

ganization's representative in these words from his 3 December 1969 letter to Budget Director Robert P. Mayo:

On Nov. 18, 1969, a member of our staff, Gerald W. Winegrad, an attorney, was told by Mr. Harry B. Sheftel of your

office that he would have to clear attendance at this Public Utilities Committee meeting with a Mr. Dana Barbour, Acting Director for Clearance Operations of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Winegrad on calling Mr. Barbour was advised that "we just can't have any more people,"

that there was no more seating room. Mr. Winegrad advised him that he would stand during the meeting but was still told he could not attend. Mr. Barbour advised Mr. Winegrad that he would send him a copy of FPC Form 67 in lieu of his attending the meeting. At the meeting which

## Student-Student Polarization Plagues U.S. Campuses

The national press this spring has focused on the increasing distrust and confrontation between students and those in authority—police, university administrators, and faculty members. But politization on campuses has bred polarization not only between students and their elders but also between students and students.

When radical students wanted to take over or vandalize university buildings this spring, they were often voted down, blocked, or physically fought by more conservative students. With campus grievances and the Vietnam war setting the stage, politically divided student bodies, by their very existence, can generate a series of ugly scenarios. This sharpening student-student polarization portends a relatively new source of campus disorders, which may catch university communities by surprise.

One reason for the increasing student polarization is that the radical movement can no longer mobilize non-radical support as effectively as it has done in the past. This failure in leadership can be traced to the split that divided the radical Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) into two bitterly opposed factions last summer. One faction consists of two allied radical groups—the Worker-Student Alliance and Progressive Labor—whose names are indicative of their ideology. They often wear their hair short and oppose any tactic that they feel would alienate workers, such as rioting and breaking windows of small family-owned stores. They prefer a long-term political perspective. The other radical faction, formerly known as the New Left, is more interested in following a gut impulse to fight in the streets immediately for a revolution. Physical confrontations between these two factions are not uncommon.

This spring, President Nixon's announcement of the Cambodian invasion, and the killing of four Kent State students, provided ample ignition to activate students holding a wide range of political views. But there were sharp disagreements among students over the tactics to be used in the attempt to end the Vietnam war. Those disagreements heightened the intensity of student-student polarization. On hundreds of campuses, radical students tended to press for a strike directed against their universities, which they consider tools of American imperialism. Nonradical students who wanted to work against the war insisted that the strike be directed outward, toward canvassing the public and lobbying in Congress.

Ohio State provides a relatively mild example of increasing student polarization. This university, which closed from 7 to 19 May, had a strike in process prior to Nixon's announcement of the Cambodia invasion. When the protests escalated in May, a group of conservative students and parents brought a lawsuit against

campus radicals. In early June, the suing group won a court order enjoining the radical defendants from a number of actions, including making speeches or distributing pamphlets that might incite violence.

Stanford University shows one of the most clear-cut cases of student-student polarization. In January 1969, before building takeovers came into vogue in the East, the conservative Young Americans for Freedom successfully blocked a planned building takeover by SDS. The incident ended without violence.

However, when Stanford had the two most bloody nights in its history, on 29 and 30 April of this year, hospitals treated 65 persons (45 police and 20 students). According to both radical students and administration sources, half of the students who were treated were injured by other students, not by police.

Polarization at Stanford is so sharply defined, that this spring a conservative group of Stanford students, faculty, and staff began utilizing floodlights and cameras to give the police unrequested assistance in taking demonstration photographs.

At Harvard, polarization between radicals and other students has been dramatically displayed. On 7 May of this year, an SDS attempt to take over the ROTC building failed when 350 students opposing the takeover stopped 200 SDS'ers one block away from the building. The 350 students, who had decided to block SDS non-violently, chanted "Go Home" while barricading the street. Nevertheless, as SDS approached the massed group of nonradicals, some students on both sides literally began picking bricks from the cobbled sidewalks and gathering rocks.

An SDS speaker who wanted to break the student barricade shouted through a bullhorn, "There are more of them than there are of us. But that doesn't mean they're right." Other radicals disagreed: "If we fight the students, the movement is dead." Eventually, those on both sides who wanted to fight were shouted down by their colleagues.

Harvard government professor Michael Walzer, head of the faculty's liberal caucus, said in referring to the polarization among Harvard students, "Any sustained political activity makes those divisions deeper. We now have a lot of students who are politically experienced and who have a new understanding of what it means to have political enemies."

Will student-student polarization next year increase even more or will the trend toward student infighting somehow stop? Harvard professor Seymour Martin Lipset, an expert on student movements, said that the degree of next year's polarization will depend mostly on the state of the Vietnam war.—SAMUEL Z. GOLDBABER