occupying the factories.

In much student rhetoric it is difficult to separate "reform" and "revolutionary" goals; the mixture—or apparent mixture—makes student "participation" and student political rights inside the university the controversial issues they are.

Optimists believe that the reform can be implemented as long as students maintain self-discipline (no violence) and mutual tolerance. Pessimists, including a large corps of faculty members, fear that the university will become "politicized"—that students and faculty will become preoccupied by questions of internal and external politics, that educational decisions will become dominated by doctrinaire politics.

Against last spring's militant heritage, it is possible to balance moderating forces. The present student mood, though difficult to judge, seems more mellow; the thought of renewed protest raises the prospect of losing a full year and, for some, the possibility of financial difficulties. Faure's reforms, tactically designed to split the moderates from the militants, may succeed in doing just that; to date, he has been particularly restrained in his use of police, the symbolic rallying point for the students. Paris, where one-third of French university students go to school, presents the major problems; in the provinces, the new year appears to be beginning more smoothly. Finally, the majority of French students are from middle-class families, and, whatever their political values, they still retain fundamentally bourgeois values and life-styles.

Only events will tell how these different forces interact and which, if any, prevail. The underlying consensus about French universities—who is to run them, what they are all about—may not be completely shattered, but it is showing some prominent cracks.

—ROBERT J. SAMUELSON