

William & Mary Law Review

Volume 11 (1969-1970)
Issue 3

Article 6

March 1970

Campus Unrest: Illusion and Reality

Francis B. Smith

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr>



Part of the [Civil Rights and Discrimination Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Francis B. Smith, *Campus Unrest: Illusion and Reality*, 11 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 619 (1970),
<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr/vol11/iss3/6>

Copyright c 1970 by the authors. This article is brought to you by the William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository.

<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr>

CAMPUS UNREST: ILLUSION AND REALITY

FRANCIS B. SMITH*

While not characteristic of earlier decades, student protest activities in the 1960's were dissimilar to anything our society has ever experienced. They differed so completely in origin, nature, intent, and message that the comprehension gap between parents and their college-student offspring has reached a new high. Whether right or wrong, whether divinely inspired or tragically misled, students are dedicated and determined in their efforts to force major change, and the nation's understanding of, and reaction to, their behavior will have serious and far-reaching national consequence. It therefore is most important to avoid illusion and recognize the realities of student unrest.

In late summer of 1969 it was believed that the level of campus disturbance had peaked during academic 1968-69 and that universities would be peaceful in 1969-70. This illusion was promptly shattered on September 17, 1969, when over 100 persons were arrested at the University of Michigan following disruption of ROTC classes and a demonstration against establishment of a university-managed, rather than a student-managed, bookstore. At Cornell students protested the presence on the campus of a Marine Corps recruiting team. At Harvard two deans were harassed and another held captive several hours by students who demanded that the University pay higher wages to Black painters. At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology 300 pickets attempting to bar entrance to M.I.T.'s Instrumentation Laboratory had to be driven off by police using tear gas and dogs. Vassar, Boston University, and the Universities of Wisconsin, Notre Dame, Hawaii, Washington, and Texas, among others, also have had demonstrations during the 1969-70 school term.

RECENT CAMPUS UNREST

One of the first campus protests to attract national attention was the University of California at Berkeley "free speech" demonstration in

*B.E.E., University of South Carolina, 1943. Mr. Smith is currently the Assistant Administrator for University Affairs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and is responsible for the agency's dealings with approximately two hundred domestic and foreign universities.

1964. At that time, however, most casual observers dismissed these demonstrations as confusing and peculiar to the Berkeley campus rather than as the first stirrings of nation-wide student rebellion.

The violent and unexpected clash at Columbia University in 1968 might be viewed as the starting point of the current wave of campus demonstrations, confrontations, and riots which have occurred at universities across the country on frequent occasions since that time. At Columbia, on April 23, 1968, about 200 students forcibly occupied several buildings, rifled files and papers and destroyed furniture in the office of Columbia's President. The dissidents protested the construction of a university gymnasium on land previously used as a public park and demanded that the university stop work on military projects for the Department of Defense's Institute of Defense Analysis (IDA). After several days police were called in to remove students from the university buildings. Following the demonstrations the university abandoned construction of the gymnasium and the President resigned.

Meanwhile, at Stanford University students and faculty protesting classified work undertaken by Stanford Research Institute (SRI) forced the university to sever its business and legal ties with SRI and to stop all classified research on the university's main campus.

At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology student and faculty protests initially took the form of the widely publicized "March 4th Strike" during which those who participated stopped government-sponsored research and attended lectures on various subjects related to American involvement in Viet Nam, university research on weapons systems, and the relationship of science and technology to human values. Discontent focused on the research being done by M.I.T.'s Instrumentation Laboratory and Lincoln Laboratories for the Department of Defense. The protestors, including some faculty members, felt that secret research on weapons systems, such as the Navy's Poseidon missile, had no legitimate place on a university campus and that the talents of the Institute's Instrumentation Laboratory should be redirected toward solution of urban and social problems.¹

In May, 1969 an estimated 15,000 students at Berkeley were involved in a protest which erupted when police and the National Guard

1. The protests led to the resignation of Dr. Stark Draper as head of the M.I.T. Instrumentation Laboratory. Dr. Draper, the country's leading expert on inertial guidance systems, has played a major role in the development of ICBM weapons guidance systems and of navigational instruments and techniques our astronauts used to land on and return from the moon.

were called in to quell attempts of a group of students to force the use of a portion of university land for a "people's park." More than 2500 National Guard troops were used to stop the demonstration and about a thousand demonstrators were arrested.

Conditions on many campuses grew so intense that several university presidents, including Douglas Knight of Duke, Buell Gallagher of the City College of New York, Ray Heffner of Brown, and James A. Perkins of Cornell, resigned rather than continue to deal with what they considered unmanageable situations.²

According to Bayer and Astin of the American Council on Education³ nearly one-fourth of the 2300 colleges and universities in the United States experienced "disruptive protests" during the 1968-69 academic year. One hundred forty-five of these institutions experienced at least one incident of "violent" protest involving activities such as the wrecking of buildings or furniture, destruction of records, or personal injury.

STUDENT DISSATISFACTION WITH UNIVERSITIES

The question must be asked: What is wrong with the colleges and universities in the United States that allows an atmosphere to exist which is conducive to violent protest? The primary business of most American universities before World War II was the education of students, but today many universities, rapidly expanding into more diverse activities, have allowed their larger spectrum of interests to overshadow attention given to undergraduate students. Too many universities are no longer student-oriented but instead are research-oriented, publication-oriented, and advice-to-business-and-government oriented. Typically a professor's status and advancement depend more upon the number of books and papers he publishes and upon the outside financial support he attracts than upon his effectiveness as a teacher. The situation in the "best" universities is that a faculty member who does good research in his discipline, attracts research grants from government and foundations, and publishes learned scientific papers is assured of tenure and higher pay, but the professor who subordinates his research and writing to teaching and dealing with students is almost equally assured of having to seek another position. Another facet of the dilemma is that a professor who does not do enough research will have difficulty keeping abreast of new

2. Wentworth, *Universities Reel into New Paths*, Washington Post, June 8, 1969, at B1, cols. 6-7.

3. Bayer & Astin, *Campus Disruption During 1968-1969*, 4 AM. COUNCIL ON EDUCATION RESEARCH REP. (1969).

developments in his field. He is likely to grow stale and become an ineffective teacher. To be outstanding, a professor must be a good researcher, a good writer, *and* a good teacher—a rare combination.

The university's primary mission is education, but high quality education is heavily dependent upon research, especially at the graduate level. Any university which expects to become or continue as a first-class institution must allow its professors to participate directly in research where new knowledge is being discovered. Some say that the best graduate training in science and technology *is* research. Since much of the most advanced scientific and technical work in the United States is now being supported by the federal government, universities quite naturally do research for and with federal agencies.

If not wisely administered, government-sponsored research can lead university researchers to spend too much time on problems primarily of interest to themselves and the government but not necessarily in the best long-range interest of the university. It is possible, however, for federal agencies to support university research in a way which provides professors with ample opportunity for essential participation in advanced research and, at the same time, ensures that the universities will be aided rather than hindered in meeting their primary educational goals. For example, NASA seeks to avoid accentuating the research-teaching dichotomy. It tries to ensure that universities which deal with NASA will be strengthened as educational institutions rather than exploited. To the extent possible, NASA research grants are awarded for work to be done on campus where teaching faculty and students are involved, and not for the type of research which removes the researcher from his campus and his students for long periods of time. NASA also tries to discourage the growth of university sponsored research centers or institutes which employ large numbers of nonteaching professionals who function largely outside the academic mainstream of the university. When it is necessary to work with these institutes, NASA encourages and provides funds for the involvement of teaching faculty and students.

Another problem is that university curricula and organization are matched more to the specialized interests of faculty members rather than to what students need to learn to become well adjusted, responsible citizens capable of dealing with the complex multifaceted problems confronting society today. Modern universities are so compartmentalized, so specialized, that it is difficult for a student to find a professor who can give him much insight into the combination of complex social-tech-

nological problems plaguing our rapidly changing society. The typical professor has little understanding of or interest in problems outside his own field of expertise.

By contrast, the early Greek academies were communities of scholars seeking a better understanding of man as well as nature. There was no sharp separation of their studies into what is now known as the physical sciences and the social sciences and humanities. The early philosophers did not consider the understanding of nature (science) as a subject to be pursued independently of their efforts to understand man, his spiritual and intellectual development, and the meaning of life. Just within the past half century, however, the sheer volume of knowledge and the difficulty of becoming an expert in more than one or two subjects has naturally led to specialization and to almost total separation in the universities of the physical sciences from the social sciences and humanities. The university's rigid adherence to disciplinary organization and curricular and consequent failure to give students a better understanding of the relevance and importance of subjects outside their own disciplines could be responsible for a portion of the students' legitimate discontent and represents a serious weakness of modern universities.

Furthermore, our most complex problems such as urban and racial strife, environmental pollution, transportation developments, and arms control, are all multidisciplinary and multifaceted. They are macroscopic rather than microscopic. They are challenges of such breadth, scope, and complexity that they cannot be dealt with by any one professional or scientific discipline. Society can no longer contemplate "breakthroughs" made by individuals or even by groups of individuals within any one discipline who suddenly provide the "answers" to these problems. They are not just engineering problems, just sociological problems, or just political problems: they are most difficult combinations of all of these.

The nation today needs people competent to deal with macroscopic, multidisciplinary problems, and there are many capable young people in universities eager and enthusiastic to tackle them. These students are seeking an interdisciplinary technical-liberal education that will prepare them to deal with pressing "real-world" problems, but universities do not normally offer courses, give faculty promotions, or grant degrees, especially at the graduate level, for work which cuts across several departments, even though the competence, ingenuity and creativeness of the student are not questioned.

One must be aware of the difficulties in educating generalists and of the dangers of turning out graduates who have a little knowledge of many subjects and are expert in none, but universities still must compromise on their traditional adherence to highly specialized schools and curricula to provide better educational opportunities for students and faculty whose interests are broader than those of any single university department.

A paradoxical note is that these conditions and others which students frequently protest, are those established and maintained by the faculties, not by university presidents and governing boards. A fact of university life little appreciated either by people outside of universities or by students is that presidents and governing boards do not control the curricula, the teaching methods, and the research activities that constitute the academic environment of universities. Control over these matters is a jealously guarded prerogative of the faculty.

DISSATISFACTION WITH THE "ESTABLISHMENT"

Students are upset not only by the injustices and inequities of university administration but also by analogous problems which also exist in our mass society. They attack the university partly because it is the closest segment of the "establishment" and the one most vulnerable to their attack. Robert S. Morison stated:

The students tend to identify the university with everything they dislike about modern society—its elaborate and "suppressive" regulations, its indifference to moral and esthetic values, its preoccupation with bits and pieces of life to the exclusion of overall purpose or meaning.⁴

While Viet Nam is a major source of campus insecurity, another source of campus unrest is the civil rights and race problem which besets the whole country outside as well as inside the university. For example, according to Bayer and Astin⁵ the most prevalent specific issue on 96 of the 145 campuses that experienced violent protests was the creation of special educational programs for disadvantaged minority groups. White campus activists from time to time champion various Black demands for changes such as Black studies, integrated dormitories, better Black employment opportunities, or higher proportions of Black

4. Morison, *The University and Student Dissent*, 163 SCIENCE 1013 (1969).

5. Bayer & Astin, *supra* note 3.

students. For the most part, however, Black student unrest is separate and distinct from other student protests. In most instances Blacks apparently prefer to support their own causes independently.

Congressman Brock of Tennessee drafted one of the most concise catalogs of the causes for student unrest. He and twenty-one other congressmen visited more than fifty universities and colleges and talked to students, faculty, and administrators to gain a better understanding of what was happening on university campuses. The congressmen's report to the President⁶ listed the factors on unrest under two categories: *Internal*, or university-oriented problems, and *External*, or society-oriented problems.

Among internal factors identified by the congressmen were poor communication between students and faculty, lack of responsiveness to students' needs by university administration and faculty, student intolerance, hypocrisy, the universities' lack of relevance, and Black-White campus problems. Among the external factors were the Viet Nam War, the draft, racism, the military-industrial complex, poverty and hunger, the role of the United States relative to Viet Nam, Formosa, and Latin America, economic oppression, misplaced priorities, materialism, and superficial mass media coverage.

CONGRESSIONAL REACTION TO STUDENT UNREST

Many congressmen were determined when they returned to Washington in early 1969 that federal legislation was needed to help universities control rioting students. They felt that since university presidents seemed to be unwilling or unable to discipline students on their own campuses the Congress should pass laws which would assist them or, to some extent, *force* them to deal more firmly with student radicals. The House Special Subcommittee on Education, chaired by Congresswoman Edith Green of Oregon, made the most significant attempt to apply federal pressure to curb protesting students.

The proposed Higher Education Protection and Freedom of Expression Act of 1969,⁷ more commonly known as the Green Bill, would have required that each institution of higher education expecting to receive federal financial support file with the United States Commissioner of Education a certification of its rules and regulations covering ". . . con-

6. Brock, *Report of the Brock Campus Tour*, 115 CONG. REC. E5237 (daily ed. June 25, 1969).

7. H.R. 11941, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969).

duct of students and faculty, and other university employees and the maintenance of public order”⁸ The bill also specified that the certification should “clearly set forth a table of penalties for violations of such rules and regulations.”⁹ It also provided that any university student, faculty member, or employee who refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of the university or who seriously disrupted the administration of the university should be denied any further financial assistance or payment derived from federally financed grants or contracts. The bill originally specified that such aid be withheld for periods up to five years, not only by the institution where the offense occurred, but also by any other institution with which the offender might subsequently become associated.

There were strong convictions both for and against the Green Bill. Those who supported it felt that the situation on university campuses was out of hand, that protesting students should be dealt with quickly and firmly, that university administrators were unable or unwilling to cope with the problem, and that as a minimum the federal government should not aid those who were bent on destroying the system which supported them. Those who opposed the legislation felt that universities and colleges were better able to deal with their own problems, that passage of a legislation would play into the hands of the more radical students and precipitate even more rioting and violence, and that it represented an unwise step in the direction of federal government control of universities.

The twenty-two congressmen under Congressman Brock of Tennessee reported on this subject to the President on June 17, 1969. They stated that they did not consider violence in any form or in any measure or under any circumstances to be a legitimate means of protest or mode of expression, but

[a]ny action by the Congress or others which would, for example, penalize innocent and guilty alike by cutting off all aid to any institution which has experienced difficulty would only serve to confirm the cry of the revolutionaries and compound the problem for each university. This holds also for any action which would establish mediation or conciliation on the part of the Federal government. In our opinion, the fundamental responsibility for order and conduct on the campus lies with the university community.¹⁰

8. *Id.* § 102(a)(2).

9. *Id.* § 102(a)(2)(D).

10. Brock, *supra* note 6, at E5241.

Finally, after several weeks of discussion and revision the House Education and Labor Committee rejected the Green Bill by a vote of 18 to 17.

The Administration also opposed harsh legislation which would place the federal government in the position of an overseer or enforcer of rules for the conduct of students, faculty, or other university employees. In a letter to Republican congressional leaders July 17, 1969, Attorney General Mitchell and Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch, after indicating that the President had requested them to give the views of the Administration with regard to such legislation, said,

We realize that Congress is rightly concerned with the situation on college and university campuses. Violence and intimidation must not be permitted to undermine the university institution. In our studied judgment, however, such legislation would be counter-productive, and would seriously jeopardize the relationship between the academic community and the Federal government which has been of such inestimable benefit to our society. We strongly feel that the threatened cutoff of institutional funds is an entirely inappropriate way of dealing with a serious problem. More specifically, we feel:

First, forcing institutions to submit or certify that they have developed such policies and plans dealing with campus disorders would imply a Federal standard by which their policies and plans would be judged. The Federal government must not be placed in the role of enforcer or overseer of rules and regulations for the conduct of students, faculty, and other university employees.

Second, the administrative independence of colleges and universities is an essential element of the academic freedom which this Nation always cherished for its institutions of higher education. Responsibility for the orderly maintenance of these institutions should not be preempted by any Federal agency.

Third, Federal legislation already exists which withdraws aid from students who engage in disruptive violent acts at college. To extend this cutoff to institutions would be beyond existing laws and punish the entire academic community—which is, after all, the victim, not the instigator, of violence.¹¹

Although the Green Bill did not become law, legislation restricting university protestors has been included in the authorization or appro-

11. Letter from Attorney General Mitchell and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Finch to Republican Congressional Leaders, July 17, 1969, in 18 *BULL. ON HIGHER EDUCATION & NAT'L AFFAIRS* 1 (July 18, 1969).

priation bills of most Federal agencies which deal extensively with universities. NASA's contractual relationships with universities are constrained by the following language:

Sec. 7. (a) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed after the date of enactment of this Act and which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education to prevent officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, and that such crime was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution with respect to which such crime was committed, then the institution which such individual attends, or is employed by, shall deny for a period of two years any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act. If an institution denies an individual assistance under the authority of the preceding sentence of this subsection, then any institution which such individual subsequently attends shall deny for the remainder of the two-year period any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(b) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution after the date of enactment of this Act, and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny, for a period of two years, any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.¹²

Similar provisions govern university grants and contracts awarded by

12. National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of Nov. 18, 1969, Pub. L. No. 91-153, § 706, 83 Stat. 403.

the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Interior, and National Science Foundation. Moreover, section 706 of the State, Justice and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act¹³ provides that no funds appropriated under the Act may be used to assist any person who has engaged in certain forms of coercive conduct at an institution of higher education. The institution is required to initiate appropriate proceedings in order to determine whether the provisions of this limitation are applicable. They are further required to certify their compliance with this provision to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at quarterly or semester intervals.

In a similar manner, the Curtis Amendment prohibits NASA from awarding grants to universities which bar armed forces recruiters from the campus. This provision, sponsored by Nebraska Senator Curtis, states that funds appropriated to NASA cannot be used

for grants to any nonprofit institution of higher learning unless the Administrator or his designee determines at the time of the grant that recruiting personnel of any of the Armed Forces of the United States are not being barred from the premises or property of such institution¹⁴

This provision could be very difficult for NASA and the universities to interpret and administer except for the words "at the time of the grant." Fortunately, it is not required that funds be withheld in those cases where demonstrating students have at some earlier date forced temporary closing of recruiting offices.

The House Armed Services Committee also proposed additional restrictions on grants or contracts awarded to universities by the Department of Defense (DOD). Section 402 of H.R. 14000 as originally drafted would have required DOD, before awarding a grant or a contract to a university to file a statement with the Congress ". . . summarizing the record of the school, college or university with regard to cooperation on military matters such as Reserve Officer Training Corps and military recruiting on its campus."¹⁵ The provision also specified that the statement should provide complete details as to the purposes, cost, and duration of the proposed project as well as other pending DOD research projects at the university. Those who objected to this provision

13. Act of Dec. 24, 1969, Pub. L. No. 91-153, § 706, 83 Stat. 403.

14. National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of Nov. 18, 1969, Pub. L. No. 91-119, § 1(h), 83 Stat. 196.

15. H.R. 14000, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. § 402 (1969).

felt that it would play into the hands of campus agitators who wish to remove ROTC from the campus or force university professors to stop doing research for the DOD. In the final DOD bill, Congress deleted the provision; however, the Senate House Conference Report on the bill stated:

the continued award of these defense research and development contracts to educational institutions which appear to be making a determined effort to either ignore or deter our national defense effort will be given very careful scrutiny by the House Committee on Armed Services during the coming year.¹⁶

SIX REALITIES

To understand and respond intelligently to what is happening on university campuses, it is first necessary to recognize several realities of the student protest movement. The first is that alienation and unrest are widespread. Though most students do not take part in the destructive acts of violence that generate sensational newspaper and television stories, thousands of them on campuses across the country are deeply dissatisfied and frustrated. The twenty-two Congressmen in their report to the President said: "We were alarmed to discover that this problem is far deeper and far more urgent than most realized, and that it goes far beyond the efforts of organized revolutionaries."¹⁷

A second reality is that most students are honestly and deeply concerned; they are not merely attempting to gain attention or shock their elders by various public protests. They are concerned about the inadequacies and the irresponsiveness of universities, about inequities and injustices in society, about unfairness and dishonesty in business, about duplicity and misadministration in government, all of which they feel have grown beyond acceptable limits as a result of the older generation's failure or refusal to properly react. To respond adequately to these thousands of moderate, concerned, but not-yet-unreasonable young people is a more important and difficult challenge than how to deal with the relatively few who are occupying buildings or locking deans in their offices.

A third reality is that most of the protest comes from social science and humanity students and faculty, and to some extent represents a re-

16. H.R. REP. NO. 91-607, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. 24 (1969).

17. Brock, *supra* note 6.

bellion on their part against science and technology. As Dr. Samuel B. Gould has said:

Campus protest today has as one major thrust an unexpressed desire to hold on to liberal education, although many protestors would be surprised to be told this and would undoubtedly deny it. The revolt is against scientism as much as against authority.

It is an effort of the non-scientist, who has been put in the shade now for at least the past two decades, to get back some of the spotlight. Campus agitators are rarely, if ever, students or faculty from the scientific disciplines; they tend to come out of the social sciences, which are relatively inexact in their researches, and the humanities, which are and should be preoccupied with unanswerable questions.¹⁸

A fourth reality, and perhaps the most sobering one, is that, although keenly perceptive in their views of injustice, most students have at best a shallow understanding of the complexities of society and government and offer almost no constructive ideas as to how conditions might be improved. If students earn A's for their sensitivity to injustices and for courage in speaking out, they get no better than C's for their understanding of the complexities and origins of these injustices, and surely F's for their ideas as to what to do about them.

Students seem mostly unaware of the intricate combination of historical, technical, economic and anthropologic forces and events of our past which shape our present and so strongly influence our future. Indeed, some of the more vocal ones apparently have never contemplated the vast difference between merely recognizing a bad situation and understanding its origin and nature in sufficient depth to propose changes needed to correct or improve it.

Students too easily assume that society, government, business, "the establishment," arbitrarily and deliberately maintain society in its imperfect state simply because its leaders prefer it that way; inequities could be corrected forthwith if the establishment only chose to do so! Students usually do not even formulate conceptions of what their ideal society would be like. The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development commenting on this aspect of the students' dead-ended attitude said: "Too many of our young are concerned by

18. Gould, *Lectures at Colgate University on "The Academic Condition,"* N.Y. Times, Sept. 23, 1969, at 30, cols. 4-5.

what they are *against*—the war, racism, poverty, corruption. They need, as have all youth in all times, to be for things, to have a star, a dream.”¹⁹

A fifth reality, one which has attracted the most attention, is that a relatively small number of students are bent on physical violence and destruction. Their actions on university campuses usually have the single purpose of revolution and destruction rather than remedial action. The targets chosen for their assault are not necessarily related to any legitimate complaint but are selected for maximum vulnerability and publicity. Typical of their type of activity was the senseless disruption of a group of M.I.T. alumni and their wives who had assembled to hear an address on “The Role of Nutritional Research in an Expanding World of Medicine” by Dr. Hamish M. Munro. In describing the demonstration Dr. Munro said:

At exactly eight o'clock, when I was now about halfway through my discourse, the doors burst open and some fifteen youths . . . [marched] in singing ‘Ho-Chi-Minh, Ho-Chi-Minh, the N.L.F. is going to win,’ and wound their way in single file round the tables, back again to the Speaker’s platform. At the urging of the Chairman, I tried to continue but this proved to be an impossible exercise. The alumni were obviously outraged and several of them rose from their seats and had to be separated from the intruders. For the next fifteen minutes, there were scattered arguments throughout the hall. I protested to the students that my topic was unrelated to the war, but they dismissed it as mere molecular biology. Then, as suddenly as they had come in, the group marched out again.²⁰

The radical nihilistic students apparently believe that simple destruction of present institutions and organizations will somehow magically lead to new utopian systems that will arise Phoenix-like from the ashes. They are unaware that even their ability and freedom to protest are almost totally derived from those very institutions they seek to destroy. Dr. Dwight Waldo, Albert Schweitzer Professor of Humanities at Syracuse University, has compared this attitude to an embryo which,

19. Haskew, *Leadership and the Educational Needs of the Nation*, in 1969-70 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES (1969).

20. Open Letter to Members of the Faculty of M.I.T. from Dr. Hamish M. Munro, Sept. 11, 1969, on file in office of the Assistant Administrator for University Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D. C.

not understanding the source of its existence, seeks to destroy the mother.²¹

The use of physical force to push acceptance of one's views over those of others is more out of place in a university than in any other institution, especially in view of the wide latitudes of freedom universities guarantee for non-violent expressions of divergent views. Physical coercion not only violates academic freedom but shows that some of the students and faculty members who are so outraged at false pretenses in society find some brands of hypocrisy quite acceptable for their own purposes. Yet one positive aspect of campus violence is that student attacks on universities have drawn attention to some serious faults in universities as well as in other institutions outside the universities. Many corrective actions now being taken almost certainly would have occurred much more slowly, if at all, had it not been for some of the more active campus protests.

The sixth reality is that a sizeable proportion of those involved in deliberately violent campus protest are not students but outside agitators. It has been suggested that legal authority be given to university chancellors to keep such known nonuniversity agitators off the campus.

It seems self-evident when rational negotiations with demonstrators are not effective that whatever force is necessary to restore order quickly should be used to put down building take-overs, prolonged sit-ins, or other similar activities which seriously disrupt normal university activities. But this is where university administrators face a major difficulty: since the radicals usually represent themselves as championing some legitimate cause of the larger group of moderate students, forceful treatment of the protestors can easily lead to further alienation of moderate students, increased support for the radicals, and escalation of the unrest. This leads one to note again that the most compelling aspect of the whole matter is that university and government leaders must listen carefully to what students are saying and thoughtfully consider with them what steps must be taken to correct the imperfections and injustices the students have identified.

Universities, to the maximum extent practical, should consider in advance what student protest actions are considered acceptable and which will not be tolerated. They should also consider what counter actions the universities would take and notify would-be violators in advance

21. Address by Dr. Dwight Waldo, National Conference on Public Science Policy and Administration, Sante Fe, New Mexico, Sept. 8-9, 1969.

what disciplinary actions to expect. The Reverend Theodore Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame, follows this procedure. In an open letter to students and faculty he stated specifically how the university would react to attempted use of force on the campus. The gist of his statement was that anyone who persisted for more than a few minutes in the use of force either violent or nonviolent as a substitute for rational persuasion would (if a student) be suspended or (if a non-student) be officially charged with trespassing and disturbing the peace.²²

CONCLUSION

What then are the questions, messages, implications, or required actions for us who are a part of, or identify with, the establishment so sharply criticized by youth? Certainly the universities themselves, faculties, administrators, and governing boards, need to reexamine their objectives and practices to ensure that undergraduate student interests have not become too submerged by the many other demands for the universities' time and resources. Universities should reconsider their stand against inter-disciplinary research and teaching and provide better opportunities for those students who prefer a broader, across-the-board, combined liberal-technical education instead of the traditionally highly specialized one. Federal and state governments must also share a part of the universities' responsibility in this matter since their policies and financial support are major influences in shaping the universities' policies and actions.

We also must go deeper in questioning the adequacy of the total educational process in the United States. As Marshall McLuhan has shown, this process includes not just educational institutions, but many elements of our technological environment such as radio, television, motion pictures, automobiles, jet airplanes, and communication satellites. The process is undoubtedly producing a generation whose quantity and breadth of factual knowledge and information is unprecedented. At the same time, however, universities are failing to provide the kind of interdisciplinary technical-liberal education students need to integrate and evaluate these vast amounts of existentially acquired information. These two factors in combination may be producing a generation which is also unprecedented in its failure to understand the complex social and cultural frameworks to which knowledge must be adjusted before it be-

22. Open Letter from Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh to Notre Dame Students, in 94 READERS DIGEST, May 1969, at 104.

comes meaningful. If this is true, basic changes in institutions and methods are needed to help young people develop a depth of understanding to match their breadth of knowledge.

In spite of the nihilistic nature of the more violent and more radical student protests, if we make the necessary effort to see our country and its institutions as the students see them, and if the students themselves mature sufficiently to redirect their energies toward constructive changes in society, politics, business, and government, the end result will be much better universities, more equitable and responsible government support of universities, and most important, a better society and better government.