"Crisis at Berkeley": Readers Comment on the Recent Science Articles

A Totally Different View

One view of the "Crisis at Berkeley" has been presented in a series of two articles in recent issues of *Science* (*1*). We, as witnesses and participants, have a totally different view, which is here presented.

The Berkeley crisis has been mistakenly termed by some a civil war. A civil war is fought between components of the same social entity. In fact, the revolution on campus, led by extremist students and abetted by some like-minded faculty, was resolutely fought by no one in authority. The opposition of the administration was rendered ineffective by the disagreements, now made public, between the chancellor and the president.

To understand what happened in Berkeley in the fall of 1964, one must go back farther into the history of the campus. As long ago as 1957, a small student coalition sought to gain the political advantage of claiming to utter their extremist political views in the name of the 20,000 registered students. One candidate for a student office dramatically declared that, unless the entire slate with whom he was campaigning was elected with him, he would not serve. Thus was formed the campus's first political party, Slate, which ran on the platform that the student government "should take stands on national and international issues," contrary to the principle embodied in the university's charter that the university and its official subdivisions should be "free from political influences." Slate was resoundingly defeated. Later, after repeated defiance of authority, Slate became an off-campus organization in which many ex-students continued to work actively, in some cases admittedly devoting full time to it. The organization continued to press for a number of radical demands but, until the recent past, with negligible success.

In the summer of 1964 Slate published a manifesto (*2*) for revolution on the campus, to match and support political revolution in the world. It urged students to "begin an open, fierce, and thoroughgoing rebellion on this campus . . . start a program of agitation, petitioning, rallies, etc., in which the final resort will be CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE. . . . ORGANIZE AND SPLIT THIS CAMPUS WIDE OPEN! . . . If such a revolt were conducted with unrelenting toughness and courage, it could spread to other campuses across the country. . . ." The pamphlet, written by a former student, extolled "the drop-outs, . . . this 'Hidden Community' of unseemly hangers-on in Berkeley [which] now numbers in the thousands. . . . These students are the real ones." The Slate manifesto predicted "nation-wide publicity" for the revolt and warned that "the press [will be] 'red-baiting' you, but . . . students all over the country will read between the lines. By this time you may also be able to call for a mass student strike. . . ." Also included were such exhortations to students as "you must cheat to keep up."

The importance of this revolutionary manifesto is that it was distributed to students at registration time in September 1964, *before* the occurrence of any of the later incidents which allegedly led to disorders. The student newspaper, in its second edition of this academic year (*3*), reported this call for rebellion without any recognition of impending trouble. Thus, Slate announced a revolutionary program in advance of any supposed provocation—a program which it was able to follow almost as a blueprint, even while drawing such nonrevolutionary groups as the student Republicans and Democrats into a Popular Front. The slogans of this program became the battle cry of the Free Speech Movement (FSM).

The first fact one must know about the FSM is that, despite repeated assertions, free speech was never an issue on the Berkeley campus. One can document this in many ways. A relative newcomer to the Berkeley campus, Professor Nathan Glazer, put it this way (*4*): "Berkeley was one of the few places in the country, I imagine, where in 1964 [pre-FSM] one could hear a public debate between the supporters of Khrushchev and Mao on the Sino-Soviet dispute—there were organized student groups behind both positions." But perhaps no one fact will more strongly indicate the contrived nature of the "free speech" slogan than the fact that the American Association of University Professors, "by the unanimous and enthusiastic vote of AAUP chapters and individuals" (*5*), gave the Alexander Meiklejohn award, in the spring of 1964, to the president and the now much-maligned Regents of the University of California for fostering free speech. Could the university authorities so honored in the spring be guilty of suppressing free speech only months later? The truth is that not free speech but freedom to organize political action and collect funds on the campus was the immediate issue in the dispute that broke out 2 weeks after the Slate manifesto was distributed to students.

The leaders of the FSM sought to change university regulations in order to organize activist groups which could sit-in, sleep-in, shop-in, and otherwise apply ingeniously aggressive tactics to compel employers in the San Francisco Bay area to hire more Negroes. The university community was sympathetic with this cause, though many deplored the routine violation of laws. Some even saw how fallacious it was to justify such acts by citing the disobeying of unconstitutional state laws in the South purposefully undertaken in order to prove their unconstitutionality. California has a law against discrimination in employment, and an effective agency to enforce that law.

The university's objection to the conduct of such activities on its premises was not arbitrary or new. It had been in effect as regulation No. 17 for 6 years. Charges that the university's enforcement of this regulation would effectively end all student political activity were contradicted by the history of its actual earlier enforcement.

As the dean of students pointed out to Slate in 1959, "In their individual capacities or as members of groups not recognized by the university [students] are, of course, free to engage in political activity off campus." In its purpose and its effect the regulation can be compared with the one barring religious activities from campus. The campus is ringed by a large number of

"off-campus" church-related student associations, many of which have also afforded facilities for political agitation and organization.

Over the years Slate continued to press for the right of students to organize political activity on campus. When the rules prohibiting political activity, long laxly enforced, were suddenly tightened in the fall of 1964, the radical students seized this opportunity to muster a United Front in support of their demands. On principle, the university could not permit its buildings and grounds to be used for one-sided propaganda for any political cause, no matter how noble or moral, or for the organizing of aggression, no matter how idealistically motivated, against elements of the surrounding community. In order to undermine this commitment, the radical students and their faculty allies continually advanced their "rights" in opposition to the "meddling" of the administration. They did more: rules were diligently sought in order that they might be broken; whenever and wherever the two forces could be brought into confrontation, a direct attack was made. When the administration forbade putting a collection table in the small disputed area outside the gate, rebels put additional tables inside; when several students were instructed to see the dean to explain their actions, several hundred of their associates demanded that they be called in at the same time; when, later, a nonstudent was arrested for flaunting an obscene sign on campus, some of the same Slate leaders deliberately committed exaggerations of the same offense to challenge the right of the administration to control them in any way. For months, in innumerable instances students not merely broke this or that law but conducted a determined campaign against the rules of the university. To do what one wishes without regard to rules or laws is lawlessness; but when, at some inconvenience, one seeks out laws to break, this provocative anarchism can be understood only as a struggle for power.

That the issue was and remains a struggle for power on the part of the FSM (currently metamorphosed into the FSU—Free Student Union) is illustrated by a recent statement of Bettina Aptheker, a leader of the movement in both of its phases (*6*): "We want to be able to bargain collectively with the Regents and say, 'Baby, you give in or we strike.' "

Loose usage of terms and reporting of numbers has been common in published accounts of the events associated with the sit-in and arrests of students on 2 and 3 December, giving the impression that only students were involved and exaggerating their numbers. In fact, 690 students and 83 nonstudents were arrested on 3 December. The nonstudents included some well-known participants in agitation elsewhere; the police reported that some 150 professional agitators whom they could identify entered with the sit-in volunteers (though almost all of them accepted the offer to leave unmolested), and many known adult agitators were shown in published photographs in continual contact with student leaders of the sit-in and the strike that followed. Hal Draper, a Trotskyist leader since the 1930's and at present employed on the Berkeley campus as a librarian, was the author of a pamphlet, "The Mind of Clark Kerr," which almost became the FSM bible. The first person arrested in the sit-in was a lawyer known for his frequent association with extremist causes; and the Circe whose music piped the sit-in group into Sproul Hall was a professional folk-singer with unorthodox views about paying her taxes.

The removal and arrest of those who remained in Sproul Hall throughout the night, despite pleadings of the student-body president and the chancellor, were the occasion for charges of "police brutality" that were not only unsupported but flatly contradicted in the eye-witness accounts of faculty, administration officials, state legislators, reporters, and even some of the arrested students with whom we have discussed the matter. Some published accounts evoke imaginary scenes of an army of troopers with military weapons, prepared to mow down defenseless students. In fact, Berkeley police officers, who performed all the actual arrests in Sproul Hall, had been specially trained for this occasion to accomplish their tasks with a minimum of force; they did their best, with the aid of university authorities, to persuade a group of provocative lawbreakers to leave a university building and go free, then offered them the option of walking out if they insisted on being arrested, and finally carried out those who refused to walk.

Four officers were injured—one was hospitalized for nearly a week—when they tried to confiscate public-address equipment that was being used by students who had smashed windows in order to place the equipment on a balcony and broadcast false reports of violence against students. No significant injuries of students were reported other than one case of a cut chin that required a stitch. The report of the physician at Santa Rita Rehabilitation Center states: "Fifty persons were treated for minor complaints. Forty men were given aspirin for headaches. There was no evidence of injury. Several students received analgesics for hoarseness due to singing. One subject had a sprained wrist; another complained of a headache due to concussion. There were no symptoms of any such injury. Another had a one inch laceration. The wound was sutured and dressed."

The events surrounding the unsuccessful attempt to arrest an individual on 2 October have been inaccurately described in some reports. Some of the facts seldom disclosed are these. The arrested man was a nonstudent who had been warned against soliciting funds at the campus entrance and had defiantly moved his table onto the plaza in front of the administration building, Sproul Hall. The person who initiated the action to prevent his removal by the police was a nonstudent, out on parole on a narcotics charge, who threw himself in front of the wheels of the car containing the arrested offender. A small group of militant students joined in blockading the car, though reporters' accounts of the huge crowds of spectators gave the impression that thousands joined in the crime of obstructing the police effort to remove an offensive trespasser. A move to free the car with the aid of police officers who had been summoned to the campus was about to be undertaken by the chancellor, as agreed with the president, when the chancellor received word that the president was negotiating with a self-appointed student committee. Within a couple of hours Savio came out, mounted to the roof of the police car, and announced that the president had granted all their demands, including even the demand that they need not promise to obey laws on campus in the future.

Students' demands for their "political rights" have been frequently said to constitute the principal motivation of the FSM. Undoubtedly the demands were an important factor; but the basis of the demands, which were supported strongly by militant segments of the faculty, contradicts law, tradition, and history. To set the record right, it is necessary to begin with the legal status of the university.

A hundred years ago the people of

California recognized the wisdom, which later generations have confirmed, of removing their state university as far from political control as public ownership permits. Replicating the experience of the great private universities, they created a board of trustees, the Regents, to exercise full ownership rights in behalf of the public. They gave these Regents an independence slightly greater than that of the State Supreme Court justices, who must be confirmed every 12 years: the 16 appointed Regents (eight are *ex officio*) are named to staggered 16-year terms, so that no one governor, during his 4-year term, can appoint an unduly large fraction of the board. To prevent political tampering with this structure, its form was embodied in the state constitution. The Board of Regents is sometimes described as a fourth branch of the state government, on a par with the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches.

The Regents, as public trustees, not only own the property of the university but have full operational responsibility and authority. Since about the time of World War I, except for the controversy some two decades ago about a loyalty oath (a momentous struggle whose echoes still reverberate), the Regents have acted as a buffer between the scholarly community and those political groups or their elected officials that have occasionally attempted to bend the university to their political opinion. One important example of the Regents' independence from the political winds of the day occurred in 1963, in the lifting of the ban against Communist speakers on the campus, in a state in which the forces opposing such moves wield great influence. But the crowning achievement of the Regents of the University of California is that they helped create one of the leading universities of the world. In the light of this history, those who charge the Regents with being "outsiders" who "meddle and interfere" with the university and apply illicit and threatening pressures ignore the facts.

The Regents entrust to the faculty the duties associated with the educational function of the university—the setting of qualifications for admission, the content of courses, and the qualifications for degrees; the recruitment of new faculty members and their promotion; and so on—and with very few exceptions the decisions of the faculty have been accepted by administrative officials and the Regents. In fact, the degree of faculty self-government in academic matters at the University of California was extolled by Lynn W. Eley in the *AAUP Bulletin* of June 1964 (*7*) in these terms: "The Academic Senate of the University of California is generally regarded as the most powerful such institution in the country. . . . The fact that so many activities fall into the . . . categories [in which it is consulted] makes it apparently unique among faculty organizations."

The formulation and enforcement of rules for student conduct have been the responsibility of the administration for almost 30 years. The chancellor at Berkeley has exercised this authority with advice from the standing Faculty Committee on Student Conduct, which, during the troubled fall semester of 1964, was rendered impotent by its reluctance to intervene. The university policy on political advocacy was put forth in regulation No. 5, originally in 1934 and later in a slightly revised form, as follows.

> The function of the university is to seek and transmit knowledge and to train students in the processes whereby truth is to be made known. To convert, or to make converts, is alien and hostile to this dispassionate duty. Where it becomes necessary, in performing this function of a university, to consider political, social, or sectarian movements, they are dissected and examined—not taught, and the conclusion is left, with no tipping of the scales, to the logic of the facts. . . .
>
> The University assumes the right to prevent exploitation of its prestige by . . . those who would use it as a platform for propaganda. . . . The University respects personal belief as the private concern of the individual. It equally respects the constitutional right of the citizen. . . . Its high function—and its high privilege—the University will steadily continue to fulfill, serving the people by providing facilities for investigation and teaching free from domination by parties, sects, or selfish interests. The University expects the State, in return, and to its own great gain, to protect this indispensable freedom, a freedom like the freedom of the press, that is the heritage and the right of a free people.

This excellent defense of academic freedom incorporated elements of a contract with the people of California —a contract which *they* have never broken but which the university has in effect breached by allowing a demagogic sector of the campus community so to distort the meaning of "constitutional rights" as to afford a "platform for propaganda" to extremist groups. If the California public and their legislators reach that conclusion and act on it, then indeed will academic freedom come upon hard days. The main blame will fall on the FSM and its faculty supporters, but some portion of the onus must be shared by the administration that granted so much illegitimate power to these extremists.

The courts have frequently held that it is no infringement of constitutional rights for a college to limit student behavior, speech, and writing in a variety of ways not constitutionally permissible relative to the general public. The general counsel of the Regents has recited a long list of relevant cases in state and federal courts, dating from 1915 to 1965. A few excerpts are pertinent:

1) "The power is inherent in University officials to maintain proper order and decorum on the premises of the University."

2) "A state may adopt such measures . . . as it deems necessary to its duty of supervision and control of its educational institutions."

3) "The maintenance of discipline, the upkeep of the necessary tone and standards of behavior in a body of students in a college, is, of course, a task committed to its faculty and officers, not to the courts."

4) (In a case concerning an arrest for picketing or parading near a courthouse to influence the court): "This statute on its face is a valid law dealing with conduct subject to regulation so as to vindicate important interests of society, and . . . the fact that free speech is intermingled with such conduct does not bring with it constitutional protection." The Regents' counsel remarked concerning this decision that it is "especially significant since it is established by other Supreme Court cases that peaceful picketing and parading are forms of exercising freedoms of expression and association" and hence this decision constitutes a limitation of free speech in the public interest.

As recently as 2 November 1964, the statewide faculty Committee on Academic Freedom recommended a policy with respect to *faculty* political activities—at least as much protected by the Constitution, one presumes, as activities of students not old enough to vote. While many "political" activities "are a part of the normal functions of professors in certain fields," and for these "the use of University facilities . . . is of course entirely legitimate, . . . activities that are political in the sense of being partisan should not involve the use of University facilities." Nevertheless, on 20 November 1964, the Regents reversed their historic policy and

allowed the use of university facilities for the organizing of political activity and the soliciting of funds.

At the same meeting, following the recommendation of both the chancellor and the president, the Regents authorized the reinstatement of the suspended leaders of the FSM; however, they called on the Faculty Committee on Student Conduct to institute disciplinary proceedings against some of the same students for other offenses, largely related to interference with the arrest of an offensive nonstudent. These acts, committed before hundreds of witnesses, had not been considered up to that time by either university or civil authorities. The individuals were charged with preventing an arrest; entrapment of a police car for 32 hours; forcibly blocking the exits of an administrative office so that 67-year-old Dean Katherine Towle and a number of women employees were forced to leave through a window and across a roof; and biting a policeman in the leg and otherwise assaulting the police.

It is to be noted that the Regents did not exact punishment for these offenses but only directed that a faculty committee call the students before them to answer charges. It was in response to this summons that Savio gave the university a contemptuous ultimatum to withdraw its charges within 24 hours or he would "bring the University to a grinding halt." He said, "I don't think anyone here is naive enough to think" they will accept the ultimatum. The university, of course, could not and did not; so Savio led the invasion of Sproul Hall which brought about the arrests of 3 December and the present trial.

The cry of the FSM leaders in response to the faculty committee's summons was that the students were being placed in "double jeopardy" for past offenses; yet they had not been subjected even to the "single jeopardy" of the civil courts for these violations of the criminal law. If, as they insist, their cause was just, why did they not face the faculty committee and expose to the university community the alleged injustice of the charges against them, rather than irresponsibly subjecting almost 700 of their fellows to arrest? They have never, to this day, tried to explain why, instead of four students' answering university charges before a faculty committee, 773 people should be made to face criminal charges before a judge.

What, then, is the meaning of the Berkeley events which has escaped so many who have attempted to analyze them? Contrary to the expressed views of some who assert that this was primarily a movement of idealistic students, with no hint of leadership by outside agitators or professional left-wing revolutionaries, there are many pieces of evidence that establish the true nature of the leadership. The public admissions of some of these leaders (*6*), made when they transformed the FSM into the FSU, support and confirm the concept presented in this article: "Last semester the FSM was not democratic. . . . At that time normal students were not in on the policy-making of the movement. . . . A small group formed the movement. It was necessary to catalyze the students."

The Slate manifesto published in the summer of 1964, *before* the *casus belli* materialized, shows that a left-wing movement against the university was not a fantasy. True, the agitators and professional revolutionaries have been mainly students and ex-students; but their ideology and the publications they peddle are not all homegrown. Some of the other ingredients in the Berkeley explosion were maladroit and discordant administration; active support for the revolutionary student leadership by a segment of the faculty; and—perhaps most importantly—exploitation by the rebellious students of the tactics of the civil rights movement, including civil disobedience, as if the issues were the same at Berkeley and in Mississippi. These ingredients are not peculiar to Berkeley. That they may lead to eruptions in other American universities is attested by a recent report of the activities of the "Students for Academic Freedom" on the campus of Howard University. This is how the president of Howard University, Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., described this movement (*8*): "They do not believe in civil rights for anyone. They thrive on dissension. They create mythical evils and invent issues but do not want solutions to problems. . . . [They] cloak themselves in the mantle of civil righters and plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship." Dr. Nabrit told reporters: "I cannot document it, but I think that in the incidents at Berkeley these people established a beachhead. Now they want to do it here in the East. And they have picked Howard because it is an institution predominantly for Negroes. They want to cloak it in a mantle of civil rights."

These remarks should give cause for reflection to all who ponder the significance of the events at Berkeley for other universities in the United States.

ALEXANDER GRENDON
Donner Laboratory
HARDIN B. JONES
Division of Medical Physics
WILLIAM PETERSEN
Department of Sociology,
University of California, Berkeley

References

1. E. Langer, *Science* **148**, 198, 346 (1965).
2. *Slate Suppl. Rept.* **1**, No. 4 (1964).
3. *Daily Californian* (16 Sept. 1964).
4. N. Glazer, *Commentary* **39**, 40 (1965).
5. *AAUP Bull.* **50**, 186 (1964).
6. *Daily Californian* (29 Apr. 1965).
7. L. W. Eley, *AAUP Bull.* **50**, 6 (1964).
8. New York *Times* (28 Apr. 1965).

The Regents' Role

The crisis was brought on by the illegal activity of a small group of students and supported by a small number of faculty—whose support made the illegal activity possible.

The two articles in *Science* are remarkable, first, in their apparent preconceived picture of the reasons behind the Berkeley crisis, based apparently on interviews with a selected group of students, faculty, and members of the administration of the university at Berkeley. Secondly, these articles are remarkable in their unbelievably naive attack on the Regents of the university, who for generations have provided the protection and support which nourished the greatness of the University of California. The University of California has been noted among state universities, and in fact among all universities, for its remarkable freedom from political influence and from legislative and gubernatorial control, and freedom of speech for its students and faculty. This has always been attributed to the fact that the state constitution has placed the governing of the university in the hands of the Board of Regents. However, they have delegated a substantial portion of this governing authority to the administration and the faculty. . . . No governor can, in one term, appreciably influence the total board by his appointments; this restriction protects the university if his aims are primarily political. Such a board is unique in America. I grew up as the son of a college president in a state where such was not the case, and having trained at Harvard and taught at Yale before coming to California and being familiar

with many other universities here and abroad, I have always been especially conscious of the great freedom of the atmosphere at Berkeley. Yet, in the present crisis, and in these articles, the Regents are being attacked—seemingly as the cause of the whole crisis. What have the Regents done? Is it sinful that some of them are leaders in industry or in science or in business, economics, or cultural activity? What evidence is there that the Regents are doing anything but continuing their support of this fine university and freedom for its students and faculty?

Have they interfered in the present crisis? On the contrary, they have been exceedingly patient. They are a distinguished group of men and women who are dedicated to the freedom and welfare of the faculty and students of the university. As far as I have been able to learn, they in no way have tried to administer or to dictate to the faculty or administration. In fact, many citizens of the state and nation and many faculty and students have been appalled at their lack of action when action seemed important in the present crisis—and this can be explained only by their extreme patience with, and love for, the university and their knowledge of its importance to the future of this state and country, and their hesitancy to make a move which might damage the university and its future.

Only in one instance—and this is only based on newspaper reports—did the Regents apparently tend toward interference with the administration of the university. This was in the matter of the obscenity cases. That these cases aroused their concern is hardly remarkable, and their desire for prompt action would be better understood if the nature of the problem were known to the general public or the average critic of the Berkeley scene.

I attended one of the obscene sessions at Sproul Plaza. Photographs and recordings document the proceedings which I and several of my colleagues heard. For about one hour, a remarkable series of speeches by students and nonstudents were made, using obscene words time and time again, describing group sexual intercourse, arguing that sexual activities on the campus should be as free as for the dogs, and so forth. These remarks were audible hundreds of yards away. They were addressed to approximately 2000 students and others in the plaza, either standing or walking by, who were forced to hear the monotonous repetition of obscene words and their use in lewd context which, in any modern society, should not be forced on anyone—man, woman, boy, or girl. . . .

My colleagues and I, finding out an hour after the performance that the administration had not immediately called the speakers in for disciplinary action, went to the campus police station to cause their arrest but learned that complaints against the offenders had just been signed by a student.

The tragedy of Berkeley up to the present time is that there has been no prompt and firm discipline for students guilty of acts interfering with the purpose of the university. The false idea that the courts must decide whether a rule has been broken is unique in American university history, but this idea is urged by the radical left today in Berkeley. The final tragedy is propagation of the concept, either misguided or dishonest (I believe the latter), that the crisis can be blamed on the Regents of the University of California . . .

I am confident that in the near future most of the facts will become widely recognized and that the university will then continue its career of great contributions to the teaching of students, to the advancement of knowledge, and to its traditional service to the state and nation. The public at large and scientists in particular have the right to expect that *Science* will attempt to be accurate in reporting grave sociological phenomena.

JOHN H. LAWRENCE
220 Glorietta Road, Orinda, California

Future of the University

Langer's report is a relatively clear account of what is actually an extremely complex and generally confusing crisis. Two comments may be appropriate: one regarding President Clark Kerr's "resignation," the other relating to the future of the University.

Kerr did not resign. He called a press conference at which he announced his intent to resign at the next meeting of the Board of Regents. The reaction to this announcement was so swift and so full of regret from students, faculties, the Regents, and the general public, that Kerr was persuaded to carry on. He received an overwhelming expression of confidence from all concerned and did not enter into a formal act of resigning the presidency. His procedure was followed by genuine relief and by earnest indications of firm endeavor to go along with his conciliatory efforts.

The University of California is a relatively young institution; its centennial is three years hence. It is very much alive, and "kicking" vigorously, as one would expect in a healthy youngster. Its students are intelligent, its faculty is competent, and its administration is understanding. Some of its nine campuses are just beginning to develop. All are in the throes of intensive planning to develop teaching excellence directed toward individual students, even in the face of anonymity of huge numbers. All are devoted to solid research, with detailed effort to balance the sciences with humanities, and with direction toward ethically acceptable goals. All are involved in offering extensive intellectual and often practical service to the public. These matters were intensively explored at the 20th All-University Faculty Conference held at the Riverside campus 11–14 April. All in attendance were exhilarated at the evidence of faculty and administrative wisdom and determination. Several regents were present and won acclaim for their good-willed pleas for a tolerant approach to conflicting points of view.

The Berkeley situation is indicative of the growing ferment of undergraduate frustrations at the inevitable tensions which arise as a result of population pressures. In learning to understand the development of these frustrations from the common anxieties of our times, and in acquiring self-discipline in preventing the focusing of these frustrations, the students, faculty, and administration at Berkeley are openly trying to find ways to resolve the complex difficulties besetting all our major educational institutions. The people of California respect the effort, and will continue to do all they can to maintain the best possible system of higher education for their youngsters.

CHAUNCEY D. LEAKE
University of California Health Center and *Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco*

Statements Challenged

. . . This disrespect for law and established standards of orderly conduct is abhorrent to the majority of Californians. Even those whose sympathies are with the goals of the FSM agree that the means used cannot be justified, especially in view of the fact that well-known and established methods

of legal redress were not utilized. And, while the actions of the demonstrators were shocking, even more shocking was the inept handling of the situation by the university administration.

Although many of the statements in the Langer report can be challenged, certain of those in part II are most misleading. To say that "it is only Berkeley that has placed the university as a whole in a position of leadership in American higher education" does a disservice to the other campuses of the University of California. The majority of students and faculty are located on other campuses, and the implication is that these are inferior to the Berkeley campus. Yet the entry requirements are as stringent at the other campuses as they are at Berkeley. The quality of scientific research is not inferior at these campuses. And certainly neither the teaching nor administration is inferior. The university's great position in higher education is attained in a large measure through its multi-campus concept. Each campus can point to something it offers academically that Berkeley does not. When put together, these make the University of California great. All are an integral part of a single educational system.

The actions of the administration, faculty, and students at the other campuses with respect to this controversy have been admirable and certainly acceptable by community standards. Neither students' rights, education, nor research have been compromised on these campuses. The "tradeoff between . . . student 'beatniks' and . . . academic distinction," to use Langer's phrase, does not seem to be necessary at these campuses. Langer says that many Californians want a "respectable" rather than a great university. I do not know how many; I do know that the majority of Californians would agree on and strive to maintain what we have had in the past: a state university both great and respectable.

RONALD L. KATHREN
14744 Washington Avenue, San Leandro, California 94578

The Basic Priorities

The articles on the Berkeley "student revolt" constituted excellent coverage of that unhappy situation. Although *Science*'s articles touched on the basic problems involved, most of the editorials and news stories I've seen missed the mark by a wide margin.

The American public (including many scientists and educators) evinces an appalling lack of understanding of (i) the aims of education, (ii) the current pressures on students, and (iii) the nature of university administration. Education should encourage all possible freedom of thought, speech, and action that will contribute to the intellectual, moral, and physical growth of the learner. At Berkeley this dictum was forgotten or overlooked by all four groups involved—students, faculty, administrators, and regents. Owing to several factors—such as enormous enrollment increases and plant expansion, emphasis on faculty and graduate research, disregard for undergraduate teaching and guidance, inept administrative and board decisions—pressures on students blew the safety valve.

One solution to the dilemma is for all of us to recognize that each of the four campus-related groups has a specific or primary role. When these roles are reversed, or otherwise mixed up, serious dislocations occur. At the risk of oversimplifying, scholars of higher education have suggested the following basic priorities: Students are on campus to study; faculty members are there to teach; administrators should manage, negotiate, and facilitate; trustees and regents should establish the governing policies. The American public is composed of these four academically related groups, plus hundreds of other interested groups such as parents, alumni, donors, and legislators. Each person in each group can make a significant contribution to the alleviation of such pressures as caused the "revolt" at Berkeley. The first step should be in understanding the dimensions of the three numbered points above. The second step should be the acceptance of a position on these points. The third step should be a willingness to express this position by suggesting appropriate action. Really constructive criticism is in short supply!

This nation is great at least partly because of the education provided its citizens. It should be the responsibility of every citizen to take the steps necessary to insure that our schools, colleges, and universities will continue, if not improve, their important function of educating for freedom, democracy, and justice.

GERALD P. BURNS
Independent College Funds of America, Inc., 7004 Empire State Building, New York, New York 10001