

tainly opportunity abounds, but opportunity for security, not adventure. To many of us the world seems bureaucratized, a kind of massive civil service. I do not mean to toll the bell of doom. But this helplessness is there, and its existence helps explain the increased popularity of politics, journalism, and, especially, civil rights—all fields in which an individual can assert himself and in which the restrictions on adventure are more the result of self-will than the system.

And it is in this context, against this background, that student unrest has led to student activity in the 1960s. Action—above all, political action—came partially as a result of the excitement conveyed by President Kennedy's example and his ideas. It was also the crystallization of discontent that remained inchoate but real, under a blanket of apathy, in the 1950s.

The rise of involvement, which has been the most significant development in our four years at Harvard, is both natural and healthy. It has brought to the surface discontent that had long existed below. It has made students aware of problems of education and society, and has provided the added dimension of commitment.

At their best, protests and demonstrations can lead to more penetrating thinking about issues of deep concern, as the teach-ins on Vietnam have done. Even at their worst, they can compel people who have not thought before to think, to clarify, to form opinions.

But action for the sake of action should not become the motto of student unrest. Doubtless, though, in the years ahead, at Harvard and elsewhere, there will be outbursts that defy reason and countermand good sense. There will be outbursts that lack constructive ends and well-defined aims.

In such cases, authority should display all the tolerance and forbearance it can muster. Of course, there are bounds beyond which disrespect cannot go, but these should be bounds of law, not of taste or personal judgment.

And those who are dissatisfied or actively rebel should remember that theirs ought not to be an attack to destroy the machine, as Mario Savio said, but an attempt by man to assert himself over the machine. Theirs should not be a battle between individuals and society, but an attempt by individuals to overcome all that is stultifying and dehumanizing in society.

Unless based on such beliefs, student unrest will become only a negative force. Its protests will present a shrill, irritating dissonance rather than a critical voice that can be heard and hopefully heeded. Without genuine commitment to reason and understanding, student activists will alienate their sympathizers

and at the same time justify their critics.

But despite some doubts about the future of student unrest, I do not envision an inevitable process of degeneration and deterioration, as some educators and writers have suggested. I do not believe that anarchy will become its philosophy or irresponsibility its hallmark. The vast majority of us who are dissatis-

fied shun ideology. Instead, we seek to find honest alternatives that permit adventure without destroying principle. Ours is not an unrest to be feared or suppressed. Rather, it should be accepted, tolerated, and encouraged, for from it can come fresh thoughts and new directions, as America examines and questions the quality of its life.

2. *A Radical Frame of Mind*

By ROCHELLE GATLIN

COLLEGE STUDENTS of the 1960s are different from those of ten years ago. Specific issues in which questions of ethics are sharply defined have impelled them to reject the beat-style withdrawal of the 1950s. To paraphrase Crane Brinton, "Many of the new generation have thrown themselves into movements like the Peace Corps, civil rights, disarmament, and international government. They do this often to the accompaniment of words of despair and anger, but their deeds belie their words." Many of the same students who heroically went to Mississippi last summer were carried out of Sproul Hall last winter. Although the Berkeley Free Speech Movement contained a few hipsters and revolutionary zealots, there was a surprisingly large proportion of what U.C. graduate Michael Miller calls the most intellectually serious and morally alert students on campus, who demand the most from the university, who are concerned with putting knowledge of the past to work in the present and who believe that the educational process should provide a continuum between ideas and social action.

Fortunately demonstrations, sit-ins, and arrests are not the only ways to affect university and social reform. The Free Speech Movement was a dramatic event that occasioned sensational headlines, but at other institutions less publicized programs have been initiated. For example, the Committee for an Ideal Campus at Brandeis University in Massachusetts is an officially recognized organization, which receives a budget from the associated student body. Some of the programs of this committee include: compiling a critique of professors and courses, tabulating a student-faculty poll intended to ascertain what issues concern the campus community, making plans for a national convention of similar student groups, and initiating the Spinoza Institute—which will offer non-graded courses and seminars next fall in the Modern Cinema, Eastern Thought, Psychedelic Stimulants, and the History of Peace Movements.

In its first Statement of Purpose, the Committee for an Ideal Campus summed

up principles which are advanced by student reformers and university critics all over the country. This statement says in part:

We believe that the ideal university is an intellectual community of teachers and students. . . . knowledge is advanced as a force which is personally relevant and meaningful, not as a commodity which is produced and marketed. . . .

By virtue of its intellectual freedom, the university can serve society as a center of independent thought and criticism. The members of the university may challenge undesirable customs and values, offer suggestions for their improvement, and exercise their rights as citizens to participate in social and political action.

Obviously the constant scrutiny of university and social practices found in the above declaration may lead to unrest, but I do not believe that unrest is something that can or should be "remedied" by suppression. To state this positively, the effect of current student unrest may be a critical analysis—even exposé—of hypocritical practices in relation to traditional American values of peace, equality, and individual freedom. For example, it took the Freedom Riders and the registering of disenfranchised Southern Negroes—and unfortunately the murder of a few white Northerners—to focus the country's attention on the wide discrepancy between the ideal and the practice of equality.

One characteristic of socially alert students is their dissatisfaction with and even discarding of the liberalism of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Clark Kerr. Stanley Kauffmann has expressed the growing irrelevance of liberalism with its optimistic belief in progress by saying that although liberal sentiments are unimpeachable, they are almost irresponsible in the light of existing conditions—the contemporary equivalent of a hundred Hail Marys to avert the Black Plague. To many students, there is something ineffectual about the liberal bureaucrat with his tools of mediation and compromise. Furthermore, (as Michael Miller has said in a recent article in *Dissent*) "the more militant (Continued on page 103)

A PLATFORM FOR CITIZEN-STUDENTS

By ABRAHAM Z. BASS, *education writer, The Milwaukee Journal.*

CAMPUS student governments, long scorned by student activists as pallid reflections of administration policy, are beginning to assume a vital role in the campus movements for educational and social reform. The growth of active student political groups, covering the whole political spectrum, has taught students that the boundaries of their classroom are actually the boundaries of the world. Now student government officers are striving to join the militant leaders in order to bring a sense of vitality and involvement into the student government.

Because of the strength of this movement the eighteenth annual Congress of the National Student Association, a confederation of some 300-odd student governments, last month in Wisconsin took its firmest stand so far in support of student involvement in campus, community, and national affairs. In essence the Congress declared:

When all responsible efforts at negotiation have failed, students should actively, non-violently protest the unjust policies of the college administration.

When the war on poverty and for civil rights stalls, students should attempt to organize rent strikes, sit-ins and boycotts.

When the federal government ignores their stand on foreign affairs, students should hold teach-ins as a creative and legitimate way to make their opinions felt.

These declarations were passed by student body leaders from 310 colleges and universities, representing one-fourth of the students in American higher education. In a series of policy decisions, they emphasized that both students and student governments should be where the action is.

To this end, the congress came to the support financially and philosophically of the Free Speech Movement at the University of California. The resolution, passed 274 to 19 after four hours of floor debate and a week of continuous discussion, strongly affirmed the rights and duty of students to participate fully in society. The delegates then urged the individual student governments to raise money to pay for legal expenses of

students arrested in the incidents at Berkeley.

Broadening this principle, the delegates instructed NSA officers "to offer all possible support in the form of fund raising, publicity, mediation, and coordination of support efforts of member campuses for any protest movement taking place on the campus of a member school and whose ends and means are in accord with NSA policy."

Actions proposed for dealing with off-campus affairs were equally militant. In a resolution on "The Student and the City," the Congress said that students had an important role in eliminating slums "by actively working in the community to develop leadership and organization." Social action and civil disobedience were again endorsed as means of forcing action.

Humphrey On Student Action

"I wish to suggest that ample opportunity does exist for dissent, for protest, and for nonconformity. But I must also say that the right to be heard does not automatically include the right to be taken seriously. The latter depends entirely upon what is being said, and how often or how loudly."

• • •

"I am here today to salute those students who not only voice constructive criticism and wholesome dissent, but who by the logic and substance of their arguments have compelled the citizens of America to pay attention to their views—to take them seriously."

• • •

"The tactics of freedom rides, sit-ins, and picket lines have been crucial factors in tearing down the barriers of legalized discrimination in America. The protests were legitimate. They dramatized outrageous conduct against fellow citizens. And they pricked the conscience of America."

—From an address by Vice President Hubert Humphrey before the National Student Association, August 23, 1965

The delegates also told their officers to begin a program of action aiding the nonviolent civil rights movements. This position is not completely new for the congress, which has been supporting civil rights for a long time, a position which has led to the withdrawal of some conservative members. Now the delegates have instructed their officers to be ready to act wherever and whenever the next confrontation should develop.

The most time-consuming single subject at the congress, however, was Vietnam. The debate began in the opening days of the meeting in a seminar on Asia, and concluded with a resolution calling on the United States Government to stop the bombing of North Vietnam as "a positive step toward a cease fire," but saying that the United States presence in South Vietnam is one of the elements necessary until guarantees can be found to assure self-determination to the South Vietnamese.

The final resolution was a compromise, with the more radical students wanting a bigger slap at the government and the more conservative students also slightly disappointed. In the liberals' informal caucus, any demand for immediate withdrawal of American troops had been squelched.

An amendment made it clear that the delegates thought students should be heard on subjects of national purpose and concern.

This resolution and others are intended to do more than merely reflect the opinions of the student leaders representing their campuses. They must also serve as guidelines for the NSA international affairs vice president in his dealings in the diplomatic world of international student cooperation and meetings.

Since NSA is a loose confederation of student governments, the congress can only make recommendations to its member campus units. Thus, the delegates primarily create policy and project mandates for the national officers. The resulting national programs guide and serve the individual campuses, providing direction and a link.

So the final practical question is whether the delegates can carry back some of the congress enthusiasm to their campuses and lead this vast number of citizen-students, eager to participate in society, in the spirit with which the congress concluded—the singing, one after the other, of the National Anthem and "We Shall Overcome."