

University of Delaware
Disaster Research Center

Historical & Comparative Series
#6

DISRUPTION ON THE CAMPUSES OF OHIO COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES
SPRING, 1970

Russell R. Dynes
E. L. Quarantelli

1981

Report prepared for the Ohio Council of Churches and the Ohio Board United
Ministries in Higher Education

PREFACE

It is appropriate at the very beginning to make certain comments about the origin, development and intended use of this document. This is necessary in order to understand its value and its limitations.

After the widespread campus tensions of last spring, there was a period filled with charges, countercharges, implied threats, as well as legislative and administrative action. There was also the beginnings of a period of reflection on the meaning of the events which had taken place. It was in this context that the General Board of the Ohio Council of Churches (OCC) requested an analysis of the basic causes and meaning of the tension (or lack of it) on Ohio campuses. On the basis of this request, the Director of the Division of Church in Witness of the OCC approached a group of ecumenical and denominational persons with responsibilities at the state level for campus ministries, and urged them to share in the request. These persons supported the concern of the OCC General Board. They placed emphasis on the value of developing a "factual" study of what did happen, prior to any consideration of implications of the campus tensions for the Church. Subsequently, The Commission on Higher Education of The United Methodist Church in Ohio provided funds for such a study -- the results of which are contained in this document.

It was in the above context that preliminary conversations were held with Russell R. Dynes and E. L. Quarantelli, Professors of Sociology at The Ohio State University in May, 1970. They agreed to pull together the material and to prepare a background document for a consultation to be held in the fall. Because of delays in the clarification of the sources of possible funding, as well as restrictions on the availability of personnel, the study was not initiated until mid-July and the initial draft of the document was prepared in less than a month.

A variety of types of materials served as a basis for the document. Materials from individual campuses were obtained in several different ways. Newspapers, official reports, and other written documents were obtained where possible. On certain campuses, an individual (in most instances a faculty member from the social sciences) was asked to prepare a case study on the events on that particular campus. On some campuses, materials drawn from student experiences were used (see Kent State in the Appendix I); on others, a wide sampling of faculty observations was obtained. In certain instances, the case studies were based on the involvement of the person in the process which is described. The treatment of the various types of materials was the final responsibility of Dynes and Quarantelli. In most instances, they retained the tone and flavor of the events as reflected by those who prepared the case study.

In dealing with materials as controversial as contained here, one is always open to charges of bias. Persons who expect such a report to be written in a way which represents their point of view probably will not accept any disclaimer. The authors do have one bias which they readily admit. They are professional sociologists and faculty members at a large state-assisted university. Because they are sociologists, this means that they are not psychologists, campus ministers, police officers, National Guard members, nor university presidents. Other documents can be obtained written from the viewpoint of any of these groups. Each would be different in certain respects. In addition to being sociologists,

the authors have had considerable field research experience in a variety of types of crises situations -- including natural disasters, civil disturbances, and student protests. It is perhaps not completely irrelevant to point out that the authors have also taught and been involved in research and administrative duties at several different types of educational institutions.

In reading this document, it will be important to remember that Dynes and Quarantelli were not asked to make policy recommendations. Their task, as it was defined to them, was to attempt to find out what had happened on Ohio campuses and to provide an interpretation of it in terms of their knowledge and experience. It is on the basis of this and other documents that policies of the Ohio Council of Churches and other bodies may be based.

- A. Laten Carter, Executive Director
Ohio Board for United Ministries in
Higher Education
- Henry L. Gerner, Director
The Division of Church In Witness
Ohio Council of Churches

Address inquiries to either:

The Ohio Council of Churches
18 West Spring Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

or

The Ohio Board for United Ministries in Higher Education
891 High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many persons contributed to the development of this report. Laten Carter of the Ohio Board United Ministries in Higher Education and Henry Gerner of the Ohio Council of Churches were important from the inception and throughout the process. They supplied material they had collected from many sources as well as acting as demanding and friendly critics. We have profited by their assistance. Among others that helped us collect information were Jerry Lewis, Kent State University; Harold Gaines, Cuyahoga Community College; Art Neal, Bowling Green University; Donald Traybig, Baldwin-Wallace College; Jack Foster, Youngstown State University; Elaine Hobart, Otterbein College; Mrs. Denis Baly, Gambier, Ohio; and Paul Cass, The Ohio University. We depended primarily on our own observations at the Ohio State University. All of the material collected was supplemented and enriched by conversations with students, faculty, administrative personnel and law enforcement personnel. We also had the advantage of knowledge of the research tradition concerning student protest in the United States and around the world. To all of these sources, we are thankful since the problems associated with the limited time available for the development of the report were somewhat mitigated by the excellent cooperation we had. Since this is intended for a general audience, documentation and notation of bibliographic sources has been minimized. Some sources of documentation are indicated in the bibliography attached and further information could be obtained from us. It is obvious that the final responsibility for the use of the various materials has been ours.

RRD
ELQ
Columbus, Ohio
September, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	i
Acknowledgments	iii
Introduction	v
Part I: A DESCRIPTION OF THE EVENTS OF SPRING, 1970 ON OHIO CAMPUSES	1
Part II: THE CONTEXT OF STUDENT PROTESTS: EDUCATION AND SOCIAL ISSUES	7
Part III: THE ROLE OF THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY	31
Part IV: AFTERTHOUGHTS, CONSEQUENCES, AND QUESTIONS THAT REMAIN	37
Appendix I: CASE STUDIES	43
Private and Church Related Institutions -	
Kenyon College	43
Baldwin-Wallace College	47
United Theological Seminary	51
Otterbein College	51
State Assisted Institutions -	
Cuyahoga Community College	56
Youngstown State University	60
Bowling Green State University	64
Ohio University	70
Kent State University	76
Ohio State University	82
Appendix II: THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS	93
Appendix III: BIBLIOGRAPHY	111
Appendix IV: SUMMARY	

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, and more specifically last spring, attention has focused on what was happening on the campuses of Ohio colleges and universities. This attention, however, has not been on the real accomplishments of these campuses -- in providing an education for hundreds of thousands of students from Ohio, the other 49 states, and from almost every country in the world -- but on campus disruption and destruction. Certainly, the events at Kent State University brought home to Ohioans, as well as people all over the world, the real and the symbolic tragedy of campus disturbances. The aftermath has brought on charges and recriminations, but perhaps less careful reflection as to the meaning of the events.

One of the barriers to careful reflection of the events is the fact that our knowledge about what is going on in colleges and universities is limited by our own immediate experience and hence we have to depend in large part on the mass media. While we do not suggest, as some have, that the mass media intentionally distorts academic life, the images they present have a vividness which we accept as reality in the absence of other facts. That these images have always been vivid can be seen by comparing two different ones. The current picture of the mass media is different from that provided by Hollywood several decades ago. Campus life then presumably centered around fraternity life, the spring prom and the Andy Hardy types who reveled in their irresponsibility during that four-year loaf called college. The picture today is different. It is more colorful and diverse -- black faces now join the white; long hair now joins the crew cut. The fraternity pin is replaced by the clenched fist. The big rallies do not concern football, and the spring event is more likely to be a picket line than a prom. For many students now, the four years are not a time for loafing but for action, not the time for vocational training but for "education." College is no longer the ivy covered refuge but often an armed camp.

The vividness of both of these images of college life is achieved by narrowing the focus which excludes the depth and complexity of what actually exists. Such vividness is the advantage of the media but it does sacrifice complexity. Just as the Andy Hardy image did a disservice to the many self-supporting, serious students who populated campuses at that time, the image of the long-haired, radical, riotous student of today is equally distorted.

In raising questions about these images, we indicate what we wish to do throughout this report -- to raise questions. In the aftermath of Spring, 1970, many persons have answers and solutions but they are often in response to the wrong questions. We wish to reverse the procedure here. We do not begin with solutions because the first step is to obtain factual information on what actually did happen on Ohio campuses in the spring. In Part I, we will present a summary table which will provide information as to the range and scope of activity which occurred on Ohio campuses in the spring. There is great diversity in what went on. We have chosen illustrations to emphasize that diversity. These are

represented by case studies of the activities on several campuses. Since these are descriptive and lengthy, the reader may wish to sample this section (Appendix I) before going on. Understanding what happened in Ohio requires an understanding of the context of student unrest and disruption all over the world, but particularly in the United States. While Ohio is unique, this does not imply that we cannot learn from what is happening elsewhere and by others. (Part II)

In conclusion, we wish to talk about the implications of what we have discussed. It should be re-emphasized, however, that our intent is to raise questions, but to raise them on the basis of the best factual information that we could obtain.

PART I

A DESCRIPTION OF THE EVENTS OF SPRING 1970 ON OHIO CAMPUSES

Much of the mass media coverage in Ohio in the spring of 1970 focused on Kent State University and on The Ohio State University. There were, of course, good reasons for this focus. The death of four students at Kent made it a central symbol of the most destructive aspects of campus disruption. These events, in turn, were the cause of further campus protests and demonstrations in other campuses in Ohio and across the country. The Ohio State University was important because of the massive nature of the events. At one of the largest universities in the United States, there was massive action by police and National Guard, and there was involvement, in varying ways, of thousands of students.

It is perhaps important to underscore certain dates and events which provide a context to the events. At the beginning of the 1969-1970 school year on most Ohio campuses a great deal of student attention and effort was given to the October 15th moratorium peace march. National student leaders, supported by many respected Congressmen, organized peace marches in major cities throughout the country to protest the continuing war in Vietnam. In most major cities in Ohio and across the country as well as on many campuses, moratorium marches were held as well as seminars and mass political rallies. A month later, in Washington, many of the same people who had paraded on their campuses and their home towns marched down Pennsylvania Avenue to rally at the foot of the Washington Monument. Over the winter months, the discussion of the Vietnam War, changes in the draft toward a lottery system as well as other concerns continued as topics of campus discussions. Another series of moratorium marches were planned for April 14-15, but they failed to gain the same support and enthusiasm of the ones in the fall.

In the early spring, there were scattered events at Ohio State University which were indicative of some of the events to follow there. On Monday, March 9, a number of students representing a newly formed Afro-Am Society presented a number of demands on behalf of black students to the Vice-President of Student Affairs at The Ohio State University and asked for a response by Friday. On Friday, some damage was done in the Administration building, a few fires broke out in other buildings and several fire alarms were set off. In April, several students disrupted a military science class at Ohio University. And at other campuses, such as Miami University, several types of student disruptions were already starting.

During the winter, however, a new concern had begun to attract a great deal of student attention -- pollution and issues of environmental quality. In the spring, student projects were initiated and a number of speakers were invited to campuses to talk about various aspects of

this problem. A nationwide Earth Day was proclaimed on April 22 and most campuses, in a variety of ways, gave their attention to the complexities of the issues.

At Ohio State, on April 21, a career information program being held in the Ohio Union was disrupted. On Friday, an Ad Hoc Committee for Student Rights (a coalition of Afro-Am, Columbus Moratorium Committee, Third World Solidarity Committee, Student Mobilization Committee and later to include the Women's Liberation Movement) called for a student strike. On Wednesday, April 29, the strike started. Demonstrators blocked several entrances to the campus. Security forces were called in and, in the late afternoon and evening, large quantities of tear gas was used to disperse crowds and small gatherings. During the day, over 75 persons were injured, none seriously, and over 300 arrests were made, most of them for curfew violations.

On Thursday evening, April 30, President Nixon went on national television to announce that the United States combat forces a few hours earlier had entered Cambodia for a seven-week operation aimed at curtailing enemy action and intended to end the war more quickly.

Reactions to the announcement was, of course, varied but on many campuses meetings were held to try to develop some plan of response. While almost all of this was peaceful and thoughtful, in some places violence began to occur.

At Kent State on Friday evening, May 1, police cruisers were rocked, bonfires were built in the middle of the street and storefront windows were broken. On Saturday night, a curfew was imposed in the city and students could not leave the campus. A crowd gathered on the Commons that night and, after moving around the dorms, approached an old Army ROTC building. Rocks were thrown at it and flares set it afire. Firemen called to the scene were harassed by some of the onlookers. Later that evening, National Guard contingents were moved on campus. The next evening there was a small protest against the presence of the Guard on campus. Monday, May 3, classes started as usual but rumors spread of another rally at noon to protest the presence of the Guard. The normal heavy pedestrian traffic at noon hour was evident on the Commons. A small group of demonstrators began to shout slogans but most of the crowd at that time were onlookers or those who were caught in the change of classes. Tear gas was used. Rocks were thrown and one segment of the Guard moving up a hill turned and fired into the students. The students scattered, but four could not.

The shooting of the four Kent State students was as widely circulated a story as the international issue which seemed to precipitate the original protest. On almost every major campus, some form of reaction was registered. Some sponsored a moment of prayer or an evening candlelight parade and prayer service dedicated to peace and to the memory of the Kent students. A giant rally protesting the Cambodian move and the Kent deaths was held in Washington, May 9. Hundreds of campuses that week witnessed mass assemblies and rallies. At still other colleges, a more violent reaction was felt. At more than 500 colleges and universities, strikes began in which students refused to go to classes or in

some way indicated their reluctance to continue business as usual. On many of these campuses, demonstrators used the issues of Kent State and Cambodia to identify with local issues and to strengthen local protests.

The preceding comments have provided a context which emphasize the more dramatic and destructive aspects of what happened in the spring on Ohio campuses and around the nation. While they may evoke initial interest, such descriptions may detract from what were the more typical types of concerns during the spring.

To try to ascertain the range of behavior which actually did occur on Ohio campuses, we gathered information on the following colleges:

The University of Akron	Malone College
Antioch College	Marietta College
Ashland College,	Mary Manse College
The Athenaeum of Ohio	Miami University
Baldwin-Wallace College	College of Mount St. Joseph on the Ohio
Bluffton College	Mount Union College
Borromeo Seminary of Ohio	Muskingum College
Bowling Green State University	Notre Dame College
Capital University	Oberlin College
Case Western University	Ohio Dominican College
Cedarville College	Ohio Northern University
Central State University	The Ohio State University
The Cincinnati Bible Seminary	Ohio University
University of Cincinnati	Ohio Wesleyan University
Clark County Technical Institute	Otterbein College
Cleveland State University	Pontifical College Josephinum
Columbus Technical Institute	Rio Grande College
Cuyahoga Community College	Saint John College of Cleveland
University of Dayton	Sinclair Community College
Defiance College	The College of Steubenville
Denison University	The University of Toledo
Dyke College	Urbana College
Edgecliff College	Ursuline College
Findlay College	Walsh College
Heidelberg College	Western College for Women
Hiram College	Wilberforce University
John Carroll University	Wilmington College
Kent State University	Wittenberg University
Kenyon College	The College of Wooster
Lake Erie College	Wright State University
Lakeland Community College	Xavier University
Lorain County Community College	Youngstown State University.

Information was obtained on almost all of these campuses.

Table I provides information which indicates that, on most campuses over Ohio, there was some type of protest activity, particularly if manifestations of sympathy for the students at Kent is seen as a form of protest. Of the 62 schools reporting, the students on 45 of them had held

mass meetings, often involving the vast majority of the students, faculty and administration as well as, in some instances, interested members of the community. The students on 19 of the campuses were involved in activities relating to the national student strike, while on 26 of the campuses, students were involved in direct political action, either by formulating petitions or direct lobbying with various governmental officials. On 18 of the campuses, various types of demands for change were made by students to members of the administration.

The more disruptive aspects, while more highly publicized, were actually much less frequent. For example, on only 11 campuses were classes disrupted or was access to campus buildings blocked. In only six campuses were the police called to assist campus security forces, and in only 7 campuses were students arrested on campus. (Some of these arrests were made on charges such as drugs which had little relationship with protest.)

In 13 of the campuses, there was physical damage which occurred on the campus itself. In addition to the destruction of the old Army ROTC building at Kent State, at Marietta College an older building containing the bookstore was destroyed by fire, and a cafeteria was burned at Ohio University. Most of the damage of the various campuses consisted of window breakage, small fires which could be controlled and defacing of buildings by paint. In 4 instances, acts of violence spilled over into the local campus community. Again, this consisted primarily of window damage, vandalism, and the occasional painting of signs on non-campus buildings. The overwhelming picture of violence and destruction which was often the conclusion derived from the many fast-moving events of the spring is somewhat tempered by these findings. There were, of course, particular instances which did lead to extensive property damage. For example, while there had been sporadic window breakage on the campus of Ohio State related to several issues during the spring, the most extensive damage did not occur until May 21 when a number of demonstrators, many of them non-students, blocked High Street. When the initial window breakage occurred, most of the students left and, as the police moved to clear the streets, the remainder moved north on High Street breaking windows on both sides of the street. Damage to university buildings included many windows in Mershon Auditorium, the Ohio Union, and the College of Law. (One eye witness saw the same person break six windows in the Law School.) On the eastern side of High Street, only a few of the stores on an eight-block stretch escaped some window damage. While the damage was widespread and costly, the vast majority of it was done by a small number of persons, most of them non-student.

Again, looking at the range of activities over Ohio colleges, 22 of them did suspend classes at some time during the spring. Only 9 actually closed down. Kent State and Ohio University closed down for the remainder of the academic quarter. Miami University was closed for 10 days; Ohio State for 12. The University of Cincinnati was closed two different times -- once for 6 days and another for 9 days. Most of the colleges closed their classes for short periods of time -- several hours or a day -- during which time memorial services and/or campus discussions were held. For example, Cuyahoga Community College shut down one day in

memoriam of Kent State and another day in memoriam of two students killed at Jackson State in Mississippi.

The predominant picture, then, over the range of Ohio colleges and universities was one in which a considerable variety of types of social concerns were evidenced. The most frequent form was an expression of sympathy for the deaths of the Kent State students and expressions of concern for what was seen as the expansion of the Vietnam War. These concerns were expressed in memorial services, mass meetings, direct political action such as lobbying, and in some instances, making demands for change within the college. The vast majority of this activity was peaceful and was characterized by careful but agonizing consideration on the part of students. In a much smaller number of campuses, the protest took a more disruptive character. In a small number of instances, certain classes were disrupted and/or buildings blocked. Again, on a smaller number of campuses, there was property damage, most of it in the form of breaking windows. In an even smaller number, outside security forces were called in and, in the resulting confrontations and continued violence, seven of these colleges and universities had to close down, most, if not all of them, as a direct result of implications of the deaths of the four students at Kent.

TABLE 1. TYPES AND CONSEQUENCES OF PROTEST BEHAVIOR AT 62 OHIO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, SPRING, 1970

	State-assisted Institutions			Private and Church-related Institutions		
	Present	Absent	Percent Present	Present	Absent	Percent Present
Student memorial services for Kent State students	13	6	68%	32	11	75%
Student mass meeting	13	6	68%	26	17	61%
Student participation in national student strike	8	11	42%	11	32	26%
Student lobbying and formulating petitions	7	12	37%	19	24	44%
Student demands on college administration	11	8	58%	7	36	16%
Classes disrupted or buildings blocked	9	10	47%	2	41	5%
Classes suspended	11	8	58%	11	32	26%
Police called on campus	6	13	32%	0	43	0%
Students arrested on campus	7	12	37%	0	43	0%
Physical damage on campus	10	9	53%	3	40	7%
Physical damage in campus community	3	16	16%	1	42	2%
College closed down	8	11	42%	1	42	2%

Note: Institutions not included in the summary were Case Western Reserve University and Hiram College. The western and metropolitan campuses of Cuyahoga Community College were counted separately. The University of Dayton was not in session during most of the events reported here. The total possible number of responses is 62. A few schools did not answer individual questions. Interpolations were made where possible.

PART II

THE CONTEXT OF STUDENT PROTESTS:

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL ISSUES

In considering what happened in Ohio colleges and universities in the spring of 1970, it is necessary to put it in a larger context. In many ways, there is not anything exceptionally unique as to what happened, with the exception of Kent. A somewhat similar pattern of protest activity could be found in the institutions of higher education in other states. Therefore, it is instructive (1) to consider some of the trends of higher education within the larger American society; (2) to talk about the diversity of higher education in America; (3) and to talk about the diversity of students in these institutions; and (4) to look more closely at some of the issues which become the focus of campus protest. In addition, (5) it is useful to consider some of the conceptions and misconceptions which have developed about campus protest. These are important since misconceptions often provide the rationale for suggested solutions to campus problems. Finally, we will discuss some of the probable outcomes of campus protest.

1. The Changing Nature of Higher Education

In the last twenty-five years in the United States, institutions dealing with the tasks of higher education have grown tremendously. This growth has come about for a number of reasons:

American society is increasingly dependent upon the development of knowledge. This is true both in the sense of knowledge to develop new technologies as well as in the sense of the knowledge necessary to "solve" human problems.

An increasing proportion of the population of the United States is in the age categories which necessitate higher education. The birth rates in the decade after World War II were high and produced a "tidal" wave of students. One estimate points out that one-half of the population of the United States in 1972 will be under 21.

There is an increasing expectation on the part of every segment of the population to obtain further education. While not too long ago only a high school diploma was considered necessary, aspirations have been increased so that today, for many, a college degree is seen as a reasonable expectation. This can be illustrated in the following way. In 1900, it is estimated that one percent of the college aged persons actually attended college. In 1939, 15% attended, but in 1970, it is estimated that 50% of all college aged students will be attending institutions of higher education. This is 50% of a significantly larger population category, too. In addition, many persons in older age categories, because of the expectations of their jobs or their own expectations of self-fulfillment, seek educational opportunities and create additional demands upon higher education.

These increased demands on higher education have often not been accompanied by increased resources to meet the demands, either in terms of facilities, faculty, or operating budgets. Also, these increased demands have changed the nature of colleges and universities in a number of ways, some of them marking rather dramatic shifts in the nature of higher education. Much of this can be illustrated by the growth of Ohio's largest university, Ohio State.

- A. Increase in Size and Rate of Growth. When Ohio State University opened, there were 7 faculty members and 24 students. A century later, there were 3,500 on the teaching staff and more than 49,000 students. The student body has grown steadily since 1951 and the post war "baby boom" has brought large yearly enrollment increases during the '60s. While there are problems with sheer size, most of the problems of large institutions are associated with the rate of growth. For example, because of the current age distribution in the population, most of the growth in student enrollment occurred in the '60s. While colleges and universities had students, there was not available a corresponding increase of trained faculty nor could classroom space, dormitory space, nor needed changes in the physical plant be accomplished overnight. Colleges with selective admission policies could avoid these problems by simply refusing to accept more students, and some did so. Many public universities, particularly those which had to accept any and every applicant, had to make adaptations in these circumstances. The quality and training of the faculty often suffered in the attempt to obtain teaching personnel. Class size was doubled and tripled to accommodate more students. Many residence halls were built involving a long-term economic commitment. By the time that many were finished, other housing had become available, and also students had begun to prefer to live off-campus as a symbol of their independence. As these institutions were growing rapidly, financial support for them often did not keep up in a corresponding fashion. With demands being made on all public services, funding for education sometimes did not fare well in competition with other needs. Therefore, makeshift arrangements had to be made for the students who were there, even in the absence of adequate resources.
- B. Increase in Complexity. An illustration of the increase of complexity is again found in the growth of the Ohio State University. While initially there were seven faculty members representing seven fields, there are now over 5,000 courses offered, organized in 10 undergraduate colleges, 6 professional schools, a graduate school and 9 special schools. Students in the graduate school may seek degrees in 93 areas which offer the Master's degree or in the 73 which offer the Ph.D degree. There are, additionally, about 40 on-campus centers for research and study, and 6 regional undergraduate campuses, all of which have been established since 1957. Two of these regional undergraduate campuses have become parts of new independent campuses.

Across the United States, all other colleges and universities show a corresponding increase in complexity. Two-year junior colleges hope to develop into four-year degree granting ones. Liberal arts colleges hope to develop other emphases, perhaps education or engineering schools. Undergraduate schools hope to develop a graduate program. Universities giving a Master's degree hope to develop doctoral programs. All tend to move in new directions and to greater complexity.

- C. Increase in the Diversity of Students. A recent study of almost 1,200 colleges and universities of varying sizes conducted by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education indicated that one of the important changes in the last two decades has been an increase in the diversity of the student body. This diversity is evidenced in differences in ethnic, socio-economic and religious background. While the students in many colleges in the past were white, middle class and Protestant, this homogeneity has tended to break down and the college population today is more representative of the population of the United States as a whole. The study suggested, however, that although the colleges have opened their doors to more members of various ethnic groups, they have not as greatly expanded the number of students from lower socio-economic groups.
- D. Decreasing Ability of Colleges and Universities to Control the Actions and Activities of Students. This decreasing ability has several roots. One of these roots is the change in attitude toward in loco parentis, the idea that the college should act in the place of parents while the student was in college. This doctrine has declined with the changing student body. When World War II veterans returned to the campuses, many of them were older and married and the notion that the college should act as a parent seemed peculiarly outmoded. In addition, the decrease in proportion of students living on campuses because of the lack of college funding for more dormitories, the increase in both the size and the number of urban institutions with commuting students, plus the increased emphasis on the freedom and maturity of college students all have led to a decline in the abilities of colleges and universities to exercise significant effect on other than the intellectual lives of the students. Although many parents wish the university could continue (or improve) their familial influence on students, neither the conditions nor current philosophies of the nature of the student support close "supervision." Rather than enlarging the family table in the residence hall, the university is scattered to the cafeteria, the hamburger joint on the edge of the campus and to the shared apartments off campus.

While these shifts indicate only some of the changes on campus, they point to the necessity to ask hard questions, not just for those immediately involved with higher education, but for everyone concerned in the development of public policy.

Who should go to college?

Should publicly supported colleges and universities be expected to accept all graduates of accredited high schools, as they do in Ohio?

Should the criteria of admission to college be based on ability to pay fees or should the most capable students be admitted and supported? How does one determine who are the more capable students?

What should be taught?

What constitutes a college education? Is it training in occupational skills? Is it exploration in different ways of seeing the world? Does it involve moral behavior? Does it involve the close supervision of the lives of students?

What is the optimum size of a college or university?

Are certain types of education best achieved in small colleges? How can one encompass the complexity of knowledge without the complexity of structure of a university? What does increasing specialization of knowledge do for the unity and coherence of the educational process?

Who should pay for higher education?

Are only those students who have personal economic resources eligible for higher education? Should extra effort be given toward students who come from disadvantaged groups, such as black students or for students from lower income families? What responsibility does state government have for financial aid to "private" colleges and universities? If such schools are important in training human resources, should public funds be used to aid in support of these endeavors?

2. The Diversity of Institutions of Higher Education in the United States.

In the fall of 1969, almost seven million students were attending about 2,300 colleges and universities across the United States. More than two-thirds of those students were in publicly supported two-year, four-year or graduate level institutions. The rest were in private colleges and universities -- some of them church related, others independent. These campuses ranged in enrollment from fewer than a hundred to over 40,000. These institutions varied in quality, in affluence in faculty competence and in the academic aptitude of students.

Covering the 1968-69 academic year, a report by the American Council of Education indicated that an estimated 524 institutions experienced at least one incident of violent or disruptive protest. During that year, major protest incidents were about twice as likely to take place at

private rather than public universities. About 70% of the private universities and 43% of the public ones experienced protests. Beyond that, in general the larger the institution, the more likely it was to experience protest, and interestingly enough, the more selective a university, the more likely it will experience protest.

3. The Diversity of Students in These Institutions

While there is a tremendous diversity of kinds of institutions of higher education, some of this diversity comes from different compositions of students. There are still exclusively male institutions and female institutions, although there is a definite trend toward coed schools. Many of the traditional one-sex institutions have "integrated" in recent years, to the consternation of traditional alumni and to the satisfaction of most students. There are predominantly white institutions and predominately black institutions. There are institutions which attract students from upper income families from across the nation. There are denominational colleges that attract primarily their own kind. While patterns of predominance and homogeneity still exist, earlier it was noted that there is a major trend toward greater diversity of the students attending the same institution.

One recent classification of students provides some understanding of the diversity of student types on most campuses. Outsiders often tend to treat students as homogeneous and as having similar motivations. The following classification provides some insight in the diversity that exists:

Vocationalists and Professionals - Those students who are interested in college primarily as a source of occupational skills.

Collegiates - These are students who are interested in college as a source of entertainment for the pursuit of pleasure. Heavily involved in the more traditional college aspects -- fraternity life, etc.

Ritualists - These are students who are going through the motions of college. Their motive for being there is to please parents, to avoid the draft, to find a husband, etc. If they can achieve these goals in other ways, they might drop out.

Academics - These are students who are interested in their academic work for its own sake. They are oriented toward doing good work in their courses. These are often called academic grinds by others.

Intellectuals - These are the students who are interested primarily in ideas, concepts, and values. The idea is often more important than the course work and they may be impatient at academic requirements which they see as restricting their intellectual excursions.

Activists - These are the politically-minded students. They express a social concern for the plight of others and a concern for a self development which is often inhibited by the world as well as by the university.

Hippies - These are the students who find the university a free environment in which to "do their thing." Their thing is generally not directed outward in political activity, but is concerned with self-expression found through music, art, and new relationships with others, and perhaps drugs. Many drop out of the university and live within the university community.

The particular mix of students on a campus is an important element in the development of protest activity on campus. The activist types are most likely to be most involved in such activity. Estimates of the number of students who can be classified as activists generally range from 1 to 2 percent of the national college population. However, there may be certain institutions which have a greater concentration at particular times. Going back to the findings of the American Council of Education, this report noted that the more selective a university, the more likely it will experience protest. In 1968-69, about 85 percent of the most selective universities -- those enrolling students of the highest academic abilities -- had disruptive incidents. These protests were a result of the greater proportion of activists within their student population. Since the activists tended to be "intelligent, and independent, and non-career oriented children of rather affluent parents," they tended to be enrolled in the better colleges and universities. By contrast, the over-whelming majority of American college students is politically apathetic and are caught up in their own vocational, academic, or hedonistic pursuits.

While the more selective colleges had a greater proportion of activist students as a result of their admissions policy, large universities are likely to have a greater number of activist students by the simple fact of size. If we accept two percent as a reasonable estimate, a college enrolling 1,000 students would have only 20 activist students, but a university of 45,000 would have 900. The critical mass of numbers is important, but it does not totally explain the scope of protest on campuses. The relatively small percentage of activist students is not sufficient to initiate a widespread protest by themselves. A widespread protest depends on developing interest and support of the other "types" of students. As a specific example, at Ohio State, the student strike initially had very little support within the student population. Many students, however, were interested in the issues and were interested in the events as a matter of curiosity. After a gate was blocked to the campus by some of the activist students, State Highway Patrol and Columbus Police proceeded to open the entrance and to use tear gas to disperse the crowd. Tear gas was used extensively and thrown at students who were spectators and relatively uninterested bystanders. Pushing groups of students off campus, the police threw considerable tear gas in areas where many fraternity and sorority houses were located and where many off-campus apartments and rooming houses were in which large numbers of uninvolved students lived. Since the quantity of tear gas made staying

in these living quarters impossible, these students came out into the streets where they were met by more tear gas and, in certain instances, were arrested. The "injustices" which were perceived by the students as a result of such police actions tended to involve many previously uninterested students. In terms of the previous typology, many of the intellectuals, academics, ritualists, collegiates, and vocationalists as well as hippies became involved as a result of these actions. The actions provided credence to many of the issues which had been raised by the strike leaders earlier.

4. Background on the Issues that Concern Students

While we have already indicated that a relatively few students on American campuses can be considered political activists, the fact that there exists this relatively small group still presents a sharp contrast to other eras on the campus. Immediately after World War II, the student body was swelled by veterans who were preoccupied with the acquisition of occupational skills so that they could initiate their delayed career as soon as possible. The world was reasonably safe for democracy again and they could turn back to their more private concerns. During the 50's, most campuses were populated by apathetic students. They were known then as the silent generation and, at that time, a number of observers felt that they were anticipating placid lives, content with a job in a large corporation and with a home in a growing suburb. The overwhelming apathy of the time period prompted many observers to hope that they would develop more social awareness and concern for others. They seemed so **content**, self-satisfied, and so preoccupied with material goals. They were "ideal" college students. They were quiet and so were the campuses.

To date the change is difficult. The development of student activism was closely related to changes in the structure of race relations in the United States. In the summers of 1963 and 1964, a number of students, particularly those at some of the more selective institutions, became involved in civil rights activity in the South. One result of the experiences of these summers was their impression of the overwhelming injustices which blacks experienced in the South. It was the summer of 1963 when police dogs were used to stop a Martin Luther King in Birmingham. Later that summer, however, he could reaffirm from Lincoln Memorial that he still "had a dream." In November, the enthusiasm which had been generated in the beginning of the Kennedy administration with its emphasis on youth and idealism exploded in Dallas. In the summer of 1964, violence was beginning in the ghettos of northern cities, 24 black churches were burned over the summer in Mississippi with the direct involvement of local law enforcement officials. All of the events lead to sober reflection about the nature of a civilized society, perhaps most critically among the young who had much more of their lives ahead of them.

In the fall of 1964, the first major student disturbance occurred at Berkeley. Many of the leaders, in what was to become known as the Free Speech Movement, had had earlier experience in civil rights activity in the South and they adapted many of the same techniques -- marches, vigils, picketing, etc. -- which had been used in the civil rights movement to the issues of the campus. The FSM was initiated by restrictions

which had been placed on students who used the campus to support or advocate off-campus political and social activity. This initial event established the precedent of combining national issues and campus issues, which sometimes is so puzzling to outsiders.

The direction of the civil rights movement came to be increasingly under the control and direction of blacks, coinciding with the rise of the black power ideology. Students did not have to look too far for another issue. The escalation of the Vietnam war provided the next focus of attack with the widespread teach-in in April, 1965. The Vietnam war has provided a major theme of protest ever since, as have the issues related to it. Obviously, many students on campus are directly affected by the draft so the injustice of a selective service system which would coerce participation in an "unjust war" also became a focus of attack. Too, the relationship of colleges and universities to the military effort was given scrutiny. The existence of ROTC programs seemed, to some, an immoral intrusion of the military on the campus, as did the recruiters for the armed forces or from defense industries. Research on campus supported by the defense department often came under careful view.

Changes in strategy in the conduct of the war were met with protest. Some students lost faith with what they saw as a lack of credibility in political leaders' discussions of the war. Almost every year promises were made and not kept. To some students, the invasion of Cambodia was a step to enlarge the scope of the war, not to speed withdrawal. Throughout the past five years, the Vietnam war has provided a major theme of campus protest through the United States. Student protests have attempted to influence national policy concerning the war and university policy concerning cooperation with the military. And they have influenced policy, but not to the extent that many have wished.

Also, much of the civil rights activity in recent years in the larger society has been taken over by black leadership; white students have continued their interest and support in several new directions. Much of their protest is directed toward the campus, attempting to develop special educational programs for minority groups, such as black studies programs or programs to provide compensatory programs for disadvantaged students. Also, protest has been directed toward establishing special admission policies for minority groups based on the idea that competitive standards can only be applied when competitive conditions are equalized. Since minority groups have been discriminated against, many students feel the same standards cannot be used for all groups. A more recent type of protest which has emerged is the creation of financial and moral support for black leaders which students feel have been unjustly handled by police and civil authorities. Recent examples have been the 1970 rallies in support of Black Panther leaders at Yale and the contributions collected for "defense" funds by students at several schools, including Antioch.

Sometimes the issues relate more directly to the lives of the students on campus. There have been a number of protests directed toward the services which the educational institution provides -- foods in the dormitories, housing and recreational facilities, medical services, etc.

There have been protests directed at rules of student conduct and dress -- dormitory regulations, drinking regulations, visiting hours. Too, attention has been focused on the practices of student discipline -- the grounds for dismissal, institutional infractions of privacy, etc. There have been protests directed toward the increase in tuition charges and student fees. There have been protests directed toward the same current educational procedures -- class size, the grading system, student evaluations, the quality of instruction. There have been demands for greater student participation in the decision-making process -- particularly in the areas of colleges and universities which most closely affect the student's life -- rules, curriculum, living conditions, etc. There have been protests dealing with the issues of free expression -- centering on the censorship and support of student publications or the exclusion of "controversial" speakers. Occasionally, there have been issues dealing with the faculty where students take up the cause to protest the dismissal of a popular instructor.

In these issues, there is a strong "oppressed" minority theme. This is true, of course, with the black students. This is also true on campuses in areas where there is a large Mexican-American population and where one focus is on the treatment of the "chicano." Many of the issues of "student power" are cast in minority terms. In the rhetoric of the day, the student (and the young) are seen as an oppressed minority, fighting for its rights, resenting the discriminations which are directed toward it. A new minority theme has emerged more recently in some campus protest activities and these are the concerns of various "women's liberation" groups. While this theme has not been very prominent previously, militant women who have participated in other protest activities -- civil rights, anti-war, etc. -- often felt that their participation was treated with condescension. In some instances, women's liberation groups have been organized on campuses and have been involved in protest activity, often in combination with other groups and other issues. This was true at Ohio State. Such "minority" groups often have organizational ties with other similar groups in communities around the campus.

This catalogue of campus concerns may seem somewhat overwhelming and even other concerns could be added. We would be remiss not to note that the trustees of Carson-Newman College voted in March 1970 to end a 119-year ban on social dancing. Student polls indicate that 90% of the students favored dancing and so do the majority of the faculty. Alumni letters to the President run about 50-50. The Executive Committee of the Tennessee Baptist Convention has asked the board to reverse its decision to allow dancing. Students fear that when the full Convention meets in the fall and appoints 1/3 new members to the board that the new trustees will be able to reverse the 16-8 vote earlier. In the meantime, over the summer the students hope to rally the "silent majority" of their parents to speak up and avert the continuation of the ban.

5. Half-Truths, Misconceptions, Panaceas and Cliches About Student Protests

To attempt to generalize about student protest and campus disturbances places one in the position to reaffirm that "all generalizations,

including this one, are false." The most prudent approach is to try to point out that most generalizations about student disturbances are, at best, only half-truths. And most of the "solutions" offered are like patent medicines -- they provide those who market them some satisfaction but seldom do they help those that take them. The fact that many of these half-truths are "common knowledge" among students, faculty members, college administrators, state legislators, police officials, parents and non-parents, old and young stand in the way of understanding. Perhaps some are overstated here for purposes of discussion but all of these themes are evident if you listen to conversations, speeches, declarations, letters to editors, editorials and testimonies. Some of these misconceptions relate to the nature of students and to the nature of protest activity. Others deal with the process of protest while others center on proposed solutions. Many of them are contradictory when paired but consistency is more often desired than observed.

- ...THAT THE MAJORITY OF STUDENTS ARE RADICALIZED
- ...THAT FEW STUDENTS ACTUALLY PARTICIPATE IN DEMONSTRATIONS
- ...THAT THE STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATE AGREE WITH THE AIMS OF THE DEMONSTRATION

While studies dealing with the attitudes and values of students indicate some slight increase in social concerns on a national and international level, they still point out that the vast majority of students possess rather conventional values. As one example, the Kent State University student government conducted a poll in 1970 which obtained 5,400 responses from a total student body of 18,700. The students responding indicated an 80% agreement in favor of continuing ROTC on the campus and 54% of them approved President Nixon's Vietnam withdrawal plan. The vast bulk of students tend to be much more concerned with immediate personal goals and with family-related goals than they do with broad social issues. While they do not necessarily lack interest in social issues, they do not approach those in which they are interested with radical solutions. Some may be interested in ending the Vietnam war, not for ideological reasons, but for the fact that such a conclusion would probably reduce their chances of being drafted. Such a student might engage in peaceful demonstrations, organized by others whose interest in stopping the war was based on a much more complex ideological reason. It is very common to observe students engaging in protest activity leaving to go to class and perhaps returning at another time when they have a free class period or after the noon meal at the campus dining hall. Protest activity may become another "unrecognized" extra-curricular activity and it is often tailored to fit the other ongoing regular commitments of the campus.

Because of the widespread nature of student protests in recent years, however, many contemporary college students have had the opportunity to participate. In one study covering 232 campuses in the first six months of 1969, there were indications that at least 215,000 students on these campuses had been directly involved in campus protests. (It is likely, however, that this may be an inflated figure since the anxiety of university and police officials tend to overestimate the "threat.") Another study conducted in January, 1970, of students on

eighteen Midwestern campuses, found that 20% of the students had taken part in a demonstration at some time during their stay on campus.

Participation, however, can mean many different things. It should not be overlooked that participation in protest activity is considered by many students as "fun" and perhaps today as an integral part of the college experience. How much different is it than the older alumni who now reminisce about the excitement of that glorious football victory and the demonstration afterwards and conveniently forget the violence and vandalism which did occur, or the parent who remembers the comradeship of the picket line during the attempts to unionize in the '30's and the confrontations with National Guard or the minister whose earlier participation in the civil rights movement gave him a sense of relatedness and commitment which had since sustained him. In a time when so much is experienced vicariously, being involved creates a sense of excitement and there is the anticipation of seeking new experience. There is also the status which comes from having experience, becoming a veteran, getting one's service stripes and communicating one's experience to others. Thus, for many students, particularly at the start of such activity, protest activity does not involve a serious commitment to a cause.

Misunderstanding the varied motivations of students involved in protest activity leads to several unfortunate consequences. Leaders of confrontations, strikes and other forms of protest seriously overestimate the amount of support and the intensity of commitment of their "followers." The leaders who may have an intense commitment to a particular issue use the "size" of the disturbance which develops as an indication of the support for "their cause," even though the "cause" may be almost irrelevant for a very large number of the participants. Too, others interpret the extent of the participation as confirming evidence as to the extent of radicalization of students. The participation of large numbers of students is seen as an automatic prelude to violence and authorities, in taking action to prevent it, often provoke it.

...THE WIDESPREAD STUDENT PROTESTS ARE A RESULT OF A CONSPIRACY
...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS ARE CAUSED BY OUTSIDERS
...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS ARE SPONTANEOUS FROLICS

The conspiracy theory and attributing blame to "outsiders" is a common one in accounting for protest movements. "Establishments" of all kinds interpret reality in this fashion. Conservative and liberal political leaders see protest as the result of a conspiracy of revolutionary forces. Revolutionary leaders interpret their difficulties as being caused by a conspiracy of conservatives and reactionaries. Such an accusation implies that the motivation for protest could not possibly be as a result of present conditions and, therefore, must be caused by outside influences of a conspiratorial nature. It is often assumed to be true even in the absence of evidence, which makes it particularly difficult with which to deal.

It is no doubt true that most students, including the more radical ones, know people in other colleges and universities. Many of these

friends are probably like them. In other words, radical students know other radical students. Conservative students know other conservative students. It is also true that, through the various media, there is a great deal of information which is shared among students as to what is happening on other campuses. Too, many students attend more than one college during their college career and they may have the opportunity to participate in disturbances on several different campuses.

In addition, on any given day, not just the days involving protests, there are likely to be "outsiders" on every campus in the United States. In the context of the extensive mobility throughout American society, younger people are probably the most mobile group. Some can afford one or two trips a year to Washington to attend protest rallies and can also afford trips to visit friends on other campuses. In those colleges in urban metropolitan areas, there are many local residents on the campus for various reasons at any one time. Too, there is the growth of "street people" living on the fringes of most large urban campuses. These people have high mobility as well as depend on the campus for "cultural activities." Too, when disturbances start, they often draw students from other campuses, particularly if those campuses are on vacation or are closed. For example, in the spring some students from closed Kent State and Ohio University came to O.S.U. Their motives were quite understandable. Many of the "visiting" students lived in Columbus or they dropped off to see friends to compare experiences on their way home or elsewhere. Their presence, however, could always be interpreted in a conspiratorial fashion.

Students, themselves, often react negatively to the charges of "outsiders" and sometimes parody it. For example, students in one peaceful demonstration at O.S.U. after the school had reopened went on a long winding march through the campus "looking" for the President. As they came toward a camera from a local TV station filming their march, they pulled out their college identification cards, waved them toward the camera, shouting "we're outside agitators."

On the other hand, one cannot completely dismiss the possibility that a very small number of persons plan deliberately to provoke confrontations and have developed considerable skill at it. A well-thrown rock or the initiation of harassment of security forces can precipitate a confrontation which, in turn, can create martyrs which leads to more intense involvement and more widespread participation which in turn may lead to further confrontations. Evidence pointing to the involvement of the Weatherman faction of the SDS in certain violent actions in Chicago and in bombings in Manhattan indicates the possibilities for such involvement in some of the more violent aspects of activity. The SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) was formed in the early 60's and became the most publicized and perhaps the most influential of radical student groups. In its initial stages, it emphasized non-violent action and "participatory democracy" and it initiated a number of protest of university practices. Over time, its members became increasingly disaffected with American institutions and values and, in doing so, it has lost much of its support among students. It has since fractionated into several splinter groups and some of these segments seemingly have been involved

in more radical and more violent actions, particularly off campus. Kent State had had a particularly active chapter of SDS in past years and, in the spring of 1969, after an incidence of violence, the chapter of SDS and several students were suspended. The next week, supporters of the SDS members suspended tried to disrupt a university hearing. Several former SDS members were released from jail just previous to the violence in the spring of 1970. This may be sheer coincidence and it probably is, but the possibilities of a small number of individuals provoking critical incidents cannot be totally dismissed.

In addition to the possible participation of a small number of radical agitators, there are some indications that undercover security agents may now be playing a part in demonstrations, perhaps even in escalating them. In the spring of 1970, in New York State, students charged that a police undercover agent had provided materials and encouragement to start fires on a campus which later he could report as an incident. There was also evidence that two undercover state highway patrolmen were arrested in the initial incident closing the gate at O.S.U. Several students reported that the young plain-clothes men had helped in closing the gate which created the incident which led to the arrest of many others.

In sum, it seems unlikely that a sufficient explanation for campus protest and disturbances can be provided by attributing them to a conspiracy or to "outside agitators." On the other hand, one cannot completely dismiss the possibility that, in certain situations, individuals may deliberately provoke incidents without the consent or even knowledge of the others involved. The acts themselves may not be particularly violent or dramatic but the strategy seems to be based on the premise that if enough incidents are created, sooner or later "the authorities" will make a mistake.

...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS ARE CAUSED BY RADICAL SPEAKERS
...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS ARE CAUSED BY THE READY AVAILABILITY OF
REVOLUTIONARY LITERATURE ON CAMPUS

Some persons note that radical speakers often appear on one campus and then another and see in this a conspiracy, assuming that such speakers are a major force in radicalizing students. Since such radicalization has not occurred, radical speakers obviously are not a sufficient cause.

On every campus there are a considerable number of students, some radicals but most not, who are interested in hearing radical speakers as well as other types. The motive for inviting such speakers and listening to them is somewhat like listening to rock and other music; the intent is to achieve an experience rather than to obtain knowledge. They go to see if Abby Hoffman is really as far out as he is reputed. They go to see what a real black militant looks like.

There is, of course, a considerable amount of faddism in the types of speakers who are most sought after. Certain types of people who are "extraordinary" are usually in. Being in trouble with various authorities is one qualification but not the only one. This coming season, one could

rather safely predict that certain persons would be considered "desirable" -- any Black Panther, Betty Friedan, the Chicago Seven, Ralph Nader, Angela Davis, the Berrigan Brothers, members of the Manson Tribe, ex-drug users, married priests, Caesar Chavez, and draft resisters on moral grounds. These are likely to be "in" if some of them are out. At other times, others were "in" -- Jim Garrison, Barry Goldwater, Stokely Carmichael, Mario Savio, Rap Brown, Robert Welch, Martin Luther King, Madame Nhu, Richard Hatcher, ex-Communists, William Buckley, Malcolm X, Castro-type revolutionaries, Ralph Lane, Dick Gregory, Teddy Kennedy, Timothy Leary, William Sloan Coffin, Bernadette Devlin, ex-Cons, homosexuals, Dr. Spock, Allan Ginsberg, Julian Bond, Al Capp, James Meredith, a Black Muslim, the Mahareeshi, etc.

For most college students some events are somewhat like going to the sideshow at the fair -- once you have seen it, you are less interested in seeing it again. Part of the attraction of such speakers is that it provides an opportunity to embarrass college officials and to threaten local community officials. One might posit that the greater the embarrassment, the greater the potential enjoyment. In such a threat context, the speaking engagements sometimes take on dimensions of the excitement of a conspiracy -- finding a room, surreptitiously publicizing the speech, etc. The speeches may take on the appearance of an old-fashioned camp meeting and the results are remarkably similar -- few lasting conversions. One can deplore the tastes of students but one can hardly fear for their souls.

Some persons also suggest that the ready availability of revolutionary literature is a significant factor in student radicalization. Of course, the core of any student protest is a mimeograph machine, but its products more frequently cause environmental pollution rather than ideological conversion. Students read many things including their textbooks, but the prose exhibited in student revolutionary literature seeming is seldom more convincing than is the message on the side of cigarette packages.

Attributing power to revolutionary and protest literature is not just a fear of some but it is also a common error that protest leaders make. This error is made most often in situations where freedom of expression is allowed and encouraged. When expression is restricted, protest leaders assume their lack of success is due to repression. When free expression is present, they often assume that, if people are given the chance to read their message, they will accept it without question. Given such a situation people do read such messages, have the chance to discuss them and, for most, to reject them. When there is free expression on a campus, protest leaders often overestimate the strength of their support while others assume that the protest leaders have gained support because they have been allowed freedom of expression. These are slightly different versions of the same illusion -- that if people read something, they will be convinced. (...and the Bible is still the most widely read book?)

...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS ARE CAUSED BY LONG-HAIRED, DRUG USING HIPPIES

In order to deal with complex reality, many people develop ways of simplifying it in order to try to understand it. This is a widely shared practice and simplifications may involve quite different phenomena. For example, students talk quite glibly about the administration which implies uniformity. Any administration is quite complex with divergent views, not only on educational matters but on ways to deal with student protests. But to many students, it is the administration which acts and which comes to symbolize the focus of their complaints. Others have different villains, however, and the "hippie" has come to be such a symbol for many. (It is interesting to note that the term hippie is not considered a useful term within the "hippie" subculture, since it does not make sufficient differentiation among various types.)

Historians of the future will have to tell us how hair came to be, for many Americans, a critical moral issue in the 60's, but it is increasingly obvious that the young infidels have won. The last bastions of defense on the campus - the football team and those in the professional schools -- have been crumbling, overcome by growth. It is obvious that the battle was lost when it was discovered that talent, motivation, ability, masculinity nor political conviction is determined by a barber.

Just as there is no necessary association between long hair and a radical position, there is also no necessary association between drug-using hippies and political action. In fact, there is increasing evidence that drug users and what are called hippies are generally quite uninterested in direct political action. (It should also be noted that not all hippies are drug users.) Most drugs which are used have the effect of creating physiological and psychological reactions, not direct political action. Too, the "hippie" is most interested in the more humanistic, artistic, romantic and individualistic values, rather than social and political ones. Such persons are more interested in doing their own thing and hope to be left alone, not to become involved. As we indicated earlier, however, hippies may become involved in certain ways because campus protests are dramatic spectacles, sensations in themselves, and appealing to the romantic as well as the revolutionary. The hippie may become caught up in the events as a participant but he is unlikely to provide much of the initiating force.

...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS ARE CAUSED BY DISSATISFACTION WITH LARGE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

One major theme in student protests is criticism directed toward certain educational practices and policies. The fact that protests of all kinds are more frequent at the large universities is assumed by some to provide evidence that the "cause" of such protests is the alienation of students because of the impersonality of the institution.

It is in this context that it is useful to look at the results of a study conducted at the University of California, Berkeley, after the

first major student protest, the Free Speech Movement. In that protest, much of the apparent focus of the protest centered on various aspects of educational impersonality and insensitivity. The leaders of the FSM, in both speeches and pamphlets, severely criticized the nature of the educational process. In the spring of 1965, a random sample of the students was questioned. Seventy-eight percent of the students agreed that "The University sometimes seemed to operate as a factory" and sixty-three percent agreed that "The University was an impersonal institution." In the same study, the students expressed considerable criticism of the specific aspects of teaching, grading, the faculty, administration, and the largeness of the institution. Such evidence could and has been used as documentary evidence for widespread student alienation as a cause of the protest.

On the other hand, other questions in the same study necessitate several afterthoughts:

Sixty-eight percent agreed that "In my contacts with administrative personnel, I have been treated with the consideration a human being deserves.";

Eighty-two percent were satisfied with their courses, examinations, and professors;

Nine-two percent agreed that "Taking everything into account, Cal is a good place to go to school."

These opinions were recorded after six months of protest activity which were characterized by the most intense and vitriolic criticism of the aspects on which they expressed general satisfaction.

The conclusion here is not that students are inconsistent -- they are, as are non-students. This does imply, however, that students are quite willing to criticize certain abstract qualities of university life while, at the same time, maintaining that they have not experienced it. For example, they may agree that "professors do too much research" but yet also say, "I have had no difficulty in obtaining all of the help I need from my professors." One might also infer from this paradox that we are most critical of those aspects of life with which we are most satisfied. (Parents might take heart at this.) Too, give any resident of a large city the opportunity to indict the place he lives and then ask him why he doesn't move. Large cities, and large institutions, are perhaps impersonal, but this is part of their attractiveness -- they are very exciting places to live.

...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS ARE CAUSED BY UNRESPONSIVE ADMINISTRATORS

Sometimes students claim that many campus disturbances could be avoided if college administrators were more accessible, available and responsive. This is often the ideal image of the college president, as field commander willing to circulate among the troops on the battlefield.

(College presidents often have difficulty in determining whether the troops on the battlefield are theirs or where the front lines are.) This fits in with student notions about the therapeutic value of communication. In a 1970 study of 400 students on 18 Midwestern campuses, they identified the leading single cause of campus unrest as being "lack of communication between students and college administrators."

If one looks over the events of the spring of 1970 in Ohio, it would seem that the "causes" and course of student protests had little relationship to administrative style. The case study of Ohio University indicates the variety of ways in which the President tried to be responsive to a wide variety of situations and issues but was powerless to prevent the closing of the school. Evidently he was communicating but some others were not listening. Administrators in Ohio colleges have diverse educational philosophies as well as different personal administrative styles, but these did not seem to bear any direct relationship to "preventing" a disturbance from developing nor in substantially changing the course of events once they began.

Increased communication may have some intrinsic merit, but it also has its risks -- with increased communication, two parties can be much clearer on how much they disagree. The beginning of increased communication might be achieved if student rhetoric were deflated. To call college administrators "Fascists" is not only a poor historical analogy, but inaccurate. To talk about the United States as being a "police state" indicates more the need for increased understanding than for the necessity of reform. To talk about an institution of higher education as totalitarian indicates more about the lack of validity of the "oppressed" ideas than their repression.

...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS ARE CAUSED BY RADICAL FACULTY

College faculties have often been charged as being radical by persons outside the university. This designation is seldom made by radical student leaders today, who see the faculty as very conservative. It is true that taken collectively, professors are more liberal than the general population or than other professional groups in national and international considerations. For example, a study, conducted by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education during the academic year 1968-69, sampled the opinion of more than 60,000 faculty members from all ranks and from all types of institutions. Politically, 41.5% of the faculty members characterized themselves as "liberal" and 5.5% as "left." About 30% said they were "middle-of-the-road," 22.2% were "moderately conservative." In terms of voting behavior, just over half (50.1%) had voted for Humphrey in the 1968 elections and 29.8% had voted for Nixon. Only 0.8% voted for Wallace and the rest did not vote at all.

In the study quoted above, there were certain questions about student activism. More than half (54.1%) disapproved of the "emergence of radical student activism in recent years." Student protests had occurred on campuses of almost two-thirds of the faculty members surveyed. Only

15.6% of all respondents said they approved of the demonstrators' aims and methods. Another 18.4% approved of the aims but not the methods and 20.7% disapproved of the aims. Concerning their own role in the protests, 0.3 percent said they had helped plan, organize or lead them, "1.2 percent joined in active protest with demonstrators and 7.7 percent openly supported the goals of the protestors." (Unfortunately, there is not data available now to indicate the type of protests in which faculty were involved, e.g., anti-war, civil rights, violent, non-violent.)

Faculty members themselves, had a negative view toward activism. More than 76 percent agreed that students who disrupt the functioning of a college should be expelled or suspended. In addition, over 80 percent agreed that "campus demonstrations by militant students are a threat to academic freedom." They were also asked to assess the positive and negative effects of the demonstrations on their academic tasks and relationships. While they felt that the demonstrations had had a slight positive relationship in their teaching and in their relationship with students, the greatest impact had been in the view of campus administrators and on the institution's relation with the local community. As a result of early demonstrations the faculty were more likely to have developed a more favorable view of the administration but were much more likely to assess the consequences negatively for the institution's relationship with the community. (It should be recalled that this survey was conducted in 1968-69 and it is likely that the faculty would take an even more negative view of campus activism today.)

Looking at these findings and, perhaps going beyond them, on any campus, faculty have contact with students. This is the nature of their role in teaching and research. Because of their more liberal political stance, they probably share many of the same values which are expressed in student protests -- opposition to the war, civil rights, etc. On the other hand, the study quoted above indicates that the faculty rejects many of the other goals which have been evident in other campus protests. They very strongly rejected any suggestion that students have control over faculty appointments and promotions, undergraduate admissions policy, contexts of courses or degree requirements. Seventy-nine percent felt that most rules governing student behavior were reasonable and 81.5 percent felt that campus rules at their university were generally administered in a reasonable way.

The study quoted does show that 0.3 percent of the faculty has indicated they had helped plan, organize or lead protests. Without further information from the study, perhaps several guesses could be made. Faculty, often in their teaching role, are asked or, in other instances, assigned responsibility for advising student groups. There are a number of ways in which the advising role can be handled -- minimum attention, active encouragement, dampening uncritical enthusiasm, etc. There are a number of possible groups in which advising is done -- academic, political, social, interest, etc. It is certainly possible that a student peace group might wish to organize a protest march and the faculty advisor may be involved in the planning process and may join the students in their action, indicating both his support of the students and the cause. Such actions may be interpreted by others as being an "agitator."

The close connection between faculty and students has other dimensions which can easily be interpreted as conspiracy and collusion. Some studies have shown that student protest leaders are well-known to faculty -- as they are often bright, articulate and inquisitive students. The perception of collusion between protesting students and faculty is often heightened when members of the faculty intercede for students in a number of ways -- to try to prevent precipitous police actions, to post bail for arrested students, to defend students in disciplinary matters, to try to convince students of the consequences of certain planned actions. Because of their previous relationships with students, the faculty tend to treat them as persons, rather than stereotypes, even though they may disagree with their particular actions. The various case studies indicated in a variety of ways the involvement of faculty -- through the organization of faculty marshals, through attempts at strategic intervention, etc. Attempts to intervene in any way is sometimes interpreted as being an agitator. The same conditions of closeness and the same charge of collusion is often made of campus ministers.

It is possible, of course, that faculty members can and do play a role in the heightening of student protest. Some faculty members, in discussions with students or in speeches at mass rallies, may state ideas in abstract and theoretical terms and then find that students take these ideas in ways which were unintended and unanticipated. They may, for example, talk about the desirability of revolution in some particular historical context and find students translating such ideas to contemporary situations. Ideas do have consequences and some of them negative. Part of the problem lies in the nature of certain types of academic rhetoric. Faculty members, like certain black militant leaders, may not "mean" what they say in their own rhetoric, but often find that their "followers" will try to enact it. "Kill the pigs" may be intended as a rhetorical complaint, but it can become murder when it is interpreted as a set of instructions.

One other aspect of faculty involvement should be noted. In many campus protest activities, some graduate students sometimes come to play important leadership roles. Some of these graduate students are activists. They are often bright, capable people who support their graduate work by assisting in teaching and research. Since they are, in one sense, on the instructional staff, newspaper accounts of their activities often describe them as "faculty" members, creating the impression of vast faculty participation in the leadership of protest.

To sum up a single "faculty" position is impossible, but it probably would not be too distorted to suggest that faculty members, in general, feel that peaceful campus protests are a legitimate part of the student's educational experience. Given that premise, they might encourage it or, more likely, tolerate it. They also see confrontation tactics used by students as being a distinct threat to the nature of the university which is based upon free inquiry and rational discussion. They intensely dislike the presence of off-campus security forces on the campus, but they recognize that a campus which emphasizes openness, flexibility and freedom is ill-equipped to meet the kinds of disruption which has developed on some of the best known campuses in the United States. In their

relationship with students, faculty are sympathetic toward many of their goals and, in fact, have encouraged much of their idealism. On the other hand, they see the actions of some of the students and other demonstrators as leading to the consequences which some of the students already say exist -- the development of a police state. In other words, the actions on some campuses will be self-fulfilling -- in order to prevent the destruction of the University, methods will have to be used which will destroy it another way. Since the University is "home" for the faculty and not a "vacation spot" or a "place to visit" as it is for students and others, the faculty feel helpless in trying to keep their house from burning down or being destroyed by those who are trying to put the fire out.

...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS ARE CAUSED BY THE GENERATION GAP

The concept of the generation gap has perhaps become the modern version of original sin as a universal explanation for contemporary problems. While there are obvious differences between old and young in certain areas -- style, dress, taste in music, heroes, villains, scope of experience, etc., most contemporary studies do not indicate exceedingly sharp differences in attitudes and values between generations. This is not just true among the more conventional college students but it seems to be true even about the more activist students. According to a study by Flacks, the activists are not a generation in revolt against their parents but a generation nurtured by parents who themselves deviate from conventional religious, political and social attitudes and values, and whose children have also accepted these same values. Many of these parents have reared their children with a basic concern with self-development and self-expression with a rather spontaneous expression to the world and also with a concern for the social conditions of others. Generally, the activists have a good relationship with their parents. (These same factors would not necessarily characterize the "hippie," however).

Certain questions could also be raised as to whether considerable differences between generations actually exist on some of the more critical political issues of the day. A study reported in Scientific American, June, 1970, concluded that the young and the college-educated have not opposed the war in Vietnam as much as popularly supposed. In fact, the study indicated that surveys had not revealed until recently any distinct relation between age and attitude toward Vietnam. The generation gap that one would have expected, wherein the young oppose the war and the old support it, simply failed to appear and the differences that existed were not large. (They go on to suggest that public opinion has tended to respond to Presidential initiative and illustrate this by pointing out that in 1968, 51 percent opposed a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam but, when the bombing was halted a month later by President Johnson, 65 percent approved. They also report a 1968 study which indicates that even among people favoring complete withdrawal from Vietnam, 53 percent also expressed distaste for the activities of the protestors.)

The point to be underscored here is that the values of college students, including opposition to the war in Vietnam, is not that sufficiently different from those of their parents or a more general public. Although myths, such as those which emphasize the vast differences between the generations, have a force all their own, they are not true. While vast differences which are often suggested may not exist, the belief does and many persons, young and old, act as if it were so.

...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS WOULD BE STOPPED IF THE CULPRITS WERE IDENTIFIED, ARRESTED AND THROWN OUT OF SCHOOL

In any problem situation, the most usual response, as in a good detective story is to find the villain and to punish him. But in detective stories, as in all works of fiction, it is always easy to identify the bad guys, at least on the last page. This is not the case with student protests. The vast majority of student protest activity is perfectly legal as well as honorable. Students are engaging in freedom of assembly and free speech which sometimes results in picketing. There is no destruction, only the normal wear and debris associated with large gatherings of people. Cluttering may be irritating and even illegal, but a drive down any street will attest to its prevalence.

Illegal acts and the destruction of property occur in only a very small number of cases, and destruction is usually relatively minor -- breaking windows, etc. People who break windows are exceedingly hard to identify, either when there are hundreds of other persons around or when there are no other persons around. The attempt to seek the culprit and to make identification often leads to further destruction. Let us look at a typical campus script.

Students initiate a mass meeting to protest X.

Some student (non-student) expresses his protest by a rock.

Campus police are called in. They make tentative identification and arrest students, some of whom may not have been involved.

Crowd at meeting perceive the police are involved in unjust action. (This may be brought to their attention by protest leaders.) The issue of the protest changes to injustice of arrest.

Crowd starts to harass the police. Additional security forces are brought in. More breaking windows. Security forces use tear gas to break up crowd. Tear gas difficult to control, affects many bystanders. Security forces then begin to arrest persons "at random." This confirms the injustice.

Violence escalates as do the methods to control it.

Because of the great difficulties of identification of those committing acts of destruction in mass situations and because of the negative

public relations problems which would develop if blame is not assessed, universities and the security forces often charge the more visible student leaders, whose crime may only be leadership. This symbolic solution for blame very often becomes, however, a symbol of repression for students. The assessment of blame may satisfy the opinions of others outside the institution, but it may only confirm the impression of students of the repressive nature of the situation.

Very often, university administrators (and security officials) know the risks involved in such symbolic punishment and know its potential for aggravating the situation. They often feel compelled to follow this path, in spite of the extreme difficulty in assessing responsibility and guilt for destructive acts. Otherwise, reaction from boards of trustees, alumni, state legislators, angry store-owners, and parents would think they are "coddling" students and encouraging anarchy. Thus, the disciplinary process during and after those student protests which involve violence are more closely related to reducing indignance than they are to insuring justice.

...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS WOULD CEASE IF STUDENTS WERE GIVEN MORE POWER

One theme in certain student protests is the demand for more power in the activities of colleges and universities. There is considerable virtue and justice in this, and most colleges and universities have, in recent years, made certain modifications which allow greater student participation, particularly in those areas which directly impinge on the lives of the students while on campus. One might also predict, however, that greater involvement in the decision-making process might also lead to greater frustration and, then, to continued protests. Meetings involving faculty and administrative personnel on most college campuses are certainly not the most exciting adventures and to persons who place emphasis on immediate results, such meetings would be very dull. Too, the complexities of college decision making in which a wide variety of groups and interests have to be involved and considered are scarcely designed to produce clear-cut and dramatic results. To many students who are interested in instant change, such complexities would be interpreted as resistance of the establishment toward change.

With greater participation, students are going to be introduced to the many paradoxes of power within the colleges and universities. As it stands now, students claim they have no power and they want it. The faculty claim they have no power and they do not want to give any more up to students, administration or trustees. Administrative officials claim they have little power since they are constrained by the trustees, the faculty and the students. The trustees claim that although they have the legal responsibility to set policy, they often have to accept what the administration suggests and ultimately can only implement those changes which the faculty wants. Ultimately, the students, the faculty, administrative officials, and the trustees insist that the direction of the university is determined by the political climate of the campus.

community and the state or by the economic control of wealthy benefactors, state legislators or the religious denomination which provides support. In addition to all of this, everyone agrees that the direction of colleges and universities is determined by policies of the federal government.

These are some of the paradoxes of power which exist on the contemporary campus which indicate the complexities of decision making. To those students whose view of the world simplifies the nature of power, participation in it will be a very disenchanting experience.

...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS OFFER THE OPPORTUNITY FOR SECURITY FORCES
(LOCAL POLICE, NATIONAL GUARD, ETC.) TO EXPRESS THEIR AGGRESSION
BY BEATING UP STUDENTS

A somewhat common interpretation which has arisen among many college students is that security forces which are called onto campuses use the opportunity to indiscriminately attack students. While this might provide an explanation for certain types of behavior, it would seem that a more general explanation might be that, in most situations, where there is a confrontation between police and large numbers of students, a great deal of fear is generated on both sides which then has its consequences in the subsequent action. For example, in a study of Columbus police who were called to the campus at the incident at 11th and Neil, policemen were asked how they perceived the crowd gathered there at that time. They defined the crowd as being hostile and aggressive. Over eighty percent of them said that they saw persons who acted in ways which threatened them (the police) with physical harm. Approximately forty percent of them indicated that they were injured or hurt at the time, and over ninety percent said that they had been afraid for their own personal safety. This is a rather remarkable expression of fear, particularly since, for most American males and for police officers, it is difficult to admit to being afraid in such situations. The point to be made here is that the reaction of many security forces seems to be characterized more by fear than aggression. They perceive certain student crowds as hostile and aggressive with agitators and, in that sense, fear may be a rational response to the situation. It is probable that studies of other types of security forces, e.g., National Guard, might exhibit even more fear because the units may have had less experience and training than the police group we are talking about. About eight-seven percent of them had been in riot situations previously, but they still perceived this one as being extremely threatening.

...THAT STUDENT PROTESTS LEAD TO SIGNIFICANT EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

This is a particularly difficult assertion to untangle. In the American Council of Education report on campus tensions covering the 1968-69 year, they reported that "although unrest and change are positively associated, colleges and universities also have been instituting changes, without confrontation and crises." Most campuses, regardless

of whether they had had violent or non-violent disruptive protests or whether they had had no disruptive protests, had made changes. These were changes in racial policies, changes in student power, modifications in ROTC programs, etc. The most frequent single change, however, was in the formation of new committees or study groups on campus. This was true particularly on campuses which had experienced violent disruptive protests. One wonders whether the formation of committees could not have been achieved in some other less costly fashion.

Another study by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in August, 1970, indicated that "after five years of labor, the university reform movement has brought forth mountains of committee reports but little actual change." Such a finding could be interpreted as an indication of the resistance to change on the part of the university but, on the other hand, the lack of major change could also indicate that colleges and universities are doing a reasonably good job in spite of the contradictory expectations various groups have for them. Too, some of the suggestions for reform may have more negative consequences than the current practices. For example, required courses which have been a part of general education (or a liberal arts curriculum) are now under attack. These requirements were originally intended to help reverse the technological and materialistic trends toward early job-oriented specialization. Today, students who are hostile to materialism ought to applaud these efforts but they do not want to be told what they must study. Yet, if the requirements are dropped and everyone has the opportunity to do their own thing, the effect is likely to be a return to the fragmentation and specialization which the requirements tried to avoid. Corrections for other types of "problems" may also have unanticipated consequences. Grading, for example, is often attacked because it "creates fear and anxiety." However, like in all other areas of life, there is some need for the evaluation of performance and putting an end to such an evaluation might also be another step in the direction of ignoring the student and would reduce the contacts between teacher and student.

While universities and colleges have changed during the periods when student protests were evident, many of these changes would have occurred anyway, as they did on campuses which did not experience disruptive protests. The changes which have occurred have not been particularly dramatic or revolutionary. The lack of revolutionary change within colleges and universities is more likely an indication of the fact that the current arrangements are not that badly functioning rather than due to rigidity on the part of the institution itself. Many of the changes which have been suggested and demanded have unintended consequences which are often ignored by those who propose them. Some of the changes are valid ideas which, in time, will probably be incorporated in the structure of higher education. If such ideas are so superior to existing practices, then their superiority should be apparent as a result of rational discussion rather than as a result of confrontation.

PART III

THE ROLES OF THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

IN THE CONTINUING CAMPUS CRISES

"The student protests on several university campuses last Spring are dramatic evidence of a deep-rooted crisis in higher education. The causes are complex. They have been preceded by several years of ferment, and colleges and universities across the country will be wrestling with the underlying problems for years to come. The "crisis" involves profound questions of moral and educational value in our society as well as in the universities. They have great social and political significance and are thus important to the churches and the general public.

It is not a new thing for the Christian Church to be concerned about higher education. Throughout its history, the Church has had a sense of responsibility for and a relationship to universities. This relation to higher learning has been expressed in different ways as the Church has become aware of changing needs and different understandings of its role in culture. The Church has founded and supported colleges and universities and has developed ministries among students and faculty in all types of institutions.

Today there is a new situation in higher education with dangers and opportunities that call for new forms of concern for students, faculty, and administrators, and for the colleges and universities in which they live and work. It is important that churches study this changing situation and seek an understanding of what is happening so that a constructive response may be made."

-- "A Letter To The Churches About
The Crisis In Higher Education,"
from the General Board of the
National Council of Churches
meeting in Houston, Texas,
September 12, 1968

The religious community has had an important stake in higher education historically, and has continuing interest in contemporary higher education, either from the viewpoint of Church-related colleges or from the viewpoint of support of church-related activities on state-assisted colleges and universities. It is, perhaps, appropriate to look more closely at the various roles that representatives of the religious community played during the spring of 1970 and then also to indicate some of the possible continuing responsibilities.

Roles During the Events of Spring, 1970

Campus ministers and college chaplains played many different roles in the reconciliation process during the spring. There were many different emotions which students found difficult to handle. There were on many campuses tremendous increases in anxiety -- at the presence of violence and potential violence on campus. There was grief at the deaths of the Kent State students and also for the students at Jackson State. There was anger directed toward security forces and at activist students. And there was growing hostility among certain segments of the students on particular campuses. Campus ministers were involved in a wide variety of attempts to help students to handle these feelings and emotions. Their activity ranged from individual counseling, group discussions, and major participation in memorial services for the death of the Kent State students. As we indicated earlier, this was the most frequent "protest" response on Ohio campuses in the spring.

Too, campus clergy played roles in the conduct of informal classes and discussions which on many campuses supplanted or supplemented regularly scheduled classes. They acted as enablers, keeping open channels of communication between disparate, antagonistic, or otherwise separated groups.

At some of the campuses where violence occurred, churches and student religious centers became sanctuaries in the medieval sense. One evening, in the later stages of the disturbances at Ohio State, a number of demonstrators were gathered on the Oval intending to spend the night in discussion when the National Guard moved in to enforce an existing curfew. A confrontation was avoided when the group moved to St. Stephen's Episcopal Church to continue their "free" university during the rest of the night. During the period when Ohio State was closed, St. Stephen's, located on the edge of the campus, became a major meeting place for all sorts of groups -- groups of striking students, meetings of the Green Ribbon Committee -- a faculty peace-keeping group, and even "official" meetings of some segments of the university. The United Christian Center was another center of activity and refuge. During the period when tear gas permeated the campus and when no-one outside could escape its consequences, first-aid stations were set up at the Center and at Hillel Foundation to help assist those suffering from the temporary but irritating consequences. In the ambiguities which surrounded the imposition of the curfew, one campus pastor was arrested for "disorderly conduct" while trying to help students return safely home. Others were directly gassed.

Some churches and nearly all of the religious centers also served as substitute classrooms. Graduates and undergraduate students in electrical engineering met in eight rooms of the Hoge Memorial Presbyterian Church in Columbus to continue 20 classes, with faculty members conducting the classes. The United Christian Center served as Mathematics Department (over 12,000 students enrolled) headquarters. Others were similarly engaged.

On some campuses, ministers indicated their concerns in a variety of ways. Four ministers conducted a fast at Ohio University to protest

the killing at Kent State and in Southeast Asia and some of them participated in the leadership of a large peaceful student/faculty march through parts of Athens on May 6.

In several of the campuses, e.g., Kenyon, Baldwin-Wallace, Bowling Green, etc., students spoke at local churches in an attempt to inform others of the concerns of students at that time. There are indications that they were not well received.

The various case studies provide other illustrations of the role and participation of campus clergy in events of the spring and early summer. These situations, and their specific responses, point up the contemporary roles of campus ministers as reconcilers, ombudsmen, interpreters and communicators, bridge-builders and facilitators. As such they acted to keep channels open, sometimes as almost the only such in times of great tension and confusion, between the alienated and the sources of power: between administration and students, and between churches and the university community. Often religious centers became Communication Centers.

Consequently, these functions of campus clergy can be lifted up and emphasized as essential in the total set of functions and services in the complex communities of higher education, and their related communities. The Church, and members of religious communities, especially, need competent interpreters to communicate reliable information and informed opinions based upon first hand experience and involvement. Campus ministers, generally, are qualified to meet that need, among others.

Continuing Roles for the Campus Ministry

If one poses the question of what the campus clergy might do to "prevent" future campus disruptions, the possibilities are very restricted, as they are for everyone else. Many of the multiple factors which finally culminate in campus disruption are beyond the control of anyone on a specific campus. The Cambodian decision and the death of the Kent State students were factors outside of the control of any students, faculty, administrators, campus ministers, or community officials. Their cumulative impact which culminated in grief and anger was, in the last analysis, handled fairly well on most campuses in Ohio. The expressions were primarily peaceful and responsible. Part of the credit for this course must go to religious personnel on campus. A high level administrator at one of the larger public universities in Ohio has written that he is convinced that the violence which erupted last May would have come earlier if it had not been for the work of many faculty, administrators, and clergy, "most conspicuously the campus ministers." And on at least one other campus, campus clergy are credited with significant contributions in helping to keep that university from more violent disruption.

On the large campuses, with their greater diversity of students and, therefore, diversity of interest and motivations, Cambodia and the Kent State deaths only added tensions which aggravated already existing multiple problems. Heterogeneity brings on problems which are "avoided" if a student body is composed of students with similar racial and

socio-economic backgrounds. Also, the physical isolation of certain campuses often results in cultural isolation. Universities with graduate schools and with multiple colleges are likely to draw more diverse types of students. These types of heterogeneity are likely, on certain occasions such as the spring of 1970, to provide rather violent eruptions. The confrontation model which has been adopted by a small number of students often produces circumstances which elicit the support of the larger number of students who have multiple motivations for participation. Such circumstances are unlikely to be avoided by such simplistic notions, as "better communication, "more responsive administrators," etc. While these ideas may be worthwhile ideas in themselves, they will not have a significant determinative effect on the course of campus disruptions or student unrest since many of the factors which culminate in these events are beyond the effective control of any one campus or beyond the control of any one segment on campus. Just because a problem exists does not mean that there are easy solutions.

It would seem, however, that there are continued needs on college campuses to which the religious community needs to be responsive. If one looks at various themes with the student protest movement, there are a number which are not only admirable but ones which have been part of the concern religious groups have had for centuries. There are heightened concerns about the nature of war and its morality as well as the consequences of discrimination and poverty. Students have been raising questions about the obligations of citizenship -- what shall we render unto Caesar? They are raising questions of justice; about the flexibility and receptivity of structures; and about the nature of the governing process. They have been raising questions as to the responsibilities of stewardship of the world in which we live. They have been raising questions about the quality of interpersonal relationships and the possibilities of improving them. Many students have, in Harvey Cox's terms, re-discovered the celebration. These themes and these concerns have always been strong in the church.

It is obvious that many students are extremely idealistic both in terms of their own goals and in terms of the goals of the society. They are not just dealing with problems of the campus, but with larger problems of life. Because of this, there is, on the campus today, possibly the most intense search for values among students that has been evidenced in many years. Much of this search can be seen in religious terms even though the terminology is often different and the awareness of the seekers as to the religious sources is often lacking.

While it may be difficult for a number of people to accept, some aspects of the "hippie" movement and the counter-culture social phenomena are religious in nature, sometimes approaching the fervor and commitment of a religious sect through which members reach what they feel to be the highest levels of an achievement of values, with missionary activity as an effect as members attempt to bring salvation to the corrupt society that rejects them. Many of the "hippie" themes have parallels within Christianity: the doctrine of universal love and the unique value of the individual. Like all religious movements, the hippie movement

has its small core of devotees and theologians, its phonies and its saints and a large mass of vacation, weekend and Sunday members. But it is a religion which proclaims the superiority of the meek and the downtrodden who are looking for forms of order which require less violence, less pain and less contempt.

The student's search for new values take in a wide range -- the mysticism of Eastern religions, the consciousness expansion of drugs, the zealotry of political activism, the creation of new culture, the renewed attention of the acts of artistic creation, the emphasis on the full range of the senses, not just the intellect. Are Christian values irrelevant to this search?

It would seem that there are many aspects of the Christian tradition which continue to be extremely relevant to the campus. The function of the university is not messianic and hope for salvation must be sought elsewhere than at the university. But it would seem that there are many aspects of the Christian tradition which continue to be extremely relevant to the campus. And there are a series of religious understandings which do provide some insight into some of the contemporary dilemmas of the campus.

The following extensive quotation from the previously cited National Council of Churches "A Letter To The Churches About the Crisis in Higher Education" contains some positive suggestions. Appropriate responses on the part of the religious community are indicated in the face of manifest dissatisfactions and unrest in academic communities.

"It is of crucial importance to the churches and to Christian people that we listen to what young people are saying. The words may not seem right and we may not always agree, but we must listen seriously to their message. We must follow closely what is going on so that we may understand the inner meaning of it, respond with openness to the criticisms that are being made, and press for the changes that are necessary. Further, this is no time for emotional reactions, snap judgments, and calls for legislative or police action that lead to forceful restraints, punitive measures, and coerced obedience.

The churches must not forget that their greatest contribution is to sustain in the community and higher education men and women of character, intelligence, integrity and sensitive, human concern. This task will call for the churches to be more open to the influence of higher education in their life and work. They need the resources and perspectives of higher education if they are to make the gospel relevant to our technological culture. As more and more young people are exposed to higher education, the more they will need the undergirding of informed and sound theological understanding if they are to be able to apply effectively the principles of faith to today's complex, ethical, and moral issues.

As churches, let us be reminded of the basic kinship of purpose that exists between churches and colleges and universities.

They share a common concern for man and society, learning and service. The churches should give support to the many faculty, administrators, and students who are constructively seeking educational reform, experimenting in new directions, and exploring new frontiers of service to man. The churches must give their support to all those in higher education who know that the basic problem is the inability of many institutions to move students beyond self-centered vocational aims to deeper and more exciting social vision and life commitment.

The churches have a particular opportunity to work with their own church-related colleges in activities that will further humane concerns and serve community needs. These colleges have great freedom that makes possible educational innovations and creativity."

PART IV

AFTER THOUGHTS

CONSEQUENCES

QUESTIONS WHICH REMAIN

AFTERTHOUGHTS

In the previous section, we have tried to deal with some of the simplistic thinking that often characterizes discussions of student protests. In doing this, one intent was to indicate that there are no easy solutions, no panaceas. Therefore, in the agony of the aftermath, many of the immediate reactions are probably wrong. Campus protests are not going to be significantly changed by new laws. Neither are they going to be significantly changed by arresting the "leaders." Neither will protest be stifled by cutting off funds to colleges -- for then protest will be transferred more directly to the broader society and the focus may turn away from college administrators to the public officials. Nor will protests be reduced by dramatic changes within the university structure. This does not mean that certain changes within colleges, universities, or within the larger community should not be made. Many changes should be made but not necessarily because it is assumed that by making that change, it will sufficiently reduce campus protests. Many of the factors, the multiple factors, which lead to campus disturbances will still be there after the changes are made. It is perhaps necessary to underscore certain points.

The colleges and universities of the United States now have the largest number of students in history.

These students have many different motivations and interests. Very few of them have radical value systems.

Peaceful campus protests have had a long tradition and now a greater number of persons involved in them.

Most student protests in recent years have been peaceful.

The model for confrontation protests which often lead to violence has been suggested to students by ghetto disturbances.

A small number of students have adapted these tactics to the college and university scene.

Confrontation models become widely shared through communication and mass media coverage.

Events from the larger society, e.g., the Cambodian decision and events from other campuses, e.g., the Kent State shootings may

heighten conflict already existing and/or may initiate new protest activity.

Small numbers of students may provoke confrontation and the response to it may elicit support of previously uninvolved and uninterested students for whom the original issues are irrelevant.

Prohibiting peaceful protest on campus would be contrary to certain values of the University and to the constitutional rights of the students.

Repressive measures to control protest has a high probability of radicalizing an increasing number of students.

Continued protests which eventuate in violence will lead to greater pressure to use more repressive measures.

So, a situation exists which can lead to the loss of freedom within the university and to the possible destruction of the university as the locus of rational thought and discussion within the society.

CONSEQUENCES: SOME EVEN POSITIVE

It is perhaps too early to assess all of the consequences of the spring of 1970 even to be aware of some of them. But a number of things happened;

- many students were forced to think seriously about the nature and causes of violence -- not just in Vietnam but on their own campuses. Too, they were forced to evaluate the contribution of their behavior to the whole process. To many students, previously, violence was something on the evening news, not something they were close to or involved in.
- most members of the university community were involved in rethinking the nature of education and the nature of the college and university. For some campuses, it was a creative experience. For others who tried just as hard, it was a frustrating experience of not being able to control the forces which lead the university down the path toward the cessation of educational activity.
- most members of the university community were involved in rethinking the relationship of their campus to the events of the larger society. How isolated can a campus be and how isolated can an education be to the problems of a larger society?
- as a result of the rethinking process, it is evident that a greater cohesion developed among certain segments of the university community between faculty and student, between administration and faculty, between campus ministers and other

parts of the campus community. They had shared a common experience, a traumatic one.

- as a result of the experience of the spring, many of those charged with the problems of security also rethought many of their assumptions. When is force justified? What are the proper ways to handle disruptive incidents? When should the National Guard be called out and what should they do? What situation warrants what methods? Are loaded guns necessary?

One could argue that the rethinking process for all of the elements involved had positive consequences, but there are likely to be other consequences, not so positive. Only some of these can be mentioned here.

- increasing polarization among students on campuses. Several times we have mentioned the diversity of students and their values. Much of the student protest activities on campuses have been initiated by the more radical leadership. It would seem that one of the consequences of the spring, which was evident even then, will be the growth or resistance on the part of more conservative students. With campus grievances and with the Vietnam War setting the stage, politically divided student bodies, by their very existence, can generate a series of ugly incidents, not between students and "authorities", but among students. Security forces may, then, have to be called to intercede rather than control.
- increasing loss of sympathy with campus protest. Even after the shootings at Kent State, a poll by Louis Harris indicated that only 27 percent of the public expressed sympathy with student protestors while 52 percent condemned them. In the same poll, the majority (53%) did not feel that the protests should be declared illegal but there was clear indication of a loss of sympathy. If a message is supposed to be communicated to the larger society by campus protest activity, evidently the wrong message is being communicated.
- increasing estrangement of college campuses from the communities in which they are located. Many colleges and universities have been viewed by communities in which they are located as being an important cultural resource, as well as an important economic resource. Many of these communities have felt in the past that colleges provided skills, programs, facilities and personnel which enriched the community. Too, colleges and universities had important economic consequences for communities. The presence of a number of persons engaged in educational activity provided "money" which was converted within the community into food, shelter, clothing and taxes. Now some communities seem to be considering the presence of such schools as not so desirable. Rather than being a cultural advantage, such schools are now being seen as contributing to and creating a number of undesirable consequences caused by the presence of large numbers

of students. Too, the economic consequences of the schools are now less often being seen in terms of their positive contribution but primarily in terms of the cost for the community -- the costs of law enforcement and the damage to local stores and other buildings.

-- increasing allocation of university resources to security rather than to educational considerations. In order to reduce the negative consequences of student protests upon local campus communities, many colleges and universities are allocating a greater amount of time and money to campus security -- recruitment and training of campus police, increased control of access to campus, increased protection of buildings, protection of vital research capacities, such as computers and libraries, etc. While these are seen as necessary in the context of the times, efforts in these directions take resources away from other pressing educational needs.

-- increasing loss of public support for higher education. Since any form of student protest is being viewed increasingly as not constituting a legitimate educational experience, disapproval of it is often translated into a reluctance to continue support for higher education. This may be reflected in the reluctance to contribute to an alumni development program. It may be reflected in the reluctance to allocate large gifts. It may be translated as a lack of enthusiasm to provide continued financial support for tax-supported institutions. These reactions may be justified as punishment for the inability of institutions of higher education to control "their" students. Such punishment may come from parents whose sons and daughters are in college. The irony is that "those" students are also "their sons and daughters." The tragedy is that, since the theme of many student protests is centered on change, the "punishment" will make legitimate change more difficult.

QUESTIONS WHICH REMAIN

On The Nature of Protest -

Should protests be prohibited on college campuses because of the possibility that they might develop into violence?

What are acceptable ways of expressing anger, grief and frustration?

Should mass meetings be banned on campuses even though the vast majority of them are peaceful assemblies?

Are the issues which are at the center of protest activities really that important to the mass of students or are they the interests of a small group of students?

Should a college or university be held responsible for every action of any of its students?

How involved should a college, its faculty, its students be in political matters?

How important does an issue have to be in order to close down a college? Is a Presidential speech sufficient grounds?

To how many members does an issue have to be important to close a college or university down? Can a small number do it?

Is any idea worthwhile if it has to be communicated by force?

On the Nature of Violence -

How do you determine who provokes violence?

How do you establish a dialogue with a small number of students who have abandoned reason?

When do you call in security forces from outside campus? At what stage? If it is done too early, you provoke the situation; if it is done too late, you risk destruction. What is too early or too late?

When security forces are called on campuses, who's in charge?

Who makes the decision when to use tear gas? fire weapons?

Is violence on campus actually related to student unrest? Or is it caused by groups who have nothing to do with the students?

How do you protect a university from fire-bombing, window breaking, etc.?

Does the use of force by the larger society in military endeavors justify the use of force on the campus?

On the Nature of Discipline -

What are the grounds for expelling a student from a university? Does he have the right to a hearing or should it be an administrative responsibility?

Should students be subjected to double jeopardy? Should they be punished by the civil courts and/or the university? Is one punishment enough? How do you determine guilt?

What responsibility does a college or university have to protect its students from unfair treatment by law enforcement officials?

What responsibility does a college or university have in protecting law enforcement officials from students?

Should we be as concerned with human rights on campus as we seem to be about property rights?

Is it possible to deal in a humane fashion with those who are intent with destroying the university?

Should the campus be a sanctuary protecting students from punishment which would be forthcoming in off-campus situations?

On the Nature of Educational Change -

How is change brought about in a university? By the vote of students? By the desires of faculty and administrators only?

Are institutions of higher education so unresponsive that change requires violent methods?

What responsibility does a college or university have to disadvantaged minorities -- blacks, lower income students, women, etc.?

How can universities deal rationally with problems which cannot be solved rationally?

How can a community, such as the university, be so politically conscious and yet be so politically inept?

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

CASE STUDIES OF THE EVENTS ON SELECTED CAMPUSES

Overall descriptions of the range of activities of a large number of campuses and universities tend to average out differences and to ignore unique aspects. In order to correct this, there are certain advantages in looking at some campuses in a more concentrated fashion. There were several criteria for selection. One, we wished to include both Kent State and Ohio State since, in each of these campuses, there were violent consequences. We also wanted to include other campuses where various forms of protest occurred without violence. We also wish to emphasize some of the diversity in Ohio colleges and universities. They differ in size and location and as to whether they are private or public institutions. We have presented them here in terms of private and church-related, or as state assisted. Every campus would have been worthwhile to consider but we did have to make a selection.

The complexity of the events and the difference in their meanings to different participants and observers makes a unified picture almost impossible. In most instances, what we have tried to do is to look at the events at the selected campuses in a chronological fashion. We have obviously been selective in what has been included here, but what is presented is based on a variety of diverse sources. In each of the situations we have asked persons who were closely involved either as observers or, in some way, participants to describe it for us. We also collected a number of first-hand accounts in other ways and from other persons. In addition, we have collected a vast quantity of newspaper accounts of the events and other documentary materials. The norms of free speech have great implications for the quantity of material one can collect. While the responsibility for the final reconstruction of the chronology has been ours, the credit should be with many others -- students, faculty, campus ministers, administrators, reporters, etc.

A. Private and Church Related Institutions

KENYON COLLEGE

Kenyon is a small school (790 students) in a smaller town (640). It is a private, co-educational (though mostly male) institution offering undergraduate degrees in liberal arts and sciences. While Kenyon has an Episcopal background, its students and faculty normally represent somewhat diverse religious, ethnic, and racial backgrounds. A nationally known and respected college, Kenyon has a fine faculty and attracts the better than average student, many of whom go on to graduate and professional schools.

Thursday, April 30	President Nixon announced the dispatching of U.S. troops to Cambodia.
--------------------	---

Monday, May 4

The killings at Kent State are reported nationally. The response of the Kenyon community was an informal, ad hoc group of students, faculty, the school chaplain, etc., which met at the Dean's house till early morning hours. The following decisions were made (and approved by the administration):

1. An all-college assembly was to be held at 10:00 a.m. the following day and class attendance was not compulsory that day.
2. All faculty were notified that night about the following day's assembly.
3. A steering committee to preside at the assembly was formed. (The newly elected student body president was to function as the general chairman.)

Tuesday, May 5

The college assembly was held from 10:00 a.m. to after 2:00 p.m.

A brief presentation was made by the committee; then a free discussion followed (speakers coming to microphone) to decide upon Kenyon's response to the situation.

1. The President announced he had joined with 47 other college and university presidents in sending a joint telegram to President Nixon.
2. A decision (by both faculty and students) was made to send a telegram to President Nixon and Governor Rhodes and signed by those who wished to do so. The plan was to run the telegram as an ad in Columbus and Cleveland papers. (The ad was paid for by contributions collected from those who signed: over \$1,000.)
3. A decision was made to meet the next day. (About 10:00 p.m. a meeting at Wooster College was held between student leaders from five or six nearby institutions. They planned a march on the State House that Friday, hoping for complete participation from each college.)

Wednesday, May 6

An all-college assembly was held from 4:00 till 9:00 p.m. A long debate ensued. The hall was jammed with college and town observers. An extraordinary change of opinion took place during this session. Some decisions were made:

1. The march planned for Friday was given up as not appropriate. (15 or 20 students did join

in the Columbus march but not the whole community.) A committee to inform the other participant colleges was formed.

2. The President agreed to invite other Ohio presidents to request an interview with the Governor of Ohio. (23 ultimately joined; the Governor never agreed to meet.)

(Proponents of a student strike and complete cessation of all college schedules, etc. freely argued their cases.)

Thursday, May 7

An all-college assembly was held.

Again, a long, open discussion was held. Finally a series of recommendations were made to the college. These included: that examinations be cancelled; a series of forums and teach-ins be substituted along with daily assemblies; daily quiet prayer in the chapel; invitations to Mt. Vernon residents to join in the assemblies and symposia. The students presented the above to the faculty. In response, the president of the college and the faculty secretary called a special faculty meeting for Friday.

Impromptu peaceful sit-in at Mt. Vernon Post Office.

Friday, May 8

A faculty meeting was called for 4:00 p.m.

At the above-mentioned meeting, the faculty voted to admit students (the first time in the school's 146-year history); at the meeting carefully planned presentations of the pros and cons of each position were made. There was a standing ovation by the faculty at the end of the presentations.

The faculty recessed at 6:00 p.m. The intention was to meet again on the next day, Saturday, May 9.

Saturday, May 9

There was a faculty meeting at 1:00 p.m. preceded by a 9:00 a.m. Faculty Council meeting which framed an answer to the formal request of the students for a discussion at 1:00 p.m.

The meeting of the faculty brought out and passed a compromise motion which delayed exams till the 20th through the 27th and excused seniors from course exams. A supplemental program of convocations and seminars was approved with a new committee (faculty, students, and administrators) for the seminars and the regular joint Committee

on Convocations for the Assemblies. Particularly over-wrought students were to be permitted to take incomplete grades.

A small meeting was held with student leaders to explain the faculty motions. A request was made that an assembly be called that night to present this to the student body.

The result of the above request was an all-college assembly held at 8:00 p.m. Two professors presented the faculty's recommendations. There was much discussion. The compromise eventually worked out did not satisfy everyone, but it was accepted.

(It has been reported that the public and press were at the above meeting as they were at most assemblies. A national column appreciated and mentioned the "...civility, an appreciation of academic freedom and mutual respect between faculty and student body...." that was evident at the assembly.)

Other decisions were made. Special committees formulated the up-coming week of seminars, the evening assemblies, and a series of approaches to the non-academic community.

Sunday, May 10

Students appeared at 22 churches to give five-minute statements about the concerns and reactions of the college.

Monday - Friday
May 11 - 15

There were evening convocations and daily seminars. Both were well attended.

May 11: Booths were set up on Main Street, etc. for students to discuss concerns with any who would listen and/or participate. They passed out several thousand addressed, stamped postcards (addressed to Congressmen and Senators). They urged communication with the legal representatives of the people, asking that persons write, whatever their opinions.

May 15: The last evening assembly on Kenyon and its relationship to community action. A panel of Mt. Vernon/Gambier/Kenyon individuals discussed the gap between two towns and the school and ways of serving together to meet community needs.

May 20 ... on

Examinations were held, regular procedures resumed, and Commencement held on 31st.

BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE

Baldwin-Wallace College is a liberal arts school in the north central Ohio county of Cuyahoga. Located in the town of Berea (population: 24,000), the college has a full-time enrollment of 2,400 students. Baldwin-Wallace is a co-educational institution with a Methodist affiliation.

The events indicate a greater concern over national issues than local ones. As such, the college was more concerned with the ramifications of the nation's involvement in Vietnam and Cambodia than about the condition of their own campus, faculty or administration.

What follows is a documentation of events from the 2nd through the 10th of May, 1970.

Saturday and Sunday
May 2 and May 3

During the weekend of the 2nd and 3rd of May, six members of a campus group, the Peace Forum, concluded that the college should go on strike. (The Peace Forum is reported to be a campus-recognized organization composed primarily of student activists.)

The reasons given for the proposed strike were many and varied and described as both specific and vague. The six students who proposed the strike became the nucleus of what was to be termed the Student Strike Coordinating Committee (SSCC). Employing a variety of devices, printed bulletins, the Baldwin-Wallace radio station, and notices in buildings, the SSCC leaders were able to advertise a student strike proposed for Monday, May 4.

SSCC leaders met several times with the school's Academic Dean during the weekend. The content of their discussion involved talk of the possible consequences of the strike activity and the course and type of expression possible or likely to develop. The SSCC leaders were reminded that the college would not tolerate violence or any type of forceful disruption of scheduled campus activities. The SSCC leaders expressed their belief that the Baldwin-Wallace strike should coincide with the national student strike. Furthermore, SSCC planned to urge the boycotting of all classes in order to turn attention to the world political climate. Emphasis on the Southeast Asian situation was of particular concern. SSCC members desired that both the President of the College and the faculty make statements clarifying the position of Baldwin-Wallace.

The Academic Dean's relations with the SSCC was described by others as good. In ensuing events,

there were no class disruptions, no police called or students arrested, no damage to the campus, no building blocked and no suspension of the college's regularly scheduled activities.

Monday, May 4

Beginning Monday, those students who so wished were urged to boycott classes, attend discussions and debates on the current national and international crisis.

The primary focus of the strike was reported to be American foreign policy; with Southeast Asia of particular importance. However, the Kent State deaths were to later expand SSCC concerns and "bring it all home" for a number of students.

A special group, the Liaison Committee, decided, due to the nature of the campus situation, that a special faculty meeting be called. (The Liaison Committee is a committee of faculty that deals primarily with sensitive faculty-administration problems.) The purpose of the meeting was to consider the general campus situation and the SSCC request for a positional statement by the faculty on the Asian war and, specifically, the move into Cambodia. The meeting was scheduled for and held at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, May 4.

A petition presented at the above-mentioned meeting opposed the Vietnam and Cambodian wars and demanded the withdrawal of U.S. troops. The petition was not a positional statement of the entire faculty at Baldwin-Wallace. Rather, the petition provided an opinion/position which individual faculty members might endorse if they so desired.

Furthermore, the faculty passed a resolution supporting the study, interest and action of those students for the Vietnam and Cambodian Wars and the decisions of President Nixon and those other students who opposed the wars and the actions of the President.

The responses to the faculty resolutions passed at the above-mentioned special meeting were mixed. While most students were reportedly positive or neutral, the SSCC and their student supporters were negative. SSCC and its supporters felt that the faculty should have taken a stronger and more definite position. And SSCC said so. Through the campus paper and campus radio station, SSCC made its disappointments known. Furthermore, SSCC expressed hope that the President of Baldwin-Wallace

would take a position critical of the Nixon administration's Cambodian venture.

The strike continued for the rest of the afternoon. Although SSCC urged a boycott of all classes, they took no action to actually disrupt the campus' schedule. Debates and discussions were held in the college union. Size was estimated, at varying times, of 15 to 100 students. The Academic Dean's office contacted the various college division chairmen, asking that estimates of class attendance be forwarded to his office. There was no significant drop in class attendance, although some students did stay away.

Tuesday, May 5

One should remember that it was on the evening news of May 4 that the killing of the four Kent State students was reported. Baldwin-Wallace reported that no change was observed in the strike behavior or of the faculty and students participating. On May 5, 3:30 p.m. a memorial service for the dead Kent State students was held in the college chapel. The memorial service was well attended as was a candlelight procession.

The Academic Dean notified all individuals with faculty rank that they could (if they so desired) sign the faculty petition that had been formulated on May 4th and that it would be available for signatures from 9:00 a.m. till noon on May 6 in his office. The petition eventually contained 29 out of 129 possible signatures.

SSCC published a statement decrying in "strong language" the May 4th faculty action. The SSCC group later rectified and withdrew the "strong language" after a talk with the Academic Dean. The Dean told SSCC he would not tolerate their verbal abuse of the faculty. SSCC complied with the changes he demanded.

The strike continued. SSCC members and supporters, some with black armbands and some with posters stationed themselves in well-travelled areas of the campus and distributed leaflets. They also engaged in voluntary discussion and debate with students and faculty and urged the boycotting of classes. No confirmed class cancelling was documented, although there were non-confirmed reports of several instructors cancelling their classes.

Wednesday, May 6

An early evening all-campus assembly was held in the college union ballroom. It was well attended.

A positional statement was made by SSCC:

"The main function of the strike is to provide a rational vehicle for concern, introspection, and active non-violent participation for members of the Baldwin-Wallace community."

The SSCC further desired:

"...a boycott of classes for active, non violent means of expression of concern, to allow students to focus their energy on the present political crisis, and for state and federal lobby, redefinition of the educational goals and redirection of academic process in the academic program."

Furthermore, the SSCC urged a petition of local off-campus residents regarding Southeast Asia; a letter-writing campaign to congressional representatives; the speaking at local churches; the endorsement of political candidates (Howard Metzenbaum and John Gilligan.)

The College President read a letter/statement aimed at President Nixon, a letter which reportedly satisfied the vast majority of the Baldwin-Wallace community, including SSCC members. After his address there were several statements by concerned faculty and students.

Thursday, May 7

Members of SSCC and various members of the student government, concerned about possible ramifications of strike activity on grades, spoke with the Academic Dean. The Academic Dean invited several members of SSCC to meet in the early evening with the Dean's Faculty Advisory Board. The meeting resulted in the emergence of a "Two-Track Education Program." The program was designed to ameliorate the scholastic condition of those students who were too overwrought with the events of the strike week and the international situation.

Friday, May 8

The "Two Track Education Program" was presented to a regularly scheduled meeting of the Policy and Procedures Board. It was approved and sent to the faculty where, except for minor alterations, it was also passed. The program allowed students to take a T grade in place of a letter grade. (90 T grades were eventually given.)

May 8, 9, and 10

As the SSCC strike continued some individuals felt that they would attempt to disrupt the annual May Day festivities that began on May 8 and were

to continue through Sunday, May 10. However, SSCC openly condemned any group or individual who would disrupt the festivities. There was no trouble reported.

Monday, May 10

There was no more strike activity on Monday or for the rest of the spring term at Baldwin-Wallace.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Now associated with the United Methodist Church, the seminary is a graduate theological school of some 240 students located in Dayton. It offers the B.D. degree and most of its students enter the parish ministry.

Wednesday, May 6

Classes were cancelled in the morning and an all-morning hearing was held on campus with about 75 percent of the students attending.

The morning was concluded with a special chapel service with communion.

As a result of the all-morning meeting, an organized letter-writing campaign was initiated, in support of the Cooper-Church amendment, as well as protests against the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State shooting. The letters were to be directed toward President Nixon and to the student's senators and congressmen.

The President of the seminary joined with other presidents of colleges and universities in sending a telegram to President Nixon concerning the invasion of Cambodia and the Kent State shootings.

Friday - Saturday
May 8 - 9

Seven or eight students and faculty went to Washington to join the protest being held there.

OTTERBEIN COLLEGE

Otterbein College is situated in Westerville at the outskirts of Columbus. In the spring of 1970, it had a total student body of about 1,350, including 20 blacks and six foreign students. Otterbein was started by the Evangelical United Brethren Church but has become Methodist affiliated recently when the two denominations merged. Approximately 60 percent of the present student body are education majors. It is a residential college. Most of the male students move out of the dormitories at the end of their sophomore year into fraternity houses and approved rooming houses. Women students are required to live in dormitories. Tuition is relatively low compared to other private colleges.

"In a bold move, church-affiliated Otterbein College (Ohio) will add three students and three faculty members with full voting power to its 30-member board of trustees in September.

"Also, it will establish a unicameral legislature of an equal number of students and faculty, and a smaller number of administrators, thus giving students a voice in hiring personnel, formulating curricula and regulations, and considering budgets.

"This is a wise move by a small college of 1,400 students, which has been virtually untouched by disorders.

"Involvement of the young men and women will add student viewpoints in solving problems and give the students valuable experience in the practical issues of higher education....

"Such forward programs should go a long way toward solving problems at these schools before they can become a cause for disorders."

The above quotation from an editorial in the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times of June 15, 1970, is representative of the wide local and national coverage given the adoption of a new governance plan at Otterbein College. The plan received approval from the students and faculty on May 6, 1970 and trustee approval on June 7, 1970. Coming after the wave of campus unrest in May, the plan was assumed to represent a spirit at Otterbein that kept that small college quiet while others were exploding. Things are never that simple. To understand the complexities, perhaps it is best to begin with a recounting of the activities at Otterbein during that period.

Although those associated with The Ohio State University are aware only peripherally of Otterbein, OSU looms large in the minds of the Otterbein community. For many there are official ties; for others, OSU is the source of library books, films and speakers. Otterbein students see OSU as a reference point for evaluating their own campus. For the mobile students, the OSU area is a source of those amenities noticeably absent in their own area: the various "watering places," well-stocked book stores, campus-oriented shops and the general excitement of mingling with the varied "types" found around and on large campuses. Thus, what happens at OSU has repercussions at Otterbein, so a recount of Otterbein activities must begin when riots first occurred at OSU and an unknown number of Otterbein students went to where the action was. Among this group were some seven or eight who spent the night in the city jail on charges of curfew violation. When further disturbances occurred at OSU, most Otterbein students avoided the area.

President Nixon's announcement of the move into Cambodia was met with indifference at Otterbein, except for a small cadre of students who represent, in a modest way, the activist, peace-oriented students found at all campuses. There was also a group of faculty members who met for discussion and plans for action to express their protest to Washington. The weekend passed quietly. Then on Monday, May 4, came the news of the Kent State shootings, the plans for a national student strike, etc.

On Tuesday signs began to appear with the red fist symbol of student power, urging the students to strike. These joined the previously posted signs calling for a change in women's hours; a protest initiated by the Student Senate. Notices were placed in all mailboxes outlining the purposes of the strike and calling for classes to continue so that class attendance could be a matter of one's own choosing. Wednesday dawned bright and clear, the day chosen for "Spring Fever Day." Spring Fever Day was begun as a day when, the weather being fine, the bell in Towers Hall would ring at length at 7:00 a.m., and all would know classes were called off and the day was to be given over to enjoyment. Thus, the Wednesday after the Monday deaths at Kent State, Otterbein presented a picture of an entire day given over to fun and games. It was also the day the students were to vote on the new governance plan; this to occur at the same time the faculty was meeting for the same purpose. An unprecedented number of students voted - about 1,060 of the approximately 1,350 registered for spring term. The plan was approved 1,041-14 by the students and 55-6 by the faculty. The "activist" students were infuriated by the non-concern of their peers regarding the war and the Kent State deaths. Those few who took part in the march on the State House that day found Otterbein the only college in the area not mentioned as being represented by a group of students. The attention of this group turned from one of getting fellow students to show their concern to trying to develop a concern among their fellow students.

At the faculty meeting it was apparent that the majority of the faculty was as unaware as the student body of the national student strike, the underlying causes of protests on various campuses, and the differences in those causes among, say, OSU, Princeton, and Antioch. The word "strike" seemed to arouse real fear - perhaps visions of the violent labor troubles of the 1930's. Even when one faculty member tried to explain that it was only another word for "moratorium," the sense of fear remained. Perhaps it was this fear of antagonizing some unknown dangerous element that defeated a motion to express faculty disapproval of the strike as an effective means of protest. After much discussion, the faculty decided to hold a memorial service on Friday, the director of religious affairs being given the task of organizing it. The motion for the memorial service was carefully worded in order to avoid it being a memorial for the Kent State students, who might have been up to no good when they were killed. Instead, the nature of the service was left to the discretion of the director, who was aware that it was to be "non-controversial." The same motion suggested that time be devoted in classes on Friday to the discussion of the concerns of the day.

On Thursday, an important meeting was held at the Red Tub, a coffee house and headquarters of the director of religious affairs. A group of more liberal faculty members had been assembling there for a Thursday "brown bag" lunch for most of the school year to discuss social issues: local, national, and international. On this Thursday, the director had invited the leaders of the student activist group to be present, thus the "Red Tub professors" were joined by four students, two white and two black. (It should be pointed out that the official black student group was not involved in the strike call. The two activist blacks were marginal to that group.) Rumors were emanating from the "Country Club"

fraternity (all athletes) that if any demonstrations occurred, violence could come -- not from the demonstrators but from the Club, directed against the activists. Because of a real fear for the safety of the students and the threat to passage of the governance plan by the trustees, the Red Tub professors asked the activist leaders to relinquish their strike call, substituting the memorial service. The two white students agreed; the two blacks excused themselves from the room. This evidence of alienation caused the advisor of the black student group to hurry over to the Campus Center to find them and try again to make clear that the Red Tub professors were equally concerned and upset. This effort appeared to be at least partially successful with the more amenable of the two and gained his cooperation in avoiding a confrontation between student groups.

The strike was called off in favor of the memorial service and an announcement made to that effect. The meeting was possibly the most crucial occurrence during the period, since, although the students were persuaded not to strike (for the above-mentioned reasons), the activist group in general did not feel the alienation of having been "put down" by the faculty. This demonstrates a crucial component possible in the small college: an open communication system, personal faculty-student relationships, and the trust that grows from these relationships. However, it is possible that an essential bitterness remained with the two black students -- one that is common to students and blacks. To them the white students and the older generation were unwilling to risk the consequences of standing up for their beliefs, thus, "they can't be trusted." It might be projected that it is the counterparts of these two, multiplied many times, that are most likely to turn to violence to express the hopelessness inherent in this belief.

Other than the above, Thursday was generally business as usual, except for those trying to construct a memorial service. Friday's class discussions -- when they were held -- followed largely the pattern described by a faculty member in the Towers, Spring 1970, (p. 15):

"As comments unfolded during 'discussion day', I felt the degree of concern ranged all the way from apathy (or a gross lack of information) through being mildly upset, to that of a few who were distressed enough by national and international events to want to take some positive action to make their views known where it might count..."

Anyone familiar with campus life will realize that attendance at a memorial service at 4:00 p.m. on a warm hazy Friday required at least a mild sense of commitment for both students and faculty. A very rough estimate would put the "audience" attendance at 200-250, plus some 30 band members and a contingent of speakers representing the different views of a divided nation. The speakers included a Korean minister and professor of religion -- a refugee during the Korean war and an ardent pacifist; a spokesman for the black students; the head of the "activist" group ("Where were you Wednesday when every other college was marching on the State House?"); a representative of the foreign students; the president of the Student Senate; a government professor

urging action in the form of letters and petitions to Washington, etc. Lasting about an hour, the atmosphere was one of perhaps grief and concern -- not anger.

Following the service, about 75 students and several faculty members met in the Campus Center to plan ways to counteract their frustration with the apathy of the overwhelming majority of faculty and students. From this meeting a peace group was formed which was later affiliated with the Ohio Peace Action Committee, with headquarters at Antioch College. Thus, for the first time at Otterbein, the "activist" students had an organized outlet for their concerns. The group met every week for the balance of the school term, with attendance ranging from 30-60. The emphasis, as indicated before, focused on increasing the awareness of the rest of the Otterbein community regarding the seriousness of the problems of the society. Activities included sponsoring a "peace walk" on May Day (May 16) evening after a play, when about 100 faculty, wives, children, and students participated in an impressive candlelight walk, with a large group of onlookers. Other activities included furnishing petitions to the Campus Center to express conviction on a variety of items, etc.

An incongruous group action was a letter from the Country Club fraternity. This letter received wide circulation and is reprinted for the second time in the Towers of spring, 1970 (p. 18). Expressing a devotion to law and order and the system, it came from a group not known on campus as particularly devoted to such matters, nor to the Otterbein community or the academic quality of the institution. However, some members had indicated their determination to change the image of the fraternity, so perhaps the letter is evidence of this effort.

When OSU closed its doors, liberating thousands of students from their OSU-oriented pursuits, the tension among some members of the Otterbein community began building to a climax. The rumors of an invasion by OSU trouble-makers were considered credible by some administrators. A meeting was hastily called on Tuesday, May 12, by the acting Academic Dean, a meeting attended by over 100 persons, focusing on those who were in advantageous positions to hear rumors, come into possession of underground information, and be able to identify outsiders on the campus. At the meeting it was announced that a rumor control committee had been set up, composed of students and faculty who were in the best positions to check out such rumors. Other than this, the purpose of the meeting was obscure -- the participants were asked to watch for outsiders, then questions were invited. The response was puzzlement, no questions were asked, and the meeting was disbanded.

The above recounting of the activities of the two weeks of tension has focused on those activities directly related to the responses to the particular situation. As such, it gives a biased picture. To the outsider, or even most insiders, the response was almost non-existent. For the vast majority of students, faculty, and staff the weeks passed in their usual pattern of unconcern. The most important events were Spring Fever Day, the acceptance by students and faculty of the new governance plan, the crowning of the May Queen, and the opening of the drama department production of "My Fair Lady."

B. State Assisted Institutions

CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

To understand what went on on the campus during the winter and spring terms 1970, one must first understand the structure of the College. While it is one College, it is, at present, two campuses with some degree of distinctiveness. Both campuses are headed by a district office, which serves as the principal administrative force for the district.

Each of the two campuses has its own administrative staff headed by a campus president, and the usual complement of deans, department heads, etc. The Western Campus is located geographically in the southwest portion of Cuyahoga County and has a student population of roughly 5,000. It is located in a middle income area and its students seem to have many of the advantages of what might be designated as the middle and upper-middle classes. This campus experienced little student unrest and while it did close for the Kent State memorial, it did not participate in any of the activities centered on the Metropolitan Campus. It is significant to note, at this point, that the Western Campus, largely due to its geographic location, serves a very small number of black students.

The Metropolitan Campus is located in "downtown" Cleveland; more specifically, in the black ghetto, and services roughly 10,000 students, about one-fourth of which are black.

At the beginning of the past academic year there was a rather strong (politically) Afro-American Society, which was very active on the campus. There were no other black groups of any size which offered it (Afro-Am) any competition. It would be fair to say that while the group did not have a significantly large membership, it was the group to which most black students looked for leadership. In the fall of 1969, however, a number of smaller but very vocal groups began to emerge on the Metropolitan Campus, most of which were black oriented. It was on this campus with the emergence of several vocal black groups that the disturbances began on February 6, 1970.

In the late afternoon of February 6, a meeting of the Afro-American Society ended with a challenge being thrown out to its president. He had been accused of being too close to whites and his leadership role was being threatened. He left the meeting after declaring his intention to "get me a hunky." He went to the student cafeteria and jostled, indeed, it's claimed he hit, the first white student he saw. This precipitated a confrontation in which all whites were driven from the snack bar, into, and finally out of, the garden center.

It appeared that three or maybe four black students had taken over the snack bar, where tables and chairs were overturned, and the garden center. They were ranting and accusing the white population in general for the status of black people in America and specifically on the campus. They also belabored the "niggers" standing by who would not join them in getting the "hunkies" off the "black campus." They were quieted and

subdued momentarily by several black faculty, as well as a black man and president of the Board of Trustees, who appeared to be making a visit to the campus.

When one of the black faculty members was talking with three of the dissenters in the now empty snack bar, two policemen from the Cleveland Police Department made an appearance in the garden center. The appearance of the policemen was like a shot in the arm to the dissenters who ran to a confrontation with the police, joined by a large group of black students. The policemen retreated from the garden center and presumably reinforcements were called. Newspaper accounts indicated that some 60 policemen responded, along with ranking officers and the newly appointed safety director. There was considerable milling about with the malcontents being contained in the garden center by police who ringed the platform above it.

At this point a large group of black students, perhaps 100 who had been observing and verbally encouraging the dissenters, marched on the president's office in the nearby administration building. They demanded to see the campus president. The campus president, the district president, and the chairman of the Board of Trustees were persuaded to meet with the students in a large lecture hall in a nearby building. This meeting was attended by more than 150 black students and was totally unproductive. The demands that were made of the administration were so confusing and incoherent that nothing could be done.

The meeting was dismissed with the police still on campus in good force. The students themselves dismissed the meeting. In the melee that followed in the court-yard, ten students were arrested and taken to Central Police Station. Of the ten students, three had been active in the original action. The students continued to mill about on the campus and refused to leave until someone went to the police station to see that their "brothers" were not mistreated. The Dean of Student Services, and a black faculty member were asked to attend to this task. They went to the police station and saw the students through the booking procedure. (They were in no way manhandled or treated with disrespect.)

The students had left the campus and some 100-200 chose to come to the police station to demand the release of their brothers. The Dean and the faculty member met them on the steps of the police station which was sealed off and promised to do what they could in exchange for their leaving and discontinuing the threat to the police station. They did leave but they chose to go to the office of Mayor Carl Stokes who was not available and protested there. Again several community leaders and faculty members persuaded the students to leave. The arrested students were released on bond about 9:30 the same evening, were picked up by remaining friends and taken to their homes.

The following week, black students held a series of meetings, and, as a result 23 demands, some of which had previously been presented, were given to the administration of the College. The administration responded by creating task forces composed of administration, faculty and students to investigate the demands of the black students. These task forces have now completed their work and made their recommendations to the College.

From the above description, the original event had to do largely with the black/white issue rather than any other; but concurrent with this and to some extent related to it, was the action of students over the prices of cafeteria food.

This did not cause much dissent, but perhaps should be included in any discussion of the campus during the past year. In essence, what the students did was simply to sell food at their own stands. This did result in a re-evaluation of prices in the cafeteria and snack bar and it resulted in the administration forbidding the sale of goods by non-recognized agencies.

The spring quarter began, though the tension brought about by black/white confrontations was apparent. It was not until the Kent State incident, however, that students again were physically active, though the black students had continued to hold meetings, public and private, in an effort to solicit the support of other less committed black students. A memorial service was held in honor of the students killed at Kent and classes were dismissed for part of one day and all of the next.

When the students were killed at Jackson State College, the black students demanded both a memorial service and dismissal of classes for an equal period of time given to those killed at Kent. The memorial was held and classes were dismissed for one full day. Subsequently various student groups demonstrated both in and out of the buildings in an attempt to get permanent dismissal of campus activities for the remainder of the quarter. The administration did not agree (neither did the faculty) and the quarter was completed.

For the actions in the various incidences on campus, six students appeared before the conduct committee (5 black, 1 white) and all six were dismissed from the College for varying periods of time. Among those dismissed were three members of the national Committee to Combat Facism; one of whom was found not properly enrolled and who subsequently was arrested in a "shootout" with police this summer; still another student was dismissed and later committed suicide in jail after an arrest for disturbing the peace during the summer, and two other students have been dismissed for one quarter.

The following statements can be made:

1. Mass meetings were held and, with the exception of the memorial to the Kent State students, they were almost exclusively confined to the participation of black students.
2. Demands were made of the administration and, though they had been made before, were returned to the students for clarification and then re-submitted to the administration. The administration met the demands by creating task forces, whose job it was to get to the issues and to propose solutions to the problems.
3. There was differential involvement of students. The president of the College, in one speech, indicated the existence of

approximately 50 "malcontents." This was a reasonably accurate assessment of the number of those whose involvement was extreme. However, there existed a larger group on the fringe until the action began and who acted as followers of the 50 who are best described as activists.

4. Classes were disrupted and suspended. Two of the students who were dismissed from the school were charged with disrupting a class. Buildings were blocked and, as earlier indicated, police were called and students were arrested. Physical damage did occur; one bomb was set off in the Humanities Building, slogans were painted on walls, and chairs and tables were broken. Windows were destroyed when a group left the administration building after being denied temporarily the use of an incomplete facility on the campus.
5. The role of some of the faculty in the solution of the problem was important. Black faculty continually met with the students and some white faculty were extremely influential in meeting the issues on campus. The campus clergy did not seem to be extensively involved. At least one member of the Trustees was continuously involved in the solution to the problems. The other members of the Board were equally involved since the Board is generally considered to be quite active. The community was involved to a great extent. Local community members, among whom were the director of the settlement house nearby and members of the community services staff of the local office of the Department of Justice were involved.
6. The overriding major issues seem to have been the local campus. From time to time such issues as the war, Kent State, Jackson State, the relations of the College to the immediate local environment, and other issues seemed to attach themselves in one way or another to the overriding issues of the solutions of the problems of the Metropolitan Campus, Cuyahoga Community College.

The College is young and growing. It is experiencing the pains common to all colleges, and it is encumbered by the burden of being so young and, in a sense, new to this local community. The community college environment itself is so unfamiliar to the local people that they (that is, the local community) have not yet learned how to properly make use of the College. At the same time, the College, new to this unique community, has not had the time required to fully adapt itself to the community. Ironically, both the community and the College are anxious to experience the time when they can come together to meet each other's needs. Perhaps it is out of this anxiety that the problems grow.

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

Youngstown State University is located in Youngstown, a northeastern Ohio city of 160,330. The University is co-educational and has some 10,098 full-time students enrolled. There are 4,017 part-time students. Although there is no graduate or professional school, Youngstown State University has a number of four-year programs. A two-year Associate degree may also be obtained. The school appears to be in many ways a hybrid between the four-year undergraduate university and the two-year community college. The institution's character may be reflected in the ratio of full-time to part-time students: about 2 to 1. Youngstown State is assisted financially by the State of Ohio. The University has limited dormitory space, and the in-state tuition and fees are among the least expensive in Ohio.

The majority of students at Youngstown State University appear to be career-oriented and somewhat uninterested in many of the issues evident on other campuses. Although a poorly defined activist group grew out of local issues, this group and others were not supported by widespread student participation.

Youngstown State has been relatively free of student unrest during the last six years when other universities throughout the United States encountered confrontation and violence. There is no one who can completely explain this situation, although there are some salient observations that might be made in an effort to understand what has happened (or failed to happen) at Youngstown State University.

The campus remained calm during most of the 1969-70 academic year. There were peace marches, anti-Vietnam war protests, etc., but there were no crises, threats, or violence in connection with any of these activities. The first student-administration crisis arose out of the failure of the University to renew the contract of an untenured professor of the Political Science department. While the professor received many plaudits from students and some faculty during the brief period of controversy over the non-renewal of his contract, he had not been a particularly controversial faculty member nor the center of any student activist movement. His firing, as it was referred to by those who objected to the non-renewal of his contract, was the issue which activists used as a basis for arousing student interest in an attack upon the university administration. He neither sought nor profited by the events that followed, although he became the center of the controversy between students and the administration.

Although the professor received notification that his contract would not be renewed on March 10, it was not until March 31 that students became involved in his "cause." A small group of students consisting primarily of those whom he had had in class attempted to get some sort of movement organized to bring pressure to bear upon the administration to change its initial decision regarding his employment for the next academic year. The leader of this movement was a student editor of the University annual, THE NEON. He was responsible for an effort to widen student interest in the professor's "plight" through the circulation of petitions requesting an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the "dismissal" and the justification of it.

It took nearly three weeks (March 31 to April 23) for any movement to emerge with sufficient organization and leadership to support a direct confrontation with the administration. In the interim, the professor had made an appeal to the Board of Trustees who, after careful evaluation of the circumstances decided to uphold the decision of the administration and Department Chairman. The professor then released the content of his letter to the Trustees to the student newspaper, THE JAMBAR, which took up the issue in an editorial appearing in the April 17 issue. The "Gates of Eden," a coffee house organized under the leadership of the Protestant Chaplain, became the meeting place for those students interested in creating some type of movement that would bring student pressure to bear on the issue. An ad hoc student group known as the Student Committee for Academic Reform (SCAR) emerged from the sessions at the "Gates of Eden." This group remained somewhat amorphous throughout the crisis and its leadership kept shifting throughout the period. This frustrated many efforts by the President of the University to enter into discussion on the various issues that were of student concern.

It should be noted at this point that the "Gates of Eden" and the Protestant Chaplain played a significant role in the development of the confrontation. Youngstown State University has never had any well-organized activist group on campus because all efforts to organize the students in previous years had failed. Those students with more activist views tended to gather at the "Gates" to engage in discussion of various ideas but there was no formal organization representing them.

SCAR was the product of a loose-knit coalition between those students interested in the firing of the professor and the activists and more militant blacks. Although a student named "M" began the processes of gathering signatures on a petition, the initiative shifted from him to a young, married Vietnam war veteran named "H". In the effort to gain as much student support as possible through the coalition, "H" had to widen the scope of issues to include those of concern to the others involved in the coalition. This produced a document of 15 "demands" which SCAR was going to make on the University administration. These were presented to the President, after much fanfare, on April 23. While the dismissal of the professor was No. 1 on the list, it was obvious that he was no longer the central issue. At this point there was loss of some student support which was based only on concern for the professor and not on the 15 demands of SCAR.

The President answered the demands in a public address on the lawn outside the building housing his office. Printed copies of his reply were distributed to those present, and was also printed later in THE JAMBAR. A small core of about 75 students were present with a predominance of Black students who attempted on various occasions during the President's speech to disrupt the meeting through laughter, shouting, and other types of distracting activity. The events that followed seemed to indicate that the leadership of SCAR had anticipated the response that the President would make, and wanted to create a crisis atmosphere that would lead to some kind of incident that might become the basis for involving other students whom they regarded as apathetic. A student interrupted the session to inform the group gathered there that there were "riot police with shotguns" awaiting them across the street behind one

of the campus buildings. He attempted to mobilize them at that time to cross the street and confront the "pigs" but the crowd did not move. This student, who later became a leader of SCAR (at least that portion of it which was made up of Black students), then led the group later in the afternoon on a march across the street. This resulted in a planned blocking of a main street of the city. The police dispersed the group,, only to have it re-form elsewhere to resume the tactic of blocking traffic. Almost one hour later, the police finally arrested the two leaders and the group dispersed completely.

The next day SCAR called for a student strike in support of its demands, and in sympathy for those who had been arrested the previous day. The strike call did not elicit much support. The President sought out those whom he thought to be the leaders and arranged several private sessions with them, but the leadership kept shifting from one meeting to another and this made resolution of the issues difficult. He spent many long hours with this group of students, who could not agree among themselves as to what was a reasonable response from the administration on the various demands they had made. A split in the leadership became apparent in a public meeting held in the campus student cafeteria which was attended by a sizeable number of persons who were not students. The meeting centered almost exclusively on the concerns of the Black students who dominated the meeting. Mr. "H" played no significant role in this meeting and the only white student representing SCAR left no doubt that he was disgusted in the remark he made at the conclusion of the meeting: "If the administration thinks they can pacify the Blacks and not do anything else -- they're wrong."

The following Friday (May 1) saw a significant change in SCAR after the announcement by President Nixon that he was sending troops to Cambodia. The anti-Vietnam war element of the coalition then wanted to use SCAR as a vehicle for a protest against this widening of the war in Indochina. Since the Black students were beginning to make gains with some of their demands, and had less interest, at the moment, in having the efforts of SCAR diverted, the leadership again was divided -- this time between the Blacks and the anti-war activists.

The next Monday brought the tragic killing of four students at nearby Kent State University, and the events of that week centered on the national crisis that developed out of the President's Indochina decision and the student deaths. SCAR then enjoyed its greatest student support during that week. They called noonday rallies daily, and called for the University to be shut down out of sympathy for the four KSU students. There were many students from other campuses (which had closed) that came to the YSU campus and joined with the small SCAR core in their efforts to close down this University as well. In order to lessen the tensions, the University President declared two days, Wednesday, May 6 and Thursday, May 7, as "discussion days," but made it clear that classes were not dismissed and the University was to remain open during this period.

During the week there was an attempt by outside groups ranging from the Black Panthers to SDS to infiltrate SCAR in order to exert influence on it. However, some of those who had been most active in its initial

formation rejected this effort and cooperated with the Campus Security Force by identifying the people involved and asking for the formation of student marshals to assist in keeping the protest non-violent. This left the outside group without a base from which to operate and minimized all attempts to close the University. While SCAR endorsed the nationwide student strike called for Friday, May 8, it was ineffective. Almost all classes met as usual, and by mid-afternoon all pickets had left their posts and the strike call was considered a failure. University security personnel praised the work of the student marshals, whom they credited with keeping things quiet on the campus.

The Newman Club sought to have the "Spring Weekend" (an annual Spring social event) called off out of sympathy for the four KSU students, but the Student Council decided to go ahead with the event. There was a confrontation between students at the Spring Weekend event as some sought to disrupt the activities of the evening. This resulted in some shoving, rock throwing, and a broken window. A short time later a large tent being used by the students was set on fire with a molotov cocktail, but was quickly put out before there was serious damage or personal injury. At this point, the Dean of Student Affairs called off the remaining activities of the evening. They were resumed the next day, however, without further incident.

After the Spring Weekend incident, the campus returned to normal and SCAR publicly admitted in a televised program that it had failed to meet its objectives, and that the YSU campus was too conservative and apathetic to be "shut down", and that efforts to this end were being abandoned for the time being. Nothing more was heard about the demands, and SCAR, after that. However, the University administration continued to act on those demands which were agreed upon earlier, and progress was regularly reported to the students through THE JAMBAR, or memos to the faculty.

SOME OBSERVATIONS - First of all, the President made considerable effort to meet with students and negotiate any reasonable concern they had. He continued this effort at the expense of many other important administrative responsibilities and under difficult crisis conditions. The students were unable to make creditable the claim that the administration was insensitive to student issues, since the President, personally, attended many of the rallies and held both private and public meetings with students to hear out their grievances. Although he met with obscenities and rudeness from some students, he continued to give their motives priority and tried to overlook efforts made to intimidate him.

The efforts of SCAR to involve the general student body failed. At least two-thirds of the student body work in order to go to college, and the majority are the first generation in their family to get a college education. While some were sympathetic to the issues involved, they resisted efforts to disrupt the routine of classes, and openly denounced those who called for a shut down of classes. They seemed to be saying: "I agree with you that something should be done about these issues, but shutting down the University will not change things. Besides, I have paid my hard-earned money to enroll in classes and I intend to see that

this money is not lost by having classes dismissed." Therefore, to a large extent the type of student body at YSU is not conducive to this type of involvement.

The constant in-fighting within SCAR led to its own demise as a useful vehicle for campus issues. This came about because it was not the product of a single cause or issue. When the coalition was made at the outset, it was very weak and never gained in strength during its brief lifetime. Also, the Cambodian issue diverted the attention of the student body from the local issues, and by the time these issues were raised again, the movement had lost its momentum. None of these elements were the product of planning, but they did help to change the course of events as they were developing, and ultimately led to the lack of effectiveness of SCAR.

The Gates of Eden played a significant role in the activities of SCAR. The Protestant Chaplain became more open in his support of the students, and stated that they were right in their opposition to the administration. He called it insensitive and establishment oriented. He also took an active role in every event sponsored by SCAR, but was careful not to advocate violence since he did not personally support violent solutions to these problems. It is not clear to what extent he may have "stood in the gap" between those suggesting confrontation and those who did not. He may have felt that it was better to remain involved rather than turn them out to meet elsewhere without his tempering influence.

The last observation deals with outside influence and campus disruption or student unrest. There were repeated efforts made by various non-students to get involved in what was happening on the campus. Certain local Black militants wanted to enter into the negotiations, or involve themselves with those students who were the leaders of the Blacks in SCAR. Students from other campuses came and tried to gain access to classes in order to make speeches on behalf of the strike, but most classes did not wish to be interrupted and requested that these persons leave them alone. The students took much of the initiative away from the "outsiders" in the interest of keeping their own school open and violence free.

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

The Bowling Green State University is a predominantly undergraduate university with a small graduate school located in Bowling Green, Ohio. The University (in the Spring, 1970) had 11,485 full-time students and 408 part-time students. Bowling Green, itself, is a town of some 18,800 persons and is in Wood County in northwestern Ohio. BGSU is co-educational and has students from both inside and outside Ohio. It is a state-assisted institution. Bowling Green State University is interesting; especially so since it was, in the spring of 1970, perhaps the least violent of the large state-assisted schools in Ohio.

In its broadest sense, perhaps the most striking features of the responses to the Kent State crisis at Bowling Green were the early commitments on the part of a significant number of students, faculty members, and administrative officials to keep the University open (insofar as this was possible) and to reduce the prospects for the emergence of destructive forms of violence.

At the time of the Kent killings, the atmosphere on campus was already tense from the student responses to the Cambodian venture, intense concerns with the ecological (environmental) crisis -- which was heavily emphasized at Bowling Green, and other types of national concerns. Locally, the Black Student Union had submitted a set of demands to the Administration and were waiting for an answer.

Monday, May 4

Early in the afternoon of Monday, May 4, following the news of the killing of students at Kent by the National Guard, a student rally was formed on the central campus and microphones were set up in front of Williams Hall.* The student speakers were interrupted by an administrative official (an assistant dean of students) who was responding to a faculty complaint that the noise was interfering with classes and in violation of the "noise rule" which is in effect on the inner campus until 5:00 p.m.

Several students then moved toward the Administration Building to stage a sit-in demonstration outside the offices of the President and the Vice-President of Student Affairs. At the time, however, the President was meeting with other administrative officials to formalize a response to the demands of the Black Student Union. The President was notified of the events at Kent and of the emerging mood on campus. Following a brief discussion, the President sent an announcement to the students that he would speak to them in front of Williams Hall. Addressing a rally of several hundred students, the President expressed sympathy for some of the student points of view regarding Kent and Cambodia. The announcement was made that classes would be cancelled on Tuesday morning to permit a teach-in to discuss the meaning of the events at Kent and as a memorial to the slain students. In response to questions from students,

*Williams Hall is a faculty office building for the departments of sociology, history, and political science, and is the students' favorite location in the inner campus for teach-ins, rallies, and mass meetings. Attempts to get students to hold their mass meetings at the student services building (which is in closer proximity to dormitories than to classroom facilities) have been unsuccessful. Apparently, students prefer to hold their meetings at a location where they are visible to the faculty and to administrators.

the President indicated that if the National Guard were sent to the Bowling Green campus it would be over his objections. His position was emphasized as one of a commitment to keeping the University open (as an answer to the students who were advocating a strike and/or other means of closing down the University).

By Monday evening, the crisis character of the campus was readily apparent. Students, faculty members, and administrators were each responding to events on both an emotional and an intellectual level. The prospects of the University staying open, the possibility of continuing with classes, external responses to events on college campuses in general, and the possibilities of local violence were among the numerous forms of initial anxiety. At the mass meeting on Monday evening, new forms of student leadership were emerging to provide definitions of the crisis and to plan for appropriate courses of action. Repeatedly, the emergent student leaders at Bowling Green emphasized the importance of non-violence (many had had previous experience in the civil rights movement, the peace movement, the demonstration at the Democratic Convention in Chicago, etc.). It was pointed out that nothing could please the establishment-oriented more than a closing of the University, since this would have the effect of dispersing the students and depriving them of a base of operations for engaging in effective political action.

Tuesday, May 5

At the rallies (teach-in and memorial service) held on Tuesday morning, the importance of maintaining lines of communication with the students was recognized by several faculty members and by several members of the administrative staff. For this reason, there were present at all of the large gatherings several faculty members and administrators. These were people prepared to address the students in the event that speakers started advocating the use of destructive forms of violence as a form of social protest or as a way of closing down the University. The numerous themes emphasized at the mass rallies included a vast array of notions about what is wrong with the University and with American society at large, as well as a wide variety of recommended changes.

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, which was scheduled for Tuesday afternoon, was moved to the amphitheater of the Student Services Building in order to accommodate the several thousand students who wanted to attend. In view of the tense

atmosphere surrounding the senate meeting, it was an open question about what would happen to a "deliberative assembly" meeting under these circumstances. The operational procedures for the meeting were clearly indicated at the outset and students were informed that extensive disruptions would result in closing the meeting and re-scheduling it for some other location. After the Senate meeting, some faculty members expressed a dim view toward holding a meeting of the senate under these circumstances. The open meeting, however, was probably a critical turning point in the development of student confidence in the faculty and the administration.

Recognizing the uncertain character of future events, informal meetings were held by faculty members and students to bring some degree of organization to the expression of social concerns. An agenda was developed for faculty members (or graduate students) to be present at the lounges of the dormitories to hold discussions with students on whatever topics were of interest to them. The unstructured discussions had the effect of capturing student interests and engaging them in an intellectual examination of social events. Thus, the sharing of concerns by faculty and students had the effect of increasing the sense of cohesion within the university.

Wednesday, May 6

On Wednesday morning, the student emphasis upon not permitting the University to return to "business-as-usual" was evident. The response to the national strike was primarily one of emphasis upon voluntary participation and a peaceful boycott of classes. Class attendance dropped sharply and the students organized to picket classroom buildings, but not individual classes. There were no attempts to physically block entry into buildings or to interfere with the freedom of movement of students or faculty.

As an alternative to class attendance, workshops were organized around topics presumed to be of social "relevance." The workshops were held at numerous locations on the lawn of the inner campus and in the lounges of the living quarters. In order to retain their students, some faculty members turned their regular classes into student workshops around topics of mutual interest. Throughout the day on Wednesday, the prospects for violence were implicit within the situation. A small group of students sought, unsuccessfully,

to organize an effort to block traffic on Interstate 75 near the campus. On Wednesday afternoon, students conducted a march around the living units on campus to mobilize interest in the memorial march scheduled for Wednesday evening.

At the rally in front of Williams Hall on Wednesday evening, the speakers included representatives from the Black Panther Party in Toledo and from the Farm Labor Organizing Committee (union of Mexican-American, migratory workers in Northwest Ohio) who attempted to elicit student interest in social justice. Taped speeches by Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy on non-violent resistance was played over the loudspeakers and instructions were given for the conduct of the march. Students and faculty members served as marshals along the parade route through downtown Bowling Green. The parade included some people from the community who were sympathetic to the student cause. Law enforcement officials remained in the background, but were prepared to move into action if the march got out of hand. Apparently, a fairly large number of men had been deputized and were waiting in the County Court House, which was in a strategic location along the parade route. The parade was conducted in a solemn manner and proceeded without incident.

Thursday, May 7

By Thursday, the informal and spontaneous workshops took on a greater degree of organization. A "New University" was formed and organized into several colleges (e.g., Peace, Ecology, University Organization, etc.). Approximately 200 seminars were organized by faculty members, graduate students, and administrators. Titles for the seminars, instructors, and meeting places were given widespread publicity. Some were organized as a single event and others were scheduled for regular meetings throughout the remainder of the quarter.

Throughout the crisis, a number of faculty members were concerned with the possibility of faculty office buildings and/or research facilities becoming the object of student violence. The services of graduate students were obtained in providing security (around the clock) for research experiments and research facilities. Some faculty members transferred non-replaceable research data and lecture notes from their university offices to their homes. The only reported act of violence was a single fire bomb tossed through a window

into a research lab. The fire was quickly extinguished by a graduate student who was in the lab at the time.

Friday, May 8

Friday was a relatively quiet day on campus, with some of the more action-oriented students preparing for the Columbus march and the march on Washington. The central concern of the rallies in front of Williams Hall were expressed by the Black students who were responding to the killing of black students in Mississippi. The central theme seemed to revolve around the charge that white students do not get upset by the killing of black students.

Saturday, May 9

The major event on Saturday consisted of a meeting of student leaders with the Senate Executive Committee to make a series of recommendations in the academic area for the remainder of the quarter. As a result of this meeting, an emergency meeting off-campus of the Faculty Senate was called for Sunday afternoon. At this meeting, the Senate adopted a resolution permitting students to select the option of continuing with classes as usual, or changing their registration in any given course to a grade option of S-U (Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory). This would permit students to participate in the New University (which carried no credit) without jeopardizing their grade point averages.

Participation in the New University courses was open to anyone interested. Attendance varied from six to eight people in some workshops to several hundred attending some of the panel discussions. The style ranged from the more highly academic to the absurd. At some of the seminar meetings the number of faculty members attending exceeded the number of students. Some of the seminars were attended by members of the Board of Trustees (out of interest in the subject matter) as well as by people from the Bowling Green community.

The responses to the New University concept were intense and highly varied, both within the University and in the surrounding community. Some faculty members charged that the academic integrity of the University had been violated by giving in to student demands. Some people in town were very upset by seminar titles, such as "Contemporary Bull Shit" and "The International Were-Wolf Conspiracy." At the conclusion of one of the seminars, the student instructor disrobed before his audience and ran around the classroom in

in the nude. Members of the state legislature were demanding an investigation to determine the possible misuse of state funds and state-owned facilities. Some of the students regarded the New University as the most exciting educational experience of their lives and expressed hope that it will be continued as a para-organizational adjunct of the University for the next academic year.

OHIO UNIVERSITY

Ohio University is one of the larger institutions considered. A school with a full-time enrollment of 17,000, Ohio University is situated in Athens, a southeastern Ohio community of 29,000. A state-assisted school, the university is co-educational and offers a variety of undergraduate and graduate programs.

During the events of the spring of 1970, Ohio University was not a quiet, contained university. As with some other schools that were forced to close, Ohio University suffered physical damage, disrupted activities and eventual intervention by the National Guard. In the chronology that is reported below, mention is made of the University's attempts to deal with its problems, both before and after the closing of the University.

Thursday, April 23

Upon recapitulation, Ohio University's troubles seemingly began around mid-April. Several small anti-ROTC demonstrations occurred on campus. A ROTC class disruption and the subsequent arrest of nine students on April 23, was a harbinger of the crisis that was to eventually close the University.

Thursday, April 30

On Thursday, April 30, President Nixon informed the American people of his decision to send U.S. troops into Cambodia. That evening a banquet given in one of the university clubs was interrupted by several students. Fires were later started in front of one of the college buildings and on one of the streets of Athens.

Monday, May 4

A noon demonstration was held on campus to protest the entrance of U.S. troops into Cambodia. The demonstration grew after news of the Kent State shootings reached the campus. Ohio University students called for a strike on Tuesday and Wednesday to mourn the death of the four Kent State students and to protest the U.S. invasion of Cambodia.

The President of the University called for reason and peaceful appeals to the nation's leaders,

regarding the Cambodian invasion. Furthermore, he urged that all concerned make every effort to keep the campus peaceful and the University open, citing the disasters at Ohio State and Kent State as situations he did not wish to see duplicated at Ohio University.

The evening of May 4 witnessed an on-campus demonstration of an estimated 3,000 students. A student strike was called for the following day. Those students who planned to attend were urged to wear red arm bands, signifying their support of a peaceful assemblage. The issue reported was to be non-violent concern to the national and international situation.

Tuesday, May 5

A student strike began on this day. Discussion groups and workshops were held outside on the campus. Several buildings were picketed by the strikers in an effort to gain support for the strike. That afternoon a number of students held a peaceful meeting. At 2:15 the President of the University addressed the crowd. He proceeded to answer questions and his wish for non-violence was supported. That evening another meeting/rally was attended by the President. The President commended the strikers at that time for the peaceful manner in which they chose to protest. He expressed his sympathy with the issues and explained why he would not close the University, saying that the rights of those who wished to attend classes would be respected and protected.

Wednesday, May 6

The student strike continued. Workshops and discussion groups met on the campus.

A group of students, reported to be about 35 in number, walked through downtown businesses in Athens. They urged that the stores be closed in support of the student strike. At 4:00 p.m. another march, of some 2,500 individuals, also moved through the business district of Athens. The march, composed of concerned faculty and students was peaceful as it moved from campus to town and back to campus.

Later an evening rally drew some 2,500 people. The majority of the crowd voted not to strike.

The Governor of Ohio had earlier recommended the closing of any state university in Ohio, should that school experience disruption. The President of Ohio University issued a statement to the

effect that it was hard not to close in light of the threats of violence and disruption. But the President felt that it was more important and meaningful to keep the university open. He urged all those concerned to help him do so. (At this time Ohio State was closed.)

Thursday, May 7

A ROTC supply room, located in a university stadium, was firebombed at about 4:00 a.m. An estimated two fire bombs were thrown. The damage to the building and contents of the room was estimated at \$4,000. In response, the President of the University condemned the act. He said, however, that the University must remain open. (Later the President was informed by a spokesman for the Governor that the Ohio National Guard and the Ohio Highway Patrol would not be available to keep the school open.)

Classes continued to be held, as did workshops and discussion groups. Several student groups emerged in an effort to coordinate the efforts of the students and dispel rumors. It was reported, at this time, that continuing emphasis was placed on non-violence.

The university provost confirmed the earlier report of the non-availability of the National Guard and the Highway Patrol.

During the afternoon groups of students moved into the Athens business district. Twice were such marches made. The marchers harassed local merchants and occupied several stores. (30 stores were eventually closed.)

Both faculty and students were called to volunteer for duty as marshals to patrol University property.

That evening a large rally was held on campus. It was reported to be peaceful, but it was tense and allegedly confused. However, just after 9:00 p.m. approximately 400 students blocked the intersection of several streets near the University. The Highway Patrol refused to respond. Police from Athens and several surrounding communities diverted traffic. Student and faculty marshals were reported as helpful in keeping the students peaceful. The crowd dispersed about 12:30 a.m. on Friday. (After the above-mentioned rally the P.A. system loaned to the students was taken away.)

Friday, May 8

Striking students were denied use of the P.A. system except for 10 minutes between classes.

Friday afternoon students once again marched through local stores. The stores closed temporarily.

The President of Ohio University flew to Washington to appear on an ABC commentary of President Nixon's press conference on Cambodia. A small group of students and faculty met the President at the airport upon his return from Washington. The group presented him with some demands. The demands, reportedly, involved the use of certain university facilities and a list of speakers for a rally proposed for the following Monday. The University of Cincinnati was closed on this date.

Saturday, May 9

Attempts are made to reach the President of the University for a reply to the demands presented him on the 8th. Some believe that the President was, in effect, denying the demands. Students and strike leaders and participants eventually agree to lift demands and concentrate on debate, discussions and "workshops".

Sunday, May 10

Sunday was described as a "cool" day on the Ohio University campus. A "CR" credit grading system was recommended and distributed for comment by a faculty committee.

Monday, May 11

The President of the University overruled the Dean and Vice-President, who had, the day before, denied students' request to have Richard Taube (Youth International Party/White Panthers), John Froines (Chicago Conspiracy Eight), and Benson Wolman (American Civil Liberties Union) speak on campus. The talks/rally were held.

After the rally about 100 students entered a then unoccupied library. Once there the group claimed the building (awaiting renovation) to be the site of a Free University. The University administration offered the students the use of rooms in another building, whereupon the more moderate members left the library. The more militant members left when police arrived early Tuesday morning and threatened to arrest those who would not leave.

Tuesday, May 12

At about 1:30 a.m. a fire was reported in an uncompleted cafeteria on the south part of the campus. At 1:45 a.m. another alarm was given for a

fire in an uncompleted dormitory. Damage to the cafeteria was estimated at \$120,000 while that for the dormitory was set at \$2,000.

The facilities offered the Free University students (see May 11 above) were found to be inadequate.

The President of the University, reporting the events of the previous night and early morning, urged the active efforts of all in keeping the University open.

Throughout the day, Tuesday, the situation was tense. There were bomb threats and fires reported. The University Provost office requested student marshals from the various residence halls. Several hundred students responded to the request.

Late in the afternoon of Tuesday, May 12, the President's office issued a statement concerning the right of the President of the University to both enforce a curfew on campus and ban or expel or suspend any student, should he decide that the situation warranted such measures. The President made clear the fact that any student so expelled could appeal for re-enrollment.

A few hours after the above announcement, the President announced the suspension of seven students. The President explained that such procedures were necessary if the University was to be kept open. That evening some 75 students gathered and drafted a series of demands which were delivered to the President's house. The demands were reportedly concerned with the actions taken (or to be taken) against students who participated in the disruptions.

Wednesday, May 13

Due to suspensions of the evening before, there was considerable tension on the morning of the 13th. During the afternoon, the Faculty Senate met and put forth an appeal procedure for the seven suspended students. The Faculty Senate also added an amendment that would have revoked the suspensions until a hearing could be held. Students then held a rally to discuss suspensions and to await the President's response to the resolution.

The President, on a radio program, agreed to all of the resolutions but would not revoke the suspensions.

Following the President's announcement, at 7:30 p.m., some 300 students marched through campus urging others to join them. The group, reportedly unruly, moved to protest the suspensions. The University President appeared and attempted to speak with the group. He was shouted down. Windows were broken, and the students then moved off campus to the streets.

Once off campus, the students continued to break windows, singling out a local, reportedly disliked, bookstore. The acts which followed carried on into Thursday morning.

Thursday, May 14

Athens police, assisted by police from several other areas employed tear and pepper gas to move the crowd back onto campus. By 3:00 a.m. the streets were quiet; while by 5:30 a.m. the campus was also.

The administrative committee of the Faculty Senate with the President of the University and others met in a closed session on Thursday. Two statements supporting the President's intention to keep the University open were forthcoming; while a third opinion urged the closing of the school.

Classes continued as usual through Thursday, while small groups of students met here and there about the campus.

The University Provost attempted to mobilize some 2,000 student marshals. (Later the administration disbanded the marshals due to complaints from faculty, referring to some allegedly "strong arm" tactics employed.)

A number of students were denied the use of a University ballroom for a rally. The crowd moved onto the streets of Athens. Once off campus the students began breaking windows. The police moved in. Tear gas was thrown and the disturbance grew.

Some 25 students were treated at the University Health Center for what were described as injuries related to the disruption. (The total number of student arrests for Wednesday and Thursday nights was 54.) The unrest continued throughout the rest of Thursday night and on into Friday morning.

Friday, May 15

Sometime shortly after midnight Thursday the President of Ohio University and the Mayor of Athens

jointly called in the National Guard. The University stated that the decision to call in the Guard was coincident with that to close the school. The Guard was to assist both in the protection of the city and in the closing of the University.

The University was closed at approximately 3:10 a.m. Referring to the tragedy at Kent State, the administration felt that to keep the University open with the National Guard present was impossible. The Mayor of Athens and the President of the University issued a joint statement. They cited the personal injury and property damage and exhaustion of law enforcement resources by the previous nights' disruption as the primary reasons why the Guard was called.

All students were asked to leave campus. The University was declared closed until the summer session. The Educational Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate met to draft a grading proposal.

Saturday, May 16

The Faculty Senate met and approved the grading system proposed on Friday. (A student was able to receive a "CR" credit for all courses unless he or she desired to take a letter grade.) Most students left by evening.

Sunday, May 17

The Ohio University was quiet.

Monday, May 18

A regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held. The topic of the recently passed grading system was discussed.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

(Note: The following discussion departs somewhat from the other case histories and chronologies. The widespread media coverage of the Kent State situations has resulted in the fact that many persons know the general outline of the events which took place. The concentration here and the discussion which follows centers on an assessment of a number of students in a Collective Behavior class of the incidents and the mood of the campus. Forty students were asked to write essays concerning their perception of the mood of the campus prior to the culmination of the shooting incident. These documents were analyzed for the themes which the students offered themselves in these essays and for their assessment of whether the factors were important elements in shaping the mood. In this sense, it is a subjective view from the eyes

of several students as to how they saw and interpreted the campus situation and also it is a retrospective view and interpretation of the students.)

The University and Its Students

Kent State, before May 4, was often pejoratively described by students and faculty as the largest unknown university in the United States. There was some justification for the description. Over 80% of Kent's students come from Ohio (Fall on-campus enrollment was 21,190) and 62% of the students come from the University's home county (Portage) and its six contiguous counties. Kent has had a reputation of being a suitcase college that closed down on weekends, but this has changed somewhat in the last two years. The University now houses 40% of the students on campus with many more living in student ghettos in the surrounding area.

The students tend to be first generation college who come from well-off working class families. A recent study by the Office of Student Affairs showed that 48% of the freshmen classes of 1967 and 1968 (now sophomores and juniors) come from homes having family incomes above \$7500. The national average is 38%. Most (33%) indicate they want to be teachers. They are locally oriented both socially and politically.

There are five colleges in the University, with Education being the largest. This college has a national reputation and ranks in the top ten in teacher production in the United States.

The University is located in the city of Kent which is 11 miles east of Akron and is an hour's drive southeast of downtown Cleveland. The population is 31,500 (50,000 with KSU students). There are numerous small manufacturing firms producing plastic products, small machines, and tools. The downtown Kent area consists of specialty shops, professional offices, banks, a couple of drug stores, and bars. These night spots provide live music and dancing space and serve both KSU students and youth from Kent and the surrounding area. There are a half dozen located close together on one street, which is where trouble first began on the Friday night preceding the Monday campus shootings.

May 1-4

Late Friday night, May 1, trouble started with some young people gathering in the streets about 11:00 p.m. yelling anti-war chants and throwing bottles. Some people in the bars along the "strip" came out and joined them. Police arrived in riot gear and then demonstrators in the crowd of about 500 started breaking store and office windows and also throwing rocks and bottles at the police. Police moved them all back toward the campus, four blocks away down the main street. There the crowd was dispersed with tear gas. Calm was restored by 2:00 a.m. About 50 windows were broken with \$10,000 damage. (About \$500.00 of damage was not covered by insurance.) There were two reasons people were on the streets. First, it was hot and the bars were over-crowded and uncomfortable. Secondly, the police, after the initial trouble began, shut the bars down and put a lot of angry people onto the street. One owner reported that the police over-reacted and should never have closed the bars.

The townspeople awoke Saturday morning feeling threatened. Rumors about Weathermen and weapons being on campus and a few threats made to downtown merchants to put up anti-war signs enflamed feelings. The rumor about Weathermen was never substantiated, nor was the rumor about guns being used by students, nor were any threats against merchants carried out. The campus was calm. Several members of the administration and faculty began to form groups of faculty peace marshals. By 8 p.m. Saturday, a group of 35 faculty-administrator marshals, along with 40 student marshals, were on the campus. Their principal goal was to inform the students that a University-obtained injunction against physical violence towards person or property was enforced. Their goal was accomplished by passing out a "handout" outlining the injunction. From about 8:00 to 8:45 p.m., a crowd of 300 to 500 left the Commons and milled around the campus, moving first to dorms, then to classroom buildings and finally back to the Commons. Throughout this period, faculty marshals attempted to talk with students, but they were in no mood to listen. There were never any plans for violence articulated, and faculty members felt that the majority of students first wanted to see what was going to happen. There was a carnival spirit with many straight couples in the crowd. Then the crowd returned to the Commons. The ROTC building, an old barracks structure, became the center of attraction. Rocks were thrown at it. Someone tried to light a curtain through a broken window using paper matches. The fire didn't take. Another tried a burning piece of paper, but the curtain only smoldered. A small flare was thrown on top of the building's roof. Then someone brought a rag soaked in the gas tank of a parked motorcycle. That got the wall burning. The Fire Department came. Their hoses were cut. The riot squad of the campus police arrived in helmets and gas masks and were pelted by rocks. The firemen almost put out the fire, but apparently were rattled and packed up fast. The blaze flared again and by the time fire trucks returned, it was out of control. Tear gas was being fired at the crowd. The time that elapsed from the first attack on the ROTC building until the fire truck and the police arrived was at least 20 minutes. Other estimates are as high as 35 minutes. The campus police station is 100 yards from the ROTC building and the fire station about $\frac{1}{2}$ mile.

The National Guard moved onto campus about 9:00 p.m. Unknown to the marshals, they had been in Kent since 7 p.m. because the mayor of Kent had decided to call in the National Guard because of rumors about Weathermen and guns, the threats, and the damage done on Friday night. The Guard took over the campus with tremendous force, often refusing freedom of movement to top University officials. The enlisted men seemed more cooperative than the officers who showed a lack of knowledge about the academic world.

Sunday morning the Governor of Ohio arrived in Kent and met with University and local officials. He changed the Guards' orders from protecting property and lives to breaking up any assembly on campus, whether it was peaceful or violent. He said every force of law and every weapon possible would be used. He commented that no-one was safe in Portage County and added, "I think we are up against the strongest, well-trained militant group that has ever assembled in America." The Governor said he was going to ask the state legislature to make rock throwing

a felony. The county prosecutor asked that the University be closed on Sunday; the Governor refused. So, the prosecutor waited until Monday after the shootings. The University officials were not consulted beforehand. Sunday night there was more action. The Guard cleared a crowd of about 200 who were sitting in the street, and one student was bayoneted, but most of the action involved students yelling at the National Guard and the police.

On Monday students were angry, Guardsmen weary, town merchants short-tempered, and the running of the University was no longer the province of its officials.

Classes, for the most part, were held on Monday morning. Shortly before noon a crowd began to gather on the Commons, a central meeting place for any group that wants to hold a rally.

Three separate categories of students could be identified on the Commons: the active core, the cheerleaders, and the spectators. In any crowd situation involving young people these three types are present. The active core were those who carried out the action toward the Guard by gestures, yells, and the throwing of missiles. The cheerleaders were those students who yelled in support of the active core and, occasionally, yelled at the Guard itself. The spectators observed what was going on, neither interacting or cheerleading. In a crowd situation, the active core does not necessarily have to be verbally or physically violent. For example, the same situation might occur if the active core were conducting a nonviolent sit-in.

The active core, about 100-150 students, were standing around the victory bell yelling at the Guard who were protecting the burned down ROTC building. The cheerleaders and the spectators were concentrated primarily on Taylor Hall and nearby dorms which are both on the edge of the Commons.

At 12:15 p.m. warning was given for the crowd to disperse, that they were in violation of an order which was against any form of peaceful assembly. Shortly after the warning was given, the Guard began, through the use of tear gas, to move the crowd. The students divided into several sectors. One group went to dorms near Taylor Hall; Another went down onto the football practice field, and a third went down into the Taylor Hall parking lot near Prentice Hall.

By any definition, the crowd had been widely dispersed and broken up. There was a skirmish between the students and soldiers on the football practice field. About 30-60 soldiers had followed the students to the practice football field and the students engaged them by throwing some rocks, but mostly clods of dirt. Soldiers, in turn, lobbed tear gas at the students. A few of the canisters were thrown back at the Guard. Most of the students gathered were just watching and yelling both taunts at the Guard and support for those returning the canisters to the soldiers. The interaction between the Guard and students was almost like choreography, and one had the feeling that a sporting event was in progress.

The Guard turned and marched in formation to the top of Taylor Hall hill. At that point, about ten to fifteen guardsmen turned and fired. There seemed to be no warning and no evidence of a sniper. The result of firing was four dead and nine wounded. Three hours later the University was closed by court injunction, and most of the students had left campus.

Why Were the Students on the Commons on Monday?

This question has been raised by students at other schools as well as other thoughtful people. The answer is crucial to understanding what happened at Kent.

An analysis of the 40 student case study documents centered on various factors which they suggested contributed to the mood of the campus that Monday. Five of the mentioned personalities -- the Governor of Ohio was mentioned by 13 students in relation to his statements and official orders; the President of the United States was mentioned by 19 persons in the context of his lack of rapport with students and his handling of national problems; the President of Kent State University was mentioned five times; the Vice-President for Student Affairs, twice; and the Portage County Prosecutor was mentioned four times.

Four of the themes which the students mentioned were concerned with issues. Twenty-six of the students mentioned the extension of U.S. troops into Cambodia and most indicated that this move was inconsistent with student desire for peace, and that the move had increased feelings of futility and frustration. Nine mentioned the problem of war in general and another 12 saw the presence of the Guard as an extension of the Cambodian War and war in general to the campus. Twenty-one of the students indicated objections to the massive use of force on the campus and feeling frustrated by the complete takeover of the campus by the Guard.

The students mentioned a number of events which also contributed to the creation of the mood on campus. Twenty-three students mentioned the take-over of the campus by the Guard as a threat to dissent and freedom on campus. Eight mentioned the campus difficulties at The Ohio State University as providing students with a precedent for enacting dissent. Twenty-five talked about the events on campus and in the community which had preceeded the May 4th shootings, seeing them as creating tensions. Seven mentioned the appearance of Jerry Rubin on campus and suggested that this had no great influence on the mobilization of radicals. Nineteen indicated that Nixon's speech on April 30th was the "straw that broke the camel's back." Eighteen mentioned that the unusually warm weather of that weekend created the context for outdoor activity, a feeling of relative freedom and the desire for "kicks and excitement." Another mentioned the release of radical students from the county jail that week and the possible effects on the protests of Friday and Saturday.

These were the range and types of themes which were mentioned by the students in their description of the mood of the campus prior to

the shootings. The most salient factor as seen by the students in shaping the mood was the entry into Cambodia which 26 students saw as contributing. Twenty-five of the students saw the events of the preceeding days -- Friday, Saturday and Sunday as important. Students talked about their initial tense relationships with police officials and the Guard. Twenty-three students mentioned their objections to the "take-over" by the Guard. Several quotations from the essays catch the flavor of their concerns.

Cambodia:

"Discrepancy between culture norms (war violence) and individual values human life, peace was exemplified in the Cambodian invasion."

"The majority of students opposed this move, but some had deeper feelings than just words would satisfy..."

"Youth ... are thoroughly opposed to President Nixon's ending the killing with more killing, or bringing about peace by extending the war."

"...Nixon escalated the war by ordering troops into Cambodia. Those who had tried peacefully for months to openly assert their opposition to the war came to the grave realization that they had demonstrated in vain."

Take-over by the Guard:

"Many frustrated students were more concerned now because they had lost their freedom to walk across campus."

"After the Guard arrived, their very presence, it seems, would have been enough to keep things boiling indefinitely."

The invasion of Cambodia and the presence of the National Guard presented an extension of the students' feelings about the War. Further, it provided a strong motivation to send some students to the Commons to protest. One might be surprised, not at the large number of students on the Commons, but rather that there were so few. The feeling against the war is strong among many students at Kent.

The second reason for being on the Commons, or rather, not leaving, was the feeling among most students and faculty that they were safe. Kent had had over the past two years a series of demonstrations which had been safe and nonviolent. Kent had experienced at least five marches and rallies over the past two years that had been peaceful. Four of the five of these rallies had either started or ended on the Commons.

First, in the fall of 1968, black students walked off campus in protest against the Oakland, California police department's recruiting

on campus (Kent offers a B.S. in Law Enforcement). There was considerable tension prior to the walkout, but the student marshals (particularly blacks and the S.D.S.) and a few faculty marshals facilitated a peaceful exit. In the spring of 1969, three large rallies were held by a civil liberties coalition of faculty and students. This group called the Concerned Citizens for the Kent Community (CCC) was formed in response to a series of actions by the University against the S.D.S.

Finally, in the fall of 1969, there was a large protest march (4,000 students on October 15) which ended about 100 yards from where the Guard fired at the students on May 4. Because of this tradition of peaceful, well marshalled protest, these had developed at Kent, most of the students present on Monday saw the Commons as a kind of "Hyde Park" safety zone for dissent.

Third, the students did not know the National Guard had loaded weapons. One faculty member yelled to students immediately after the Guard fired, "Don't worry, they are blanks."

In summary, the students were present on the Commons because they were motivated by opposition to the war and its extension to the campus. They also had a sense of security based on this history and on a lack of knowledge of locked and loaded weapons. Finally, most students and faculty were unaware of the exact nature of the order which was against any form of assembly.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

The largest university in the state of Ohio is The Ohio State University located in the capital at Columbus. The school is co-educational and has an enrollment of 41,555 full-time and 3,707 part-time students. Columbus, itself, has a population of 581,883. Like Ohio University, The Ohio State University is a state-assisted institution and is particularly responsive and attentive to the State Legislature which is located in Columbus. The University offers a broad choice of undergraduate, graduate and professional programs. Substantial funding of student education is provided by research grants and contracts from all governmental levels, industry and the military. Scholarships, loans, assistantships, fellowships, etc., are held by a number of Ohio State students. Should one visit the main Ohio State campus he would be impressed by the vast physical plant and the large and varied student body.

Ohio State also had disruptions in the spring of 1970. However, like those at Ohio University, the disturbances were not initiated by the Cambodian invasion or the Kent State shootings. Rather, disruption at Ohio State is reported to have begun some weeks before.

Monday, March 9

On this date a group of individuals, claiming to represent some 200 black students at Ohio State, notified the Vice-President of Student Affairs that they wished to meet with him in the afternoon.

That afternoon at 2:00 p.m. the group mentioned above went to the office of the Vice-President of Student Affairs and presented him with a list of 19 demands. The group requested that the list be distributed to the appropriate University offices and that a reply to the demands be made not later than noon on the 13th of March.

Thursday, March 12

The President of the University was asked by the Vice-President of Student Affairs to make a few remarks regarding several of the demands. The President mentioned a number of difficulties inherent in the demands and explained how they could not reasonably be met at this time.

Friday, March 13

The school newspaper, commenting on the 19 demands, said that the black students would have been better advised if they had forwarded their demands earlier during the winter quarter or had waited until the beginning of the spring quarter. The paper reasoned that the administration would take advantage of the last few days of the quarter and the approach of exams to pass lightly over the black demands, wait, and see if they would, in effect, go away.

At 9:00 a.m. the Vice-President of Student Affairs awaited the black delegation to appear at a meeting which had been scheduled for that time. The black students did not appear.

The President of the University met with his advisors to review the situation at 10:00 a.m. There were rumors that the black students planned to assemble at 11:30 and move on the Administration Building.

Noon found the Administration Building secured by University personnel at the direction of University officials. However, a group of 12 blacks were admitted to the building to talk with the Vice-President of Student Affairs. They met for approximately 15 minutes. Nothing was accomplished. No agreements were reached. The Vice-President claimed that the twelve individuals refused to identify themselves.

Upon leaving the Administration Building, however, the 12 students appeared to have let in some 75 to 80 more individuals. These newcomers caused some very minor damage in a few parts of the building and shouted obscenities at the Vice-President. The State Highway Patrol was summoned. A fire alarm was set off and the milling crowd left the building. At 1:00 p.m. the highway patrol arrived.

At 1:55 p.m. the University requested a temporary injunction in order to prevent any further disruptions. The request was granted by a county court at 3:00 p.m. (Note: several of those mentioned by name in the injunction were, On August 20, dismissed from the University after being found guilty of violating the University's disruption rules.)

During the afternoon of the 13th of March there were several small fires reported around campus.

The President of the University requested that the Highway Patrol support the University Police in patrolling the campus.

Late in the afternoon a group of three black students and a black faculty member met once again with the Vice-President of Student Affairs. Nothing productive came from this meeting. (From the 13th to the end of the quarter there was little "action" on The Ohio State University campus. But the spring quarter was still ahead.)

Tuesday, April 7

The two black students charged with the March 13 disruption of the Administration Building (and later dismissed) identified themselves.

Thursday, April 16

Hearings for the above mentioned black students were postponed until the end of April.

Monday, April 20

Some 200 students in the School of Social Work left classes to protest what was termed a denial of rights. They wanted to have a greater control over departmental decision-making, course structure, job placement, and their role in the community.

At about 12:35 p.m. some 100 students protested a career information program being held in the Ohio Union. The director of the Union asked them to leave.

Tuesday, April 21

The school newspaper carried a notice that advertised a protest march. By about noon that day some 175 individuals had assembled on the campus. The group marched to the Ohio State Student Union to once again protest the presence of representatives from various industries on campus. It was stated that the career day program was sponsored by industries profiting from the war in Vietnam and military recruiters. The group entered the ballrooms where the program was in progress. A little after noon the director of the Ohio Union advised the group that they were disrupting the program and asked them to leave. Finally, the school's Director of Security repeated the request. The Vice-President was called names and the police were called. Six students were finally arrested. They were taken to city jail. Efforts to agitate the large number of students that were spectators to the event failed.

Wednesday, April 22

On this date the first action was taken by what was a coalition of the several activist student groups, the Ad Hoc Committee for Student Rights. The Ad Hoc Committee outlined the demands they intended to present to the administration.

Thursday, April 23

A meeting of a number of groups was held in a University building that evening. The meeting was a preliminary to a rally for the following day.

A sizeable group of students from the School of Social Work voted to reject a faculty offer to seat seven students at their meetings. They adhered to the 50-50 representation which they had demanded earlier.

Friday, April 24

The Ad Hoc Committee for Student Rights held their rally. About 300 attended. Some of those there opposed the rally and the Ad Hoc Committee. The group moved on the Administration Building.

At the Administration Building, the group found that the doors had been previously locked. An executive assistant met with the leaders. It was explained to the leaders of the rally that the President of the University was not then in the building, but that they could meet with the offered University official; the Ad Hoc Committee leaders handed a list of demands to the administration representatives present.

Monday, April 27

A two-hour meeting was held on the afternoon of the 27th between representatives of the Ad Hoc

Committee and administrative officials. It was said some progress was made toward illuminating certain problems and the overall tone of the meeting was described as cordial.

A hearing by a University committee dealing with the discipline of some black students (for the March 13 incidents) was ended when the students, their University advisor and their lawyer left. They protested the University's refusal to make the hearings public.

Tuesday, April 28

Some representatives from the administration met with the Ad Hoc leadership and a representative of a black group. Ad Hoc assured the administration that the demonstration scheduled for the following day would be peaceful. The black representative voiced a number of grievances of the black student population. The meeting ended with little accomplished. The administration did, however, promise the loan of public address equipment for the rally the next day.

That night the campus Student Assembly passed a resolution supporting the rally planned for the 29th. Furthermore, they stated their support of a student boycott of classes until that time when the administration should be willing to discuss in a more open manner, what it was engaged in doing to meet the current grievances of the students.

Wednesday, April 29

At 7:00 a.m. officials asked campus security personnel and a 40-man contingent of the Highway Patrol to move to a standby basis and be ready for possible crowd control.

At 10:00 a.m. the Vice-President of Student Affairs released a letter responding to the Student Assembly's support of a class boycott. In the letter the Vice-President expressed the administration's concern with student demands and grievances and attempted to dispel reports of hard feelings and difficulties between administrators and student representatives.

At 11:00 a.m. the boycott and resulting picketing began. The demonstration was peaceful at this time. At 11:50 a.m. some demonstrators began moving toward the Administration Building. The doors of the Administration Building were secured. The peaceful crowd of some 2,000 students was orderly. A number of speakers from the various

subgroups making up the Ad Hoc Committee aired their views. The assembly had dispersed within the hour.

Around 3 p.m. that afternoon the main entrance to the campus was partly blocked by some student-erected barricades. No vehicular traffic was allowed to pass.

At about the same time a few other demonstrators partly blocked another University entrance further to the north.

At 3:15 p.m. the largest group of demonstrators blocked another entrance to the University. This was on a street that normally carries public traffic.

By 3:30 p.m. highway patrolmen were sent to this last blocked entrance. The crowd grew to a fairly substantial number, although it remained peaceful other than blocking the entrance. City policemen were called. They ordered the crowd to disperse. When it did not do so, tear gas was used. Arrests were made as the entrance was opened. The street was clear by 5 p.m.

At 4:20 p.m. the Ohio National Guard was notified to standby.

At 4:30 p.m. an injunction was released, directed at several student groups and specifying certain personalities.

At 4:45 p.m. perhaps 1,000 demonstrators gathered in front of and around the Administration Building. While the group in front of the building remained peaceful, clashes occurred between smaller groups of students and police in back of the building. Students hurled rocks, attempted to use a fire hose and threw gas cannisters back at the police.

At about 6:15 p.m. Columbus city police in riot gear proceeded to clear the area around the Administration Building. They continued to sweep the major campus area, hurling hundreds of gas canisters. Clashes developed between students and police over a wide area.

By 7:30 p.m. the major street in the University area was blocked while groups gathered on particular street corners. Scattered minor damage,

mostly window breaking, was done throughout the area. City police reported they were fired upon at this time.

By 8:30 p.m. police were marching through streets, dispersing groups. Some tear gas was thrown into residences, fraternities and sororities. Rocks, bricks and cans were thrown by the demonstrators. Shots were fired and several dozen students were injured by gunfire as the clashes continued.

At 9:00 p.m. the Mayor of Columbus called a curfew into immediate effect for an area around the University.

At 10:15 p.m. the President of the University held a press conference. He stated that the situation was tense and that he would not hesitate to call in additional forces if the conditions warranted such action.

At 11:40 p.m. the Ohio National Guard arrived on campus. They had been called by the Governor of Ohio at the request of the President of The Ohio State University.

By midnight the campus and the area around it were relatively calm.

Thursday, April 30

By 10:00 a.m. an estimated 3,000 students had gathered in the main campus area. At 10:45 tear gas was used again to clear these spectators from around the Administration Building. Clashes between Guardsmen and students continued. There was heavy verbal harassment of the military.

At noon window breakage was reported at local stores and approximately 350 demonstrators were cleared from the area streets.

At 1:30 p.m. a student in the major campus area was wounded in the leg and calf. A crowd gathered. It was dispersed with tear gas.

At 2:00 p.m. several students left a campus rally to confer with the Vice-President of Student Affairs. But at 2:15 p.m. they returned with word that the Vice-President would not talk with them. A second delegation did manage to see the Vice-President and they reported that he was, in fact, willing to talk.

About 7:20 p.m. a small explosion and fire took place in a University building.

Friday, May 1

10:00 a.m. on Friday found students again holding a mass meeting on campus. Later small groups of students broke away from the rally to begin picketing classes. In the afternoon the administration altered suspension policy so that only those charged with inciting to riot, or assault and battery, or resisting arrest would be subject to temporary suspension. The curfew was imposed again later that night.

Saturday, May 2

The weekend was quiet. Many meetings were held. Some talks between administration and students took place. A Saturday curfew from 1:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. was set.

Monday, May 4

An announcement began the day. It involved the appropriation of some \$170,000 for the Black Studies Program. Furthermore, an appointment of a black faculty member to assist in developing an improved admissions program for the disadvantaged was announced.

At 10:00 a.m. demonstrations resumed in front of the Administration Building. A rally was held. Groups left the rally to picket buildings.

About 4:00 p.m. the news of the Kent State shootings reached the Ohio State campus.

The University Committee on Discipline held hearings for 53 students accused of having violated the campus disruption rules.

Tuesday, May 5

Early Tuesday morning student pickets formed at several student dining halls. National Guardsmen escorted the food service personnel through the student lines.

At 8:00 a.m. the student newspaper published a new list of student demands. These were largely the result of the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee.

By 10:00 a.m. demonstrators began blocking the entrances to at least one building. Some students were being physically prevented entrance to their classes. Other class buildings were eventually blocked. At 2:15 p.m. a National Guard Officer went to these buildings and ordered the demonstrators to leave. Some forty-five minutes later National Guardsmen moved south on campus, clearing blocked buildings as they went. By 4:00 p.m. the demonstrators were back for another rally.

At 6:00 p.m. the President of the University went on local television stations and made statements to the effect that the past week had been difficult, but that the University should be preserved.

During the day, as with the day before, there were a number of fire calls made. Although the majority of the calls were false alarms, a few were not.

Wednesday, May 6

At about 3:00 a.m. two male arson suspects were arrested near the University stadium.

At 5:30 a.m. further attempts to picket and close the food facilities were made. Some personnel did not report for work.

In order to assuage faculty and student opinion on the events taking place at the time, the geology department conducted a campus referendum.

At 11:30 the President of the University held a press conference. He announced the cancelling of several events previously scheduled for the following day, including May Day festivities and a ROTC Review. He further proclaimed that Thursday all classes be held as scheduled, but that the time be used for discussion and reflection upon the current issues.

At noon a large group of demonstrators blocked the entrances to a class building. The National Guard moved them away.

At 2:30 p.m. a fire in a classroom/art studio was responded to by city firemen. There were reports of stones being thrown at the firemen. These were not confirmed.

At 3:30 p.m. the National Guard dispersed a group of demonstrators who had assembled near the President's house. Another group moved around the Administration Building. By 4:00 p.m. the crowd had grown to 1,500. Thirty minutes later the National Guard moved the crowd away from the Administration Building.

At 5:30 p.m. the President of the University closed Ohio State. The President cited the recommendation of the Governor of the State of Ohio to close the school. The President requested that all those students who were able should leave immediately. All other students were expected to have vacated the campus by noon of the following day. Only

key personnel were to remain. All activities were to be suspended until further notice. The University was closed May 7-19.

Some students were opposed to the closing as they were to the demonstrations. Some classes met off campus but with regular faculty during the time the University was closed. Several groups organized to work for an open University and to say that the tactics employed by many of the demonstrators were wrong.

Throughout the days that the University was closed, a number of people were working to get it reopened. Administration, faculty and students continued to meet and talk. A faculty meeting of May 12 called for all functions of the University to resume. On May 13 administrators directed faculty and necessary personnel to return to campus and prepare for reopening. On Thursday, May 14, the Board of Trustees voted to reopen Ohio State. The Trustees set Tuesday, May 19 as the date for reopening. Furthermore, the Trustees established a security system to be followed when the University did reopen. Among other things, the system included control and inspection of student and faculty identification cards and security personnel. A number of "check points" were positioned in the more strategic entrances to the campus and manned by the above-mentioned personnel. Provision was also made for a campus curfew if the situation should call for such a measure and a ruling that limited any gathering on campus to less than five people.

Saturday, May 16

Some 400 faculty members petitioned for the rights of those students wishing to follow academic programs. The petition also called for dismissal from the University of those persons disrupting the school's functions.

The President of the University briefed faculty members and student leaders regarding the reopening scheduled for Tuesday.

A progress report was issued to students, faculty and administrators.

The Ohio State University reopened amid much hope, worry, and speculation. A number of groups urged discretion and calm. A noon rally was held. It was quiet.

The next seven days brought renewed demonstrations and one violent clash with police that was primarily engaged in by non-student elements. Somehow these did not have the impact as those preceeding the closing of the University. Whether it was because of the identification system operating or the fact that Ohio State was effectively a "closed" campus or that some negotiations were held or that some activist leaders were restrained via injunctions, or that the law enforcement personnel merely handled the situation in a much more professional manner cannot be said. Quite possibly these and other factors all contributed to keeping Ohio State open for the rest of the quarter.

APPENDIX II

THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS

Thinking Theologically, or
Theologians Thinking about

MORAL CONCERNS AND ETHICAL ISSUES INVOLVED IN CAMPUS UNREST

A group of thirteen "working" theologians* -- some seminary deans and professors, a campus church pastor, a few campus ministers and several others -- were called together in a "theological task force" to "lift up ethical issues and moral concerns which should be considered by Churches and Churchmen (and whoever else will listen) in the face of the present critical situation of higher education in our society today." Out of this engagement, presumably, was to come a critique, a document, or a series of documents to append to the Dynes-Quarantelli Report, which would hopefully stimulate others also to think theologically about campus unrest.

Such matters as elitist higher education, delivery of educational services to the poor, repressive police powers and legislation, self-determination and participation in decision making and governance, education for humane ends, public financial assistance direct to individuals rather than institutions, equal educational opportunity and open access and retention services in higher education, the right to dissent from public policies and civil rights and due process were all assumed to be (or closely related to) ethical issues about which the church should properly be concerned.

As will be evident in what follows, the stated goal for this group was not totally accomplished, although the occasion itself proved to be very exciting. In the first place, all of these very busy men, at one of the most demanding times of their year (early September), responded to the call with interest and enthusiasm. Not one who was asked said no. In the second place, a full afternoon and evening was spent in spirited

* Members of the Theological Task Force who were involved in preparing this section of the report were: Dr. C. King Bradow, Campus Pastor, Lutheran Student Center and Director, Religious Affairs Center, O.S.U., Columbus; The Rev. Charles Brown, Professor, and Dr. Newell Wert, Dean, United Theological Seminary, Dayton; Dr. Van B. Dunn, Methodist Theological School, Delaware; The Rev. James E. Kraus, Acting Dean, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington; The Rev. Roger Ridgeway, Director, Toledo Campus Ministry, Toledo; The Rev. Jonathan N. Mitchell, Rector, St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, Columbus; The Rev. Norman Snook, Campus Minister, United Christian Center, Columbus; The Rev. Raymond H. Swartzback, Campus Pastor, The College of Wooster, Wooster.

and sometimes heated discourse. And several of these same persons met on two additional afternoons in a further attempt to complete the original assignment. In short, agreement was not reached; polarities were evident; presuppositions hardened positions.

But although unsuccessful in one sense, the experience provided a useful model in another sense. Those present at the Task Force meeting reported going to their homes, schools, classes and other duties, and continuing the discussion with family, friends and associates. In other words, "Go thou and do likewise," is the bidding.

The members of the Theological Task Force found great stimulation and much value in reading the Dynes-Quarantelli Report, gathering to discuss it, and seeking answers for themselves in all their many professional, personal and societal relationships. They strongly recommend this process for as many churchmen and others with whom they associate as possible. The key action words are: seek information, read about, think about, talk about campus unrest; then, test assumptions and relate all to your own situation. It may be one of the most important things you can do in these parlous times.

What follows are examples of "Theologians thinking Theologically" about campus unrest and, more broadly and even more to the point, the crisis in higher education.

- A.L.C.

The following was prepared as a preliminary paper by Father James Kraus for the seminar which was held at The Ohio State University, hosting campus ministers from the Big-10 universities, October 12-14, 1970.

CHANGING VALUE SYSTEMS

After the disruptions on our campuses in the Spring of 1970, the Ohio Council of Churches was concerned to initiate a study of the situation. Two professors of sociology at the Ohio State University were commissioned to prepare an extensive study or report. This was then given to a task force of theologians who were to present "the moral implications of the study" to a Consultation of ecclesiastical officials convoked by the OCC for use by the Churches as they would see fit. So we had a classic case of the problem "what does theology say" or "what do the Churches say" to a crisis situation of our times, a crisis of the greatest interest to those attending this Seminar.

The fact is that this time, as in so many others, the theologians once more only demonstrated their human fallibility. For reasons, many and understandable (time, point of view, etc.), they have been unable to produce a significant common statement. That the Churches will fare any better is hardly likely. It seems the gift of prophecy seldom dwells in a Committee. The conveners of this Seminar, who had hoped to use this statement as a basis for discussion, were part of the task force and share the responsibility for its non-existence.

In its stead, we are here enclosing a brief report of the principal areas of agreement and some excerpts from the reports of the theologians of the task force, and we are asking the principal speakers and all participants in the Seminar to speak to the original questions: what does theology or the Church have to say about the crisis on the campus, a crisis we believe to be profoundly related to the announced general topic of the Seminar, that of Changing Value Systems.

- - - - -

1. The theologians were in agreement that campus unrest, pluralism, ideological conflict, etc., are signs of authentic university life, and are not only to be expected, but sought after on the campus. Perhaps members of churches especially need to be reminded of this.
2. They were in agreement that one of the principal functions of theology is to attempt to understand and help others understand the assumptions about man and the value systems that are operating and emerging on the campus or anywhere else. They think that in general the University does not handle this function very effectively (and they cited the otherwise excellent report as an instance). At the same time, they acknowledged that neither the theologians nor the

churches do very well at either: certainly what is being said here has been heard, or at least said, many times before on the campus.

3. Much of their time was spent discussing the nature of the university and of education. Most felt that much of the conflict centered here and must be resolved here. Not all agreed on the role of theology in this, but they were generally not as optimistic about the quality of the overall job being done by the University as are many at the University.
4. They agreed that one of the chief causes of the violence is mutual mistrust, and that one function the churches can possibly serve, to their members at least, is that of an agent of reconciliation, a peacemaker, encouraging both trust and trustworthiness on the part of all.
5. Most generally agreed on the rejection of violence as a solution, but varied in their understanding and tolerance of it as an element in the problem.
6. They unanimously agreed that the University has a real function to fill with regard to the total community, and that deep and active commitment to all kinds of causes is proper for every individual at the University. But they disagreed on the exact role of the University and of individuals as part of the University in the areas of politics, social action, etc. Some saw direct alignment and action as a positive duty; others, as simply a fact to be acknowledged and controlled; others saw it as improper or ineffective; still others advocated an indirect approach on the level of ideas, etc.
7. They were in complete agreement that simplistic analyses and solutions, and the absolutizing of limited values (e.g., "law and order", "change now", "non-violence", "total withdrawal") only compound the problem.
8. They were in general agreement that the violent campaign rhetoric of both sides (e.g., "pessimists", "bums", "pigs", obscenities, etc.) is both the sign and cause of violent attitudes and violent actions. It is significant that violence erupted and was violently repressed only when this climate had been created. To combat it without falling victim to our own repressive spirit calls for restraint, courage and understanding, on the part of leaders, especially.

I think that the University of the future, already emerging as distinct from the University of the present or past, has some new answers to the old questions. First, the old distinction between active and passive, the transmitters of the culture and the receivers, is on the way out. Tomorrow and already today, all those at the University will be active, creating their own culture, making their own mistakes, cooperating only in a community where the individuals have a right to freely establish their own goals rather than receive them from an authority or society. They do not necessarily repudiate continuity with the past,

but find it best authenticated in a process of self-creation. Secondly, at their rare best, they are not about to follow the old alternatives to resolving conflict, i.e., compromise or violence; the one is simply tinkering with or adjusting the system; the other, for reasons of their own, is to reject. Rather, they are simply going to do their thing, and demand the right and the resources to do their thing, be it strike, have black studies, moratoriums, etc. Thirdly, they reject the idea of the neutrality of the University as an excuse for non-involvement or non-commitment, or more often as a mask for clear commitment to established values of society. They come out strongly for commitment.

I believe that men of the University should use this institution for its own proper function and not others, however good the goal. Thus, the University is not to directly engage in or compel religious, political, economic or social action, thus replacing the institutions which have those functions directly. This may appear to put the University in an ivory tower when we all know it isn't, so I would clarify my position with these points:

- a) Everybody at the University should be committed to all the causes he wishes to be. They may use the University as a forum for advocating their cause as long as it's legal. But no university is a monolith, and no one should use it as if it were for their cause. "The university should be neutral" means only that it should stick to its function of examining and advocating ideas, and do that honestly, listening to all, without adopting positions as a university which are not unanimous.
- b) I admit that it is a fine line between advocating social and political action as one sees it, and engaging directly in effecting the change. The continuums the real world offers are like that. I would like to avoid the extremes of the ivory tower and the frankly political university in the hands of liberals or conservatives. Once they are totally committed to their objectives, e.g., getting us out of Viet Nam, or keeping us in, I find that most often they are willing to destroy the real function of the university, objective analysis, free choice, honest reporting, to their political goal.
- c) As a man of ideas, I do not feel that I am thereby rendered ineffective for my causes on the campus. In fact, I am convinced that the function most appropriate to the university is going to be the ultimately effective one in politics, economics, religion and society. Abandoning my ideas for direct action is to show a lack of patience and confidence, to usurp another institution's function, often ineptly, and ultimately to lose the battle for truly human progress.

I do not think that the Churches, as such, are the consciences or moral guides of the University (the denominational University aside) and therefore I do not think they have much to say to them, nor would they or Councils of Churches be effective if they did, especially since they

themselves could not honestly reach any significant consensus. But church leaders can and should say something to their own members about the University and the events of the past spring:

- a) Church goers should be told to try to understand what the University is and what it is becoming and, in my view, what its function is and how we may view its actions.
- b) They should be told not to be surprised or alarmed at the ferment of opposing ideas expressed at the University, some quite revolutionary; on the contrary, they should expect and welcome this.
- c) They should be told to support the University, use its resources, listen to it and, if necessary, keep it in its place.

A Theological Response To The Report

"DISRUPTION ON THE CAMPUSES OF OHIO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES,

SPRING, 1970"

James E. Kraus
Acting Dean of Theology
Pontifical College Josephinum
Worthington, Ohio

1. My view of theology, and therefore of this theological response, is that it is primarily an attempt to understand what is happening at the deepest level, and only secondarily is it prescriptive, and then only in very general terms.
2. I think that the University, however imperfectly realized, already is and ought to be a place where men are seeking to understand man and his world, to pursue wisdom, to learn how to serve men in a myriad of ways. These ways and attempts are all provisional and even contradictory, so the University is pluralist and inevitably a place where conflict takes place. They proceed out of man's experience of the larger world, and inevitably lead back to commitments to action in the world, so the University cannot be isolated from the total community. But these are generalities; the questions remain, how do men of the university pursue wisdom, engage in conflict, and relate to the community?
3. I think that the University of the future, already emerging as distinct from the University of the present or past, has some new answers to these questions. First, the old distinction between the active and the passive, the transmitters of the culture and the receivers is on the way out. Tomorrow, and already today, all those at the University will be active, creating their own culture, making their own mistakes, cooperating only in a community where the individuals have a right to freely establish their own goals rather than receive them from an authority or society. They do not necessarily repudiate continuity with the past, but find it best authenticated in a process of self-creation. Secondly, they, at their rare best, are not about to follow the old alternatives to resolving conflict, i.e., compromise or violence; the one is simply tinkering or adjusting the system, the other is inimical both to the University and to their more generalized allegiance from humanism or Christianity to non-violence. Rather, they are simply going to do their thing, and demand the right and resources to do their thing, be it strike, have black studies, moratoriums, etc. Thirdly, they reject the idea of the neutrality of the university as an excuse for non-involvement or non-commitment, or more often as a mask for clear commitment to established values of society. They come out strongly for commitment.
4. I am quite aware that this conception of the university and the university of the future is shared by perhaps few. I see it, with its

emphasis on certain new elements, insufficiently appreciated by those in power inside and outside the University. I see it in danger of being sold out even by the few who share its vision: impatient, angry, tired men among students or faculty. I see the mass of students unaware or uncommitted to it even while moving toward it, like labor toward unionism in the past. I see the mass of the public vaguely annoyed or opposed to it. Even this very well done Report, because of its philosophy, seems to be insensitive to what is significantly new in all that is happening. I acknowledge and regret all that; maybe the hour has not yet come, or it is utopian to hope for it, and arrogant to assume the validity of one's own vision, even provisionally. But that is part of the theologian's task which I now outline.

5. First, as a theologian and seeing the university as I do, I find their separation or tenuous relation a tragedy for both. The function of critically examining and recreating the value systems of our worlds is pitifully handled by this institution: studied inadequately and largely left up to the individual unprepared as he is. Theology should not dominate this study, but it should be and want to be a part of it, and be allowed to be a part of it at the University. Within the university, or now to the university, theologians should express their theological concerns and advocate their positions on the great issues of the times: war, race, freedom, quality of life, etc. Commitment to a position should not exclude them anymore than does an historian's loyalty to country.
6. Secondly, and this is my own theological position differing from others, I believe that men of the University should use this institution for its own proper function and not others, however good the goal. Thus the University is not to directly engage in or compel religious, political, economic or social action, thus replacing the institutions which have those functions directly. This may appear to put the University in an ivory tower when we all know it isn't, so I would clarify my position with these points:
 - a) Everybody at the university should be committed to all the causes he wishes to be. They may use the university as a forum for advocating their cause as long as it's legal. But no university is a monolith, and no-one should use it as if it were for their cause. "The University should be neutral" means only that it should stick to its function of examining and advocating ideas, and do that honestly, listening to all, without adopting positions and advocating ideas, as a university which are not unanimous.
 - b) I admit that it is a fine line between advocating social and political action as one sees it, and engaging directly in effecting the change. The continuums the real world offers are like that. I just would like to avoid the extremes of the ivory tower and the frankly political university in the hands of liberals or conservatives. Once they are totally committed to their objectives, e.g., getting us out of

VietNam or keeping us in, I find that most often they are willing to destroy the real function of the university, objective analysis, free choice, honest reporting, to their political goal.

- c) As a man of ideas, I do not feel that I am castrating myself in other ways on the campus. In fact, I am convinced that this function most appropriate to the university is going to be the ultimately effective one in politics, economics, religion and society. Abandoning my ideas for direct action is not only to show a lack of confidence and patience and to usurp another's function often ineptly, but it is my judgment to lose the battle for truly human progress.
7. All informed and concerned citizens and members of the University should exercise their right and duty to express themselves on and influence policies and events at the University, especially such as occurred this Spring. Theologians especially should do so because they deal professionally with the deepest meanings and values at stake. I, for one, strongly regret the extremists on both sides whose violent action resulted inevitably in the shutting down of the University. Both militant students and intransigent officials with their weapons of rocks, loaded guns and tear gas temporarily destroyed and could permanently destroy all the university stands for. I further deplore and indict a climate of irresponsible rhetoric of both the Rubin and Agnew type, and deplore the attempts of either side to silence the other by means other than persuasion. Since differences of opinion and unrealized dreams are of the essence of University life, all members of the University community and those outside too must exercise the virtues of patience, mutual trust and understanding with what goes on there, lest the conflict of ideas erupt into violence and compulsion.
8. I do not think that Churches, as such, are the consciences of moral guides to the University (the denominational University aside) and therefore, I do not think they have much to say to them, nor would they, or Councils of Churches, be effective if they did, especially since they could not honestly reach any significant consensus. But church leaders can and should say something to their members about the University and the events of the past Spring:
- a) Churchgoers should try to understand what the university is and what it is becoming (#2 and 3 above) and, in my view, what its function is and how we may view its actions (#6 and 7 above).
 - b) They should not be surprised or alarmed at the ferment of opposing ideas expressed at the University, some quite revolutionary. On the contrary, they should expect and welcome this.

- c) They should trust the men of the university and the process of inquiry involved, as they do other professionals; we are free and after the debate is over, we will make our own decisions.
- d) They should support the university, use its resources, listen to it, and, if necessary, as good citizens, keep it in its place.

SOME THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS ON CAMPUS UNREST

Van Bogard Dunn, Dean
Methodist Theological School
Delaware, Ohio

My point-of-view is determined by the conviction that God is at work in human history seeking to accomplish the humanization of life. The content of humanization and the methods appropriate for that goal are given in the event Jesus Christ. Thus, my reflections are controlled by Christian theology and manifest my own commitment to the Christian faith.

Campus unrest, like every other aspect of human life, is not meaningful in itself. It receives meaning from beyond itself. This fact is not restricted to Christian reflection on the matter but is operative in any effort to find meaning in the confusion and chaos of human events. Thus, when the judgment is made that the university as now structured is functioning effectively, that evaluation rests upon prior commitments about the meaning and purpose of life. Obviously, a contrary judgment about the university is an evaluation which is also based on prior commitments about values and goals.

From my own perspective, campus unrest must be judged in relationship to the goals and methods of humanization. Since I am convinced that restlessness, aspiration, risk-taking are authentic marks of human life, I affirm campus unrest as a necessary condition for the achievement of human values. The violence which occasionally accompanies campus unrest is not rooted in unrest per se. Unrest erupts into violence because members of the community ascribe absolute worth to structures and programs which are contingent and transient. Thus, in the name of the university, the partisans of unrest and the partisans of tranquillity justify violent acts which threaten to destroy the university as an institution dedicated to the humanization of life.

The task of Christian theology in the present crisis is not to give supernatural sanctions to some segment of the campus community but to assist all the members of the community to think theologically about the total experience. This involves, among other things, the following:

1. The honest recognition that simplistic analysis and simplistic remedy make interesting rhetoric but are usually counter-productive.
2. The rigorous probing of the commitments which are now governing the university so that what the university does can be measured against what the university professes.
3. The insistence that those who participate in protest must submit their goals and strategies to the same value judgments which they invoke in their struggle against the "establishment."

4. The recognition that, although human history must not be absolutized, to be human demands tentative judgments which are implemented in hard choices among imperfect alternatives.
5. The rejection of the avoidance of violence as the over-riding concern of the university and the articulation of humanization as the only legitimate goal. (If this point is not made, restraint of violence by repressive force will be used to compel conformity and silent dissent.)
6. The distinction between Truth and truth so that the university will understand that unconditioned examination of truth is the only legitimate service of the university to Truth.
7. The acknowledgment of the political alliances of the university and the encouragement of active participation in determining what those alliances shall be.

SOME RATHER DISJOINTED REFLECTIONS

Raymond H. Swartzback, Campus Pastor
The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio

1. It is my conviction that unless we lift up theological issues which can be considered by rank and file Churches and Churchmen, we are engaged in an exercise of futility. If the concerns we raise up do not "communicate" to the pastors and committed laymen who are seeking counsel in this very difficult area -- if we concentrate only on those ministers who are tied into our Institutions of Higher Learning, I feel that we will have missed a tremendous opportunity. So I plead that we stop the verbal "games" and say, "In the light of the current crisis in Higher Education, we affirm ..." I, for one, would rather affirm Section III of A Letter To the Churches About the Crisis in Higher Education (see Bibliography), than to address ourselves solely to the academic community.
2. The quest for truth is a process. The quest is bound to produce ferment. Campus tensions are not necessarily harmful to higher education. It is the responses to tensions that lead to constructive or destructive outcomes. "A campus without tensions is intellectually moribund." (See page 37: Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations.) In our report, this idea should be amplified.
3. There should be rejoicing on the part of the Churches at the questioning of the young. In their view, the failings of American society are its propensity to violence, its exploitation of the weak, its indifference to human values, its hypocrisy, its corruption. (See page 18: Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations). In our report, we should certainly lay bare some of the "underlying" causes -- racism, Southeast Asia, Environmental irresponsibility, etc.
4. Let us suggest that we have a situation where the University and College was not prepared to accommodate itself to that which it conceives to be its primary purpose -- that of providing an arena for conflicting ideas. Freedom and justice are achieved, in Biblical history, not by repression or the mere establishing of some social structures but in the dynamic of a new relationship. The problem we face is the problem of liberation -- not freedom from the self but freedom to be oneself rather than the victim of social processes controlled by others. Certainly one of the tasks of the University is to find ways by which human relations may be made more just, injustice may be restrained, and people may be liberated from enslavement to an unjust order. Are the student "revolutionaries" right when they charge that colleges and universities contribute to the corruption of the society by perpetuating and instilling in so-called leaders the values by which those leaders initiate (and gain from) external wars and internal repression, by which those leaders benefit from the status quo? Complicity with the corrupt order can be seen on many fronts -- military research, admissions policies that appear

to be elitist and racist, the makeup of Boards of Trustees, etc. Our report must recognize this dimension of the problem.

5. We ought to deal with the Christian concept of Freedom. Freedom is usually understood in terms of self-assertion. Self-assertion as a means to freedom has meaning only to the extent in which it respects or promotes the freedom of others. True self-assertion presupposes a certain measure of self-denial. For real and lasting freedom we have to pay a price. In human relations we are often inclined to use the word reconciliation in a distorted sense, when we try to bring people together in such a way that no one loses face and no one has to pay a price. Reconciliation itself is a revolutionary act. But it is never at the sole cost of one of the parties. It always speaks of mutual adjustment. (It seems to me that we should suggest that this is no time for emotional reactions, snap judgments, and calls for legislative or police action that lead to forceful restraints, punitive measures, and coerced obedience.)
6. We should say that we support the many faculty, administrators, and students who are constructively seeking educational reform, experimenting in new directions, and exploring new frontiers of service to man.
7. We are inclined to give priority to the reconciliation of structures as the way to a fuller personal humanity. I agree that Christians must strive for the humanization of structures. But as the Church, we know that changed structures do not lead to real freedom if they are manned and operated by unchanged men. The reconciliation of men, through trust relationships, has priority over the reconciliation of structures. We witness, in the present crisis, a tremendous breakdown in the trust relationships which should characterize institutions of Higher Education.
8. I still think confession on the part of the Church is necessary. In repentance we should acknowledge that many injustices have been perpetuated because the Church has remained silent. The problems we face as a nation, reflected quite clearly in the campus disorders, cannot simply be explained away sociologically. The fact of the matter is that many of our so-called student revolutionaries are raising issues which the Church has been too timid to raise.

I make no apology for pleading that those who are responsible for pulling together some sort of a working document keep in the forefront of their thinking that great alienated, hostile, silent majority. Maybe it would be better to come out with a simple paragraph pleading for understanding, pleading for an honest investigation of the facts, pleading for mutual respect, than to issue a heavy document.

I really do have strong reservations as to whether it is possible to treat this profound a subject in such a short span of time.

CONCERNING SOME QUESTIONS

Roger Ridgway, Director
Toledo Campus Ministry
Toledo, Ohio

Professor Allen Silver reviewed James Ridgeway's muckraking investigation of American Higher Education some time ago. In that review he raised some questions which ought to be a part of our reflections on campus unrest, and which I believe were inadequately represented in the study of Professors Dynes and Quarantelli.

I think, however, that the bored and rebellious undergraduates whom Mr. Ridgeway sees as fodder for the labor market will continue to be bored and rebellious in spite of his proposed reforms--including participation in university governance. For Mr. Ridgeway has little or nothing to say about the educational failures of the American university. These will not be solved only by correcting the universities' relationship to business, government and politics, nor by extensive changes in academic governance. How can academic work become more "relevant" without succumbing to fostering the cult of experience or impatience with the discipline (as distinct from the ritual pedertry) of scholarly work? How can professors respond to the personal needs of students without playing psychotherapists or abandoning a sense of scholarly calling which must be grounded in some irreducible way in specialization? How does one change things so that an intelligent and serious student meeting with a professor in his office need not feel under pressure to talk only about "the course" while five others like him wait outside? These are the kinds of questions that Mr. Ridgeway's approach to the universities overlooks.

-(New York Review, Jan. 30, 1969, p. 24)

The report contains some rather sanguine presuppositions about the state of higher education (and I do not refer only to the Durant quote), which I think ought to be more closely observed.

It might even be said that the report displays the problem which underlies the phenomena which it studies. By that I mean that the authors are clearly very adept at collecting and compiling data about campuses and their disorders; they present valuable external histories of the events at a number of campuses. Employing a schema which may be too facile, I'll say they present truth without getting very deeply into meaning. While some members of the Task Force found the section which puts the lie to "Half-truths, Misconceptions, Panaceas, and Cliches About Student Protest" to be valuable, it struck me that there was a marked lack of connection between the insights in this section and the sociological groundwork which had previously been laid down. The generalizations are undercut, not by reference to the data which had earlier been presented, but by wide-ranging appeal to everything from unspecified "studies" to psychological reductions. ("These experiences for most college students are somewhat like going to the sideshow at the fair..."). I see nothing implicitly wrong about that approach. I simply want to note that this section could as

well have been authored by someone not at all privy to the sociologist's craft and altogether unfamiliar with the data presented in the early part of the report. I do not want to limit them to speaking only as sociologists, but I emphasize that when they do so speak they reach no further than the collection of numerous truths which fail to constitute a pattern of understanding. Only when they give up the sociological stance do they address themselves to meaning and then only negatively.

It may indeed be true that "the most prudent approach" is to disclose as half-truths "most generalizations about student disturbances." But what is prudent is not necessarily valuable. I would have wished, rather, that they had set themselves the task of developing alternative, and more adequate generalizations. That would have required that they disclose their theoretical apparatus and they seek to fit the truths into a pattern of meaning. What I think happened instead, is that they brought to the study their own generalizations (or presuppositions --e.g., regarding the university and that it is basically doing fairly well a very difficult job), but that these generalizations, because they are nowhere made systematically explicit, have gone untested. They were not subjected to the discipline of careful analysis in light of data collected.

I have run that analysis through not to denigrate the work which Dynes and Quarantelli have done. They did a lot of work on the report and in spending the whole day with us. But I simply do not think we can make an adequate report on student disturbances nor (and I believe we must get to this) what they mean unless we can provide some generalizations, some theoretical constructs; these must then be subjected to the disciplines of empirical observation. But the latter without the former is without great value to us.

Now, it may be that none of the generalizations typically offered are adequate. It may be that the causes for student unrest which are adduced by students (both those at rest and the unrestful ones), faculty members, administrators, legislators and parents are all mere half-truths, misconceptions and cliches. If so, we ought to know it. But we must go beyond that and find generalizations which seem to us to be none of those things. If none of the active parties knows or admits his real motives, then we must flush them out.

Allen Silver, in the review which I mentioned earlier, said about the events at Columbia in the spring of 1968:

When the crisis came, neither the faculty nor the administration could adequately represent the idea of a university as a distinctive and precious enterprise, with special claims on its members in a time of intense political and moral stress. (p. 16)

It is increasingly my conviction that this inability of anyone to represent the idea of a university is at the root of the problem. There are, of course, many ideas of the university and there probably ought to be many universities representing those ideas. But what we have instead is all universities (and colleges, for that matter) becoming more and more alike (the recent study by Hodgkinson at the Center for Study of

Higher Education at U.C., Berkeley, puts the lie to the much vaunted "diversity of American higher education"), but none of them representing any idea; all of them based on the negotiated compromise of competing ideas, so that academic governance is not the pursuit of purpose but the constant balance of interests (Clark Kerr aptly described the process, and I find it no wonder that students become disillusioned with participation in academic governance; as James Baldwin once said of black participation in American life, it's like getting integrated into a sinking ship).

Myron Bloy has said somewhere in reporting on his study of academic governance that if the universities are unclear about their purposes, there are numerous forces outside the universities which are not, and they are all too willing to employ the universities to serve their purposes. An inventory of all the social services of the universities, from government research contracts to acting as a screening and credentialing agency ought once again to be taken. Its point would not be to demand that universities seek to isolate themselves according to old and always untrue ideologies; it would, however, force home the point that without an autonomous sense of its purposes, the university has no standard by which to judge what services it can render and to whom; it thus becomes the tool of the powerful and the wealthy.

There are very few students who are passionately taken with such questions. They are not the cause of student unrest in an immediate and direct way (i.e., they are not the "issues" on which unrest focuses), but they are in a deeper way fundamental to the problem. Were we to make report to the churches, I think it is this level of interpretation we ought to offer. Were we to address ourselves to the church on campus, I think we should seek to foster study and action directed toward these questions.

A BRIEF BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE CRISIS IN HIGHER EDUCATION,

With Particular Reference to a Churchman's Reading

BOOKS

Birenbaum, William. Overlive: Power, Poverty, and the University. New York: Delacourt Press, 1969 (Paperback).

Cantelon, John E. College Education and the Campus Revolution. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969 (Paperback). \$2.65.

Deals with the question of meaning and values in higher education and whether a college or university should be a center for independent study and criticism, standing in detachment from the community, or whether it should be a primary agency for social change. The specific focus of concern is the liberal arts college.

Eurich, Alvin C., ed., Campus, 1980. New York: Dell Publishing, 1968.

Gilmore, Susan and Miller, Michael V., editors. Revolution at Berkeley. New York: The Dial Press, 1965.

An examination of campus unrest set against the events at Berkeley in 1964; a questioning of the meaning of the Berkeley movement. Valuable in understanding the roots, growth and development of student protest and rebellion.

Hersey, John. Letter to the Alumni. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. \$4.95.

Out of what he saw, heard and experienced during Yale's Mayday, 1970 crisis, this sensitive writer sends a letter to all Americans who have graduated into adulthood. With insight and comprehension, he has written an important analysis of today's college students, of the "revolution" they seek, and of the steps that must be taken by their elders. His book calls upon all mature Americans to rediscover their sons and daughters, and themselves, before it is too late.

Jondahl, H. Lynn. Unrest on the Campus: A Christian Perspective. It is published by, and available from, Friendship Press, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027, 1970. (Paperback) \$1.50

Written for churchmen, this brief book attempts to cut through the chaotic events on campus to evaluate, from a Christian perspective, the meaning of campus unrest. The author argues that the issues at stake in higher education are the same issues facing all of society. Recognizing the university as a political institution, he calls the church to a radical ministry which takes seriously institutions and politics. This book was written to be used by laymen as a study document to focus current issues in higher education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Books (continued)

Kenniston, Kenneth. The Young Radicals. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Rogan, Donald L. Campus Apocalypse, The Student Search Today. New York: The Seabury Press, 1969. \$4.95.

Activism is not enough to describe the student search. However, it is significant that the disruptions of normal campus activity are front page news. Placing and analyzing seemingly chaotic and multidirectional campus phenomena in the perspective of salvation history, Rogan is able to relate the dynamics of the inner student quest to their outer activism.

Roszak, Theodore. The Making of a Counter Culture. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc. 1968.

Sampson, Edward E. and Korn, Harold A., editors. Student Activism and Protest: Alternatives for Social Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

A series of articles. In this book student activism, protest and dissent are looked at from the viewpoints of known professors of psychology, political science and sociology.

Simmons, J. I. and Winograd, Barry. It's Happening: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today. Santa Barbara: Marc-Laird, 1966.

Smith, G. Kerry, editor. Agony and Promise: Current Issues in Higher Education, 1969. American Association for Higher Education, 1 Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036.

The Ivy walls have been breached. It is no longer possible to consider the problems of colleges apart from the problems of society.

Spender, Stephen. The Year of the Young Radicals. New York: Random House, 1968 (Paperback).

For information about the Jossey-Bass Series in Higher Education, including Academics On The Line, 1945-1970: Twenty-Five Years, write Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 615 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94111.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - (continued)

VERY USEFUL SHORT PUBLICATIONS

"A Letter To The Churches About The Crisis in Higher Education."
Department of Higher Education, National Council of Churches,
Room 750, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10027. A limited
supply of single free copies are available from OB/UMHE, 891 High
Street, Worthington 43085.

This 1968 communication from the General Board of the NCC is a
very good summary of what is happening in higher education. A
new, updated "Letter" is being considered. It contains a list
of "Information and Study Resources," mostly magazine articles.

Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations. Report of the Special
Committee on Campus Tensions. Sol M. Linowitz, Chairman. April,
1970. Can be purchased from the Publications Division, American
Council of Education, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.
Single copies, free; 10 copies, \$5.00; 25 copies, \$10.00.

This excellent report is a must for all who are concerned with the
future of higher education in America. Written in a style that is
clear, concise, and readable it is balanced and fair. It should be
read not only by those in higher education but by all who would be
responsible citizens, parents, and churchmen at this crucial time
in history. It has specific recommendations for students, faculty,
administrators and trustees. Among the recommendations: All
members of the academic community should have a "shared commitment...
to the principle of institutional self-governance," and its
accompanying responsibilities.

PAPERS, ARTICLES AND OTHER MATERIALS

Boyd, William. "The University in Triple Jeopardy," Journal of the
Association of College Admissions Counselors, Vol. 13, No. 1.
Reprinted by and available from the Christian Faith and Higher
Education Institute, 1405 S. Harrison Road, East Lansing, Michigan
48823, as an Occasional Paper, October, 1968.

Brock, The Hon. W.E. "Congress Looks at the Campus," Congressional
Record, June 24, 1969.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Papers, Articles, and Other Materials (continued)

DeMott, Benjamin. "Seven Days in May: The Teacher in Apocalypse," Change/ The Magazine of Higher Education, September-October, 1970. \$1.50. Address: Change Magazine, 211 West 69th Street, New York, N.Y. 10023.

This is a very moving and highly personalized account of one sensitive college professor's intense involvement in events of May, 1970 on the Amherst campus.

Daedalus, The Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, "The Embattled University," Winter, 1970. Order from Subscription Office, 280 Newton Street, Brookline Station, Boston, Massachusetts 02146. \$2.25.

Keniston, Kenneth. "The Fire Outside," and "What Really Happened at Yale?", in The Journal (formerly The Journal of Higher Education) September-October, 1970.

This helpful publication of the United Church of Christ, in cooperation with the Council for Higher Education and the United Ministries in Higher Education, is available for only \$3.00 per year from The Office of Publication, Todd Hill Road, Lakeside, Connecticut 06758.

THE SCRANTON REPORT, Text of the Findings of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. Published in The Chronicles of Higher Education, Vol. 5, No. 2, October 5, 1970, and elsewhere. The cost is \$1. if still available from this source. The address is 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

This weekly newspaper is extremely valuable, providing timely and topical materials not otherwise accessible in one place. The yearly subscription rate is \$15.

"Violence and Power on Campus: A Debate," Change Magazine, March-April, 1969.

Wald, George. "I Share Your Uneasiness," MIT Speech. (Published under various titles, including "A Generation in Search of a Future.") Available from New Community Press, Inc., 3210 Grace Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007. 1-50 copies, 15¢ each.

"Higher Education for a Changing Society." A report received by the 182nd General Assembly (1970) of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Single copies are available from OB/UMHE, 891 High St., Worthington, Ohio 43085.

This article states a context of concern and makes a number of recommendations based on this concern. The emphasis is a moral perspective.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (continued)

OTHER STATEMENTS ON STUDENT RIGHTS, DISSENT, AND CAMPUS UNREST

The following "highly selected" bibliography was prepared by the American Council on Education for use by interested persons and groups. It is included here as a handy reference to major resource documents on the subjects.

Report of the American Bar Association Commission on Campus Government and Student Dissent. American Bar Association Commission on Campus Dissent, American Bar Foundation, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois. 1970. 36 pp. Single copies free.

This commission -- composed of practicing lawyers, higher education leaders, and behavioral scientists -- have drafted legal standards and procedural guidelines for campus administrators. The purpose of these guidelines is "to accommodate valid student dissent and ordinary educational processes." The report makes general recommendations in two sections: "The Protection of Freedom of Expression" and "The Maintenance of Order with Justice."

Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students. Copies available from the Executive Director, Joint Commission on Rights and Freedoms of Students, Suite 500, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. First 20 copies free. Beyond that number, charge of \$2.50 for multiples of 25.

A Declaration on Campus Unrest. Ad Hoc ACE Committee, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. April 1969. 3 pp. A limited supply of free single copies available.

Statement formulated by a committee of administrators, trustees, and foundation officers, and subsequently approved by ACE Board of Directors.

Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities. American Civil Liberties Union. 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10010. April 1970. \$.75 per copy. 40% discount with purchase of 25 copies or more.

This revision of the 1956 ACLU statement includes several sections which touch on the issue of governance: "The Student as a Member of the Community of Scholars"; "Extracurricular Activities"; "Personal Freedom"; and "Regulations and Disciplinary Procedures."

Perspectives on Campus Tensions, Nichols, David C., ed. American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. 1970. (paperback) \$3.50. These are papers prepared for the special committee on campus tensions. A useful contribution to discussion of the many issues now troubling higher education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Statements on Student Rights, Dissent, and Campus Unrest
(continued)

Constructive Changes To Ease Campus Tensions. Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. January 1970. 54 pp. \$2.00 per copy. Supplement will be released this fall.

This study surveys governance changes at 90% of the Association's member institutions. The changes are divided into two broad areas and listed by state. The areas are: (1) Student Participation in University Policy-Making, which includes such categories as institution-wide committees, boards of trustees and planning; and (2) Policies and Procedures on Conduct and Disruption, which includes codes, police policy, firearms, discipline, etc.

Model Code for Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct. Committee on Student Rights and Responsibilities, Law Student Division, American Bar Association, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois. May 31, 1969. 15 pp. Single copies, \$2.00. Additional copies, \$1.00 each.

"The Changing Legal Relationships Between Students and Universities," Wallace F. Caldwell, College and University, Vol. 45, No. 3, Spring 1970. pp. 245-265. Available through your library.

Freedom and Order on Campus. Otis A. Singletary, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. September 1968. 16 pp. Very limited supply of single copies available from ACE.

Due Process in the Student-Institutional Relationship, Thomas C. Fischer, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. August 1970. \$2.50 per copy.

This paper deals with procedural due process under the following headings: the meaning of due process; the legal relationship between the student and the institution; the present state of disciplinary procedures within the academy; developing a campus adjudicatory system; and miscellaneous issues. An excellent annotated bibliography covers the writings and legal decisions which the author believes to be essential to an administrator's comprehension of current developments in the student-institutional legal relationship.

The Report of The President's Commission on Campus Unrest

Special Report

The Killings at Jackson State

Special Report

The Kent State Tragedy

The three reports have been combined into one book, with many photographs. **The book may be the most important book published in 1970.**

Arno Press

330 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017

A Publishing & Library Service of

The New York Times

Please ship _____ clothbound copies @ \$5.95 each
of the *Campus Unrest Reports* to

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____

Zip _____

Enclosed is my check/money order plus 35¢ per copy for postage and handling. New York State residents add applicable sales tax.

SUMMARY

During the academic year 1969-70, students on many of the campuses of Ohio colleges and universities were involved in peaceful protest activities relating to the Vietnam war and were beginning to show increasing concern with environmental problems. On several campuses, various types of protests accelerated during April; the announcement by President Nixon on April 30 concerning entrance of U.S. combat troops into Cambodia initiated and/or heightened existing protest. Confrontations between students and security forces at times resulted in violence on some campuses and in the death of four students at Kent State University.

While such violence caught the headlines, the pattern of protest was peaceful on the vast majority of Ohio campuses. The most frequent forms of protest were mass meetings, mostly dealing with anti-war sentiment and later on, student memorial services for the students shot at Kent. On the small number of campuses which exhibited violence, the most common form was breaking windows, most of these on campus and less frequently within the campus community. Police were called in on only six campuses (see Table I).

Protest activities, both peaceful and violent, were more common at state-assisted colleges and universities than at private and church-related institutions. Within each of these classifications, however, more extensive protest activities seemed to characterize the "better," more complex and less vocationally oriented colleges where there is a greater sensitivity among students to various social concerns. Those colleges with a more selective admissions policy or those where size of the student body made for a greater concentration of more activist

students seem to be more frequently characterized by protest activity. Most of this protest, however, was peaceful and did not lead to violence.

The focus of much of the protest in the spring of 1970 centered on the Indo China war. The death of the Kent State students provided an additional reason for its continuation. A subsidiary theme on several campuses was the treatment of black students. (See Appendix I for case studies of The Ohio State University, Youngstown State University, and the Metropolitan campus of Cuyahoga Community College.) On most campuses, the protests usually became a combination of national and local campus issues.

Public reaction to student activism is often based on several different misconceptions. While relatively few students on any campus can be considered as radicals, an increasing number of students today have participated in protest activity, but for widely varied motivations (see page 13ff). The extensiveness of recent student protests have given rise to theories which attempt to explain them as being caused by outsiders as a result of conspiracy. This seems not to be a sufficient explanation for their prevalence or spread of campus protest (see page 17). The presence of radical speakers and literature on campuses is often seen as critical by some outsiders but this presence is seen by most students as being an interesting but not influencing experience (see page 19). Others see the growth of drug usage and the greater visibility of "hippies" around campuses as being somehow related to growing student protests, but drug use and hippie philosophy tend to be individualistic and apolitical, more likely leading to withdrawal rather than protest (see page 21).

Another theme in the explanation of student protest is that they are associated with and caused by impersonal educational institutions. While aspects of impersonality are often a focus of protest, the concentration of activist students rather than size and impersonality per se seem to explain the prevalence of protests on large campuses. The largeness which is criticized is also one of the attractions for students since largeness is often an indicator of educational vitality (see page 21). In addition, the differential responsiveness of college administrators in Ohio did not seem to be a determinative factor either in the initiation of protest or in the movement of protest into more violent forms. (See Appendix I, Ohio University.)

While many proposed solutions to violent protest center around the identification of those that "cause" it, the protest activity which on occasion leads to violence is not only legal but has traditionally been seen as a legitimate educational activity on most campuses. The identification of the few who initiate acts which precipitate violence is difficult. Public demands to identify the "villians" often results in symbolic punishment which reduces public indignance but does not insure justice.

Much student protest is directed toward issues outside the control of the colleges and universities. As a strategy of change within universities, protest has not been especially productive of significant educational change. Repressive measures of control and the continuation of violent student protest both result in the loss of freedom and rationality on the campus. Such a loss increases the difficulty of making legitimate educational change.