

Duke University: Students Demand New Deal for Negro Workers

Durham, N.C. Last month a surprising surge of student activism put Duke University to a severe test. Students, and later the faculty, began demanding a voice in Duke's policies concerning its 5000 nonacademic employees—policies of utmost sensitivity to the conservatives who run the university's board of trustees. While this crisis was only one of a number of crises provoked at universities by recent student uprisings, the fact that such an upheaval could take place on this normally tranquil Southern campus, and could even enjoy the full support of students, such as the young Goldwater Republican who runs the *Duke Chronicle*, is worthy of special notice. Equally noteworthy is the way in which a series of accommodations by the student demonstrators and the university officials led to a rapid deescalation of the Duke crisis.

The crisis arose following the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., on Thursday night, 4 April. The next night, Duke students, though little inclined to engage in activist movements in the past, reacted by beginning a major and apparently successful series of demonstrations in support of the nonacademic employees' demands for higher pay and collective bargaining rights. These employees, consisting largely of maids, janitors, cafeteria employees, hospital orderlies, and other unskilled workers, are mostly Negroes. Their union, "Local 77," had been trying unsuccessfully for some time to obtain recognition as the employees' bargaining agent.

The student demonstration began with a 2-day sit-in by over 200 students in the home of Duke's president, Douglas M. Knight, who deescalated the encounter by insisting, against all the evidence, that the students were "invited guests." The sit-in ended after Knight, harried, fatigued, and still not fully recovered from an attack of hepatitis last year, went into seclusion on the advice of his physicians. The dem-

onstrators then began a "silent vigil," on the university's main quadrangle, that lasted 4 days and at times involved 2000 or more students. "You have transformed this university," said one faculty sympathizer as the students finally ended the vigil. "There is no going back to the university that was here on April 3. There must be no going back. . . ."

Although the student demonstrators had behaved for the most part with self-discipline and restraint, there was always the danger of an "escalation" which would bring on a violent clash between the students and university au-

thorities. Whether this now-passed crisis has in itself changed the university in significant ways cannot yet be certified, for the events in question are too close at hand. Clearly, however, all parties at Duke—students, faculty, administrators, nonacademic employees, and the still somewhat provincial board of trustees—have, for the moment at least, a greater awareness that a modern university is a complex, pluralistic entity in which no one group holds a monopoly of responsibility and power.

The Duke campus seems by no means a likely place for a student uprising on behalf of Negro workers seeking recognition for their union. Both in its appearance and in its usual atmosphere Duke is polite middle-to-upper-middle class. The Gothic spires, gargoyles, and greenswards of the West Campus, where men students live, and the 18th-century Georgian style of the East Campus, where the women live, remind one of traditional values and provide an incongruous setting for activist behavior. The student body is made up of some 7800 bright young men and women



Lunch break during student vigil supporting Duke's Negro workers.

coming largely from prosperous families, for whom the country club is a far more familiar institution than the union hall.

Although drawn from all parts of the country (only 52 percent of the 4600 undergraduates are from the South), nearly all Duke students are products of an upbringing in impeccably white suburban neighborhoods. Desegregation of Duke's closest neighboring institution, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, only 12 miles away, began under court order in the 1950's. But such was the caution and social conservatism of its trustees that Duke accepted no Negro graduate students until 1961 and no Negro undergraduates until 1963. Today, Duke has 175 Negro students and one Negro faculty member.

Campus relations between Duke's white and Negro students have been ambiguous. For example, while the women's campus last year elected a Negro girl as May Queen, this gesture was followed in November by a student action which infuriated Duke's Negro students. A new student government regulation forbidding campus groups meeting off campus to use segregated facilities was overturned in a special university-wide recall referendum.

Although this surprising outcome seems to have been less an indication of racial prejudice than a sign that students felt the student government had



President Douglas M. Knight

overstepped its authority, the Negro students reacted by serving President Knight with an ultimatum: either he would forbid student groups to use segregated facilities (as he already had forbidden other university organizations to do) or they would disrupt university business. In a 7-hour study-in, the Negro students blocked the entrance to various administrative offices, including the president's. Knight issued the desired edict once the students agreed to lift the ultimatum.

Up until Martin Luther King's death, Duke's white students had not been moved to demonstrate en masse over any issue. Visits by Dow Chemical Company recruiters produced mob

scenes at Harvard and some other universities last fall. But when Dow visited Duke in January, the small crowd of students that first attempted obstructive tactics abandoned them after a warning from the university provost. And when a U.S. Marine Corps recruiter visited Duke early this year, fewer than a dozen students turned out to protest.

Why, then, the sudden militancy on behalf of the Negro? News of the King assassination produced in many Duke students a sense of shock and urgency. As one leader of the demonstrations, Jack Boger, a senior student in religion, now recalls, he and other students began immediately to discuss various courses of action by which they might show that King's goal of promoting racial justice by nonviolent means was still valid. They concluded that the university's treatment of its Negro employees was the most appropriate target of their concern.

The virtual seizure of President Knight's home was not planned and seems to have occurred more or less spontaneously as the demonstration gathered momentum. On Friday night, 5 April, some 450 students marched on University House, Knight's residence, and presented their demands. Principally, these were (i) that Knight do his best to have the university pay its non-academic employees a \$1.60 minimum wage (the existing minimum of \$1.15 for university employees was, under the federal minimum wage law, not scheduled to rise to \$1.60 until 1971); (ii) that he appoint a study committee of students, faculty, and workers to consider collective bargaining and union recognition for the employees; and (iii) that he resign from the Hope Valley Country Club, which bars Negroes from membership.

Knight admitted roughly half the demonstrators to his spacious home and spent the next few hours talking with the leaders or with all of his assembled guests. Though indicating that he shared their concern over the racial crisis, Knight refused to meet the students' demands. "This is not the proper atmosphere. I would not want to feel that I was pushed," he reportedly told the demonstrators.

While not unruly or hostile toward Knight, the students were not satisfied by expressions of good will and appeals for more time. Moreover, news of rioting in Washington and other cities and of troops mounting a machine gun on the steps of the U.S. Capitol had hardened the students' determination.



Joining students in singing "We Shall Overcome" at vigil rally are Wright Tisdale (second row, third from right), chairman of Duke trustees and vice president of Ford Motor Company, and two other Duke officials.

"We will not allow amoral institutions to trap good men," Boger said, referring to Knight. "We must do something important now. We are non-violent, but we will not be moved." Whereupon the demonstrators, the president of the student government among them, cheered and sang the old labor song, "We Shall Not Be Moved."

Advising the students throughout most of the demonstrations was John H. Strange, an assistant professor of political science who had been interested in the problems of the nonacademic employees since his days as a Duke undergraduate. Most of the student leaders had known Strange previously, some of them through his course on Negro politics. With his encouragement, the demonstrators left Knight's home Sunday for the main quadrangle and began the silent vigil.

Knight had indicated Saturday, at a memorial service for King, that he would establish a broadly representative university committee on the problems of the nonacademic employees. Otherwise, up to that point the demonstrators had accomplished little, although some of the student leaders understood Knight to have said, in his conversations with them, that he might soon resign from the country club.

Their numbers now multiplying, the demonstrators brought blankets and sleeping bags to the "quad," set up logistic groups for food and other essentials, and settled down for an indefinite stay. Monitors insisted on observance of the vigil rules against any behavior that might create a holiday atmosphere. Politically, the participants fell to the right of center as well as to the left. "Some people that even I consider reactionary were taking part," says Jim McCullough, editor of the *Chronicle* and a Goldwaterite from Honea Path, South Carolina.

On Monday, Local 77, encouraged by the student support, voted to strike; all members except hospital workers were to leave their jobs. Meanwhile, the students' support of the workers had become widely known and discussed in Durham's black community. The union leaders say they are convinced that this discouraged violence and kept Durham relatively calm following the King murder. All but a few members of Duke's Afro-American Society, however, disdained to take part in the vigil, doubting that it was militant enough to produce results.

A major break in the Duke crisis occurred Wednesday, the 4th day of

NEWS IN BRIEF

● **SST BILL:** Senator Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) has introduced a bill that would ban nonmilitary supersonic flights over the United States and its territories and possessions for an indefinite period. The bill (S. 3399) would also provide for a 2-year program of intensive investigation by the FAA into all aspects of the sonic "boom," and give the decision on overland supersonic flights to Congress. Noting that the U.S. SST fleet might eventually number from 200 to 1200 planes, Case said, "... as a nation I believe we are moving from blind idolization of technology to recognition that we must also be concerned with its effects on the quality of life and the livability of the environment."

● **NEW URBAN INSTITUTE:** On 26 April, the White House announced the creation of the Urban Institute, a private non-profit corporation which will have a \$5-million budget in its first year. The Washington-based institute will be funded by both the federal government and by private groups, such as the Ford Foundation. The director, William Gorham, now an assistant secretary of the Health, Education and Welfare Department, said between 25 and 75 researchers would be employed by the end of 1968, including scientists, economists, city planners, and engineers. The institute is modeled after the Rand Corporation and will operate as a private organization partly to overcome the salary limitations placed on government employees.

● **RESEARCH AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS:** The social implications of research in biology, medicine, and chemistry will be studied over a 3-year period by a new committee within the National Research Council's (NRC) Division of Behavioral Sciences. The new group—the Committee on Biological Research, Social Behavior, and Social Policy—will study social, moral, legal, and ethical issues and their relationship to research. Henry David, executive secretary of the NRC's division of behavioral sciences, cited a number of developments that may pose social questions in the near future, including determination of the sex of unborn children, extensive genetic control over plants and animals, alteration of complexion and skin color by inexpensive means,

and use of new biological and chemical technologies for military and policing purposes. More than half the committee, which will have about 15 members, is expected to be drawn from the social and behavioral sciences. Lawyers as well as biological and medical scientists are also expected to be on the committee. It has received \$90,000 from the Russell Sage Foundation to partially support its activities. No committee members have yet been named.

● **UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT:** Four universities have been awarded grants to develop and test new management techniques for institutions of higher education. According to the Ford Foundation, which made the grants, "The aim is to increase college and university efficiency without dehumanizing the academic community or limiting academic freedom." Universities receiving the grants are Stanford, \$700,000; University of California, Berkeley, \$500,000; Princeton, \$250,000; and University of Toronto, \$750,000.

● **NEW PUBLICATIONS:** A survey of the marine activities of U.S. state and local governments has been prepared for the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources. The 480-page report, *A Perspective of Regional and State Marine Environmental Activities*, publication 177765, is available, at \$3 a copy or 65 cents on microfilm, from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Va. 22151.

Applied Science and World Economy, the proceedings of the ninth meeting of the panel on Science and Technology before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, is available, free, from the subcommittee, Room 2321 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. A compilation of all papers given during the meeting, also titled *Applied Science and World Economy*, is available, at 35 cents a copy, from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. *Sleep Bulletin*, a bimonthly publication listing references to current works on the physiology, biochemistry, and psychology of sleep, may be obtained, without charge, by writing to the UCLA Brain Information Service, Biomedical Library, Los Angeles, Calif.

the vigil, after the board of trustees and the faculty's Academic Council had taken positions. The board, and more particularly its ten-member executive committee, clearly has been one of the

principals in the crisis, by choice if not by necessity.

Knight's physical condition was such, following the invasion of his home, that he was not able to cope with the situa-

tion, and by Wednesday he was in Duke Hospital for a rest and a checkup (he is now on leave until September). But, this aside, the board has seemed determined to deal with the collective bargaining and union recognition issues itself. Although its chairman, Wright Tisdale, is general counsel and vice president of Ford Motor Company, an enterprise unionized since 1941, he has been opposed to granting Duke's non-academic employees the right of collective bargaining. Moreover, most of the board members are from North Carolina, a state whose citizens are still none too comfortable with labor unions, and two members of the executive committee are the heads of textile companies strongly opposed to unions. These two trustees have been suspected by many at Duke of opposing recognition of Local 77 for fear of the example this would set for their own companies. "It seems unconscionable to us that motives of private gain should influence university policy," says Peter H. Klopfer, a professor of zoology and supporter of the student vigil.

On the other hand, universities, as nonprofit-making enterprises, are not required by law to enter into collective bargaining, even though a majority of employees may favor union representation. Moreover, Duke, with \$16 million still to raise to meet conditions of a Ford Foundation challenge grant, is looking for contributors among wealthy Southern industrialists and businessmen, to whom unions are often anathema.

Late Wednesday afternoon vigil participants huddled under umbrellas in a steady rain to hear Tisdale's statement of the board's position. Although largely avoiding the collective bargaining issue, Tisdale did promise that wages for the nonacademic employees would be advanced to the \$1.60 minimum 2 years ahead of the legally required schedule. At this point Tisdale found himself clasping hands with the students and swaying to the words of "We Shall Overcome."

Meanwhile, the Academic Council was appealing to all students to return to classes, which, while suspended only briefly for the King funeral, had had a drop in attendance throughout the vigil. The council also instructed its executive committee to join with university officials in considering the problems of the nonacademic workers, including the question of the "nationally accepted right of collective bargaining." Further, the council chairman belatedly named a special committee, first called

Academy Elects 50 New Members

The National Academy of Sciences has announced the election of 50 new members and ten foreign associates, raising U.S. membership to 806 and the number of foreign associates to 94. The new American members are:

Kenneth J. Arrow, Harvard University
Myron L. Bender, Northwestern University
Robert W. Berliner, National Institutes of Health
Richard B. Bernstein, University of Wisconsin
Marland P. Billings, Harvard University
Garrett Birkhoff, Harvard University
Bart J. Bok, University of Arizona
Norman E. Borlaug, International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center, Rockefeller Foundation, Mexico
Alberto P. Calderon, University of Chicago
Morris Cohen, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Gottfried S. Fraenkel, University of Illinois
Thomas Gold, Cornell University
William E. Gordon, Rice University
Verne E. Grant, Texas A & M University
James B. Griffin, University of Michigan
Karl Habel, National Institutes of Health
Louis G. Henyey, University of California, Berkeley
William C. Herring, Bell Telephone Laboratories
Robert W. Holley, Cornell University
Rudolf Kompfner, Bell Telephone Laboratories
Rita Levi-Montalcini, Washington University and Istituto Superiore di Sanità, Rome
Edward B. Lewis, California Institute of Technology
Richard C. Lewontin, University of Chicago
Thomas F. Malone, Travelers Insurance Company
Henry W. Menard, Jr., Scripps Institution of Oceanography
Robert K. Merton, Columbia University
Matthew S. Meselson, Harvard University
Adrian Morris, Cornell University
Arthur B. Pardee, Princeton University
William Prager, University of California, San Diego
Henry Primakoff, University of Pennsylvania
Hermann Rahn, University of Buffalo School of Medicine
Leo J. Rainwater, Columbia University
John H. Reynolds, University of California, Berkeley
Stuart A. Rice, University of Chicago
Sidney D. Ripley II, Smithsonian Institution
Howard K. Schachman, University of California, Berkeley

George S. Schairer, Boeing Company
Isadore M. Singer, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Richard L. Solomon, University of Pennsylvania
George F. Sprague, Department of Agriculture
Edward A. Steinhaus, University of California, Irvine
Eliot Stellar, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine and Institute of Neurological Sciences
Valentine L. Telegdi, University of Chicago
David Turnbull, Harvard University
Orville F. Tuttle, Stanford University
Eugene E. Van Tamelen, Stanford University
Jerome R. Vinograd, California Institute of Technology
John W. Wells, Cornell University
Paul C. Zamecnik, Huntington Memorial Hospital and Massachusetts General Hospital

The newly elected foreign associates are:

Erwin Bünning, University of Tübingen, Germany
Jacques Y. Cousteau, Oceanographic Museum, Monaco
Emanuel Faure-Fremiet, Collège de France, Paris
Ragnar Granit, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm
Gerhard Herzberg, National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa
H. C. Longuet-Higgins, University of Cambridge
A. R. Luria, Moscow State University
Jacques Monod, Pasteur Institute, Paris
Carl L. Seigel, University of Göttingen, Germany
J. Tuzo Wilson, University of Toronto

The Academy also announced the election of a new treasurer and four new councilmen.

Treasurer (4-year term)

Emanuel R. Piore, vice president and chief scientist, International Business Machines Corp.

Councilmen (3-year term)

Philip Handler, Duke University Medical Center and National Science Board
William D. McElroy, Johns Hopkins University and McCollum-Pratt Institute
Kenneth V. Thimann, University of California, Santa Cruz
John W. Tukey, Princeton University and Bell Telephone Laboratories

for by the council in February, to investigate these same matters. These council actions helped relieve the faculty's confusion, which had been all too evident. Some two dozen professors had joined the student demonstrations; others had been circulating petitions urging faculty members to be tolerant of missed quizzes and even to hold special classes for vigil participants; and many professors had been wondering out loud whether the university would not soon be in chaos.

On Wednesday night the vigil participants, wanting to keep faculty support, followed the recommendation of their adviser, John Strange, and elected to suspend the vigil but to continue to support the strike by boycotting campus cafeterias and by picketing. As a warning to the trustees, the demonstrators indicated that, if the collective bargaining issue were not settled within 10 days, they would resume their protest. But the significant thing is that the students had chosen to deescalate the conflict, rejecting suggestions that they occupy the administration building.

Although as of this writing the Duke

crisis has not been finally resolved, most students and faculty members appear optimistic. A special committee of university trustees and administrators, appointed on 17 April, is expected to devise an acceptable scheme for collective bargaining, though the new arrangement may be described in elaborate euphemisms. Local 77, an independent union unaffiliated with the AFL-CIO, alone will decide whether to accept whatever the committee proposes. Early last week the workers returned to their jobs, though serving notice they might strike again if further progress were not made toward meeting their demands during the next few weeks.

No university-wide committee of the kind students and faculty had hoped for has yet been set up for study of the problems of the nonacademic workers. But the new trustee-administration committee has consulted all interested parties, and a trustee-liaison committee which was first created in 1960 during an earlier university crisis is being reactivated.

For their part, the students de-

cided not to resume their protest when the trustee-administration committee acknowledged that the university's relations with its nonacademic employees were "inadequate" and promised to work with "all speed" to remedy them. On the other hand, some faculty members who had indicated through a published petition 2 weeks ago that they might resign if the faculty were not given a greater voice in deciding policy concerning the nonacademic employees are still troubled. They continue to regard the Academic Council and other university channels through which the faculty seeks to be heard as inadequate.

However this may be, Duke appears to have come through its crisis unhurt and with the morale of many students and professors higher than before. The Duke experience has, in fact, been exceptional. The student demonstrations were directed to unselfish goals, were joined in by a substantial part of the student body, and, except for the occupation of President Knight's home, were conducted with restraint and deescalated at every critical juncture.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

France: Universities Face Era of Reform by Decree

Paris. Napoleon gave France the first great national system of higher education, and the university has seemed as immutable an institution as the metric system. Today, however, the system is under attack because it has proved resistant to changes demanded by a changing society, and, despite the brilliance of many of its products, it is simply not producing enough scientists, engineers, teachers, and administrators.

Since World War II and particularly in the past decade, higher education in France has expanded rapidly. The pressure of numbers on the university has come from two familiar sources—the postwar baby boom and the rising percentage of young people preparing for entrance into the university. Enrollment grew from 148,600 in 1956–57 to more than 500,000 this year, and a level of 750,000 in 5 years is predicted.

France, like most European countries, has accepted the importance of science and technology to economic growth and social development, and, particularly in the 10 years of the de Gaulle regime, has given high priority to education in science and engineering.

Awareness has been growing, however, that inbred characteristics of the French university system inhibit development of both fundamental and applied research and of engineering studies within the university. And at least since the early 1960's the government has accepted the view that more than mere expansion of the system is needed and that serious structural changes have to be made.

The government exercises direct administrative control over France's centralized system of higher education and has, in fact, been carrying out its own

program of reform, if at a rather measured pace. Early in April, however, the government took what in France amounts to a radical step by announcing that, after next year, success in the baccalaureate examination will no longer guarantee automatic access to the university. The baccalaureate is the tough national examination taken by secondary school students who complete university preparatory studies at French lycées.

The open-door policy for *bacheliers* has been a hallowed principle, which the government was obviously reluctant to modify. The government's hand may well have been forced by the hard-pressed faculty of science in Paris. In November the science faculty received some 31,000 students and, even when current construction programs are completed, will have only about 20,000 places to accommodate them. The science faculty warned the ministry of education that it would employ its own system of selection if the government did not act.

Academic scientists have probably been most affected by problems of university growth, and most strongly reformist. The recommendations coming out of a "national colloquy" at the