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The obvious fact is that our social life has undergone a thorough and radical change. If our education is to have any meaning for life, it must pass through an equally complete transformation. This transformation is not something to appear suddenly, to be executed in a day by conscious purpose. It is already in progress. Those modifications of our school system which often appear (even to those most actively concerned with them to say nothing of their spectators) to be mere changes of detail, mere improvement within the school mechanism, are in reality signs and evidences of evolution . . . .

John Dewey
The School and Society

Student activism is as American as apple pie. An examination of North American history reveals that activism in its many forms has been an integral part of American higher education. Members of the academic community cannot ignore incidents of activism or their complex, underlying issues which are apparent today in varying degrees on every campus. Institutions are faced with the difficult task of living with activism, while, at the same time, trying to understand the causes and implications of their particular experiences with it.

In order to gain a fuller understanding of activism, one must look to the past and future as well as to the present. In this monograph, we have attempted to examine student unrest from several viewpoints. First is the descriptive aspect: What has been the role of student activism in the history of American higher education? Second is the analytic view: What are the causes today of student dissidence? Who are the activists? What are the issues? Our final area of consideration is prescriptive and involves several philosophical problems: What are the freedoms and responsibilities students should enjoy? What is the role of activism in the educational process? In this third chapter, we have also attempted to identify and suggest approaches which might be used by institutions in working with activism. We also include a selected bibliography of the literature pertaining to student activism—philosophical approaches, and appropriate psychological studies.

Although activism is an international student phenomenon, this study concentrates on North American student unrest. We have also chosen not to examine student dissidence at the secondary level of education, even though there is little doubt that the present forms of activism that appear in higher education are rapidly gaining ground in the public schools. For reasons which we have included in the brief section in the conclusion of the second chapter, we have also barely touched upon an assessment of the results of activism within the past several years.
One final word is necessary. The authors have worked diligently to be objective in their discussions of the history and causes of activism, a task that was not always easy because of the controversial and often emotional aspects of the topic. In the third chapter, however, our biases will probably be evident. Student activism, in the numerous positive forms it assumes, cannot be ignored. Nor should it be. All segments of the academic community should make every attempt to distinguish between the constructive and destructive potentials of the movement as it appears today on our campuses. Stereotypes of "the activist" must be avoided, and the distorted pictures created by the mass media should be viewed with skepticism. Activism is not to be feared—on the contrary, it is to be welcomed. Institutions must view activism within the context of its historic past as well as its future. Its constructive elements must be assimilated into our educational process while its destructive elements must be identified before they threaten the integrity of academic institutions.

We strongly believe that the academic community must give priority to locating and defining student activism in higher education. Most institutions have waited too long, and many today still choose to ignore the entire problem—and potential—that activism presents. Student activism will not disappear, in fact, it is more likely that the movement will continue to increase in intensity and frequency.

Let us then ask after the main aspects of the social movement; and afterwards turn to the school to find what witness it gives of effort to put itself in line.

John Dewey

FRANK L. ELLSWORTH

MARTHA A. BURNS

September 1, 1969
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What is happening to our young people? They
disrespect their elders, they disobey their
parents. They ignore the laws. They riot in the
streets inflamed with wild notions. Their morals
are decaying. What is to become of them.

Plato

Young people have exalted notions, because
they have not yet been humbled by life or
learned necessary limitations; moreover, their
hopeful disposition makes them think themselves
equal to great things. They would always
rather do noble deeds than useful ones: their
lives are regulated more by moral feelings
than by reasoning—all their mistakes are in the
direction of doing things excessively and
vehemently. They overdo everything—they
love too much, hate too much, and the same
with everything else.

Aristotle
CHAPTER 1

History of American Student Activism

To ignore student unrest in American history is to deny a facet in the development of higher education. Student dissatisfaction is not a new phenomenon as evidenced by a long tradition of political and social interest within the academic community. Frequently this pattern of activity that has assumed numerous forms has been generalized to society at large. Some institutions have attempted necessary reforms without consulting or involving students. As a result students often proceed to initiate reform independently. Student dissidence has contributed to the process of educational reform throughout our history. As Frederick Rudolph (1962, p. 52) reminds us:

The agents of change were the students. The particular groups to whom law and tradition had assigned the identity and purpose of the colleges, the presidents and boards of trustees and the professors stood aside, indifferent or ineffectual observers, and failed to address themselves to the questions which should always be raised on an American College campus when any extracurricular development is stirring. For if a college cannot keep ahead of its students, students will surely get ahead of the college. Neglect demands response; the young do not refuse to act merely because they are not understood.

Origins of Student Activism

Student activism began with the first model of American higher education, Harvard. In 1638, the first students at Harvard expressed their dissatisfaction over the discipline of their master, Nathaniel Eaton, and his wife’s cooking. Samuel Eliot Morison in The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England (1956), describes the situation this way:

The beginnings of the college were not happy. Nathaniel Eaton, the first head, had every qualification on paper for a successful president; but he used the rod more freely than college students were willing to put up with even in those rough days, and his wife, who did the catering, served them moldy bread, spoiled beef, and sour beer—when there was beer [p. 30].

An investigation followed after Eaton beat his assistant with a walnut cudgel “big enough to have killed a horse,” and Eaton was dismissed.

In the spring of 1766 another recorded rebellion occurred at Harvard because of bad butter in the commons.

Student rebellion flourished in the first half of the nineteenth century, too, when many colleges were young.

Nearly every college experienced student rebellion or riots, some more serious than others. In certain cases, they eventuated in broken windows or cracked furniture; in others, they resulted in deaths. All involved some kind of collective action either of a class or the whole student body. These outbursts could be found in all sections of the country, at state universities and denominational colleges, at “godless” Harvard and Virginia, and at pious Yale and Princeton. Everywhere the atmosphere was like that of a revolutionary brawl or a violent modern strike [Brubacker and Rudy, 1958, p. 53].

Administrative action against students involved in disorders was in most cases severe. In an 1802 college report, President Fitch discussed the position taken at Williams in response to a student protest:

We have lately had trouble in College. The judgments we drew up and published to the classes respecting their examinations in March gave offense. Three classes in succession were in a state of insurrection against the government of the College. For ten days we had a good deal of difficulty; but the faculty stood firm, and determined to give up no right. At last, without the loss of a single member, all were reduced to due obedience and subordination [Durfee, n.d., pp. 85-86].

At Princeton in 1807, half of the student body was suspended for participation in a violent rebellion: “Presbyterian faculty and trustees charged these youths with Deism, irreligion, and false notions of liberty, while students responded with equal fervor,
charging that their "natural rights" were being suppressed" (Durfee, p. 54).

Violence was an integral part of many student demonstrations of discontent during the early years of the nineteenth century. In his history of Princeton, Thomas J. Wertmacker (1946) describes an incident which occurred in 1817 during the Presidency of Asbel Green:

On a sudden, without any known cause, disorder commenced, and there was a series of attempts in every imaginable form to promote mischief. Crackers were fired, the walls were scrawled on, there was clapping, hissing, and screaming in the refectory. This culminated on the night of January 9, 1814, with the tremendous explosion of the "big cracker." The cracker, consisting of a hollow log charged with two pounds of gunpowder was set off behind the central door of Nassaw Hall. The discharge cracked the adjacent walls from top to bottom, broke windowspanes in all parts of the building, and hurled a fragment of the log through the door of the Prayer Hall. The merciful providence of God preserved the lives and limbs of several persons, who had passed that way (pp. 134-150).

Jefferson's plans for the University of Virginia included student self-government and individual freedom; however, in the 1830's and 1840's "... due to student disturbances, a professor had been killed and armed constables had to be brought to the campus by the local sheriff to restore order" (Bruce, 1900-1902).

Not all unrest during this period employed the tactic of violence. In 1808, following a request by students at Williams for the removal of several members of the faculty, the college refused to comply. At the same time, the faculty attempted to coerce the students into agreeing not to interfere in the faculty affairs or refuse their decision. This action only served to intensify student unrest until the president was forced to rescind the decision. Consequently, the faculty resigned en masse, and new teachers were hired (Thwing, 1914).

In the 1820's and 1830's, Jacob Abbot and a faculty committee at Amherst faced considerable difficulties; and Mark Hopkins at Williams in the 1830's ran into difficulties with the Greek-letter fraternities. Collegiate reformation during this period assumed numerous forms: the founding of the Yale Literary Magazine in 1837, the first intercollegiate baseball game between Amherst and Williams in 1859, the elaborate system of student government at the University of California in the early twentieth century, and the setting aside of girls' smoking rooms at Bryn Mawr in 1925—to name but a few (Rudolph, 1966).

In summary, the student unrest prior to 1900 was a revolt primarily against the confinement of collegiate life—traditions adapted from the English models. By 1900 the students could look back on their accomplishments: the establishment of debating clubs and literary societies in the 1750's; Greek-letter fraternities in the 1820's and 1830's; literary magazines in the 1830's and 1840's; sanctioning of gymnastics, boat racing, cricket matches, and many other sporting events as legitimate collegiate activities between 1820 and 1860; and, finally, by 1900 an elaborate system of student governments. In addition to these and other specific reforms, student activism as we define it today was firmly established as a means for initiating and hastening reform in American higher education. The need for reform as perceived by the students justified in their minds the use of drastic tactics.

Emergence of Social Awareness

In the period between 1900 and 1950, the hierarchy of values within the societal structure rapidly continued to change. The impetus, however, for new developments was accentuated by the precedent of independent student reform, which occurred when institutions neglected to reform themselves. Moreover, the mode of change continued to be evolutionary as opposed to the revolutionary momentum of the present.

Several general characteristics of higher education during the first half of the twentieth century are notable. Education became big business with increased numbers of students and faculty members. Accelerated building programs and expanded curricular offerings were in evidence. The college president became a fund-raiser, politician, negotiator, and organization man, rather than just a teacher, father, and friend.

In the transition from the small college to the large university, the development of only the intellect was deemed an insufficient goal of education. President of Harvard, A. Lawrence Lowell, satirically remarked: "The object of the undergraduate department is not to produce hermits, each imprisoned in the cell of his own intellectual pursuits, but men fitted to take their places in the community and live in contact with their fellow men" (1934, pp. 32-43).

During the depression years, student discontent began once more to emerge. At Yale, criticism was voiced in undergraduate publications because a faculty member chose to bring celebrities Gene Tunney and Queen Marie of Rumania into the classroom:

"When a Yale professor repeatedly violates this professional decorum, year in and year out, in print and in roto-gravure, on the platform and in the company of professional athletes, itinerant imposters, and other backwash of the republic, it seems about time to blow an academic police-whistle," insisted a Hoot editorial. That Phelps (a Yale professor) should bring Queen Marie and Gene Tunney to the platform of his undergraduate classes struck many as humiliating [Rudolph, 1962, p. 466].

Before the 1930's, students revolted because of bad food, suppression of rights, and other matters
related directly to campus life. The generation of the '30's and early '40's was a decidedly different group. Everywhere most students were in revolt over something or thought that they were, perhaps only over compulsory chapel or compulsory military training. Disillusioned by the nature of the post-Versailles world, they registered their disgust through peace demonstrations and through solemn pledges never to go to war. They joined picket lines; they helped to organize labor unions. In the great urban centers, a small number even signed up with the Communist party (Rudolph, 1962).

Social awareness presented itself on the campus in the 1930's and 1940's and, to date, has not dissipated. The depression, two world wars, and a desire for equality were factors contributing to student unrest that emerged in this era. Students were active but not violent in their protests; they utilized the written and spoken word rather than gunpowder and physical violence which frequently characterized the unrest of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well as that of the 1960's.

The "silent generation" of the 1950's has come to be known as one of virtual student passivity. In comparison with the student generations before and after, this categorization does describe the prevailing atmosphere during the '50's. In reaction to McCarthyism, the Eisenhower years, cold war prosperity, and the resultant absence of dissent, the student population of this decade chose between two alternatives: a withdrawal into the bohemian world of the beatnik or the acceptance of a submissive role in a seemingly stagnant society. In a sense, the campus society reflected the choice of the majority, silent and passive, at least in terms of initiating reform.

On the other hand, the minority chose the beatnik life. Nevitt Sanford (1967) presents these reasons:

One of the hardest things about growing up in contemporary America is that at just the time when a young person most needs models of private and public virtue he is likely to become aware of corruption in high places, of organized immorality in some of our major institutions, of inconsistencies in our economic system and in our sexual mores, and of meanness in people close at hand whom he thought he could admire. If the young person is not to remain in an authoritarian stage of development, and go on naively to participate and become blind to or even identified with the prevalent moral shortcomings of our society, he must learn to see things as they are, develop an articulate individual power of judgment, and become able to criticize what he judges to be bad. Now, however, he courts a new danger: that he will reject the existing order out of hand, and become totally alienated from the society and value system represented by his parents and his community. If this happens while the young person is still emotionally as well as economically dependent on his parents, and before he has had time to develop a value system that is based on his own experience, we get one type of modern "beatnik" [p. 262].

The criticism vented on society by the "silent generation," or what Jack Newfield (1966) calls the "uncommitted generation," was neither constructive nor destructive. The majority of students chose to withdraw, rather than actively to seek out reform in society. Their energies were devoted to academic pursuits in a pseudo society of campus activities—dances, football games, fraternity parties, and pantry raids. Seldom, if ever, did these students concern themselves with the issues of society. In discussing the generation of "the uncommitted," Kenneth Keniston (1965) suggests that

we already hear enough from the puppets of Academia as well as the megaphones of the mass media about the opportunities, challenges, productivity, material standards, and achievements of our society. We attend too superficially to the human price we pay for these achievements, rarely entertaining the thought that our society's accomplishments may have outrun its purposes, leaving us with out-lived and outworn values [p. 16].

Administrators found this generation compliant with the status quo or, at least, passive in their disagreement.

After the silence of the '50's, the civil rights movement and other growing social concerns served to thrust students into a new sphere of activity. The civil rights marches in 1957 and 1958 suggested the possible accomplishments students could make through militant confrontation and protest. Student activity rapidly grew in frequency and intensity and opened a new dimension in higher education. Thus, in a sense, a new generation of American students was born in response to a perceived need for heightened societal and educational reform. The range of activism became diversified, extending into political, social, and educational areas.

Historically, activism, a term coined by the media, has concerned itself with many different facets of the academic community. Moreover, since the spring of 1968, factors outside of the institution on local, state, and federal levels have become integral parts of the activist picture. Although the new left is perhaps the most obvious force in the movement, groups representing the right, the blacks, the moderates, and other vested interests cannot be ignored. Nor can the increasing concern and participation of the faculty in all aspects of the movement be minimized. "Commitment"—to an ideal, group, person, or action—and the desire for "relevance" were to become fundamental concepts for a segment of the student generation which increased with an unprecedented fervor in the '60's.

Students of the '60's and in 1970 are concerned about politics and society. Their needs differ, and, therefore, they define perfection in a variety of ways. Consequently, the thrust of each organization de-
signed to meet these diversified needs is different. In order to demonstrate the variety of groups that exist on American campuses, several examples which characterize these facets of the community are: the left (SDS), the right (YAF), the blacks (the Black Student Union), the faculty (the New University Conference), the moderates (the United Student Alliance), and the unorganized masses (Kahn, 1966). Organizations participating in “the movement” are many. The wide spectrum ranges from groups like the GUCAP (Georgetown University Community Action Program), which is committed to tutorial projects in the slums of Washington, to the FSM (Free Speech Movement) and the Campus Sexual Freedom Forums whose commitments are extreme and controversial. In between are numerous groups such as Programs Abroad, SCRU (Student Committee for a Responsible University), CORE, SNCC, VISTA, YPSL, Black Panthers, BALSA (Black American Law Students Association), the Peace Corps, the DuBois Club, Young Lords Organization, Youth Against War and Fascism, Movement for a Democratic Society, Teachers for a Democratic Society, and the Crazies.

**Emergence of Black Consciousness**

The term black power originated in the Negro religious movement of that same name initiated by Elyah Poole in Detroit in 1931 (Arthur, 1969). Since that time, particularly in the 1960’s, black power has become the slogan of the civil rights movement and, more specifically, the black student movement. The first black activist students were four freshmen at the Agricultural and Technical College in Greensboro, North Carolina.

Because the students in Greensboro and Orangeburg and Nashville were so square and respectable, what they did was perhaps even more heroic than the deeds of the current radicals in the movement. More heroic because those kids only wanted their share of the middle-class American Dream—success, prestige, money—and they were willing to risk what they wanted most in wrenching loose from everything they had been taught by conservative parents, paternalistic college presidents, and timorous Negro leaders. It would seem to be much easier for the current movement swingers, who despise the middle-class token of success, to go to jail and to jeopardize careers than it was for those cautious children of the black bourgeoisie who sang “God Bless America” in the Orangeburg stockade [Newfield, 1966, p. 40].

In February of 1960, the four Greensboro students sat down at the lunch counter of an F. W. Woolworth Company store and asked for coffee and hotdogs. They were told by several store employees to leave, and the store manager explained the policy of not serving lunch counter food to Negroes by saying, “I’m sorry but we can’t serve you because it is not the local custom.” Thus began the first sit-in demonstration. Support for the students’ principles and methods grew within the black as well as the white community.

Needless to say, the movement spread very rapidly. Spontaneous sit-ins erupted in many Southern communities: Durham, Raleigh, Charlotte, Winston-Salem, High Point, Salisbury, and Concord, North Carolina; Rock Hill and Orangeburg, South Carolina; Hampton, Richmond, and Portsmouth, Virginia. The list of sit-ins grew faster and longer than could be documented. The generation of the ’60’s had begun to earn the label activist. A decision had been made, which was to gain support throughout the decade, for this generation “to try to close the gap between the American Creed and the American Deed” (Fleming, 1969, p. 75).

In April of 1960, Mrs. Ella Baker, executive secretary of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), called a meeting of college students to assess their role in the civil rights movement. The outcome of the meeting was the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).

SNCC represented the best strains of the youthful rebelliousness that has swept throughout the country. Its programs and policies are a direct result of the beginnings of the new radicalism, but it has not replaced its inherent American ideology with any foreign ideology [Luce, 1966, p. 5].

Until 1966, when Stokely Carmichael became the leader, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee was a racially integrated group. At that time the 25 white staff members were told to organize the white poor and “keep out of the black community” (Newfield, 1966). As a result of the new SNCC leader’s action, racial separatism was introduced into the black student movement.

In citing developments in the black student movement since the introduction of the separatist concept in 1966, Jeanne Noble (1969) suggests:

Now we face an era of activism characterized by demands for participatory democracy among predominantly white student groups and for black student groups.

The black student movement has raised many questions. Is this black racism? Is this a pugnacious “go it alone and we’ll show you” strategy? Is this a death blow for racial integration? We will search together—black and white—for those answers, yet as we search for meaning, one question must guide our considerations: Is the black student movement basically a healthy search for identity?

There are two distinguishing emphases and styles among black students, depending on whether the campus is predominantly white or Negro. On white campuses, students are organized in groups such as the Afro-American Society and the Black Student Association. If several groups operate on campus, a coalition group might speak on behalf of all black groups. These groups are usually cohesive, articulate, and visible.

Their counterparts on black campuses share similar
goals but must be viewed in situ—in relation to the social structure and culture of the black campus. On white campuses, students want to escape total immersion in white values that they perceive to be alienating, materialistic, and racist. On black campuses, students want to escape total immersion in “black bourgeoisie culture,” which they see as paternalistic and authoritarian. And in as much as they see it as imitative of white society, they label it “totally phony.” One gauges these student attitudes in diffuse modes of expression. Often their efforts lack organization, and with rare exceptions mass action has led to repression, not victory [p. 49].

Black student unions, that is, all-black student organizations functioning on campuses since the late 1960’s, seem to have few nationwide similarities. Local autonomy seemingly dictates both issues and tactics for these groups. Black student unions presently confront many serious issues such as (a) support from the white leftist groups, which in most cases is rejected by the black students; (b) criticism from factions of both the black and white communities for encouraging racism by pressing demands for separate black studies centers and living facilities; and (c) the basic problems of militant versus nonviolent protest, reformation versus destruction, and power versus influence.

The Role of SDS

Exemplary of the new left is the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Historically, the organization has always stood left of center. In 1962 at Port Huron, Michigan, it chose to operate as a radical group. According to the Encyclopedia of Associations (1964), Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was founded in 1905. In actuality, the Intercollegiate Socialist Society was founded in 1905 under the leadership of Upton Sinclair, Jack London, and J. Phelps Stokes. This organization became known as the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID) in the 1930’s. Later in the same decade, the Student League for Industrial Democracy merged with the pro-Stalinist National Student League and became the American Student Union.

As a result of two events the American Student Union shattered: first, the Nazi-Soviet Pact; and then, in direct violation of the pact, Hitler’s invasions of Russia. The pro-Stalinist group could no longer support the anti-war philosophy which had been adopted when the Student League for Industrial Democracy and the National Student League merged. The remains of the American Student Union became a virtually dysfunctional group, renamed the Student League of Industrial Democracy, which endured for 20 years. In 1960, the League for Industrial Democracy (LID) decided to reinvigorate its student department, since the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID) suffered from failing membership and dwindling public appeal. The reestablished student arm of LID became Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

Three college students from the University of Michigan, who felt a desire to establish a strong student protest organization, contacted the League for Industrial Democracy soon after the reorganization and offered to develop the SDS organization. In 1961, a core of college radicals met to set up an executive structure and to agree upon a founding convention to be held in Port Huron, Michigan, in 1962. This was the birthplace of the Port Huron Statement, which was the first document produced under the auspices of SDS espousing a radical left position. Most members of SDS prefer to date their history from 1962, when the Port Huron Statement was accepted as the manifesto of the new left.

The support of the League for Industrial Democracy (LID) was finally withdrawn from SDS in the fall of 1965, after three years of disparity between SDS and its parent organization. According to Newfield (1964), these two groups “agreed to an amicable separation” at that time. Dissension initially arose between the organizations because the Port Huron Statement failed to support the socialist views of the League of Industrial Democracy (Luce, n.d., 1966; and Newfield, 1966).

SDS has grown rapidly since its inception in 1962. Its broad base of issues and its idealist creed appeal to increasing numbers of college students. However, the organization has constantly faced difficulties. In 1967, the critical issue was financial. In 1969, a problem which continues to threaten the ideological basis of the organization became evident. Student power as an issue has appealed to most SDS members; however, this is no longer an unchallenged issue. The April 7, 1969, headlines of The Chronicle of Higher Education pinpointed the crisis: “Bitter Debates Over Ideology Dividing SDS” and “Ideological Controversy Growing in SDS as It Looks Beyond ‘Student Power’ Issue.” A new era of historical importance may be on the horizon for SDS if ideological divisiveness continues to splinter the SDS organization into smaller groups. The events at the summer 1969 SDS Convention in Chicago appear to support this thesis.

The membership of SDS can be categorized in terms of social positions and performance functions. Within the organization, a member must either assume a functional role or become involved in some facet of a program deemed important by other members. Membership also implies the acceptance of social status and an appropriate peer-group role. The functions of members are important to the presentation and achievement of the ideologies of the organization. The social position and group concern assumed by the individual usually determine with whom he associates and, consequently, whom he can influence. Generali-
zations about the composition of SDS will be made on the basis of these two characteristics. Strategists, facilitators, implementers, and workers are functional positions within the organization. Due to the nature of the SDS organization, the social positions and group concerns are diversified and cover a broad spectrum: patriotic idealist, intellectual, politico, and alienated youth. The functions and roles of members of SDS within the various social positions are demonstrated graphically in Figure 1.

Patriotic idealists are only slightly left, politically; in fact, they are more anti-right than pro-left. The strategists within this group plan demonstrations concerned with civil rights, poverty programs, and justice in the courts for all Americans, regardless of their political convictions or position in society. Nonviolent protest, using the technique of teaching people to utilize the rights provided in the American political framework, constitutes the strategy of these idealistic groups of young people. The patriotic-idealist facilitators are glib proponents of the Utopian America. Individuals who serve in this capacity have the ability to present the idealistic picture of American society and the injustice of the current socioeconomic scene with genuine romantic vision and dedicated activist spirit. In actuality, the facilitator is the salesman of the ideal and provides the needed inspiration for the implementers and workers.

SDS members who organize the ghetto projects are the patriotic-idealist implementers. They take care of transportation, determine the location of a central headquarters for the service operation within the ghetto, train newly recruited workers, and make contacts with established ghetto leaders and known sym-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Position</th>
<th>Performance Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATRIOTIC IDEALIST</td>
<td>STRATEGIST Provides strategy for nonviolent protests or social work projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with civil rights.</td>
<td>FACILITATOR Glib proponent of Utopian America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter registration</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTER On the scene organizer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and economic self-help</td>
<td>WORKER College student with altruistic motives and summer vacation to spare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELLECTUAL POLITICO</td>
<td>STRATEGIST Provides strategy for protests (violent and nonviolent) and confrontation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with American foreign policy</td>
<td>FACILITATOR Chooses the issue and strategy appropriate to his local constituency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective service</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTER Organizes demonstration. Is where the action is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University reform</td>
<td>WORKER Student whose commitment varies with cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military-industrial complex</td>
<td>Creates climate for demonstration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defender of cause, not organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALIENATED YOUTH</td>
<td>STRATEGIST Although apolitical, often involved in strategy for confrontation on issues of freedom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leans toward anarchy</td>
<td>FACILITATOR Voices cynical criticism at every opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme individualism</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTER Peer-group member who feels strongly about issue to be discussed or protested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WORKER Individual whose participation is dependent upon situation and whim.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIES OF SDS
pathizers to the cause. In situations involving police intervention, the implementer is frequently the “fall
guy.” He is the community organizer who sometimes
gives up his status as a student to devote himself full
time to the job at hand. Making himself known is
important to the project’s success, but sometimes his
familiarity makes him the victim of harassment in the
community. Often his status is enhanced among his
SDS peers by his willingness to martyr himself for
the patriotic cause. Workers in the patriotic-idealistic
category are frequently college students seeking to do
something for someone else. They see their involve-
ment as a sort of ongoing service project and, conse-
quently, feel needed and useful. They typify the ideal-
ism of the Judeo-Christian ethic of morality
by which most of them have been reared. The involve-
ment they feel bears virtually no relationship to the
political activism of the SDS national organization.

Intellectual politicos within the SDS organization
may be divided into two groups: the original SDS
founders, a now “over-30” generation of leftists,
called the Old Guard by Newfield (1966); and a
younger group, generally “barely-20,” who strive for
radical changes in the draft, American foreign policy,
and institutions of higher education. Since the Old
Guard members were basically intellectual politicos, it
would seem apparent that strategy would be critical
to the survival of their organization. The strategies of
the intellectual politicos usually deal with national
governmental structures and policies or with educa-
tional institutions (Newfield, 1965).

One of the better known SDS intellectual-politico
strategists is Carl Davidson. “The Multiuniversity”
and “Toward Student Syndicalism” represent his strategy
for “radically transforming the university com-

community” (Davidson, 1966). Violence, harassment,
and disruption are presented as acceptable means for ac-
complishing change. Davidson’s strategy, as well as
that of Carl Oglesby, Tom Hayden, and Paul Booth,
is reflected as the public image of SDS. These strate-
gies embody the radical left’s activist ardor in their
multifaceted approach to protest.

Facilitators for intellectual-politico strategies are
frequently campus chapter chairmen or individuals in
other SDS leadership positions. Political ambitions
rest with the leaders’ ability to get their followers
“psyched up” to follow through on their power
moves. The results of the demonstrations or protests
are the determinants of the leaders’ success and their
status within their peer group as well as the SDS
group at large. A wide range of alternatives has been
left open by the strategists for use by the facilitators.
The function of the facilitator, in addition to creating
the emotional climate for demonstration, is to choose
the issue and the strategy with regard to the existing
conditions and constituency.

A younger SDS member seeking recognition by his
peers is usually the one who actively gets out and
organizes the picket lines and fills the role of the
intellectual politico implementer. The implementer
seldom is consulted in the initial stages of the plan-
ing of the demonstration; however, his role in organ-
izing and participating in the activities frequently
makes him a likely candidate for future election to a
leadership position within the group. If the question
were posed: Who can be counted on to be present at
the scene of action when confrontation arises? the
answer would most likely be: The person who has
assumed the role of the intellectual-politico imple-
menter.

Though the role of the implementer in the intellectu-
al-politico category may be seen as a stepping-stone
to political status, the responsibility of the person or
persons in this role cannot be minimized. Implemen-
ters carry the responsibility for keeping things going in
the face of everything from rainy weather to police
arrest. Intellectual-politico workers are often students
who are seeking attachment to a group and a cause.

The commitment of the intellectual-politico work-
ers varies with the cause. Protest of an issue draws
many of these people to SDS-organized demonstra-
tions, and they see themselves defending their position
rather than supporting the organization. The fluctua-
tion in the number of workers and the duration of
their willingness to work is often the demise of the
best laid plans of strategists and facilitators, and a
source of unlimited frustration to the implementers.

A broad category which can best be described as
alienated youth encompasses the largest group within
the SDS organization. These students create the mass
media picture of an “SDS’er”—long-haired, dirty, an
advocate of free love and free speech, a pot-smoker or
acid-head, destructive and disrespectful. Hippies, yip-
pies, pot-heads, and many other contemporary terms
have been coined to identify this group. Yet, no one
term can adequately describe its members. Diversity
within this group bespeaks a subtle strategy of its own.
Anarchy and extreme individualism constitute the
aims of this conglomerate. It seems that the strategy
is no strategy. Newfield (1966) says these are the ones
who “hobo from one project to another.”

The implementers, facilitators, and workers in this
alienated-youth category are sometimes a part of the
structure of the patriotic idealists living in the slums
and working with ghetto projects; sometimes these
same “apolitical” (by self-statement) individuals will
be sitting-in or protesting university policy or the na-
tional policy on germ warfare. They seem to be striv-
ing to withdraw from society and reject it in every
way possible; but, ironically, they have joined an or-
organization with a clearly delineated power structure
and become a part of a particular group within that
organization which conforms most rigidly to its own set of social standards.

SDS has grown in five years from 200 students and 10 functioning campus chapters to an estimated 250 chapters and 6,371 paid national members in 1969 (Brooks, 1969). In A Prophetic Minority (1966), Newfield states, “given SDS’s reticence about aggressive recruiting, its sloppy accounting, and the New Radicals’ non-joining instinct, the membership figures probably do not reveal the group’s true strength.” Support for this statement was given in the June 15, 1960, New York Times, when Thomas R. Brooks stated, “My best estimate is that SDS has roughly 4,500 national members and influences some 10 times that number more or less directly.”

From Commitment to Confrontation

From 1960 to 1965, nonviolent protests were popular; since then, violence has been coupled with nonviolent protest. Student demonstrations between 1960 and 1965 were focused on the Southern Negro’s fight for civil rights. Methods employed by students during these five years included: sit-ins, marches, voter registration, canvassing and teaching, freedom rides, courthouse and city hall praying, summer projects such as Northern, white students going South to help with the voter registration picket lines, and speeches to students in Northern colleges and universities by students who had been part of the movement in the South. A prelude to later protest concerns and tactics was also initiated in the 1960 to 1965 period. SDS began to distribute political pamphlets, establish the teach-in movement, organize ghettos in the North, and stage protest marches against the Vietnam war.

From 1965 to 1969, the broad issue first identified in 1960 to 1965 was expanded into many issues: Protest was no longer bound by the nonviolence policy of the Southern civil rights movement. New methods, sometimes violent, were introduced. Property destruction, arms, and obstruction began to be seen on campuses during this period. Student protesters were numerous at the 1968 Democratic Convention and on campuses throughout the nation. Issues with a broad-based appeal were a necessity if activism was to endure and result in revolutionary change in American society. Some methods employed in the new protest were school boycotts; student strikes for student demands, for nonacademic employees, and for dismissed faculty; heckling speakers; disrupting classes; violating injunctions against rallies; encouraging mass arrests; occupying administrative offices; chanting slogans outside administration members’ homes; establishing underground presses; barricading buildings; fighting with police; compelling military and industrial recruiters to leave campus by blocking entrances to buildings or threatening individual recruiters through physical force; and even beating fellow students.

The conservative element of the academic community is illustrated by the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF). With William F. Buckley, Jr., as a patron and spokesman and Marvin Liebman as a political organizer and fund-raiser, the organization has developed rapidly. The YAF seed was sown in 1958 by the Student Committee for the Loyalty Oath, which was founded by two students in Washington, D.C. This committee “established campus chapters, circulated petitions, testified before Congressional committees, wrote articles, distributed literature, and generally got conservative students stirred up for the first time in almost everyone’s memory” (Edwards and Edwards, 1968).

The first meeting to consider the establishment of a conservative youth group was planned by the two students who had founded the “Loyalty Oath Committee” and by William F. Buckley, Jr. In 1960, at Buckley’s estate in Sharon, Connecticut, selected students who had been active in conservative politics met for a weekend to discuss the possibility of forming a national conservative organization. The three major results of this conference were: (a) the formation of a national conservative youth group; (b) the drafting of the “Sharon Statement,” a decisively conservative declaration; and (c) the designation of a title for the group—Young Americans for Freedom. The first activity of this newly formed group was a public rally held in New York City’s Manhattan Center. One biased observer noted that the event was such a success that “in one night YAF became a national institution” (Edwards and Edwards, 1968). Although YAF may have become an institution, it has not made its way into the media’s mainstream. The history of this group is difficult to trace because its actions are usually reactions and, therefore, attract less publicity than the precipitating actions of other groups.

Although a more thorough discussion of the student activist of the ‘60’s and ’70’s—who he is, what interests him, his tactics for reform—follows in Chapter 2, it is important historically to note that the majority of the students on campus can still be classified as moderates. One writer (“Signs of Moderation?” 1969) suggests that approximately 72 percent of the American student population can be considered moderates. The decade of the 1960’s saw the moderate group express themselves by degrees of apathy or limited support for the issues that motivated their activist colleagues. These characteristics existed within the amorphous moderate group on nearly every campus. For example, as the Cox Commission on The Crisis at Columbia (1968) indicates, sympathy by moderate students following the police “bust” on April 29th–30th, 1968, was instrumental in providing
the massive support that ultimately led to the closing of Columbia. The pattern reflecting the importance of involvement of moderate students is not unique to Columbia as evidenced by the disruptions at Harvard, Berkeley, San Francisco State, and numerous other institutions.

A trend toward organization of moderate students within the academic community was first observed in the late 1960's: “The violent student revolters are at their work 24 hours a day. A response among the moderate students must be equally well organized” (Drummond and Drummond, 1969). The outgrowth of this call to action has been the emergence of a fledgling group called the United Student Alliance (USA). The results of attempts at organizing this group cannot be determined.

Faculty members have become involved in campus activism in many ways as evidenced by the recent formation of the New University Conference. This group is reported to be “the national faculty arm of the Students for a Democratic Society and the radical caucus of the American Sociological Association, an organization which seeks to involve scholars in political issues” (Janson, 1969). Louis Kampf from MIT, a founder of the New University Conference, has recently introduced his ideas into another faculty group. The Modern Language Association, representative of the traditional academic professional organizations, elected him Second Vice President, and, since that election, a major crisis in the organization has erupted. “Either non-radicals will manage to end what they consider the dissidents' 'subversion' or many of them will quit. The dissidents insist that it is not their aim to take over the Association and drive members out” (“Professors: A Most Modern Squabble,” 1969).

Since January of 1969, articles have been published regularly on the faculty involvement in activist roles in established organizations. Some of these groups originally were formed for political discussion and action. Other professional organizations have witnessed the introduction of issues of an activist nature which are not consistent with their traditional practices.

In a constantly changing society, students have exercised the initiative to express themselves in varied ways. The Free Speech Movement (FSM) at Berkeley in 1964 was a milestone in the student movement of the 1960's. Not only did it cause a major university to cease operation, but the demonstrations at Berkeley highlighted the growing student concern for institutional reform.

The FSM issues today may seem obscure, but, unquestionably, the techniques and intensity of student feeling have become commonplace within institutions across the nation. Mario Savio, the leader of the Free Speech Movement, became a model and hero for radical student leaders. The commitment of the Free Speech Movement was to provide an open forum for diverse opinions. Justuxtaposed to the Free Speech position have been the whimsical activists who picket against Flash Gordon, Howdy Doody, and other trivia. Regardless of the spoofs against activism, protest continues to gather momentum even as the issues and tactics change.

Summary

A clearer perception of the progression of historical events in the activist movement is necessary for an understanding of present and future student activism. A brief summary of the trends of the movement throughout the 1960's includes: (a) a progression of foci from merely institutional concern, to a single societal issue (civil rights), to a wide range of societal and institutional problems; (b) a change in membership from the cautious Negroes and whites in the early civil rights movement, to a multiracial body in the early liberal SNCC and SDS organizations, to the racial separatism in the late 1960's; (c) a change in participation from a small group of individuals directly affected by an issue (as in the cases of early institutional protests and the civil rights programs of the early 1960's), to the momentum of the late 1960's when student and faculty involvement soared in response to a myriad of issues.

A complete history of American student activism, of necessity, should include not only organizational trends but institutional case studies. For, in addition to the historical abstractions that adequately characterize the movement on one level, the concrete situations of specific institutions project the essence of activism. That is, a history of activism is also a history of Columbia, San Francisco State, Berkeley, Brandeis, Amherst, University of Chicago, Sarah Lawrence Wisconsin, CCNY, Harvard, and the multitude of institutions that have experienced disillusionment of students. It is imperative for the academic community to be aware of the historical perspective of student activism. Respecting the fact that unrest is not a new phenomenon but an insistent restatement of the need for both societal and institutional reform, the academic community can then address itself to the causes of activism and its place in the educational framework. Ultimately the question of the value of student activism involves the definition of education in a free society.
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CHAPTER 2

Causes of Student Activism

A thorough analysis of the myriad factors is necessary to understand student activism. During the past several years, numerous journalists and critics have attempted to simplify the causes into a single cause. Activism has been attributed, among other things, individually to Dr. Spock, Vietnam, narcotics, environmental conditions, institutional size, academic quality of the institution, and administrative approach. As the incidents of student activism have spread rapidly across the nation, many journalists have devoted increasing time and energy to isolating and defining the cause. Attempts such as these are misleading and contribute little to an understanding of the situation. In fact, the mass media have been responsible to a great degree in perpetuating a distorted picture of the movement.

Then too, many administrators and faculty members rely on their experience and common sense in analyzing the activist scene. Some have been successful and some have not—a fact adequately supported by checking the tally list of administrative casualties the last several years and the growing demand for college presidents. Instead of looking for an all-embracing cause for student dissidence, it seems more advisable for the critic to look for patterns of factors which are present not only in the academic community but in issues stemming from society.

In order to identify patterns of causes in student activism, several principles from social psychology are useful. This approach, as formulated by Muzafer and Carolyn Sherif (1956), indicates that “behavior follows central psychological structuring . . . jointly determined by external and internal factors.” External factors include objects, groups, individuals, and cultural patterns; internal factors include attitudes, emotions, various states of the organism, and effects of past experience. The ingredients of an experience consist of the interaction between internal and external factors. The psychological structuring of the internal and external factors is not observable and, therefore, can only be inferred from behavior.

The social psychologists also point out that “various factors in the frame of reference have differing relative weights” (Sherif and Sherif, 1956). Because of the individual selectivity which occurs in an experience, different elements serve as anchorages. That is, in any situation one or more aspects will be of importance to the individual and will be instrumental in determining the outcome of the situation. Basic to this understanding of human behavior is the theory that the stimulus items, or the factors which influence behavior, do not have absolute significance in and of themselves. Particular stimuli must be viewed within the individual’s entire frame of reference. Theodore M. Newcomb (1965), in his discussion of student peer-group influence, suggests that “the consequences of an event are best understood if viewed in the light of the circumstances of which that event itself is a consequence.” Newcomb goes on to present a schematic diagram which indicates the kinds of interactions which must be taken into account for an understanding of student peer-group phenomena:

![Diagram of factors influencing student activism]

An extension of the Sherifs’ theory of the interaction of external and internal factors is Newcomb’s approach to student experiences. A further extension to the complex of factors underlying student activism can be made. After inspecting the state of student activism, a diagram of internal and external factors affecting a student activist can be schematically drawn:

![Extended diagram of factors influencing student activism]
Figure 2

FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENT ACTIVISM

INSTITUTIONAL
Academic freedom for faculty
Administrative approaches
Appearance of controversial speakers
Censorship of publications
Controversy about particular faculty members
Curriculum demands
Depersonalization
Faculty demands
Grading system
Instruction (quality of)
Location
Philosophical stance
Political stance (ROTC, military research)
Religious stance
Respect for the individual
Selectivity
Size of classes
Student participation
Subcultures
University organization and power structure

SOCIETAL
Draft
Educational expectations
Environmental conditions
Family demands
Governmental repression
Industrial complex
Mass media
Military complex
On-campus recruiting
Political events (Vietnam, War on Poverty)
Social movements (civil rights)
Socioeconomic expectations
Value expectations

EXTERNAL FACTORS

PSYCHOLOGICAL STRUCTURING

INTERNAL FACTORS

Abilities: mental and physical
Attitudes and values: political, social, moral, religious
Background: family, economic, social, cultural, educational, religious
Effect of artificial stimulants (narcotics, marijuana, euphorics)
Motives and needs: power, recognition, security
Past experience
Personality traits
Physiological factors: status of organism
Personal Motivation

The personal factors involved in activism, which frequently are unidentifiable, are perplexing and diversified. A multiplicity of factors contribute to shaping an individual's college experience. When using this point of view it is necessary to acknowledge that there are as many types of activists as there are activists. A student may confront many situations that require decisions that are not easily made: definition of a sex role, religious feelings, vocational decisions, academic choices, determination of interpersonal relationships, definition of familial ties, and structuring of future goals.

Vocational trends suggest that there is a growing sensitivity toward societal ills as students choose to employ their skills in jobs less lucrative and traditionally not as commonplace for college graduates. The disruptive pressure of the draft is ever-present, as well as the Vietnam war. The “pressure cooker” atmosphere, the breaking of family ties, the impersonal, large campus, the confrontation with new thoughts and values—these and other problems serve to motivate students to new ways of expressing themselves. (Hechinger, 1966; Kauffman, 1966; Sherburne, 1966; Snyder, 1966; and “Suicidal Tendencies,” 1966).

The number of extreme activists has been distorted by the mass media. The radical militants such as the terrorists or the “noisy few” are but a small segment of the entire student activist movement, which is itself a minority of the total collegiate population. At the same time, the number of students involved in organized protest continues to grow. A Gallup Poll, as reported in the New York Times on May 25, 1969, indicates that 28 percent of the students polled had participated in a demonstration of some kind: “nearly one of every three college men and one of every four college women.” The editors of the poll stated that the attitudes varied by colleges and regions “but at the heart of the discontent... is the feeling that society as a whole is seriously ill and that changes are imperative.”

A Harris Poll, as reported in the New York Post on June 30, 1969, has several items worthy of note. In the Harris survey 51 percent of the students said that “the protests should endorse the view that protests in this country by students, Negros, anti-war demonstrators will lead to positive changes and should be continued.” Two out of three of the campuses had had protests during the past year. “Seventy percent of the students on campuses where protests took place expressed sympathies in favor of the aims and goals of the demonstrations, although 64 percent took exception to the specific tactics of the leaders of the protests.”

Another interesting fact in the Harris Poll was that the “number of students who consider themselves ‘radical’ has jumped (from the 1968 survey) from 4 to 8 percent; the number of ‘liberals’ has increased from 39 to 44 percent while those who are ‘middle of the road’ have declined from 33 to 32 percent, and self-styled ‘conservatives’ have dropped from 24 to 16 percent.” The survey also reported that the potential for student activism “has not begun to be tapped. It is likely to accelerate rather than decline.” Forty percent of the respondents had participated in a demonstration and 72 percent would be willing; 18 percent had violated the law and 34 percent would be willing; 23 percent had defied school authorities and 47 percent would be willing; 11 percent had participated in civil disobedience and 36 would be willing; 4 percent had gone to jail and 38 percent would be willing.

Surveys and polls in the past several years have estimated the percentage of participation from 3 percent to 10 percent (New York Times, 1969). Participation in demonstrations momentarily creates the impression that activists speak for the mass. In many cases, they are unrepresentative of the student population. There is little doubt that the greater number of students and faculty throughout the nation are not behind the extreme agitators; that is to say that they do not support the methods or tactics of dissent, although they may support the issues. On the other hand, some statistics which are frequently passed over are also significant. The “untold story of Berkeley,” to cite but one example, is evident in the more than 8,000 students at the University of California who are involved in slum projects.

Beneath the categorization student activist is an individual with unique internal and external influences that mold his thinking and his action. Self-definition, a process experienced both consciously and unconsciously by students, is accelerated during the college years. Extreme emotional problems, which are faced in varying degrees by many students, are triggered by a variety of factors. Many factors form an internal frame of reference for students; as a result, as new individual needs develop, students are forced to adjust and grow with them. Newcomb (1965) and others point out that at this time peer groups emerge and exert considerable influence upon students’ values and behavior. And there is no reason to exclude organized student activism from the concept of a peer group.

The extent to which personal problems do exist today on campus is dramatized by the fact that the majority of college dropouts quit for nonacademic reasons (Summerskill, 1964). In other words, institutions fail to meet the psychological and sociological needs of many students (Sanford, 1965, 1968). Situations of personal adjustment to collegiate life pose serious problems for the academic community. The search for personal involvement by many individuals
becomes a necessity, and the struggling student is greatly influenced by subcultures and peer groups, if for no other reason that propinquity. Activism is a striking example of a situation which provides the opportunity for personal involvement in political, social, and institutional reform. During the process of personal adjustment, activism becomes an appealing way for many individuals to pose existential questions concerning emergence, access, and transcendence (Lerner, 1966).

The “invisible curriculum,” which can be both organized and informal, must not be overlooked in terms of the effects of the institution on the individual personality. The private matters discussed with roommates, the challenges of pre-college expectations, and the response by the students to the social and psychological climate of the campus and society shape their approach to their college experience. In turn, the individual develops strategies to deal with dissonance and the inconsistencies between the real and the ideal as he perceives them in his everyday existence. Individual sensitivities and reactions, coupled with the search for situations to fulfill a variety of needs, create subcultures, informal groups, and organized student protest on the campus.

Institutional Factors

Institutional factors frequently give rise to student unrest and must be understood in any analysis of activism. Ever-increasing tuition rates, additional fees, high rents, exorbitant book prices, arbitrary administrative decisions, inadequate cultural facilities, unreasonable or ill-planned course loads, an absence of faculty academic counseling, lack of academic and political freedom, and the moral stance which reflects in loco parentis may give rise to situations of unrest.

An issue that will continue to grow concerns the question of admitting more students from minority and disadvantaged groups. Admissions officers are being forced to look quite seriously at their traditional “evaluators of excellence,” as it becomes more apparent that standardized tests are geared frequently for white, middle-class individuals and cannot predict the success of students from other backgrounds. Minority groups traditionally have not achieved well on standardized tests:

The College Entrance Examination Board, which has long been engaged in helping colleges identify very bright applicants for admission, spent much of its latest annual meeting discussing ways to improve the admissions prospects of students who are not very bright. The board’s concern also extended to students who are not very rich, as well as to those who are neither bright nor rich—and who, therefore, cannot make up in dollars what they lack in high school grades and entrance exam scores. Several discussions centered on higher education for disadvantaged students, particularly Negroes.

For example, in an address to the board, Harold Howe II, the recent U.S. Commissioner of Education, observed that a new doctrine had been established in elementary and secondary education with the premise that “equal educational opportunity does not result from treating all pupils equally.” Now it is time, he said, “to ask what the colleges have done, and what they propose to do, in order to reflect this new philosophy in higher education.”

The commissioner urged colleges to “read the disadvantaged background into college entrance examination scores before making decisions on admissions” [Chronicle of Higher Education, November 8, 1967].

With the increasing intensity of the black consciousness movement, pressure by black and white students alike will grow in the area of admissions. And, at the same time, protests over alleged discrimination in fraternities and other time-honored campus traditions are becoming more frequent.

The treatment and abuse of students, which encompasses many issues, is another frequent cry of the dissenters. Professor Frederick Gwynn (1966) of Trinity College suggests:

The 1964-65 campus revolts seemed to be directed against the tendency for most colleges and universities to be oriented toward an image compounded of their tradition, administrations, faculties, curricula, and plants—rather than of their students. Even if the revolts were provoked partly by non-students, and concurrent civil rights protest, and even by the old college predilection for swallowing goldfish, the orientation question was and is most serious [p. 82].

This analysis is still appropriate as higher education continues to expand in size and scope. The increasing number of graduate students who assume the teaching role, the growing size of classes, the cries of “sandbox” student government, the failure of institutions to involve all segments of the academic community in policy-making and governance, feelings of alienation of students from their teachers—all are reflected upon and criticized by students. A survey at the University of Wisconsin, for example, revealed that 80 percent of the student body felt that the institution was depersonalized (Lipsit and Altbach, 1966).

Comprehensive studies on the causes of activism have been scarce. In 1966 Richard E. Peterson’s work, The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964–1965, was one of the earliest substantial studies. Recently he has completed another distinctive study, The Scope of Organized Protest in 1967–1968. In his introduction, Peterson cites other current studies that will assist in dispelling many of the myths concerning the activist movement (Daedalus, 1968; Haan, in press; Journal of Social Issues, 1967; Keniston, 1968; and Westby, 1968). Both of Peterson’s studies merit careful consideration. In terms of the 859 institutions studied in the Peterson works, the issues which prompted organized student protest were divided into categories of instruc-
tion, faculty, freedom of expression, student–administration, and off-campus issues. In the instructional area, 13 percent of the institutions reported protest over poor quality of instruction; 12 percent in regard to prevailing systems of testing and/or grading; and 15 percent over curriculum inflexibility. In the faculty category, 20 percent of the reporting institutions experienced protests over controversies surrounding a particular faculty member.

In the area of freedom of expression, 10 percent of the institutions reported organized protest over the “censorship” of certain publications such as student newspapers. The other issues in this category resulted in lesser percentages of protest: campus rules regarding speeches and appearances by controversial persons, and the actual appearance of particular people of either the right or the left persuasion (Peterson, 1968).

The issues and the resulting protest in the area of student–administration may vary. (See chart below.) Food service “upset students on one in four campuses,” although Peterson points out that in 1965 it “stood second in the field of 27 as an issue for campus protest; in 1968 it was surpassed by at least four kinds of issues.” The statistics on college regulations in the 1968 study as compared to the 1965 study indicate that “college students continue to be very widely in opposition to in loco parentis controls over personal conduct.” In discussing the percentage of protest in response to policies regarding student use of drugs, Peterson suggests that it “is conceivable that a confrontation over narcotics could usher in an era of total freedom for students (in all but the most fundamentalist of colleges).” Alleged racial discrimination was a new issue in the 1968 Peterson study and the author suggests that this “has been less one of discrimination than of institutional recognition of the higher education needs or an emerging black consciousness.” Finally, almost one in five institutions experienced protest over lack of communication between students and administration.

In the area of off-campus issues, an interesting trend has occurred during the past four years. In 1966, 38 percent of the institutions reported organized discontent over civil rights issues; in 1968, 29 percent of the reporting schools experienced protest (Peterson, 1968). As indicated in Chapter 1, most black students and their organizations in the past several years have preferred to initiate and sustain their own reform in the area of civil rights, often at the explicit exclusion of white activists. Unquestionably the most frequently cited issue in 1968, both overall and in the off-campus category, was the Vietnam war. In 1965, 21 percent of the reporting institutions experienced protest over the war; in 1968, 38 percent reported organized activism (Peterson, 1968). Thus, a summary of the issues which prompted the most organized protest in 1968 includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues Causing Most Protest in 1968</th>
<th>Percentage of Organized Protest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. policies regarding Vietnam</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory and other living group regulations</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil rights</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient student participation in establishing campus policies</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The draft</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus recruiting by one or another of the armed services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy surrounding a particular faculty member</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress regulations</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus recruiting by any other firm or agency such as Dow, CIA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The philosophic and religious stance of the university—as perceived by students—influences their reactions to their educational experiences. Some students easily fit into their chosen institutional environment; others do not. Peterson’s earlier study, *The Scope of Organised Student Protest in 1964–1965*, leads to the prediction that “Catholic institutions are more likely to have protests over curriculum inflexibility than are independent universities.” Organized student unrest today tends to be “issue-oriented” to a great extent. Frequently the issues become issues because of the institution’s philosophic approach. For the extremists on the left, the philosophical position of the institution is important as evidenced in an early statement of purpose by the Free School of New York:

The Free School of New York is necessary because, in our conception, American universities have been reduced
to institutions of intellectual servitude. Students have been systematically dehumanized, deemed incompetent to regulate their own lives, sexually, politically, and academically. They are treated like raw material to be processed for the universities' clients—business, government and military bureaucracies. Teachers, underpaid and constantly subject to investigation and purge, have been relegated to the servant—intellectuals, required for regular promotion, to propagate points of view in harmony with the military and industrial leadership of our society.

The American university has been emasculated. Its intellectuals' vigor, exuberance, and excitement have been destroyed. What remains is a dispassionate and studied dullness, a facade of scholarly activity concealing an internal emptiness and cynicism, a dusty-dry search for permissible truth which pleases none but the administrator and the ambitious [Free School, 1966].

In addition to philologic stance, three types of institutional factors are also important: the organization, size, and geographic location. The formal organizational policies, the decision-making process, administrative personnel, and the affiliations outside the institution constitute the institutional control. Preoccupation of deans with off-campus relations, everyday paperwork, and fund-raising limits their availability to relate to the students and faculty. Some students are quick to project such facts as symptoms of a sterile and impersonal institution.

In addition, much has been stated about the significance of institutional size in relation to student unrest. Although conclusions are often moot, it appears as if role conflict and ambiguity increase more or less directly with the size of the institution. Moreover, it is felt that the more heterogeneous the student population—the greater the range of income, ethics, religious background—the larger the student subcultures will be. The recent Peterson study (1968) presents some interesting observations on the role of institutional size.

A tentative conclusion, then, is that except for protest over Dow, etc., recruiters, gross size—ranging from small colleges (less than 1,500 enrollment), through medium-size colleges (1,500-5,000), to relatively large institutions (more than 5,000)—is not linearly related to organized student protest to any significant degree [p. 24].

The "censorship" issue in Peterson's study was, however, more common to the 50 large public universities than to the total sample. Approximately 50 percent of the 50 large public universities (compared to 18 percent in the total sample) experienced organized protest prompted by racial circumstances.

The location of the institution plays an important role in molding the character of the school, and, consequently, the student. The community can be a source of student socialization, irritation, and subculture formation. Whether a school is in an isolated, rural setting, or an urban or underprivileged setting, the community—be it liberal or conservative—can affect the fostering of student unrest. Thus, relative isolation probably helped schools like Bennington, Goddard, and Antioch to maintain a certain independence of current fashions in curricular organization. The New York City schools—Columbia, CCNY, Fordham, and NYU—have been particularly susceptible to massive unrest.

In 1968, Peterson reported that the "only significant variable by geographical region was with regard to the off-campus issues (civil rights, the war, etc.), for which about one-third fewer colleges in the southern accrediting region reported organized activism." It is interesting to note that according to the earlier Peterson study, there was no significant difference between the activism on residential and commuter campuses. In the recent study, however, Peterson says "that to the extent that there is any relationship whatsoever between the residence dimension and organized protest, it is more often in the direction of greater activism on commuter campuses (which are usually larger)."

Thus, research evidence and direct observation suggest that the organizational features of an institution determine who will interact with whom, how frequently, and under what conditions. The faculty and administration must not forget this fact, for it involves the very core of their jobs. It is imperative that the university community view its own institution's physical arrangement and campus peculiarities which are potential causes for student unrest, in addition to understanding the individuals who are or may be involved. Carl Stern (1965) maintains that the external counterpart of personality need is that of environmental press; that is, the level at which the person's private world merges with that of others like him. It is a truism frequently overlooked that different students on the same campus require different treatments in order to arrive at the same end—that of an "educated" person. A student who does not find his place will either leave the situation or attempt to create his own place.

In terms of institutional type (public liberal arts colleges, public universities, independent liberal arts colleges, independent universities, Catholic institutions, Protestant institutions, teachers colleges, and technical institutions), there is little difference in Peterson's first study among the schools in issues comprising the "instruction" categories. Protests over the quality of instruction and curriculum inflexibility are found more frequently in Catholic and technical institutions. Faculty tenure policies give rise to protest at large universities.

In the area of "freedom of expression" significant differences are found between institutional types. Censorship over publications is great at Catholic institutions and low at the independent liberal arts institutions. Public institutions and teachers colleges
represent the extremes in the amount of protest over the appearance of controversial speakers. The presence or absence of religious ties are significant factors resulting in protest over the "living-group regulations." In the area of student—administration communication, there are significant differences, with protest about twice as widespread in public universities as in the private colleges. Independent universities report active participation by half of the schools, while at the other extreme, only one in eight teachers colleges report organized protest. In the area of student participation in the establishment of campus policies, the extent of student protest is uniform across the board.

In both studies, Peterson uses the presence of faculty doctorates as a measurement of institutional quality, admittedly a crude measure. In the first study, the pretested issue which correlated most strongly with institutional quality was the Vietnam issue, although the relationships from issue to issue were generally positive. The study also maintained that "students actively concerned with broad social and moral issues are undoubtedly concentrated at the high end of the intellectual ability distribution, they are bright enough to detect and comprehend some of what ails the American society." In his 1968 study, Peterson concluded that while

the relationships, issue by issue, are generally positive—that is, student activism, almost regardless of issue, is related to institutional quality (the issues of alleged censorship and proper dress are exceptions)—only the correlation with issues related to the war are strong enough to have any real significance. This is a finding to be reckoned with, however, if the Vietnam action continues to grind along; students from these "good" colleges are likely to be the opinion leaders of the under-30 generation [p. 28].

Other analyses have also pointed out the relation between intellectual ability and student involvement. Heist and Somers in their Berkeley studies revealed that the Berkeley activists had relatively high grade averages and that three-fourths of them were in the humanities, social science, and physical sciences. An editorial in America (1966, p. 613) proposes that: "It would be a good idea, too, if prospective employers took serious account of this new involvement and paid at least as much attention to indications of 'involvement quotient' as to the other I.Q." If, as the Educational Testing Service study and other studies indicate, the actively concerned student is at the higher end of the intellectual distribution, interesting implications arise in light of the Berkeley situation. Berkeley, notable for its activism, emerged over Harvard as the nation's "best-balanced distinguished University" in graduate education according to an assessment by the American Council on Education (ACE) (Cartter, 1956). This is not necessarily to equate intelligence with activism. At the same time, most of the "better" schools in the ACE study have now experienced intense and frequent organized protest. The intellectual ability and sensitivity of the students involved in activism is an important factor that cannot be swept under the rug. Thus, concludes Peterson (1966), "because of some combination of genetic and environmental circumstances, these youths have acquired an intellectual style that has lent itself well to critical examination of what is going on around them."

Psychologists have spent considerable effort examining the phenomenon of the adolescent. Many of the observations resulting from the studies have important bearing on an understanding of activism. Experiencing emotional struggles, the individual attempts to find meaning in his present situation and to place himself in society. "It is a time when we expect major attacks upon the established order" (Katz and Sanford, 1965). Eric Erickson, in Childhood and Society (1963), describes this stage as a time when a psychological revolution occurs within, while adult tasks loom ahead. There is a tendency for over-identity with the "heroes of cliques and crowds."

In a recent interview, one activist commented that "love is getting hit over the head by a cop for something you believe in" (Dunbar, 1968). Is it true that the "mixture of political and social romanticism varies widely from individual to individual" (Crisis at Columbia, 1968) and that this "romanticism" attracts many college students? The mind of an adolescent, according to Erickson, is described as a psychosocial stage between childhood and adulthood. The college-age individual is often impatient in his search for instant remedies. At the same time, some students who are intellectually incapable of understanding new ideas have a rigid mind set that perceives human relationships in stereotypes. Nor are other members of the academic community immune from this state of mind.

Family social and economic background is another vital factor in understanding the frame of reference of the activist and is closely related to studies on adolescence. Some students rebel from their parents' beliefs; others maintain their parents' views. A study at The Pennsylvania State University reveals that generally student activists are consistent with the political orientation of their families (Braungart, 1966).

An important emphasis in higher education as noted in many recent social-psychological studies is the influence of extracurricular activities in the educational process. This fact must be accepted by the academic community if it is to place both organized and informal activism in proper perspective. Newcomb (1965) presents several conditions for the formation of peer groups: pre-college acquaintance, pro-pinquity, and similarity of attitudes and interests. The latter condition is instrumental in the formation and analysis of activist groups.
The classic Bennington study by Newcomb (1956) demonstrates how groups can influence the values and attitudes of their members. This influence depends on numerous external and internal factors. Rebecca S. Vreeland in her study of the Harvard House System discovered that the syndrome of attitudes and values labeled individual-oriented and collectivity-oriented varied rather consistently with membership in certain houses (Vreeland and Bidwell, 1964). Bryant Wedge, in a study at Yale, asked four classes in the spring of their senior year to list what had made their college experience most memorable. In order of importance, the students stated: roommates and friends, social activities, junior and senior departmental courses, sports, and courses taken during their freshman and sophomore years (Psychosocial Problems of College Men, 1958). John Bushnell, in his well-known Vassar study (1964), discovered that the most important experience for a Vassar girl is the immediate group of girls with whom she associates. Thus, formal and informal groups are decisive in determining what happens to an individual during his college experience. Activism, when viewed within this fact, has significant ramifications for the growth and change of values and the furthering of educational experience for the students involved.

Recent studies have attempted to look into the conditions, mechanisms, and dynamics of attitude change, although it must be remembered that we still know little about how students acquire values and commitments. The controversial Jacob study (1947), a review of attitude formation studies, maintains that 75 to 80 percent of the students are "glorious, contented, self-centered, and express a real need for religion. The traditional moral values and the Protestant ethic of honesty, sincerity, and absolutism are highly valued. Nevertheless, students have a live-and-let-live philosophy" (p. 65). Perhaps it is time for the Jacob study to be retested. A Michigan State study reveals that for the first two years, at least, informal, nonacademic experiences play a more pronounced role in the formulation of student behavior than the formal, academic experience. Again, the authors conclude that the single most important experience is the association with people of different races and creeds and the resulting exchange of opinion (Lehman and Dressel, 1962).

As a result of social-psychological studies, several perspectives from the behavioral sciences are useful in understanding the causes of student activism. Attitudes of individuals tend to reflect the most common beliefs of the members of the groups to which they belong. Moreover, the greater the clarity of the group situation, the more the individual will be directed toward the group's goal-related task. Pressures toward uniformity are greater in a cohesive group; although the more cohesive the group, the more difficult it is for the group to adapt to changes in external conditions. Finally, it is important to note that close external supervision is associated with low group productivity (Sherif and Sherif, 1956; Trow, 1966).

Societal factors contribute to the diversity of the activism movement in ways which are still not completely known. The separation of academic theory from societal reality produces the banality and humor of the following product of the Free Speech Movement. The concepts underlying this song are frequently ignored or simply misunderstood:

Oski dolls, pom-pom girls
UC all the way . .
Oh what fun it is to have
Your mind reduced to clay
Civil rights, politics
Just get in the way
Questioning authority
When you should obey.

An editorial in America (1966) suggests that a segment of the academic community is tired of being treated as unreflective minors, impatient with waiting unending years before plunging into the real world, and not a little bit distrustful of the type of real world their elders have built or accepted; they want to do something now [p. 613].

Social Causes

Not only are the students critical of institutional situations but they are concerned about problems which they face as members of society: problems of peace, democracy, civil rights, Vietnam, environmental pollution, poverty, police action, the expansion of universities into ghetto areas, and the like. Vietnam usually sparks discussions and protests centering on the moral basis of the war. Frequently, for many students the concern is even deeper because their lives may be sacrificed on a battlefield in Vietnam. They have known since childhood that nuclear warfare is a reality with which they must exist. Specific issues associated with the war are the uncertainties of the draft, the training of military personnel on campus (ROTC), recruitment arrangements with war-related industries and the armed forces, government and military research, and the assistance received by draft boards from the universities in the form of class ranking information (Crisis at Columbia, 1968). Activists are concerned about the role of the United States in the war, as are many of the silent student majority. The immediacy of the situation, as experienced by most students, has prompted the questioning of long-accepted practices on campus.

In urban areas, expansion of the universities into
the ghettos, thereby displacing whole sections of a neighborhood, has stirred students to action at the University of Chicago, Case Western Reserve University, Berkeley, Harvard, NYU, CCNY, and Columbia. During the crisis in the spring of 1968 at Columbia, the gymnasium in Morningside Park was one of the crucial, immediate causes. “The nub of the issue was that the community’s property was being used by a private institution, yet the newly emerging voices concerned with community action had no influence in the decision” (Crisis at Columbia, 1968, p. 87). “The presence of racial issues, symbolized by the projected gymnasium in Morningside Park, undoubtedly had much to do with the breadth of faculty and student support for those who sparked the April [1968] uprising” (p. 13). Students voiced concern over questionables techniques of eviction and the apparent aloofness and bruskness exhibited by institutions toward their neighbors. Recently, Teachers College, Columbia University, unveiled expansion plans which contained housing for neighborhood residents who would otherwise be displaced.

Students raise their voices against “the system,” “the bureaucracy,” “the ratrace,” and “hypocrisy.” Some students react negatively to the needs of adults and many faculty members and administrators to analyze, rationalize, and set up procedures for dealing with categories of experience which, for these students, are very personal. At the same time that the student faces the evils of society as he perceives them, he must also cope with the pressure of a society whose insistent push for achievement has little tolerance for failure. To separate student involvement from societal factors is dangerous:

The unrest doesn’t start in the University—it is all around us—in our homes, community, nation, and world. And the unrest may turn out to be a powerful force for good, but not unless we respond and join with it to pursue the ultimate values and goals of our institutions of higher education [Kauffman, 1966, p. 386].

Students and the Media

The mass media’s attempt to promote the public knowledge of news events has created a stereotype of the college activist: a long-haired, dirty, anti-intellectual revolutionary. Federal and state governing bodies and, unfortunately, many institutions themselves have frequently acted with this image in mind. Since the spring of 1968, the direction of legislation has been to curb the activity of dissenting students by limiting institutional funds, denying grants to disrupting students, and requiring college administrators to dismiss faculty members or students who take part in campus disruption (Turner, 1969). Now that one study suggests that 28 percent of the college student population has participated in a demonstration of some kind (one out of three men, one out of four women), the implications of suggested legislation are significant.

The mass media have always been fascinated by the “activist movement.” Labels that have become part of everyday vocabulary have been created or reemphasized by the media to explain the activism as well as sell a product. The movement, activism, student unrest, dissident students, riots, rampage, radical students, violence, destructive, and protest: this list of labels is extended with each week’s newspapers, magazines, and news reports.

What role have the mass media played in creating, maintaining, or projecting an image of collegiate life in the 1960’s? Clark Kerr (1969, p. 15) has commented that “exaggeration is one word that fits this new generation. It has exaggerated itself. It has been exaggerated by the news media. . . .” The media have created public support of certain segments of the student population: “Newspaper, television, and radio stations in every community which has a college ought to be searching out the moderate student movement to give it moral and visible backing” (Drummond and Drummond, 1969).

The media have informed, inflamed, complimented, condemned, supported, and rejected actions of students of the 1960’s. The compliments and support have generally been accorded to the conservative and moderate students, while the inflammation, condemnation, and rejection have been heaped on the radicals or on the students left-of-center. The results of this commentary within the media have sparked polarization. In a strong statement, Lerone Bennet, Jr., a black journalist, maintains: “American journalism reflects the biases of the middle-class white scholars and scholarship which are weighted heavily against radical change” (Bennet, 1968). Others have criticized the press for encouraging campus protest by providing the publicity that is sought by dissident students. Although during the Columbia crisis many observers felt the presence of the press decreased the possibility of further police violence, a recent ACLU study concludes that the presence of the press was not that much of a deterrent (Police on Campus, 1969).

Television, radio, newspapers, and magazines have all contributed to the image of the college campus of today. The primary motive of many reporters has been to report the sensational events which emphasize the undesirability of campus protest. A frequent cry of faculty and students during the events at Columbia in the spring of 1969 was the covering of the incidents by the New York Times—an issue compounded because of the presence of Arthur Ochs Sulzberger of the New York Times on the Board of Trustees at Columbia. Rioting students creating an indelible picture in the public mind may serve a very different end. The majority of students do not engage in vio-
lence on campus, yet the repressive actions of governmental agencies cannot be selective. When an institution's funds are reduced, the effect is felt most acutely, not by students involved in the protests, but by the other 72 to 75 percent of the student body.

Higher education and American society are unquestionably influenced by the media. The legislature, an important segment of the society which makes decisions vital to higher education, bases those decisions on public opinion, which is expressed through the democratic process. Many students, faculty members, and administrators are voicing the concern that was stated in The Daily Collegian of The Pennsylvania State University: "One of the biggest problems raised by campus disorders is how local, state, and federal governments should react to them" ("Ludicrous Steps," 1969). A response to this problem was voiced by The Columbia Spectator when it suggested that student unrest would be "exacerbated and not cured" by legislation to put off federal funds from dissidents or from institutions that failed to discipline them" (Raskin, 1969).

When the media convey a message from the legislature, such as "California's state-supported colleges and universities may pay the price in the State Assembly this spring for riots and demonstrations that have hit the schools" (Turner, 1969), the administrator finds himself in a difficult position. Administrators, as well as students and faculty, must try to maintain the vitality of the university, institute new programs, and retain competent faculty members on a budget often considered less than adequate. Bills before the federal legislature demonstrate this trend, particularly the laws on student aid:

1. The Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Act prohibits the appropriation of grants or loans to students "who have been convicted by any court . . . of any crime which involves the use of . . . force, trespass or seizure of property under control of an institution of higher education to prevent officials or students at such an institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their duties.
2. The Higher Education Amendment of 1968 denies funds from the following programs: National Defense Education Act, educational opportunity grant, student loan insurance program, college work-study program, and any fellowship program under NDEA, to any individual attending or employed by such institution who has been convicted of a crime "involving the use of force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education . . . ." ("Provision of two federal laws on student aid," 1969).

Summary

The causes of student activism are complex. Generalization is difficult and, in a sense, of little value. The faculty and administration must first examine the numerous potential causes for unrest on their particular campus. They must look for a pattern of causes and the results, not just for a single factor which may result in formal and informal protest. Moreover, they must study and utilize recent findings of sociopsychological studies in an attempt to understand individual and group behavior. Only at that point can they proceed in taking a stand or in developing an approach to the activism as it appears on their campus.

The results of student activism are as diversified and complex as the causes. Lacking historical distance, it is difficult to ascertain the full impact of the movement. It is also just as difficult to attribute an institutional report, for example, to activism, because other factors are frequently involved. Regardless, there can be little question that activism has affected American higher education in both positive and negative ways. A note of caution is necessary: It is questionable that activism can be termed a social movement. Sherif and Sherif (1956) define a social movement as one that

... consists of a pattern of attempts through pronouncements, literature, meetings, and direct action to build or maintain a definite scheme of human relations and values prompted by a state of common unrest, common discontent, or common aspirations of a large number of individuals [p. 726].

It is not possible to articulate a "definite scheme of human relations and values prompted by a state of common unrest" that would be acceptable to the diversified movement of student activism today. Distinctive characteristics of a social movement are that they must permeate the population, spread from a nucleus, have a motivational basis, and display sociopolitical maturity and leadership. Organizational difficulties seem to be the rule, not the exception, for the extremely radical organized groups. In the long run, the movement may be insignificant in terms of societal impact, or it may herald social change. The point is moot. "On the other hand, it is much more likely that it is one of many unsuccessful attempts in the United States to create a radical movement in an essentially unfertile environment" (Lipset and Altbach, 1966).

It is more probable, however, that activism will have greater impact on the American campus. The Berkeley Rebellion resulted in a report, Education at Berkeley, compiled by a committee chaired by Charles Muscatine, eminent medieval scholar. This report and the Cox Commission Report on Columbia make recommendations that are rapidly filtering into institutions throughout America. The academic community is slowly realizing the urgent need for a reexamination of the policies, the purposes, and the role of the student in the educational process.

The Muscatine report, 200 pages with 42 recommendations, reveals some interesting trends: a call for greater stress on teaching; the need for the under-
graduate to hear (but not necessarily take over) academic policy-making; a suggestion of experimentation with student–faculty relations; the need to hear student opinion; the establishment of ad hoc courses; and the establishment of the seven-man Board of Educational Development ("New Plan for Berkeley," 1966). Extensions of examples of these trends are numerous and very much part of the campus scene today. Across the nation, institutions are questioning the role of student governments, opening communication channels, placing students on institutional committees at all levels of governance, examining affiliations with government projects and classified and military research, reorganizing student personnel services, recasting the role of extracurricular activities in the educational process, and reviewing the role of the institution in society. Institutional reform, often quietly and with intensified vigor, is occurring at an unprecedented rate in many institutions.

Shadow Schools have arisen in numerous locations. San Francisco State offers 76 courses in this academic underground with an enrollment of about 1,200 students out of their total enrollment of 18,500. Other Shadow Schools are found at Princeton, Dartmouth, Cornell, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of New Mexico. The Free School of New York is characterized by the medieval roots of direct dialogue (Shadow Schools, 1966). These Shadow Schools, like the other results of activism, have an immeasurable effect on student attitudes, either negatively or positively, through assimilation or through reaction.

Undoubtedly one of the most significant contributions of the current student activist movement is the fulfillment of certain emotional and intellectual needs which have been discussed earlier in this chapter. Thus the explicit and implicit impact of student demands, activities, and pressures have been felt in current economical, political, and social affairs. Activism must be viewed in its entirety if the administrator is to deal effectively with the variety of individuals and commitments involved.
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CHAPTER 3

Philosophical and Administrative Approaches to Activism

Ultimately the study of student activism is philosophical in nature. What is the place of activism in the educational process? How much freedom and responsibility should the student enjoy within his contractual agreement with the institution? In what areas? The problem involves the controversial issue of the relationship between freedom and responsibility.

Numerous administrative approaches to activism are evident today on the American college campus. Before an administrator can make a decision in the face of activism, however, he must first have a thorough understanding of the causes and the present state of activism on his campus. Utilizing results from behavioral studies, the administrator can develop his own philosophy and approach for dealing with activism. Numerous problems are involved.

As previously illustrated, the range of activists and their interests, activities, and tactics is broad. "It is not always clear which kinds of student political manipulation among students are necessarily good or bad, sincere or insincere, for what university, at what time" (Mallery, 1966). Tension between the "art of the possible" versus "the good of the system" underlies every administrative decision. Despite numerous recent studies, the lack of knowledge of what actually constitutes an "educational experience" hinders the administrator as he deals with controversial behavior. If the social psychologists have trouble understanding what makes up a casual relationship, how can the administrator make a well-informed decision concerning a situation as complex as activism? Many modes of behavior are new to the campus scene, though often student protests are not.

The administrator as an "instructor" in the academic community must also develop his own philosophy in order that he may effectively function in his day-to-day relations with students. The task is not easy. In order to work with the realization that inherent in the student activist movement is the duality between freedom and responsibility, the administrator must develop an approach that does not generate mass hysteria, suspicion, unnecessary administrative harassment, or arbitrary interference. He must strive to create a self-understanding and, at the same time, a philosophy which does not deny the potential educational value of human questioning and active commitment.

The University and Society

An underlying philosophical problem of the movement acknowledged by both students and critics of activism is the growing gap between society and the academic world, a gap which accompanies expressions of discontent for the disparity between the real and the ideal. In this sense, the university becomes a microcosm for the society at large (Bay, 1962; Kerr, 1962; and Stewart, 1962). John Dewey speaks of the academic world in terms of social significance, as "instrumentalities through which school itself should be made a genuine form of active community life, instead of a place set apart in which to learn lessons."

Some students today view the individual as existing in a futile, impersonal society and view the academic world as divorced from the realities of societies. These same students then verbally and actively apply this awareness in their immediate collegiate situation and in society. Thus, for many individuals, the zeal for applying the principles of academic life extends far beyond the classroom. As the social–psychological studies previously discussed indicate, the educational process is greatly influenced by incidents, individuals, and groups outside the classroom. Administrators cannot overlook the educational value of the "invisible curriculum." Frederick Rudolph (1966) suggests:

The most sensitive barometer of what is going on at a college is the extracurriculum. It is the instrument of change, the instrument with which generations of students who possess the college for but a few years, register their values, often fleetingly, yet perhaps indelibly. It is the agency that identifies their enthusiasms, their understand-
ing of what a college should be, their preferences. . . . It is a measure of their growth [p. 53].

John Dewey, as well as other more recent educators like Nevitt Sanford and John Gardner, emphasized the social role of education as well as the growth of the individual. Many educational programs today are justifiable only in pragmatic terms, although not according to Dewey's pragmatism. Lawrence A. Cremin reminds us that "such justification of a democratic program must lie in its ability to enhance the individual lives, or, to use Dewey's phraseology, to encourage the intellectual, moral, and aesthetic growth of individual human beings" (Cremin, 1965).

The problems remain, however, in the implementation of such a philosophy, that is, in creating a program that will educate the student so that he can function effectively within society. Is it possible that the reason the extracurriculum serves as a sensitive barometer is that it can be altered more easily than the formal, tradition-oriented programs? How can an individual be free and yet responsible? Or, to rephrase the problem, what kind of social conditions enable individuals to develop so that they change or improve the very society that produced their individuality? Can one build or teach self-reliance, initiative, moral courage, or other professed ideals and objectives of education? To a great extent, the problem is existential. What does happen to the individual in the learning process? How does he choose the events that will be central to his education?

Dewey's concept of growth is central to an understanding of the educational process. According to Dewey, we must organize the powers that assure growth. "Living," says Dewey, "has its own intrinsic quality, and the business of education is with that quality." Education must continually reorganize and reconstruct experience.

Infancy, youth, adult life—all stand on the same educative level in the sense that what is really learned at any stage and every stage of experience constitutes the value of that experience, and in the sense that it is the chief business of life at every point to make living thus contribute to an enrichment of its own perceptible meaning [p. 109].

Immaturity, according to Dewey, is the primary condition of growth, the possibility of growth. "We treat it simply as a privation because we are measuring it by adulthood as a fixed standard." This comparative standpoint is an "overweening" presumption according to Dewey. "Where there is life, there are already eager and impassioned activities."

Dewey, however, cannot avoid the normative problem involved. The administrator must also make normative statements concerning activism; hence, the prerequisite for a thorough understanding of the situation. Just as the concept educative has an opposite, miseducative, growth has an opposing concept, ungrowth. Who is to say that activism is not a condition for "ungrowth?" The core of the problem, thus, is epistemological: What does education mean? What does freedom mean? The answers, by necessity, demand normative statements which place values on concepts such as: "Controversy is the essence of academic freedom" (Thorndike, 1965).

Currently, at least four cries of freedom which the administrators must face appear in various forms on the campus: freedom from external authority, freedom of conscience, freedom to do what one pleases, and freedom within restraint. The E. G. Williamson and John L. Cowan study, "The Role of the President in the Desirable Enactment of Academic Freedom for Students" supported by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, is a thorough inquiry into the philosophical questions involved in activism.

The results indicate how various freedoms are widely practiced. The data reveal that there are "surprising gaps and inconsistencies in the practice of freedom, which possibly are causing some degree of student unrest." The study qualifies broad generalizations concerning a massive "new generation" of politically involved and cause-committed students. The authors point out a significant relationship between unrest and institutional control. "Changes on Catholic campuses can be described as no less than phenomenal." Ninety percent of the Catholic schools reported new social and political awareness, about 75 percent at the private schools, and about 50 percent at the public institutions. This growing trend is significant and must not be ignored.

Eighty-three percent of the deans of 813 schools agreed without reservation or qualification that "an essential part of the education of each student is the freedom to hear, critically examine, and express viewpoints on a range of positions held and advocated regarding issues that divide our society" (Thornton, 1965). Thirteen percent added a qualifying statement that student freedom has to be exercised "responsibly and critically" and 6 percent expressed "some agreement" but set clearly defined limits. Only 1 percent disagreed:

To put obstacles in his way in the form of falsehood inhibits or retards the learning process unless a mature and experienced person aids the process of delineating chaff from wheat, truth from falsehood. A Philosophy of Education based on absolutes provides the student with a sound foundation as a starting point . . . a student who is allowed to hear, examine, and express viewpoints indiscriminately benefits neither himself nor his peers [Thorndike, 1965, p. 6].

Numerous philosophies of education underlie higher education today. Pragmatism, progressive education, idealism, realism, religious theories, existen-
isim, and others can be found in varying degrees in all institutions of higher education. Numerous philosophies—both traditional, and modern—are employed by the student activists. Administrators must not overlook the role that the writings and interpretations of philosophers and writers like Marcus, Sartre, Nietzsche, Mill, Goodman, and the Zen writers, and others play in the formulation of ideas and modes of actions.

The University and Its Students

The administrator must try to understand the approach of his institution as well as the philosophies used by the activists. This task is not always easy, for many institutions now find themselves without an expressed or implicit definition of purpose; and, at the same time, many institutions find themselves in the midst of fundamental changes. Frequently, the administrator struggles in the midst of the changing times. Since activism is a relatively new phenomenon on many campuses, there may be no established procedural approaches. As a result, the administrator must confer with students and other policy makers to suggest and help create approaches and techniques toward dealing not only with the dissident students but also with the issues which underlie the protest. If this is not done, the administrator will probably find himself moving desperately from one crisis to another. Moreover, if the administrator does not take the initiative, he denies an important function of his position—that of a mediator and communicator between the institution and the students.

The Williamson and Cowan study found considerable student freedom in the area of student expression, that is, measures in which students are permitted to advocate and influence social or political reform. In the area of freedom in choosing topics for discussion, 75 percent of the institutions said that the students could discuss and publicize unpopular positions concerning 13 of the 14 controversial political, socioeconomic, and religious issues. The one exception concerned the abolition of the law prohibiting interracial marriage.

The methods of establishing student rights and freedoms are varied. Some students assume that the rights were always present and make a declaration of their inalienable rights. Too many students forget that the institution has the authority to enact “what rights and freedoms are relevant and necessary for achievement of its institutional mission over the years” (Thornton, 1965). The militant activists today utilize the tactics of rioting, demonstrations, and sit-ins. Other methods of change stem from the institution’s governing board and administration. Observed innovations from other campuses also frequently prompt institutional reform, especially as schools hasten to avoid the errors of others. Some institutions have changed their positions through resolution or adoption of standards of groups like the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), or the National Student Association (NSA)—groups that can recommend or persuade but do not have the authority to establish institutional policy. A final method for instituting change, which is becoming more frequent, is the continual consultation between those who possess authority and those who wish to influence policy. In this situation, the changes occur within a reasoned atmosphere of inquiry and action (Thornton, 1965).

Along with the existence of freedom evolves the growth of responsibility—the end of the spectrum sometimes overlooked by some radical students who appear to have no constructive suggestions. Howard Mumford Jones (1966) states:

But the student by becoming a student has lost something and gained something. He has lost the opportunity of embracing anarchy, and he has gained the more durable possibility of becoming a mature citizen to both the political republic and the republic of learning [p. 182].

A mature student must responsibly develop a sophisticated taste for the quality of living, learn to feel compassion, and recognize that within the growth of freedom is the growth of personal and societal responsibility. At the same time administrators and the rest of the academic community must not generalize the activism of students automatically with the categories of irresponsibility, nihilism, or immaturity. They, too, must responsibly look at the issues and causes of student discontent. “We are free not because of what we statistically are, but in so far as we are becoming different from what we have been” (Dewey, 1965). The student must be viewed in a state of “becoming”—literary, scientific, humanistic, and responsible.

The growth of freedom and responsibility can occur on the campus. However, there is no predetermined formula that guarantees success, for too many variables are involved. Jacob, in his study of student values, points out that the particular potency of some colleges is evident in their intellectual, cultural, and moral climate.

What is expected is not the same. It may be outstanding intellectual initiative and drive, profound respect for the dignity and worth of work, world-mindedness or just open-mindedness, a sense of community responsibility or of social justice, a dedication to humanitarian service, or religious faithfulness. Everyone, however, is conscious of the mission to which the institution stands dedicated, though this is not necessarily loudly trumpeted at every convocation, nor elaborated in fulsome paragraphs of aims and purposes in the college bulletin [Jacob, 1957, p. 9].

The institution must promote infinite opportunities for association among students within the intellectual
environment of the university, and, at the same time, assure that the resulting benefits will not interfere with the institution's educational responsibility. Whereas the extracurricular experiences of the student have historically been considered an appendage to the educational process, the current campus situation demands that this assumption be reexamined. The value of extracurricular activities will vary from campus to campus, activity to activity, group to group. There can be no guarantee that a certain activity will have an educational value; but, for that matter, can there be a guarantee that any link in the formal, traditional, educational process will be educational?

Many of the studies in this area of freedom and responsibility are incomplete and inconsistent. Part of the resulting ambiguity stems from the complexity of activism; some, from misunderstanding basic facts. Most studies prefer the status quo approach toward activism, claiming that it is not the administrator's function to determine a philosophical approach in this area; others ignore the problem completely. Thus, in this area the education of administrators is very much in order. A 1965 study written during the swell of protest begins by maintaining: "One of the distinctive characteristics of American education is the emphasis on nonclassroom activities." The remainder of the study neither mentions nor discusses activism (Frederick, 1965). Other studies have emphasized the role of college environment (Wright, 1966). Several philosophical assumptions are involved that can be useful to the administrator. The learning environment becomes the major factor in motivating students to educate themselves. The richer and more stimulating the learning environment, the greater the student motivation and, therefore, the greater the learning. Institutional expectations determine, to a degree, the character and atmosphere of the environment. Thus there are ways by which the environment can be developed. "The key factor that breathes life into a learning environment is student involvement" (Wright, 1966).

Today we are witnessing a time when "old concepts of faculty-student relations, of research, of faculty-administration roles are being changed at a rate without parallel" (Kerr, 1966). It is estimated that by 1975, more than two-thirds of full-time students will be enrolled in publicly controlled institutions (Hungate, 1964). The multiversity grows and with this insistent growth the need for changes becomes apparent. Administrators must project student needs into the future in order to assure student growth within an environment of freedom and responsibility. Examination of standards, policies, and individual philosophical approaches is necessary. As the multiversity grows, the administrator cannot remain static and provincial. The idea of a multiversity affects more than merely the student: "a city of infinite variety. Some get lost in the city; some rise to the top within it; most fash-
areas such as the college, the community, and the educational process; basic principles of freedom of expression, freedom from discrimination, and government by law; student government; student clubs; student publications; regulations concerning student life and discipline; students as private citizens; and student records ("Statement on the Academic Freedom of Students," 1965). Administrators must be familiar with these documents, for the basic changes in students' rights during the past few years have been predicted in these statements. Specific proposals are outlined for the handling of student groups such as the activists. These suggestions do not assume that student rights and proper academic freedom are absent. However, as both the Peterson study on student protest and the Williamson-Cowan study on academic freedom indicate: Inconsistency in terms of student freedom is evident in both on- and off-campus activity at many institutions.

Understanding Activism

Misunderstanding and confusion about the components of activism can result in embarrassing situations for the administrator and the academic community. The display of emotionalism, arrogance, and disrespect by administrators will only intensify delicate situations. Political and social areas traditionally have not been the administrator's forte. Some administrators who have served an institution distinctively, after shrewdly confronting many student problems, have been baffled and ineffective in dealing with student dissidence. Although controversial issues have been accepted traditionally in many classrooms, administrators are not able to handle current controversial extracurricular problems with traditional machinery. Thus, new approaches and policies and, in many cases, new administrators are needed. For strong advocates of the status quo who begin on a defensive note in confronting activists, this task is not easy.

Administrators are no longer able to rule the roost by issuing memorandums which dictate policy. Simplistic solutions to institutional situations of unrest, based on stereotypes and myths created by the mass media, will only heighten the problems. As many seasoned administrators have discovered in the past several years, attempts at concluding an incident with a resounding tone of finality often simply refresh the student forces and, increasingly, those of the faculty for the next round. Policy-making and university governance must include all components of the academic community. Administrators who resist or reject this principle, either visibly or silently, should be quietly removed from positions in which they work daily with students and faculty. At no time in the history of American higher education has the need for talented administrators been greater than at the present.

Institutions must clean house, so to speak, of administrative officers who are unable to cope with the issues and situations that are commonplace today. Institutions must strive to strengthen their administrative staffs and student services with well-qualified individuals and be willing to offer the salaries and benefits that will attract the desired people. Traditional policies of promoting academic staff to administrative positions after years of distinguished service or because a tenured professor is no longer desired in a department must be questioned.

Students have become conscious of their own power.

They read the educational literature; they quote the reformers and invite them to their campuses; they take seminars on student life and university problems; they know that reforms are possible and feel that the colleges have been letting them down. Above all, they have experienced success in making their presence felt and in extracting concessions [Katz and Sanford, 1966, p. 397].

Nor should administrators find "student power" an undesirable situation. Numerous institutions such as Antioch, Bennington, and Oberlin have lived happily with student involvement for some time. Neglect of student personnel services such as counseling, psychiatric treatment, and residence halls cannot continue. Several of the Ivy League schools and other distinguished universities might look at the ways in which state universities such as The Pennsylvania State University, Indiana University, University of Minnesota, and Michigan State University have dealt with residence-hall programs, disciplinary procedures, and counseling needs. As the events of the past several years indicate, many students are hard to deceive—at least, many of the more perceptive and verbal students. They are quick to note the flaws in the educational process on their campus. They spot administrators who are inept and vulnerable, and they criticize administrative mistakes. By hastily generalizing a situation and then proceeding with decision-making, administrators display a lack of perspective in understanding the situation.

Creating standards for accepted campus behavior is not an easy task. How does one create rules applicable to the diversified student body found on today's campus? It is difficult if not impossible to discover a consensus in society in terms of values and rules for accepted behavior. The administrator can no longer turn to the home for a "public philosophy." The place of the philosophical approach of in loco parentis in dealing with students is a highly controversial topic, and, in an ever-increasing number of institutions, a dodo bird, a thing of the past.

As the academic world struggles to define proper "student behavior," the administrator is expected to carry out his duties, faced on all sides by conflicting
and diversified demands of the students, parents, trustees, alumni, and society. Traditionally the college years have been the time for establishing values, a "testing experience" which inevitably results in the clash of the young and the old. The administrator is ensnared in difficulties as he administers and structures the policies which control student association—informally and formally. How loud should the "clash" be?

The formulae for dealing with activism vary. At one extreme is arbitrary administration of power. At the time of the Berkeley turmoil, Max Rafferty suggested that 500 students who had belonged to the discontented faction be dismissed (Bart, 1966). It still remains to be seen how the approaches—or at least the approaches presented by the mass media—of S. I. Hayakawa at San Francisco State and Governor Ronald Reagan in California, will affect particular institutions and the California State University system.

On the other hand, many advocate persuasion rather than coercion. E. G. Williamson (1966) states:

We have 384 student organizations. We hope that they represent all possible legal positions in the political or social action spectrum. My personal position has been to bring ideas out into the open, to recognize all student activists, to work with them to educate other students in the big issues that should bother students. We coax left wing groups to come on campus rather than drive them underground.

Recognizing Activism

The process of recognition of certain activist groups can be controversial for the academic community. For some institutions, to maintain a principle of freedom is an accepted goal; to recognize the SDS is another matter. Most institutions have a board of review which examines requests for recognition of student groups. By doing this the administrator can do much to structure the tenor of activism on his campus or to drive the movement underground.

Requirements range from the mere submission of the group's constitution to elaborate rules. The following are criteria used by administrators of various institutions:

1. Enrollment: "If the group requests services from the college, the use of college buildings, or the right to use the name Oberlin College as part of its title, or other college services, it must apply for enrollment as a student organization" (Oberlin College Handbook).
2. Temporary participation: While the petition is being judged, only meetings specifically approved may be held.
3. Copies of the proposed constitution.
4. Minimal number of group membership.
5. Adviser.
6. List of the members: This area continues to be of concern to government groups and other external groups.

After being approached by the FBI and asked for the names of current SDS members, Dean Stanley Izerd of Wesleyan replied: "It's unfortunate that a climate of suspicion can be created by such activities that might lead some students to be more circumspect than the situation requires. Things like this can be a danger to a free and open community if men change their behavior because of it—we consider the student's activity his own affair" (Izerd, 1966).

7. Restrictive clauses: "No petitioning organization with restrictive membership clauses regarding race, religion, or creed shall be granted recognition, provided that special consideration will be given to the merits of bona fide religious groups not founded for the purpose of religious discrimination" (Penn State Guide to University Regulations).
8. Academic conflict: Assurance that the activities of the organization will not unduly interfere with the primary educational pursuits of student members.
9. Active subversion: "No subversive activities against the government of the United States or the state or advocacy of the overthrow of these governments by force" (Penn State Guide to University Regulations).
10. Evidence of financial responsibility.
11. National affiliation: "Groups desiring status as local chapters of national groups must also include information regarding the purposes and activities of the national group with which they desire to affiliate" (Oberlin Handbook).
12. Interference with the educational role of the institution: "Students and groups shall refrain from conduct which significantly interferes with University teaching, research, administration, or the University's subsidiary responsibilities ... and from disorderly conduct on University premises or at University-related events" (Berkeley Handbook).
14. Limitation of active membership to students and academic administrative staff.
15. Status of the executive body of the group.
16. Participation: "The extent to which the group participates in campus affairs that are designed primarily for student organizations" (Minnesota Handbook).
17. Duplication: "That the organization not duplicate the purpose and functions of a previously registered organization unless need for such a duplication be shown" (Indiana Handbook).

Toward a New Philosophy

There is extensive literature concerning theoretical schools of administration: classical, human relations, and structural. Each school has contributed to some degree an understanding of what constitutes administration. However, several points of emphasis found in the human relations school have direct bearing on the administrator's approach to today's activism. Administrative support of individual creativity or innovation has rarely been eminent in the history of American education:

At the mundane level of jobs, administrative realism points out that a large part of the work that needs to be
done in any modern organization is best done through rational programming of individuals able and willing to carry through the program. The individual who will follow direction, who will make decisions according to program rules is to be preferred over the one who attempts to be innovative or creative. . . . It seems likely that an emphasis on administrative support of creative behavior moves us to another form of the inescapable dilemma of individual versus organization. In addition to confronting the conflicts of individual needs and/or organization goals, an administrator would inevitably contend with the consequence of creative behavior in the form of increased variety and unpredictability versus organizational equilibrium [Dewey, quoted in Ohm and Monahan, 1965, p. 105].

Most of the cries for reform by the activists demand innovation. An administrator who is an extreme skeptic will greet and accept every issue and demand with skepticism.

Another kind of administrator is only concerned with functioning as one who facilitates an establishment with minimum disturbances; skepticism gives way to an operation that might sometimes be characterized as over-libido, falling in with the prevailing tide and letting it lead him where it will, maintaining through it all a calm rationalization that his job is to "keep the store" [Dewey, quoted in Ohm and Monahan, 1965, p. viii].

Somewhere between the extremes is the administrator who believes in his power and ability to achieve something worthwhile, lives with the anomalies of policymaking and policy execution, and "who tries midst much evidence to the contrary to continue to feel that man is good and worthy of respect" (Dewey, 1965).

When facing the student activists, the administrator must remember that it is for these students as well as the rest of the students that he administers. He does not select the students who enter the institution unless he is an admissions officer. He must attempt to relate to all segments of the academic community. "Efficiency is good only so far as it does not override the human values of personhood" (Dewey, 1965). The question of freedom that warrants consideration in any discussion of activism involves both students and administrators. Concepts of growth and becoming are just as applicable to the administrator as to the maturing student. Lloyd P. Williams states:

For the administrator to be free, he must have a good general education, be trained in the technical skills of his craft, and he must work in a social-educational milieu which permits him to the fullest degree of his understanding and ability to expedite the learning process for his staff and for their students [Williams, 1965, p. 26].

The administrator must be flexible and agreeable to change. The stereotype of the administrator who is thoroughly indoctrinated with the status quo, busily absorbed in making power charts, hopelessly out of contact with student needs, and mechanically producing memos may or may not have validity. Somewhere in the administrative process is the fundamental fact that the student is an individual. For some administrators, the student is to be approached as the it of Martin Buber's I-it relationship rather than as a thou in an I-thou relationship. Students as they can be found on a chart somewhere. Students as thou cannot.

The plea by students to be treated as individuals appears to be so obvious that it need only be mentioned. A distortion of Dewey's pragmatism or administrative approaches that treat students categorically often leads to a denial of an opportunity for the process of growth which is what education is all about. When the laws of administrative expediency take precedence, the student as a human being involved in an educational process becomes an item of secondary concern. "You can't substitute memos and bulletins for the courtesy of a dialogue and an explanation" (Murphy, 1966).

Many people have suggested approaches to the problems resulting from militancy and other extreme forms of activism. To combine speculation and common sense with findings from social psychology appears to be a logical starting point. Moreover, it is imperative that activism be understood in all its facets. The journalistic stereotype of the extreme, destructive, and bearded nihilist is not an adequate base upon which to build policies and personal approaches to the entire movement. Moreover, it is necessary for the administrator to understand the student in all of his activities—classroom and extracurricular—to understand what it means to be a student.

We need considerably more knowledge of the details of the student's academic and nonacademic life and of their feelings about and attitudes toward their situation. . . . Knowledge can also be gained by having those who are in especially strategic positions devote an important part of their time to detailed listening to what students have to say [Katz and Sanford, 1966, p. 397].

Continual consultation with students is necessary in the development and review of policies. Administrators must attempt to sense the attitudes and orientation of the activists in all of their activities and base their educational policies on this information.

Some administrators need a clearer and more logical perspective of what is really going on behind the scene. An administrator needs to be cognizant of the extent of his personal influence, for some do not realize that much of the students' behavior that he wishes to control cannot be controlled. Certain areas in student behavior such as drinking, sexual practices, and off-campus behavior cannot be controlled, and administrators might as well direct their energies elsewhere. Although administrators are very much involved in the educational process which includes moral growth, they must acknowledge their limitations.
Katz and Sanford (1966), who have completed many studies of students at Stanford and Berkeley, suggest that the administrators should focus on what they can do: “that is to fulfill an important educational function by providing more facilities for advice and discussion in these crucial areas.” Katz and Sanford also discuss the preoccupation of some administrators with deviant behavior, noting that too many rules and policies are made with deviant behavior in mind.

Many deans seem to have an exaggerated conception of the amount of deviance that would result once rules were relaxed. Our own research, as well as that of others, has shown that, in the matter of sex, for instance, students exercise a high degree of responsibility [p. 399].

Firmness is necessary in dealing with students who have not learned to accept authority. At the same time, administrators must be careful not to attribute the behavior of the destructive agitator to the entire movement. The individual needs and the consequent growth involved varies from student to student. In dealing with some activists, patience may be a better approach than mere execution of power. Emotionalism and persistent pressures must not overcome rational dialogue. As Roger Heyns (1965) stated in the midst of a Berkeley incident: “We have no intention of accepting a pattern of granting general immunity to all violators of student rules merely because the situation gets confused or passions get aroused.” In addition, as social-psychological studies indicate, the administrator must provide democratic rather than directive leadership. Furthermore, it is not his role in itself that is effective, but the manner in which the administrator interacts with the students. He must be a symbol of creativity who proposes new approaches to old structures, deviates from routines, and values creative effort. “Creativity, in short,” suggests Theodore Brameld (1965), “becomes one important gauge of his own right to leadership at all.” The administrator must foster a climate in which ideas are believed to be important in and of themselves. For, as Jacqueline Grennan (1967), now President of Hunter College, said: “We ought to create the kind of tension that forces students to ask hard questions. Nobody’s answers are any better than his questions.”

A basic premise in social psychology maintains that role conflict and ambiguity increase more or less directly with the size of the organization. Many institutions have attempted to minimize the requirements for coordination between groups. Attempts have been made so that the student’s personal and social life is inseparable from his academic life. The University of California at Santa Cruz and San Diego have small undergraduate colleges planned. Stephens College has a house plan in which 100 students and 5 faculty members pursue a common curriculum while living together. Administrators must attempt to structure the institutional environment to suit the students’ needs. Many administrators have difficulty in determining how the educational process can be integrated into extracurricular activity. An elaborate system of interest dormitories may sound spectacular to the student personnel worker in terms of personal-social needs and “identification purpose”; but, increasingly, “identification” becomes a psychological excuse for extracurricular programs which actually move farther away from the classroom. Residence halls must be more than administrative conveniences that provide only “room and board.” Conditions must be provided in which leisure is enjoyed and academic responsibility respected and furthered. Institutions should expand their psychiatric and counseling services. “Such an arrangement is beneficial not only to the students involved, but also provides the college with a group of people who have special professional competence to represent the students’ points of view” (Katz and Sanford, 1966).

It is necessary for institutions to examine all student services to see if they are serving the needs of the students. Moreover, it is imperative that the entire role of extracurricular activities be reexamined. Perhaps many of the adolescent preoccupations of the nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century college life are no longer relevant to today’s students or integral to the educational process.

The administrator must realize that nonclassroom activities can promote a living intercourse among the disciplines and bring together the students, the faculty, and the administration and build bridges between the arts and the sciences, between the recreational and the academic, between the intellectual and the spiritual [Boling, 1966].

Seminars and dialogues, welcoming expression of discontent and criticism, should regularly be held for and by students, professors, and administrators. Continuous examination of educational goals, university policies, and institutional complexity must include all members of the academic community: “In the last eighteen months one central fact emerged, namely, that students have arrived as a new power, a fourth estate which is taking its place beside the traditional estates of faculty, administration, and trustees” (Katz and Sanford, 1966). Rearticulation of the basic purposes, philosophy, standards, and values of the institution is necessary.

Even more significant is the realization and actualization of educational theories in an academic community. Administrators must pay more than lip service to concepts of change and complexity by transferring philosophies of education into their everyday relations with students. It is a truism that change occurs
slowly at institutions. Consequently there is increased need for administrators to sharpen every necessary bureaucratic process so that needed change will not become smothered in the status quo or the inoperable, time-consuming channels.

In dealing with the minute segment of activists who are nihilistic and irrational in their demands, E. G. Williamson maintains that the arbitrary exercise of charter authority reinforces the student's resistance to authority. Unquestionably the administrator must be firm and must act quickly in volatile situations.

There is no substitute for benign patience on the part of those assigned authority, as they seek to exercise every opportunity of personal relationship to raise philosophical questions, as a means of aiding the students to think about the implications and complications and consequences of unilateral employment of their own concept of unlimited freedom [Williamson, 1965, p. 37].

Being accessible to students is essential. Roger Heyns, after assuming his Berkeley position, spent approximately 80 percent of his time working on student political affairs. Andrew W. Gordier, President of Columbia, spent innumerable hours with students and faculty opening up the channels of communication which are a prerequisite for the effective operation of any institution. Underlying all these suggestions for dealing with activism is the persistent demand and necessity for reexamination and reevaluation. "More important than any single policy decision that we might take is the strengthening of our capacity to reconsider established policies in the light of changing facts and circumstances" (Hechinger, 1966).

Summary

Student activism is very much a part of today's collegiate life. The administrator faces a wide variety of student behavior. He must attempt to work effectively with the activists in order that the movement can become an effective part of the educational system. Understanding the causes and implications of activism is but the beginning for dealing with activism. Generalizations concerning the extreme verbal activists who intrigue the mass media must not be applied to the entire movement. Assuming a philosophical stance and creating a structure for dealing with activism before a crisis emerges is a logical step forgotten by some administrators who awkwardly stumble from crisis to crisis. The complete impact of the activist movement cannot yet be ascertained. But without a doubt the movement must be recognized today as a significant factor on the American campus and in our society:

Despite its shortcomings and failures, the new student generation has made a more substantial impact on its environment and on American higher education than any group of students since the volatile 1960's. Professors and administrators may not always approve of the tactics or goals of the new student movement, but they cannot overlook the new trends on the campus. If the generational and political gaps between administrator, teacher, and student can be bridged, a vital source of energy as well as insight into important educational and social issues may be constructively used [Altbach, 1966].

The question remains how to bridge the gap. Within the implications of this question, the administrator who faces student activism can and must contribute to the definition of American higher education. The philosophical implications of the activist movement cannot and must not be oversimplified. An administrator cannot ignore their existence. Writing off student activism with sweeping generalizations concerning the student such as "immature," "rebellious," or "statistically insignificant" reveals an embarrassing ignorance on behalf of the administrator. What are these activists saying? What contributions do the activists have for the educational process? To deny the movement of any educational significance reflects the inability of the administrator to perceive the ever-changing role of the student in the continual growth of an ever-changing campus in an ever-changing society. As a member of the academic community, the administrator should welcome the chance to contribute toward molding educational experiences.
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