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The term “The Movement” is associated with a number of social and political events that rocked college campuses in the 1960s. Current literature on the student movement of this decade often does not mention students at other types of institutions and sometimes fails to put into perspective the actual percentage of students who participated in active demonstration. This thesis presents a new view of student activism by exploring how small, private, religiously affiliated institutions used the public forum of collegiate publications to contribute to the dialogue surrounding various political and social movements of the 1960s.

Student editorials and letters to the editors in the campus publications at Ashland College in Ohio, Ohio Wesleyan University, and Hillsdale College in Michigan were analyzed from the year 1960-1970 to determine student opinions on the Civil Rights Movement, Vietnam War, Free Speech Movement and student protest, and the shootings at Kent State University. Through the analysis of major themes and perceptions of these student voices, the study provides implications for future research and practice regarding student activism in the 21st century.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Perceptions and interpretations of historical events are often influenced by the passage of time, context, and personal convictions. The varying influences on the dissemination of history often lead to diverse analyses of a single event or period of time. The history of 1960s America is not immune from this effect, most notably when it comes to analysis regarding the environment of the American university. This period was a time of general discontent between President Nixon’s “silent majority” and those Americans who continued to press for the civil rights, free speech, an end to the Vietnam War, and deplored violence like the Kent State University shootings.

Context of the Study

Post World War II America was a time of social, political, and economic boom. The United States was arguably the world’s most powerful and wealthy country and its influence was seen around the world in the restructuring of post-war Europe and in the wide spread success of American popular culture. The late 1950s was also a time of greater and easier access to higher education for many Americans. Along with the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 which provided free tuition and other benefits to those who had served in the military, Congress passed the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA) in 1958 which for the first time allocated federal aid for education including loans to college students (Young & Young, 2004). This commitment to education in the late 1950s combined with the baby boom following the end of the war would lead to a record number of young people entering American colleges and universities in the 1960s. Throughout the decade the number of students in higher education degree programs increased from 3,216,000 to 7,136,000 almost doubling the number of college students by the end of 1969 (Faber & Bailey, 2001, p. 346). This massive increase of college aged students in
the American population would make the college campus a more significant and relevant environment in society than it had been previously. Reilly (2003) noted:

A consequence of this expanding college population was that the campus became the center for a large portion of the youth culture. It is reasonable to surmise that much of the civil rights and anti-war activity of the decade might not have occurred without the growing strength of this college population. (p. 24)

This rapid expansion of youth combined with the large increase of students on college campuses led to a growing belief that the youth of America and older generations were pitted against one another with divergent world views. According to a poll in 1969, 73% of Americans said there was a “major difference in the point of view of young people and older people today” (Faber & Bailey, 2001, p. 348). These older generations were identified and labeled as the “silent majority” by Richard Nixon in November of 1969. Political pundits later used the term to describe Americans who were disillusioned with the Civil Rights Movement, Vietnam war protests, and the overall environment of revolt (Faber & Bailey, 2001).

The battleground where members of the silent majority and those pushing for a more progressive agenda often became volatile was America’s college and university campuses. In the early 1960s, college students first spoke out against racism and segregation by participating in sit-ins at local restaurants which only served White customers (Faber & Bailey, 2001). In 1962, during their time as students at the University of Michigan, Al Haber and Tom Hayden began the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and produced the Port Huron Statement which became an expression of a commitment to participatory democracy (Reilly, 2003). Mario Savio, the face of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, fought for students’ First Amendment rights following the implementation of policies by the University of California- Berkeley to
restrict the ability of organizations to recruit individuals for civil rights work. Later in the
decade, students would rally around the cause to end the Vietnam War. One of the largest
rallying points in the anti war movement was the War Moratorium held on October 15, 1969 on
campuses across the country. The Moratorium provided an opportunity for students to either
demonstrate against the war effort or participate in various dialogues regarding the current
the country were the focus of the nation’s attention when four students were shot and killed
during a confrontation between anti—war demonstrators and members of the National Guard.

While university administrators often tried to suppress the protesting that occurred on
their campuses, the resources and organization of the university served as the ideal place for
young thinkers to congregate and share their ideas. Specifically, the campus newspaper provided
a public forum for students to inform others of their position, cause, or plan for action. For
example, while at the University of Michigan, Tom Hayden served as the editor of the main
student publication, the Michigan Daily, and Mario Savio used the Daily Californian frequently
to share his hopes and dreams of an ideal America.

Although the issue of campus protest and violence was a legitimate concern of the
American public during this decade, Reilly (2003) noted that campus unrest can be placed out of
context in today’s literature.

While large numbers of young people were marching against the Vietnam War, working
on behalf of civil rights for the nation’s minority citizens … large numbers of other
young men and women were doing what their parents had done (or at least aspired to do):
get a good education, find a job, buy a house, raise a family, support the government, and
attend church regularly. (p. 24)
Trepidation of the American public facing a new and rapidly growing youth culture in the United States during the 1960s combined with the fascination of this decade in the historical literature of today, not only results in skewed perception of the frequency and quantity of student demonstrations on campuses, it also fails to acknowledge the large number of college students at institutions other than large, state universities, who did not choose to participate in campus protest. This ultimately results in a weaker understanding of the American college landscape during this decade.

Statement of the Problem

A majority of the research surrounding student activism in the 1960s is focused on the opinions of students attending large, public, and predominately research intensive institutions. Brown and Brown (2001) noted that decisions made by the mass media during this time period had a large influence on the focus of research on student activism. “Relatively few studies on the anti-war movement focus on specific universities, and those that do deal with the handful of universities that received extensive media attention during the 1960s and 1970s” (p. 120). The concentration of the mass media on certain institutions during the time period, combined with a focus on large and often public institutions, can result in a manipulation of how history portrays student activism and higher education throughout this decade.

By focusing primarily on large universities with sizeable student populations such as the University of Michigan or University of California- Berkeley, current literature on the student movement can fail to put into perspective the actual percentage of students who participated in active demonstration. Anderson (1995) noted, “Numbers are not precise, but it appears that between 1965 and 1968 only 2 or 3 percent of students considered themselves activists while 20 percent had participated in at least one demonstration” (p. 4). In accordance with Anderson’s
observation that self—described student activists may have been more of a minority than current literature has portrayed, Wynkoop (2002) acknowledged that student organization membership reflected that students often aligned with conservative political thinking.

It is important to remember that during the 1960s Young Americans for Freedom, a conservative political group, and Youth for Christ, a fundamentalist religious youth group, had more members than Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) or any other leftist organization had. (p. 68)

In an attempt to understand why the large block of conservative—minded college students are often unacknowledged in literature surrounding 1960s student activism, Wynkoop noted that the nature of their activism was less exciting and thus was not often discussed.

Conservative and moderate students found themselves reacting to activists’ demonstrations, which made them less visible and, consequently, less memorable. But the fact remains that anti—war activists understood that they were a minority and that their struggle was one that placed them on the edges of the American, political, social and cultural spectrum. (p. 68)

Conversely, at the beginning of the decade some students embraced student activism through the conservative movement as noted by Lee (1970).

What was interesting about the early Sixties was that the trend toward greater activism was also taking place on the political Right. Editor Peter Stuart of the Michigan Daily observed in 1961: ‘The signs point to a revival of interest in individualism and decentralization of power—principles espoused by John Locke and Thomas Jefferson and rekindled by Barry Goldwater.’ Interestingly, the reason given by many students for turning to the conservative movement was the rebellion against conformity. (p. 114)
Further research on these students and institutions can contribute to the history of this era, as well as acknowledge the various ways in which institutional type shapes the collegiate experience in America.

Need for the Study

Because current research on student activism in the 1960s focuses primarily on the abundance of primary sources available on large public institutions, there is a lack of research on the larger majority of students who either did not protest or who attended institutions where demonstrations did not take place or were not largely publicized. The concentration of study on the protesting that did happen is often not supplemented with a discussion of the campuses and students who did not protest, thus creating the perception that student activism (especially violent student activism) was a norm on all campuses.

A second significant focus, which is missing from the literature on student unrest during this decade, is an analysis of other institutional types which may have experienced various forms of activism, but because of their size, lack of notoriety, or the nature of the activism did not receive media attention at the time thus leading them to less likely be the focus of future literature. The purpose of this study was to research student publications at three small, private, religiously-affiliated colleges.

Research Questions

The focus of this research was an analysis of small, private, religiously affiliated institutions’ student publications during the 1960s to identify major themes surrounding the issues of the Civil Rights Movement, the Free Speech Movement, the Vietnam War, and the student shootings at Kent State University. By analyzing student editorials and letters to the editor, in each respective student publication, the researcher achieved a general understanding of
how students at these small private universities used student publications to respond to the leading political issues of the decade. The first research question addressed in this study was whether students at these institutions used the medium of the student publication to discuss the four issues. The second research question that this study addressed was what framework students tended to use in order to analyze these national issues. Did they observe policy and affairs from an internal (i.e., university) perspective or did they rely on events happening externally to support their arguments and opinions? This study also addressed whether students established a relationship between attending a small, private, religiously affiliated university and their perspective on these issues. This research also focused on what contributed to a lack of violent protest from students at these institutions. Did students not protest because they supported the status quo or were there other reasons that led them to not perceive protesting as an option? The final research question was whether there was a significant difference between the institutions in how their student publications addressed the four issues analyzed in the study.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

General Context of the 1960s

Accusations of encroachment on rights are often contentious, passionate, and well-publicized. Throughout the 1960s, the defense of basic freedoms was fought aggressively in myriad environments within our society, the most controversial possibly being the nation’s college campuses. Throughout this decade, college students across the country protested against university administration policies that they perceived as infringing on students’ First Amendment rights. Landmark Supreme Court cases such as Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District, 393 U.S. 503 (1969) would eventually protect students’ right to freedom of speech within the school environment, but an exploration into the extent of free speech prior to these rulings demonstrates unregulated control by an institution over the speech of their students.

Prior to the ruling in Tinker, students had little legal precedent to assure that they were equally protected under the Constitution. As a result, students’ ability to express free speech was at the whim of a university’s administration. Throughout the decade of the 1960s America’s university students spoke out on a variety of issues ranging from civil rights, to dissatisfaction with the nation’s involvement in the Vietnam War. While some students took physical action for their causes by going out into the streets, many of the battles of the decade were intellectual and took place across the editorial pages of campus newspapers.

Higher Education in the 1960s

Higher education during the 1960s underwent significant transformations for numerous reasons, but one of the main catalysts for change was the unprecedented number of students coming into America’s colleges and universities during the decade. Lee (1970) noted the variable which had the largest impact on the influx of college students during this timeframe.
The first of the post-World War II baby boom were entering college in 1965 and the scramble to build and expand hit the big state universities and all others who did not hold down their registrations. Not only were there more young people than ever before, but more were entering college. (p. 122)

In addition to the postwar baby boom, and a more qualified student body in general, students had new opportunities when it came to choosing an institutional type. Two year community colleges enrolled one and a half million students in 1966, an increase of six fold from the previous decade (Lee, 1970). Another trend seen in higher education during this time was a growing number of students who spent their college years at more than one institution. Approximately one fourth of every college graduating class consisted of students who did not begin at that institution originally (Lee, 1970, p. 122).

An additional impact that large enrollments had on higher education was general student dissatisfaction with their collegiate experience. The strain placed on university resources combined with the culture of academia to produce original research, left students feeling abandoned in the classroom. Wynkoop (2002) addressed the tactics that America’s “multiversities” used to spread their resources in order to accommodate their expanding student body.

University administrators from Harvard to Michigan to Berkeley responded to growing enrollments and increased demand for faculty research grants by increasing class sizes, using teaching assistants as instructors, and relying on televised lectures. (p. 26) Lee (1970) also discussed the disconnect students felt between themselves and their instructors. “Large universities, particularly public universities, were by the mid-Sixties being criticized for the neglect of teaching. To respond to the criticism that professors must ‘publish or perish.’
student evaluation of teaching performance became common” (p. 122). Along with the perception that professors’ primary reason for being in the classroom was to support their own continued research efforts, students seemed disillusioned with the subject matter within their courses. With so many fervent issues being played out across the national landscape, students had difficulty understanding how mundane lectures prepared them to solve the world’s problems. Brubacher and Rudy (1976) discussed the discrepancy students perceived between their classroom work and the world outside the campus walls.

Just what criteria were the students using for relevance? For one thing, they thought that the conventional curriculum held inexcusably aloof from contemporary moral and political forces in their environment such as war, race riots, psychedelic drugs, sex—indeed a whole new counterculture. (p. 278)

One response to this lack of relevancy in the curriculum was the idea of the “free university.” Brubacher and Rudy (1976) explained the dynamics of this alternative learning environment. “The ‘free university’ thus was a voluntary association of those who wanted to learn with those who wanted to teach. Nothing was either prescribed or proscribed. The curriculum reflected students; otherwise the instructor had no students” (p. 279). Anderson (1995) offered an example of the type of “free university” which sprang up around college towns in the mid Sixties. ‘Prerequisite: Curiosity’ was the sign at the University of Man at Kansas State, as teachers throughout the nation volunteered lessons on everything from abstract art to mechanics” (p. 274).

The amalgamation of students’ frustration with America’s polarizing issues and an inadequate collegiate experience led many students to some form of activism. Lee (1970) addressed the overarching perception of the American campus near the end of the decade.
By the late Sixties, it was difficult to be a college student and not participate in, or be affected by, some kind of ‘in’—sit-in, sleep in, stand-in. A Gallup poll estimated that 20 percent of students participated in some kind of protest… the mood of Campus, U.S.A., was one of confrontation, escalation and protest. (p. 136)

He later put the student activism of the decade into perspective by making a comparison between the number of student participants and incidents in relation to the total number of institutions and college students in the United States during the decade. “Of the 2,500 colleges and universities in the United States, scarcely two dozen were seriously disrupted. Of the 6,700,000 college students, perhaps only 2 percent can be considered radical” (Lee, 1970, p. 142). He was also quick to note that quantifying the campus unrest does not do justice to the impact the events of this decade had on the American public, both students and others alike.

But the events of the Sixties affected far more colleges and many more individuals than those bare statistics would indicate. It was more than just the media that frequently magnified incidents because of the insatiable public appetite for such news. (p. 142)

**Status of Small Private Colleges in the 1960s**

While the dilemmas of the large state universities of America were playing out quite publicly during the 1960s, the small, private, college was facing its own demons during this period. Although they may not have made headlines or the nightly news regularly, the small private colleges were still responsible for educating a significant number of students during this time. In June of 1971 Clark Kerr, then Chairman of The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and previous president of the University of California- Berkeley, wrote in a foreword: “Almost half a million students in the United States attend private four-year colleges with relatively small enrollments and moderately selective or unselective admissions policies. These
institutions constitute about one-third of all four year colleges in the country” (Astin & Lee, 1972, p. xi). The book in which Kerr’s statement was featured was The Invisible Colleges, featuring research conducted in the late 1960s on behalf of the Carnegie Commission of Higher Education on small, private, colleges in America. Through their research on these universities Astin and Lee (1972) coined the phrase “invisible college” to describe the serious issues facing small, private, moderately selective, or unselective universities at the end of the 1960s.

At the heart of this dilemma is the confusion of the invisible college over its role and identity. So far, no one has developed a strategy for the salvation of invisible colleges that does not jeopardize either their small size or their private status. Therefore, salvation has rested in faith: faith in traditional purposes, faith in their Christian mission (in the case of church-related colleges), faith in the values of smallness and of freedom from state interference and control. (p. 95)

In their 1968-1969 study on the visibility of colleges and universities in the United States, the researchers concluded that the two characteristics which played the largest role in the level of notoriety of an institution were selectivity and size (Astin & Lee, 1972). Colleges which lacked both of these attributes were considered to be in serious jeopardy of surviving. Astin and Lee detailed the vicious cycle brought on by the characteristics of the “invisible college” and its lack of national visibility.

Because the invisible college is private, it gets only limited support from the state.

Because it is unknown, it suffers in the competition for federal grants. Because its financial resources are pitifully scant, it cannot make attractive offers to students needing financial help. Because the invisible college is often church related in a society that is
increasingly secular, it must grapple with the question of retaining affiliation of severing the bonds with its parent church. (p. 11)

Ultimately, the history of higher education in the 1960s cannot be told only through the narrative of the large, public, state institution. The exceptional enrollment numbers, and the relentless media coverage of student unrest (while captivating) was not the summation of nearly 500,000 college students’ experience in American higher education in the 1960s.

The Civil Rights Movement: The Beginning of Student Dissent

The 1964 student protests at the University of California-Berkeley are often viewed as the events which sparked student unrest in the 1960s, but student protest against inequality had been underway since the turn of the decade. In February of 1960, four African American college students in North Carolina asked to be served at a White-only lunch counter. When they were refused service they remained seated and persevered through verbal and physical harassment until they were served a cup of coffee (Farber & Bailey, 2001, p. 16). Over the next several months, individuals across the South began to participate in this form of civil disobedience with 70,000 people in 150 cities following in the footsteps of the four college students (Faber & Bailey, 2001). Over the next several years, college students became committed to helping end Jim Crow racism.

As the push for civil rights continued, college students traveled to states like Alabama and Mississippi to gain support for granting voting rights to African Americans. When a new school year began in the fall of 1964, some students’ previous summer in Mississippi and the goal of equality were still heavily on their minds. Mario Savio in a speech titled “An End to History,” described how his experience in the Mississippi Summers influenced his perceptions of student rights.
Last summer I went to Mississippi to join the struggle there for civil rights. This fall I am engaged in another phase of the same struggle, this time in Berkeley …. The same rights are at stake in both places—the right to participate as citizens in a democratic society and the right to due process of law (Wallerstein & Starr, 1971 p. 419).

Anderson (1995) discussed how students returning from working for civil rights in the South began to see their own environments differently. “As young Americans became involved [in the Mississippi Summers] they also realized that hypocrisy and inequality were not just a ‘southern problem’” (p. 82).

A year later, another event revived the vigor for civil rights among college students across the nation. On March 21, 1965, Martin Luther King Jr. led over 3,000 White and Black activists on a march from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama (Anderson, 1995). Selma had for years been used as the city to represent the need for voting rights for African Americans. Anderson (1995) discussed how seeing advancement in the Civil Rights Movement encouraged students to believe that they could initiate progress on their own campuses.

Most students of the sixties generation agreed. The few who had become active during the year could look back at successes in the South and on their campuses—they could make a difference …. Selma also provoked other students into action, not only at larger universities but also at smaller ones. (p. 119)

Mario Savio and other student activists in the mid 1960s articulated how the Civil Rights Movement influenced their decision to advocate for other forms of equality such as the First Amendment right to free speech. Many of the same students would become ardent opponents of another major political issue in the 1960s, the Vietnam War. Anderson discussed how individuals who participated in the Civil Rights Movement continued their involvement in
political action. “Some of the first anti-war feelings had been expressed by students who felt part of the movement and had participated in civil rights demonstrations or in Freedom Summer” (Anderson, 1995, p. 138).

Free Speech Movement and Student Protest

In the fall of 1964, students at the University of California- Berkeley became outraged when administrators of the university prohibited civil rights workers from recruiting students on Telegraph Avenue, a stretch of road well known as an area in which organizations typically recruited and distributed information (Farber & Bailey, 2001, p. 199). Many student organizations at the university believed the ban to be a violation of their First Amendment rights and ignored the new policy. When university officials ordered five university students to attend disciplinary hearings because of their violation of the ban, hundreds showed up to be tried, and when 4,000 students gathered to protest the arrest of individuals trying to distribute information in front of the Administration Building, the spontaneous protest was hailed as the beginning of the Free Speech Movement (Farber & Bailey, 2001, p. 199).

Wallerstein and Starr (1971) noted that although the Free Speech Movement was not a single issue movement, many of the goals these students wished to see come to fruition were connected by the right which had united them in the beginning. “[T]he Berkeley students centered their demands for reform around the greatest of liberal themes: free speech” (Wallerstein & Starr, 1971, p. xxiii).

The Free Speech Movement, which began at Berkeley in the fall of 1964, would later come to encompass a variety of causes beyond First Amendment rights. As it grew and transformed, the movement would represent and support civil rights, women’s liberation, and the
end to the Vietnam War. Anderson (1995) described how the movement underwent a variety of transformations throughout the 1960s.

Activists defined and redefined their movement throughout the era. In the early years demonstrators referred to the “struggle” for civil rights while others later felt part of “student power” or the peace movement.” (Preface)

The progression of time as well as regional and institutional type became significant factors in the direction of the student movement, as well as the way in which it was perceived by the general public.

The Vietnam War- Growing Dissent

Although American involvement in Vietnam had been going on for nearly six years, campus protest against the war did not gain widespread attention until the spring of 1965. Gilbert (2001) noted that the event which fostered intense anti—war efforts on American campuses was a teach—in staged in 1965 on March 24 and 25 at the University of Michigan campus. University students and faculty determined that many people (including themselves) were not educated enough on the political or historical context of Vietnam to come to a well— informed conclusion regarding American foreign policy. Over three thousand people took part in the University of Michigan teach—in and news of the event sparked various other teach—in’s around the country (Wynkoop, 2002).

The growing anti—war protests of 1965 culminated during the weekend of October 15 and 16 which were designated the International Days of Protest (Anderson, 1995). Anderson (1995) noted the extent of the protest and the diverse campuses which participated, “Nearly 100,000 activists participated in 80 cities ranging from the University of California at Santa Barbara to Iowa State to Yale” (p. 141). The year 1965 marked the beginning of the shift in
student protest from the issue of free speech to the anti-war movement, and the years 1967-1969 would become the climax of anti-war sentiment in the student movement. As Wynkoop (2002) stated, “The issue of the war in Vietnam simply could not be avoided in the fall of 1967. Student protests were escalating, not just in Washington D.C., but on nearly every campus in the country” (p. 54).

Another nationally organized event for universities would bring anti-war protests to the forefront. Activists organized a Moratorium for October 15, 1969 in which individuals would take one day away from their daily routine to generate support for a quicker withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam (Anderson, 1995). College students and other American citizens found a variety of ways to participate in the Moratorium including attending church services, participating in processions, wearing black armbands or boycotting classes (Anderson, 1995). The impact of the Moratorium on college campuses went beyond the large, public, universities. Edmonds and Shrock (2001) discussed how Ball State University, a Midwestern, widely recognized “conservative” university that had previously been viewed as apathetic towards the war, actively participated in the Moratorium.

Even the previously quiet Ball State University became part of that diversity and pervasiveness. The October Moratorium deeply affected Ball State. For the first two and a half weeks of October, the Ball State News was filled with articles, pictures, editorials, and especially letters concerning the war and the national protest that was planned for October 15. (p. 145)

Some literature on the anti-war movement provides evidence of the array of university students who participated, while others try to put the movement into perspective by comparing it to the general college student population at the time. Anderson (1995) placed the anti-war movement
into greater perspective when he stated, “Less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the population participated in an anti war demonstration… and on campus students overwhelmingly supported American policy in Vietnam” (p. 145).

Kent State University: Tragedy in Ohio

Although many of the student protests throughout the 1960s and early 1970s were non—violent in nature, as college students continued to see American involvement expand in Southeast Asia their patience began to wane. On April 30, 1970, President Richard Nixon announced to the country that American forces had moved into Cambodia (Farber & Bailey, 2001, p. 16). Around the country, campuses protested against the decision, and some of the demonstrations could no longer be classified as peaceful.

At the University of Kansas students burned down the student union, and at Kent State University in Ohio, students set the ROTC building on fire. As a response to the vandalism, Ohio governor James Rhodes sent the National Guard to campus. When tensions escalated soldiers opened fire, killing four people (Farber & Bailey, 2001, p. 50). Gilbert (2001) noted that the Kent State University shootings as well as a shooting incident at Jackson State University resulted in pushing students toward more active ways of protesting the war.

[T]he extraordinary events associated with the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State University-Jackson State killings presented them with an unprecedented challenge. They felt the situation required a heightened level of commitment from them. More was required of them than just speaking out, something that they had been doing for a long time. (p. 136)

Kent State University became the rallying point for student protestors in the southern United States even though in the region anti—war sentiments were unpopular and often difficult
for people to express (Gilbert, 2001). Preceding the events at Kent State University, many of the student protests regarding the Vietnam War were unique to a particular campus and focused on the issues surrounding the war. Wheeler (2001) noted that the shootings had a remarkable effect of uniting student protestors from around the country. “While … [some] incidents might appear to be isolated and somewhat individualistic, in the aftermath of the Kent State University incident, southern college students who had been struggling to voice their opposition to the war found a universal rallying point” (p. 154).

Anderson (1995) also discussed the role the Kent State University shootings took in igniting protest around the nation.

In the week after Kent State University, students at 350 universities went on strike, and protests resulted in closing about 500 campuses, 50 for the remainder of the semester. Protests were so common wire services began reporting campuses that did not have demonstrations. (p. 350)

The news of the shootings spread rapidly across the nations’ campuses. At Iowa State University, two days after the shootings occurred, the morning issue of the Iowa State University Daily featured the headline, “STRIKE” and reported on the demonstrations which happened the previous day as well as the events planned to continue on throughout the week (Brown & Brown, 2001, p. 127). At Ball State University in Indiana, the Ball State Daily News covered the October 15, 1969 Vietnam Moratorium for two weeks and a half weeks leading up to the event (Edmonds & Shrock, 2001, p. 145).

While student protest continued to flair across the country, Faber and Bailey (2001) noted that for a majority of Americans these protests were immoral. The authors reported, “Three-
quarters of Americans surveyed shortly after the Kent State University shootings and subsequent protest said that it was wrong to protest against the government,” (p. 51).

Role of Student Publications

Throughout the student activism of the 1960s, university students from around the United States exercised their First Amendment right to freedom of speech by submitting their opinions for publication in their student newspapers. The collegiate newspaper has historically played a significant role as a student organization which provides a medium for information and intellectual discourse within the university community. As a student organization, the newspaper on a college campus creates opportunities for active leadership by staff writers and editors, but also allows non—members to contribute to editorials and provide interviews. Even in the most passive sense, students can still participate in the organization by reading the product of other students’ work. Pittman (2007) noted that the presence of the college newspaper remains strong. “Today, American college students publish more than 1,600 daily and weekly newspapers,” (Pittman, 2007, p. 155). Throughout the decades, student newspapers have provided a public forum for all types of students—from the budding journalist to the student activist.

In its most simplistic role, the student publication was used to disseminate information to the student body regarding events and demonstrations which were taking place on campus. Michael Rossman a significant student figure in the Free Speech Movement, created a self—named report on the University of California- Berkeley’s administration’s history with previous political activity (Taylor, 2008, p. B3). Rossman described how the Daily Californian, University of California- Berkeley’s main student newspaper, played a crucial role in the early months of the FSM when he needed information, but was isolated from others because of his
academic work. “For a week or more I toiled alone, locked in my room, breaking only to attend my classes as a TA [Teaching Assistant] and to check with friends and the Daily Cal about what was happening,” (Rossman, 2002, p. 198). Student publications at this time served as a way to disseminate information, but also became organizations through which student leaders could hone their leadership skills, or be utilized as a public forum to share opinions and manifestos.

Many of the individuals who would become famous for their involvement in the 1960s student movement used their campus publication as a means to exhibit leadership, mobilize their peers, and share their ideologies with the student body. Mario Savio, a student at Berkeley, became an outspoken student activist against the administration’s policies. Along with his public speeches, and participation in protests, Savio’s speeches and interviews were frequently printed in the Daily Californian. Students at Berkeley employed their right to freedom of speech and of the press throughout the Free Speech Movement. The Ice Box, University of California-Berkeley’s student editorial page, featured student-submitted editorial pieces including one from a graduate student named Steve Weinstein:

In the controversy over political activity at Bancroft and Telegraph, it would be well to note that the University has long offered a so-called “free speech” area behind the Union building. Thus the argument given by the Administration that State law prohibits such political activity on campus is revealed as hypocrisy. Apparently the administration does not feel that political activity on campus is illegal on its face, but rather that pressure from certain political elements can be relieved by relegating free speech to an area where no one will hear it. (Weinstein, 1964)

The Daily Californian was not the only student publication which fostered leaders of the movement. Tom Hayden, a freshman at the University of Michigan, was given the opportunity
to have an editorial piece published in the *Michigan Daily* on February 9, 1960. His piece titled, "U' Administration: A Critique" featured the statement, "A University, like other organizations, requires a certain unity. It is organic, a total of interrelated parts, demanding coordination, direction and leadership" (Achenbaum, 2000, p. A4). Hayden would later become the Editor of the publication and a co-founder of Students for a Democratic Society.

Student publication editors from around the country faced opposition for editorial pieces which were published in student newspapers. William R. Smoot II, the Editor of the *Purdue Exponent* in 1968, described in an editorial the consequences of a previous piece he had published. “In the next two days I had several phone threats, one by a student who identified himself as Bob Bradshaw” (Wallerstein & Starr, 1971, p. 419). Smoot continued to discuss the tension between his publication and the administration at Purdue when he described a discussion between himself and a dean at the university:

We discussed the dilemma of editorial freedom versus alumni donations and legislature funds and both agreed that the question could well come down to whether you’re willing to pay a million dollars for telling it like it is, and in the manner you want to tell it.

(Wallerstein & Starr, 1971 p. 419)

Student leaders emerged from collegiate publications across the country during the late 1960s to ban together to publish opinions. Over 250 student body presidents and newspaper editors came together to issue two joint statements in the year 1969. An excerpt from this statement *A New Call to Resist Illegitimate Authority* included a commentary on the dissatisfaction with the American government. “Imperialism, materialism, economic exploitation, undemocratic power, racism: though the words may seem stale, they describe the illegitimate authority in the United States today” (Wallerstein & Starr, 1971, 192).
Regional Influences on the Student Movements of the 1960s

Most of the literature available on student activism of the decade comes from universities that are identified as large, public, research institutions. The Free Speech Movement began at the University of California- Berkeley, so students at similar institutions were more likely to see parallels between the student dissatisfaction with the administration at Berkeley and the discontent with their own university’s policies towards certain issues. Wynkoop (2002) noted the influence that Berkeley had at Indiana University (IU) during this time period, “So, too, at IU, activists were sometimes unwittingly aided by an administration whose actions spurred students to form coalitions they might not otherwise have considered. And, as at Berkeley, the issue was free speech” (pp. 31-32).

Although these universities may have shared similar organizational structures, missions, and student body size, the characteristics of student activism at different schools were impacted by other variables. Anderson (1995) described how the regional location of a university influenced the movement. “Midwestern activism naturally reflected the character of the people, “It was not as aggressive as on the coasts, or ‘less ideological and more laid back,’ as a Brown University student noticed when he visited the University of Minnesota” (Preface). Brown and Brown (2001) noted that many of the schools which participated in the Vietnam War protests were similar to the big East and West Coast universities, but located in the nation’s Midwestern region. “Anti—war activities went on at hundreds of colleges and universities. Many of these schools were considered conservative and mainstream and some, like Iowa State, were located in the nation’s heartland (p. 122). Wynkoop (2002) also noted the way in which university location influenced the extent to which students protested various movements.
Unlike students who attended colleges and universities on the East Coast (…) most IU students, like others in the Midwest, were largely indifferent to foreign policy. In fact the main obstacle that many Midwestern anti-war activists faced was not opposition but student apathy. (p. 38)

Other authors described the influence of institutional type on the issues students demonstrated against or if activism had a place on campus at all. “Few southern universities witnessed demonstrations on issues other than civil rights; church—affiliated ones like Brigham Young or Baylor did not experience much activism at all; and liberal ones such as Emory and Rice did not see protesters until the late 1960s (Anderson, 1995, Preface). The lack of sufficient literature and coverage of other institutional types during this time of student protest, as well as the focus of previous literature on left-wing political opposition, seems to present a limited view of the movement (Gilbert 2001, xiii).

**National Media’s Impact on Perceptions of Student Activism**

Gilbert described how media outlets of the time focused on the left—leaning movements at universities like Columbia and often missed the events at less well—known institutions.

The events there that held the nation in thrall on the nightly news were certainly outpaced in scope and lasting impact by social developments that transpired on hundreds of less-prestigious state university, community college, and high school campuses that the camera trucks of the national media rarely visited. (Gilbert, 2001, xiii)

Gilbert is not the only author to discuss the role of the mass media in shaping the portrayal and memory of the student movement. While student publications sought to express intellectual arguments, often mass media publications and television programs only covered the more controversial aspects such as vandalism and violence. Gilbert focused on how the lack of
coverage for certain events influenced how the movement was seen by Americans. Other authors claim that the events the media chose to cover falsely portrayed the many factions of the movement, as well as the extent to which less aggressive action was taken. Cohen (2002) addressed this issue:

This view of a “radical” FSM is not wrong, but it is incomplete. Savio did make some extremely militant speeches. Masses of Berkeley students did commit civil disobedience. Berkeley did inspire radical protests on other campuses …. Yet the story of these students has for too long since been subordinated to radical imagery, the Savio sound bites, and the tendency to depict the FSM as simply a chapter in the history of the New Left. (Cohen, 2002, p. 228)

Summary

The years 1960-1970 are often noted as a decade of unrest in our national history. Events such as the Civil Rights Movement, the Vietnam War, the Free Speech Movement, and the shootings at Kent State University all contributed to the narrative of student unrest at America’s colleges and universities during this time period. Beginning in 1960 with the student sit-ins in the South, college students played a significant role in shaping the national dialogue of the decade. Through the exploration of small private university accounts of this era this study explored further the extent of the student movement and how institutional type shaped the perceptions of this period of history.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

This study was a qualitative analysis of student publications at three small, private, religiously affiliated institutions of higher education located in the Midwest. The researcher acquired archives of each institution’s primary student publication and analyzed editorial commentary within and between institutions in order to determine common themes in student opinion regarding the Civil Rights Movement, the Vietnam War, The Free Speech Movement and student protest, as well as the shootings at Kent State University. Additionally, the research considered how perceptions of student activism on college campuses have transformed in recent decades.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of student opinion within the culture of small, private, colleges in the 1960s. The data collection used in this study was student publication editorial pages at Hillsdale College in Michigan, Ashland University in Ohio, and Ohio Wesleyan University. These editorial pages from the period of 1960-1970, including opinion pieces such as letters to the editors, as well as featured staff editorials, were analyzed. Stein and Paterno (2006) defined the similarities and differences between editorial and opinion pieces.

“The editorial or opinion piece … makes no pretense of being fair, though writers strive to argue their case well enough- using accurate facts and statistics to change other people’s minds …. Editorials are usually unsigned columns voicing the opinion of the newspaper’s owners, penned by staff members hired specifically to champion or criticize causes and initiatives from a partisan perspective. Opinion pieces usually run on the op-
ed page, are written by guest or staff columnists and often, though not always, reinforce the beliefs of the editorial writers. (p. 7)

The primary goal of this research was to establish major themes in the opinions, approach, and perspectives of students at these colleges on the issue of civil rights, the Vietnam War, the Free Speech Movement and student activism, and the Kent State University shootings. Newspaper editorials and letters to the editor were determined to be appropriate primary sources to analyze these themes. McDowell (2002) addressed the information that editorials and letters in newspapers can disclose to a researcher.

Letters pages can reveal much about the views, values, preoccupations and prejudices of contributors (and editors) on economic, moral or political issues…Each newspaper has its own target audience and, for local newspapers, its own geographical distribution. These factors undoubtedly influence the perspective from which external events are viewed. (p. 67)

Through an analysis of these issues the researcher aimed to understand how students at these small, private, religiously affiliated colleges perceived the major polarizing issues of the decade.

Overview of Historical Methods

McDowell (2002) noted that one of the primary goals of historical research is to, “look for connections between events so that a meaningful pattern or structure can be discerned” (p. 76). A variety of approaches to writing history exists and the nature of the topic being researched often dictates which historical method is appropriate. Traditionally, historians have employed the historical narrative when writing about the American college history (Goodchild & Huk, 1990). Goodchild and Huk (1990) defined this approach stating, “The most simplistic understanding of a historical narrative is a story” (p. 209). Thus much of the history regarding
American colleges and universities has often lacked an analysis of the various events in an institution’s history, but rather describes what the author believes to be the notable events in a college or university’s narrative. Over the course of the 19th and 20th centuries there was a progression through three schools of thought regarding the writing of history. Each school offered a perspective into the authors, intended audience, and the perceived purpose of written history during the given time period. These three schools— the Romantic School, Policy School, and Cultural School—served as a large influence on the approach historians used in the writing of higher education historiography. These three approaches—the presidential administration, public policy, and the intellectual approach reflected the preferences of the school of historical thought which was leading at the time.

The first school of historical thought to influence higher education historiography was the Romantic School. Prevalent in the early to mid 1800s, the Romantic School focused on telling the narrative of the United States through the stories of grand individuals whose triumphs and successes contributed to the growth of the country (Goodchild & Huk, 1990). Goodchild and Huk (1990) elaborated on the use of the individual in the Romantic School historical narrative. “American historians during the mid-1800s used the idea of progress and the role of the individual as structural techniques to recount their stores of American nationalism emphasizing liberty, democracy, and Puritan providentialism” (p. 218). Hofstadter (1968) also provided an analysis on the goals of the characteristics of the Romantic School. “Despite the philosophical historians of the Enlightenment, history was still regarded as a literary art whose main aim was to recapture experience. Foremost was the experience of major heroic characters” (p. 13).

The prominence on the individual in the Romantic School historical narrative is also evident in the presidential administration approach used in the historical narratives of higher
education during this same time period. Goodchild and Huk, (1990) described the characteristics of this approach in the narratives of colleges and universities written during this period.

Their narratives were detail-laden descriptions of events, such as college foundings or courses of study, usually focused on presidents who dictate the course of their institution.

Paralleling the patriotic motive of popular historians, educational works had an over promotional and celebratory quality. (p. 221)

As Goodchild and Huk noted, historical writings during the Romantic School period often served as a way to publicly acknowledge and record great achievements. As Hofstadter (1968) observed, history during the Romantic School was often written “by well-to-do gentlemen—amateurs inspired by a literary ideal and writing grand narrative history aimed at a broad reading public” (p. 35). With a literary influence and the intent to interest an audience of the general public, history served the purpose of providing entertainment value. In order to sell his writings, an author would aspire to write a captivating narrative which divulged the story of fascinating events put in motion by even more fascinating individuals.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the writer of history was no longer the bourgeois man whose interest in history could be considered a hobby, but rather shifted to that of the well—trained academic. Hofstadter (1968) noted this change stating that the writing of history was “rapidly taken over by professional scholars… writing for the most part highly focused monographic inquires intended for other professionals” (p. 35). Hofstadter observed that with the changing characteristics of the authors of history, there came a shift in the intended audience of historical writings. Without the need to provide entertaining stories which would appeal to the masses, writers took a new approach and philosophy toward historical writings in order to better serve the needs of other academics in the field. This new philosophy towards historiography is
known as the Policy School. The main characteristics of the Policy School were evident through the writings of 19th century historian Herbert Baxter Adams who as Goodchild and Huk (1990) commented, “sought to discourage the emphasis which American historians had given to the description of events. He looked for a means to explain the general continuity of political and educational institutions” (p. 250). Adams was also noted for incorporating analysis into his writings, specifically about the impact of external forces such as societal and political influences on institutional growth (Goodchild & Huk).

Hofstadter (1968) provided a more in-depth analysis of the Policy School approach used by Adams:

The Adams school took institutions, especially political institutions, for its subject and scorning (as it thought) all bias, disdaining the play of feeling in the work of the romantic writers, tried to concentrate on digging out the hard facts of institutional change, and then, through the comparative method to lay bare the generally applicable principles of evolutionary development. (p. 39)

The corresponding approach in higher education historiography during the School of Policy period, is known as the public policy approach as described by Goodchild and Huk( 1990):

Unrecognized for most of this century, this policy school of higher education has contributed to our understanding of the significant role which federal, state, municipal, and organizational policy played in shaping and directing the mission of colleges and universities. (p. 240)

Historians in higher education seemed to heed Adams’ advice to move away from the notion of storytelling as they began to consider the role of external factors beyond the physical
campus and administration when writing about the decision making taking place at America’s colleges and universities.

Lastly, the Cultural School approach to historiography began in the mid 20th century, but was largely influenced by preceding historian Fredrick Jackson Turner. Turner’s 1893 thesis concerning America’s Western Frontier is deemed by many historians to be exceptional for its consideration of issues such as environmental, social, and economic factors (Goodchild & Huk 1990). Goodchild and Huk (1990) go on to discuss the shift in historical philosophy by the New Historian of the 20th century. “Unlike romantic historians with their penchant for promoting national unity and harmony by ignoring sectional, ethnic, and racial difference, the so called New Historian at the turn of the century found incongruities and disharmonies more reflective of American history” (p. 251). Hofstadter (1968) succinctly described how the writings of progressive historians such as Turner were unique to previous approaches to historiography.

The pivotal idea of the Progressive historians was economic and political conflict. Since conflict is a universal presence in history, they were hardly the first to discover it. But Turner began in a somewhat ambiguous form, to give an unaccustomed emphasis to conflict and to put it to new kinds of uses … and was taken up between 1910 and 1950 by a generation of historians who applied it to everyday American history. (p. 437)

The corresponding higher education historical narrative approach to the Cultural School is the intellectual approach, in which the historian notes historiography trends, but also considered myriad points of view when explaining the growth and development of the American college or university. These historians also go beyond the public policy approach by not only considering how external variables influence the university, but also explore how events and developments which happen within the college campus impact society (Goodchild & Huk,
Goodchild and Huk (1990) provided an example of the various perspectives the intellectual approach takes into account. “Their excursions into campus architecture, religious groups, ideological forces, women’s issues, and local environments reflected the broad role which higher education placed in American culture” (p. 268).

For this historical narrative, the researcher applied the Cultural School methodology and employed the intellectual approach. Through reading student publications at small, private, religiously affiliated institutions this study attempted to contribute to the higher education historiography of American colleges and universities by considering institutions which are not commonly featured in the literature on 1960s higher education. Finally, this research addressed both external and internal developments which impacted the campus environment while focusing on the role of conflict in the narrative of these institutions.

Criteria for Selection of Institutions

For this research, the primary characteristics of the institutions studied were that they were small, private, and religiously affiliated. The researcher defined a small institution as one which enrolled less than 3,000 students throughout the decade of the 1960s. All universities used in this research have been determined to be classified as religiously affiliated based on the mission statements of the institutions which stated an association with a specific denomination of Christianity. In order to eliminate the variable of institutional type, all three institutions were considered liberal arts universities during the 1960s as well as during the period of this research. In order to eliminate the role of regional differences in this research, as well as to allow easy access to institutional archives, all three institutions are located in the eastern-Midwest.
Data Collection Techniques

For each university chosen, university websites were used to determine the name of the main student publication on campus as well as whether online archives were available. In the case of Hillsdale College, a complete online archive of the student publication the *Hillsdale Collegian* was available in the Student Newspaper Collection through the Hillsdale College Mossey Library. A general search was conducted to locate published issues during the time period January 1, 1960 through December 31, 1970. At this time, the *Hillsdale Collegian* was being published on a bi-weekly basis. All editorials printed by staff, as well as letters written to the editor, were read to determine the nature of the commentary. Editorials which featured remarks regarding the Free Speech Movement or student protest in general, the Civil Rights Movement, the shootings at Kent State University in 1970, or the Vietnam War were analyzed further and considered in this research.

In order to obtain newspaper issues from Ashland University, a Bowling Green State University library search revealed that the University newspaper titled *The Collegian*, was accessible on Microfilm at Bowling Green State University’s Center for Archival Collections. All editorial pages were read and analyzed from the period of January 1, 1960 through December 31, 1970. Similar to Hillsdale College, Ashland University’s newspaper was also published on a bi-weekly basis and all editorial commentary as well as letters submitted by students were read to determine which commentary covered the issues chosen for this research.

The final newspaper used in this research was Ohio Wesleyan University’s college newspaper *The Transcript*. The Ohio Wesleyan University Historical Collections had original copies of the newspaper bound in leather volumes available for use on site. All editorial pages were read from the period of January 1st 1960 through December 31st 1970. Editorial
commentary and letters submitted to the editor were analyzed to determine if the topic under discussion could be classified under the issue of the Civil Rights Movement, The Free Speech Movement, the Vietnam War or the Kent State University shootings. Unlike the *Hillsdale Collegian* and Ashland University’s *The Collegian*, Ohio Wesleyan’s *The Transcript* was printed on a weekly basis as opposed to a bi-weekly basis. Editorials which were determined to be useful for this research were photographed with a digital camera for later reference.

**Data Analysis Techniques**

Hill (1993) addressed the notion of archival sedimentation as the process through which individuals or organizations “create, discard, save, collect, and donate materials of potential archival interest” (p. 9). The author goes on to describe various levels of sedimentation as others determine which materials are considered relevant or valuable. Throughout this process, materials may be discarded or reorganized thus limiting future researchers to an entire collection of artifacts through which to conduct their data analysis (Hill, 1993). For this research, complete collections of newspapers were available. Schwartz (2003) noted the next step in historical research following the collection of archival data. “At this point it is possible to combine, compare and select the most pertinent information in a meaningful manner. Certain information collected should corroborate other pieces as a more complete picture emerges” (p. 108). As a result of having access to the complete archives of all three newspapers from 1960-1970, it was necessary to select which quotations would not be included in the results chapters. Due to the vast number of articles that addressed the four issues studied, articles that were less articulate or repetitive in their argument were not quoted specifically in the study, but they were analyzed. Several considerations were made when determining which articles were selected for data analysis. Opinion pieces which did not address civil rights, the Vietnam War, the Free Speech
Movement and student activism, or the Kent State University shootings were not included. Any piece which was sent anonymously was discarded because it became impossible to determine whether the author was a student at the institution. Submissions from individuals who were not students were only used in the case of submissions from faculty members at the institution. Articles in which the researcher was uncertain of the intent or tone of the original author were discarded due to an inability to accurately discern the views of the individual. For example, the following is an excerpt from an editorial critiquing the inability of students at Hillsdale to stray from the status quo of the college. “There is no need to try anything new; the Hillsdale students have found THE way, and this pragmatic path is good because it’s been used for 100 years (“The Narrow Way”, 1968, p. 2). With this editorial it becomes the responsibility of the reader to discern the sarcastic tone of the piece in order to fully comprehend the authors’ intent.

Another significant consideration taken into account during data analysis was to avoid the practice of presentism. Moro-Abadía (2009) defined presentism as a “term employed to designate the influence of the present on the writing of history” (p. 55). McDowell (2002) elaborated on the issues which may arise when using presentism while analyzing artifacts which were written immediately following a given event.

Ideas and values do change over time, so you may have to take account of the historical and cultural climate which existed when these ideas were captured on paper. In particular, three obvious problems arise when the written record covers more recent historical events: the best sources are seldom available until long after the period they cover; impartiality can be difficult to achieve when describing and analyzing more recent events; and the correct perspective might only be grasped by viewing events from a sufficient distance in time. (p. 112)
Following the determination of which articles would be used in the research findings, the author organized articles by institution, then according to the issues addressed in the piece. The author then identified major themes in the opinions and approach students at each institution used to comment on each issue. Finally, the author addressed common themes between student opinions at the three institutions.

Limitations

The method and nature of the document analysis for this study did create limitations for this research. Love (2003) noted various limitations to research using document analysis. One which was particularly relevant for this study was the potential for the researcher to be unaware of any “unknown bias of the author of a particular document” (p. 87). Because the nature of this study involved the analysis of given individual’s opinions on certain issues, it was unclear to the researcher what variables contributed to an author’s opinion on an issue, unless they provided a rationale in a piece.

A second common limitation to document analysis is the matter of incomplete collections. For this research all issues of the publications for each institution studied were available during the time period selected, however, a selection bias was evident as a result of the researcher not being able to include all relevant editorials and letters to the editor in the results chapter because of the volume of articles available. Some letters to the editor were sent anonymously and were not included in the research chapter, while letters concerning these issues from individuals who were not current students at the institution were also not used.

A third limitation to this research was the potential disconnect between the researcher’s interpretation and the original intent of a given author’s works. Throughout the study the researcher relied on her own ability to discern emotions such as sarcasm, passion, and anger
within an author’s writing. Love (2003) addressed the issue of the potential for a researcher to misinterpret a document’s intent because of a lack of commentary from the original author. “So although texts and documents can be “interrogated,” “deconstructed,” and analyzed, often they have been disconnected from their creation so it is not possible to explore original meanings and intent with absolute confidence (p. 86).

A final limitation was that the researcher was limited to only the student opinions and arguments that were submitted and published in each publication. Opinions which were submitted but not published were unavailable to the researcher, and may have led to a more complete understanding of student opinion on the four issues studied. It was also evident that some students had multiple opinions published during their collegiate career. Reoccurring opinions from a single individual may have skewed the perception that a given position on an issue was held by a majority of students.

The 1960s were a turbulent and exhilarating decade in United States history that continues to fascinate the American people. The nation’s colleges and universities became the environment where many of the achievements and shortcomings of the decade were presented in the public forum. This research attempts to contribute to both the understanding of the 1960s and the historiography of American higher education by analyzing the perspective of students at institutional types that are not often the focus of research during this era.
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the opinions of students at private, small, conservative colleges during the 1960s. Much of the literature which exists on the collegiate environment during this decade is based on research and events which took place at large, research intensive, state institutions thus leading to a perception regarding the collegiate experience during this decade. The lack of a significant discussion of the small, private school experience in the historiography of higher education in the 1960s fails to recognize the collegiate experience of nearly a third of college students in the country during that time (Astin & Lee, 1972, p. xi). Through the use of collegiate newspapers as a primary source, the author aimed to analyze the opinions of students at Ashland College, Ohio Wesleyan University and Hillsdale College on the issues of the Civil Rights Movement, Vietnam War, Free Speech Movement and student activism, as well as the Kent State University shootings. Through analyzing the opinions of students at these institutions the author identified common themes in the student experience and also observed how the student publication was used as a means of communication on these campuses.

Themes at Ashland College

Ashland University, known as Ashland College during the years 1960-1970 is located in Ashland, Ohio. Founded in 1878 by the Brethren Church, Ashland College maintained a strong foundation in its religious affiliation throughout the decade of the 1960s as stated in their College Bulletin, “From this time to the present, the college has been affiliated with the Brethren Church and has sought to serve the interest of the church educationally as well as those of the community of which it is apart” (Ashland College Bulletin, 1970, p. 10). The Ashland College Bulletin published in 1960 outlined the mission statement as follows:
The objectives of the institution, as defined by the Board of Trustees and Faculty, are:
To assist students in the development of sound scholarship, character, and refinement
under influences which are frankly avowedly Christian and to provide opportunities for
Christian experience. To aid students in organizing and unifying their experiences into a
workable and satisfying philosophy of life. To prepare students for service as ministers,
missionaries, and religious workers, especially in the Brethren Church. To provide a
broad liberal education for future specialization, with a sufficient amount of the technical
to acquaint the students with the practical pursuits of life. To help the individual student
to develop his whole personality by coordinating and integrating the instructional process
with the physical education, health service, extra-curricular activities, student guidance,
and religious program. (Ashland College Bulletin, 1960, p. 20)

This mission statement remained unchanged throughout the 1960s and was reprinted in the 1970-

Over the course of the 1960s, Ashland College experienced a rapid increase in student
enrollment. During the first semester of the 1959-1960 school year, Ashland had a total
undergraduate enrollment of 635 students (Ashland College Bulletin, 1960, p. 132) and by the
first semester of the 1969-1970 school year the university had a total enrollment of 2,872

The student publication from Ashland College which was used in this study was The
Collegian. The staff of The Collegian was made up of current students enrolled at the college,
but the publication also had a faculty advisor. From the years 1960-1967 the newspaper was
published on a bi-weekly basis, and then became a weekly publication beginning in 1968.
Student subscriptions to The Collegian were included in the college’s activity fee thus all
students attending Ashland College had access to the paper as a result of their enrollment (*The Collegian*, 1965, p. 2). As mentioned previously, enrollment at Ashland College increased significantly during the decade of the 1960s and this increase in student enrollment is reflected in the average number of copies of *The Collegian* which were printed throughout the years. In 1964, the average copies per issue were listed as 1,800 (*The Collegian*, 1964, p. 2) while in the year 1970 the publication states that the average copies per issue was 3,000 (*The Collegian*, 1970, p. 2).

Throughout the decade studied, the layout of student editorials and letters to the editor remained relatively similar. Depending on the preferences of the editor-in-chief for a given issue, editorials were either written by an individual or presented as a united viewpoint of *The Collegian*’s staff. As the decade progressed, various student staff writers were given opportunities to have a column in which they expressed their opinions.

**Civil Rights Movement**

Students’ use of events outside of the Ashland community to situate an opinion on an issue was particularly true of the approach editorials and letters to the editor took in addressing the Civil Rights Movement. In the early years of the decade, *The Collegian*’s editorials did not use concrete events to express opinions, but often resorted to generalities to discuss the issue of racism and discrimination, as seen in the following staff editorial.

> Of immediate concern, not only in the South but also to us, is the civil rights issue. College students are taking a stand on this principle throughout the land. They are supporting the sit ins with man power and money. They are writing letters expressing concern to those who are taking part in the racial issues. (“Editorially Speaking”, 1960, p. 2)
A year later, civil rights were still acknowledged as a major problem facing America, but the staff continued to base their reasoning on the importance of the issue through overarching examples.

The truth is that one of the greatest challenges facing America’s students and America in general today is the challenge of the inequality confronting some American citizens … the challenge of discrimination. Sometimes this discrimination takes the form of segregation and sometimes various levels of prejudice. (“Students Face Great Challenges”, 1961, p. 3)

At the end of 1961, students began to discuss specific events at the national level to express their concern over civil rights. In an editorial, the staff described occurrences at various university campuses to demonstrate to readers why the issue was a pressing matter. “The incidents in Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, which received nationwide press coverage, can be used to dramatize the problems in the South and the needs to be met” (“An Editorial”, 1961, p. 1). In the early years of the decade, students at Ashland College acknowledged the need to support civil rights, however there was no significant dialogue on the issue until the beginning of the 1970s.

In 1970, The Collegian’s editorials and letters strayed away from issues external to campus and began a dialogue on civil rights which centered on Ashland College’s Black Emphasis Week. Students Jennifer Fog and Bessie Walker praised the event, but ultimately displayed their disappointment with the week.

This is a phenomenal achievement of the black students on campus who have organized, planned and directed this program. Yet, at the same time, it is a tragic defeat. Black Emphasis Week will last only seven brief days... Why cannot Ashland College – its
administration its faculty and students- not recognize blacks throughout the school year? (Walker & Fogg, 1970, p. 2)

It appears that Black Emphasis Week elicited a strong response from the student body, thus prompting *The Collegian* to dedicate an editorial to the subject. The following quote from the editorial reflected a perceived backlash among the student body against the event.

> Can anyone say that Black students at Ashland are treated equally either by their fellow students or by the administration? … It really gives you something to think about and that’s exactly what the Ashland Black students had in mind when they formulated the idea of Black Emphasis Week. Already, critics of the program are demanding a “White Emphasis Week.” Forget it, you’ve had 51 of them. (“Black Week”, 1970, p. 2)

In his column, Herbert Lord (1970) took a more philosophical perspective on the intended purpose and outcomes for this event.

> As members of this integrated college community, all of us should feel morally obliged to take a few moments of our day so as to ponder on the fundamental questions which our black brothers are trying so hard to present. For what is our purpose on this earth if it is not to learn, to accept and even to love those who in some ways are different from ourselves. Isn’t it a certain safeguard to our own individuality to preserve and defend the individualistic of others? Our hearts already know the answers. Let us hope that Black Emphasis Week will provide us with the needed courage to stand by them. (p. 2)

Overall, the Black Emphasis Week appeared to push racial issues to the forefront of Ashland College. Students and *Collegian* staff members alike acknowledged the impact that racial tension had on the specific environment of Ashland College as opposed to addressing the issue on the national scale. In two of the submissions, students even acknowledged their belief that
Ashland’s administration participated in racial discrimination. The belief that there was a racial divide on Ashland’s campus was reflected in a letter to the editor which concerned a white student’s praise for a play put on by black students.

It is difficult for a White man to comment on a Black play, particularly if he liked it, for then his remarks could sound like paternalistic head patting. Yet I feel obligated to do so, if only to thicken the all too thin lines of communication between the races at Ashland College. Black students, thank you for reaffirming my belief in people, if only for awhile, at least until I catch myself saying something like “he’s nice for a Negro”…

(Michener, 1970, p. 3)

Overall, the issue of civil rights was not addressed in The Collegian consistently throughout the decade of the 1960s, thus it was difficult to demonstrate an in—depth understanding of the climate on Ashland’s campus concerning this issue. It seems that as a philosophy, the idea of equal rights for the black community was supported by The Collegian’s staff members in the early sixties; however, students did not effectively communicate an explicit rationale for their support, but simply stated their belief that the issue was a pertinent one. It is not until that 1970s that students demonstrated an ability to delve into specific aspects of the movement, and use in—depth analysis of current events to express a complex opinion on the issue.

Black Emphasis Week in 1970 resulted in an increase in student dialogue from the White community on civil rights. These opinions expressed support for the Black community, but inherently used generalized values such as “morality” “love” and “acceptance” to demonstrate to White students why they should participate in the week’s activities. These arguments tended to elicit a feeling of obligation out of guilt to support civil rights, and this theme continued in the
student letter concerning a White student’s thoughts on the college’s production of *Black Misery*. Although the student wished to express his liking of the play, he clearly admitted feelings of guilt that his remarks would appear condescending.

**Vietnam War**

A significant number of editorials and letters to the editor were dedicated to the subject of the Vietnam War. Throughout the years 1965-1968 the issue of Vietnam was discussed on a relatively consistent basis in *The Collegian* with earlier opinions mostly in favor of the United States’ participation. It is not until the National Moratorium on October 15, 1969 that there was a significant increase in the number of editorials and letters dedicated to the subject of the war. An interesting result of the Moratorium was that a dialogue between students developed in the forthcoming issues. Instead of submitting personal reactions to the event, students began to respond to the perceptions of those who had submitted commentary previously.

In the early years of the war there was a general support for the United States’ effort in Vietnam. The primary argument used to support this opinion was the notion that through the war effort it would be possible to spread freedom and democracy to the South Vietnamese. This argument was portrayed in the following editorial and letter.

So if you sympathize with those who burn their draft cards and demonstrate against the war, this is your prerogative. But remember this, “The privilege of determining one’s own destiny is characteristic of our own form of democracy.” Let us not be so selfish with democracy and freedom. The South Vietnamese would like these privileges also. (Krocker, 1965, p. 2)

All Ashland College students and faculty, who believe as I do in the greatness of America and the freedom of all mankind, come join, and support our local Ashland
College Branch of The National Student Committee for the Defense of Vietnam. … In such manner, we may demonstrate to all people everywhere that we of Ashland College, believe in the future of America as well as the peace and freedom of man. (Smith, 1965, p. 2)

In the years 1966 and 1967 a shift occurred and students began to question whether the war was accomplishing the intended outcomes it claimed to pursue. The editor who supported the effort a year earlier later wrote:

> Just what is our purpose in Vietnam? Does the United States belong on the continent of Asia? Are we policemen for the rest of the world? There are so many questions, and so few answers to the complex situation in Vietnam that even the experts are dumbfounded. (“Why Not Peace”, 1966, p. 2)

A letter submitted by another student also questioned whether the methods for achieving the nation’s goals were effective. “Neither soldiers nor gifts have changed the minds of the enemies of America. Perhaps it is time to use words and ideas. Perhaps the pen is still mightier than the sword” (Banks, 1967b, p. 4).

Although there was a shift in support for the war by some of the students who submitted or wrote for The Collegian, throughout the decade there were students who continued to support the war efforts. Editor- in- Chief for the 1967-1968 school year Charles Leb Homer (1967) stated:

> Right or wrong, the commitment of this country (and all its people) is to continue President Johnson’s policy of the bombing of North Vietnam. One president made this commitment and we the people have elected the president and given him the authority to make such a commitment. (p. 10)
The national Moratorium on October 15, 1969 was widely covered by *The Collegian* both in its editorials and letters, but also in its news articles. The following two editorials were submitted by the editorial staff at *The Collegian*. The first was an explanation of the event and its purpose prior to the actual day, while the second was published the day after the Moratorium as a reflection of the event.

The Moratorium is meant to bring pressure to bear upon the Nixon administration to take action to end the war… it won’t. It is meant to continue monthly until the war ends… it won’t. What it does do is to afford thousands of students a means of voicing their opinions where there was none before. …*The Collegian* endorses the Moratorium both locally and on a national scale. It will prove to be an honest and good way for individuals to say to anyone who cares to listen, ‘I don’t support the American intervention in Vietnam.’ (“Moratorium”, 1969, p. 2)

The Moratorium at Ashland College is over, but is the movement? What are the ramifications of the protest? How can it be compared with, say, the Civil Rights March on Washington in 1965? One immediate result is apparent, even at this early stage that the Moratorium Day activities have focused attention on the Vietnam War in particular and war in general as a historical phenomenon. As the leaders of the Ashland College movement put it, “Whether you are for the war, or anti-war, there was some honest soul searching.” (“In Retrospect”, 1969, p. 2)

While *The Collegian* staff endorsed the event, and appeared to feel that the Moratorium was successful, it was apparent from the number of student letters that the event elicited a wide range of opinions. As mentioned previously, a dialogue developed between students on campus through the medium of the college newspaper as students began to respond to one another’s
letters regarding the Moratorium. The following dialogue occurred over the course of three weeks from October 23, 1969 to November 6, 1969 and was between members of the Ashland College Young Republicans and Greg Busch, an Ashland student.

We feel that President Clayton and the Ashland College administration owes 85% of the student body an explanation as to why such unpatriotic activities were approved by the college. Why were the minority of students (15%) allowed to infringe upon the rights of the majority (85%) who didn’t take part in this unpatriotic activity? (Ashland College Young Republicans Club, 1969, p. 4)

This Moratorium gave everyone a chance to take time out of their lives to devote it to two things 1. The war dead, and 2. The Vietnam War. … To me you are the pigs of the world. If you don’t want to get involved then shut your mouth of criticism, because you are worse than the people you criticize. (Busch, 1969, p. 2)

Greg: Our letter was intended to point out the Communistic and Revolutionary elements who organized and supported the October 15th Vietnam Moratorium at the national level. By marching in this nationwide Moratorium you gave support to these people and their beliefs. If you did not wish to associate yourself with this type of Revolutionary element of our society you should not have supported them by holding your peace rally on the same day. (Robertson, 1969, p. 3)

Other students independently expressed their opinions regarding the war and the Moratorium.

Just because a person would like to see a peaceful world, this does not make him a coward, a communist, or an Ashland College pig. The real cowards, the real pigs, are those who feel that we should not have exercised our rights as Americans-rights of free assembly and the rights to express our own belief. (Rodgers, 1969, p. 4)
Ultimately, the level of participation that Ashland College students showed in the Vietnam Moratorium was later viewed as a tipping point in which student apathy changed on the campus. A staff editorial featured at the end of the 1969-1970 school year reflected back on the previous events of the fall semester.

In the following few years, anti-war expression tended to be confined to a few individually motivated students who generally found their way to other campuses to demonstrate their feelings. Last semester signified the first real expression of anti-war sentiment that held any really broad base of student support. In the October 15 Moratorium last fall, moderate students mirrored demonstrations across the country as those who previously had remained silent turned out to join the activists. (“Protests New to Ashland”, 1970, p. 4)

A week later, Editor-in-Chief John R. Allen (1970) also concluded in his outgoing column that the Moratorium had a significant impact on the increasing involvement on campus.

It was in this year that Ashland College students announced to all that they were now socially concerned and a Moratorium demonstration emerged, but very carefully… Everything that Ashland College students did this year, they did with tremendous intensity…and the Collegian tried to mirror that attitude. As the news on the campus intensified, so did the news page. As students formulated opinions on issues, the Collegian stated its opinions. (p. 2)

In the beginning of the United States’ involvement in Vietnam, Ashland’s discussion of the war focused on the merits of the intended outcomes of participation and whether the methods chosen to achieve the outcomes were effective. Later, during the aftermath of the national Moratorium, students seemed to focus on whether the event was a success, as opposed to a
discussion of students’ rationales for supporting or not supporting America’s actions. Most interestingly, following the Moratorium the prominent issue seemed to be a discussion of Americans’ rights (specifically the right to freedom of assembly) instead of focusing on the war itself. What is absent from the dialogue is a discussion of America’s decision to instigate conscription during this conflict. While there is mention of burning draft cards, there appeared to be no discussion of the morality, necessity, or fairness of this policy.

Free Speech Movement and Student Protest

_The Collegian_ did not definitively address the Free Speech Movement at the University of California -Berkeley; however, the editorial staff and students alike had a variety of opinions regarding student protest and activism throughout the decade of the 1960s. Editor- in- Chief Joel Krocker (1966) did discuss his frustrations with the University of California- Berkeley, but not in regards to the Free Speech Movement but rather his self—described “sex without love” movement which he felt was another example of the progression of freedom of speech spinning out of control.

First it was free speech, then profound cursing. We had free press, then pornography.

Free assembly, then sit ins and demonstrations. Free politics, now Birchers and Leftists.

… Ours is a country where a once strong code of moral righteousness existed ….The Berkeley students could hardly be leaders in society, teachers in schools, or believers in the established laws of Christianity as long as they condone sex without love. … Today this group is a radical minority. The majority of college students ignore this group. But the fact that the University of California administration allows the sexual freedom to sell their literature and trash on campus reveals that the sagging morality that is so often mentioned is starting to sag into a routine and gain momentum. (p. 2)
In regards to their perceptions about protest, students at Ashland initially condemned and later supported activism for a variety of reasons. One of the themes seen among those who did not support student activism was the perception that these methods were ineffective for solving the problems that the nation faced. One student described his frustrations in the following editorial.

Sure, it’s easy to blame society and Uncle Sam and dear Dad and the memories of Mother, the old bat. But it’s difficult to try to do something meaningful to solve one’s own problems; to solve other people’s problems. So… why try? They don’t want to see, to know, to understand. They want to make love, not war. …But someday, they are going to have to make sense. Should they remain hippie hooligans, they will be of no value to society and of less value to themselves. (Banks, 1967a, p. 4)

Another student wrote a letter to The Collegian following the Vietnam Moratorium to express her belief that protest may not be the most effective method for a change in American war policy.

If one really wants to do something about the Vietnam War and wants to protest it-write your Congressman …. I believe in the right to protest but when one protests without offering solutions to the problem-why protest? As one individual in society, I have little control over ending the war, but my congressman is my representative and he should know. (Black, 1969, p. 2)

Richard Alan Casali demonstrated his frustration with the way student action was defined by the mass media. In his column he mentioned that a national publication had recently labeled Ashland College as a school “Where the Action Ain’t” due to its lack of student protest.

Thus, Ashland has been titled “Where the Action Ain’t.” But this label is entirely dependent upon how one defines “action.” Is action evidenced by pot-smoking draft card-
burning, rioting leftists, or is action the presence of serious-minded students in a warm, growing academic environment? ... [W]e measure success not in terms of protestors, but in terms of well-rounded individuals who are a benefit to society. Ashland is not represented by demonstrators, but by fine athletes, students, and organizations with high-minded goals. (Casali, 1968, p. 4)

In a subsequent editorial, Casali condemned the media once more for his belief that they portrayed student activism inaccurately.

The riots and violent demonstrations of today are very real and frightening; yet they represent only a very small segment of the Cultural Revolution in America today. News commentators and reporters seem to neglect the vast number of peaceful revolutions and seem to emphasize the small percentage of violent undertakings. (Casali, 1968, p. 4)

A new perspective on student activism was visible near the end of 1968 as one student editorial stated that without a Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) chapter on campus there was a missed opportunity for proactive education.

But the lack of an SDS chapter on campus does point out a significant downfall, that of being a campus almost completely void of student activism in any form, positive or negative…. The observant students and the progressive administration will promote student activism and involvement. Not only are these characteristics healthy, but also serve as a vital part of liberal education. (“Student Inactivism at AC”, 1968, p. 2)

A response to the editorial a week later portrayed the belief that some students still perceived activism in a negative context.

At the onset, I believe that a definition of the term “activism” is called for. According to “Webster’s Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary” activism is, “a doctrine or practice that
emphasizes vigorous action as the use of force for political ends.” This being the fact of the definition, I for one, and happy that there is a dearth of activism at AC. (Shaver, 1968, p. 2)

In 1969, staff writer Richard Casali took a less dualistic position on the student activism issue and noted that many of the causes that students stood for were right, but that they should not be pursued in a violent manner.

Such is the case with students who are closing down and burning the colleges and universities here and abroad. These people cease to be students and become criminals subject to punishment. Many of the reform demonstrators call for are just, but when violence and disruption are the means of obtaining the goals, administrators have every right to take action against these activists… One must be thankful that Ashland College students are not among such groups responsible for these violations of law and principle. The world needs more Ashlands where honest students can endeavor without violence and disorder. (Casali, 1969, p. 4)

A staff editorial in 1970 offered a reflection on the changing role and perceptions of student protest at Ashland College.

The protest movement at Ashland College, although active in the last week, has not always commanded the support it now appears to hold. In the early years of student activism, Ashland College remained relatively conservative on the war issue and in other phases of the student movement. In 1964, Berkeley was in the midst of the Free Speech Movement, but Ashland was a small campus of 1100 students and concerned with other issues. (“Protests New to Ashland”, 1970, p. 4)
The editorial alluded to a staff belief that students at Ashland College during the mid 1960s were not focused on the prominent issues of the time because they did not actively participate around the issues of Free Speech, and the Vietnam War. The major theme that seems to continue throughout the decade when it comes to student activism is that many students perceived activism as something that was violent in nature as well as something that was an ineffective means of achieving one’s goal. Students such as Richard Casali pointed to the mass media as placing a prominent focus on violent student behavior, while others saw activism as a proactive way to gain a liberal education. Ultimately, it appears that in the year 1970 there was a more unified belief that student activism could be non—violent and even positive.

Kent State University

Editorial commentary on the Kent State University shootings was rather limited at Ashland College. This may largely be due to the fact that a bomb scare on campus occurred in the week immediately following the Kent State University incident which resulted in Ashland College being closed for a week. This event led to a week without an issue of The Collegian, but more significantly when the students returned to campus, newspaper coverage focused exclusively on the events on the Ashland campus. The editorial which was featured in the paper following students’ return to campus reads, “With last week’s closing of the campus, Ashland College gains the somewhat dubious distinction of stepping into adulthood among other colleges. We can now claim our own demonstrations, our own bomb scares and our own radical fringe” (“Editorial”, 1970, p. 2).

The editorials which did cover the Kent State University shootings exhibited a common theme of placing the violence within the context of American society.
The National Guard veterans can hardly be held personally responsible for what happened. They merely reacted the way they were socially instructed to react. They are classic products of what our society has out in quantity. The first reaction is to kill. The same can be said of the students. Although pleading for peace, they talk of violence, and the rhetoric of violence emerges as tragic action. But one thing is certain. This brute of an American society is sick. It is busy saving the world while it kills itself slowly. And if it doesn’t take the time to look at itself to see what is happening, the slow kill from within will continue and become irreversible. Kent State University is quiet, but it serves as a symbol of the unrest that is all pervasive. ("Editorial", 1970, p. 2)

The four students who gave their lives at Kent State and the many who in a similar way have given their lives elsewhere have hardly died in vain. Their deaths have merely produced greater energy and strength to all those eager and determined to create a better, a more idealistic world. The deaths have indeed quickened the inevitable and well deserving destruction of the society that killed them. ("Anatomy of Discontent", 1970, p. 2)

Both students appear to have perceived the Kent State University shootings as the ultimate example of a society in a state of self—destruction. In the first editorial there was the reoccurring theme seen in the attitudes of other students who discussed their perceptions on student activism, that in many ways it was a hypocritical action that sought peace, but often proceeded with the language and intent of violence. While the second editorial portrayed a more idealistic belief that the students did not die in vain, the author still expressed the same abysmal outlook for the nation.
While this study focused on students who were currently attending Ashland College when they submitted pieces to the student newspaper, it is noteworthy to mention that Dick Gregory, a famous black comedian during the period, submitted multiple editorials discussing his perceptions on civil rights and the student movements of the decade. Preceding his first editorial was an Editor’s Note which read, “Mr. Gregory’s views are not necessarily those of the staff.” Throughout the research of *The Collegian* this was the only editorial in which this notice appeared. In the editorial, Gregory referred to Black Panther members Stokley Carmichael and Rap Brown.

Black militants are seen to be the enemies of the wholesome race relations in this country and are continually publicly rebuked by the mass media. But what America fails to understand is that its own rejection of the philosophy of non-violence has produced Stokley Carmichael and Rap Brown. (Gregory, 1968, pp. 4-5)

Later that year, Dick Gregory submitted another letter to the editor in which he delved into his perceptions on the relationship between the Civil Rights Movement and student protest.

To understand the ferment on the college campus today, you must have some perspective of recent history. When the civil rights movement first began, there were many honest white kids who wanted a piece of that action but their parents prohibited their involvement. In like manner, the white youth who are seizing college administrations and protesting the war in Vietnam today really wanted to be involved in the early days of the civil rights movement. And parents who forbade that involvement fed and nurtured the resentment their kids are expressing now. (Gregory, 1968, p. 4)
Summary of Themes

One major theme seen throughout *The Collegian* is that the student writers often situated their interpretations of issues within the national context as opposed to the college’s environment. Not only did these students tend to choose to discuss events which took place on the national stage over those that occurred on Ashland’s campus, they also perceived that this national perspective was important. In a staff editorial, students on *The Collegian* expressed the duty and significance of having a world view. “However, as the leaders of tomorrow, we must be aware of the state, national, and world situation as well. We must be concerned with the daily problems facing the United States” (“Editorially Speaking”, 1960, p. 2). Throughout the decade, students acknowledged how the events that occurred on other college campuses, in other states, and even in other nations impacted their perspectives and opinions.

Themes at Ohio Wesleyan University

The second university chosen for this project was Ohio Wesleyan University in Delaware, Ohio. The University was chartered in 1842 and founded by Methodists and according to the university, “maintains an active affiliation with the United Methodist church” (Ohio Wesleyan Universit, 2009, ¶ 1.) Ohio Wesleyan University updated and reworked their Statement of Aims over the course of the 1960s. The 1960-1961 Aims of Ohio Wesleyan began as follows:

The primary aim of Ohio Wesleyan is to provide each of her graduates with those educational disciplines and experiences which are fundamental to enduring personal satisfaction, social usefulness, and occupational competence. The attainment of such aims, the University believes, rests upon skills and habits, knowledge and attitudes which may and should be acquired in those major areas of human activity which compose our civilization. (Ohio Wesleyan University Bulletin, 1959, p. 9)
For the 1970-1971 school year, Ohio Wesleyan’s Statement of Aims began as follows,

By its charter, traditions, and convictions, Ohio Wesleyan is committed to the principles of liberal education. It attempts to develop in its students those qualities of intellect and character which will be useful no matter what vocation the student chooses to follow.

(Ohio Wesleyan University Bulletin, 1970, p. 98)

Also in the year 1970, the university adopted a Statement on Rights and Freedoms in addition to its Statement of Aims. It stated:

In 1970, the Ohio Wesleyan faculty adopted the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedom of Students, which endorses a concept of community responsibility where students, along with faculty and administrators are encouraged to play a more determining role in formulation of institutional policy. (Ohio Wesleyan University Bulletin, 1970, p. 99)

The student publication chosen from Ohio Wesleyan University was the Ohio Wesleyan Transcript. As of the 2009-2010 school year, the Ohio Wesleyan's Transcript was the oldest independent student newspaper in the country, with 142 years of continuous publication; the student newspaper did not change to its current name, The Transcript, until 1972 (Kostyu, 1999, ¶ 10). For its 131st anniversary in 1999, then associate professor of journalism at Ohio Wesleyan, Paul Kostyu, wrote a piece discussing various time periods in the history of the paper.

Of the 1960s and 1970s he wrote:

If the ‘fire in the belly’ ever existed among journalists on the OWU campus, it may have shown itself best during the 1960s and 1970s when campuses around the country were erupting with anti—Vietnam War fervor. Student journalists felt invigorated to challenge administrative authority. Erne Edwards, who served as advisor to The Transcript during his 33-year tenure as a journalism professor, recalled… “The administration used to be
scared to death of the paper,” Edwards said. “But I think our paper showed more responsibility than most student papers of the period (Kostyu, 1999, ¶ 20-21).

Civil Rights Movement

The issue of civil rights at Ohio Wesleyan University played out on the Ohio Wesleyan Transcript editorial pages within the context of events and policies at the university as opposed to events at the national level. Early in the decade, the university considered offering scholarships to students who were expelled from universities in the South because of their participation in actions of civil disobedience. Students felt quite passionate about the subject as can be seen in the dialogue between three students in the Letter to the Editor section:

My answer is, these students deserve special consideration from the University because they have courageously risked their opportunity for an education, even risking the humiliation of jail to peacefully protest against what we all know are social injustices which should not be allowed to exist in the United States. (Sell, 1960a, p. 5)

If Ohio Wesleyan has an overabundance of scholarship funds, possible more aid might be given to some students who carry a full schedule and try to hold two or three part time jobs, rather than aid students who have wasted their time sitting around lunch counters in South Carolina. (Hill, 1960, p. 5)

One wonders which is the more lethal: the now legendary apathy of our student body or a half-hearted interest in issues which leads to the kind of inaccurate conclusions Joe Hill expressed in his comments on the current protest demonstrations being conducted by Negro college students in nine southern states. … My initial reaction to Hill’s statements that Negroes who are fighting for the first—class citizenship which is
theirs by right are “wasting their time” is unprintable; my printable reaction is a compelling urge to hang, burn, or drown Mr. Hill in effigy. (Anderson, 1960, pp. 5-6)

While the possibility of offering scholarships to expelled students created impassioned responses from some students, the campus issue that consistently stirred controversy and conversation regarding civil rights were the policies of the Greek fraternities and sororities at the university. The height of the discussion was from the years 1962-1964, but the dialogue continued through 1969. The initial issue was brought to the forefront in a letter to the editor from a student:

Freshmen note that during rush, pointed questions about discrimination were met with evasive generalities or silence from upperclassmen of the fraternities not classified as ‘interracial’ …. What is even more disturbing is the fact that racial jokes have an almost universal appeal: there is no easier way to “get in with the boys” than to make a snide crack about Negroes or Jews. (Spear, 1961, p. 5)

Following this letter, students offered a wide spectrum of positions and solutions to the issue. Below, a student determined she could not continue to support Greek organizations:

Thus, because I believe very deeply that all people are created equal in the sight of God and that limitation of fraternity membership on the basis of difference in race or religion are unjust and destructive, I have come to the decision that I cannot maintain my personal integrity and continue to support a national organization whose membership policies directly contradict these beliefs. (Berkley, 1962, p. 5)

Other students, while not supporting the policies that they perceived as discriminatory, believed that the level of organization of the Greek community placed it at a distinctive advantage to fight discrimination. The editorial staff at OWU presented this belief in an editorial:
We feel the advantages of the fraternity system should not be discarded because of the faults. Rather, the faults should be done away with because of the advantages. Ohio Wesleyan men and women can better fight for nation-wide Greek integration when they are in the fraternity circles. Progressive action is better and more easily effected by pressure from within, not without a social group. (“OWU Can Fight Bias Better in Greek Bonds”, 1962, p. 4)

A year later, a student made the same claim, citing that the Greek community should take responsibility for their actions, but should not be forced to disband.

Now, after the vile murder of President Kennedy, hatred’s despicable implications should be clear to us all. The Greeks should not be forced to leave our campus, the solace of groupness. But if they will not take the responsibility upon themselves, then the administration and the trustees must compel them to end discrimination now.

(Rosefielde, 1963, p. 4)

A third opinion offered by some (and strongly vocalized by one student) was that on some level, choice and discrimination were inherent components of Greek life, and changing policies became an infringement on others’ rights.

But something is wrong, because Ohio Wesleyan discriminated against someone else and selected you to come instead. Well, how about that. A basic freedom, the freedom of choice, which seems to be the cardinal objective of the Negro is also a right the Greeks want to keep. Although in general they must submit to the fact that they do participate in the apparently inherent American sin of racial discrimination, would it not be a greater sin and one against ourselves to eliminate the right to select our friends? (Simpson, 1963, p. 3)
As the next two years progressed, national Greek chapters placed pressure on college chapters from the top down in order to eliminate clauses of discrimination. Some students and the editorial staff believed that forcing organizations to eliminate their clauses did not solve the problem at Ohio Wesleyan:

But they have only mentioned that we have to get rid of the clauses of discrimination that external pressure groups have put down, these groups being the national or alumni. But really is this the problem? If they really wanted to change, no pressure could hold them back. It is not the external pressure of segregation that is holding up the works, but the complacency of the houses in general, who do not want change or don’t really care.

(McWilliam, 1964, p. 4)

The wording of the resolution itself may be open to interpretation, but the ideal it argues cannot be denied. We strongly endorse this demand for local autonomy as the last workable written step toward ending discrimination in Greek organizations …. No one can guarantee unbiased membership selection until the entire moral attitude of the community changes. (“Anti Bias Resolution Shows Changing Time”, 1965, p. 4)

It is not until 1967 that any Black students submitted letters to the newspaper to discuss their perceptions on the issue. Below is a letter from one student:

A white liberal student may be unhappy and frustrated because he discovered that a Negro has been barred from a fraternity house because of his color. But I would be reluctant to grant that his unhappiness and frustration would equal the Negro’s unhappiness, frustration and bitterness. (Sotondiji, 1967, p. 5)
The backdrop of Greek Organizations as the battlefront of segregation continued after the discrimination clauses were eliminated. Students from the Racial Awareness Committee used the following fraternity event as an example of the continued racism on campus:

Recently a fraternity party was arranged at this bar and a part of the festivities was the showing of an Amos n’ Andy cartoon. During the film two blacks walked into the bar and there was an immediate reaction of tension on the part of the whites who were aware of their presence. The blacks, noticing the movie and undoubtedly sensitive to the tension quietly left. As soon as the door closed behind them, a sense of relief was felt by those who had witnessed the incident. Some tried to relieve the guilt-charged atmosphere by cracking weak jokes such as, ‘This place is gonna burn tonight!’ These sick jokes are examples of the way in which whites attempt to relieve their feelings of guilt. Yet these attempts are only temporary methods of defense and do not begin to resolve or even face the problem of white racism. (‘Racial Awareness Committee’, 1969, p. 4)

While the students at Ohio Wesleyan situated the issue of civil rights largely within the confines of the walls of Ohio Wesleyan University, the depth to which the issues of discrimination and racism were discussed throughout the years was extensive. Even in the early years of the decade students took strong positions regarding the issue of civil disobedience through the discussion of the potential scholarship for expelled Southern students. The issue of discrimination stayed in the spotlight and was expanded upon as new developments arose both at the university (the elimination of discrimination clauses) and outside of the university (the shooting of President Kennedy) as new students came to the university and were affected by these policies they contributed their perceptions regarding the issue, thus bringing new life to the dialogue.
Vietnam War

It is clear from the number of letters and editorials, that the Vietnam War was a pertinent issue to students at Ohio Wesleyan. Individual students like Jody Courtney, Suzy Neuberg, Jim Radcoe, and Jan Whittemore (1968) came together to write a letter with their concerns regarding the war. “1. Does war have direction?; meaning?; any value?; limits?; any concern for its participants?; a purpose? A beginning, middle, end?; is an American game? 2. What did you expect? (p. 5). Similarly, the staff at the Ohio Wesleyan Transcript wanted the OWU administration to make a formal statement declaring the school’s position on the war. “If OWU is willing to face these obstacles to education in order to perpetuate a war which it supports, then the fact must be made known” (“Policy Statement Needed on War in Vietnam”, 1968, p. 4).

Perhaps there are sound reasons for continuing a bloody war on foreign soil, perhaps there is a reason for disrupting the educations of thousands of students who may never see their homes again, and perhaps there is a reason for allowing this thinking to be bred on the Ohio Wesleyan Campus—but to date we have not heard it. (“Is There Any Dialogue?”, 1966, p. 4)

Individual students also chided their peers to give some attention to the war situation. “If we at OWU could sandwich, somewhere between apartment policy fights and ‘student rights’ rallies, a little support for this much larger issue, we may not look a little less ridiculous to ourselves in 20 years” (Palmer, 1969, p. 4).

Students at Ohio Wesleyan certainly held strong opinions concerning the Vietnam War, but many spent almost as much time discussing the most effective and appropriate ways for students to voice their opinions. As student Don Adams (1966) wrote in a letter:
The uncontrollable, massive unruly crowds that turned out on Saturday to protest the war in Vietnam and to support the picketers were certain signs that the Ohio Wesleyan SDS is ‘in’, and that Ohio Wesleyan is truly the ‘Berkeley of the Midwest.’ (p. 4)

A dialogue occurs between students Dan Storrs, Bobby Bao and Lawrence Boen concerning the most effective means of sharing one’s opinion on the war when an assistant chaplain planned to organize a group of students to go to Washington D.C. to protest American policy in Vietnam.

Assistant Chaplain Quentin Woomer of the Religious Life Office:

This demonstration is to be in opposition to American actions in South Vietnam. I find this proposal irresponsible and obnoxious. He and I apparently agree that peaceful demonstration is an acceptable means of self expression. It is in my experience that many OWU students feel the same way. Further, I think the majority hate the idea of interrupting their lives and careers to go off to a jungle war in Southeast Asia. But playing on these fears, and a desire for self expression especially to demonstrate against a government policy is obnoxious in itself. So why does Mr. Woomer want to picket the Pentagon? I suggest he might more profitably turn his energy towards producing a Wednesday Chapel program that the other half of the campus would stay through, rather than organizing bus tours to succor his own need to demonstrate. (Storrs, 1965, pp. 4 - 5)

Dan Storrs’ letter last week, which opposed Quentin Woomer’s stand on the Vietnam issue, reflects the partial success of the Johnson Administration’s desperate endeavor to inculcate on the masses a mentality which favors blunders in foreign policy. Storrs believes, understandably, but regrettably that “to demonstrate against a government policy is obnoxious in itself” as long as the policy is rational and to the national interest. It appears to us that one distinctive trademark of American democracy
is the freedom to criticize government. A government dedicated to genuine democratic principles should welcome criticisms even if they are considered erroneous. (“2 Students Fire Back at Viet March Critic”, 1965, pp. 4-5)

Similar to Ashland University’s *The Collegian*, the *Ohio Wesleyan Transcript* supported the October 15, 1969 Vietnam War Moratorium throughout their editorials.

On October 15 students and all others concerned about the U.S. and its continued involvement in the undeclared, bloody inhumane war in South East Asia, are planning to band together in their horror and shock, mourning and disgust at America’s presence there. Here at OWU the Free University has planned a University of Concern to emphasize positive discussion and community endeavor towards making this withdrawal a reality. (“Vietnam Moratorium: A Positive Endeavor”, 1969, p. 4)

This day is as every day must be until the end of the Vietnam War, a time for mourning the slaughter of all those who are fighting. Ohio Wesleyan University’s Statement of Aims reads in part… “Ohio Wesleyan has functioned upon the assumption that a university is by definition a community of scholars devoted to the free pursuit of truth.” This pursuit of truth is based upon reason and faith in each individual’s intellectual potential. How can such an institution not take a position of mourning on October 15, 1969? (“A Time to Mourn and Be Aware”, 1969, p. 4)

Some students found faults in the activities which took place during the Moratorium observances. In particular, he discussed the pressure he felt to donate money to the anti—war effort.

We were told that it was “expected” of us to donate money for a cause…We were made to feel sick, ashamed, and without moral values for the sole purpose of raising money
rather than seriously thinking about the problems and situations that this country has
today. This money, that was so generously donated by the students of Ohio Wesleyan,
may very well be the same money that will someday place this country in the hands of
these same irresponsible activists who believe that the end justifies the means (Potts,
1969, p. 4)

Students at Ohio Wesleyan demonstrated a concern for the issues surrounding the
Vietnam War, and also encouraged their fellow students to take time to ponder these dilemmas,
whether it be informally such as Bob Palmer, or formally as the editorial staff did for the October
15, Moratorium. A theme which existed within these letters and editorials was the need to
discuss the methods that individuals used to express their opinions regarding the war instead of
focusing on whether they supported the war or not. Dan Storrs suggested that the assistant
chaplain would be more effective if he wrote a speech for the chapel service as opposed to
traveling with students to Washington D.C. Don Adams expressed his disgust with the “unruly”
protesters, and Hank Potts wrote of the inappropriate way students raised funds for the anti-war
movement. In contrast, the staff editorials appeared to be largely concerned with a position on
the war and made a strong push for the administration to formally express their opinions on the
Moratorium and the war.

Free Speech Movement and Student Protest

Similar to Ashland University’s The Collegian, Ohio Wesleyan’s student newspaper did
not directly come out with any statements concerning the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley,
but students did on occasion refer to OWU as Berkeley when they felt students were acting
unruly or if they were determined to demonstrate that Ohio Wesleyan was not a campus of
protest. For example in a staff editorial the students’ stated: “So, mothers, when you leave Ohio
Wesleyan, remember that your son or daughter is not a student at the ‘Berkeley of the Midwest,’ but is striving to prepare for this world in flux” (“Students Change With the Times”, 1966, p. 4).

A lack of discussion about Berkeley did not mean that Ohio Wesleyan students always perceived that their beliefs aligned with the university’s administration. The two main issues seen as causing tension between the students and the administration were the philosophy of *in loco parentis* (in place of the parent) and protests against the presence of Air Force Reserve Officers’ Training Core (AFROTC) on campus.

The issue of *in loco parentis* was strongly fought on the pages of the *Ohio Wesleyan Transcript* in the year 1966. Chuck Babcock (1966) a retiring editor-in-chief at the end of the 1965-1966 school year was the first to address the administration regarding this issue.

I challenge them to recognize the weakness of *in loco parentis*—for one enters an academic community to learn, from freedom and responsibility, so he may enter the real world freed from mama’s apron strings. I challenge Ohio Wesleyan University, therefore, to forsake its family image for that of the academic individual. (p. 5)

A staff editorial also addressed the issue of *in loco parentis*. The editorial expressed the concern that students were frustrated by the lack of administration compromise in granting students more freedom at Ohio Wesleyan. “The recent student agitation against University regulations is just another reflection of this generation’s demands that their increased concern and responsibility be reciprocated by the intellectual community” (“Closed Doors, Deans Block Communication”, 1966, p. 2).

During the time that students began engaging in a dialogue regarding *in loco parentis*, the *Ohio Wesleyan Transcript* introduced a new voluntary column entitled “Faculty Speaks Out.” Two professors in the next month, discussed both the issue of *in loco parentis* and student
unrest. The first column was by Daniel Anderson, an assistant professor of philosophy, while the second quotation is from an assistant professor of politics and government, Gene Chenoweth.

There seems today to be a general unrest among students—not just Ohio Wesleyan students, but students throughout the world. It would be in my estimation a serious blunder to brush this away as the noise made by a vociferous few, a result of delayed adolescent rebellion, or, as one recent visitor to our campus seemed to suggest, some sort of mass youthful psychosis. (Anderson, 1966, pp. 2-3)

Signs point to increasing student restiveness under traditional “in loco parentis” patterns of college life. Faculty and administrators did not create this restiveness; neither can we alone deal with it. If deans and administrators are pressured by well meaning parents and alumni to maintain older patterns of “custodial care” of student mores, and if we consent to attempt this, we may well witness some unfortunate and disruptive explosions as part of the coming change. (Chenoweth, 1966, p. 6)

The second issue that students at Ohio Wesleyan disagreed with the administration on was the presence of Air Force ROTC on campus. The staff at the Ohio Wesleyan Transcript felt that the religious affiliation of the school was a stark contrast to the administration’s support for AFROTC. “Methodists have always held to the principle of separation of Church and State. The installation of ROTC units in church colleges is in violation of this principle ‘The Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Church’ (“Consider the Following”, 1966, p. 4). These editorial remarks were subsequently rebuffed by two letters to the editors from Professor W. F Waber, and student William D. Watson.

Does his quotation imply that he, or his editorial board, accepts the Methodist discipline as an authoritative source on all questions of faith morals? If so, I accept the answer as an
article of personal faith and say no more. However, I have gotten the distinct impression from certain past issues of the Transcript that its editorial board is not always in perfect accord with that discipline. In which case, it seems to me, it is not sufficient simply to quote a single item that happens to agree with one’s views. (Waber, 1966, p. 7)

Also somewhere in the back of their minds must be the fact that someday they may be faced with death so that this institution may continue its “liberal arts” educational program and so that The Transcript may continue to write editorials opposing ROTC (Watson, 1966, p. 11).

In response to Waber’s commentary the editorial staff replied, “As for Waber’s point concerning the Methodist Doctrine, we most emphatically agree that ‘The Transcript is not always in perfect accord with that Discipline.’ We were merely citing the statement to exemplify the University’s hypocritical use of Methodist doctrine” (“AFROTC Not Academic Apathy Kills Valid Issue”, 1966, p. 5).

The dialogue on how to effectively and efficiently express one’s point of view continued throughout the years at the Ohio Wesleyan Transcript, and shifted into other student issues beyond the Vietnam War. During the years 1967 and 1968 there remained a disagreement between students as to whether protesting was a positive act of involvement, or if it was an ineffective waste of time. The editorial staff of 1967-1968 questioned the effectiveness of student demonstrations, but later expressed the belief that this action represented a positive change away from apathy.

Recent student demonstrations call attention to the need for re-evaluation of their effectiveness and method… Irresponsible demonstrators have been countered by equally irresponsible law enforcement. The once fashionable student riot now leaves a bad taste
in the mouths of political affiliates on both sides of the center line. (“Riots Leave Bad Taste”, 1967, p. 4)

Countless other examples of involvement and action in the past year could be cited. Some of the efforts have yielded positive results; others have failed to create a notable impression. What is important is the fact that OWU is awakening to the problems within as well as outside its community. A continuation of such activity can result in only one thing: progress for Ohio Wesleyan University. (“Student Involvement Marks Changing Campus”, 1968, p. 4)

Students also questioned the effectiveness of student protest, but supported change in policies and perspectives. Barbara Boles asked students to take additional initiative if they wanted to demonstrate true commitment to social change, while Stephen Jacoby questioned whether the environment of Ohio Wesleyan was even susceptible to another perspective.

There is little effort involved in carrying a picket sign protesting social injustice or inequality. A demonstration such as that last Saturday during the president’s reception, is meaningless unless the students involved demonstrate their sincerity through organized social action. (Boles, 1968, p. 4)

If Ohio Wesleyan is a school founded by ‘conservative churchmen’ run by a ‘conservative’ administration, financed by ‘conservative’ parents, propagated by ‘conservative’ benefactors and attended by ‘conservative’ students, then it seems quite improbable that a few ‘liberal’ students will make any cracks in this ‘conservative’ institution. But I wish you the best in your attempt. (Jacoby, 1967, p. 4)

Although Ohio Wesleyan students made efforts to claim that they were not, “the Berkeley of the Midwest” it was clear that there was a level of dissonance among students and the administration
at Ohio Wesleyan University. While these students may have chided their peers for participating in protests and demonstrations, it seemed that they did not admonish standing for a change in the status quo. Ultimately many of the students simply perceived protesting as an ineffective method for achieving change. Through issues such as in loco parentis and the Army ROTC, it is evident that students not only disagreed, but were willing to speak out against the administration’s policies. These students may not have received the attention their peers at Berkeley did, but they were certainly active participants in student demonstration.

Kent State University

The Ohio Wesleyan Transcript’s reaction to the Kent State University shootings demonstrated that many students perceived the incident as an opportunity for student protestors to see the error of their ways, rather than an event which evoked outrage. The three editorials written following the shootings all share a common thread of pointing out the contradiction between using violence as a means to achieve peace. While the first two pieces were reflections of the incident, the third offered students alternative peaceful outlets for voicing dissent against the war.

The student movement which has swept the nation has been stained—bloodstained. Students, with basic morality on their side, have the forces of violence working against their good intentions. Peaceful demonstrations, no matter how massive they may be, are generally tolerated by the nation as a whole, which, more and more reluctantly, admits that citizens have the right to dissent. But when that dissent turns to violence, the result is a nationwide backlash. (“Violence Hurts Student Anti-war Movement”, 1970, p. 4)

The present student movement towards representative democracy and an end to a ridiculous and tragic war across the sea has gone out of control in some aspects. When it
is influenced by outside agitators without sincere interest in a meaningful peaceful "revolution" and, even worse when the presence of an improperly trained National Guard over-reacts with firepower and tear gas, things get out of control. (Del Corso, 1970, p. 4)

Violence has proven contrary to the best interests of the peace cause … plus it represents an obvious paradox. Massive demonstrations and rallies alienate the vast majority of middle class Americans, who see even peaceful dissent as an annoyance, communist-inspired and highly un-American. The boycott, if it spreads to other products, may bring fast results with no violence and a minimal amount of discomfort to the public. When you have a chance to support the anti-war boycott do so. Unless you truly believe that the war is just, sensible, honorable, ‘American.’ (“Consumer Boycott Helps the Anti-war Movement”, 1970, p. 4)

The first editorial “Violence Hurts Anti-war Movement” seems to find that the tragedy in the event is the “national backlash” that violent student protest provoked. The second editorial stops short of blaming the victims in the shooting as “outside agitators without sincere interest in a meaningful peaceful ‘revolution.’ ” Finally, while the third editorial offers a peaceful alternative to violent protest, the reasoning behind the suggestion to participate in a peaceful boycott appears to be that the editorial staff finds that boycotting products “may bring fast results.” It is also interesting to see the contradiction between the first and third article regarding the authors’ perceptions of American’s tolerance for protest. The first author perceived that protests “are generally tolerated by the nation as a whole” while the third author observed that “the vast majority of middle class Americans, who see even peaceful dissent as an annoyance, communist-inspired and highly un-American.” Ultimately, the Ohio Wesleyan’s Transcript
concluded the contradiction and ineffectiveness of violent protest was the biggest regret of the Kent State University shootings.

Summary of Themes

The students who wrote for and submitted letters to the *Ohio Wesleyan Transcript* commonly chose events within the campus community in order to discuss larger national and world issues. This was seen through the use of the Greek Community as the backdrop for a discussion on civil rights, as well as the feelings expressed regarding Vietnam War protesting on campus. Students also addressed issues of student protest and dissent through their disagreements with the administration on policies of *in loco parentis* and the presence of Air Force ROTC on campus.

One theme that was apparent throughout the decade was students’ perceived hypocrisy between the Christian values of a Methodist institution and various policies or student behavior. Many students perceived the issue of racial discrimination within the Greek Community as a complete rejection of Christian values. Below is commentary from student Jerry Sell and Mark Liebergall:

In the Midwest, one commonly hears of the “Godless Ivy League College” where Midwestern freshmen go to lose their faith. On the other hand we see colleges like Ohio Wesleyan founded and run by the Christian church and supposedly and ostentatiously indicating Christian principles. Yet one of the fundamental truths of Christianity is the equality of all men in the eyes of God and in the eyes of a real Christian. But which college takes a courageous step against racial discrimination in its social scene? Is it the “Christian” college or the “Godless, sophisticated Ivy League” school? It is the latter.

(Sell, 1960b, p. 5)
I wish to state the problem as openly and as plainly as it can be done. If people have the right, as President Smith stated, to judge one another on human qualities, not only on criteria of race and religion but on dress, speech, “slickness” of manner, and other superficial qualities, why then is this a Christian institution?... People in a Christian context have no right to judge other people—only God has this right—as Christ died to show! (Liebergall, 1963, p. 4)

On the issue of Vietnam, student Robert Dorman (1966) questioned reconciling his Christian education with the war he would fight if he was drafted.

I wonder, however, just how valuable our degrees are going to be.... I am not sure how valuable will be the arts of objectivity and logic, which we are also learning. These arts make it somewhat difficult to square a Christian and Democratic ideology with American support of dictators such as Batista in Cuba and Trujillo in the Dominican Republic; military coups in the Dominican Republic and Brazil; and the fascists Diem and Ky in Vietnam (p. 4).

As mentioned previously, one of the fundamental arguments made by members of the editorial staff against having the Air Force ROTC on campus was a dissonance between the AFROTC and Christian university goals and values:

Military training seems in direct opposition to the basic premises of this University—a faith in intellectual decision making and rational problem solution. For an educational institution, such as OWU purports to be, to give academic credit to courses which further violent, rather than rational means for solving world problems seems unreasonable even hypocritical. (“ROTC Credit Not Valid”, 1969, p. 4)
One final dialogue seen throughout this decade in the *Ohio Wesleyan Transcript* was a discussion regarding the most effective means of expressing dissent and incurring change. Whether it was bringing attention to issues of civil rights, the Vietnam War, student dissent, or more campus community based issues such as *in loco parentis*, students consistently argued that there were other methods of expressing one’s opinions besides protest. Many students often went on to argue that to genuinely stand for a cause one must do something more proactive than protesting.

**Themes at Hillsdale College**

The third university chosen for this research was Hillsdale College located in rural southern Michigan. Founded in 1844, the university continues to maintain its commitment to the Judeo-Christian faith (Hillsdale College, 2009, ¶ 1). The following mission statement was featured in the college catalog beginning in the year 1960 and remained unchanged through the year 1970. It stated the purpose of Hillsdale College as:

To prepare young men and women for leadership as citizens of their country and of their world. By directing them toward an understanding and appreciation of the American way of life. By encouraging them in the development of a satisfying religious faith. By surrounding them with opportunities to observe and practice the best that is known in human relations. By inspiring them to achieve the high intellectual standards for a rich cultural and vocational life. All these to the end that as leaders of tomorrow they may sustain with wisdom their personal search for truth” (Hillsdale College Bulletin, 1960, p. 2).

During this time, Hillsdale was in the midst of making an administrative decision that would make it an anomaly in higher education. The Department of Health, Education and
Welfare informed the Hillsdale Administration that because some students were receiving federal loans, the college was required to count its students by race (Hillsdale College History and Mission, 2009, ¶ 6). The trustees response to the government regulations was to make Hillsdale a completely independent college, in order to free them from complying with federal regulations:

Hillsdale’s trustees responded with two toughly worded resolutions: One, the College would continue its policy of non—discrimination. Two, ‘with the help of God,’ it would ‘resist, by all legal means, any encroachments on its independence.’ Following almost a decade of litigation, the U.S. Supreme Court decided against Hillsdale in 1984. By this time, the College had announced that rather than complying with unconstitutional federal regulation, it would instruct its students that they could no longer bring federal taxpayer money to Hillsdale. Instead, the College would replace that aid with private contributions. (Hillsdale College History and Mission, 2009, ¶ 6 and 7)

Throughout the decade of the 1960s, Hillsdale College experienced various changes in their student demographics. The Annual Hillsdale College Bulletin (1960) reported that for the 1959-1960 school year a total of 856 students were enrolled at the college. These students represented 16 states and 11 foreign countries with a total of 74% of students being identified as Michigan residents (p. 139). In contrast, for the 1968-1969 school year the Hillsdale College Announcements (1969) reported a total enrollment of 1,135 students, representing 34 states as well as the District of the Columbia and 19 foreign countries (p. 134).

The Hillsdale Collegian is Michigan’s oldest college newspaper. The initial Hillsdale Herald was first issued as a four page weekly newspaper by Professor Rideout in 1878, and served the needs of the faculty and administration, as opposed to the student body. Its first
editorial stated that one goal of the *Herald* was “to present… from time to time one or more ‘solid’ articles from faculty, scientific or otherwise, on living issues of the day…” (Moore, 1943, p. 433). As the years progressed, students became more involved in various aspects of the paper. In 1899, the publication became the *New Collegian* and was edited by students as opposed to faculty members, but as Moore (1943) noted, a lack of funds almost ended the paper completely.

Throughout the earlier decades of the twentieth century, the *Collegian*’s chief anxiety was the insufficient income from its subscription list…. Finally in 1922 the subscription price was included in the tuition and the paper’s financial difficulties were at an end. (pp. 440-441).

**Civil Rights Movement**

One of the major themes seen throughout the discussion of civil rights at Hillsdale was the trepidation to condemn the Southern regions of the United States for racism. In 1960, a student editorial discussed the rights of private business owners to refuse service to Black customers in order to cater to the desires of its White clientele. The editorial acknowledged that Southern culture was a variable in race relations that made the issue more difficult to navigate.

What was involved was a protest against racial prejudice as such. Yet we would question the appropriateness of protesting against a Southern (and to a different extent a national) custom by applying pressure on a private business establishment that has found it necessary to conform to the wishes of society in order to do business. What conclusions can we draw? While we are for desegregation, we realize that the problem is complex and that no easy solution is possible. (‘On Other Campuses’, 1960, p. 2)
Five years later, the dialogue evolved beyond a simple acknowledgment of differences in Northern and Southern culture. The following student confronted his peers for hypocritical attitudes towards southern racism and the belief that racism did not exist in the North.

We sit in our little corner of the world and righteously condemn the authorities in Alabama. But the problem of civil rights is not peculiar to this area. It is easy to throw stones at others. Perhaps in this atmosphere of indignation it would be well for some to introspect [sic]. Is our area just as guilty in Hillsdale (perhaps in subtle ways) as the rulers of Alabama? (Swartz, 1965, p. 2)

Later that year, another student conceded that Northern racism did exist, but felt that again there was a contradiction between how society perceived regional racism.

On no grounds other than the color of their skin, children are forced to attend another school. That is racism. But, opponents of racism raised no outraged cry, so it must be concluded that there are two kinds of racism; good racism and bad racism. Are Southerners ‘bad racists’ and Northerners, with ‘truth and justice’ on their side, ‘good racists’? (Roesch, 1965, p. 2)

Student Timothy Wilson (1967) also delved into the issue of regional racism. He interviewed an African American man for an editorial column in order to get his perceptions about the differences between the North and South.

“The great riots don’t occur in the South. There the Negro is told where he stands. If you’re black stay back. If you’re white you’re all right. It’s here in the North that you are left hanging. In some places you’re treated as an equal. In others you’re spit on.” (p. 2)
Throughout the decade, students at Hillsdale used national events as their foundation to address the issue of civil rights. This analysis began as a basic acknowledgement that cultural characteristics created complications in passing judgment, and evolved to an exploration into how these cultural differences may make it difficult to perceive the racism which existed in their own region, as well as at Hillsdale.

Vietnam War

The students at Hillsdale College, similar to many students around the country, initially supported American involvement in Vietnam. The following editorial expressed the sentiment of the editorial staff in 1965:

To most college students Vietnam is a far off place in which the United States has no business fighting; they can see little benefit from this ridiculously outmoded war, and actually there is none, except that it puts a recheck on the aggressive advance of Communism in this remote home of ‘those lethal little men in black pajamas’ and in countless similar places in Europe, Asia and South America, where Americans have fought in the past and are fighting now. (Allen, 1965, p. 2)

Near the end of 1965, a student remarked on a common trend at Hillsdale when it came to the debate surrounding the war. He observed students’ reaction to a speech made by a guest speaker who self identified as a practicing pacifist:

In talking with various members of the class after hearing Mr. Young speak, the same reaction could be heard over and over again. This reaction was that these students disagreed more or less by instinct with what the articulate pacifist had proclaimed, but that they generally felt incapable of pin-pointing specifically why. (Keller, 1965, p. 2)
While there were students who continued to support the war efforts throughout the decade, student dissent began to appear, specifically when it came to the issue of the draft. Some students placed their frustrations with the draft on the Hillsdale administration, who they perceived as using the draft to put pressure on the academic achievement of male students. Below are student editorials from Steve Fairchild and Mike O’Mara:

The college deferment will probably be the next group dipped into. Tell me you haven’t noticed the pressure. It seems like every letter you receive from the Dean or registrar ends with ‘failure to comply with the above… will result in informing your draft board of your present status’ At the present escalation rate, by 1980, Hillsdale could become an all girls’ school… (Fairchild, 1966, p. 2)

It is unfortunate, however, that a number of male students are no longer members of our student body because of the new academic requirements, but have now been conscripted to defend our country in Southeast Asia. I suppose it could be said that they have left one failing situation only to enter another. (O’Mara, 1967, p. 3)

Throughout the remainder of the decade, the draft continued to dominate most of the discussion regarding Vietnam. Male student editorials and letters began to reflect students’ frustration with a lack of control over their future.

Today’s college senior man has many alternatives. He can wait and get drafted. He can get a job or go to graduate school while waiting to get drafted and hope that maybe he won’t get drafted at least not for a while. The other choice is to sign up to be an officer, where military life isn’t so bad. It’s such a great selection. (“Carl’s Corner”, 1969, p. 6)

The point of this system is that candidates for the service now know where they stand and can predict in some way their future, but by the way the television stations...
covered the drawing, I think that only the men fighting or who are going to fight give a
damn about the future anyway. (Rems, 1969a, p. 2)

Whilst students and newspaper staff members vented their frustrations with the potential hold
placed on their future, some students critiqued the productivity of those who had received
student deferments.

I received a student 2S deferment. Now the question is what do I do today? It seems that
more brain power is being used by students today to find ways of preventing their
obligation to fight. Harvard University students even published a number of accounts
explaining different situations that the service turned down. These activities vary from
felony to homosexuality. (Rems, 1969b, p. 2)

This editorial received strong feedback from students, who objected to the notion that men were
obligated to fight.

Contrary to what your editor says you do not have an ‘obligation to fight.’

Eligible men have a legal obligation to serve their country for a minimum two years. If
you see another way out, that is your business. If you want to go the Conscientious
Objector or jail route more power to you. You may be broke for the rest of your life but
at least you will have a clean conscience. (Schaeffer, 1969, p. 2)

I hope sincerely that those who are against the war and the draft will make it
known. I’d hate to see those repulsed by the war dying because it was expected of them.
You spoke about Harvard’s booklet with a bit of sarcasm. Doesn’t it seem the least bit
frightening that in order to practice what America preaches, namely honesty, virtue,
freedom, equality, love, peace and all we know as good, college students have to pretend
to be something which they aren’t to avoid jail in standing up for what they know is right? (Dubois, 1969, p. 2)

There was significant participation in the October 15, 1969 Vietnam War Moratorium on college campuses across the country, however, there was only one editorial and no letters to the editor discussing this event at Hillsdale. The following comment on the event while cautious remained supportive of the cause.

I don’t think 70 percent of all students involved in yesterday’s activities across the nation were not seriously involved with the proceedings. I have all hopes that yesterday will benefit any cause which involves the war, but by no means do I want people to sign petitions without complete knowledge of its contents. (Rems, 1969c, p. 2)

Hillsdale’s dialogue concerning the Vietnam War largely revolved around the draft, and it appears that the College’s administration played a role in bringing this reality to the forefront for its male student body. By raising its academic standards and informing students about the impending consequences of not remaining in good academic standing, students were constantly confronted with the possibility of going to war.

Free Speech Movement and Student Protest

Hillsdale College’s unique decision to refuse federal government funding during the 1960s influenced some students’ perceptions of why the administration’s policies were strict and strongly against student protesting.

As an independent college, Hillsdale must gather funds from any possible source. To do this the College has to project a favorable image, which, as I see it, accounts for some of the stricter than necessary rules. Hours for women, drinking restrictions, Men’s
and Women’s Council judgments—a great many of these and others are based on the all important publicity. (“Editorial”, 1966, p. 2)

It’s so nice to come to ‘this last bulwark of educational freedom,’ where student freedom is non-existent. We can’t protest kiddies, because the sterling reputation of this fine institution may become tarnished. Then dear old J. Don can’t go out and mush up a few hundred grand…. (Acitelli, 1969, p. 2)

Other students expressed frustrations with student activists rather than the administration for thwarting the efforts of change in society. The following editorial critiqued the methods of student protest, while the second quotation came from a student who placed blame on student activism for the defeat of granting voting rights to 18 year-olds in Michigan.

Unfortunately, the hot and heavy hand of passion so often used by college students to make themselves heard, instead makes them ludicrously foolish in the eyes of the public, and their voices are muted by derision. (“Editorial”, 1965, p. 2)

My feeling however, is one of rather acute disappointment. The young men and women of our state, I fear, once again have been sold short due to the small minority of punks and troublemakers who unfortunately, grab most of the attention of the public eye. (Potter, 1966, p. 2)

At the beginning of the 1968-1969 school year, the editor-in-chief offered this advice to students who wished to see change at Hillsdale. “You probably won’t make television by instituting some change by channeling your efforts through the Federation, but you’ll at least be in school to enjoy the fruits of your work” (“Across the Editor’s Desk”, 1968, p. 2). With students being asked to use appropriate methods to voice their concerns, there were still others who felt that this could not be achieved.
If the war and draft are wrong, and they can’t be ended by going through the “system” or by using peaceful means (as they can’t), then what are we going to do? Are we going to fight and use any means necessary to end the war and draft? I for one have made up my mind. (Immerman, 1969, p. 2)

The policy at Hillsdale College is that there are no riots, demonstrations, or violence—oriented protests allowed on campus. Bravo Hillsdale College. All suggestions for change are to be conducted through ‘proper channels’. A second splendid idea, H.C. But when the majority’s ideas—which were expressed in a proper form of protest—are squelched in the turmoil of a compromise in which it has no voice, then the institution which condones such policies is inviting the only form of protest left—violence. (Wakefield, 1969, p. 2)

Starting in 1968, there was a change in the attitude of some of the editorial board concerning student protest that suggested that students at Hillsdale saw some merit in the practice. The editorial staff still had disdain for the “hippy” lifestyle’s lack of morals, but they also critiqued the apparent complacency at Hillsdale.

In this age of hippyism and the radical detachment from the mores of society, it is ennobling to find that the Hillsdale student body has chosen to follow the righteous road—the narrow way. Where but at Hillsdale could one find students completely dependent on the tried ideas and the unchanging patterns? There is no need to try anything new; the Hillsdale students have found THE way and this pragmatic path is good because it’s been used for 100 years. The narrow path is not difficult to follow; one merely follows the leader. There is no need for new ideas; they are set. There is no need for intellectual endeavor; everyone is alike. (“The Narrow Way”, 1968, p. 2)
One editorial member correlated student unrest to an understanding and interest in world affairs.

Three weeks ago a senate sub-committee was at Hillsdale to study the reason for the “Air of Peace” here while other campuses across the nation are being plagued by violence. This study group was looking for solutions to student dissent. I hope to be able to help this senate committee by simplifying the means of stopping student problems. The first step is to screen out the very top high school applicants, because the highly intellectual students seem to take more interest in the world situations. (Sussman, 1969, p. 2)

While all colleges and universities consist of people with differing ideology and attitudes, Hillsdale appeared to struggle with their perspective on student activism. In one year, student activism was admonished by an editorial as a way for people to become famous on television, but then the same editorial staff appears to come down harshly on students for following a “pragmatic path.” Throughout the various editorials and letters on the subject, it seemed that regardless of whether a student condemned or supported taking alternative action towards change, student activism was perceived as involving violence and rioting.

Kent State University

The response to the Kent State University shootings by Editor-in-Chief Andy Nickle was in contrast to a letter submitted by a group of students in the same issue. Nickle’s reply was a backlash against violence on campus, but instead of blaming the soldiers from the National Guard, his blame rested on student protesters who took their anger out irrationally and senselessly against a university administration who had no say over the issue they were protesting.

Monday, four students were killed at Kent State, other colleges were reporting extensive damages and long injury lists. While many causes of these students appear worth
support, one must question the rationale of turning a college campus into a battleground. Many times, during this past week, college property was destroyed and operations were stopped concerning an issue which the college administrators had no control-the Cambodian situation. (Nickle, 1970a, p. 2)

One week later Nickle remained frustrated when he learned that students at Hillsdale wanted the president of the college to make a statement regarding the events at Kent State University. He felt again, that students were directing their attention in an inappropriate place. “The point that upset me most was the request that President Phillips issue a statement of his position on Cambodia, Vietnam, and the Kent State University incident. President Phillips owes none of us his personal views on these off-campus issues” (Nickle, 1970b, p. 2).

Other students on Hillsdale’s campus drafted a “Statement of Concern” in which they declared their opposition to violence on campus.

We the undersigned, disturbed by the violence abroad and the resultant violence here in the United States, and most recently appalled by the deaths of six [sic] Kent State students, after much responsible thought, suggest that the Government of the United States consider the following recommendations: 1. We are opposed to all violence, whether initiated by civilians (i.e., students, etc. or by troops.) 2. We recommend that no lethal weapons be loaded in a protest area in anticipation of violence, but rather that such weapons be loaded only on the definite order of the officer in command, and then only in a defensive situation. We strongly urge a re-evaluation of the current system of crowd control and the present method of coping with violence. 4. [sic] We are unconditionally against any form of escalation of the war in any part of Southeast Asia. 5. We earnestly hope that President Nixon is sincere in his statement that sending
American troops into Cambodia is not an escalation of the war, but instead is an honest attempt to protest [sic] American troops already in Vietnam. 6. We charge President Nixon to respect his announced plans for withdrawal from Southeast Asia with the greatest expediency and with the smallest loss of human life; our greatest concern being for the loss of American men fighting for a cause which we, the American people, do not understand. 7. We recommend that the direction and the fate of the war be delegated to Congress where it Constitutionally belongs. 8. We demand that Congress and the Administration accept the [sic] their Constitutional obligation to honestly represent and directly inform the American people (“Statement of Concern”, 1970, p. 6).

The frustration which arose from Hillsdale College as a result of the Kent State University shootings was focused on myriad people for various reasons. The editor while still supporting the anti-war efforts deplored the students’ violence. In the same way, the student authors of the “Statement of Concern” did not approve of student rioting, but they also acknowledged the role of law enforcement in the incident.

Summary of Themes

Hillsdale College students’ perspectives on the social and political issues of the decade often were within the context of events playing out on the national stage. Discussions on civil rights involved the impact of regional culture, the Vietnam War dialogue was largely concerned with the policy of conscription, and student activism and the shootings at Kent State University often involved a discussion of what was happening on campuses nationwide. What is consistent throughout these discussions of national events was how often students incorporated the choices or policies of the Hillsdale administration into their writings.
When students discussed the draft they also mentioned the pressure from the administration to meet high academic standards in order to keep student deferments. In the debate on student activism, school policies regarding student protest were critiqued and even cited as the reason why students felt a sense of unrest. Lastly, one student suggested that the reason there was a lack of student activism on campus was because of the willingness of the college to accept students who were not intellectually adept enough to be interested in world politics.
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION
Integration of Themes Across Context

Through studying the editorial and letters to the editor pages of the Ashland College, Ohio Wesleyan University, and Hillsdale College student newspapers during the 1960s, various themes arose not only within each institution’s approach to certain issues, but also between the three institutions. Major themes included perceptions and admonishment of student apathy, a critique of the media’s portrayal of student unrest, and the ineffectiveness of student protest as a means of instigating institutional and national change.

Student Apathy

While small, private, religiously affiliated universities were not perceived as bastions of activism, many of the students who submitted pieces to their college newspapers were incredibly critical of their peers’ apathy during this decade. Even before the student activism of the decade received attention at larger public universities, students at Hillsdale were calling for their fellow students to break the bonds of apathy.

There’s a condition that exists at Hillsdale which is best termed apathy, of the advanced variety. It seems to affect all areas…Greeks, independents, publications, student government, school spirit, etc… and it takes a major event to jolt our students out of this blissful, dreamy state of mind. (“Peacock Alley”, 1962, p. 2)

Later in the decade as the student protest movement began to gain negative attention across the country, students continued to call for undergraduates to take a stand for their beliefs.

And yet life goes on in the smug, cloistered world of Hillsdale, where politics means a list on the Fraternity or Sorority bulletin board telling the members whom to vote for, and
nobody knows enough about what’s going on in the world to demonstrate for or against it, and what’s more, nobody cares. (“Editorial”, 1965, p. 2)

A third student evoked the language of violence to express the dire results he believed apathy created.

Not just struggle but rebel. What is needed is a rebellion; a rebellion against our own apathy and that of our parents. A rebellion against passing the buck on to the next guy or on to the Federal Government. We must face these problems and conquer them ourselves. Rebel against non-involvement. If you don’t and I don’t, who will? (Doyon, 1968, p. 2)

One student provided strong imagery for the level of apathy he perceived at Ashland College.

I view Ashland College as a plastic society with plastic people who do not question the values of their society here or in the “real world.” … What about the War, riots, inequality, life, mass murders, pollution, which purge society, everyday? But the students here are uninformed and seemingly don’t care. (Jacobs, 1970, p. 3)

Ohio Wesleyan students who were not members of the newspaper editorial boards spoke often of the apathy on campus in letters to the editor. One student offered that the solution to campus apathy was simple interest. “It will not be until the students here at Ohio Wesleyan adopt the values of duty and self-interest in their political thinking before apathy will begin to disappear from this campus” (Sisson, 1961, p. 5). Not all students perceived apathy to be the complete downfall of the university as this new transfer student noted:

OWU is not a Utopia. Student preoccupation with campus life narrows their opinions on outside affairs. School spirit and student conduct are not what they could be. Yet
clearly, OWU’s personal atmosphere and to an extent its conservatism have positive value, as this new student has discovered. (Underhill, 1961, p. 5)

In the middle of the Vietnam War, Ohio Wesleyan offered three talks on the situation in Southeast Asia. One student expressed dismay at the level of attendance at these events:

> It was somewhat appalling to see only a little over two per cent of the students (nearly the same students were present at the three lectures) showing any visible signs of interest at a current issue of such magnitude…. Perhaps preparation for bluebooks and mid-terms could be cited as contributing factors to the poor attendance or perhaps it was just plain old apathy. Somehow the all-campus dances seem to draw much more enviable crowds. (Leh-Yuen, 1965, p. 5)

The students who submitted letters to their student publications articulated a commitment to maintaining a campus dialogue regarding the major issues of the period. Throughout the decade there were countless requests for students to participate in forums, events, and discussions surrounding a variety of topics. Many students who submitted letters regarding the apathy on campus expressed the belief that a college educated individual demonstrated their intelligence by being aware and concerned of national and world events.

Critique of the Mass Media

A second theme seen throughout the decade was a critique of the mass media’s portrayal of student activism. Students’ criticisms regarding this matter ran the gamut from claiming that the media blew the amount of student activism out of proportion to stating that the reason student protesting persisted was because of the media attention students expected to receive. One student at Ashland demonstrated the extent to which student protest garnered national attention. He discussed a recent trip to New York City and an exchange with a New
Yorker who inquired what the A.C. on his jacket stood for. “This guy naturally had heard of Ohio State and some of the bigger schools in Ohio, but the only little schools he had heard of were those that are known for student demonstrations and such” (Burns, 1967, p. 4).

An editor in 1967 expressed his belief regarding the real reason behind students participating in a picket line on the Ashland campus.

There are rumors that a group of students will picket his speech and cause a disturbance. These students are rumored to be coming from Oberlin with a few from AC itself. The cause of peace is a very honorable and noble reason to demonstrate if this is the true purpose, but many students just join these movements to get their names and pictures in the papers…. If these students show up Friday, show your disgust by ignoring them. Don’t give them the satisfaction of getting in the papers. (Nase, 1967, p. 4)

In a series of editorials the Ashland Collegian attacked the media, and promoted putting pressure on journalists to divert attention away from violent activism in order to focus on more positive involvement.

News commentators and reporters seem to neglect the vast number of peaceful revolutions and seem to emphasize the small percentage of violent undertakings. We cannot ignore the violent events making news today, but we can get to the causes of injustice and reason and work them out. One such means would be to prevent the press from playing-up these events and blowing them out of proportion. (“The Age of Revolution”, 1968, p. 4)

The following editorial described the role of sensationalism in the news media to explain why negative actions garnered more attention than the positive involvement on Ashland’s campus.
The press, seeking sensationalism, would define action in the former sense, but any visitor on Ashland’s campus would realize action to be the former definition … The energetic programs instituted here at Ashland far outweigh the scenes one sees and reads about in our news media today. (Casali, 1968, p. 4)

At Hillsdale, an editorial contested the media’s perception that a majority of students participated in the violent protests taking place around the country.

First of all, they represent a miniscule of minority students, but this small group has managed to play a leading role in the violence, bloodshed and arson that has exploded across college campuses from Columbia to Stanford. (“Across the Editor’s Desk”, 1968, p. 2)

Others in letters to the editor at Ashland College discussed their observations of the news coverage of student dissent. “It seems that all we hear in the news concerns the youth of today who abhor violence in the world, but who condone it as a means of protesting the same” (Guilbaunt & Hendricks, 1970, p. 17).

At Ohio Wesleyan the editorial staff took on the task of placing news reports into context, and asked students to abandon stereotypes regarding the Vietnam War.

The only sour note in Washington involved a minority of the group which took part in weekend demonstrations. The violence which took place Friday and Saturday evenings there was a footnote to the rest of the proceedings. Though it was the focus of much attention, it was not an indicator of the prevailing mood. (“Weekend of Reflection”, 1969, p. 4)

Everyone who opposes the war in Vietnam isn’t a 20-year-old college student- not everyone who marched in Washington last November wore blue jeans and long hair.
Some peace-minded people are mothers, some are clergymen, and some are noted and successful business men…. (“War Opposition Unites Businessmen, Students”, 1970, p. 4)

Ineffectiveness of Protest

A final thread seen between these three institutions was the argument that student protest was an ineffective means of instigating change. As mentioned previously in this chapter, students at Ohio Wesleyan commented on the contradiction between protesting violently for peace. These students often provided alternative suggestions to members of the university community who wished to participate in demonstrations. “I suggest he might more profitably turn his energy towards producing a Wednesday Chapel program that the other half of the campus would stay through, rather than organizing bus tours to succor his own need to demonstrate” (Storrs, 1965, pp. 4 - 5). After the violence of the Kent State University shootings the editorial staff asked their peers to participate in a non-violent boycott. “The boycott, if it spreads to other products, may bring fast results with no violence and a minimal amount of discomfort to the public. When you have a chance to support the anti-war boycott do so” (“Consumer Boycott Helps the Anti-war Movement”, 1970, p. 4). One student challenged undergraduates to support civil rights through proactive means. “I challenge students to take action on their claims by personally organizing to recruit black students or to raise money to provide scholarships for students of different cultural backgrounds…” (Boles, 1968, p. 4).

As with Ohio Wesleyan, students at Hillsdale also suggested alternative options to voice dissent without protesting. “I agree that there are effective means of communication on this campus for airing student opinion. One such vehicle, as mentioned in the letter, is the Student Federation and another, mentioned in my column last week is the Collegian” (“Across the
Another student at Ashland used violent imagery to describe a more peaceful means of voicing discontent.

We have met in the columns of this newspaper, the great “battlefield” as a very special place for anyone who is willing to give up his silence so that constructive criticism might live. It is all together fitting and proper that we should do this. In a larger sense, we must promote, we must endorse, we must encourage this form of criticism. (Boyer, 1970, p. 17)

Others went beyond noting a contradiction in committing violence for peace, but reasoned that achieving higher education was the vehicle to accomplish the goals that the student movement aimed to attain.

The main cause of the violence is the apathy of the silent majority. The way to end this apathy is not through violence, but through simple use of the intelligence and knowledge you’re supposed to be gaining at your institutions of higher learning. So why destroy your one chance of overcoming this apathy by burning, shooting down and looting these same institutions? (Guilbault & Hendricks, 1970, p. 17).

Editors and student submissions to the Ashland Collegian also noted that protesting (especially violent protesting) was the least effective means of accomplishing one’s goal.

“There is a peaceful means to accomplish any reasonable end which will benefit society. These violent student groups neglect to utilize these-peace means too often” (“Editorial”, 1969, p. 2). Another student in response to the Vietnam War Moratorium, stated her belief that there were more effective means of voicing dissent. “Thus my way of protesting has a solution in that I am writing my congressmen and telling him of my disapproval” (Black, 1969, p. 2).
Restatement of Research Questions

It was the purpose of this study to explore the opinions of students in the environment of the small, private, religiously affiliated colleges on national political, social and cultural issues taking place during the decade of the 1960s. This purpose was met through an analysis of three collegiate publications’ editorials and letters to the editor. Once it was established that students did consistently use the medium of the campus newspaper to state their opinions on the issues chosen for this study, the author then sought to find common themes in the way these students chose to address these issues. One theme addressed was whether there was a propensity for students to analyze these issues through the framework of university policy and occurrences or through national events. The author also desired to determine whether students acknowledged that their attendance at a small, private, religiously affiliated university influenced their perspective on the issues studied. This research also sought to find evidence which provided an explanation for why there was a lack of violent protest from students at these institutions. The final research question was to determine whether there were any cross institutional themes between student opinions at the three institutions studied.

Over the course of this research, different themes developed within the individual institutions regarding the framework and the length of time each student publication participated in a dialogue regarding the four topics studied. Ashland College’s The Collegian often approached the social, political, and cultural issues through examples at the national level. Students who submitted their writings to Ohio Wesleyan’s The Transcript regularly contended that the university’s religious affiliation should play a major role in the perspectives of students and the decisions of the administration. Student commentary in Hillsdale College’s The Collegian focused on the institution’s independent status. For example, students mentioned how
the need for private donations to finance the college shaped administration policy in terms of student protest, as well as the university’s use of the draft as an incentive for male students to adhere to higher academic standards.

At Ashland College, there was commentary on the morality of civil rights in the first two years of the decade, but the issue did not gain significant attention again until 1970 when the school hosted Black Emphasis Week. Ohio Wesleyan’s *The Transcript* regularly addressed the issue of civil rights throughout the decade through events and policies at the university level—most notability within Greek Life and the elimination of discrimination clauses. This ongoing dialogue regarding Greek organizations and their perceived role in discrimination at the university appears to have kept students engaged in the discussion. In their approach to civil rights, Hillsdale students addressed the issue from a national perspective and discussed the impact of cultural difference between the North and South in perceptions of discrimination.

In response to the Vietnam War all three student publications’ editorials and letters tended to support the war efforts through 1965. At Ashland College, the Vietnam War Moratorium was perceived as a tipping point in the college’s history where students began to voice their opinions on the subject. The Moratorium served as an opportunity for college and university students across the nation to demonstrate their anti-war sentiments by skipping classes and participating in various forms of protest on campus. Ohio Wesleyan’s *The Transcript* also spent a significant amount of time covering the Vietnam War Moratorium, but focused on the issue of how people expressed their opinions regarding the war as opposed to the content of their opinions. At Hillsdale, *The Collegian* contained no discussions on the National Moratorium in-depth, but instead focused on the issue of the draft and the college administration’s use of the
threat of conscription to encourage higher academic performance from the male student population.

Ashland College’s *The Collegian* featured critiques of student activism on the grounds that it was not the most effective way to pursue change for a given cause. Ohio Wesleyan’s *The Transcript* offered a similar rationale arguing that social action offered better results than student protest, and used the issues of AFROTC and *in loco parentis* to demonstrate that student publications could be used to express dissatisfaction with university policy. Students also used the issues of The Vietnam War, AFROTC on campus, and civil rights, to demonstrate a conflict between the aims of a religiously affiliated university and the policies in place at the university. Hillsdale’s *The Collegian* focused largely on the impact of the College’s status as an independent institution on the inability of students to express their dissatisfaction in university policies and national events through student activism.

Regarding to the Kent State University shootings, Ashland’s *The Collegian* perceived the event as a reflection of the general decline of American society, and the hypocritical state of the student anti—war movement. *Ohio Wesleyan’s Transcript* also used Kent State University as an example to demonstrate the paradox between students’ desire for peace and the violence which occurred. Writers in Hillsdale’s *The Collegian* perceived the Kent State University shootings as a terrible tragedy, but also used it to highlight the irrationality of student protest by noting that administrators were not the individuals students should be rioting against because university officials were not responsible for making decisions regarding policy in Vietnam. Although all three colleges’ student publications approached the four issues studied in differing ways, there were three overarching themes in student opinion between the three institutions: (1) Perceptions of student apathy, (2) concerns regarding the media’s portrayal of student unrest, and (3) the
perceived ineffectiveness and hypocrisy of student protest were all common themes seen throughout the decade at these institutions.

Another theme of note between these institutions’ publications was the contribution of female students. It was apparent that opinions from men appeared far more often than from women. This inequality between the number of submissions between men and women could be attributed to a variety of reasons, including the often assertive nature of submissions which may have been perceived as unbecoming of a 1960s female college student.

If there is a common theme which ties together submissions from female students it is that women were often prompted to submit letters as a reaction to a personal experience on campus which upset them. Examples of this can be seen at Ashland College when students Jennifer Fog and Bessie Walker expressed dismay that Black Emphasis Week did not address the fact that Black students should be acknowledged throughout the school year, not just during a designated week. At Ohio Wesleyan, Anne Berkley, stated that she could no longer participate in the Greek community after the realization that the national membership policies do not align with her own values. Another student at Ohio Wesleyan, Barbara Boles, was prompted to submit a letter regarding more proactive ways of fulfilling social change after she witnessed a protest against Ohio Wesleyan University’s president. These examples demonstrate that female students were clearly influenced by the events taking place on their campuses, but their feelings were almost always expressed through tones of sadness rather than anger.

Summary

It is likely that the three colleges and universities in this study have previously been considered to be institutions that did not participate in the student activism of the 1960s due to student body support of the conservative status quo, however, this research reveals that this may
be a false perception. Throughout the primary sources, many student letters and editorials over the years demonstrated support for progressive thoughts on civil rights, free speech, anti-Vietnam war sentiments, and the unacceptable actions at Kent State University. What appeared to be a major deterrent in the lack of protest at these institutions was the influence of the legal rights afforded to administrations at private institutions during this time period. Students often discussed the power of the administration to enforce policies against student protest. Kaplin and Lee (2006) discussed the difference between the public and private dichotomy in American institutions of higher education:

Private institutions, not being subject to federal constitutional constraints, have even more latitude than public institutions do in promulgating disciplinary rules. Courts are likely to recognize a board right to make and enforce rules that are inherent in the private student-institutional relationship or to find such a right implied in some contractual relationship between student and school. (p. 924)

Thus students attending these institutions inherently possessed fewer rights when it came to privileges afforded by the First Amendment. Compared to their peers at public institutions, students at private universities were at higher risk of being suspended or expelled from their institution if they participated in acts of protest. In the case of Carr v. St. John's University, New York. 231 N.Y.S.2d 410 (N.Y. App. Div 1962), the courts concluded that, “in conformity with the ideals of Christian education and conduct, the university reserves the right to dismiss a student at any time on whatever grounds the university judges advisable” (Kaplin & Lee, 2006, p. 924).

The Ashland College Bulletin from the 1960-1961 school year reflected the rights afforded to private institutions in its section titled General Regulations:
Whenever it is obvious that a student is not in accord with the interests and ideals regarded as vital by the administration of the Seminary and College, his registration may be canceled, even though no specific offense be charged against him. *(Ashland College Bulletin, 1960, p. 43)*

In their research on the invisible college, Astin and Lee (1972) acknowledged that institutions such as those studied in this research, differed greatly from other institutions in the strictness of their policies.

It is in the severity of their administrative policies toward certain types of behaviors that the invisible colleges differ most dramatically from the elite colleges. The invisible colleges are far more likely to act *in loco parentis*, inflicting harsher penalties (e.g., suspension or expulsion) for drinking, for aggression, particularly as expressed in demonstrations against administrative policies…. *(p. 71-72)*

This support of progressive agendas, but fear of administrative repercussions is evident in letters and editorials written by students at the various institutions. At Hillsdale, the editorial staff used the institutional type as a way to explain the strict rules at the college.

As an independent college, Hillsdale must gather funds from any possible source. To do this the College has to project a favorable image, which, as I see it, accounts for some of the stricter than necessary rules. *(“Editorial”, 1966, p. 2)*

A student at Ashland College acknowledged that the administration had strict policies that students did not support, “We are surrounded by a host of archaic rules which do more harm than good. For it is through these rules that the administration has cushioned us from reality” *(Michener, 1969, p. 2).* A staff editorial at Ohio Wesleyan also reflected dissatisfaction with the strict policies of the administration. “The recent student agitation against University regulations
is just another reflection of this generation’s demands that their increased concern and responsibility be reciprocated by the intellectual community” (“Closed Doors, Deans Block Communication”, 1966, p. 2).

It is evident that students at all three institutions demonstrated a level of respect for administrative authority as well as an understanding of their role at the institution. It also appears that students were aware that the policies at their respective institutions were stricter than at other institutional types. This likely influenced the decision making process of students who may have been interested in supporting a cause, but did not want to risk the possibility of being expelled for participating in active demonstrations. The greater legal rights afforded to private institutions to suspend or expel students may have also influenced the perception at these institutions that student protests and violent demonstrations were ineffective at achieving results. Students may have realized that there was a high probability of being expelled if they protested, and being removed from the institution would be an ineffective consequence which hindered assisting the causes they supported. As a result, the student newspaper at these institutions served as a public forum where students could participate in the student movement by using the language of activism without having their status at the institution placed in jeopardy. An example of the use of this language is seen in a letter to the editor in Ashland’s The Collegian:

We have met in the columns of this newspaper, the great “battlefield” as a very special place for anyone who is willing to give up his silence so that constructive criticism might live. It is all together fitting and proper that we should do this. In a larger sense, we must promote, we must endorse, we must encourage this form of criticism. (Boyer, 1970, p. 15)
The function of the student publication at the private institution during the 1960s was significant because it represented a rare opportunity for students at these institutional types to express the First Amendment right of freedom of the press on relatively equal terms as their peers at public institutions. All three student publications were run by students, and frequently featured critiques of institutional policy as well as dialogue surrounding the various controversial subjects of the decade.

The institutional type has played a significant role in the historiography of student unrest in higher education during the 1960s. Over time, the lack of prominent demonstrations and violent protest at small, private, religiously affiliated colleges has come to be perceived as a lack of student unrest in general. What this research has shown is that student unrest did exist at institutions like these, but the unrest was demonstrated largely through less newsworthy forms of self expression such as student publications. Through the use of student newspapers at these institutions, this study has shown that there were students who attended small, private, religiously affiliated institutions who supported a progressive agenda, and like their peers at other institutional types, believed that the status quo was no longer sufficient for American society to thrive. While the threat of expulsion existed at both public and private institutions, it is clear that students attending private institutions were not protected under the constitution in the same way as students at public institutions.

This research demonstrates the significant impact that institutional type plays in the historiography of higher education in America. Not accounting for institutional differences such as the public and private dichotomy may lead to improper comparisons between student experiences when looking at specific periods in higher education history. In this case, the
policies and institutional missions of these institutions may play a larger role in how the student body is perceived rather than the actual attitudes that these students expressed.

Implications for Practice and Future Research

As mentioned previously, as a result of expressing student dissent through the medium of student publications as opposed to violent demonstrations or protest, the institutions of higher education researched in this study were and may still be perceived as institutions where students did not actively participate in the activism of the 1960s. This research has shown that students at these institutions were engaged in a dialogue regarding the major social, political, and economic issues of the decade, however, research on this period of higher education history has focused on the prominent archives available on the institutions which engaged in more active forms of dissent. In turn, students at small, religiously affiliated institutions are and were generally perceived as apathetic or supportive of the status quo. Acknowledging that participation in a physical form of public assembly is not the only form of dissent in America has a significant impact on future research and practices in student affairs, particularly concerning perceptions regarding current student activism.

Impact of the Internet on Perceptions of Activism

As student dissent through the medium of the campus newspaper may have been perceived as a lack of activism on campuses in the 1960s, today’s college students’ use of the Internet to express opinions regarding institutional and national issues may be seen in a similar way. Similar to the medium of a newspaper, the activism which occurs on the Internet is often perceived as a more passive commitment than participation in a large public demonstration. Contrastingly, Brey (2006) noted that the Internet can organize individuals into communities which often serve as a catalyst for action.
The Internet facilitates the development and maintenance of communities of individuals with shared interests and concerns and the formation and maintenance of structured organizations with specific agendas. The Internet also provides new ways for individuals to engage in collective behavior and form social movements. Community formation and social organization are important in any society, and any technology that provides new means to support these processes can be seen to provide important benefits. (p. 43)

With the growth of the Internet there are many contradictions which may keep society from perceiving Internet activism in the same way that demonstrations in physical spaces are viewed. Garner (1999) acknowledged some of this opposition, “Contradictions arise from reality itself from problems in the definition of concepts (terms like ‘community,’ ‘public space’ ‘identity,’ ‘dominance’ (pp. 8-9). Through the rise of the internet community and public space has been transformed into new public forums where people can connect with others who share similar interests or a passion for certain causes. Students posting articles, opinions, and grievances are no longer accessible in one tangible artifact such as the campus newspaper- instead they are throughout cyberspace. Both the vastness and anonymity of the internet has made it harder for both academia and the public to discern if there is a popular opinion among college students regarding certain issues or if their lack of visible restlessness is a sign of apathy.

Gardner (1999) noted other ways in which the internet is perceived as allowing greater connectivity while at the same time appearing to create isolation (p. 9). One consequence of the internet community on student activism may be that those who are inclined to participate in a physical demonstration over the injustices they perceive have found solace or a similar feeling of participation in the dialogue of an internet community. While the internet has created a new
public forum in which active dialogue has taken the place of public demonstration, the internet has also created entirely new forms of activism.

The term *hactivism* has been defined by Manion and Goodrum (2000) as the (sometimes) clandestine use of computer hacking to help advance political causes (p. 14). An example of *hactivism* would include artificially overloading a particular website in order to disable access to internet users. Manion and Goodrum offer a more in—depth definition and insight into the term:

Perhaps these attacks are evidence of a new form of civil disobedience, which unites the talents of the computer hacker with the social consciousness of the political activists. Adapting a variation of civil disobedience, with its practices of “trespass” and blockade” to the electronic age, participants in what has been called electronic civil disobedience, or hacktivism, can attack the websites of any individual, corporation, or nation that is deemed responsible for oppressing the ethical, social, or political rights of others (p. 14).

Similar to Gardner’s perceptions on changing definitions as a result of the rise of the internet, Marion and Goodrum also use language associated with physical space to discuss the type of civil disobedience taking place on the internet. Parallel to the way that the 1960s Ashland student used language associated with violence to describe the interactions between students on the pages of *The Collegian, hactivism* is redefining language to associate its nonviolent form of protest with more physical forms of assembly.

Another example of the use of violent or physical activism language on the internet is the act of *Googlebombing*. The algorithm used by the internet search engine Google, tracks the frequency that a website is visited along with the commonly used phrases associated with a link posted for a given webpage. These two variables when combined determine the order in which a given website will appear when a particular phrase is searched using the Google search engine.
(Johnson, 2004). As a result of this algorithm, it is possible to manipulate when a particular website appears in a search of a given phrase. People have used googlebombing as a form of serious activism against certain individuals, while also taking advantage of the algorithm for less serious political statements. Johnson (2004) offered an additional explanation of the process as well as an example:

That knack for pattern recognition is central to Google's intelligence, but it can be exploited. Encourage enough people to link to a given page with a specific phrase and you can manipulate Google's results. This is how Google came to think of George W. Bush as a miserable failure. A computer programmer named George Johnston linked to the president's biography with the "miserable failure" phrase and encouraged other like-minded Netizens (Internet Citizens) to put up similar links from their sites. (¶. 8)

The need to associate internet activism with language which is violent and physical in nature may represent a perception that physical activism is widely viewed as the most active form of dissent in our society. Nevertheless, the emergence of internet activism offers more opportunities for individuals to participate in these issues without feeling the need to resort to other forms of protest. Student affairs professionals should take this into consideration when looking at ways to promote student participation even in the most controversial issues on college and university campuses. By offering multiple ways of getting involved, students should be able to find ways to express their concerns without perceiving violence, protest, or demonstrations as their only way of gaining an institution’s or government administration’s attention. Beyond campus organizations and publications, universities can invest in physical spaces such as living and learning communities or create forums online specifically for students attending a particular institution.
The research in this study is considered an analysis of narrative structures. Love (2003) defined an analysis of narrative structures as a means to “look for repeated structures across texts” (p. 93). One method to improve future research on this study would be to conduct oral interviews with individuals who contributed their writings to the primary texts of the collegiate publications in order to create a more comprehensive understanding of these structures and the role that institutional type had on their actions while attending their respective institutions. An additional area of study which could contribute to this area of knowledge would be specific disciplinary actions employed at these institutions during this time. While these institutions did publish their disciplinary policies, they are often ambiguous and lack an understanding of what actions would constitute suspensions or expulsion as well as other options for punishment. A better understanding of the continuum of these policies may lead to a clearer perception of what students at these institutions may have experienced if they were disciplined for demonstrations or violent protesting. Possible opportunities to expand this research could include a study of institutions during this time period with other religious denominations such as Jesuit Catholic universities or the study of small private institutions such as liberal arts colleges with no religious affiliation.

Conclusion

The student voices on the pages of the Ashland Collegian, Ohio Wesleyan Transcript, and Hillsdale Collegian during the 1960s represent only some of the student opinions at these institutions of higher education, and count for only a small percentage of students attending small, private, religiously affiliated institutions across America. Through the medium of their student publications, these voices from the border offer varying perspectives that sometimes align with the missions of their institutions, but also often express a dedication to a change in
America’s status quo and a commitment to altering the perceived student apathy at their institutions.

As technology redefines how students can express their views on national politics and university policies, higher education should remain dedicated to offering students forums through which their voices can be heard. As emerging citizens it is imperative that today’s student of higher education develops the ability to voice his or her opinions articulately through various mediums.
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