Professors and Political Petitions

Academic opponents of the Vietnam War are described by field, rank, and university affiliation.

Everett Carll Ladd, Jr.

In the sweeping criticism of American involvement in Vietnam, no institution has been as prominently engaged as the university, and no occupational group as vociferously represented as the men of the academy (*1*). This paper presents data not on why there has been relatively high faculty opposition to the war but rather on the characteristics of the war's academic opponents. About 14,750 university-affiliated persons contributed 18,500 signatures to a set of newspaper-published petitions which formally and publicly challenged the war policy of the government, attacking that policy as "brutalizing and degrading," "reckless and barbarous," "disastrous," "illegal," "senseless," "inhumane," and "immoral." What types of institutions did these signers come from? Were they disproportionately from the high or the lowly, the public or private, big or small, eastern or western, or the great in-between? Were Catholic colleges represented in proportion to their numbers? Were southern schools? Were the signers mostly young, junior faculty still studded with the idealism of youth, their necks still touched by the hot breath of General Hershey? What were their fields of specialty? Were they disproportionately the disaffected humanists whom we like so much to patronize? Were they predominantly the mathematicians and the physicists, as is so widely assumed? Is it true, as Max Lerner and William Buckley assure us, that, in general, those scholars who actually know something about communism, international relations, Asia, or politics shunned the petitions, and that the deluge of academic signers represented only the cries of the Great Unwashed of Academe?

The petitions were, of course, but one expression of opposition to government policy on Vietnam, and it is far from our intention to suggest that the signers were some faithful microcosm of the larger body of faculty critics. This study proceeded only on the following: that the 1965–68 petition campaign against the war on college campuses was a substantial and significant enterprise aimed at influencing both the elite and popular opinion; that the signing of these petitions was an unequivocal and public expression of opposition; that those responsible for initiating and circulating the petitions aimed at inclusiveness rather than exclusiveness—they welcomed anyone wishing to sign; and for these reasons, that in relating who the academic signers are we provide some data on the larger matter of the opinions, attitudes and general political style of those who dwell in the many houses of the academy, a topic on which speculation is impressive but hard data rather sparse (*2, 3*).

Petitions and Sponsors

Petitioning the government to complain about old policies, to ask for new ones, to advise and beseech and belabor is not at all new—but the phenomenon of the newspaper-published petition loaded with names does seem to be. A survey of the Sunday New York *Times* for 1953—not a tranquil year politically—failed to turn up a single political petition of any kind (*4*). Since the early 1960's, however, the newspaper petition has come into its own. Vietnam has not in any sense been the only subject touched, not all the petitions dealing with the war have been critical, and not all the signers of Vietnam protest petitions have come from the academy. But between 1964 and 1968 the war was the principal object, virtually all the mass signature petitions were critical, and professors predominated, both in the number of petitions which they submitted and in the number of signers (although clergymen made a good run in capturing second place, just ahead of primary and secondary school teachers).

Eight Vietnam protest petitions and their signers are examined here. They were selected by the following criteria: They constitute all the petitions opposing the government on Vietnam, with over 400 signers, supported by faculty members from five or more colleges, which appeared in the Sunday New York *Times* between October 1964 and June 1968 (*5*). The reader might reasonably wonder about the wisdom of limiting the sample to petitions published in one newspaper which has the bulk of its circulation in the Northeast. Before deciding to work exclusively with *Times*-published petitions, however, we surveyed a number of major regional papers and found that the *Times* was in fact the principal home for petitions. For example, between June 1966 and June 1967, when the greatest number of Vietnam protest petitions were appearing in the Sunday *Times*, none were published in the Sunday issues of the Los Angles *Times*. A few Vietnam protest petitions found their way into the Washington *Post*; some of those first published in the New York *Times* were reprinted with local signers in college town newspapers like the Ithaca *Journal* and the Madison *Capital Times*. In addition, most of the petition sponsors confirmed that they had deliberately selected the New York *Times* because it alone approached the status of a national newspaper, and because it reaches more of the people whom they wanted to reach, (and the Sunday *Times* because it has a much larger circulation than the daily).

The organization of the petition protests is a story in itself, requiring much fuller treatment than we can give it here. The eight petitions grew out of the activity of five groups of varying coherence and persistence (*6*).

The author is associate professor of political science and director of the Political Data Center at the University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut. This article is based on a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, held in Washington, D.C., 2–7 September 1968.

Most of the work was done by two of these: the Boston Area Faculty Group on Public Issues, affectionately known as BAFGOPI, and the Teachers Committee for Peace in Vietnam (*7*). Of these, the first is the more enduring and demands a little attention. It was first given form in 1961 by faculty members at Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.), Brandeis, and Boston University (B.U.), mostly in the natural sciences, who had been urged at a "Cuba protest meeting" (26 April) to organize to protest the Bay of Pigs invasion (*8*). Then, in the fall of 1961, many of these same professors became concerned about the campaign for bomb shelters. One member of the Boston group put it this way:

> There were a lot of engineers and physicists who thought they knew something about the technical questions raised by the shelter program, and felt that the proponents in and out of government were seriously in error. This thing was just not practical. But more than this, the shelter campaign was having the effect of preparing the people to accept nuclear war as an instrument of our national policy. We wanted the Administration to put the money and the energy toward plans for peace. So we made a public protest in a petition published in the New York *Times* in November. The response was extraordinary. We received 4000 letters, and requests to provide persons to testify before congressional committees on this matter (*9*).

He felt that the anti-shelter campaign provides a good exposition of the conditions under which petitions can be most effective:

> Our timing on this was perfect. A lot of people were expressing grave reservations. Rockefeller had just pushed through the New York legislature that $100,000,000 appropriation for shelters, and people at the New York *Times*, for example, were unhappy about this. There was a lot of concern and uneasiness about the program among people in government. These are the kinds of conditions in which the petitions can have real results, real impact: When there are divided counsels in the seats of power, and a statement by a lot of responsible and well-known academics, many with real expertise, can help tip the balance. We have indications that our intervention was very important.

Since 1961 the Boston group has had continuous existence, with varying degrees of formality and informality, at times holding luncheon meetings every 2 weeks, at times falling into long periods with little formal activity. It has continued to seek out, in the words of one member, "important public issues on which a firm and reasoned voice can have a helpful impact." After bomb shelters, the nuclear test ban demanded their attention. Since 1965 Vietnam has been center stage. Although BAFGOPI has had no permanent staff, no one person who has dominated its activity, there has been a group of Boston academics who have been regularly involved, including biologists Salvador Luria and Cyrus Levinthal (M.I.T.), Hilary Putnam in philosophy and Everett Mendelsohn in history of science (Harvard), law school professor Banks McDowall and political scientist Howard Zinn (B.U.). These men are full professors, and well-known members of their professions. A few junior faculty members have been active, too, in a constantly changing membership. "Just who has taken the initiative at a particular time has depended on who was less busy at that time."

Its large mailing list includes academics who have been sympathetic to BAFGOPI's activities. Its members agree that this list was formed in a haphazard manner, based on professional contacts and a network of former graduate students, and that it got frozen in its early form. When an issue arises, a statement is drawn up and circulated among persons on the list at colleges around the country. "If we want a national petition, the first thing we do is call Berkeley." "We let them [those on the list] know what we plan to do and invite them to work at their institution, if they are so inclined."

However, the Boston group has not, as such, been the sponsor of any of the petitions. Each time it has initiated the formation of an ad hoc committee for the particular issue, so the name of the "legal sponsor" varies. It has been suggested that this resource to ad hoc committees goes back to the experience of some of the senior members during the McCarthy period.

Some of them had gotten caught in fixed membership groups, found themselves linked to past or future activity of these groups, activity in which they had not participated. The faculty group avoids this by remaining a loose coalition, and by never taking a stand itself. An *ad hoc* committee is formed on the specific issue, and only those who agree with the particular response on that issue participate.

The Boston Area Faculty Group on Public Issues is the most professional of our petition organizers. It also has the strongest establishment quality. After this group, the field tapers off, both in terms of the renown of the sponsors and the formality and longevity of the organization. At the other end of the spectrum is the University Committee to Protest the War in Vietnam, which circulated the February 1965 petition. Its 12 members were mostly junior faculty and graduate students at New York City colleges, and many have since moved on to institutions in other parts of the country (*10*). It was a one shot-group, and ceased to exist after the petition was published.

Table 1. Signers of eight Vietnam protest petitions by region and relative size of higher education facilities by region (*23*, p. 78; *24*). The Petition Signing Index (P.S.I.) is computed by dividing the percentage of signers from a region by the percentage of faculty from that region. For example, only 2.5 percent of the 18,477 petition signers taught at southern schools, but 27.3 percent of all full-time faculty in the country are in the South. Dividing 2.5 by 27.3, we get a P.S.I. of 9. Below 100, the region is underrepresented.

Region	Signers (No.)	Signers (%)	Full-time faculty, 1963–64 (%) (N = 200,501)	Students, 1967–68 (%) (N = 6,897,169)	P.S.I.
Northeast	12,303	66.6	27.7	23.6	240
North central	2,720	14.8	27.5	27.4	54
West	2,983	16.1	17.5	23.2	92
South	471	2.5	27.3	25.8	9

Petition Signers: University Affiliation

The New York *Times* was the principal outlet for the mass-signature Vietnam protest petitions, and our decision to work solely with petitions published there only acknowledged this decision of the petition sponsors. Still, it is important to recognize that the petition campaign was run by men teaching at New England and New York schools, and that this unques-

tionably contributed to the extremely heavy representation of northeastern faculty among the rank and file of signers. Academics from schools in other parts of the country were not in any sense excluded. The four largest petitions, accounting for 15,600 of the 18,500 signatures, had national listings. But with northeastern sponsors and a northeastern outlet, we would expect to find the Northeast overrepresented. How much of the observed difference is accounted for by this matter of networks and contacts—itself interesting—and how much has other sources such as differences in the attitudes of faculty in the various regions toward the war, and differences in the receptivity of the public outside to this form of dissent, our data do not permit us to say (Table 1).

The absence of signers from southern schools is striking, and becomes even more so if we replace the United States Bureau of the Census definition of the South with the Civil War definition: The number of southern signers of the eight petitions drops from 471 to 199 (*11*). What accounts for this? Some of the petition sponsors think it is partly due to the haphazard way in which the early lists were put together, and their having been "frozen" in their early form. One member of the Boston Area Faculty Group offered a different explanation.

> Well, you know, there just aren't that many Harvard graduate students who have moved South. . . . Besides, the network of contacts depends principally upon the "hard" sciences. It just happens that there aren't too many well-known natural scientists in southern schools, and those who are there aren't of the sort who get involved in this.

If contacts as regular and elaborate had been made at Duke and North Carolina and Florida and Vanderbilt as at Harvard and M.I.T., there would have been many more southern signers (*12*). It is interesting to note, however, that the network which extended to Chicago and Madison and Berkeley did not reach Chapel Hill or Austin.

It seems likely, too, that the South's general lack of sympathy with dissenters to a "patriotic" war was shared by the faculty at many southern schools and felt and feared by still others. In any case, only 199 of 18,500 signers, about 1 percent, were from colleges and universities in states accounting for 20 percent of the total enrollment in institutions of higher learning and 21 percent of the full-time faculty (*13*).

Table 2. Signers of the January–February 1967 petition by rank and all full-time faculty by rank.

Rank	Signers (%)	All faculty (%) (*23*, p. 80)
Professor	32	25
Associate professor	25	23
Assistant professor	31	31
Instructor	12	21

We expected, too, an underrepresentation of the faculty of Catholic colleges, because the network referred to above does not extend to them, and also because of less receptivity in administration and faculty. Kearns notes that "Catholic universities have played . . . [an] important practical role in demonstrating to a not entirely unskeptical white Protestant majority the patriotism and loyalty of Catholics" (*14*). And Lazarsfeld and Thielens observe in *The Academic Mind* that Catholic schools are places where "one frequently finds emphasis on the ecclesiastic virtue of *prudence*" (*3*, p. 121).

There is some indication that this atmosphere of "patriotism and prudence" is now changing. Many prominent Catholics have been in the forefront of opposition to the Administration over Vietnam. And Catholic colleges are evolving, as Greeley and Rossi note, before two major developments in the position of the Catholic Church in America: (i) from a church of the immigrant ghetto to one of the middle-class suburb; and (ii) from a "garrison church" to the "open" church of the ecumenical age (*15*). Still, there is ground left to cover in the direction pointed by these changes.

The 376 Catholic colleges and universities in the United States are underrepresented, accounting for 331 signatures on the eight petitions. Holy Cross and Boston College lead the field in numbers (with 66 and 64), but St. Mary's College of California, a little school with only 65 full-time faculty members, has by far the highest proportion with 53 signers (*16*).

Public institutions have proportionately fewer signers than privately controlled schools. In 1963–64, the last year for which complete and hard figures from the United States Office of Education are available, approximately 54 percent of the full-time college faculty taught at public institutions. But among the petition signers we find this distribution: public colleges: 7064 signers (42.5 percent); and private colleges: 10,613 signers (57.5 percent).

Thus, the individual institutions with the heaviest representation are private schools in the Northeast. Indeed, four of the five universities with the most signers are in this category. Of the top 20, 12 are private and 16 northeastern. Again not surprisingly, the schools with the most signers are big universities. But they are also generally well-established places, of the top and middle ranks: Harvard once more finds itself at the head of the list (*17*).

Petition Signers: Rank and Field

The representative signer of the Vietnam protest petitions taught at a large northeastern university. But what else can we say about him? To try to answer this, we selected one of the eight petitions for more intensive examination. This petition was published in three parts in January and February 1967 under the general management of the Boston Area Faculty Group. It had the most college signers—about 6000, the shortest and most limited appeal—"Mr. President: Stop the Bombing," and a national distribution of signers. It was, then, the logical choice, apparently the Vietnam protest petition with the broadest university circulation and representation.

We decided to include all full-time faculty members who signed from colleges and universities which had 20 or more names on the first part of this petition (published 15 January 1967); or 50 or more spread in any combination over the three parts. The 51 schools which met this criterion of numbers had 4112 signers, slightly more than two-thirds of the total. Not all of these were full-time faculty, however; there were part-time faculty, administrators, and from some schools graduate and undergraduate students. The universe with which we worked was the 3037 members of the regular faculty with the rank of instructor and above from institutions at which the petition had significant circulation. These signers resembled the entire body of 18,500 signers of the eight petitions in the principal characteristics of their institutional affiliations. For example,

41 percent taught at private schools, 59 percent at public institutions; the distribution was 43 to 57 percent for the total set. Of the 3037, 70 percent were at colleges in the Northeast, 16 percent in the North Central states, 14 percent in the West. And 67 percent of the entire 18,500 were connected with schools in the Northeast, 15 percent North Central, 16 percent West and 2 percent South.

Were the faculty signers mostly junior men, instructors and assistant professors? There was some reason to expect them to be. Might the younger faculty not feel a closer bond to the undergraduate and graduate students who, but a few years their junior, were facing the draft? Has not the cutting edge of opposition been sharper among younger persons, the ardor of protest somewhat stronger? Irving Kristol thought so, for he wrote that "what brought Vietnam into focus was the spreading upward of the radical temper into the junior ranks of the faculty."

At any rate, once the junior faculty took the leadership, even nominally, there had to be an unambiguous political objective. Our Vietnam policy, already under some criticism, and patently not working out as the Government desired, was conveniently at hand (*18*).

On the other hand, there was some empirical evidence that this was not the case. Armor and his associates found that "tenured professors were slightly more likely to oppose the war than the nontenured" (*19*). Our analysis of the petition signers gives modest support to Armor's findings. The percentage of signers holding the rank of professor or associate professor is higher than the percentage of all faculty members holding these ranks. Our data here (Table 2) are hardly conclusive. The parent group for this petition, BAFGOPI, has a strong establishment aura; its contacts at institutions around the country are drawn heavily from the more senior faculty, and these in turn can be expected to have more of their contacts among senior colleagues. But it is certainly not the case in this the largest of the academe petitions that the signers are disproportionately of the junior faculty.

What of the academic fields of the signers? Here, speculation appears virtually endless, and there are interesting linkages with assumptions about various academic subcultures.

Some faculty specialties are decidedly underrepresented, and they are the ones most of us would expect to be. A number of studies have shown (and this surely does not contradict the sense impressions of anyone who has observed political activities on university campuses) that the "liberal Democratic" orientation of academics does not extend much beyond the boundaries of colleges of arts and sciences (*20*). Would anyone have expected the faculties of schools of agriculture, business, education, or engineering to be heavily represented among the petition signers? They were not, and those who cultivate yeomen of the fields or produce titans of industry came close to ciphers (Table 3).

Table 3. Representation of faculty from schools and colleges of agriculture, business, education, and engineering. The Profession Representation Index (P.R.I.) is computed by dividing the percentage of the total full-time faculty which is in the field into the percentage of all faculty signers of the petition from that field. For example, 7.7 percent of the college faculty in the United States are in engineering; 4.6 of the signers of our petition are professors of engineering. Dividing 7.7 into 4.6 we arrive at a P.R.I. of 60. An index figure of over 100 means that the profession is represented among signers to a higher degree than among the universe of faculty members. The data on faculty by field were computed from (*25*).

Schools	Signers (No.)	Percentage of all faculty signers	P.R.I.
Agriculture	6	0.2	6
Business	12	.4	10
Education	94	3.1	18
Engineering	140	4.6	60

Many of the petition sponsors whom we interviewed stressed the role of natural scientists in the circulation of the petitions, and also believed them to be represented beyond their numbers among the rank and file of signers. Not that natural scientists were seen as a homogeneous category. Mathematicians, physicists, and biologists have been more active, we were told, leading in the race for virtue, while chemists trail badly. But most felt that social scientists had been much less active than their older and harder brethren. Why? Opinions varied. One petition activist felt it was because social scientists typically had less contact with government.

They doubt the effectiveness of the petitions. It is fashionable in their circles to say that this sort of thing doesn't do any good. But natural scientists with more experience with government understand that the petitions really can help—especially when there are divided councils in government. Here is ammunition. . . . We have had some indication that the Vietnam petitions have been helpful to Senate critics of the war.

Natural scientists understand better how government is run than do such social scientists as the students of politics because they have had so much

Table 4. Representation of natural and social scientists.

Field	Signers (No.)	Percentage of all faculty signers	P.R.I.
Natural scientists	1045	34.4	117
Life sciences*	556	18.3	114
Physical sciences †	489	16.1	122
Social scientists	747	24.6	251

* Included in the ranks of the life sciences are those teaching in the health fields and the entire biology group. † In the physical sciences, those in physics, chemistry, geology, mathematics, and statistics.

Table 5. Distribution (percent) of faculty signers from six academic fields by rank; and distribution of full-time faculty from these fields by rank. These data on the distribution of full-time faculty in the various fields among the academic ranks were computed from (*26*) and are in parentheses in the table.

Field	Instructor	Assistant professor	Associate professor	Professor
Life sciences	9 (15)	33 (31)	27 (24)	31 (30)
Physical sciences	8 (15)	29 (29)	21 (23)	42 (33)
Social sciences	9 (13)	31 (31)	27 (26)	33 (30)
Humanities	14 (25)	34 (27)	25 (22)	27 (26)
Fine arts	23 (19)	23 (33)	29 (27)	26 (21)
Engineering	11 (13)	23 (29)	22 (27)	44 (31)

Table 6. Representation of faculty from the principal natural sciences.

Group	Signers (No.)	Percentage of all faculty signers	P.R.I.
Physics	231	7.6	253
Health fields	337	11.1	137
Mathematics	185	6.1	127
Biology	207	6.8	85
Chemistry	61	2.0	54

more real—that is dollars and cents—contact with government for a much longer period of time.

But our data do not substantiate the argument that faculty in the physical and life sciences contributed most heavily to the petition protests. Natural scientists are represented beyond their share of the academic profession—not too surprising in view of the lack of signers from schools of education, agriculture, and business—but they are not nearly as heavily represented as social scientists (Table 4).

It could still be, of course, that senior natural scientists are better represented than senior social scientists. And they may in fact be among the principal sponsors. But not among the signers. There are some variations (Table 5) from field to field, but nothing significant; a higher proportion of the humanities and fine arts signers are in the lower ranks, but a higher proportion of all fine arts faculty are in these ranks.

Chemists are decidedly underrepresented among natural scientists; physicists are, relatively, the most numerous by far. Surprisingly, in view of the observations of the petition sponsors, biologists are poorly represented (Table 6).

What of the men of the humanities? Much has been written about them as swimming in a stagnant pool by the wayside of the river of academic life. Some social and natural scientists—perhaps too unkind—have suggested that the humanists have grown waspish as their status if not their relevance has diminished, and that many of their numbers have come to claim stridently some moral superiority. Margaret Mead for one has written of the "reaction formations so apparent in the humanities today, in which students of the humanities, as they lost their hold on contemporary developments in science, began to stress their monopoly of eternal values" (*21*). Some academic observers have thus explained the high involvement of humanists in the Vietnam protest which they believe they detect: humanists feel they are the keepers of the conscience (in contrast to coldly expedient social scientists) and our Vietnam involvement is a primary crisis of conscience.

Once again this may be, but it clearly is not substantiated by the participation of humanists in the petition protest. A lot signed, of course, more than from any other field (28 percent of all signers); there are a lot of people teaching in the humanities. But the Profession Representation Index for the humanities—their representation in relation to their numbers—is much lower than for social scientists, about like that for natural scientists. We can summarize the relative representation of the principal fields (Table 7).

In the bountiful speculation about who, among academics, the protesters are and are not, the assertion that the "experts" have not signed is often encountered. It has been voiced by both friends and foes of the petition campaign. William F. Buckley, Jr., a foe, wrote that he had surveyed the signers of some petitions and found little representation of the qualified—social scientists and specifically those in political or Asian affairs—but many from the "irrelevant" natural sciences (*22*). At the same time, most of the sponsors whom we interviewed lamented the lack of participation by social scientists, and offered a variety of uncomplimentary explanations for this. In fact, we have seen, the social science disciplines are by far the most heavily represented. The proportion of sociologists signing is nearly three times that of professors of English, nearly four times that of biologists. And only sociology within, and philosophy without, surpass what is presumably the "most relevant" of the social sciences, political science (Table 8).

Table 7. Profession Representation Index among the principal academic fields.

Field	P.R.I.
Social science	251
Humanities	132
Physical sciences	122
Life sciences	114
Fine arts	60
Engineering	60
Education	18
Business	10
Agriculture	6

Table 8. Profession Representation Index for selected academic subjects.

Subject	P.R.I.
Sociology and anthropology	304
Philosophy	287
Political science	284
Psychology	281
Physics	253
Economics	211
History	166
Mathematics	127
English	110
Languages	89
Biology	85
Chemistry	54

Epilogue

Predictably, more questions have been uncovered than answered. That college professors have engaged in much more organized public opposition to the Vietnam War than most if not all other occupational groups is clear, but why this is so is not. There have been marked differences in the participation of various sets of academics in the petition campaign, but we are far from any systematic description of the patterns of political attitudes among the men of the academy. Professors undertook in the petition protests a substantial campaign to influence opinion on an important issue, but we are made aware of how little we know about the scope, content, and direction of the interest-group activity of American academicians. The call for further research on which articles so often end seems especially insistent here.

References and Notes

1. Several kinds of data have shown professors exceeding most other Americans in opposition to the Vietnam War. Armor and his colleagues, for example, interviewed a sample of faculty at 17 colleges and universities in the Boston area in 1966, and found that the proportion of professors believing American involvement in Vietnam to be an error was more than twice as great as that of college graduates in the population as a whole. The data on the response of college graduates nationally was obtained from a Gallup survey conducted at the same time and phrasing the question on the war essentially the same [D. Armor *et al.*, *Public Opinion Quart.* **31**, 162 (1967)].
2. Some work has been done, of course. We have modest data on the party affiliation and voting behavior of academics. See H. Turner *et al.*, *Western Political Quart.* **16**, 650 (1963); *Sociol. Soc. Res.* **47**, 273 (1963). Lazarsfeld and Thielens have contributed a major study of the responses of social scientists to the pressures of the McCarthy period (*3*). There is a limited literature describing the opinions, activities and influence of faculty and nonacademic scientists around specific areas of

public policy, such as R. Gilpin, *American Scientists and Nuclear Weapons Policy* (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1962). But the amount of investigation has been modest.

3. P. Lazarsfeld and W. Thielens, *The Academic Mind* (Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1958).
4. Academics need hardly be reminded that in 1953 and 1954, the age of the other McCarthy, college professors felt that they had plenty to protest. Certain types of petitions were then circulated. In November 1954, when the censure of Joseph McCarthy was in the final act, a group called Ten Million Americans Mobilizing for Justice formed to petition against censure. It brought truckloads of petitions to Washington, and claimed, when it gave up the ghost after censure, to have collected slightly more than 2 million signatures. On the other side, the League of Twenty Million Americans for the Censure of Joseph McCarthy was organized in New York, evolving into Twenty Million Americans to Unseat McCarthy. This organization announced in December 1954 that it was collecting signatures of those of like mind. But of newspaper petitions there was little.
5. The dates and number of signers of these petitions are:

Date	University-affiliated signers (No.)	Colleges and universities with five or more signers (No.)
28 Feb. 1965	400	15
9 May 1965	772	20
31 Oct. 1965	655	37
13 Feb. 1966	1248	46
5 June 1966	3400	75
15, 22 Jan. and 19 Feb. 1967	6000	121
12 March 1967	2302	103
14 April 1968	3700	168

The total number of signers of these petitions exceeds 25,000. The largest block of exclusions were from the 14 April 1968 petition, which contained over 9000 names. Most of those omitted in this analysis were primary and secondary school teachers.

6. Twenty-one faculty members prominently engaged in the initiation of the eight petitions were interviewed in the summer of 1968. The discussion of the petition organizations which follows is based on information furnished in these interviews.
7. The petitions of March 1967 and April 1968 were the work of the Teachers Committee. The hand of Bafgopi can be seen in those of May 1965, October 1965, February 1966, and January–February 1967.
8. A petition appeared in the New York *Times* of 10 May 1961, urging President Kennedy to give no further support to the invasion of Cuba and to concentrate constructive efforts on removing throughout Latin America the social conditions on which "totalitarian nationalism" feeds.
9. The petition referred to was published in the New York *Times*, 10 November 1961.
10. In 1965 they were at New York University, Brooklyn College, and Queens College.
11. The United States Bureau of the Census includes Maryland, Delaware, Washington, D.C., Kentucky, and Oklahoma, in addition to the 11 states of the old Confederacy as southern states.
12. There is some evidence that this is the case. In 1967 all faculty members of the American Sociological Association were invited to sign a petition or letter to the President and the Congress calling for a halt to bombing, immediate negotiations, and an "orderly, phased withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam." Of the 1300 signers, 108 taught at southern schools, or 8.3 percent. This is in sharp contrast to the 1 percent from the South on the eight petitions in our sample.
13. It is commonly observed that "the South is more militaristic," more likely to support American military action. This may be, but survey data on regional responses to the Vietnam war do not substantiate it. A careful examination of Gallup data from 1965 to 1968 shows that whereas residents of the Northeast have been more opposed to the war, the South, Midwest and West are not significantly distinguished among each other.
14. F. Kearns, in *The Shape of Catholic Higher Education*, R. Hassenger, Ed. (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1967), p. 224.
15. A. Greeley and P. Rossi, *The Education of Catholic Americans* (Aldine, Chicago, 1966), p. 14.
16. In 1965–66, Catholic schools were educating 417,885 students, about 7.5 percent of the total. They provided 1.7 percent of the petition signers.
17. The 20 colleges and universities with the most signers are: Harvard (974); New York University (676); Massachusetts Institute of Technology (600); Columbia University (524); The University of California, Berkeley (516); Brooklyn College (450); City College of New York (409); Yeshiva University (407); Case Western Reserve University (309); University of Connecticut (287); Tufts University (279); University of Wisconsin (267); Rutgers University (267); Boston University (264); Brandeis University (263); Stanford University (260); Queens College (245); Princeton University (225); University of Pennsylvania (221); and the University of Massachusetts (219).
18. I. Kristol, *Encounter* **25**, 68 (1965). Kristol was referring specifically to the teach-ins, but his comments were such as to be just as clearly aimed at the petition protests.
19. D. Armor *et al.*, *Public Opinion Quart.* **31**, 169–170 (1967).
20. Gottfried, for example, reported on a survey of the faculty at the University of Washington. He found that most of the arts and science departments had gone for Kennedy over Nixon in 1960 by large margins, many like ten to one. But Nixon carried the professional or vocational schools [A. Gottfried, *Western Political Quart.* **14**, 44 (1961)].
21. M. Mead, *Daedalus* **88**, 141 (1959).
22. W. F. Buckley, Jr., "Hope in academe," *On the Right*, released by the Washington Star Syndicate, 1 September 1966.
23. The data on full-time faculty, by region, are from the U.S. Office of Education, *Digest of Educational Statistics* (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 78.
24. The data on students are from the U.S. Office of Education, *Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education 1967* (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 15.
25. From *Staffing American Colleges and Universities* (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967), table 4, pp. 15–29.
26. *Teaching Faculty in Universities and 4-year Colleges, Spring 1963* (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966), table 1, p. 61.

Reprints from Science

AAAS is now offering reprints of selected articles from recent issues of *Science*.

The following reprints are now available from AAAS Reprints, 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

	Copies Ordered
B. Berelson, "Beyond Family Planning" (7 Feb.) 12 pages	
R. E. Schultes, "Hallucinogens of Plant Origin" (17 Jan.) 12 pages	
A. T. Weil, N. E. Zinberg, J. M. Nelsen, "Clinical and Psychological Effects of Marihuana in Man" (13 Dec.) 12 pages	
G. Hardin, "The Tragedy of the Commons" (13 Dec.) 8 pages	
D. Price, "Purists and Politicians" (3 Jan.) 8 pages	
E. Q. Daddario, "Academic Science in the Federal Government" (13 Dec.) 4 pages	
H. F. Eichenwald and P. C. Fry, "Nutrition and Learning" (14 Feb.) 4 pages	

Reprints of other articles published since 1 September 1968 can be made available in quantities of 25 or more for classroom use. Identify each article by author, title, page number, and issue date.

Prices and Terms

One reprint—$1.00 **Two to nine reprints—60¢ each**

	10 reprints	25 reprints	50 reprints	100 reprints
4 pages	$4.00	$ 8.00	$15.00	$25.00
8 pages	$5.00	$11.00	$20.00	$35.00
12 pages	$5.50	$13.00	$25.00	$45.00

Please enclose payment with order. Do not send currency.