

released him. Corporate bureaucracies denied individuality while proclaiming it. The gross national product became Marcuse's One-Dimensional Man.

SOCIETY IN MINIATURE

It was not long before the university was regarded as a microcosm of society, a society in miniature. And so students began to ask questions about the university. As a "multiversity", does it conspire to alienate? As a researcher, does it service the military-industrial complex? As an urban university, does it treat the ills of our urban hives? As educator, is it relevant? As teacher, does it care? As administrator, does it understand? All of which was summed up in the remarks of a student at a meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of California:

"We have asked to be heard; you have refused. We have asked for justice; you have called it anarchy. We have asked for freedom; you have called it licence. Rather than face the fear and hopelessness you have created, you have called it Communistic. You have accused us of failing to use legitimate channels, but you have closed those channels to us. You, and not we, have built a university based on distrust and dishonesty."

The result was that more students became increasingly politicized. The politics of confrontation made it radical. The impersonality of the "mega-university" fuelled the radicalism. The communications media made it international. Co-operation gave way to confrontation. Dialogue gave way to disruption. Participation gave way to provocation. Students who had called for justice now spoke in the name of anarchy. Students who had argued for freedom now demanded licence. Students who looked to legitimate channels for expression now found illegitimate channels of violence. Assertions were to be treated as facts. Slogans were to substitute for solutions. Apocalyptic rhetoric was controlling and the argument became: "I can assemble; you may not. I can speak; you may not. I can organize; you may not."

The university may be the battleground, and the representatives of the "establishment" under siege are the university officials. But the primary target is the "system", and the university is there only as stand-in for the system. The university, then, had to be reformed or destroyed. And so the university, as it were, is co-opted by the radicals rather than the radicals being co-opted by the university, as Marcuse would have it. Student militants, as Professor Nathan Glazer at Berkeley has pointed out, demand that the university offer a refuge and base for political action, if not a sanctuary for guerilla warfare.

Finally, the university is placed under siege. It is not only the students who are at the barricades but, as Professor Charles Frankel points out, it is education itself which is at the barricades. It is not just the university administration which is up against the wall, but the system society itself. The politics of confrontation are escalating into the politics of

demolition. The garrison university, while derivative of the garrison state, has a dynamic all its own. The crisis of the university is capable of its own Armageddon.

CONTROLLING THE CATAclySM

How, then, is this cataclysm of violence to be controlled, if not prevented? How do we disarm the garrison university? What are the limits of legitimate protest? Is there a place for civil disobedience? What are the principles for free dissent in a free society? Before setting forth these guide-lines, let us make certain assumptions:

(a) We reject the idea that the university must be destroyed in order to save it, or that society must be destroyed in order to salvage it. Such apocalyptic views are better left to the Theatre of the Absurd.

(b) We reject the thesis that the university is, or must be held, responsible for all the ills of society, or that it can be the basis for its cure.

(c) We reject the idea of guerilla warfare in the university arena; we reject the abusive concept of demolition politics. It assumes a monopoly of virtue and an absolute righteousness which becomes self-serving. It betrays an arrogance of power that refuses dialogue.

Let us now posit the guide-lines or principles of constructive dissent which must be read together, rather than separately or disjunctively:

(1) One cannot speak of the duty of government to live *under* the law and the right of an individual to be *above* the law. If a government is to be bound by its laws, so are its citizens.

(2) The *right* to dissent does not mean that *all* dissent is right. The question is not "*May I dissent*" but "*How may I dissent?*" The right to free speech means what it says and nothing more. It is not, as Justice Holmes once pointed out, the right to cry "*Fire!*" falsely in a crowded theatre and thereby cause a panic. This is true even though one may be shocked or even outraged at the lack of proper fire regulations, or one may wish to dramatize the need to bring about government action in the public interest.

(3) There are several legitimate forms of protest. A person distressed at the inadequacy of fire regulations may speak in a public forum, print and distribute pamphlets or leaflets, organize mass meetings and picketing for the same purpose, denounce the political leaders as incompetent or corrupt, and exercise any other form or modality of dissent. Ultimately, there is the power of the ballot box, and while there are those who may argue that elections are nothing but a "ritual in which the system renews itself", opposition has still found itself translated into governmental policy and dissent has still seen itself prevail. Order under law, then, does not mean a law that is rigid or inflexible or insensitive to change. The law must reflect movement in society.

(4) Acts of dissent cannot always be expected to express themselves in "polite" dissent or in the