Student Unrest: Administrators Seek Ways To Restore Peace

While student unrest has been much on the minds of academic administrators ever since the upheavals at Berkeley in late 1964, the events of this past school year have given the problem new urgency. Scores of institutions have experienced sit-ins, mill-ins, or worse, and at Columbia the conflict between student demonstrators and constituted authority attained an unprecedented savagery. Faced with this upsurge of student discontent, college and university officials and many faculty people are asking: How can disruptive protests be avoided and how can they best be dealt with if they occur?

However colleges and universities respond to student unrest, many institutions will face the prospect of disorder until substantial progress is made in liquidating the war in Vietnam and in easing the racial crisis. According to Joseph Shoben, director of the American Council on Education's Commission on Academic Affairs, an analysis of 71 of the student disturbances which have occurred since October 1966 indicates that 68 of them were related either to the Vietnam war or to the race problem, or to both. Thus the outcome of the 1968 presidential election, the results of peace negotiations, and the mood of Negro slum-dwellers may have a much greater impact on student attitudes than anything academic officials can do.

Nevertheless, even though they may be concerned largely about the war and about conditions of racial injustice beyond the campus, students naturally tend to express their discontent on the campus, shooting at targets of opportunity: the recruiter from Dow Chemical or CIA; the university's involvement in classified military research; or perhaps the institution's failure to admit more black students. Their activist behavior often violates campus rules and exposes the students to disciplinary action, whereupon the principal focus of student discontent is likely to shift to the institution's administrators.

The confrontation may be the more bitter if students have felt aggrieved about certain purely campus issues, such as overstringent rules governing student conduct, poor teaching, "irrelevant" curricula, and lack of a student voice in institutional decision-making. Such "student power" issues, of course, can themselves stir enough emotion to lead to demonstrations.

Demonstrations of the more disruptive kind often are begun by a few campus radicals. However, if the issues thus raised are (or appear to be) valid, or if the administration can be forced to use repressive measures (such as calling in police), student involvement in the protests may grow massive. Such was the evolution of events at Columbia.

Some leaders in higher education are of a mind to quell disruptive demonstrations with little delay. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education and a prominent figure in the higher education "establishment," predicts that disruptive tactics by students will increasingly be viewed as a police problem and acted on accordingly. College and university administrators, he feels, should neither negotiate under coercion nor tolerate coercive tactics.

This attitude seems to have been shared by President Henry King Stanford of the University of Miami recently when he called in police about an hour after some black students began a sit-in in his office. The students, whose list of demands included one calling for a 25-percent increase in the enrollment of black students, had been told that if they refused to leave they faced arrest and expulsion or suspension. In a similar episode, 40 black students at the University of Chicago ended a 4-hour sit-in in the administration building after being told that, in keeping with university policies, disciplinary action would be taken if they failed to leave the building within 30 minutes.

While conceding that a stern response of this kind can be necessary, some prominent educators believe that to adopt a flat rule against negotiating with demonstrators who resort to disruptive tactics is wrong. "Our reactions to the particular tactic used by students are leading to much rhetoric that obscures and to over-simplified judgment," says Richard H. Sullivan, president of the Association of American Colleges and former president of Reed College. "We are calling many student operations 'violent' that have been conducted with forcible means but with restraint, a kind of orderliness, a kind almost of decorum," he says. "I am not condoning or defending, let alone advocating [students' occupying buildings], or of other uses of disruptive force," Sullivan adds. "I *am* of the belief that we shall advance no long-range, viable solutions if our abhorrence of the tactic in itself blinds us to the wide range of differences among student groups and motivations."

It was in this spirit that President Douglas M. Knight of Duke accepted as "invited guests" the 200 students who invaded his home in April and conducted a 2-day sit-in on behalf of Duke's Negro employees. Roland J. Hinz, Northwestern's vice president for student affairs, also took the conciliatory approach early last month when he made major concessions to black students who had taken over the administration building. A highly controversial provision of the pact Hinz negotiated with the students was its promise of separate housing for black students. Northwestern's trustees later approved the pact in the main, but warned that negotiations will not again be conducted while unlawful or disruptive activity is in progress. Brave words of this sort cannot always be backed up, however, as many administrators well know.

A conference on student unrest was held at Chatham College in Pittsburgh on 5 and 6 June, with seven college and university presidents, several foundation officials, three mental health specialists, and the presidents of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges (AAC) among those attending. "The general consensus was that we are nowhere near the end of campus unrest," says Edward D. Eddy, Jr., president of Chatham. The conferees foresaw a strong possibility of growing student distrust of the political process and of more direct-action protests.

Mounting student demands for greater participation in institutional governance and for changes that would

NEWS IN BRIEF

• **NSF DEVELOPMENT GRANTS:** A $4.1 million grant to the University of Indiana for the construction of a new high-powered cyclotron is one of four development grants totaling some $15.6 million awarded recently by the National Science Foundation. The 200-Mev cyclotron, which will have a segmented main magnet that will produce very high spatial and energy resolution, is still in the very early stages of construction. The total cost of the cyclotron is estimated at about $8.2 million. Other grants were awarded to Michigan State, the University of Washington at Seattle, and Case Western Reserve. The largest —$5 million to Washington—will go partly toward the development of four interdisciplinary and environmental departments. Michigan State received $4.3 million and Case Western Reserve a 2-year grant of $2.2 million. The other grants are for 3 years.

NSF also announced 12 more recipients of grants under its new Departmental Science Development Program. The 3-year grants are aimed at improving graduate education and research in individual departments of various universities. Recipients are: City University of New York (physics), Claremont Graduate School (mathematics), Hunter (biological sciences), Louisiana State (chemistry), Oakland University in Rochester, Michigan (engineering), State University of New York at Binghamton (geology), Denver (mathematics), Illinois at Chicago (chemistry), Louisville (psychology), Utah State (interdepartmental program in ecology), Washington State (chemical physics), and Wesleyan in Connecticut (physics).

• **HOUSE CUTS EXCHANGE BUDGET:** In an effort to "keep the professors at home and let them teach instead of conducting research abroad," as Representative Durward G. Hall (R–Mo.) put it, the House cut by one-third the appropriation for the Department of State's educational and cultural exchange program. The reduction—from a requested $45 million to a final $30 million—was made, in the words of the Appropriations Committee's report, because "this was an area where substantial reductions could be made in view of the present financial situation and also in view of the efforts to discourage private citizens from traveling abroad." Last year the program's appropriation was $46 million. The cut is the most severe that the program has suffered in its history. As of this writing, the Senate had not yet acted on the appropriation.

• **MOON MAPS:** The Geological Survey has published 13 multi-colored maps of regions of the moon's surface. Each shows the geologic features of approximately 120,000 square miles of the moon's surface area. The 13 completed so far are part of a series that will eventually include 44 maps. Information about the maps available may be obtained from Distribution Section, U.S. Geological Survey, 1200 South Eads St., Arlington, Va.

• **IDA REORGANIZES:** The Institute for Defense Analyses (*Science*, 17 May, page 744) has dropped its official ties with the 12 universities that had served as sponsors of the defense-oriented research agency. But representatives of the 12 universities are still a part of IDA, the distinction being that they are now IDA members serving as "private individuals from a university" rather than actual representatives of that university. At the same special meeting held on 4 June, C. Douglas Dillon, former Secretary of the Treasury, was added to IDA's board of trustees.

• **CRISIS MEETING:** The New York Academy of Sciences has scheduled a "town meeting" on the "Crisis Facing American Science" in hopes of persuading the President and Congress to save science from the adverse impact of impending budget cuts. The meeting, which will be held on 21 June at the Waldorf Astoria in New York City, will permit scientists and their political representatives to discuss what an Academy spokesman calls "the disaster that will result from cutting off funds for scientific research and education." The Academy has invited numerous congressmen, government officials, scientists, and educators.

• **NEW PUBLICATIONS:** NASA has published *Sonic Boom Research*, the proceedings of an April 1967 conference held in Washington, D.C. Copies may be obtained for 50¢ from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

make curricula and student living conditions more relevant to student needs were seen as inevitable. "We felt that major changes in the structure of higher education were both necessary and desirable," Eddy says.

While acknowledging that some situations may require calling the police, the conferees were agreed that, when police are called, there is no turning back. "Once you have turned your campus over to civil authorities, it is no longer your campus," Eddy says. "The president of the college can't be the police chief and say, 'Don't beat the students over the head.' "

Principally, the conference focused on the question of how to avoid confrontations in which a university administration finds itself opposed not merely by a small radical minority, such as the Students for a Democratic Society, but by large numbers of students and many faculty members as well. "We would reaffirm the importance of strong presidential leadership," Eddy says, "but with the recognition that the president no longer can be king. Within the university there must be multiple seats of authority, with students, for instance, responsible for their own judicial system and the faculty responsible for curricula. The seats of authority should be interlocking. Students should have a voice in curriculum planning, for example."

According to Eddy, most of the conferees felt that student government must be strengthened and given a significant voice in governance of the institution and should not be by-passed in the selection of student members of university committees or in other matters.

The liberal attitudes evident at the Chatham conference about the student's role in institutional governance clearly are no longer a rarity in academic circles, even though more conservative men still head many institutions. In fact, the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students now being promulgated by the sponsoring groups who drafted it [AAUP, AAC, the National Student Association (NSA), the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and the National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors] seems pallid by comparison with currently emerging attitudes about student rights. It says, for example, that rules governing student conduct should be prepared with "significant student participation." Edward Schwartz, president of NSA, would have students gain "complete control" over such rules, and

educators such as Eddy go far toward agreeing with him.

Nevertheless, the joint statement's appeal for such student rights as a free, uncensored student press, "due process" in disciplinary cases, and freedom to set up and run campus political and social organizations is a challenge to the practices of some institutions. Accordingly, the groups sponsoring the joint statement are expected to promote its widespread adoption and observance by establishing soon a Joint Commission on Rights and Freedoms of Students and a national clearinghouse and national consultation service on student rights. Some educators, including a number of those at the Chatham conference, favor the more fundamental step of lowering the legal age of adulthood to 18. This would be expected to eliminate much of the present ambivalence in the attitude of institutions toward their students and in that of the students toward themselves.

Treating students as responsible adults and giving them a major voice in policy through their student government will be a half measure, however, unless the student government itself truly represents student interests. Often it does not. "It's senseless for a large institution to put on its committees representatives of a student government which has been elected by only 15 percent of the student body," says Schwartz of NSA. On large campuses student representatives should be identified with particular constituencies, based on dormitories and perhaps on academic groupings such as departments, Schwartz says. "Elections at large—mass politics—work badly at large universities," Schwartz says, adding that at very few large institutions does the student government really represent the student body.

The University of Missouri campus at Columbia is a case in point. According to Lowe S. MacLean, the assistant dean of students, about half of the 20,000 students there live off campus and take little interest in the student government. The editor of the student newspaper has advocated establishing student councils for each of the university's 14 divisions, such as the college of arts and sciences and the college of agriculture.

The development of effective student constituencies on a large campus is a problem closely related to that of finding ways to help the student escape anonymity. The State University of New York at Buffalo this fall will start building a new campus for 30,000 students for whom a series of 30 colleges will be established, each to serve no more than 1000 students. "Each college will have the intimacy of a Swarthmore," says Martin Meyerson, president of the university.

But while new or developing institutions such as SUNY at Buffalo or the University of California at Santa Cruz may provide mass education in a small-college atmosphere, there is not much evidence yet that large established institutions are going to accomplish this. As acting chancellor at Berkeley in 1965, Meyerson advocated dividing the College of Letters and Science into four separate colleges. This proposal, while still under consideration, has gained little momentum.

Black students are now appearing in significant numbers on many campuses which have had few of them in the past. Their separatist tendencies are making it difficult to fit them into the institutional framework. The University of Chicago, while declining to provide the separate housing demanded by black students, has offered to help establish a club for them. In April, Arthur S. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon, after receiving the demands of the Black Student Union, established a committee on racism. Flemming has since moved to meet some of the students' demands, in particular their demand for special efforts to recruit black students and aid them financially.

At many institutions the black student union will be emerging as one of the centers of student power. Black student militancy and the civil rights movement in general already have had, and are likely to continue to have, an enormous influence on students at predominantly white institutions. As Schwartz says, "The student movement runs remarkably parallel to the civil rights movement in style of rhetoric and in style of demands and tactics."

Students at Howard University, Schwartz observes, set a new fashion in student militancy this spring by forcibly occupying the administration building. Such fashions quickly spread, for,

Ley Succeeds Goddard at FDA

Herbert L. Ley, Jr., has been named to succeed James L. Goddard as Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Goddard, who resigned last month after an often stormy 28 months as FDA's head, will become vice president of EDP Technology, Inc., a data-processing corporation, in Atlanta, a city where Goddard spent a good part of his career. Ley, 44, was brought to FDA from Harvard's School of Public Health by Goddard in 1966 to direct the Bureau of Medicine, which tests and evaluates drugs. Ley has been closely identified with the policies that Goddard pursued in trying to impose more rigorous safety standards on the drug industry. Wilbur J. Cohen, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), in announcing Ley's appointment on 6 June at the White House, said that there would be "no change" in FDA direction and that Ley would "continue the fine record Dr. Goddard made." Ley, a graduate of Harvard Medical School, becomes the second physician—Goddard was the first—to serve as FDA's chief.

Herbert L. Ley, Jr.

Cohen also announced the appointment of James H. McCrocklin, president of Southwest Texas State College, President Johnson's alma mater, to Cohen's former post of HEW undersecretary.—A.J.

while students on many campuses have gained new rights by nondisruptive means, a kind of Gresham's Law of publicity seems to operate, with the news of disorder at some campuses driving from circulation the news of peaceful accommodation at others.

In Schwartz's view, the student movement for McCarthy gave student liberals, who still believe in the political process, a temporary advantage over student radicals, who do not. Accordingly, Schwartz thinks that any significant effort to encourage student participation in politics—whether it be lowering the voting age, enlisting students in local party organizations, or mounting student lobbying efforts—might absorb some student energies that otherwise would be released in disruptive behavior. However, the assassination of Robert Kennedy, the most politically potent figure opposing the war, can only have deepened the alienation of many students from the political process.

In sum, the conditions for avoiding more campus disturbances seem to be not yet at hand. The war continues, the racial crisis remains acute, and the restructuring of institutional government still has far to go. Vice President Humphrey, the likely Democratic nominee for President, is viewed by most students, Schwartz says, as an apologist for the war. Moreover, this year's graduating seniors are now being reclassified 1-A by their draft boards, and, by fall, many of them will either have been arrested as draft-resisters or inducted against their will. Thus, Schwartz predicts that the start of classes again next September will signal the opening of a new round of campus turmoil.—LUTHER J. CARTER

NAS Presidency: Seitz's Resignation Stirs Speculation on Successor

Behind the decorous facade of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), there is now a fair amount of motion related to the forthcoming vote for a successor to Academy president Frederick Seitz, who departs next year to become head of Rockefeller University (*Science*, 12 April).

Though nominations are yet to be made and balloting will not take place until near the end of the year, letters of endorsement for various candidates are beginning to circulate. More significant, the imminence of a change in leadership has raised interest in a reassessment of the role the Academy should seek in national affairs. The Academy is, of course, a conservative outfit where nothing happens fast, but with the scientific community currently feeling unloved and financially undernourished, there is widespread feeling that the self-assumed Olympus of American science might do more to ease some of the problems in the science-government relationship. Whether the Academy can do anything significant in this regard, even if it wanted to, is a separate matter, but there are those who think it should function as science's embassy in Washington, and they feel it has been laggard in playing this role.

Most prominently mentioned as possible successors to Seitz are Harrison Brown, who holds professorships in geochemistry and science and government at Caltech, and who has been Foreign Secretary of the Academy for 7 years; Philip Handler, the Duke University biochemist who is chairman of the National Science Board, a one-time member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, and current chairman of the NAS Committee on Research in the Life Sciences; and, finally, among those most mentioned, Glenn T. Seaborg, the Nobel laureate chemist who has been chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission since 1961.

Also mentioned, though considered to be in the dark-horse category, are Marvin L. Goldberger, of Princeton; Roger Revelle and Harvey Brooks, of Harvard; Franklin A. Long, of Cornell; Kenneth S. Pitzer, of Rice; and Philip H. Abelson, of Carnegie Institution of Washington. Donald F. Hornig, the White House science adviser, is also mentioned, but is said not to be interested in the job.

Whether any of those mentioned as candidates is, in fact, interested is difficult to ascertain, for the governing protocol demands an appearance of aloofness from ambition. And in some instances, it is said, personal reasons or professional commitments stand as barriers to accepting the post. But there is no doubt that the Academy presidency, as it has evolved in recent years, is an extremely attractive position in terms of prestige, potential for influence, and remuneration. (In Seitz's case this has been $45,000 a year, plus a residence that the Academy purchased and refurbished at a total cost of approximately $250,000). Furthermore, the vocational alternative for those considered eligible for the presidency would most likely be a university presidency, which, as things go nowadays, stands a good chance of turning out to be a professional suicide mission. On the other hand, virtually unique among American institutions, NAS is yet to see its first picket.

Like the College of Cardinals, convened to select a Pope, NAS feels that its electoral proceedings are its own affair until the outcome is ready to be announced to the world. But since NAS is a quasi-governmental body, wields a good deal of influence on public affairs, and subsists on some $20 million of federal money a year, its preference for privacy need not be taken too seriously.

To pick a candidate, the 17-member Council of the Academy has appointed a nominating committee. This is chaired by Harry Eagle, of Yeshiva University. Among the members are Frank Westheimer; Preston E. Cloud, Jr.; Frank Brink, Jr.; Chen Ning Yang; Charles Yanofsky; and Abraham A. Albert. There are several others whose names were not obtainable at this writing.

At a preliminary meeting, held in May, the committee decided that it would not limit itself to selecting a candidate but would—as a person close to the committee put it—"re-think the mission and objectives of the Academy and look for someone who would take the initiative in that direction."

Just what possibilities interest the committee is not certain, but, by and large, among those Academy members who care about their organization—a