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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem: Conflict in the Academy

Why study communication in student controversies?

In five years America has witnessed great change in students' reaction to society, authority and university. There have been changes both in degree and kind—from vague and lethargic discontentment ("Don't complain, transfer!"), to sometimes angry dissent to occasional defiance. Accustomed calm and objectivity have given way to coercion and fear—what President Buell Gallagher has called an "eristic" threat to the "heuristic" mode of inquiry. Educators are of a different generation from protesters, and, increasingly—as black nationalist movements appear—educators are suspect symbols of the white establishment. Axen comments on recent experience at San Francisco State College:

... let me say that those ... who have only struggled with white militantism have only glimpsed the tip of the iceberg. Black anger directed in black nationalistic ways toward college policies that frustrate their black ambitions is a threat far more ominous--and, far more fear-producing.

---


The tendency is toward a "campus climate of mistrust and suspicion," Axen says.¹

But campus strife did not start with the forces that produced the Free Speech Movement (FSM) on the Berkeley campus of the University of California in 1964. Actually student dissent and revolt have a long and productive history. Herron and Bradley observe:

Those who feel that the campus is a hot-bed of agitation because there are not enough rules, courses are too easy, and teachers too lax are refuted by a history of student disorders going back to colonial times . . . Benjamin Silliman of Yale explained [mid nineteenth century] strife and turmoil . . . as a direct outcome of the forces let loose by democracy itself. An integral part of democracy is a continuous jockeying for positions of leadership. We suggest that campus disorders being experienced now are a dry-run experiment in power which students consider a legitimate rehearsal for the roles they will assume as adults.²

This paper is based on the assumption that controversy is more educative than lethargy, hence preferable in academe—if it can be kept productive. Fischer, writing of the place of controversy in public and private institutions (including universities), had this to say:

... men in power need watching—not because they are any more wicked than the rest of us, but because what they do affects all of us ... every institution—whether a university, a museum, a trade union, or a literary clique—is likely to grow sluggish and complacent unless it is subjected to a sharp and irreverent scrutiny ... controversy [is welcomed],

¹Ibid., p. 4.

not just for the joy of combat, but because that often is the only way to get at the truth.\textsuperscript{1}

On this point, Hutchins contends:

A non-controversial university is a contradiction in terms. A university where no debate is going on is as good as dead.\textsuperscript{2}

Ratterman agrees that controversy is inherent in a true university:

Argument is the characteristic of truly civil society. It is certainly the characteristic of a university that is alive and seeking truth.\textsuperscript{3}

Cousins in discussing the Berkeley Free Speech Movement (FSM) of 1964 attests to the value of controversy, citing recent history:

For years now, educators have deplored the passiveness and political lethargy of the American student. Some of the educators grew up during the Thirties, when the college campus was an arena of blistering political controversy. Those were hard days but at least people found themselves forced to think.

After the end of the Second World War, and with the passing of the Depression, social and political consciousness in the college tended to dwindle.

Even the reality of a nuclear arms race failed to animate more than a small percentage of students. In the past year or two, however, shaken and shocked by the ground swells of the race crisis, American students have erupted into action. Not all of it is tidy or proportionate, but at least it comes under the heading of active concern.\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}John Fischer, "The Editor's Easy Chair," \textit{Harper's Magazine}, CCXXXV, No. 1406, 27.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Patrick Ratterman, S.J., \textit{Ibid}.
\end{itemize}
However they may have decried lethargy, many faculty members—teachers, researchers and administrators—find the current state of affairs intolerable. Accustomed to sharing hegemony only with each other and trustees, they are severely threatened by student assertions of power and discontent with policies and practices. They are bothered by the noisy intrusions of the young into the quiet of the world they had built for themselves. William James identified youth itself as one important factor in the problem when he wrote:

For the young, life needs to be defined in terms of the strenuous, the vivid, the intense. Life is to be conceived in such heroic terms that, in comparison with it, the heroism of war will offer no charms. It is doubtful whether a peaceful way of living will be achieved for modern man in terms of the traditional hymn writers' conception of peace as a region of lilies in the green pastures beside a murmuring brook. The old, the sick, the tired can be charmed by such visions; the young, the tough, and the resolute cannot. They will have their danger; they will have their struggle against obstacles.

Students, it seems, will have their controversies. Increasingly, however, colleges are populated by young people for whom the gridiron, spectator stands and fraternity pledge pranks are anachronisms. A new generation impatient to redeem society and university from its evils, has been studied by Keniston. The "style" of the new breed he describes in terms of nine features: (1) Fluidity,

---

Flux, Movement; (2) Generational (rather than Organizational) Identification; (3) Personalism; (4) Nonasceticism; (5) Inclusiveness (capacity for involvement with those that are superficially alien); (6) Antitechnologism; (7) Participation (especially face-to-face primary groups of their peers); (8) Antiacademicism (academics seen as apologists for the "Organized System," new knowledge and ways of learning are sought); (9) Non-violence.1 After discussing the present generation gap (a discussion well worth the reading), Keniston pays the "young radical" a compliment:

These speculations on the credibility gap between the generations in a time of rapid change may help explain two crucial facts about post-modern youth; first, they frequently come from highly principled families with whose principles they continue to agree; second, that they have the outrageous temerity to insist that individuals and societies live by the values they preach. And these speculations may also explain the frequent feeling of those who have worked intensively with student radicals or hippies that, apart from the "impracticality" of some of their views, these sometimes seem to be the only clear-eyed and sane people in a society and a world where most of us are still systematically blind to the traditional gap between personal principle and practice, national creed and policy, a gap that we may no longer be able to afford.2

The problem is pressing hard upon American higher education. The problem of controversy is, none the less, the challenge of controversy. The challenge is in the

1Kenneth Keniston, "Youth, Change and Violence," The American Scholar, XXXVII (Spring, 1968), 228-236.
2Ibid., p. 240-241.
comparative newness of conditions, the different generation of students (and young faculty!) and the widespread ineptitude of the various segments of academe in communicating with each other. Much has been written in the popular press and professional journals. Not a great number of research studies have been reported.

Other Studies and Pronouncements

In the summer of 1964, before Berkeley, Kauffman declared, "The role of conflict in the educational process should be explored further by behavioral scientists working with late adolescents. . . . [We] have much to gain from a greater understanding and a rationale for the presence of conflict on the . . . campus."¹ Freedman points out that "Most research workers in the social sciences have not been interested in the study of whole human beings in real life situations, but the need to understand college students may change this attitude."²

Most researchers interested in these problems have applied survey methods to student protest. Peterson hoped, by learning more about the scope of student activism and activists on American campuses (1) to understand it as a new cultural phenomenon and social force, (2) to learn


how to deal with it, (3) to check the stereotypes and simplistic views of students that abounded, and (4) "to obtain systematically comprehensive information about organized student protest which could serve both as a context for the . . . accounts . . . at . . . colleges, and also as a source of data and hypotheses for further study. . . ." He concluded "that college students and student bodies across the land are not of a mold, that generalizations and 'images' are highly misleading." With regards the perceptiveness of student activists, he writes:

Since they are disproportionately enrolled in selective colleges and universities, students actively concerned with broad social and moral issues are undoubtedly concentrated at the high end of the intellectual ability distribution; they are bright enough to detect and comprehend some of what ails American society.

In discussing how to "handle" protests, he concludes:

Some of the respondents [deans of students] commented in terms of "channeling" or "draining off student excesses," "hostilities," and the like. However, the new forms for "recognizing the student"--faculty-administration-student seminars, student representatives on policy committees, and so forth--unless they truly allow for real student participation, may or may not prove to be wise where a critical student intelligence is present. Sophisticated strategies for manipulating the students are likely to be seen for what they are, and the entire situation will be worsened.

---

2 Ibid., p. 43.
3 Ibid., p. 44.
4 Ibid., pp. 46-47.
Earlier, before Berkeley, under the sponsorship of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), Williamson and Cowan made a similar survey of deans. NASPA's concern was to learn about student rights and freedoms. Much data were derived from questionnaires completed by a high percentage of American college presidents, deans of students, faculty chairmen of student affairs committees, student body presidents and student editors. As a result of those massive data, and his own long experience as dean of students and professor of psychology, Williamson became the foremost spokesman for a communicative mode which, he claimed, was most appropriate in an institution of higher learning. Relationships with students should be conducted "in continuous consultations and conversations" in which student personnel workers teach rights and responsibilities, and means of academic citizenship education.

Related to the research by Peterson is a study by Sasajima, Davis and Peterson. They used the College and University Environmental Scales (CUES) to study relationships between six indices of student protest and five dimensions of college climate. CUES did not "predict

---


protest concerning campus problems; it was, however, a reasonably good predictor of student protest over off-campus issues.*1

Commissioned by the College Student Personnel Institute, Mallery visited seven campuses in the West. These were chosen for the variety of climates they provided. The report was intended to show "how college students today become interested in major issues of our time."2

A study was designed by the NASPA Division of Research and Publications "to determine institutional policies with regard to selected controversial topics which are frequently the focus of administrative concern and action" and "so . . . administrators would have a sense of policies and practices on a wide range of issues in a substantial number of institutions." By way of explanation the researchers commented:

Too often in crisis-oriented situations, therefore, administrators are forced to act without the benefit of established policies or the thinking and experience of others in the field. Intensification of a problem might be avoided if those involved had a wider understanding of different approaches to problems and if institutional policies were clearly formulated. Advanced thought and well-developed policies might be the difference between

---


an institution-wide crisis and the routine processing of a problem.¹

A thorough attitude survey of students was conducted by the business-oriented Research Institute of America. It seems to have grown out of a lessening interest in business by college students. These findings were reported:

(1) Dissatisfaction with the Educational Establishment; desire for a voice; (2) dislike of indecision in adults; (3) acceptance of change as a way of life; (4) unsure why they should be patriotic; (5) majority not activists; (6) closer agreement than in earlier generations between males and females. It was concluded:

Perhaps adults would be better serving the needs of the young if they lecture and worry less and, instead, listen to what the affirmative segment of youth is saying. What they are urgently seeking is guidance. This guidance can only come about if the adult generation feels--and communicates--a confidence in young people and encourages their intellectual and philosophical quest for "individual self," the most frequently used phrase in the entire survey.²

Curious, as a college president about students' perceptions of administrators, Eddy did some informal research. This commentary on administration communication emerged:

"For . . . two years I have been reading sample student newspapers in order to find out what is on the student mind as reflected in the student press."


In summary, according to the students, the university administrator governs by whimsy and evasion, has two faces but usually neither face is on the campus at any crucial moment, and stands with one foot firmly placed in the past, the other in the future but without any relationship to the vital present. . . . Hear what a student writes about the administrator's "rhetoric of evasion;"

"Every time students have tried to resolve some issue with the administration they have lost. . . . Just by talking the kind of words the administrators use, we trap ourselves into despising the least of us and degrading the best. . . . There is a very powerful rhetoric which demolishes this inhumanity. It is the rhetoric of trust. Just as the administration's rhetoric carries within it the inevitable seeds of inhuman success, the rhetoric of trust carries within it the seeds of the best of human tolerance. If the administration would only trust us, we and they might be free."1

In addition to these studies pertaining directly to student-faculty controversy and communication, there is significant basic research in the literature. Presumably, and hopefully, much of it will in the long run shed wider light on the problems of higher education. Examples of such research are studies by Giffin, Newcomb, Festinger, Sherif, and various scholars at The University of Michigan Center for Research in Conflict Resolution.

Giffin and others at The University of Kansas Communication Research Center are embarked on several projects as part of a Study of Inter-personal Trust in the Communication Process. This is discussed later in

---

In a landmark paper Newcomb presented "An Approach to the Study of Communicative Acts" pointing toward the possibility that many of those phenomena of social behavior which have been somewhat loosely assembled under the label of "interaction" can be more adequately studied as communicative acts. It further points to the possibility that just as the observable forms of certain solids are macroscopic outcomes of molecular structure, so certain observable group properties are predetermined by the conditions and consequences of communicative acts . . . promising possibilities of investigating the phenomena of social interaction by viewing them as events within communication systems.

Festinger and colleagues have done much with his Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. The theory is that the way to modify an attitude toward an object is to introduce dissonance which would set up a tendency to change the perception thus moving toward consonance. It appears from their writings that merely setting up communication will not necessarily, without dissonance, result in consonance.²

Goyer has explored the possible implications of the theory of cognitive dissonance for explaining communication behavior. He theorizes,


If, as Brehm and Cohen (1962)\(^1\) conclude, commitment is a necessary condition for the arousal of dissonance, and dissonance stimulates efforts by the individual to reduce this state, then it should follow that, in interviewing or small group discussions especially, one way to encourage active communication behavior would be to require a committing statement of position from each participant. Thus when different positions are committed (other things being equal), dissonance is created which might lead to further communication behavior to reduce the dissonance and secure a possible by-product of understanding or agreement.\(^2\)

Also with profound implications for student-faculty-administration-trustee relations, and not unrelated to Goyer's study, is the work of Sherif on superordinate goals which are defined as

goals which are compelling and highly appealing to members of two or more groups in conflict but which cannot be obtained by the resources and energies of the groups separately.\(^3\)

Related to the work of Sherif and exemplary of the work being done at the Michigan Center for Research on Conflict Resolution is a study by Kimmel. His "results suggest that the use of different styles of communication led to different cognitive outcomes in discussion."\(^4\)

---


A study by Milbrath of Washington lobbyists might have implications for colleges if one sees some student reformers as lobbyists. Milbrath's characterization of government officials' motives seemed to bear resemblance to those of at least some university bureaucrats: (1) to maintain or enhance their positions, (2) to fulfill their political [i.e., educational] philosophy, (3) to enjoy pleasant relationships with colleagues, (4) to have a good time, and (5) to earn more money.¹

Rudolph, an historian, traces the changes in American higher education. He starts with the student dominated extracurriculum of the pietistic colleges of Mark Hopkins' day, passes through an era when the faculty reformed campus life to make it intellectual, before arriving at the present. He contends the students and faculty, not the administration, are the real power elements. Present problems are a delayed response to nineteenth century faculties' superseding student authority. Professionally oriented faculty are not sensitive to the human needs of growing adolescents, maintains Rudolph. Now, he sees a sensitivity to public relations by governing boards and an assertion of power by them. Students, in his judgment, would prefer a happy blend of freedom and order, freedom and concern.

And what is most distressing of all is how often in our history students have had to tell us of

their presence—of their needs as young human beings discovering the limits of their individual destinies.

This Study

Cognizant of the enormity and complexity of the problems of student-college relations, this writer has long been grateful for an orientation learned in graduate study with Knower. The communicologist's way of analyzing human communication behavior has been exceedingly useful in the combined role as student of communication and practitioner in college student controversies.

Throughout the noise and anger, recalcitrance and recriminations, dissent and defiance, this writer entertained a hypothesis. It was almost a conviction, that on many lively campuses differences were being resolved without undue publicity or bitterness. Therefore came the need for this study: to secure reports of controversies from all sizes and types of institutions and to see what might be learned from an application of the communicologist's method of analysis. We embarked in the hope that the results might be of benefit primarily to the chief personnel administrator and also to his staff, his president, his

1Frederick Rudolph, Changing Patterns of Authority and Influence, Knorr and Minter, 1-10.

faculty colleagues and his students. And we did so, as remarked earlier, on the premise that controversies should be conducted so as to be educative and productive. It is the purpose of this study then to learn more as to how, through communication, such educativeness and productivity can be achieved.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Background

The design for this study evolved over a period of years to meet certain needs. The problem at first was to find a method of studying the critical behavior of deans of students in certain types of settings. During that stage in the planning, the intent was to use the Critical Incident Technique developed by Flanagan. It grew out of the Perceptual or Transactional approach to studying human behavior--part of the Holistic or Organismic branch of Gestalt Psychology. The hope was to learn what were the critical communication behaviors that tended to distinguish successful deans from ineffective ones. The setting was to be the residential college.

As the decade of the 1960's elapsed, however, not only did the nature of the dean of students' job change, but it moved onto center stage. At more and more colleges and universities, the critical student relations of the dean were conducted during controversies virtually unprecedented in American higher education before the Berkeley

---

Free Speech trouble of 1964-65. The dean of students, like the football coach, was conducting his most crucial operations before the entire campus—students, faculty and higher administration. Townspeople, television (often nation-wide), trustees, alumni, and legislators also watched. Increasingly, too, presidents, vice presidents and other faculty members were being drawn into the fray. It was clearly a new era that seemed to call for a different design.

While casting about for a suitable method to see what could be learned about communication during contemporary campus controversies, we were conscious of the problem of the perceiver and his subjectivity. Ittelson and Cantril were helpful in this regard:

... perceiving is that part of the process of learning by which each one of us, from his own particular point of view, creates for himself the world within which he has his life's experience and through which he strives to gain to his satisfactions.¹

They point out that perception is unique and that it is always an activity by a participant in his unique position, providing him his own unique world experience, that even the scientist studying a "transaction" enters as a participant. Any scientist who makes statements about perception as if he were not the perceiver, say Ittelson and Cantril, is doing more than committing a logical fallacy—he is talking nonsense. "A scientist may be a student of other

subject matter; he is always a participant in perception.\footnote{1} With this point of view we decided to ask deans and other educators to provide reports of controversies, trusting them to be as objective as they could be in selecting and reporting instances with which they were familiar.

**Steps and Problems in Procedure**

Late in 1965 when the decision was made to study controversies, the question was posed: To what extent does communication produce change in conflict? The intent was not to limit the study to Berkeley type controversies. We would search for examples of communication that worked well and poorly and speculate as to why. Out of such a study, we hoped, would also emerge material for discussion outlines and other training aids for deans and others who deal with students. Such a study was believed to be important.

It was also felt to be doable. This investigator had moved in speech and student personnel circles for over a decade. Enough contacts had been made in those years, it was hoped, to yield sufficient data for such a study. In addition to a mail solicitation, consideration was also given to trips to campuses where controversies were occurring. Campus interviews would provide further data. The publication, in the winter of 1966 however, of a study by

\footnote{1}{Ibid.}
Mallery,¹ caused a reconsideration of the campus interview notion. Commissioned by the College Student Personnel Institute, the Mallery study was primarily an interview survey of student attitudes. Interviews with deans and other administrators were also included. The Mallery study provided good background for this study. In addition it pointed up the size of the task of traveling to campuses, conducting interviews, and making something of them. The enormity of a second data gathering job was cause for abandoning it.

The biggest problem at this point was one of personal courage. In an era of fast changing assumptions and procedures it was difficult to decide to go ahead. A major campus controversy caught this writer in his role as dean in a whirling pool of action and quick rethinking of old positions. The strong feelings abroad in the land against mail questionnaires were also strongly felt: if it was an imposition to ask busy administrators to fill out yet another questionnaire, how then to justify asking them to perform even more demanding, or at least unaccustomed service? The justification lay in the importance of the problems facing American colleges and universities, indeed all of American society, and the growing realization that the scholar of communication might well have a significant contribution to make.

On those two premises, in July of 1966 a letter was composed. After several drafts it was duplicated by a photographic process; name, address, salutation and date were individually typed. The letter asked for help on a doctoral dissertation. There was some discussion of the relative efficacy of not mentioning a dissertation but simply enlisting aid on an important research problem. While acknowledging the possible negative reaction in some quarters to "another questionnaire," we banked on the additional motivation of helping a friend or colleague might serve to trigger more additional responses. The decision was a difficult one.

Each of 306 recipients was asked "to describe a situation you know at first hand in which communication, or an attempt at communication, did or did not yield a change for the better." Instructions were:

Simply report the chronology of an episode in which segments of an institution disagreed about how to proceed and in which some kind of written or oral communication was tried, successfully or otherwise, to resolve the conflict. Conferences, memos, official notices, public meetings and radio appeals are examples of the kind of communicating that often occurs.

Also, the letter asked each to secure the help of a student or colleague in providing incidents. Case studies were sought as well. The promise was made that anonymity would be protected.

Consistent with "A Note for Maximizing Returns of a Mail Questionnaire" given by Charles Gruner and Robert
Kibler,\(^1\) a brightly stamped (attention getting), addressed envelope was enclosed. The brightest, newest commemorative stamp was sought. A new issue that fitted the requirements appeared the week of the first mailing. A vivid yellow stamp, with green triangles symbolizing national parks, commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of the National Park Service. Samples of the letter and return envelope are shown in Appendix A.

Names and addresses were selected from these sources, with numbers sent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roster of Membership of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) as of June 1, 1966</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central States Speech Association (CSSA) Members as of July 1, 1966</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Speech Newsletter, The Ohio State University</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Women Deans and Counselors (NAWDC)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal friends in higher education, not affiliated with any of the above</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The letters were addressed, signed and sent over a five week period in late August, September and early October, 1966. Responses began appearing almost immediately. Many early replies were promises to be redeemed after the opening of school. Individual letters of acknowledgment and thanks were sent for the first several weeks until the volume of

responses plus the opening of the school year made this task impossible. By mid-November 116 replies had been received. These were given a careful initial reading.

The results were so encouraging, and there were so many unfulfilled promises, the decision was made to combine a thank you letter with a report that might stimulate more cases. It was later termed "the gentle reminder memo." On the first sheet were listed all of the respondents up to that time, by name and institution. As can be seen in Appendix B, it was an imposing list. A half page report expressed gratitude, gave statistics on replies and some idea of what was being done by way of data analysis. The text also recommended to student personnel officers that a journal and file be kept on each incipient controversy. Individual notes were penned on most of the letters, either specific comments on cases received or, for those who had not yet sent cases, "gentle reminders." The reaction to this mailing was distinctly favorable. It produced another twenty-five answers with slightly more than that number of cases. Several reported being pleased to be included in such a list of distinguished deans and teachers. One friend introduced a valuable incident with these observations, which attest to the utility of the reminder.

Your letter of December 5 was ingenious. In fact, to me, irresistible.

If you had not sent the reminder, I would have gone on thinking that I had replied to your request (which should give you an idea of just how well College is now being run)!
In March, 1967, all of the cases were read again and preliminary notes made. Letters of thanks, requests for clarification, etc., were written. A model of the variables of communication had been prepared. It was refined during the winter of 1966-67 as the cases were received and studied. The last case to arrive through the mail came on April 17. During 1965-66 and 1966-67 most spare time was spent reading books, journal articles and the popular press as a tidal wave of material developed on the New Left, New Breed, Hippie Generation, variously called.

During this time also, this writer as dean was having his own troubles. The advice to respondents to keep a journal with accompanying documents of each controversy was followed at home—to the joint benefit of this study and the integrity and equilibrium of Lawrence University.¹ There were twelve cases acquired this way, from January, 1966, to January, 1968. Other cases were gleaned from books compiled for training student workers. These included (1) cases from seminars sponsored by NASPA in cooperation with The Institute for College and University Administrators,² (2) Cases in College Student Personnel

¹Other Lawrence administrators during the trying months of spring 1967 were fond of remarking to the effect that they wished Venderbush would finish his thesis and stop provoking crises from which to gather data.

²Formerly at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, now part of the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C.
Administrations compiled and edited by Bernard R. Black, then Associate Professor of Human Relations, Ohio University, for his graduate seminar there, and (3) the 1958 NASPA Case Book. Other sources were examined, but none was found suitable for the purpose of this study.

Considerable care was taken to keep identities secret. The cases had been ordered and numbered so as to obscure their identity from anyone but this writer. Only the 1964 Free Speech Movement (FSM) events at the Berkeley campus of the University of California are identified in this study by institution and figure. So much having been written about those tumultuous months, it seemed pointless to attempt to disguise the FSM affair. Similarly after another, smaller crisis at Berkeley two years later, our only source was a national newsmagazine and the happenings were so much related to the earlier ones. On all the other cases, every effort was made to substantiate the promise, "Of course the anonymity of institutions and respondents will be guarded." Only those facts needed by the reader were disclosed. Distinguishing details, like titles of committees and administrators, frequently were changed.

The task of analysis was gigantic. Cases varied in length from a third of a typewritten page to, in the case of Berkeley FSM, a stack of papers several inches thick. Due to the generosity of Dr. E. G. Williamson, Dean of Students and Professor of Psychology at University of Minnesota, this study was beneficiary to his compilation
of "reports, observations and some basic papers" on "The Berkeley Phenomenon." These, plus the documents sent by Dean of Students Arleigh Williams from Berkeley, comprised a substantial dossier on the Berkeley events. In all, the 170-odd cases and Williamson compilation measured almost thirteen inches.

The system used was this. A large spiral notebook was divided according to the elements of communication. Each element was identified by a letter of the alphabet (e.g., cultural background—A, channel—E, feedback—P). A list of component parts was drawn up for each element. For example, in the Cultural Background section were these items: Conventions, customs, expectations, values, assumptions, norms, frames of reference; under Message Content were these: Ideas, research supporting material, accuracy, type of appeal. These sub-items were meant only to guide the analyst and a certain amount of overlap was acknowledged.

As the analysis began, there were these sections: A—Cultural Background, B—Specific Situation, C—Message Content, D—Symbol System (which later was combined with H), E—Channel, F—Arrangement, G—Type and Pattern, H—Language and Style, I—Time, J—Amount, K—Speaker, L—Writer, M—Listener, N—Reader, O—Interference, P—Feedback—Evaluation—Adjustment, and Q—Effects. During the analysis, several changes were made. First an inadequacy was felt in

---

1ODS Staff Paper No. 16, April, 1965, and Supplement No. 1 to No. 16, June, 1965.
the K, L, M, N sections. There were communicators present who were more than one, or none of these. For a time two new categories were added: R--The Facilitator and S--The Anti-facilitator. In the latter were placed troublesome types such as "Bandwagon riders, flame faners, attention seekers, non-communicative militants serving hostile causes, etc." Gradually, as the analysis proceeded, it became clear that all human communicators needed to be in one section which could then be re-divided according to the data that were there at the end. Hence, Speaker, Writer, Listener, Reader, Facilitator and Extraneous Disrupter were combined into one large category--The Communicator.

The section on Effects of Communication was also troublesome. Effectiveness is dependent on many factors and judged according to the purpose of the communication source. Most of these factors were already to be discussed in this paper, so there was considerable overlap in the items that were placed in the Effects section. Furthermore, the purposes of the sources were often too obvious, often too obscure to treat. And since many of the sources of communication during controversies were also the sources of data for this study, any tally of effects would have been unreliable as well as unduly tedious and burdensome. Actually most of the items which found their way to the Effects section had to do with unintended by products of the communication. Since all of these were included elsewhere, the decision to abandon was made. As is implied
several times throughout, the student of communication or 
of conflict should not overlook the importance of studying 
the effects of communication in terms of the intent of the 
communicator. These modifications decided, the data were 
treated according to the amended list of communication 
variables, as the reader will see upon examining the divi-
sions of the Results and Discussion chapter.

The actual analysis was done in two stages, with 
constant re-analysis following during the various writing 
steps. The first analysis of each case occurred during 
the months of July and early August, 1967. Each case in 
turn was thoroughly read, digested and pondered. In some 
cases an analysis had been made by the respondent and it 
was considered. Many of these were very astute and showed 
sensitivity to matters of communication that was encouraging. 
On the first few readings, the alphabetical symbols (e.g., 
AEQ) by which the variables were keyed were placed in the 
margin where possible learnings were to be had. Later an 
attempt was made to state the learning in words, keying 
each by the symbols (e.g., KB, P). Many of these were 
single variable statements; most, however, had something 
to say about two or more elements in the communication 
process. This overlapping was one of the biggest problems 
and caused more agonizing than any other. The problem was 
discovered in the early stages of analysis when it was clear 
that the overlap would tend to cause duplication and redun-
dancy in the results. On the one hand in the interest of
the reader was the need to be as brief as possible; in conflict was the desire to group all learnings about each variable, however much they might duplicate what was written in other sections. Because the second choice could yield a great number of statements and unmanageable length, the writer opted for economy. Since the largest number of statements concerned the communicator(s) it was decided to write those results last. While treating the other variables in the process of communication (message, situation, channel, etc.), when a statement seems equally applicable to two or more sections (e.g., Message and Communicator) in the interest of economy it is usually reported in the section on communicator. The decision to do so was a difficult one, for at the outset there was no indication of where the preponderance of results would be. Furthermore there was, on the part of its author, not a small amount of desire to make the pure scheme work; compromises on methodology were resisted.

The next trip through the cases began in August immediately upon the conclusion of the labeling. It lasted through September, 1967. It was then that the learnings, keyed to the variable-letters, were transcribed into the notebook. There were 562 of these at one count, although their number was constantly changing as new insights came. During the transcription stage many earlier analyses were modified considerably. The researcher discovered that he had gained tremendously in perception and sophistication,
so that later insights made early analyses seem shallow, overextended, or in a few cases, just plain wrong. A case at University 100 might have provided the key to understanding something at College 10. In regards overextension of the data: the researcher had to guard against the temptation to read too much into a sketchy account. Some briefly described cases had to be disqualified. Letters were constantly being written and received, thereby clarifying and making reasonable interpretations possible. A certain amount of self-confidence was required, however. After fifteen years as student activist, teacher, dean and/or adviser to student groups in five institutions, this seemed allowable. Personal knowledge of most of the respondents and their institutions seemed to justify an extra degree of interpretation in a number of cases. In other words, there was a constant internal tension between humility and objectivity on one hand, and subjective intuition and experienced judgment on the other. The line between was often vague and shrouded in misgivings. The number of times each case was handled and each hypothesis reconsidered, provided some reassurance about the probable validity of most of the statements made. Many of them still are purposely couched in tentative language, however. The perceptions of any researcher, as Ittelson and Cantril point out, are bound to be a function of his own personality structure. No matter how many "objective" reassessments, a certain amount of bias is inevitable in field research. Hopefully it is minimal here.
The number of descriptive statements in each category is given in the chapter on Results. The range was from four for the variable Arrangement of Ideas to 175 for the combined total of Communicator. Many of these were duplicates, however. The decision was made to write the results section by section, beginning with the smallest and working toward the largest. The reason was simply to enable the writer to feel his way gradually. At the outset of the writing, the prospect of organizing the larger sections seemed awesome, as indeed it proved to be.

Limitations

Higher education and the controversies between students and "the establishment" are in a great state of flux. One senses that there is a pattern of development which tends to replicate itself on various campuses in various years, although such a pattern is by no means certain nor predictable. The point is that nothing is predictable and no one can, in a study like this at least, provide any panaceas or palliatives for frightened faculty or distressed deans. No pat answers can be conclusive in such a fast changing game being played in so many different arenas. Let the reader proceed with the hope of learning a method of analysis, a framework within which to consider controversies with which he may have to deal. The results of this study should be viewed as suggestive rather than prescriptive. There are simply too many subtle forces in a campus controversy and too many factors influencing
communication for one respondent to capture in a few pages. Two respondents, among others, articulated these problems. One, a speech professor, wrote:

... I am a little at a loss to know just how you expect to get anything out of this. For instance, if resolution of conflict actually occurs, no two persons participating in the episode are likely to give the same account of what happened. Possibly, more importantly, even any kind of publication or summary analysis of what has gone on may endanger the likelihood of success in future situations.

In the same vein, a dean of students sagely observed:

... Anecdotal accounts cannot reveal the quality of appeal to reason, the personalities involved, the innumerable personal, emotional factors which produce a critical situation, and the value systems of those involved.

Other limitations, briefly stated, are these. There is the possibility that the instrument to solicit data may have acted to skew the responses because of a phrase or example. Had the letter been written by someone else, or had there been a pretest or two forms of the letter, the extent of influence from these factors might have been evident. One did have the impression that some of the respondents did not understand what really was sought: some took it to be a study of communication breakdowns leading to controversies rather than what communication occurred after the controversy erupted, however it was caused. This tendency, we suspect, grows out of two conditions in American higher education. One is the desire of many professors and deans to live in an academic world where there are no major controversies and where the dean functions to "keep the lid on." The other is an experience many
educators have had with studying, and writing, episodes for case studies. These usually described in detail the personalities of the principals and the antecedent conditions. When the action began, the story broke off enabling the group to discuss possible courses of action. An extra sentence or two in the instrument might have prevented these two tendencies from occurring.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Of the 306 letters sent, 134 met with some response. This was forty per cent return. Eighty-nine of these sent one or more usable cases of a campus controversy (twenty-nine per cent). The number of usable cases from the mailing was 125. Thirty-eight respondents each sent one short case (three pages or less). Twenty sent two short cases. Four sent three short cases, one sent four cases, and one professor sent seven related by his students. Ten respondents compiled extensive narration and documentation of student controversies. Two cases were covered from different vantage points by more than one source. Eight short cases (three or fewer pages) were augmented with exhibits and documents; and three respondents sent two such short cases. Finally in the tally of responses that produced controversial cases, two people sent reports, with documentation, of the same incident.

Other statistics on the responses were these: seven who sent cases had previously sent letters of promise to get the job done later, which they did with no further reminder. Eight more also promised, also came through, but only after the memorandum of reminder in December, 1966.
Eight responded for the first time only after the December mailing. Ten people addressed referred the letter to another person (student, staff person or someone judged more competent to reply); one person did both, send a case himself and solicit another case.

The forty-five educators who replied to one or both of the mailings with no usable response were categorized this way: Nine sent promises but did not follow through. Three referred the request to another person who did not respond. Twelve wrote but declined politely to take part. Two expressed confusion as to what was sought. Sixteen made observations and commentary but sent no cases. Two sent cases that were not at all usable in the study, and one dean reported he had experienced no student controversies.

Statistics on the data that emerged from the controversy cases are these, arranged according to factors in the communication process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Background</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Situation</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form and Type</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Style</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker¹</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer¹</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listener¹</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader¹</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise, Resistance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator¹</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹These five categories later were combined under the label The Communicator and are treated last in this chapter.
The presentation and discussion of these results are arranged according to the number of items in each category, from fewest to most.

**Arrangement of Communication**

As is indicated above only four of the cases, as they were written and analyzed, seemed to disclose anything significant about the arrangement of communication in student controversies. Schatzman and Strauss summarize the importance of organizing frameworks.

One of the requirements of communication is that utterances be organized. The principle of organization need not be stated explicitly by the speaker or recognized by the listener. Organizing frames can be of various sorts. . . . The great number of events, incidents, and images which must be conveyed to the listener may be handled haphazardly, neatly, dramatically, or sequentially; but, if they are to be communicated at all, they must be ordered somehow. 1

The degree and method of organizing ideas in communication are universally regarded as among the most significant variables of communication. Baird and Knower testify, ". . . we believe that the selection and organization of ideas is the most important factor. . . ." 2 They were writing about speech, but the same could be said about the content and arrangement of written communication as well.

---


No special mention was made in the letter of solicitation of the organization of communication. It seems not too surprising, therefore, that few significant lessons could be learned from the cases submitted. In presenting these we do not pretend to believe they are the most important ones. This method of gathering data is not ideally suited to studying the communicative organization of participants in student controversies. None the less we present these four, all of which involved speech communication but in quite different contexts and to a variety of ends.

One case was a lengthy report of a confrontation at University 47. The dean of students was enforcing rules governing the use of facilities by student groups. The situation was a test by a group of the new student left, the W. E. B. DuBois Club. The latter had not received university recognition to operate as a student group. One thing was clear: in dealing with purposeful violators intent on testing the rules and the patience of the authorities, the dean, or his agent, must be very careful to follow procedures that will stand up in whatever judicial proceedings might follow. He should have prepared in advance a format to follow, much as do police officers and judges. In this instance the dean's remarks were very official sounding, rather devoid of personality, and altogether apropos the legalistic testing by students. After earlier in the day directing representatives of the unrecognized W. E. B. DuBois Club to leave the scene of
a student activity, the dean of students reported:

I then went up to the two individuals behind the table and identified myself. They were the same two men who were there in the afternoon. I asked them if they knew who I was and received an affirmative answer. However, I showed them my identification card saying that I wanted to make sure that there was no misunderstanding of the capacity in which I was acting. They said they knew I was __________, Dean of Students. I then asked them who they were and they identified themselves as __________, a graduate student of the department of History and Philosophy of Science and __________ who stated he was an employee of the Fine Arts Department. I then directed my attention to (the former). I stated that since he was a student it was my responsibility to inform him that he was occupying space which had been assigned to the Student Activities Fair, that he was not eligible to have a booth in this Fair and that I was asking him to leave the premises. I further stated that if he did not obey my request to leave within a period of five minutes, I would be forced to suspend him from school for refusing to obey a proper request of a University official given during the course of a performance of his official duties. I explained that suspension from school could be the penalty for such an offense and that I would be forced to apply this penalty if he did not comply with my request . . .

Such careful arrangement seems necessary to lay the groundwork for the legal action to follow.

College 57 was undergoing a sharp disagreement about visiting hours with doors open or closed. The student body president asked for a general college meeting to have explained the college's new policy, which he found inexplicable. The meeting was highly successful in part because the dean who spoke put the social problem with which the students were so concerned in the context of academic staffing and financial problems which the institution was also coping with. By juxtaposing the two subjects, he "gave a glow of satisfaction to the social situation." This case
will be discussed at greater length in connection with the dean's language, the content of his message, the meeting as a form and the administrator as communicator.

Another serious conflict had boiled for weeks at College 83. The president, after hearing appeals from all sides, and considering the substantial and procedural considerations, was going to announce his decision at a meeting of junior class women. The controversy pitted the dean of women against a group of students whose methods were unethical but successful in gaining support. The president's was to be an unpopular decision and he did not equivocate: "I have been requested to make a statement regarding the housing of women students next year. First may I announce that the decision of [the Dean of Women] to house sophomore women in the new dormitory will be carried out." He next told them how much time he had given the matter, mostly listening to student opinion. Finally the president made six forthright observations about the situation including the conduct of some of the student agitators, all of which supported deductively his frank statement at the outset.

And finally, with regards arrangement of speeches, is this humorous situation at College 111, a religious college, where some pranksters had stolen the chapel hymn books. Both sides waited for a week for the other side to make the first move. At long last when something had to give way, humorous announcement was arranged for maximum suspense and climaxing with a spoof on the speaker, the dean
of students. The speech, and so the prank, was successful in all ways. The incident is reported in the words of the dean of students.

After about a week and no sign of the hymnals, it seemed appropriate for me to make some general announcement or statement indicating our displeasure at the length of time the prank had been allowed to continue. Of course, I was aware that it would be inappropriate, and surely ineffective, to threaten or "chew out" the student body for this prank. It seemed to be necessary to let the students know that we wanted the hymnals back, but at the same time I realized there needed to be an element of humor and some degree of admission to them that they had succeeded in keeping the hymnals from us. Our main objective was to get the hymnals back—not necessarily to discipline the pranksters. In light of this, I made the following announcement prior to the chapel service: "Over the years students have made a number of suggestions for ways in which we could improve the chapel services. These have included more student involvement in chapel, a changing of the order of worship, etc. As you all know by now, someone has decided the best way to change the order of worship was to take the hymnals, so that we must in some way revise our worship service (at this point there was laughter). As Dean of Students, everyone is aware that I am responsible for students' conduct, and unfortunately this includes the stealing of hymnals from the chapel last week. Since we have been missing the hymnals for a week, a number of people have come to me asking what I intended to do about the matter. I had to honestly admit that I was at a loss as to the course of action I should follow. As is always the case, a number of people had suggestions as to ways in which I should approach the problem. A number of people suggested that I get up in chapel and threaten the student body, so here goes! (In a rather emphatic way I said the following). If those hymnals are not back by tomorrow it will be necessary for me to sing a solo in chapel every day (laughter). If any of you have ever heard me sing, you will soon realize that that is the worst possible threat I could make to the student body (laughter). Seriously, it seems to me that the prank of last week has run its course and we would greatly appreciate having the hymnals returned as soon as possible."
Interference

Anyone who has tried to communicate within a social organization like a college or university knows there is resistance and distortion. Sometimes they seem complete, sometimes, especially in smaller institutions and in face to face communications, inoperative. Smith says of this interference:

\[ \ldots \text{we have assumed that when a signal goes from one point to another in a network the signal does not change. We have assumed full fidelity in the system of communication. In practice, however, there is always some change in the signal, some distortion, and this distortion is called noise. Both the mathematical and the social psychological theories of communication recognize the presence of noise, and this is one of the points where the two theories converge.} \]

Knower and Wagner add:

Whether or not there is interference depends upon the readiness and willingness of the communicatee to receive a message or a feedback to his message. It has long been recognized that the communicator may need to overcome resistance to the reception of his message. This technique of overcoming resistance to the reception of his message. This technique of overcoming resistance is commonly associated with procedures for adapting his messages to their intended receivers. \ldots \]

As we began the process of analysis of the controversy cases these subheadings were included in the Interference category: Clarity, accessibility, noise, resistance, difficulty in getting people together, distortion. The results here tend to overlap with some in these other

1 Alfred G. Smith, *Communication and Culture*, p. 275.
categories: Channel, Language and Style, Amount, and Form-Type. They are particularly complementary to the results on the Facilitator and the Communication Expert whose functions are to eliminate and cut through the interference.

One case at University 94 involved narcotics. The dean of students, noting a great amount of misinformation and rumor, appointed one member of his staff to act in a continuing capacity collecting and filtering information about drugs. He talks with students and staff members with concerns or information. "Much of the rumor and speculation are filtered away and it is easier to find out what the real facts are."¹

At College 28 occurred a wrangle over the use of obscenity in fraternity skits and publications. A dean declined to trust his oral statements to the vagaries of the student secretaries to the student senate and interfraternity council. Whenever he met with one of these groups during his protracted and highly publicized attempt to crack down on obscenity, the dean came prepared with a written version of his statement to assist the secretary in the preparation of minutes and press releases—hence to minimize the chance for distortion of his message.

At University 45 tremendous resistance met the efforts of a student editor trying to get the facts on a

¹It is interesting and distressing to note that in the Spring of 1968 this dean of students is under indictment for allegedly tolerating drug abuse on his campus.
matter of student concern. In a trustees meeting the university president was reported as mentioning a housing shortage due to building delay. As the reporter tried to learn more, the buck-passing among the petty bureaucrats was a source of great frustration and anger to the young man. He could not get a statement from any of three offices he called. Finally one sensitive administrator heard of the inability to penetrate the morass. She called him and managed to salve his frustrations. Then she moved to cut through the red tape. She was not able, however, to forestall a hostile account in the student paper of the resistance he had encountered from staff people. They were unwilling themselves to issue a statement and to facilitate his getting one elsewhere.

In a much smaller institution, College 33, a president with exceptionally good rapport with students began a carefully planned campaign for a policy change indicated by the growth of the school. "For the first time in his 15 years at this college, the president was the target . . . increasingly negative . . . student response." All his attempts failed to restore the good "communication and mutual trust" that previously existed. Upon subsequent investigation, it was disclosed that the resistance had grown out of comments made by faculty members to students. They had suggested that the president's motives were not the ones he announced. The seed was planted that the president wanted really to accomplish something much more
extensive and threatening to the students, the end of the fraternity system. The campus was so contaminated by this "noise" that there was no way the president and his staff could find to convince the students of his intent, although several were tried. The policy change was, for the time, abandoned.

The reader should realize at this point that the cases described briefly here will be discussed in future sections of this chapter as they apply to other elements of the communication process.

Language

The possibilities for learning about language use in campus controversies were much greater than the results to be reported here. The methodology as applied in a general way seems not to have yielded much fruit in this specific part of the communication process. A few significant results did emerge, however, but before examining them let us put the matter of language into perspective. Ross in discussing "language as code and symbol" has this to say:

In many respects it is in the use of oral language that we need our most rigorous training, for there is an infinitely larger number of meanings available to the communicatee (the listener) in the oral situation than in the reader situation, due to the concomitant or simultaneous signals which are operative over and above words. Your voice, for example, is a wonderfully sensitive instrument which has a powerful influence upon the meaning the listener attaches both to the words and to the speaker himself. . . . The appearance of the speaker--his dress, movement, facial expressions, and use of gestures--represents another concomitant signal which obviously affects the decoding mechanism of the listener.
Another less obvious point to be made is that these codes and signals are related in such a way as to seriously and fundamentally affect each other. Sometimes they work together and strengthen or reinforce the meaning intended. . . Sometimes . . . they conflict with each other and distort the intended meaning. . . Words are symbols which are conventionally agreed upon to represent certain things.

Knower and Wagner add, with particular relevance for this paper and its great length as well as for the tasks of communicators during controversy:

Major problems in all communication are to select the particular symbols most representative of the subject under consideration, and to do so with the economy which is the justification of symbolic activity.

In the analysis of all 170-some cases there was none in which the crucial variable was concerned primarily with the symbol system as such, apart from the actual words used or the symbolic value to student protesters of occupying a certain building. Although there undoubtedly were in many of the situations gestural, pictorial, verbal or even musical elements, none came through as having a decisive effect—unless it was the singing of Joan Baez in Sproul Hall at Berkeley during the Free Speech Movement (FSM) sit-ins of 1964.

In one way or another twelve cases are cited, however, as suggesting ways in which language or style were even slightly crucial. Anyone familiar with the FSM weeks

---


2*Communication in Educational Administration*, p. 11.
at Berkeley will recognize that certain metaphors, labels and catch phrases had great utility to the movement. There can be no doubt to the careful reader of documents and news accounts that such euphemisms as Free Speech Movement and figures of speech as "Do Not Fold, Spindle or Mutilate," and "bring this machine to a grinding halt" had great impact on the imagination of the campus and the country. Even the term "multiversity," coined by President Clark Kerr, became a byword for the rebels in their appeals for support from the faculty and students. Of course in the later, so-called filthy speech episode, the main emphasis was on another kind of language used for effect.

In view of the extensive use made of devices of language in the Berkeley affairs, it is surprising to note the paucity of catch phrases and figures reported in the other cases submitted for this study. There were a few, however. At College 20 students protested the decision to build residential facilities to house the whole student body, forcing some out of their off-campus diggings back into dormitories. The term "Superdorm" was coined. It was derisively applied to the plans when announced. After a campaign of persuasion described elsewhere in this paper, the term Superdorm lost its derision and continued as part of the subculture of the college.

The only other instance involving a loaded label took place in the year 1965-66 at University 18. The administration refused to recommend for approval a student
activity because it misleadingly called itself "Peace Offensive." It actually was a service project to aid the displaced people of South Viet Nam. When the name was changed by the leaders, somewhat reluctantly, the project won easy approval.

It is clear from studying Berkeley-type power confrontations that presidents, chancellors, deans and other members of "the power structure" need to adapt their language to the situation and the audience they face. When "eye-ball to eye-ball" with the militant power testers who no longer desire to communicate, it behooves the Establishment to be formal and legalistic. In such a war of nerves pleasantries may be superfluous and excess talk or writing may provide the basis for charges that "due process" was abridged. Although the evidence is in general not conclusive, one thing is quite clear. The legalistic language of the enlightened police officer in a civil rights demonstration has been adopted by the college administrator confronting a protest demonstration or power confrontation. In such an instance, the slightest slip may provide the entering wedge for a clever lawyer, or law student, to establish that proceedings were illegal or rights were violated. Therefore an officer of a university is well advised to be sure of his legal grounds and to select his words with care and precision. For an example of such careful use of language, the reader is referred to the quotation from the Dean of Students at University 47. The
case concerns the DuBois Club and has already been referred to. Salient parts of the text are quoted later in the section Type and Pattern of Communication, under the discussion of keeping a written record of the controversy.

On the other hand before the situation reaches the "eyeball to eyeball" stage, when persuasion still is possible, there is no reason for agents of the university to behave like linguistic-legal automatons. Indeed, in the typical controversy when the forces of student power have found an issue with broad appeal in the student body and faculty, a university campus comes to resemble a courtroom or pre-election campaign: the great mass of students of faculty, gradually at first, then in great numbers drawn into listening to appeals and arguments from both sides. The radical students and faculty members are opposed by the forces of moderation, the latter advocating that orderly procedures be followed through regular legislative channels. In such a gigantic court of opinion, as the uncommitted students and faculty are drawn in as jurors, responsible use of the "available means of persuasion" can be effective. The choice of language and the appropriateness of oral or written style can be important determinants in the outcome of today's highly fluid collegiate controversies. These observations grow out of cases in which the president or dean of students took on, in addition to a role as administrator and educator, tasks as advocate or moderator. For example at an outdoor mass meeting during the height of a
weeklong left-inspired fervor over Selective Service tests and rank-in-class, the president of University 113 addressed a mass rally of 6000 students. This case will be cited again and again in this paper. Much about it epitomizes sensitive, enlightened, restrained administrative behavior in tension filled situations. Here we shall refer only to the language chosen by the president of the university. Seeking to be personal, rather than formal, he used exclusively simple, direct, personal sounding words. In seventeen lines of copy there are thirteen personal pronouns and possessive adjectives in the first and second persons. For example, he begins by saying:

Chancellor _______ and I met with the president of the student body and with several of your liaison representatives this morning. The Chancellor has been meeting steadily with your representatives for the past two days. He will, in a moment, have a policy statement for you in which I concur.

And a few lines later he continues:

Thus he has been dealing most directly with you. And thus he will give you our reaction--his and mine--to some of the things which so deeply concern so many of you.

At College 57, in addition to his skillful interweaving of two themes mentioned in the earlier section on Arrangement, much of the success of the dean's speech to the campus community lay in his appropriate language. The dean was described as having seen "over 300 days of continuous combat in the Italian campaign" and as being "a very direct and forceful person." Referring to the success of this address, the correspondent concluded, "I am sure that
one will not communicate with today's students in any form of florid, pious rhetoric—as they say you got to get down to 'the nitty gritty.'"

In addition to these instances of direct and effective speaking, examples of direct, concrete written language were also studied. At University 13 the dean of students found himself faced with an "OPEN LETTER TO THE DEAN OF STUDENTS" from the defensive president of the men's Residence Hall Association (RHA). It was sent to all the resident men and was a direct challenge of power ("... whether it be now, next week, next year or ten years hence, the administration of this university will have to realize that while there are many things it can do and much power it does possess, there are spheres of student authority which will remain inviolate." If student government is to be a government not a puppet of the administration then our case will be upheld. Let's find out now.")

The dean's answer, short and direct, also was sent to all RHA members. By contrast with the angry, almost paranoid sounding student letter, it was restrained and literate. Its first paragraph said simply, "Thank you for your open letter of May 14. I am bewildered." Then after setting the record straight in less than 22 lines, the dean concluded, "All this, I believe, is not cause for a call to the barricades but rather demands our common cause to ensure that the will of the majority of the Association is followed." Both letters are included in the section of Type and Pattern
in the discussion of Written Requests for Support. The dean of students' letter is cited as a model of urbane, restrained use of the written word.

Similarly, when a dean is functioning in his roles as educator or exponent of college expectations, a clear, direct and candid style with no equivocation seems to work best. At College 28, writing as chairman of a faculty committee that had overturned a student judiciary board decision, the dean fulfilled his role as an educator in an admirable fashion. After two short paragraphs of introduction, including mention of a point conceded to the student government, the dean wrote frankly,

Because the Committee has no confidence in the capacity of the IFC-JC to conduct a proper investigation or reach an objective conclusion, the Committee's ultimate responsibility to the Board of Trustees left them with no alternative but to assume full responsibility for disciplinary matters affecting fraternities. Our specific concerns were the following: [three were briefly and frankly stated].

To contrast with these examples of direct, concrete, relatively simple but well chosen language and style, some of the memoranda studied violated all the rules of readability. Typical faults are excessive verbosity, hence length; long, involved sentences; overuse of impersonal and passive verbs. Such writing, in the experience of the present writer, is characteristic of low level government bureaucrats,

1Jeanne S. Chall, Readability (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research and Services, The Ohio State University, 1958), and Rudolph Flesch, How to Test Readability (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951).
including the military, as they fight their Parkinsonian paper wars. No doubt the same tendencies creep into growing universities. Passive and impersonal verbs in long and ponderous memos almost seem to provide a shield for the writer. More important than the cultural or psychological causes is their effect. They create the appearance of an impersonal administration and contribute to the feeling of alienation which students feel. And they do not make for effective communication because they are hard to read.

Two other cases yielded principles having to do with language. One was sent by an English professor recently made aware of General Semantics. He related an incident that occurred at College 32 during a controversy over fraternity high pressure rushing techniques. Communication failed to occur, he observed, because both parties were "using language not to communicate information but to create an effect or to reveal [their] feelings. . . ."

This young faculty member serving as head resident in a freshman residence hall attacked a certain fraternity for their tendency to scare freshmen into committing themselves to membership. He chose loaded, locally colorful terminology in talking to representatives of the fraternity. Even though they had come to appease him, the student delegation responded hotly. The charge was not true, they asserted, but they did not expect "you administrative types would see

---

it that way." The faculty member observed in his letter to this writer, "To be sure the underlined words seem neutral enough but the same connotations are at work as in his label for their behavior. You have suddenly been lumped together with a lot of mythical gentlemen who have filing cabinets for brain pans."

The final case in this section concerned a campus visit by the late George Lincoln Rockwell of the American Nazi Party. The incident and others involving Rockwell suggest that when a virulent demagogue is invited to speak at a university and the event is preceded by considerable discussion about his beliefs and techniques, the event itself will seem tame, even anticlimactic in the face of everyone's efforts toward self restraint. On the other hand, as in this instance, if someone from the academic community tries on the same program to refute the demagogue on his own low level, the delicate balance can be lost and the result unfortunate. In the words of a student correspondent:

His speech . . . was tacitly received and responded to for the most part in a manner fitting an "educated audience." The professor delivering the rebuttal, however, resorted to sensationalism primarily in the form of "name-calling" to discredit Rockwell. This was obviously totally unexpected from a member of the academic community, and the consequences were to degenerate audience reaction to a level well within which the "Rockwell" type of speaking ordinarily thrives. The end result was that Rockwell left ________ University feeling that his public appearance on behalf of the Nazi Party had indeed been more successful than he had anticipated. Incidentally, many of the students who stayed for the rebuttal felt this way too.
So we see that the psychological impact of words should be considered carefully when communicating in controversial settings. The relevant cases suggest that use of language may be one of the most important variables. The data were not sufficient to yield any hard conclusions, however.

**Feedback, Evaluation and Adjustment**

Smith introduces the concept of feedback in this way:

In a communication network a signal goes from point A to point B with more or less fidelity. It also goes from point B back to A with more or less fidelity. The signals sent out are often sent back in order to control what is sent out. In human communication particularly, the signal A sends to B is largely determined by the signal B sends back to A. A can also anticipate B's reaction; A can even react to his own output himself. This is feedback. Feedback serves to control and correct the signals fed forward. It serves to realign all the signals within the network to one another. It makes A and B truly interacting members of a communication system.

Berlo in discussing feedback, states:

Feedback provides the source with information concerning his success in accomplishing his objective. In doing this, it exerts control over future messages which the source encodes. ... Action-reaction relationships are significant in analyzing communication. Feedback is an important instrument of affect. The reactions of the receiver are useful to the source in analyzing his effectiveness. They also affect his subsequent behaviors because they serve as consequences of his prior responses. If the feedback is rewarding, he perseveres. If it is not rewarding, he changes his message to increase the chances of being successful. ... The ability

---

1 Alfred G. Smith, *Communication and Culture*, p. 322.
to observe carefully the reactions others make to our messages is one of the characteristics of the person we designate as being good at "human relations," or "sensitive as a communicator." ¹

In this section, then, we shall examine instances that shed light on the place of feedback, evaluation and adjustment in the communication during campus controversies. Fourteen of the 173 cases seemed to reveal something significant about these parts of the process. None of the findings was contradictory to any of the others. First of all we shall consider three pairs of incidents which suggested similar principles.

The first pair occurred at the same institution, University 76, although in different academic years. One concerned a left wing peace group and the other the campus conservative group during the Goldwater campaign. Each group was polite in its dealings with the dean of students' staff, but exhibited minimum compliance with deans' directives. Perhaps typical of extremist groups on campuses, these were disposed to pay as little heed as necessary to the "housekeeping" rules of the institution. In both cases the deans acted toward the groups' requests as they would to any other group but seemed to keep a somewhat sharper ear than usual cocked for feedback that might indicate whether the zealous student groups were adrift of the guide lines set by the deans. When it became evident that the

student groups did not intend to follow the directives and agreements as to procedure, the officials acted promptly to assure that there was compliance. To fail in this is to erode the power and respectability of the institutional administration, especially the office or dean concerned. In the Peace Union case a dean stopped communicating and took action himself on the scene of a traveling Japanese peace trailer. In the Conservative Club case a dean directed the union director to remove a display when its contents continued to run afoul of the rule against partisan political material in union display cases. In both instances the power and respectability of the university administration and the dean's office seemed to be enhanced by the conduct of the case in the critical moments when the negative feedback began coming.

A case at University 9 showed what can happen when feedback is not heard nor heeded. This case is perhaps illustrative of many administrative actions in response to student complaints. Amid general dissatisfaction the managers of a large dormitory food service simply assumed after one meeting with student representatives that the problems were solved. They were apparently insensitive to a further dissatisfaction brought on, at least in part, by the attitudes of their workers. The managers were therefore surprised when a second food uprising exceeded the first in scope and intensity. Evaluation and continued reading of feedback should have followed the first meeting.
In two controversies, one occurring at a large state university and the other at a private college, feedback was prudently sought. Interim policy statements were issued on matters of new controversy where it wasn't clear in the dawn's early light what all the details of a more permanent policy might be. As soon as the direction of the policy that would fit the institution became clear an interim statement was put out. One at University 40 having to do with "free speech area" was issued by a dean in his role as chairman of a faculty committee on student life; the other, on drugs, was issued by a corresponding dean, though also the chairman of such a committee, from his office as dean, with copies to the committee, the president and deans, faculty and student members of committees concerned, the student press, etc. Both the time and feedback gained were valuable in formulating the permanent policies in both cases.

In a similar case at University 137 a student council president, convinced of the need for a constitutional change in student government, set out to effect the changes. His planning was thorough and his initial actions early enough so that he could deal with the feedback from student council members. By listening to feedback from each of them he was able to adjust his campaign successfully and gain enough votes to accomplish his purpose. On the other hand a student leader at College 74, proposing a similar change, did not anticipate feedback. When a key question was asked at a
meeting called to discuss his proposal, he was devastated. The proposal did not win approval because its advocate had not thought through the whole situation, anticipated reaction and prepared to deal with it.

At University 61 the feedback reaching the dean of students about the faculty Disciplinary Committee was over a period of years increasingly unfavorable. The "Committee was feared by students. The Chairman was accused of being a . . . heartless man. . . . any student who went before this committee was doomed to dismissal without a fair hearing." As a result after much effort he succeeded in having the name changed to Committee on Professional Conduct and three student members added. The latter served as a channel for accurate feedback, and actually were harsher than the faculty members; but the renamed, augmented committee enjoyed "the reputation of being fair and just."

Students in an advanced seminar at University 61 were so dissatisfied with its progress that they met after one of its later meetings to collaborate on some written "feedback" for the instructor. The course was eighty percent over before the instructor received the suggestions but he did discuss them at the subsequent meeting. He later asked for a written critique from each student. The next time the seminar was offered, the suggestions that required no more work by the faculty were incorporated; others were not. ¹

¹It was not clear to this writer whether the student chronicler considered the outcome satisfactory. Probably
During the legislative process, as indicated in the cases above where interim policy statements were issued, there is likely to be good feedback available. Often legislators do not tune in to receive it. At College 163 during a controversial attempt to pass regulations on motor cycles, one member of the administrative staff assumed responsibility for the problem as it underwent the legislative process. He sat in on a public hearing, listened to all sides, and commented enough to have the students, faculty members and townspeople present identify him as someone interested in the problem. A small group of students offered to draft a bill. Thereafter the administrator followed the bill through the legislative maze of that institution: through a student-faculty committee, through the Student Senate, to the appropriate faculty committee. While it awaited a hearing there the administrator studied the feedback from those concerned with the problem and decided the bill was more restrictive than it needed to be. After carefully balancing feedback from both sides, he proposed that the bill be amended so as to make it a palatable compromise to both sides. It was changed and passed, with happy response from all quarters, thanks to the sensitivity of the feedback monitor.

In contemporary student-administrative power confrontations such as at Berkeley in 1964, student antagonists he did, to the extent the instructor acknowledged the dissatisfaction and efforts of the students and made adjustments in the course accordingly.
are likely to be few in number and on very shaky ground at the outset. At Berkeley in September of 1964, the leading members of the incipient Free Speech Movement (FSM) studied the reactions of the administration very closely for evidence of weakness. The latter kept changing spokesmen, and positions. By seeming equivocal and willing to submit to pressure they in effect invited more pressure from the radical demonstrators thus invalidating the regular organs of student government for dealing with the problem. This investigator was singularly impressed from studying the chronicles and documents of those unhappy months, at how closely and sensitively Mario Savio and his colleagues scrutinized the reactions of the deans, chancellor and president. Often after protracted debate the next move would be decided. Then the feedback would be studied again.

In such times harassed administrators often fail to grasp the full significance of a student protest movement.

As one Berkeley professor observed during the fall of 1964,

Before the disorder of recent days can be overcome it would seem that the Administration and Faculty must indicate that they have heard what the students have been talking about. The students are not well impressed by the world as they see it. They see much that is wrong, as I am sure most of us do. They feel it is their privilege—indeed their responsibility—to take steps to make changes in an undesirable pattern.¹

¹Owen Chamberlain, Professor of Physics and Nobel Laureate, writing in a memorandum from members of the Berkeley faculty to colleagues on other campuses of the University of California and at other institutions, December 14, 1964. Reprinted by E. G. Williamson, ODS Staff Papers, No. 16.
In this instance the administration having provoked the controversy and fed it with shifts of position and recriminations against its leaders, could have gained support for its legal position had it demonstrated concern for the students and understanding of their causes. Administration and faculty failure to provide such feedback served to make the angry angrier and swell their numbers.

As a way of registering both communication and feedback, to facilitate evaluation and adjustment of efforts during campus controversies, in several instances someone kept a journal of events and communications. This study has benefitted immeasurably from the receipt of several of these. This writer, as an undergraduate caught up in a college controversy of overwhelming and debilitating proportions, found himself losing perspective. A daily journal was begun just so the writer could keep his bearings in a typhoon that will be described later.

Most of the dossiers examined were built after the battle was over from the documents and memoranda of the case, the memories of the participants and any recording of speeches, etc. The purposes of preparing one seem to include institutional self-study (how to avoid making the same mistakes again) and to report to the governing body how the fracas was handled. These retrospective chronicles seemed remarkably objective. Someone who had prepared a file on a controversy would gain skill during future controversies in monitoring and recording events, including one's own behavior. The most useful dossiers, however, are likely
to be those from more than one source. Correspondents at two institutions recently caught up in large-scale conflicts, sent this writer two reports. In each case one was prepared for the alumni magazine and the other for the administration. Those gathered for alumni were thorough day-to-day journals, more objective and complete than the report prepared by university officials. In addition, at California the University Board of Regents appointed a committee (The Forbes Committee) to study events at Berkeley in 1964. It in turn hired a staff to reconstruct what happened and make recommendations (The Byrne Report). Both types of reports provide exceedingly valuable feedback—the on-the-spot reporting by a trained journalist and a neutral study commission's post facto reconstruction of what happened.

This matter of written records of controversies is discussed more fully in the section on Type and Pattern of Communication on pages 257-63. In terms of feedback, evaluation and adjustment of one's own communication behavior during a controversy, beginning a file at the outset of the fracas can be a significant move.

Message Content

With Berlo, "We can define content as the material in the message that was selected by the source to express his purpose." In this section we propose to learn what can be gleaned from the data about the ideas expressed in

controversy communication. We shall also be concerned with the treatment given to the message—the type of motive appeal used, the research done and material selected to support the ideas.

Hovland, Janis and Kelley say of motive appeals:

In the formation and modification of beliefs and attitudes, as in other types of human learning, motivational factors are generally assumed to play a prominent role.¹

Knower and Wagner put these considerations in a slightly different perspective:

While the ideas and meanings in a communication would appear to be its most important feature, and no doubt are in most cases, it is well to remember that this is not always the case. The communicator may need to select his subject matter with care, for what is selected to stand for the whole as well as the symbols employed can only lead to inferences about meaning by the communicatee. Moreover, communications appear to be most efficient when they are only indirect and suggestive of meaning. Distorted representation of subject matter appears not uncommonly. This can be the product of ignorance, unconscious bias, diplomacy, or malicious design. It can readily be seen that the problem of getting subject matter meanings adequately understood is not a simple one.²

During the process of analysis thirty-six statements about message content and treatment emerged from the 170-odd cases. Of these, about half seemed, on later examination, to be more applicable elsewhere and not worthy of repeated coverage here. The remaining will be discussed


²Knower and Wagner, *Communication in Educational Communication*, p. 11.
in four groups: the ideas themselves (three statements), type of appeal (eleven), research and supporting material (three), and accuracy (two).

The ideas themselves

The handling of two controversies cited by Blaine are examples of how messages which combine firmness and reasonableness can be successful. When used by an administrator dealing with protesting students, these qualities can contribute much to the equilibrium of the campus and student respect for authority.

At Brandeis when students protested a new rule about doors being kept open during women's visiting hours in men's dorms and threatened a mass strike, President Sachar announced that all striking students, no matter how many in number, would be immediately suspended, and in the same statement granted permission for the students to present their complaints to the University's board of trustees.

Similarly, President Brewster of Yale combined firmness with reasonableness when the students protested the withholding of tenure from a faculty member. He announced that the students should have no control over faculty appointments but agreed to request a review of this decision by the committee responsible, making it clear he would support whatever decision this group made after its review of the matter.¹

These two messages seem to meet the needs of the situation while at the same time setting the limits that students, or any protesting group in an orderly society, need. One gets the impression from reading about college controversies

that there is a good deal of bluff and sophistry in the messages communicated. How much can we get? How much can we get away with? What shall we tell them? What reasons shall we give? Students want to respect their faculty and their administrators, and vice versa. Communication that takes a firm but not rigid stand, with sound and honest reasons, will succeed. This point will be developed further in connection with The Communicator.

The other lesson to be mentioned here grew out of a case in the life of this writer. Without knowing for sure what communicating will be required in a controversy, let the communicator prepare carefully his possible messages and keep them available as the controversy unfolds. This technique was learned by accident in 1967 when this writer, in his capacity as dean of men, was obliged to enter and search student rooms without the occupants present. This is a practice we avoid in all but compelling circumstances. Reliable reports reached the deans' office that pot smoking and sex orgies were occurring with some regularity on Saturday nights in one residence hall and involving not just college but high school students as well. Furthermore, one student was reported to be importing marijuana from the West Coast by the suitcaseful. The college had a policy on how such inspections might be made; it was followed to the letter. One provision was that the student(s) whose room was entered should be notified afterward in writing.
Feeling defensive about having entered other people's rooms and searching their belongings, this writer set out to prepare a statement to be issued when the campus outcry began, knowing that it would. The statement was to inform and mollify faculty and students who would be at least curious, and probably angry, about the matter. After consultation with colleagues, however, we did not release the statement. They pointed out the procedure, however unpopular, was legal and justified in that instance. The statement, they contended, would seem apologetic.

In the heat of several moments during the ensuing few days, that draft statement proved to be exceedingly useful. When explanations were sought, when denunciations had to be answered, the text was already prepared. Minor adaptations were necessary, but the facts and legal authority were succinctly stated and available to help deal with a new problem troublesome to a whole campus. When controversies can be anticipated, then, we recommend a few minutes be spent preparing a few cogent remarks to avoid having to speak impromptu and perhaps badly in a crucial situation.

Type of appeal

This section is unfortunately lacking in number of cases. It could, of itself, be a major study answering the questions, "In a major student controversy what kinds of appeals by whom to whom are effective and ineffective in persuasion?" If indeed all the other variables could somehow be controlled (e.g., position and credibility of
administrator, influence of faculty members and non-aligned students, past occurrences and sub-cultural pattern, etc.), which they obviously cannot, such a study might be the neatest and most useful instead of the present one which often seems so sprawling and fraught with loose ends. None the less, the cases supplied for this study do, in the way they are here treated, provide some interesting examples of persuasive appeals used to cope with controversial situations on university campuses.

Irrespective of what other appeals are used, the underlying fear of disciplinary action is a very real one; especially after a recent decision by the Courts of California, including the Supreme Court, universities may take action to punish, including by exclusion, students whose conduct interferes with the operation and well-being of the institution. Three different kinds of such threats emerged from the data. The most direct was a statement after a widespread water fight at University 121. The dean wrote, "Isolated incidents among fraternities and sororities . . . generated a campus-wide involvement requiring the use of campus security, student personnel staff and local police to control." In the face of evidence

1 Goldberg vs. Regents of the University of California. "... the university has the power to formulate and enforce rules of student conduct that are appropriate and necessary to the maintenance of order and propriety, considering the accepted norms of social behavior in the community, where such rules are reasonably necessary to further the university's educational goals." Quoted in Higher Education and National Affairs, XVI (October 6, 1967), pp. 4-5.
that there would be a repetition on a larger scale the next evening

... we called together our fraternity presidents and told them flatly that we expected them to be able to keep their brothers at the fraternity house and away from campus gatherings and that further we would expect that there would be no involvement on the fraternity property with the throwing of water. We told them flatly that we would hold the fraternity responsible for the conduct of its members and that we would close the doors of any group that was not able to impose an adequate discipline upon its members.

Such a "flat" fear-arousing appeal is unusual in this writer's experience. It is probably the type of thing some critics have in mind when they say colleges should "get tough" with student miscreants. In any event, as a result of this threat to the very existence of the groups "nothing happened the following evening aside from a general uneasiness of those who waited for something to develop."

Another tack taken during a protest demonstration, was less direct. At University 113 the administration issued a statement of its expectation that there be no interference with the conduct of business during a sit-in. In the event there was, each student was to be asked to show his identification card and leave the building. If he did not leave he was to be removed with no threat of police action unless he resisted. Then came the "threat":

Once the student has been removed from the building, his name will be reported through normal disciplinary channels for such action as the conduct committee may care to take. No legal charges will be filed against students unless by their individual actions they choose to make this necessary. Otherwise the incident will be handled purely as an internal University matter.
This form of threat also was successful in achieving the administration goal allowing dissent and protest without overt interference in the rights of others.

In addition to dire threats to the existence of a student group and threats to disciplinary action for individuals, a third kind of threat was noted—an appeal for support of the present leadership in a crisis out of fear that if this one falls the next administration is bound to be worse. At the Berkeley campus of the University of California in the fall of 1966, two years after the Free Speech era, Roger W. Heyns, former dean of arts and sciences at Michigan, was chancellor. A group of agitators called a strike after a fracas over Navy recruiting in the union.

The key question for Heyns was whether Berkeley's unpredictable faculty, which passed the buck in the campus uproar two years ago, would support him. In a calmly delivered speech, Heyns told 1,000 members of the Academic Senate that the campus was faced with "a chronic condition" in which non-student agitators, in "one of the most unusual town-gown antagonisms in history," had made the campus a target for protest. He drew a burst of applause when he said, "There are hundreds of faculty members and thousands of students who are heartily sick of the unrest, turbulence and the tenuous control we have over our community and who yearn for the stability essential for a climate of productive learning." Vowing that he would enforce all campus rules "as long as I am in this position," Heyns—in a clear reference to the rising ire of the university regents over Berkeley's problems—warned that if the faculty did not support him, "no other chancellor will have as much independence as I have been given." 1

His appeal to the yearning for peace and threat of regental action was followed by a 795 to 28 vote "to deplore the use

of external police 'except in an extreme emergency' but to
urge an immediate end of the strike and 'to affirm our
confidence in the Chancellor's leadership.' Each of these
threats of dire consequences seems to have been effective
in achieving the end desired, be it ending a water fight,
controlling a sit-in demonstration or showing a student
body that its faculty supports the administration's handling
of a crisis situation. Judging from the paucity of such
instances in the cases used in this study we can infer that
threats are not the mode in dealing with student controversies
but that they might well be used more than they are.

Student combatants and the faculties that sometimes
support them would benefit from advance insight into the
possible consequences of untoward behavior. There seems
no valid reason for withholding a statement of expectations
to counter the glib assurances sometimes offered by militant
leaders looking for followers (e.g., "The administration
wouldn't dare to kick out 200 students--they need the revenue.")

The introductory statement by Acting Chancellor
Martin Meyerson of Berkeley is notable for the appeals
contained in it. The explosive autumn of 1964 had trailed
into the Christmas recess. Chancellor Edward W. Strong
whose handling of the Free Speech crisis had been less than
successful had become a negative symbol for many. Suddenly
as classes were about to resume Dean Meyerson of the Berkeley

1 Ibid.
College of Environmental Design was named Acting Chancellor effective the same day. On the following day he issued a statement "... to state some of my views which I hope will be helpful in building upon the progress and understanding which have already been accomplished." By way of introduction he expressed confidence not only that an early solution could be found but that they could "move to deal with some of the present and future potentialities of the campus."

There was a passing appeal for respecting other people's points of view; failure to do so would "hurt all intellectual communities everywhere."

The body of his text contains, in quick succession with little developing material, appeals to values probably held by most members of the Berkeley community: "... the rights of democracy have to be extended not only to those with whom we agree but to all those with whom we disagree"; "... against prior censorship; as the father of young children I want them exposed to all the ideas the adult world has to offer"; "... against double punishment for a single violation"; "... courts ... are better equipped than a university to handle legal questions arising out of free speech and advocacy." Then having plucked those strings in the harp of academe, he recognized the feelings of the non-academic world by acknowledging, "I also understand the reluctance of law enforcement agencies to let universities relinquish their traditional disciplinary role. Universities have been expected to control their own discipline. ...
we must assume a mature and responsible civic posture." He did not resolve the apparent contradiction here; the purpose was to get support from as many sources as possible.

He then went on to deal honestly with the matters of rules, civil disobedience and the size of the university and did so on an air of reasonableness and hope. Each paragraph ended with a short declarative sentence, all of which taken together seemed to suggest he was a man of orderly mind whose approach would be direct and reasonable, e.g., "Avenues of recourse are now available on this campus. ... I have no more affection for being an IBM card than anyone else. ... It may be that student efforts are fragmented by too many courses."

He closed with a challenge which seemed to put the dimensions of the problem in perspective and again to appeal for all concerned to keep things that way.

For ours is the task to reconcile the eternal traditions of a community of scholars with the needs of a modern democracy in swift evolution. It is a task we must solve, not only for the University but for the people of California. With generosity toward each other we may succeed in bringing into harmony greater quality with quantity, responsibility with freedom, teaching with research which feeds teaching, intellectual experimentation with service to the state and nation, serious accomplishment with humor and even age with youth.

In most controversies between students and the older academic generation participants seem to feel a dichotomy, often false and destructive, between "us" and

---

1University Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 21, January 11, 1965, as reprinted by Williamson, ODS Staff Papers, No. 16.
"them." This need for a scapegoat on whom to lay the blame for one's problems is not peculiar to students,¹ but is characteristic of them. This phenomenon, lumping everyone and everything not on "our side" into a vaguely defined, hostile "they" or "the administration" often needs to be dealt with. The best example in the controversies studied happened at University 113 during Selective Service sit-ins in 1966. We refer here to the short speech discussed earlier in connection with Language. Before an open air, open meeting, the president succeeded in making himself seem very human and personable as he spoke of the proud tradition of responsible protest and dissent (This theme was an undercurrent running through administrative statements during the affair). It was a speech introducing the chancellor and contained only 200 words. As mentioned earlier there were numerous personal pronouns. But this appeal to pride in a tradition of free and respectful inquiry was the most striking part.

... I want to say that free and open discussion are in the university tradition. This includes discussions involving students, faculty and administration. Dissent and protest are also in the tradition, as are protection of individual rights, and majority rule.

This University--perhaps more than any other institution in this nation--is one in which students and faculty and administration work together with mutual respect--though certainly not always in complete agreement.

¹This writer can vividly remember numerous instances in college history classes when the instructor interrupted a student recitation to ask, "Just whom are you referring to as 'they'?"
Already mentioned in two other sections, the case at College 57 is applicable for the appeals used. In an open meeting, by way of explaining restrictions on dormitory visitation, the dean-historian appealed to some of his students' highest motives. He broadened the topic and spoke from the texture of life itself—a mixture of good and evil where choices are likely to be gray on gray and where today's wisdom may seem tomorrow's folly... with great frankness to the students, not trying to gloss over any of the difficulties and problems that faced the college. As an historian he was able to give some perspective to the manner of what is regarded as proper and improper in the conduct of students. On the matter of faculty departures, he talked at some length about the real existential pressures brought on a small college like ______—particularly a college which is experiencing considerable improvement... The Dean was able to speak very directly, honestly and positively to the academic concerns of the students and I believe this gave a gloss of satisfaction to the social situation.

The dean satisfied students' need for esteem by showing that he respected and trusted them enough to speak frankly about the problems facing the college; and the facts and perspective did much to satisfy the Desires to Know and Understand. As Broderick points out, students want to be trusted "to have enough sophistication ... to understand ... that there has to be a limit to the yielding."  


Likewise one can gain support from constituencies other than one's students by trusting them to understand the complexities and perplexities of a problem. Whereas many colleges may tend to gloss over their controversies, as mentioned previously some alumni magazines give complete reports of campus uprising—even hour-by-hour chronicles. The entire February, 1965, issue of *California Monthly* was devoted to the events of the Fall of 1964,¹ ninety-some pages of editorial, chronology, narration, historical background, documents and messages from President Clark Kerr and Acting Chancellor Martin Meyerson. Meyerson made such an appeal by discussing the relation of freedom of speech, academic freedom and economic freedom. He closed, presumably after having won some support by this lofty appeal to their Needs to Know and Understand, by observing, "The Berkeley alumni are the people best able to strengthen the vital link between our campus and its environment."²

About the same time a four page duplicated statement went out from Berkeley to colleges and universities across the land. It came from the Emergency Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, Berkeley Division; it was entitled "'How Are Things at Berkeley?'" The stated purpose was to inform the many members of the larger academic community who had expressed concern and support during the height of the melee. The unspoken purpose seemed to this writer to be based on the premise that people's confidence in The

University of California at Berkeley needed to be restored. The statement was frank and seemed to serve both purposes well. Perhaps also a third purpose was served—to quiet anxieties of educators who correctly foresaw similar episodes on their own campuses.

Research and presentation

A few cases pointed up the value of thorough research and presentation of students' cases for controversial programs. Two sets of contrasting instances demonstrate the principle that policy making councils are not likely to be persuaded by slip-shod preparation. At University 66 a 12-man committee on student life was such a council. In the first case the women's student government in cooperation with the dean of women "did a very complete research job through questionnaires to determine the acceptance of responsibility by the women if they were granted the privilege of practically complete freedom of hours, and the right to have a key. . . ." A case was made for their proposal that with her parent's permission each woman would be granted a key. The council, made up of eight faculty members, four students and four administrators, passed it unanimously and the system was inaugurated.

By way of contrast, "... the request for parietal privileges ... was not well researched by the students who sought the extension of this privilege, and their presentation so completely lacked methodology for its implementation that it was turned down . . . unanimously" by the same council.
In another institution, College 161, such decisions are made for the faculty by a committee of teachers and deans. Again a long, careful job of analyzing a problem, gathering data and support for a new idea was done by a women's governmental group in cooperation with a dean of women. In a college that had long had freshman men and women in separate living units with voluntary upperclass counselors, the proposal was to segregate instead the senior women in one hall and intersperse blocs of freshmen and their counselors in the other halls. By the time it was presented the program, a radical one for the campus, had almost complete backing from the women students and the dean of women; it passed easily.

Late in the time the women were preparing their case a small group of men students decided the idea had merit for their residence hall system and proposed that the student senate name a committee to look into the matter. The motion was loaded in favor of change and so was the composition of the committee set up to prepare a proposal. Their deliberations were sporadic, subject to the theatrical obligations of the chairman; there was no contact made with any of the dean of men's staff or the male counselors; there was no questionnaire study, only isolated interviews with men who committee members knew, and faculty members known to be in favor of change. When the matter was before the faculty committee for decision, a referendum was organized by students who were largely opposed to the method of
proceeding used by the proponents. Because of the methods used, the proposal was soundly defeated.

The importance of careful preparation to defend and interpret a controversial decision was shown by a case from church-related College 123. The issue was whether or not students who engaged in pre-marital intercourse should be liable to suspension from college. For two decades the deans levied no penalties on the pregnancy cases they learned about. As one of the deans told it,

In every case that came to our attention the students seemed to be in love and we felt it was our opportunity and responsibility to help make the world as favorable a place as possible for the arrival of the child. With the passage of time, however, the number of pregnancies increased and the number of students who thought they were pregnant increased, so we changed our policy after considerable discussion and consultation with people who were qualified to have both knowledge and opinions in the field. The enforcement of this rule on at least three occasions and one in particular aroused considerable resentment on the campus. Great pressure was put on us by students and faculty alike to change the standard, but this we refused to do because we felt that the procedure we were following was working toward the goal of the greatest good of the greatest number. Everyone involved has not been suspended, but anyone who does engage in pre-marital sexual intercourse is liable to suspension.

I think we have reached the place now where students know that we take a stand against this kind of sexual experience and we have reason to believe the problems have diminished since we changed our procedure and stayed by our decision in the face of considerable objection and criticism.

When a rule is controversial, those responsible for maintaining it should be conversant with the principles underlying the rule and how it serves the best interests of student and institution.
Accuracy

Finally, having to do with the message, are two instances of inaccuracy that should have been suspected and checked. Both occurred on large university campuses; both involved students in conflict situation who asked the assistance of a faculty member in dealing with the problem. In one case, at University 105, the student concerned was lying. He hoped his presentation of the situation would cause his faculty adviser to intercede for him in changing the decision of a dean who wouldn't let him drop some courses. He told his adviser he had gotten behind because of the recent death of his father. In the other instance at University 70 a student told her debate coach she was about to be dropped from the university because of failing to attend physics labs which she had missed because of unspecified emotional problems. Here again the faculty member was asked to intercede with only the troubled student's report of the facts. By his own hindsight he might have checked at various points with the student's instructor, the registrar and the dean before proceeding. In the first case the adviser issued a blast at the dean for being so calloused as not to grant redress to the troubled student; she was tremendously embarrassed when she was told how inaccurate the student's story was (his father was very much alive). In the second instance, over a period of months the debate coach gave advice, signed a petition, and wrote a letter of personal testimony without, to his memory, checking with any of the others concerned
whether the student's story was as she presented it. He was frustrated and regretted that he had not communicated more effectively to the end that the student's problem might have been better handled. The accuracy of messages during controversies is essential and should be checked.

**Situation for Communication**

In this section we have in mind such variables in the communication process as the physical location; the occasion; the climate of opinion; institutional, sub-group or interpersonal forces—in other words the context in which communication occurs.

Ross says of location:

The same speech delivered in a church, a restaurant, or a fraternity house will be altered communicatively by the location alone. People have different expectations for different types of buildings. . . . Proximity to the audience is also a factor. . . . Seating arrangement . . . makes a difference. . . . Another environmental factor is the use of a Public Address system. . . . The noise level of the room is often a problem, as is the lighting and ventilation. Many of these factors can be controlled (or at least better adapted to) . . . .

Similar observations could be made about the occasion and its influence on communication. This writer is reminded, for instance, of two occasions, a reception for new students and their parents and a protest demonstration against CIA recruiting interviews, both of which took place in the same location within a few weeks of each other—and involved some of the same people.

---

1Ross, *Speech Communication*, pp. 93-94.
By climate for communication we mean the receptivity people feel for social interaction in general or for communication on a particular subject, from a particular source, at a certain time, etc. During a controversy, for example a few days may make a difference in yearning for a new voice, a new doctrine or a plan for change. The funeral of Martin Luther King, Jr., can change the climate on the House Rules Committee for the open housing provisions of the Civil Rights bill.

By context we are referring to something broader and longer lasting, yet harder to define. An institutional context favorable to communication and peaceful solutions to intergroup problems includes attitudes of leaders and followers toward their roles and each other, includes the organizational structure, traditions, power, pride, interest and probably other intangibles as well. Knower and Wagner summarize this way:

Communication is typically a social act; therefore it appears as a form of group or organizational behavior. It is commonly associated with other ongoing behaviors. . . . The meanings derived from . . . communication are no doubt in part derived from the situation or context in which they occur. Institutions . . . typically have policies, or rules, sometimes called standard operating procedures . . .

From the analysis of data, forty-two statements were derived. Here again there was considerable overlap and more than half were judged upon later inspection to be more applicable to other factors and not sufficiently germane

---

1Communication in Educational Communication, pp. 9-10.
to be included here also. Of those remaining, two had to do with physical setting, ten with climate and three with context.

Physical setting

At University 133 in a continuing controversy, the parties seemed to have no basis for communicating nor any desire to do so. It was a women's residence hall corridor with two hostile groups unable to function within the dormitory government or even to communicate. Only the resident assistant (RA) was in touch with both groups. After a succession of unsuccessful tries to bridge the gap she took advantage of a vacancy on the floor to create a common room. Having observed a latent desire to end hostilities ("Talking in the john is talking on community property, but going into their rooms makes me feel like an intruder."), she made available an unused double room for the residents to use to meet their individual and group needs. The common room became a repository for old magazines, a place for late study, and "bull sessions on weekend evenings for all those girls not going out, including members of both groups."

At University 86 the president, confronted with a demand for his appearance at a mass meeting called by a small group of radicals, seized the initiative and convened a conference in a place of his own choosing in the hope that his leadership would be more significant in a setting where he might better predominate. Although there were other factors (discussed in this chapter under The President, The
Form and Timing of Communication), it was clear that the choice of place was important in the outcome of this controversy and should be considered.¹

**Climate for communication**

Much harder to vary, yet important in affecting the outcome of controversies, is the climate within which communication is attempted. It will likely be proportionate to the amount of trust² both sides feel; it is often fragile and hard to restore once damaged. For example on a campus where the deans of students ordinarily enjoyed good rapport with student leaders, there was suddenly an icy chill. It came unexpectedly after an annual student leadership conference ("... I found that students with whom I ordinarily have a free and easy relationship, were unfriendly, negative and somewhat hostile."). Later it was disclosed that the deterioration came as a result of one dean remarking in an aside to another, when a student had raised a question, "Tell him anything!" Our correspondent concluded, "Suffice it to say, it took several weeks of constant contacts and discussions with these students before any semblance of rapport was re-established."

¹The serving of refreshments including whole meals, in this and a number of other conferences, although not a major factor, seemed to introduce an air of sociability which relaxed tensions, reduced hostilities and made for better discussion on issues.

²Trust as a factor will be discussed in the section on The Communicators.
If criticism by one group (e.g., the faculty) can be offered in a spirit of confidence in the other group's (students') ability to see a problem and deal with it, there will be a climate for discussion when the solution is proposed. The students will sense that although opinion is solidly against one of their practices (e.g., pre-initiation fraternity hazing), there is confidence on the part of the faculty and dean the responsible leaders will see the problem and bring about changes in their constituency so that a reform can be effected. The climate of opinion was indeed against the practice of hazing at University 68. The dean of students wrote,

The Interfraternity Council did an outstanding study, set up some ground rules, presented them to the Council on Undergraduate Life, successfully followed through on their plan, and made a complete report following the initiations held by all fraternities. They both fined and penalized two member groups, and gave other demonstrations of their good faith.

On another large campus, University 69, where fraternities felt increasingly alienated from the faculty and administration, fraternity men expected harsh discipline for an anti-administration protest stunt. They were relieved when it failed to materialize. Their reaction to fair and reasonable disciplinary action was such that a campus climate developed that made possible a rapprochement between the Greeks and the faculty.

The importance of establishing and maintaining a climate of good will was evident from studying a situation at University 5. It is described in greater detail elsewhere.
Many-faceted town-gown animosity was dealt with in a high level, face to face meeting. Present were city officials, university president, dean of student affairs, and the three most prominent student leaders. The fact of the meeting seemed less important than the participants discussing "the matter frankly and yet in a spirit of good will." That they did was remarkable in view of the intensity of hostile feeling, as reported in the press and in a letter from the dean. The latter wrote, "... an accommodation was reached that eased the situation considerably."

Another aspect of climate for communication emerged from studying controversies that absorbed universities almost totally or over a long period. However strongly members of an academic community may feel about an issue, or however hard non-participants try to remain aloof from the issues, at some point a campus may become sated with bitterness and struggle. Then it may be disposed to accept whatever peace moves are made. It almost seems that any reasonable attempt by combatants or peacemakers will suffice. This tendency might be observed (1) in any university unaccustomed to all-absorbing controversy after a long siege of bitterness and (2) at a Berkeley during yet another protest-strike. As an example of the first possibility, there had been weeks of wrangling at University 89. The president was rigid in his refusal to communicate until certain conditions were met and student members of "the movement" were unwilling to meet his conditions. They were
insistent that he deal with them on their terms. The community simply was tired of the tension; there was great yearning for a break. What happened will be discussed elsewhere, but suffice to say here there was more form and gesture than substantial change in positions: the university community, by its tiredness of dissonance, demanded an end. When someone made the first move everyone's need for consonance took over and the things were quickly resolved in the more conciliatory spirit. Part of this force toward resolution may result from the sense of alienation described by the student chronicler of this incident.

... in spite of the comraderie [sic] felt among the members of an "out group" demonstrating, there is still a vague feeling of being abandoned by society, a feeling of desperation and insecurity akin to that felt by a small child who, accompanying his mother to a large department store, turns suddenly to find he is lost in a confusing world. ...

This force for resolution of conflict resembles Pestinger's cognitive dissonance and appears, as we said, at the Berkeley campus of the University of California. The case cited in the previous section featured a 1966 speech by Chancellor Heyns during the height of the Naval Recruiting incident. Mr. Heyns evoked loud applause and overwhelming support from the faculty by articulating how sick everyone was of turbulence.

A further element of the general antipathy toward conflict is the surly attitude and behavior of some of the

---

1Pestinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, and Conflict, Decision, and Dissonance.
angry demonstrators. In the words of Berkeley Electrical Engineering Professor Charles Susskind the agitators were like "the Nazi students whom I saw in the 1930's harassing deans, hounding professors and their families."

Finally concerning climate for communication during controversy, from Glazer, is this learning about the difficulty experienced by Berkeley faculty meeting. The influence of students pervaded as the professors tried to deliberate in December, 1964.

The students were barred from the meeting, but thousands were outside, and we could hear their roars of approval or disapproval as the debate went on. It was scarcely necessary to be reminded of the terrible power of the student movement, though two professors . . . did remind us that chaos was at the door. I think there was a great deal of hysteria mixed in with the action of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate that day. Afterward men who had been friends for years but had taken opposite sides approached each other with hesitation, and felt it necessary to reaffirm their friendship, so deeply had their emotions become involved.

The practice of piping faculty meetings to student listeners, hitherto unknown to this writer, would seem to invite feedback deleterious to the climate in which a faculty best deliberates on emotion-laden issues. Perhaps the answer was provided at University 113 during the 1966 Selective Service uproar. The students were gathered in another building and the faculty meeting was being broadcast to them. Their "thunderous applause . . . hisses, boos and thumbs down gestures" were not known to the faculty assembled.

---


Finally with regard to the situation in which communication might occur, something was learned about the context. Three cases suggest that in some controversies conditions are such that one side or another is the victim of forces too great to oppose. Often students have felt what seemed like the overwhelming power of "The System"; present day obstructionist tactics are said to be reactions to such frustrations. In a university controversy, as in the words of Reinhold Niebuhr's little prayer, students, faculty members and administrators must discern between situations in which they can make a difference and those in which they cannot, and they should seek "the wisdom to know the difference."

If the context is one of bipolar suspicion between, for example, dean's office and student government, little communication and no cooperation are likely to occur. A case in point is one at University 16 involving the dean of women, an errant women's government (AWS) president and an AWS council that against all logic supported the latter against the dean. The case is detailed in the section on Type and Pattern of Communication, under Regularly Constituted Meetings. Given the relationships and predispositions before the issue arose, there appeared little the dean of her staff could do to win their point.

Two cases at College 37 similarly must typify a great many instances in human affairs, on and off college campuses.
Controversies arose because someone violated someone else's dearly held expectations without consulting him. No matter how valid the project, emotional opposition to it is likely to be decisive. Consider, for example, the deans who began a system of residence hall ratings without any general communication; or the business manager who started tearing up the front lawn of the campus to build a visitors' parking lot without consulting the faculty-student Campus Planning Committee. Both found the situations so fraught with opposition to their method of proceeding that no amount of explanation could save the project. Some battles are not worth waging. Having capitulated one has the opportunity to create the context for future agreement, if someone remembers to consult in advance.

The situation at Berkeley in 1964 yields three findings about the context for communication in a student controversy. One point, suggested by Cousins, seems major. Change is inevitable and something not to be feared. As conditions change and events show a procedure or rule to be in need of revision (e.g., at Berkeley the rule against mounting off-campus political activity from the campus), let an administrator not identify emotionally with the old and become an antagonist; instead he should work to create a context within which students and faculty may arrive at a new solution or a reaffirmation of the old. Having someone serve in this role of facilitator seems imperative for satisfactory communication in a controversy; if the
administration has sole, or even primary, power for policy making its members will not be available for creating what Cousins calls "a new context for reasonable solution." ¹

Furthermore it was clear to Somers ² from studying at Berkeley that

. . . the apparent unwillingness of the administration to consider the possibility of a legitimate intellectual and ideological ferment underlying the protest pressed more and more moderates into a coalition with the early activists. ³

In addition to the twin errors of becoming an antagonist and failing to allow for the validity of the students' claims, the Berkeley administration seem also in retrospect to have dealt too harshly with the student protesters. Again from Cousins is the assertion that an administration which finds itself with a student revolt against one of its policies must make "allowance for any supercharged circumstances under which an unworkable and unsound regulation was tested. . . ." ⁴ To the extent Cousins is right and the authorities at Berkeley were less wise and less restrained than they should have been, they created a context of anger and resentment, a wide gap between warring camps in which effective communication was nearly impossible.

¹Cousins, "Escalation in California."
²Somers, an undergraduate at Berkeley studying social research methods, took the "opportunity to learn something systematic about the thinking of students" by means of detailed interviews with a cross section of the student body.
Time Factors in Communication

This study is based on an understanding of communication as a process which occurs in time—dynamic and on-going. We turn again to Berlo and to Knower and Wagner for explanation. First Berlo writes in his discussion of process:

At least one dictionary defines "process" as "any phenomenon which shows a continuous change in time," or "any continuous operation or treatment." Five hundred years before the birth of Christ, Heraclitus pointed out the importance of the concept of process when he stated that a man can never step in the same river twice; the man is different and so is the river. Thomas Wolfe's novel of the 1940's, You Can't Go Home Again, makes the same point.

If we accept the concept of process, we view events and relationships as dynamic, on-going, ever-changing, continuous.

Even more to the point of this study of communication in campus controversies, Knower and Wagner write:

All communication is an event in time. There may be considerable time elapse between the preparation of a message and its receipt by a particular individual, but even in such cases the reaction of a reader to a play of Shakespeare may be in part determined by the time at which he happens to or chooses to read it. There is much written about the importance of reading readiness in teaching children to read. Probably a similar concept applies to the use of understanding of all types of communication. We recognize the importance of dating newspapers, letters, and contracts. We know that the effect of a punch line in a joke of play depends upon timing. We know that the release of information at one time may have far different consequences than its release at another time. Such facts suggest to us that timing deserves serious consideration by the student of communication.

---


The controversy incidents seemed to yield learnings in three categories: length of communication (3), timing (21) and sequence of two or more communications (7). A total of thirty-nine statements were assigned here, of which eight are not used because their main emphasis concerned another element as the key variable.

Length

There is no doubt much more that could be learned about the length of speeches, meetings, interviews, letters, memoranda, radio speech, and the like, relative to their effectiveness in campus controversies. Nothing specific was mentioned to the correspondents who supplied the cases for this study. Only three seemed to suggest something significant about length. Two of them concern meetings.

The first lesson is simple to state, often harder to apply. When a crisis is at hand often a conference is called among the disputing parties. Busy people should set aside several hours to allow (1) the dynamics of the group to run their course and (2) the subject to be explored thoroughly enough that the participants are satisfied with the solution. If the problem is serious and the possible ramifications of an inadequate solution threatening enough, participants should be asked to clear their calendars.

For example, consider the town-gown controversy at University 5 which was previously described. It was resolved in one three hour meeting, after weeks of vandalism, hot words, and bad feelings. Less meeting time would in all probability not have been enough.
In the other controversy, after some skillful temporizing which will be described later under "timing," the powerful president of University 86 with the many problems of an emerging university, belatedly met at great length with his antagonists. After the controversy, a study commission was appointed. Its report on the case stated:

Between May 6 and May 10, the President met some 30 hours with the 20 [movement] students and [their adviser]. A gap of three decades in age and experience made communication difficult. President ______, a skillful debater, and a determined man, proved to be intellectually superior and had greater endurance than the 20 students. In talking with students, the President learned much about the day-to-day operation of the University; the students also gained new perspectives . . . , underwent attitude changes to some degree, and matured. The dialogue with the President provided an outlet for the students' frustrations . . . . President ______ got at the underlying causes of student discontentment. He brought the discussion to a high level of problem solving, focusing the discussion on problems of communication between students, faculty, and administration.

The third case involving length of communication is somewhat different from the preceding two. It involved a controversy (women and intoxicating beverages in undergraduate quarters), with no easy solution, at University 126. The dean, known to be a skillful communicator, reported:

As a result of interminable student discussions I know that my thinking . . . has undergone considerable change. I am not so sure I have changed my position . . . but my reasons for holding it have certainly been altered. . . . I have had to rethink and rethink and rethink. I hope I have forced the students to do the same.

He then goes on to reflect:

We will probably come up with some sort of compromise agreement in the year(s) ahead. The immediate benefit, however, was the great deal of thought that went
into the argument and the gradual broadening and deepening of the total consideration.

... I do not equate "beneficial results" with "solution," "answer" or "agreement." I rate it as one of the highest beneficial results of campus argument that people can learn "to agree to disagree" all the time remaining friendly and retaining respect for one another. Perhaps at times this is the best we can hope for.

Just a year after these comments were written, students, taking their cues from Black Power advocates in the civil rights movement, are increasingly impatient and unwilling to settle for "talk now and see results after we're graduated." The heuristic ideal set forth by this dean has been subverted on campuses across the land by Student Power eristics demanding various degrees of control over student and academic affairs.

Timing

When someone in another segment of academe throws down the gauntlet, how soon should one react? How quickly should one intervene when it is his job to stop two other combatants? What risk does one run that they will turn together on him when he intervenes in their squabble? or that another party will attack him for his handling of the matter?

These are important questions which statesmen, policemen, human relations experts, parents and friends should always ask. In each new controversy they must be answered in terms of tenuous early reports.
College faculties and deans, accustomed to careful "searching and winnowing" through committee deliberation and monthly faculty meetings, have not been geared to make quick decisions in response to a sudden demand by angry students or the reaction of a legislature frightened by a protest demonstration or sit-in. After being criticized for inaction a few times, the tendency may be to overreact to the next few stimuli. All of which is frustrating and strains the relations of students, faculty, deans and other administrators, alumni, townspeople, legislators and trustees.

The cases that bear on the topic of timing of communication during student controversies seem to suggest this thesis: timing is an important yet elusive variable which should be planned carefully from the onset of a controversy. There seemed no clear rule except this: not to commit oneself too soon until later reports were in, but to bring as much intelligence to bear on the situation as soon as possible, preferably before active hostilities broke out.

In addition to conferring promptly with colleagues and advisers¹ to decide on the optimum response, the members of both sides and, hopefully, those who constitute a third force² should remain sensitive for changes in the climate of opinion.³ Communication that would be futile at the outbreak

¹See discussion of Communication Adviser, in section on The Communicator.

²See discussion of Facilitator, also in section on Communicators.

³Discussed in previous section, under Situation.
of hostilities might well work at a later stage when the
nature of the situation changes. People tire of tensions,
they realize they do not have the backing they thought they
had, exams or vacation approaching, etc. The timing of
communication seems very important for those charged with
administering an institution of higher learning caught up
in a controversy.

A controversy over student rights was described
earlier in this section in which the president of University
met for a total of 30 hours with leaders of the dissidents.
It also represents a good use of timing. The initial contact
by the "Movement" was a letter requesting the university
president and vice president appear in an open forum; it
was accompanied by a petition signed by 3,000 students
affirming that "the student must have the right to initiate
and approve the policies and rules which determine his
daily existence and the development and organization of his
life." Although the student letter was (1) unsigned, (2) de-
layed in reaching the president (it reached him at home less
than two hours before a deadline set by the students for
his reply), and (3) smacked of an ultimatum, he responded
with restraint. Presumably he did so, among other reasons
of diplomacy, to gain more time and to prepare the way for
the initiative to pass into his hands. During the temporizing
period while presumably the president was deciding how to
respond ". . . discussions were held with the Vice President
of Student and Area Services and other administrators who
relayed messages from the President."

By not becoming angry, by moving cautiously, by not expending himself in premature or procedural discussions, and particularly by not rising to the bait to appear in a public arena, the president set the stage for his own careful written reply. He proposed the marathon meetings during which he took the initiative. Jointly the conferees proposed the creation of a student-faculty-administrator study commission. Its mandate was to deliberate on the place of the university in society and the place of the student in the university.

The grievances which led to the movement were not to be lost sight of, however. Contrast his conduct with the adamant and inflexible position taken by another president in a very similar situation: a student movement sent the president of University 89 a letter requesting a meeting to discuss certain demands. "Shortly after the letter was delivered, the President issued a memorandum stating that he would not meet . . . or review the decision. . . ."

This action was taken without consultation with his student relations staff. A complicated series of events followed. Each moved to increase the intransigence of both sides and to decrease the possibility of maneuvering room when they wanted it. These are reported in the section on Type and Pattern. It was clear from studying this case that the campus could have been spared much turmoil had the president been less quick at the outset to commit himself to a categorical refusal to even talk.
Still a third response to a student protest group throwing down the gauntlet to a university president was this: immediately upon receiving the protesters' letter the president of University 113 invited the signers to meet with him in his office two days later. He had also invited appropriate administrators and the student body president. By the time of the meeting he had prepared a "public statement" which was presented to the signers. The statement and the discussion served to get the controversy launched in an orderly fashion. Events at University 113 are described elsewhere, primarily under Type and Pattern.

Timing is important also when an issue seems non-negotiable. Contrast two similar colleges facing almost identical appeals for open dorms (i.e., coed residence hall visiting). Both schools had earlier had such visiting and had the programs cancelled by presidential or trustee fiat. When the issue was raised again at College 35 the dean of students, for the president and himself, accepted the invitation to speak at a dignified rally and explained that "... it was non-negotiable and why—that various alternatives such as coffee house, union parlors, etc., were either available or projected." At College 159 the question of reinstituting open dorms was also deemed unacceptable at the highest levels but discussions were allowed to begin. Halfway through a six month period of student-faculty and faculty deliberations, the president remarked privately that he would resign if it were passed by the faculty and trustees. When the news of
his feelings leaked out there was a furor. The timing would have been much more propitious had he disclosed his position on the matter much earlier. The effect of such a statement during student-faculty legislative deliberation was reportedly demoralizing. It yielded deep distrust of the processes of student-faculty legislative collaboration. Here again, in two similar instances, timing seems to have been the crucial variable in determining a successful or unsuccessful outcome.

At yet in a third college on a similar problem (women visiting in men's apartments) the administration did not have a position when some student leaders brought the question to them. At various points of consultation the deans of College 11 showed an attitude of interest and exchanged ideas, but expressed no strong sentiments on possible action.

A formal proposal was finally developed and adopted—and here the advisor was able to bring out helpful comments which the students accepted. Students did not know where the administration stood at this point. Prior to a vote by all women, a letter was written to the administration outlining the steps to be followed and asking for a joint statement. This letter stimulated the administration to formulate a policy and issue its statement to coincide with the students' action.

A satisfactory student proposal was worked out in consultation with administrative advisees and it was found acceptable to deans who seemed to trust the students' good judgment. They timed their own communication to facilitate the students' deliberations without abrogating their own responsibilities.
On another small campus (College 122) with a no-drinking rule, the dean of students reported, "... the degree of violation became so great we felt a change was necessary." The deans waited and watched to find the right time, between disciplinary cases, to begin policy discussions with students concerned over the enforcement of the rule. The result was a model of student-faculty cooperation leading to a policy approved by the trustees and still adhered to by students five years later.

In three cases administrators or committee chairmen of discussions that had become overheated made skillful use of upcoming vacations. In one case the chairman bluntly stated that he was delaying in hope of better committee perspective after examinations and a spring vacation. Calendars should be studied for their possible effect on a controversy and communications should be spaced accordingly.

Two cases demonstrated the advantage of new administrators biding their time before attempting to deal with old problems. At College 132, when the new dean of students arrived, student services were competing fiefdoms often working at cross purposes with the aims of the college as viewed by the president. To coordinate the various offices he created a position--Dean of Students. The first dean, before moving to consolidate power and direction, waited until he saw clearly how the land lay.

In the other instance a new head resident at College 133 was confronted with overlapping power structures between
his dorm government and an ingrown and entrenched clique in a private men's society. Decrying the stranglehold held by the minority over the majority, but respecting the force of traditional patterns, he waited for an instance of someone's rights being violated by the ingroup. When one happened he moved on principle. Eventually the structure was toppled and rebuilt. Had either of these new men, soon after their arrivals, suddenly pounced to change old forms, they would have, in all probability, aroused strong forces against them without a clear idea of where their support was going to come from.

In another conflict where there was open, physical action (nightrider "jocks" administering a token haircut to one of the "grubs"), segments of College 3½ differed as to whether "individual freedom or regrettable license" was the problem. After the immediate incident was dealt with the best that could be done was to effect a standoff and let time either heal the breach, remove the rival tonsorial styles or remove individuals involved. One suspects that many administrators, faculty and student body members would not easily be able to live with such irresolution over a period of time.

One more example of admirable restraint occurred late at night after the enervating week of sit-ins, committee deliberations and finally a faculty meeting at University 113. The question at issue had been resolved by the faculty. The administration in permitting the sit-ins had announced
that once the faculty had made its decision any more sit-ins would be unnecessary. If any did persist, the chancellor announced, the demonstrators would be regarded as trespassing. During the faculty meeting the building where the sit-in had occurred was locked.

When the faculty voted, however, there were many disappointed students. They needed a place to meet and decide what to do next. They found an auditorium and when it came time to close that building, they were technically trespassing. Everyone—students and administrators—was tense and weary. The chancellor who decided not to have them removed bodily was cognizant of the timing factor; he waited until the next day to assay the situation, with good results.

But if calculated delay can sometimes be advantageous it can in other circumstances produce bad reactions. At University 99 the question concerned whether to keep all the men's dormitories at one end of a campus and the women's at the other. After years of student agitation, the regents finally agreed to change. They voted in the spring of 1963 to allow the administration to make changes 16 months later. The decision was not announced right away: "... it was felt during the [ensuing] school year there would be adequate time to work with students living in the halls involved in the shifting. They do have strong attachments to their residence hall home and can quickly develop feelings that they are being 'evicted from the old homestead.'"
retrospect, after the smoke cleared, it was judged "clearly a mistake to delay from spring to fall in making the announce-
ment . . ." and invoke charges of bad faith.

In another situation communicative delay was calcu-
lated to keep the other side at a disadvantage. It was a com-
licated situation, not all pertinent to this section, involving a student invitation to poet Allen Ginsberg to appear on the campus of University 149. The speaker policy required a decision by the Committee on Student Life.

In order to avoid the conflict, the chairman . . . found it convenient not to put this request on the agenda for several meetings. In the meantime efforts were made through various staff members to persuade the original student group to withdraw the invitation. This did succeed. However, Student Government then felt that this was a restriction of their prerogatives and proceeded to find other groups [to sponsor] Mr. Ginsberg.

As if this delay were not enough, the chairman, instead of capitulating gracefully, responded to pressure from "the Central Administration" and prepared a statement whereby Mr. Ginsberg would be refused." A special meeting was called to act on the statement. All but the student mem-
ers were cued over the phone before the meeting. "When the students arrived, they were informed of the agenda. Naturally and rightfully they were highly incensed. . . ."

After describing other degrading machinations, our corre-
spondent concluded,

Although eventually a decision was reached whereby Ginsberg was not allowed to appear on campus, the method of communicating various ideas, various con-
cerns and . . . alternatives actually created a greater problem in terms of distrust and weariness, on the part of the faculty and the administration,
as well as the students, than a straightforward discussion from the outset [would have].

By contrast to those two instances of deceptive delay is this example of announcing a controversial speaker well in advance and letting "the opposition emote and evaporate." The institution was University 124. The speaker was Julian Bond, "the Negro who was denied a seat in the Georgia legislature because of his stand on Viet Nam. This was treason in conservative ______, because, as so many ______ians knew, Mr. Bond was obviously a Communist."

During the month between the announcement and the speech, local citizens monopolized the air for two or three weeks on an evening radio opinion program. They threatened to organize several thousand people to march on the campus when Bond arrived. Many alumni were disturbed. But after three weeks they ran out of steam. The day Bond came everything was peaceful and nice, calm as anything. The whole incident simply blew over. And so I cite communication (well in advance) as a technique. . . . All it requires is exceptional patience and a healthy sense of humor. . . .

Another case in which starting early paid off featured a student body president at University 137. He saw the salvation of student government in changing it from a council of interest groups (e.g., athletics, literary, forensics, etc.), to a senate of popularly elected representatives. To make the change he was, for some reason, required to get the votes of the existing council members. He planned his campaign well in advance and allowed time for ample exchange of views between himself and the council members. This careful a procedure, rather unusual for an
undergraduate leader, was rewarded by a close, but favorable, vote to abandon the council form of government.

Three cases, not sufficiently important to describe in detail, nor different from each other, demonstrate the benefit of quick action when a controversy breaks out. In one case (College 142) a quick explanation was made to students living in a dormitory suddenly enveloped in rumors which were beginning to spread campus wide. In the second (University 87) a quickly called meeting enabled a student body president to ease himself in from a limb without losing his principles or his face. In the third (University 87) a sit-in was planned when students learned that without conference or even prior announcement to them the librarian had decided to close the library an hour earlier to save limited operating funds.

A quickly made phone call to student leaders urging delay in action and conferences with student government leaders, the librarian, the president and business manager resolved the financial need, retained the library hours and averted a library sit-in....

In each instance a dean not involved in the difficulty assumed the role of trouble-shooter and acted before an incipient rumble got out of hand. The concept of the trouble shooter will be examined later; here let us note the value of quick action to keep small dissatisfactions from upsetting whole campuses.

Sequence

The most important technique learned about the sequence of communication in dealing with student controversy
might be called the "trial balloon" or interim report device. Instances are presented later of a drug statement at College 164 and a "Free Speech Area" case at University 40. They can be found in the section of Type and Pattern under Prepared Statements with News Value. In both cases, not knowing exactly how to proceed, a dean issued a statement that served as interim policy and elicited valuable feedback for the drafters of the more permanent policy.

One further example of periodic progress reports being issued to advantage came from University 80 which was hit by a student rally protesting "deterioration of undergraduate education." To deal with the complaints a faculty-student review committee was formed. Soon after it began deliberating a one page statement was issued by the dean of the college of arts and sciences who was one of the three faculty members in the nine-man group. He announced that the committee was resolved to report its conclusions "to the student body at the earliest appropriate time: as well as to "faculty, parents, alumni, and trustees." It then went on to acknowledge the problems cited in the protest rally and to comment on them insofar as was possible in terms of the committee's early discussions. The candor of this statement was unusual and exemplary of how to deal with bright, concerned students when a matter is under study. The statement is included in this study as Appendix D.

Again at University 86, one of the recommendations of the study committee reviewing non-academic complaints of
students, this principle was stated in the committee report. It deals with the sequence of controversial policy announcements and explanations of them; apparently "adequate information and early notice" were not typically given. The committee recommended

... that in matters involving strong student feelings, student commitments, and significant changes in student habits and expectations, precipitate action be avoided and that a special effort be made to inform students of the factors involved and the basis for the proposed action.¹

Finally in this section, as a campus anachronism, let us consider a panty raid. The threat of one occurred at University 44. The strategy of the personnel deans recognized that there were different levels of commitment to the planned raid and, inversely, to the values of the institution as articulated by its popular president. This incident is also discussed elsewhere. Suffice to say in this connection that most of the would-be panty raiders were reached by a letter from the president distributed on the day the raid was to occur. Some were not, however, persuaded by the president's communique. When an alarm sounded and they came running out of their dorm, 130 strong out of a possible 500, they were confronted by a trio of deans who "... calmly suggested to the obviously surprised

¹This point, which presumably deals with how to avoid a controversy rather than how to deal with it after it happens, is included on the assumption that some policy changes are destined to evoke controversy no matter how they are made and announced. The intensity and effect of the controversy can be controlled, it would seem, by the communication that precedes it.
men that they relax and wait for the alarm to be shut off and then return to 'their earnest studies.' They did so, no second alarm sounded, and we asked no further questions."

In this section we have shown examples of communication length, timing and sequence. Hopefully the importance of considering communication as a process has been established. Student affairs in general, and the handling of controversies in particular, would be improved if sensitivity to process and time were learned.

**Amount or Quantity of Communication:**

**Breakdown**

In the summer of 1966 when the plans for this study were in the final stages of formulation, the writer was explaining them to a departing colleague. After listening enough to get the general idea, the friend, a social psychologist, opined that the success of efforts to deal with controversies would be proportionate to the amount of communication that occurred. That remark returned to mind as the forty-five statements on Amount were being viewed at all angles in the usual attempt to decide what kind of an analysis to use. It was, therefore, interesting to note that of the forty-five, nine came from controversies where little or no communication was indicated; eight where events had reached a time to stop communicating and take action; six cases were placed in a category labelled, "If you can, try to get communication started--or, Don't stop communicat-ing"; and twelve seemed to call for a great amount of
communication in order to deal best with the controversy. Eleven of the statements seemed, on further examination, not to have sufficient applicability to be treated here in addition to elsewhere in this chapter or to have been improperly included in this section.

Very little or none

In most academic communities in this country, persons accused of misconduct and those with emotional problems that cause aberrant behavior are protected from public scrutiny. The institution where this writer is employed, for example, had for a decade a procedure of having cases tried confidentially before a judicial board composed of five students and five teachers. In the early 1960's procedures were changed to permit the accused to choose that his case be heard by the Board or his dean; ninety per cent elected a dean over a five year period. When a controversy erupts over such a case, often because the accused or his friends are indignant about the charge or the penalty, or both, the officials who are privy to the case must bear a special burden for discretion. Four controversies illustrate variations of this problem. Each in its way seems to suggest that a dean, president or disciplinary board member, as well as his office or board, will gain in respect in the long run, if he maintains silence. Further, and just as important, the morale of the student body will reflect the assurance each person can have that if he should err his privacy will be protected. Following are the details of one such case,
exactly as they were reported by the dean of students at College 7.

This particular incident involved an act of vandalism by a student who had been nursing a grudge against the college and while under the influence of alcohol, broke the windows in several dormitories causing several thousand dollars worth of damage. Immediately following the act itself, there was a degree of mystery as to whether one or more than one person had participated in the vandalism. Subsequent investigation revealed the fact that only one individual could be held responsible.

The college administration found that fellow students were shocked by the extent of the damage and the display of violence involved. The students who knew of the details were most cooperative in working with college officials to get at the details involved in the entire affair.

In this particular case, the problems in communication occurred with the citizens in the community rather than with the members of the student body or the faculty. The student responsible for the damage was suspended indefinitely from school and was asked to make restitution for replacement and repair of all damaged property. No charges were filed with the civil authorities since the college administration felt that the student probably needed some professional help in working through personal emotional problems and because the student and his family were very cooperative in making arrangements to reimburse the institution for all financial losses.

Again it may be stated that the criticism of college action came from the community. Some citizens felt that the person responsible should have been brought into the courts and made to answer to civil authorities. These people felt that the college was too soft in its handling of the case. Others were critical of the college for being overly harsh in suspending the student and cutting off his opportunity to continue in college.

The Dean of Students received a telephone call from the mother of the student a month or so after the incident had been brought to a close thanking the college for having given her son such fair treatment. She reported that the family had been badgered by people who made unkind remarks about her son and expressed the feeling that he probably should have been put in prison.
It might be stated that throughout the period of time during which this matter was being investigated and acted upon the college did not release the name of the student involved to any of the news media. Furthermore, the college did not feel obligated to report to anyone outside of the institution as to the final decision regarding disciplinary measures taken.

(I might say, Ken, that the college agreed that this young man could petition for permission to register after a semester or two of time had elapsed. He enlisted in the Marine Corps during the spring, went to Vietnam in the fall, and was killed in action in December of 1966.)

Before describing a similar situation at College 91, its former dean of students stated a similar guiding principle:

We had a very rigid policy against putting out any information publicly about discipline cases, and of course our feeling that we must protect the interest of the students involved and the confidentiality in the situation often put us in the position of being unable adequately to counter the wild rumors that constantly flew around the campus when such episodes occurred.

The case involved a panty raid. Two students were suspended and there followed a period of "great student indignation over this and even a march to the president's house" with "newspaper photographers, local and state police. . . ." Although they gave no public explanation, the deans did spend "a good deal of time with the student leaders in confidential sessions over the process and our reasons for refusing to reveal information." The dean concluded his remarks by saying,

It seemed that no matter what we did because of lack of communication we were always in the wrong so far as the rumors were concerned. It wasn't a happy situation, but eventually it won us the respect of the students and I think basically their trust as well.
A third case occurred at University 107 where a dean had to ride out a storm while refusing to discuss the details of the case for publication. It involved a dean of students dismissing (from her job) an assistant in a women's residence hall "because of her participation in campus groups and publications which were vulgarly and tactlessly critical of the administration of the University."

An edited version of this case appears in Appendix E and will be discussed later in the section on the Communicator (the Dean of Students). This writer wondered upon receiving the initial response whether (1) attempt at privacy for the dismissed student was worth the trouble, and (2) whether the dean felt the whole affair was worth the abuse he had to endure for months. In an era where students and faculty members seem concerned with protecting civil rights and liberties against encroachment by heavy handed authority, one wonders how the dean's point of view is to be defended in the market place of ideas if he limits his own discussion of the matter and no colleague or student defender takes up the cause.

Another instance of this kind of dilemma occurred when a private interview provided ammunition for a public onslaught against a dean who was ethically bound to be more discreet than his attackers. The case concerns a student user of psychedelic drugs at University 119. Because of its complexity and focus on several contemporary issues and problems it is reprinted as Appendix F. It shows a dean
who kept cool; he did not let the threat to his reputation cause him to say more than he should while waiting for the situation to blow over or someone to come to his aid (in this case the student's family and the student press).

These other cases also present controversies in which administrators were, or would have been, well advised to limit their communication. The first, involved a conflict between state law on subversive groups and University policy on student organizations. An assistant dean of students was caught between the state law and the demands of a newly formed W. E. B. DuBois Club for temporary recognition and the use of space for meetings. A new, inexperienced dean of students had only been in office a few days. Student members of the Committee on Student Affairs were accusing the assistant dean of usurping their powers of recognition by failing to allow the DuBois group to use a room for their organizational meetings. In such a field of conflicting forces the assistant dean was very circumspect, reserving his comments to procedural matters. The Committee and the University faced "the dilemma of a state law and the generality of what is subversive," which needed to be handled by higher authority.

In the section on timing a case was described about the announcement of some residence hall change at University: the men's side and the women's side of a campus were to be mixed. There seems a lesson to be learned also about the amount of communication. The dean of students' report states,
Eventually the problem quieted down—as most do. As a matter of fact, later on in the year several upperclass students involved in the dormitory squabble came to the Dean of Students Office to apologize for their conduct because, as they pointed out, three years earlier as freshmen they had been among the most militant supporters of the change and had been the first to advocate that their dorm be used as a women's dormitory if the change could be initiated.

Therefore, in such a furor over a decision one does not intend to change, beyond explaining the reasons for it and defending against charges of bad faith, there seems little to be gained from mounting a big public relations campaign. Let the furor blow over and let the decision makers examine their own judgments and action in an effort to avoid trouble in the future.

Another situation in which a dean was wise to restrain his urge to jump communicatively into the fray, involved a committee of the student government at College 161. The committee had been formed, rather casually, to consider the matter of freshman men's housing—whether it should be segregated or integrated with upperclass men's. During several weeks there was a great deal of wheel-spinning and some sampling of student opinion by the committee. At no time did they make contact with any of the deans or the head counselors who ran the freshman dormitories. Neither did the deans communicate with the committee, except to send them a student doing some creative thinking on the topic and favoring the change. When their proposal to abandon the status quo was presented to the Student Senate, it passed 40-1 and was announced. Whereupon some
previously invisible students jumped into the fray, cam-
paigned for an all-men's referendum and against the change. The vote was against the change 356-134 and the proposal was withdrawn by the Senate. The dean reported being puzzled by the committee's declining to collaborate with his office but refrained from commenting for two reasons: (1) he believed that administrators should not have a dispropor-
tionate voice in making policy but should exist to administer policy made by others; (2) although he tended not to favor the change he was aware that the committee had been formed of students preponderantly in favor of the change and to oppose them prematurely might make them underdogs in a fight with "the administration." He knew he would have his chance to speak (when whatever recommendations came up for consideration) in student-faculty and faculty-administration committees.

Two cases submitted for this study and several more that they brought to mind suggest administrators should be restrained in investigating student charges of faculty incompetence and unprofessional conduct. For example at University 103, there was hostility between two instructors with sections of the same course; there was no apparent action by the dean after a group of students and the senior professor complained to him. Soon thereafter one of the teachers resigned to accept a position overseas; one can only surmise that the fine hand of the dean was behind the resignation. The other case began suddenly when the lower
house of a bicameral student legislature at University 3 met for its regular bi-monthly meeting. They passed quietly and without dissent a resolution "expressing the view . . . the Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences displays an attitude of belligerence and a method of harshness in dealing with students." The dean of men wrote:

. . . The student newspaper considered this front page news and reported the incident in detail. . . .

The reaction was varied. Many students laughed and joked about it. However many responsible student leaders were disturbed about the hastily passed resolution. . . .

The faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences called a special meeting to discuss the problem. They passed a resolution of unanimous support for the Assistant Dean.

The Dean . . . wrote to the Speaker of the [lower house] asking to see him to discuss the problem. Due to problems of conflicting schedules and out of town responsibilities, the two never got together. Finally . . . the Speaker wrote a letter explaining the students' viewpoint to the Dean. At that point communication broke off. . . . No action was taken by the Administration as far as anyone knows.

The lessons to be learned from this case are at least two: (1) responsible student opinion will tend to make an irresponsible student legislature act more carefully in the future; (2) too much administrative communication will serve to fan the fire and increase the embarrassment of the assistant dean. Whatever he was doing to antagonize students, he had, no doubt, already decided to modify.

Stop communicating and act

Of the eight controversies in this section, most had reached junctures beyond which communication appeared
neither likely to be fruitful at the moment nor to enhance the prestige or well-being of any of the parties.

At College 14 a disappointed would-be editor, together with some of his friends, started a rival publication. "At first the sheet kept within the bounds of reason and good taste, but each issue seemed to press harder on administration nerves," wrote the dean of men. After attempts "subtle and otherwise," to caution the editors "not to go too far . . . one issue . . . included a supplement on the Arboretum, which included such juicy items as a contraceptive ad and articles on some of the more animalistic activities which may or may not go on in this arboreal setting." At this point communication stopped and disciplinary action was begun.

Two incidents at University 76 were described in the section on Feedback. One concerned a left-leaning peace group, the other a Goldwater conservative club. Although representatives of both were at first friendly and deferent to the rules on displays and soliciting of funds, the dean concerned kept his ears open for feedback. When it was clear that each group did not intend to adhere to the rules, the dean withdrew permission for the display and ordered future presentations by these groups checked in advance.

An incident at University 44 was discussed in the previous section on Time and bears mention here. It was the panty raid affair where the deans followed the written
letter from the president with a strategic positioning of
themselves when the signal for beginning the raid went off.
In effect they were saying, "All right, fellows, we're
through communicating; if you have not got the message, be
prepared for disciplinary action."

The best example of this principle offered for this
study occurred at University 43. It is told in the words
of the dean of students who sent it. The unwillingness,
indeed fear, of communicating on the part of some students
is contributory to the kind of impasse that requires re­
 sponsible administrators to stop communicating and take
action. This problem will be discussed in the final section
of this chapter on the Communicator.

We have a campus newspaper which is fiercely
independent. It has a self-perpetuating staff and
elects its own editors. It submits quarterly budget
reports and semester budget askings, which I trans­
mit to the President with the advice of a Publica­
tions Board. For the past two years the number of
persons participating on the newspaper had been
declining. An in-group situation effectively ex­
 cluded persons who disagreed with the ruling clique.
Further complications included the fact that the
center of much of the drug experimenting took place
within this same group of students. There was the
usual hostile and aggressive attitudes characteristic
of this group but we took no steps to censor them
nor to limit their funds. Last year, during the Fall
semester, a long series of events brought matters
near the breaking point.

This series of matters had to do with the atti­
tude of the editor who once said to me that she
knew I was wondering why she avoided my office. She
told me it was because when she or her managing
editor came they learned too much. They wanted to
represent what they took to be the student's point
of view and how could they do that, she asked, when
they could find out everything by simply asking me?
In response I simply laughed and said I hoped she
would find it both helpful and interesting to know
more about ramifications and details of the situations which interested her. It became apparent also that the newspaper was financially insolvent.

At the beginning of the Fall semester I reminded the editor verbally and by letter that we wanted monthly financial reports of newspaper finances. She responded ten days letter (read—later by letter) that she did not think financial reports were necessary; when allocations were made to them they would be responsible for them and any attempt to require regular reporting would become a means of exercising an implicit censorship. I responded, again both verbally and by letter, that we would require such reports as we had been directed to do by the auditors. She responded another week later that she had taken the matter up with her editorial board and that they had voted unanimously not to submit them. I insisted as the price of continued supplying of funds. They consented, reluctantly, provided a report in mid-November and none thereafter.

At the beginning of the second semester we told the re-elected editor that we would supply funds on an issue-to-issue basis until the accounts could be straightened out. They had three senior accounting students as business managers, each of whom lasted not more than a month because they reported an inability to work with the editor. Advertising bills had not been issued, much less collected, and there was doubt from one week to the next that the printing bill could be paid.

Upon review of the Fall semester grades it became known that the editor was academically ineligible under the faculty rules. We have an exemptions board which allows for certain exceptions upon appeal. The editor had been a member of this board during the fall. It is a three-student board which considers individual appeals and makes a recommendation to the Dean of Students. I have always followed the decisions of the three students. On her own appeal, of course, the editor could not vote. The two remaining students split on her case. After thinking about the split vote, 1 to 1, overnight, I decided that a tie vote was not a recommendation for an exemption and disallowed the appeal.

That did it... Two days later the editor printed a defiant editorial to the effect that the faculty rules were a form of censorship and that she would stay at the editorial helm with her staff "until we
are torn from our printing presses". Below her statement appeared another editorial signed by two-thirds of the paper editorial board stating that they agreed with the editor and would continue to publish with her as their chief. At this point I suspended the paper, notified the printer that we would no longer be responsible for the printing bills after that date, closed their office, and appointed the three student ex-business managers as receivers. I announced that no further action would be taken until the report of the receivers had been completed and received.

As I say, I am not proud of this story. The newspaper eventually came back in print under a new editor after a good deal of student in-fighting involving the student government on the one hand and the ex-editor and her friends on the other. There were some more crises over the summer when the next editor flunked out of college and the managing editor attempted a coup. Today matters are all in order. The newspaper is functioning, solvent, and broad based. No one has been excluded but many more have been included. The crises are history.

What really happened was a failure in communication. Faculty rules were thought not but a paper matter. Perhaps there had been challenges to good taste, propriety, and even libel laws in the hope that someone in authority would act in a way which could be interpreted as censorship. None of this happened so they had to defy the academic eligibility rules. It was as if the student editor deliberately broke off communications in order to test the limits of authority in the dean. She was a bright girl whose first two college years were of honor quality. Her last two years were marginal, with the result that despite her ability and promise no graduate school would admit her.

What troubles me yet is how I could have avoided this becoming a case of incommunication involving more than just the two of us. It came to involve a great many people. I learned just how powerful is the cry of "freedom of the press" to the student mind. . . . I seem to have come out of this as a dean with enhanced reputation among both students and faculty so I have no regrets about my role in it. I wish I had been a better communicator, some way.

This writer has assigned a high grade to the dean in this piece as a communicator. He tried, up to a point, to get
through. Then he took action against troubled and rebellious students daring him to exercise his authority in an important issue.

On the other hand, some matters are not important enough to go on discussing; someone should decide and let the community get on with more important things. Such a question, on many campuses in the experience of this writer, seems to be the Thanksgiving Vacation issue: whether or not to have classes on the day(s) following Thanksgiving Day. The faculty typically favors classes with an earlier Christmas break; most students prefer to leave for a few days in November. On one campus where the faculty and administration hold power rather firmly, they receive an annual request from a student government study committee that annually is denied amid "considerable confusion regarding the reasons for such a policy."¹

A similar case is now reported, except that in this instance, after much communication a university administration decided they had lost the fight—or at least that a victory would not be worth the amount of communicating it would require or the possible losses in other regards. The problem grew out of a decision by a faculty committee at State University 116 "that only a limited number of juniors and seniors be permitted to remain in the University

¹In another college known to this writer one administrator annually makes the decision on the basis of a non-binding preferential referendum with each member of the community, faculty, student and staff, getting one vote.
residence halls . . . to provide more room for freshmen and sophomores. Two students who would have been adversely affected" began a campaign "on the basis that they were being asked to leave to provide space for out of state students." (Many residents of the state are sensitive to the cost and influence of students from certain other sections of the country that have not traditionally maintained excellent public universities; state law provides that only six per cent of the space in University residence halls may be reserved for out-of-state students.)

[The two students] not only tried to make their cause a crusade on campus, but sent form letters to daily and weekly papers throughout the state. As a result of their efforts, the whole issue of out-of-state versus in-state students was highlighted. This led to innumerable meetings with students and administrators, and with the campus student government officers. Most . . . students . . . were in favor of a greater number and better distribution of out-of-state students in living units. . . . The newspaper articles throughout the state, however, tended to view the issue as one of out-of-state students taking space away from in-state students. In fact, the issue of creating more residence halls space for underclassmen in many cases became lost. . . . After viewing the controversy from all angles and getting legal advice . . . the University administration finally abandoned the idea of trying to remove in-state juniors and seniors from . . . halls.

Finally in this section are some observations about the Berkeley Free Speech uproar of 1964. Some situations, and in retrospect Berkeley seems to have been one of them, are so ripe for historical forces requiring their change that no amount of communication (or equivocation) can avert the inevitable confrontation. As long as the University of California regents and administrators were to insist on
their arbitrary distinction between legal and illegal activity, they courted disaster. On October 28, 1964, Dean of Students Katherine A. Towle offered this explanation to the special Committee on Campus Political Activity of activities permitted student groups.

It was permissible, she said, for a speaker to recommend certain actions be taken, but it was not permissible for a speaker to advocate such actions be committed:

"A speaker may say, for instance, that there is going to be a picket line at such-and-such a place, and it is a worthy cause and he hopes people will go. But, he cannot say, "I'll meet you there and we'll picket."1

On the day before Dean Towle's explanation the regulations had been attacked during an open forum meeting of The Berkeley Graduate Coordinating Council.

Seymour M. Lipset, professor of sociology and director of the Institute of International Studies, described the rules as "irrelevant and destructive to the purposes of the University. Social action is relevant" to both graduate and undergraduate education. He said that while the University has liberalized a great deal in the last six years, it still has not gone far enough. He said he felt President Kerr has been responsible for "very significant changes" in the liberalization of the University.

John R. Searle, associate professor of philosophy and a few months later an assistant to the new chancellor, claimed that, while the avowed function of the regulations is to keep the campus politically neutral, the actual result is an "increase in the alienation, hostility and contempt" of the students toward the Administration.2

---

1Andrew L. Pierovich, "Three Months of Crisis," California Monthly, LXXV (February, 1965), 50.

2Ibid., pp. 50-51.
A few days later, addressing the Town and Gown Club, Chancellor Edward W. Strong said:

Finally, there is the problem of keeping the University true to its role and purpose in society. We cannot permit the University to be used or exploited for purposes not in accord with its charter as an educational institution in a democratic society. The University is a public trust. It was founded to enlighten the minds of its students and to prepare them for useful careers as educated men and women. Freedom of thought and inquiry is essential for the sifting of ideas, the advancement of knowledge, and the discovery of truth.

The rules went a long way in proscribing the "mounting" of any off campus action by members of the academic community on the campus. Chancellor Strong defended the rules and indeed went on to suggest that students who flouted the University's rules and authority were "on the road to anarchy" and undermining "respect for high offices" and demoralizing to society.¹

Amid all the speeches, meetings and machinations, both trying to restore order and to further various positions, it was clear that the student activists, fresh from the civil rights summer in Mississippi, were not going to abide by the administration line between freedom of speech and "the planning and implementation of political and social action."² Perhaps the point of this section is best summarized in this statement in the Free Speech Movement's FSM Newsletter,

¹Ibid., p. 50.
We repeat: when the morass of mediation becomes too thick to see through, action must let in the light.¹

Direct action by the FSM did occur a few days later; they called it lifting their "self-imposed moratorium on political activity" and held a rally. Whereupon the president and chancellor countered immediately by dissolving the special student-faculty-administration Committee on Campus Political Activity. Actually the students, in holding the rally, were not giving up on the committee discussions; they were decrying their lack of promise and what they claimed to be a shifting of administration position.

As will be discussed in the next section, channels of communication should be kept open at almost any cost during a crisis. The dissolution of the committee does not seem to have been a wise move by the president and chancellor: it was not a good example of "Stop Communicating and Act" for thereafter no plausible action was available to them and indeed they took none, except to begin misconduct proceedings against the participants in the rally. This brings us to the third category of results under "Amount of Communication." The Berkeley matter will be continued as an example of "Don't Stop Communicating" and again in the fourth sub-section "Great Amount of Communication"; in both, alternatives will be considered.

¹Ibid., p. 50.
If you can, try to get communication started--or, don't stop communicating.

When considering the amount of communication that occurred during the controversies studies, there were six, chief among them the one at Berkeley, that suggested that sometimes any amount, no matter how small, was preferable to a complete absence of communication. At Berkeley a chancellor and president were adhering to rules that increasing numbers of students and faculty found in need of change; they were operating in the crisis according to principles that belonged to saner times. Like angry children, when the game did not go their way, the president and chancellor dissolved the committee that was the chief hope of many, including faculty members on the committee. It seemed ill-advised during a mass protest situation to call an issue non-negotiable or shun the good offices of faculty members willing (in this case, eager) to negotiate a settlement.

Other than the Berkeley affair, the other cases in this section are of the "Try to Get Communication Started" variety. At Berkeley the chancellor's early declaration that the political activity issue was non-negotiable served to polarize the campus against his administration; so did his later dissolution of the negotiating committee. So the rigid unwillingness to communicate of any top administrator is likely to cause disaffection, even among those who agree with him. This case happened at University 89. It will be described in detail under Type and Pattern. Suffice to say here, a president, personally unconcerned with
the substance of a protest (about Selective Service examination) and convinced that whoever made the routine decision being protested was competent, refused to communicate with an ad hoc committee of protesters. Someone, anyone, should have persuaded the president to grant the request for some communication on a question of genuine concern to a portion of his student body.

Similarly, in a large incident on a small campus (College 27), students and dean should have compared their impressions of a delicate situation before making dogmatic rulings and angry responses.

A new women's housing unit . . . [was] to be operated without a [housemother] . . . for [upper level] junior and senior women . . . who will govern themselves, interpret the general housing rules for all women's residences, to fit their needs. One of the . . . rules is: "No men allowed beyond the lower visiting lounge area." Two of the . . . residents had young men friends carry their bags to their rooms on the third floor. The Dean of Women was in the building at the time and met the young men. She . . . told [the women] to move into the supervised residence. As a result other . . . women eligible to live in the unsupervised residence moved out because they "feared" too many possible mis-interpreted infractions of "the rules."

"Passing the buck," instead of meaningfully communicating, is another evil relevant to this topic. On a much larger and apparently bureaucratic campus (University 45), a succession of staff members by "passing the buck" caused a student reporter to become frustrated and angry. This incident is perhaps typical of what students encounter on campuses large and small from administrators (not only on controversial matters) who are afraid to be helpful for
fear of saying the wrong thing; it has been described in
the earlier section on Interference, but these are the
essentials: A summer reporter upon hearing that a dormitory
slated for fall opening was not to be ready, tried to learn
what would happen to the girls until the building was com-
pleted. In a series of misdirected contacts he talked with
six minor functionaries and secretaries before someone heard
about his plight and referred him to the dean of women who
tried to be helpful. By that time he was so angry that his
news story was more a report of the "run-around" than it
was of the information he had sought and finally received.
It is sufficient to the purpose of this section to observe
that someone should have done earlier what the dean of
women saw needed doing--providing a response. The attitude
that underlies the uncommunicative and frustrating admin-
istrative posture will be dealt with later.

A case was discussed in the section on Situation
and Time in which a residence hall counselor waited until
a room became vacant and set it up as a common lounge for
two feuding factions. Here was an instance of indirect
action to get communication started. This case suggests
that chance encounters will sometimes do more than the
more direct contrivances of the well meaning; they might
better ponder, as the counselor did, how to make possible
such chance meetings.\(^1\)

\(^1\)In E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* he makes a
similar point which is acknowledged here. "Bridge parties"
In institutions where joint student-faculty consultation has not been a part of the pattern, particular care must be exercised to "try to get communication started." In one such college "the students . . . [had] been desiring a change in the college drinking policy." The president and dean of students seemed to recognize the need for great care in proceeding; they carefully guided the matter through a maze that took several months to maneuver. Once communications are begun they can work in future instances much more easily; but they need to be carefully nurtured at first, this case seems to suggest.

**Great amount of communication**

At the beginning of this section on Amount of Communication, we quoted a friend who asserted the principle, "the more communication the better" for resolving conflicts involving university students. Now, having shown that the principle is not universally applicable, we move to the examination of eleven cases that do support it. Perhaps best illustrating a planned program of communication was this case at College 20. A new policy was generally accepted after first drawing loud disapproval.

Although College has been classified as a "residential" college, it has not had sufficient

were given by the British governor's wife to create a "bridge" between their group and the Indian gentry. These affairs were stilted and never got past the condescension which motivated them. Important events seemed, rather to move because of accidental, sometimes mystical, meetings of members of both groups.
residence hall space to accommodate all men students since World War II. Even after the addition of a new residence hall... in 1953, it was necessary to authorize a number of upperclass men to live off-campus each year. This number increased until in 1965 the total number... was 267...

Early in the academic year 1964-65 the college announced plans to build a new... men's residence center (300 man capacity), and that all upperclass men residential students would be required to live on-campus... Immediately there was considerable dissent among both men and women... the students adopted the term "Superdorm" in a derisive tone.

In the Fall of 1965 the student personnel staff began an organized campaign to counteract this dissent. The President of the College was asked to appoint a new men's residence center program committee composed of the Dean of Men, the Director of Men's Housing, two faculty members, and eight students. A series of biweekly meetings were held extending over a period of... three months. The committee was divided into several sub-committees with one faculty and two students on each... to study hall government, programming... room selection... who would live off-campus in case the hall was filled, student staffing, etc. The sub-committees held group hearings open to all students which were well publicized and fairly well attended. Student members of the committee were given most of the responsibility for answering questions. Reports of each meeting were released to the campus newspaper and were publicized. Architectural drawings, room layouts, were displayed in... cases in the student center. Finally, the architects designed a small model... A brochure, "College, A Residential College" was published... [and] distributed to all incoming students in 1964, 1965, and 1966.

When each of the sub-committees made their recommendations, the committee as a whole drew up a report. It was... approved by the President... Gradually, the opposition... receded... Over a shorter period, and more lightly reported, is this campaign at College 34 to correct a failure to consult students when a major change was contemplated.
1. Xenophobe College, an all male institution, has started discussions amongst the faculty, for the purpose of admitting coeds.

2. The students hear about it and certain groups resent the loss of their all male prerogative.

3. A student "Committee of A Thousand" begins to publish subterranean literature and to hold clandestine meetings in order to protest.

4. Protestation signs appear all over the place.

5. Does the administration lose its head? No! A thousand times no!

6. The problem was caused by lack of communication with the students.

7. The problem was solved by making immediately available, avenues of communication.

8. The "Committee of A Thousand" was invited to meet with faculty and administration.

9. Other groups of students apart from the "Committee of A Thousand," (which turned out to be a Committee of about 20 students!) were also invited to meet with administration and faculty.

10. The student Council got itself involved.

11. Opinions were aired all over the place. Finally a student election overwhelmingly voted in favor of coeds.

Also relevant here, is the case, previously presented, of the student council president at University 137. He allowed himself ample time and then discussed the matter thoroughly with each member of his council in order to garner enough votes to make the controversial change in the structure of student government.

Another case, amply documented, demonstrated that a great deal and variety of communication sometimes is necessary for a dean even to attract student attention to
the existence of a problem; once the controversy is aroused
much more may be required first to educate student leaders
and then to help them reach the lethargic masses. This
case concerns fraternity obscenity at College 28. It in-
cludes a daily journal covering a four-week period (which
embraced the Christmas recess), letters back and forth,
minutes of several committee and judicial board meetings,
the final action of faculty committee overturning student
judicial action and a newspaper clipping.

The dean, his staff and Committee on Administration
seemed to know where they were headed in the controversy,
and that if they were thorough in their approach that they
would get there; the calmness and firmness underlying their
communicative campaign is striking.

Three other cases, reported at some length earlier,
also demonstrate in similar ways how administrators and
teachers sometimes have to make careful plans and set aside
considerable time for dealing with student controversies.
None is sufficiently different from those just above to
justify retelling here.

A rather unusual case involved several months of
thievery in eight residence halls on a women's campus.
It was clear to this writer after reading the detailed
report submitted and considering a similar such case known
to him, that in a protracted conflict situation involving
widespread concern (e.g., stealing, missing person, peeping
Tom, exhibitionists or sexual attackers lurking on campus),
faculty and staff members need to devote an extraordinary
amount of time and energy to collaborating and talking with
students if morale is to remain high. Faculty must, in the
words of the narrator of this case at College 59, create
"a general attitude of working together on a distasteful
problem of concern to all."

After the thieves (there were two) were caught,
again a great amount of detailed communication was used
and seems worth relating.

The problem then became one of settling down the
college, stilling the gossip, and eliminating the
suspicion which by this time was running rampant.
Late one afternoon the President . . . called a
required Chapel to which everyone was to come—all
faculty, all students, all administrators and all
service help who could be spared. (Maids and
janitors and watchmen had come in for their share
of suspicion.) The President then told the whole
story, gave the names of the girls and a short
summary of their backgrounds, discussed the involve­
ment of the outside agencies and their cooperation
with the college, pointed out that the press had as
yet barely whiffed the whole nasty story, and asked
for everyone's cooperation in keeping further talk
at a minimum. He also talked about punishment and
what would happen to the two if they were prosecuted
and what was going to happen to them if they were
not. It was a most effective talk and hit the right
note—and it worked. There was, of course, a certain
amount of discussion after the talk, but nothing
excessive. Then college broke up for Christmas and
when the students returned, the whole thing was a
dead issue. I presume some of them told their
families and/or friends but there were no repercus­
sions either in the press or from parents. Some of
the faculty thought the president should not have
been so frank and should have omitted names, back­
grounds, or something, but I am still convinced that
it was his frankness which stilled the gossip and
ended the suspicion as well as enlisted the coopera­
tion of the students in keeping the matter under
wraps.
To conclude this section on the amount of communication three learnings are offered: two from the University Selective Service sit-in in 1966 and one more from University of California at Berkeley in 1964. Somers, the sociology student who polled student opinion at Berkeley just after the so-called Free Speech struggle, asked an open-ended question "on the behavior of the administration during the demonstrations." He reported:

. . . many students took the opportunity to reaffirm what we have already seen, that there should have been better efforts on the part of the administration to communicate with students or to negotiate differences. The militants of course responded overwhelmingly in this fashion, if they added anything at all; yet even the conservatives were as likely to say this as to give approval to the administration by saying that they did all right, or did what was necessary. . . . Clearly this shows that the administration made too little attempt to support and explain its position in terms which could be understood by the students on this campus and could arouse at least temporary understanding and support.¹

To the extent the administration position was valid and defensible to the campus it could have had much more support had its proponents done more to secure understanding and been more consistent from the beginning in their stands on substantive issues, on disciplinary policy and on willingness to negotiate differences.

The situation at University eighteen months later was different in that when student activists began protesting a policy (on releasing class standings to draft

boards) the administration (wisely, in the judgment of this observer) agreed that a faculty-student policy on the books since the Korean Conflict should be reviewed. Furthermore, as commended earlier in this chapter, the administration became communicators, facilitators of and channels for others' communication. Refusing to be tripped by the activists into becoming antagonists, they constantly espoused a doctrine of responsible dissent and protest. For example, the remarks of the Chancellor to the faculty (with thousands of students listening over public address systems) reiterated what he and the president had been saying and writing throughout the previous week.

There is before us today an issue which transcends in importance the serious questions of Selective Service which we shall be debating. It is whether we can maintain this University's great reputation for protest without coercion. So far we--and by "we", I mean faculty, students and the Administration--have been almost alone among the great universities in our mutual willingness to tolerate strong differences of opinion among us without resorting to the kind of coercion which destroys a free society.

The president and chancellor stated this point of view on at least six occasions during the week of May 16-23, 1966, in various speeches and written statements. The guidelines for protesters and administrators they formulated were agreed to by the protest leaders, although the latter were not always certain their followers would also "act responsibly." The official report of the episode says, "Almost every night of the sit-in, the question of initiating some interference [with University operations] was raised, debated
at great length, and the idea defeated by overwhelming vote."

As to the amount of communicating between protesters and administrators, the report makes these observations:

A minimum group of University personnel, representing the Central Administration, the Chancellor, the Dean of Students, and University Protection and Security was maintained at the site throughout most of the sit-in.

Numerous conferences were held throughout the sit-in between the representatives of the protesting group and University officials in Chancellor office with the Chancellor presiding, Dean of Students and varying other University officials present. The student representatives pushed continually for a statement accepting in full their demands. The University maintained constant pressure on the leaders to conduct their protest in an orderly fashion and take their case through normal University channels.  

An independent observer reported: "Throughout the entire sit-in activities, there was a continuous shuttle run of students and administrators going back and forth between the two camps."

Whether the University officials would been so enlightened and skillful (i.e., communicative and neutral) in their handling of a major protest without the eye-opening Berkeley forerunner is open to surmise. The amount of their communication, coupled with their neutral stance and absence of righteous indignation, was most noticeable.

This footnote must be added, in view of events on the same campus seventeen months later. Instead of a

\[1\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 6.}\]
sit-in, protesters were out to block Dow Chemical recruiters and students desiring interviews; instead of protest leaders willing to communicate, the spokesmen who occasionally emerged momentarily would only remain long enough to make their demand that the interviews be called off, then they would submerge again. In short, there were no student leaders for the administration to communicate with. There was no communication between protesters and administrators. There needed to be a communication facilitator or "channel," although the doubt remains that even with someone to serve as facilitator or as channel, the students would have settled for anything less than having their demands met. It is, to use the vernacular, a whole new ball game. With these discomfiting thoughts, we turn to our consideration of Channels of Communication.

Channel of Communication

In attempting to impose order on our thinking about channels of communication during student controversies, we have come to agree with Berlo when he opines, "... no one word in communication theory has been as used and abused as the word 'channel.' We use it to mean many different things."¹ In addition to the vagaries of communication theory, one becomes increasingly confused by the contribution of organization theory. Lines of communication and lines of power become confused. "Going through channels,"

¹Berlo, Process of Communication, p. 63.
line vs. staff relationships and the attendant screening and evaluation that occur, all add to the confusion.

Let the reader then beware. The term channel will here be used in two ways. First it will be used to refer to the sound and light waves, wires, newspapers, mail bags and boxes, telephones and human messengers. Second, it will refer to the lines of organization, e.g., between students and faculty, dean and president, committee and senate. In this latter sense, a committee or a body can serve as a channel. Necessarily, therefore, there will be some overlap between two of the other sections, Facilitator and Type-Pattern of Communication, but every effort has been made in the interest of brevity and neatness to keep the overlap minimal.

After the analysis of data there were fifty statements about channels among the 560 total. Most of these had to do with various organizational channels (committees, offices, staffs, etc.). After much consideration, juggling and reconsideration they were grouped in this way: eighteen having to do with use of normal organization lines of communication, policy making and appeal; twenty-four in which someone varied or bypassed a normal channel or improvised a new one; eight statements judged not to be primarily applicable to this section.
Normal channels

The cases disclosed a wide variation as to what are normal communication channels on American campuses. We are in an era when student activists have become tired of waiting for traditional modes and channels to produce change. They are convinced that they will not yield results. Institutions have for decades been accustomed to channels of student government, faculty committees, line and staff officers in the administration. Now American higher education is confronted with new patterns, e.g., *ad hoc* committees and radical action movements, outside the regular governmental-communicative structure. These activists, whether devoted to a single issue (longer visiting hours or opposition to the Viet Nam war), or general reform ("Student Power"), challenge the existence of the regular structure and the patience of conventional persons accustomed to gradual change through normal channels. The preference of "The Establishment" for normal channels is natural but sometimes becomes obsessive. For example, in an incident at University 89 described earlier, a president refused to communicate with a power group operating outside of student government to administration channels. His refusal did not cause the dissenters to go away or join the student government. As the gulf widened the tension on campus increased and so did the number of teachers and students who were distracted by the conflict from their regular duties.
After the Berkeley Free Speech controversy the spe-
cial Byrne report recommended

... that the charters provide for and encourage
the establishment of broadly-based student govern-
ments, which:
(1) Will be a vital resource to the Chancellor in
meeting his responsibility as the chief execu-
tive of the University.
(2) Will serve as the primary formal channel of
communication to the Chancellor of student
opinions and concerns.
(3) Will respond to the interests of students. . . . 1

During the crisis at Berkeley the ASUC Senate and its presi-
dent were earnest and plaintive in their appeals for order
and support, but unable to gain it. Similarly the admin-
istration was not steadfast in its dependence either on
the Senate or on the extraordinary student-faculty-admin-
istration committee formed to deal with the problem of
student political rights. The disastrous results of their
vacillation are well known. By bypassing the student govern-
ment at the outset, and then communicating through a coali-
tion of committee heads, group presidents, etc., across the
political spectrum, the dean of students not only ineffuctu-
ated the ASUC Senate but also sparked the creation of the
FSM.

As is the case in other sections of the chapter
contrast of the Berkeley situation with the University 113
Selective Service sit-in of 1966 is useful in discussing

1Jerome C. Byrne, Special Report Commissioned by the
Forbes Committee of the Board of Regents, University of
California. Reprinted from the Los Angeles Times, May 12,
1965, p. 18.
channels of communication. The administration at 113 while communicating almost constantly with the protester-militants about procedural matters, refused to be drawn into hostility on substantive issues. They maintained throughout the embroilment that the matter should go through regular student government-faculty channel of policy making. They invited the Student Senate president to meetings with the protesters.

Another pair of cases similarly demonstrates the disadvantage of not building sound channels and using them. One involves fraternity misconduct and a student judiciary board; the other a case of cheating. These two will be contrasted with two other cases, one about an interfraternity squabble with racial overtones and the other an all-university student-faculty conflict; in the latter two channels were available and were used. At University 63 the deans found they could rely less and less on the wisdom of a student judiciary committee in handling fraternity infractions. At one point, without warning, the deans placed an errant fraternity on probation without referring the matter to the student judiciary. A letter was sent to the judiciary with a copy to the student newspaper. The student judiciary resigned, everyone was upset (as perhaps the deans wished), and there was a standoff. Had there been a channel either for registering decanal displeasure with earlier decisions or having them reviewed, or both, the conflict might not have come to such an abrupt and wrenching a break-off.
In the second case a graduate professor of speech at University 117 discovered that a master's thesis was largely plagiarized. He and two of his colleagues confronted the student, compared the original source and the offending portions of the thesis to establish the cheating. The student denied it and appealed their decision to the Department of Speech; the chairman referred the matter to a committee. Neither the student nor his teacher was invited to the appeal meeting. The latter wrote that the committee "was not willing to accept our decision that indeed the material had been plagiarized . . . until once again material . . . had been read side by side to demonstrate . . . that it had been plagiarized." Having decided it was, the committee was divided as to what should be done. Did they have power to set aside a faculty member's decision in such a case? Should there be an all-university mechanism for dealing with the problem? It was further "revealed that there had been a similar case some years before and the student . . . had gotten off scot free" without any departmental or institutional channel of communication, adjudication or appeal being established. It was still "more or less up to [the professor] to make a decision" with the student unclear as to where to turn for review and redress.

The following two cases demonstrate how equally strong feelings can be dealt with when channels are available and used. The first grew out of a ruling by an interfraternity athletic director that a Negro fraternity at University
106 had violated an eligibility rule: one of their members had continued to play after he dropped a course and was no longer a full time student. The ruling cost the group all its sweepstakes points, retroactive to the beginning of the year, toward an annual and highly prized interfraternity activities award. The chapter contended they should not be so penalized. They pointed out that the rules had not been distributed in writing nor posted; the director had only read them once at the beginning of the year at a general meeting. The Negro group charged the non-Negro student director with racial prejudice. He countered, according to a member of the fraternity who reported the altercation, "that everyone knew the rules and that everyone who knew him knew that he wasn't prejudice [sic]." Thus existed an impasse as solid as the foregoing two; however there was here a channel.

A protest of the ruling was sent to the interfraternity counsel [sic] for review. . . . It ruled that both parties were at fault and that the spirit of good sportsmanship should prevail. Thereby only half of the fraternity's points could be taken.

The other case involves strong feelings of almost the entire student body of University 60 and is succinctly told in the words of a faculty member.

Last year the Faculty Senate, upon recommendation of its Committee on the Calendar, set the Xmas vacation . . . to run . . . to the morning of January 2. Naturally the students did not care to be driving back on the first, especially since [the university] would probably be playing a bowl game that day.
There was much letter-writing to the editor of the school paper. It was taken up at Student Senate and a resolution was made and conveyed to the chairman of the [Faculty] Senate Calendar Committee (communication! and through proper channels!). He, in turn, presented it to the University Senate. . . . Through the orderly process of debate the motion was changed [so as to please] most [faculty members] and it passed rapidly. Everyone seems happy now.

Two valuable lessons about channels of communication came out of a complex policy change at University 95. The substance (the establishment of a student activity fee) seems less important than the procedure, which was carefully planned and executed. The dean for student services made the decision after "consultation over a six-months' period . . . with a group of 15 top student leaders." The news release announcing the recommendation of a fee to the Board of Trustees "included information on the consultation procedures followed."

In spite of meetings with various student and staff groups setting forth the advantages that would accrue from the increased money, "widespread resentment arose." After a time a referendum was held with five to one against the fee with only one-third of the students voting.

The student petition and referendum were carefully reported to the Board of Trustees by the administration. In retrospect, the dean reported, this insistence "on the right of the students to petition" and guarantee to a report of their petition (i.e., a channel to the trustees) "maintained a semblance of confidence in the administration."
The dean wrote further, when asked how they managed to save the situation, that they "tardily discovered" channels that were not working.

... we had not informed our residence hall staff fully and appropriately. We took steps to correct this. We discovered that several key organizations, including the Student Center Board and A.W.S. had not been brought along fully by their leadership. We moved in on that situation. We issued a white paper in the midst of the turmoil which was distributed widely by one of the men's leadership groups. I think that all of these devices contributed to swinging support.

A minor incident at University 36 also demonstrated why channels between offices of administration should be kept open and used during a moment of controversy. Failure to communicate in either direction between the dean of students' office and the university police yielded "hard feelings and suspicion... to the detriment of the entire university." This incident not only caused enmity well in excess of its own importance but it also consumed a great deal of expensive time "up through the administrative channels to the President before the matter was thoroughly aired to the point of understanding by all parties." The incident began when a student dismissed in disciplinary action "stole his roommate's radio, camera and several other valuable items which he pawned. . . ."

The roommate found the items at the pawn shop, reported the incident to the local city police (not to the university police) and recovered the items. Later he was threatened by [the thief] not to press charges. . . . The roommate's parents came in to the Dean of Students' Office to describe the entire incident, most of which was previously unknown to the Dean.
Since Paul was no longer a student and since the incident had been reported to the city police, the Dean did not make a report to the University police, which is the usual procedure. When the university police heard about the incident . . . serious conflict arose. . . . The Chief accused the Dean of lack of cooperation with his office . . . and the dean mentioned that if the university police had contacted the Dean when word of the incident reached them, understanding might have been reached. . . .

All of this bickering in the President's Office and the accompanying hard feelings would have been avoided had the channel been used. One wonders in considering this case if an abnormal amount of suspicion was not present at the outset; if not, one or more of the principals seemed guilty of immature behavior difficult to justify in university administrators. Insecurity and defensiveness are common in higher educational administration. Department heads tend to be appointed from other vocations within academe (e.g., teaching) or from outside. It might behoove each to discover which other office heads are prone to hurt feelings and be solicitous of them: it would seem less costly of time and anxiety in the long run to keep channels in good order and err on the side of overcommunicating with those administrators.

The situation at College 41 has been discussed previously. There they had virtually no channels for students to take part in making rules and policy. The first request by students for change of a rule evoked a decision to set up channels for faculty-student communication about legislation. The president and dean did not,
however, improvise quickly. They built "regular" channels while handling the request for new drinking rules. The care that was taken at each step of the way reportedly paid off in presenting later controversies; each channel was carefully built and tried. The results were pleasing to students, faculty members and administrators.

Cases at two schools involved the student press, often an unpredictable channel of communication, whether in a crisis or normal times. At College 90 the dean of students was asked to appear before a general meeting to explain certain policies. He did so with misgivings and against the advice of colleagues ("The Dean of Men thought I had lost my mind completely . . ."). In retrospect "the public meeting and the accurate reporting of it later in the student paper did serve to quiet a good many unwarranted fears . . . [with regard to one of the controversial policies]. This remark about the student press suggests the advisability of securing in advance a promise of fair and accurate reporting from the student paper and radio station before agreeing to appear in a large meeting. Student editors and reporters are often biased against administrators and their positions on issues. In this writer's experience they are fundamentally committed to standards of objectivity, fairness and accuracy. They can be appealed to in terms of this commitment, thus ensuring in a crisis that important channels will be working and conveying information accurately. The editors and broadcasters
will want the meeting to occur, and if the dean's presence is dependent on their agreement to be fair, they will be.

Even without someone using such leverage, the student press, if it values its integrity and the dignity of the oppressed and maligned, can save the day. The case of the psychedelic drug user was discussed in the previous section and is described in Appendix F. A dean was professionally bound to silence while a cyclone of opposition was whipped up around him. The psychedelic student and his champions "went to the student newspaper with the complete story asking for an investigation." The dean wrote,

... it was fortunate that the student writers were willing to listen rather than to write their article and then attempt to seek facts. When presented with the information that I could ethically communicate, the report was worded carefully and well.

Such student journalists perform their stewardship over important channels of communication very well indeed.

Two other valuable channels of communication when colleges become embroiled in controversy are exemplified at Colleges 54 and 55. Residence hall counselors serve at 54 as the main channel between administration and students, according to the dean of students, although he did not describe a particular controversy. One wonders if just the input of information is sufficient in all cases to quell the restless natives at this comparatively small private residential college.
At College 55, a medium sized state college, there exists The Dean of Students Advisory Council. The presidents of all student groups are members. It has met "with real success in discussing campus problems" before and during the outbreak of hostilities. Although he narrated one incident concerning dress regulations, of more interest here is the dean's description of the group's functioning.

I permit the group (students) to determine the topics they wish to discuss. If it is necessary and desirable resource people such as the College President are invited. At some of the meetings we have an open question and answer session.

This is an excellent way to create good will with students because they feel they have an opportunity to get reactions to things of concern to them.

I feel this Advisory Council has done much to promote good vertical and horizontal (they are in better touch with each other also) communication.

Two final cases demonstrate the value of another normal channel on a medium sized campus. At College 122 the issue concerned the drinking rule; at College 160 it was the dormitory visiting policy. In both instances young faculty and staff members, mostly bachelors, living in student residence halls, became crucial channels of communication providing liaison across the generation gap that exists on such topics. As the gap grows wider, the inclusion of recent students on deans' staffs, faculty councils and in student-faculty consultations seems increasingly desirable—even imperative.
That there need to be channels for communication with student groups seems almost universally accepted in American higher education. There are many differences of opinion, however, as to what the purpose of such communications should be. Some favor one-way recommendations from students and no more; others favor consultations with student leaders prior to faculty legislation; still farther along the spectrum is joint student-faculty legislation; most radical of all are the Student Power advocates who would assert control over student life, granting maximum freedom to individual students in their own personal lives, with joint student-faculty control over academic affairs. The point is that yesterday's channels and power structure will be challenged tomorrow, if they are not already being challenged. Nothing is sacrosanct; and we wonder about the administrator who will not be flexible in varying at least his channels of communication with students. The incident at University 89 in which the president refused even to talk with leaders of an anti-draft movement was discussed in the previous section. The president's preference for normal channels can be understood. With a popular issue in an era when regular channels often are out of use or not respected, a president runs a tremendous risk when he refuses to reconsider, communicate, or even disclose who made a decision. Furthermore, he needs to be aware that his behavior smacks of intransigence and risks the creation
of an emotional tidal wave to wash his position away, whatever its merits.

Similarly, when the existing channel is tried and does not work, someone should be inventive enough to try another. At College 19 "a real brouhaha developed" over the fear of one fraternity leader to house a negro in his chapter house during a high school weekend.

... prospective students, all top achievers and outstanding in extra-curricular activities, were invited to the ... campus.

A Negro was assigned to one of the fraternities (all of the fraternities participated in housing our guests) and I believe that the leader of the fraternity assumed that his brothers would not wish the Negro to stay with them for a period of two nights. He asked that the Negro be assigned to the dormitory and a real brouhaha developed. I believe it turned out that the fraternity was split—that some of the members were against the Negro staying there, but that more of them were in favor of it. The administration tried to act in the best interests of the student and, as it turned out, he did stay in the dormitory—much to the embarrassment of the fraternity and of the university.

Immediate and accurate information among the members of the fraternity and between the fraternity and the student group representing the administration—which invited the guests—would have probably been a great assistance.

If only the leader could have been bypassed as channel between the student committee and the members of the fraternity, the awkward situation could perhaps have been avoided. Or the student committee as channel might have been bypassed. The director of admissions could have gone to the chapter house, or the dean of men, etc.
Such improvisation of channels was tried at College 162. As a critical campus situation was just becoming known, one of the deans headed for the coffee shop and sought out a few credible faculty members. They and the teachers with them were interested to learn the facts (of a marijuana search in a dormitory). After asking questions to ascertain that proper procedure was followed the faculty members served as effective channels to student leaders and the rest of the faculty. Several spent many hours explaining to concerned students the procedure that had been followed and the necessity for it.

Other such improvisations grew out of controversies at seven other institutions. They serve to illustrate the range of choice available to the creative and flexible. At all-male College 84 ("Xenophobe College" described in the previous section) meetings with faculty and administrators were set up for the dissidents to going coeducational, and then later for other students. The student council also held discussions. In time everyone was discussing the issue. Presumably most of the people who took part in the meetings served as a channel to other students so that when a referendum occurred, the student body "voted overwhelmingly in favor of coeds."

Fraternity house corporation presidents were used inventively as channels at University 31 in a dispute with the local city council. Relations between the city and university had not been good on several fronts. The
On a . . . Wednesday, my office was informed that the city was having a final reading the following Monday of the Minimum Housing Code Amendment. If this code was passed it would mean the city would be in a position to close eight out of the total ten fraternities on campus. The amendment, in effect, would force the fraternities to eliminate their sleeping decks. The code stipulated a certain number of square feet (35) per student on the deck. The chapters could not comply with this since they sleep in double bunks. After consulting with University officials, we began to wonder if this was not an effort by the city to squeeze the fraternities out of existence. Through an intermediary an inquiry was made to the councilman who proposed the amendment as to what his intention was. It was learned, even though for the first time fraternities were actually mentioned in the code, he was not out to "get" the fraternities. Immediately a major effort was made to mobilize the fraternity corporation presidents. Phone calls were made Thursday evening to all . . . presidents advising them of the situation and informing them that the best approach was for them to offer an additional amendment at the Monday hearing. It was soon learned that a couple of the corporations had friends among the council members. That Thursday evening an approach was made to two or three of them. The city was at the time unaware of the fact that a great deal of progress had been made in fraternity housing, that fire and safety hazards had been eliminated. . . .

Actually, the major intent of this amendment to the Minimum Code was to put pressure on the slum landlords. Working from my office, I got all the presidents to agree to meet Monday night at the Council hearing. One of the corporation presidents agreed to draw up an amendment that would be proposed that evening. When the men arrived at the Council hearing they found that their previous work had been very beneficial. A member of the council proposed an exception be made to fraternities and the Corporation Presidents did not have to make a stand at the meeting. In this case, if [they] had overplayed their hand, as some of them wanted to do, e.g., by hiring an attorney and coming to the meeting "with all guns blasting," they may [sic] have forced the council into a defensive position.
At Berkeley, in December of 1964, an attempt was made by departmental chairmen to end the two-month old hostilities. It will be discussed in the section on Type and Pattern of Communication. Of interest here is the use made of the entire faculty as communication channels to the student body. The plan was conceived to provide opportunity for individual discussion to augment a mass meeting (16,000 attended). Both were to win support for a proposal to restore order.

All chairmen have been advised by the Council of Department Chairmen to hold departmental meetings at 9:00 a.m. on Monday morning, December 7. The agreement will be publicly announced at 11:00 a.m. in an extraordinary convocation in the Greek Theatre called by the Department Chairmen at which Professor Robert A. Scalapino and President Clark Kerr will speak. Department Chairmen have recommended that classes be dismissed from 9:00 to 12:00 a.m. Department representatives will speak with students about the agreement throughout the afternoon.¹

Much as department chairmen and representatives served as channels at Berkeley, student leaders acted at University 88. The case also is discussed in the section on Type-Pattern, and the situation is similar except that it involves student organization presidents and the dean of students.

Another channel reported was a student Concern Committee. At University 8, in the early stages of discontent over vending machines, a residence hall student

government averted a major uproar by forming a committee "to investigate the situation and report its findings to the proper . . . officials."

At College 4 a minor crisis arose because there was no channel established for formal communication about a building hurriedly made available to student religious groups. The mixups that developed over the head resident were unfortunate and complicated. When they reached their peak a pair of deans stepped in to avert further altercation and then appointed a Board of Governors to define the privileges and responsibilities of the head resident. Such a board of control can be a very effective channel of communication if it is constituted to be representative of the various student, faculty and administrative elements with interests in the facility.

The dean of students at University 13 was faced with a recalcitrant president of a powerful residence halls association. The case is discussed in greater detail in the sections dealing with deans of students as communicators and Type-Pattern (letters). Of interest here is the dean's switching channels when the rebellious president failed to respond to an invitation to discuss the problem. When the mails failed, the dean tried a telegram which broke the communication barrier and led ultimately to a solution.

The last eleven cases involve changes (variation, bypass or improvisation) in human channels of communication
during controversies. Four of these suggest the advisability of one person being assigned responsibility of serving as channel. During the protracted thievery at College 59 discussed earlier, one administrative officer and her office served effectively as communication central. She "worked more on an all-campus basis with student government leaders, hall governments, and the resident faculty group. She was not as directly involved as the residents were, but she was the liaison with the rest of the administration and with the police et al."

A case at University 97 was entitled by its dean of students, "A Study in Failure in Communications." The controversy was over the conditions for woman visitors in fraternity "lodges." A proposal for change in hours and chaperonage was under consideration in a committee on student life for over three months. Careful studies were made and extensive testimony heard from sources on- and off-campus. A dialogue of witnesses, pro and con, from fraternity and sorority leaders and rank and file seemed to have created within the committee a false impression. The chairman, at least, believed each member of the committee and each witness was serving as a channel to the campus at large so that it was apprised of committee deliberations and would trust the committee to make the right decision. In retrospect it appeared that the Interfraternity Council (IFC) and Panhellenic Council members did not serve adequately as channels between the committee and Greek groups, even though their
frequent consultation with the committee seemed to create the illusion that they were. The dean-chairman was, therefore, unprepared for "an unusual, even unprecedented student reaction to the decision." He was perhaps naive since it came on a tie with his casting the tie-breaking negative vote against making the rules more liberal.

At the end of a detailed seven-page summary the dean raised three questions.

(1) To what extent could the committee assume that its procedures were being interpreted adequately to those affected by the ultimate decision?

(2) To what extent was the communication to the committee from the sorority presidents and their alumni advisers adequately communicated and interpreted to the memberships of the sororities?

(3) To what extent did the resultant dilemma—a clear statement of surprise and disappointment—result from the inability or the failure on the part of representative leadership to interpret to their constituencies stage by stage the development of the consideration of their recommendations?

In response to a further inquiry from this research as to how he would answer the questions he had posed, the dean wrote again at some length. It is easy to conclude that the committee, and especially its chairman, became too involved in the "objectiveness of the procedure" to keep sight of "an unconditioned student public" (i.e., the trees and the forest). It was also clear that neither student representatives, alumni advisers nor deans of men and women took responsibility for communicating the drift of the discussion, nor, more importantly, what the various issues were. In short,
there was almost no public information out of the committee as its inquiry dragged on. That which there was seems to have been accidental ("The major contact with women student leaders was effected by the young lady friend of one of the IFC representatives ... the sorority representatives and alumni advisers acted without consulting the membership.")

The absence of a formal channel of communication from the committee to the rest of the university seems to be the only omission in what was otherwise an exemplary, though lengthy, attempt to deal with a controversial problem. If the committee had designated someone, to serve as public information officer, the negative outcry might have been avoided, or at least minimized. If a chairman or secretary does not have time or talent for such a role, another member of the group may welcome its challenge; or another student with a flair for communicating might welcome the opportunity to serve in this way (e.g., the "young lady friend"). In any case, representative government must have channels to its constituencies or risk the loss of their support. In this case the human channel might have functioned by issuing press releases, and by meeting with IFC and Panhellenic, as well as individual fraternity chapters. By so doing he would have provided them with information to reach the same understandings as the committee, even if they did not like its conclusion.

During the Free Speech imbroglio at Berkeley, by the same token, it seems to this writer that the Chancellor
should have appointed someone to serve as a communication channel between the administration and the faculty. The latter found it difficult to understand what motivated various decisions; and more feedback from faculty would no doubt have been useful to the administrators.

At University 40, during its version of the Berkeley free speech conflict, a technique was used which served to avoid the misunderstanding and bitterness of the two situations just discussed. An administration member of student life committee\(^1\) took it upon himself to serve as channel. He conferred with faculty advisers and student members of the protest movement. In so doing, he was able better to grasp their position, to convey others to them, to be sure that committee deliberations reflected them all, and to reassure all parties of the good faith of others.

As mentioned in the section on noise, one staff member can be given continuing responsibility for a controversial problem. At University 94, like so many other institutions, there is much concern about narcotics. One man on the dean of students' staff serves as a clearing house of information (and a filter of rumor and speculation).

It is interesting to contrast the communication of two chief campus officers (one president, one chancellor) during simultaneous anti-Selective Service sit-in protests.

\(^{1}\) This dean is trained in communication and serves also as professor of speech.
These two cases have been compared with respect to other elements. At University 26 the president refused to talk with the protesters so long as they continued to "trespass" in the reception area of his office suite. In the interim until they left, however, he did make extensive use of a vice president (not the vice presidents for academic or student affairs who were out of the city) and one lesser administrative officer. These men acted as channels for the president's communication until the students decided to accede to his requirement that any meeting could not occur while they were disobeying rules. The channels kept communication alive while protecting the president's principle.

At the University 113 much to the annoyance of some state legislators, no such principle was invoked in what was a sit-in on a much larger scale. As mentioned elsewhere there was almost unbroken communication between protest leaders and top administrators (president, chancellor and dean of student affairs). The remarkable achievement was the administrators' ability to remain in the role of "channels" between the protesters on the one hand and the faculty and student senate on the other. They even succeeded in making the protest leaders serve as channels between the administrators in their other role, insisting on orderly, non-disruptive protest, and the large body of protestors, heavily sprinkled with angry militants in no mood to remain

---

1See also discussion of this case under The Facilitator in the section on Communicators.
orderly. That they did is perhaps the significant accomplishment of a model protest controversy.

Five cases pointed up the need to be wary of variously troubled students serving as channels for communication about their own problems. One extreme situation at University 70, told in the words of a student's debate coach, demonstrates the need for teachers, advisers, coaches and deans to bypass the suspect channel and communicate among themselves. This case also suggests the advisability of answering letters.

One incident of which I was a part involved a girl who transferred from another college after her freshman year. Her point hour ratio at the other school was at or above 3.0 (of 4 points). She joined the debate team and worked well, but missed some classes including physics labs. She also was having some emotional difficulties which did not reveal themselves to others (including me) until later, and was therefore not doing well in any classes. The situation became critical when she learned that her work and absences in physics would cause her to fail the course.

She came to me for advice. I suggested first she talk with the physics department to see if she could make up the lab work, as she had told me her test scores were passing (I did not verify this by talking with her instructor). She returned to me saying it was hopeless, that she would fail the course, and that it would flunk her out of school. I was surprised to learn that a girl of her intelligence would flunk out of school with one failing grade. I asked about her average, and she said ______ computed her grade average only in terms of courses taken at ______, and ignored previous grades in deciding to flunk out students. I was surprised to learn this (I did not verify it with the Dean's office). I asked if her point hour ratio would be failing if all her grades--including those earned in her first year--were considered. She said not, though again I did not verify with the Registrar. I suggested she talk with the Dean and see if he could not find a way to put her on a probation, but let her continue classes in the light of her previous success and my personal
testimony that she indicated—through her debate work—college level capacity. I wrote a letter to that effect which she took with her.

She returned again saying there was no hope. At this point, my memory is unclear. I recall asking her if she would like for me to intercede personally in her behalf. I recall she was hesitant, and that she was behaving very strangely. Her tendency seemed to be to withdraw from the situation. I do not recall whether or not I made a phone call to the Dean. If I did, I do not remember what he said. I do know the girl was dismissed from the school.

This Autumn Term—one year later—she petitioned to return. She came to me asking for a letter in support of her petition. I wrote one, but got no reply. I also wrote a letter to her counselor in the Arts College suggesting I had a personal interest in this case and would like to be informed of the university's decision. I have never received any reply; not even an acknowledgement of my first letter. It is now the end of the second week of classes, and I have not seen the girl. I know nothing. I wonder whether I will pursue the matter further.

In conclusion, my feelings about the case are these. In the first place, I was never sure of my role in the situation, as I was simply a faculty member she knew well enough to come to for advice. Also, I was and am unsure of the facts in the case as she is my only source. Probably, her psychological depression, of which I learned later, made her the worst possible advocate of her case to the physics instructor and the Dean. Probably, the physics instructor and the Dean and I had quite different conceptions of the problem. It is likely that had there been opportunity for free communication among us, a more effective decision could have been made, even though it might still have included dismissal.

A similar situation, already reported in the section on Message, occurred at University 105. A student trying to drop courses went to see his dean and was turned down. He then invoked the support of an assistant adviser who believed his story that he needed to drop to avoid failing grades brought on by the death of his father. The adviser
did take direct action as suggested in the previous case, although she assumed the student to have been aggrieved by the "brutal" dean and wrote in that vein. The dean wrote back that the student's father was very much alive and the student was known to be a liar. Curiously, to this writer, the student who reported this incident was critical of the dean for not having "alerted the assistant adviser of the student's 'common knowledge'" reputation as a liar. It is difficult from the report we have on this one to know how prickly the adviser was in her communication to the dean. The lesson here is the advantage of checking, but the need to be wary of an aggrieved student's unlikely story; siding too quickly with the student may prove embarrassing.

A similar situation developed at University 132; it involved three very strong-minded characters: (1) a baseball coach, (2) a religion professor with a late afternoon course in which the student was enrolled, (3) the leading member of the baseball team who was more serious about studies than athletics (to the chagrin of the coach) and exasperated about "over-zealous" coaches. As this case was reported it is difficult to tell precisely who said what to whom, but these are approximately the facts leading up to the moment when various faculty members bypassed the student and turned it into a faculty controversy (and presumably out of the province of this paper):

(1) Student somehow emitted cues demonstrating his preference for studies over team practice sessions.
(2) Coach, fearing for team morale if his star was cavalier toward practice, rattled his sword a mite too loudly to suit the young short stop.

(3) Student reported coach's remarks to his religion professor with perhaps some interpretative embellishments which the coach later disavowed.

(4) Religion teacher consulted with several colleagues all of whom shared his appetite for instances of athletic departmental indiscretions.

(5) Professor then called (or wrote to) coach asking him if the report of what he had said was true.

(6) Coach asserted in writing he had done no more than urge habitual attendance at practice sessions when not in class; sent copies to athletic committee chairman, athletic director, dean's office.

(7) Professor checked back with student who stuck by original story.—Whereupon the episode took off like a cyclone, touching down unexpectedly for the rest of the school year without the student knowing; it had by this time taken on functional autonomy with a new cast of characters. It is worth noting that irrespective of what the coach originally said that he would not later admit to, or what the student reported inaccurately, perhaps to embarrass the athletic department, by communicating with the coach directly (bypassing the student channel), the professor served to keep both the student and the coach somewhat honest. His action kept the student controversy
to a minimum and gave both the coach and student, without
knowing which was how guilty, a chance to save partial
face.

The final case in this set is much like the others.
A new professor at University 118 "had a young man in class
who was excessively absent and excessively delinquent in his
pursuit of the academic goals of the course." Near the end
of the term he appeared with a slip permitting him to drop
without a failing grade. The professor, who reported the
incident, "became personally very irate": the dean "had
absolutely no right to do this sort of thing without first
consulting the [teacher]." At this point the latter called
the dean and requested a conference, bypassing the student
channel who had "told the dean a number of wild tales."
The professor tried "to be open, honest and frank" with
the dean. "Without the oral communication that was inserted
into the situation, there might have been a great deal of
discord and dissatisfaction among student, faculty and
administrator." As a footnote, it might appear that all of
the "dissatisfaction" belonged ultimately to the conniving
student who was bypassed in the communication and flunked in
the course.

We have tried to show in this section how important
communication channels can be in college controversies.
Normal channels should be kept working and used; but imagina-
tive participants will also try different channels. On a
stormy trip through unfamiliar mountains the experienced
traveller carries with him a variety of maps; at various points it may be useful to consult a topographical chart or mining trail plot rather than a AAA map showing only Interstate and U.S. highways. The storms of student affairs, by the same token, call for him who is well armed to be able to call to mind a communication plan of the campus and use it with sensitivity.

Cultural Background

Higher education in the United States is interrelated with the rest of society in complex ways difficult to delineate and describe. The concept of the lay governing board (trustees or regents) contributes more independence of thought and action than may be possible in countries where ministries of education are in control of universities. Moreover, where a culture permits student rampages against unpopular policies, universities have still a different relationship with the larger society. In America, trustees ideally mediate between the university and the greater society keeping one safe from debilitating attacks from the other without letting the university get so far ahead, or so far on a tangent, that it can no longer lead the society.

Correspondingly, as Knowler and Wagner pointed out, Communication behavior occurs in a particular culture. Its form and its meaning appear to be influenced by that culture. But it likewise is apparent that it has some degree of independence from the
culture in which it occurs for under certain circum-
stances it seems to modify cultural behavior.¹

Paraphrasing Linton,² Pepinsky and Pepinsky define
culture as "... the learned behavior manifested and
transmitted by the members of a particular society. ..."³

Berlo in his discussion of membership in social
organizations as a determinant of communication behavior
discusses the concept of cultural context of communication.

Culture is all man's shared beliefs, values, ways of
making things, ways of behaving. Culture includes
games, songs, and dances; the ways of building a
shelter, growing maize, and navigating a boat; the
structure and operation of families, governments,
and educational systems; the division of authority,
assignment of roles, and establishment of norms
within such systems; language, and all other codes,
and the shared concepts which are encoded; and a
complex of ways to pass itself along, to adapt
itself to changed environment, and to ensure through
social pressure and rewards the carrying out of its
imperatives. These shared behaviors and predisposi-
tions ... we call the cultural context.⁴

This section on the cultural background of communi-
cation in university controversies will necessarily deal
with the problem of subcultures within the institution.
It is commonly assumed by even the most distant observers
of contemporary colleges and universities in ferment that

¹Knower and Wagner, Communication in Educational
Administration, p. 9.

²R. Linton, The Cultural Base of Personality

³Harold B. Pepinsky and Pauline Nichols Pepinsky,
Counseling, Theory and Practice (New York: The Ronald Press

expectations and values do not just differ across the generation gap. Within faculties and student bodies there are great variations and conflicts within the dominant culture: freedom of the individual student vs. college rules, humanitarian mores vs. stopping Communism in Viet Nam, Horatio Alger vs. the Organization Man, the Organization Man vs. Timothy Leary, Martin Luther King vs. Bull Connor, H. Rap Brown vs. Martin Luther King. These and many other issues grow out of subcultural influences experienced by students, faculty members, administrators, regents, alumni, legislators and citizens who become embroiled in campus turmoil. The issues, and communication about them, tend in turn to create subcultures dedicated to ending a war, student power, excellence in athletics, continuation of fraternities, etc.

Knower and Wagner describe this phenomenon as a "two way interaction of culture and communication."¹

Schatzman and Strauss in discussing the difference in thought and communication between groups observe,

Men live in an environment which is mediated through symbols. By naming, identifying, and classifying, the world's objects and events are perceived and handled. Order is imposed through conceptual organization, and this organization embodies not just anybody's rules but the grammatical, logical, and communicative canons of groups. Communication proceeds in terms of social requirements for comprehension and so does "inner conversation" or thought. Both reasoning and speech meet requirements of criticism, judgment, appreciation, and control. Communication across group boundaries runs the danger--aside from sheer language difficulties--

¹Communication in Educational Administration, p. 9.
of being blocked by differential rules for the 
ordering of speech and thought.

To the extent there is a sense of community in a college 
or university (i.e., absence of inner group boundaries), 
this danger does not exist. Increasingly, however, as 
institutions grow in size a sense of community is more 
difficult to maintain. Many other factors contribute as 
well to a difficulty in communicating across the subcul-
tural boundaries of contemporary colleges. As one person-
nel dean (from University 87) stated in a letter to this 
writer,

The popular emphasis of our times on freedoms, 
rights, individualism, permissiveness, creativity, 
and activism has weakened man's response to reason 
(communication) whenever responsibility to the 
group is at stake.

These and other factors will be discussed in this section. 
The data yielded fifty-six separate statements about the 
cultural background of communication in controversies. 
Fourteen in addition to the one just above from University 
87 will be grouped in a discussion of assumptions and values 
of various groups within institutions, in a subcategory. 
Three cases disclose knowledge of the myths and distorted 
perceptions and expectations which make communication 
difficult. These will be followed in order by: sub-cultural 
shifts and their effects on communication (five cases), the 
functional autonomy of protesting (four cases), institutional

1 Schatzman and Strauss, "Social Class and Modes of 
Communication," p. 442.
expectations in how to behave in a controversy (five cases), and the effect of different frames of reference on communication (sixteen cases). Only nine of the fifty-five cases included in this section during the earlier part of the process seemed on later consideration not to merit inclusion here. They will each be dealt with elsewhere.

Assumptions and values of various segments of academe

In this subsection we shall set forth various conditions which emerged from the data; taken together they seem to comprise the mosaic of cultural background within which students, faculty and administrators must try to communicate with each other during moments of controversy. These data and the author's reading are necessarily incomplete. A study by Peterson for Educational Testing Service obtained systematically comprehensive information about colleges and student protests. After studying the responses of 849 deans of students, Peterson concluded,

Counterposed against this theme of an intelligent, independent, critically minded student input, there frequently stands a college or university with all of those unfortunate properties—large classes, faculty disinterested in teaching and the needs of students, intense competition for grades (and the consequent widespread cheating), bureaucratic dealings with students, in loco parentis control of personal life, and so forth—in the language of the disaffected, the rat race, the computerized conveyor belt, the phoniness of it all, and the hypocrisy. The point is that for many of these able students, their encounter with the university has been a disappointment; out of
frustration, many have looked off campus for sources of commitment that are more fulfilling.¹

On the day of this writing, one student member of a student-faculty judicial board, experiencing just such frustration asked plaintively, "Why can't the administration understand our need to establish relationships without being treated as children?!" This remark, uttered in a discussion of faculty rules on coeducational dormitory visiting, brings us to an important cultural component of the campus—the role of the administrator and others' feelings about him.

Hechinger in assessing factors in the Berkeley situation in March, 1965, referred to "American distrust of, and hostility toward, administrators" as "one of the crucial but hidden problems at Berkeley, and in all modern institutions."¹

The result is that the best people not only are often reluctant to undertake the task but, if they do, are also quickly turned into villains and targets of hostile action.

Those professors who have stepped into the administration to try to help stabilize the badly rocked boat are almost inevitably apologetic. They take pains to explain that they do not want to sell out their souls of teaching and research to the enemy of administration.

In addition to negative feelings about administration, there are other campus subcultural predispositions that affect communication on controversial topics. If they


distrust administrators, students tend to follow the lead of faculties, or at least the members of the faculty whose attitudes they share. Hechinger quotes Berkeley Sociologist Neil J. Smelzer who "... describes this problem as one of 'a strange ambivalence.' The students want total freedom from restrictions by the administration, but at the same time, they 'want to be clutched to the bosom of their professors,' ..."1 Given this tendency it is difficult for students to accept the faculty indifference to their desires. The sense of alienation students feel from professors who are involved in their research, consulting, committees and families is well known. Even when they do attract faculty attention to one of their expressed needs (e.g., freedom from social restrictions) they need to be prepared for the conservatism they may find. At least on the first attempt to gain passage of a proposal for change, students may be disappointed. The situations at Universities 82, 97 and 160 demonstrate this principle. All three concern visiting hours and have been set forth earlier. In each case students were in touch individually with faculty members who were favorable to the increased freedom being proposed. For whatever reason (age, reluctance to express disagreement, less contact out of class generally with students) the majority of faculty members did not communicate their point of view to the eager students. The natural

1Ibid.
tendency of students to seek only the views they want, is perhaps a factor in this unawareness that many professors are conservative. The shock and disenchantment that followed majority votes of faculties or student-faculty committees was evidence that student bodies should be introduced to this conservatism as a factor in their milieu.

"Many California citizens would rather see the university be 'respectable' than great," wrote Langer in analyzing the events at Berkeley in 1964-1965. "Many of the state's needs in agriculture, commerce and industry can be nearly as effectively serviced by a mediocre university as by an excellent one."

According to Friendly, conflicting assumptions by student demonstrators and university administrators account for the demonstrations and their intensity.

Central to every demonstration is an assumption by the students that they have a rightful place in the policy-making machinery of the institution. The severity of the demonstrations in many instances is a direct reaction to an administrative stand that policy-making is reserved exclusively to the administrators and regents or trustees of the school.

Within a given university there is likely to be wide variation in willingness to concentrate on the controversies of student life. At Berkeley in 1964, for example, FSM Symbol Mario Savio was willing to drop his courses in

---

1Langer, p. 4.

order to devote time to the aims of the movement. Most faculty members, committed to scholarship and teaching, paid to meet their classes and tutorials, are less likely to put things aside. Within faculty and student groups, moreover, there is less disposition to get involved in matters considered by some peripheral to their central mission; to the activists in both groups, the issues of social freedoms are fundamental to the character of the institution, hence to its scholarly life.

Another dimension of the culture of a campus is the kind of participation students, faculty, administrators and trustees have in the governance of the college or university, e.g., student and administrative membership on faculty committees, with or without vote; traditions of joint or community government (e.g., at Antioch College); tendency of regents or trustees to "provide for and sustain" the government of the institution rather than "be" the government.¹ Similarly the extent to which there is any faculty concern for and control over student life and rules (as distinguished from administrative control) is significant to the context in which communication occurs. The range on campuses known to this writer spreads from almost complete faculty control with all rules decided by vote of the entire faculty and all policies by a committee of the faculty to

¹Jerome C. Byrne, pp. 5, 19.
complete administrative domination with faculty members "hired to teach their courses."

The extent to which students and faculty take responsibility for student, faculty, administration and trustee rules and policies seems like another important cultural element. A number of cases disclosed a deepening unwillingness on the part of everyone to support rules made by someone else, made in a past student generation, or both. This tendency is rather recent in the modern era of student government. When coupled with the generation gap and natural reluctance to be a "fink" or to "cop-out," there is great strain placed on the framework within which the life of a university or college must go on. For example, from College 65 was reported a hiatus over reporting misconduct at student parties. The dean of students requires "... that the officers of the organizations are themselves responsible for the supervision of the conduct of students attending these events, and for reporting to me fully and without reservation on matters relating to their discharge of this responsibility." The dean wrote at some length how he sees this reporting as a normal expectation in contrast to student leaders who "... view such reporting as 'ratting' on their buddies."

I am uncertain why this lack of openness persists. There appears to be no objective reason why students should be anxious about reporting on their social affairs. I have never initiated any disciplinary action as a result of such reports, and I attempt to assure students that I would not, except in the most extreme circumstances. Are student leaders anxious
that perhaps I would insist on standards of conduct which they view as being too stringent? I have some indication that what I consider to be public and offensive drunkenness is viewed by some students as an accidental occurrence, for which no one should bear responsibility; or perhaps they feel that such instances are merely unfortunate and too trivial to warrant any concern, even to the extent of a verbal and unrecorded admonition. Or perhaps the problem is merely the immaturity of those who are so accustomed to hiding things from parents and teachers, that they can not readily enter into a relationship of trust and confidence with any authoritarian [sic] figure.

A similar conflict in values and expectations was evident at College 139 in a case involving freedom of the student press. Is it the function of the board of control to censor editorial content or to guarantee the freedom of the press, protecting the editors against those who would censor them? From College 142 a related question was raised by a case also concerning student journalism. Does freedom of the press give a news staff the right to print inaccuracies? In the first case, at College 139, the answer clearly was that the Board, along with the administration and trustees, should defend the editors' freedom of the press, irrespective of whose toes they stepped on, as long as the editorials were not obscene. At College 142, on the other hand, it was decided that freedom of the press did not give editors the right to print inaccuracies and then not correct them if the paper was the only one on campus and was subsidized by the college. Given the power of the student press, these two issues seem to be fundamental to any study of communication in campus controversies.
A case at University 137 described elsewhere in this study also discloses a fundamental expectation of students. They are idealists, by and large, and expect fairness and honesty in their dealings. If a student leader, administrator or professor fails to live up to that expectation, he will tend to alienate students from his position.

Finally in this potpourri of assumptions and values of all groups in contemporary colleges, some mention should be made of the presence of students from foreign cultures. There is no evidence from the data of this study that foreign students are playing an important part in student controversies. They are, however, often the cause of small controversies brought on by their differing expectations. Only one case of this kind was reported and it will be dealt with in the section on the communication facilitator.

Myths and distortions

Three cases yielded learnings about distorted expectations which make communication difficult when the battle lines are drawn on campuses. First, at University 125, students assumed the lines were always drawn between students and faculty members. The controversy concerned a proposed student evaluation of professors and courses. Excerpts from observations by the Vice President for Student Affairs follow.

Faculty were divided. Students were divided. (Some people were quite unfriendly.) . . . The argument went on . . . all year with some positions hardening, some shifting. Frankly, I think the advantage here
was the experience everybody gained in learning to live with and deal with others with whom they disagreed in a closely knit community. . . . Lines are divided. It is not a student vs. faculty vs. administration affair. For students to learn first hand that there is no faculty or administration "position" or "line" is important. God knows we achieved this. But not much else.

A squabble over fraternity rushing procedures has already been described in the section on Message. It also presents a classical example of an audience ascribing an unpopular message to the wrong source. As was discussed above, there seems to be a generic American suspicion of administrators. Therefore it was easy for students to assume that "the administration" was the author of an unpopular solution to the rush problem, whereas in reality it was the work of the interfraternity council. The proposal reflected council members' own attitudes, which happened to run parallel to those of the dean of students.

It would appear from a situation at University 92 that there exists an even stronger cultural predisposition to attribute unpopular decisions to an unknown bureaucracy than an administration that is known, as in the case just described. University 92 is part of a state system of colleges and universities. As described by a former student of this writer,

. . . many problems have been explained as resulting from decisions in [the state capitol] . . . as students became more and more aware of [the] impersonal structure in [the capitol city]. The president, a popular figure on the campus, was not able to convince the students that the decision (to increase the size of the institution by forty per cent 'even though there was not adequate housing') was his. He
Sensitivity to subcultural shifts

It is clear from the evidence in albeit a small number of cases that there are few, if any, eternal verities where contemporary students are concerned. In a fast-changing society, a so-called Silent Generation has given way to young instructors, assistant deans and student protesters against the old order. The consensus of those with power to set the structure will change; the makeup of the power group will also change. The kind of controversies that were studied for this dissertation can be used to detect shifts in values on campuses. Altercations over disciplinary decisions in particular tend to focus attention on values. What a campus considers serious misconduct reflects its mission and its self-image. What kind of penalties are levied reflects in turn how serious a threat to the institution various crimes are judged to be. How much power students, faculty members, deans, president and trustees have in making these judgments is also indicative of the character of an institution and what it considers in its best interests and those of its students.

At University 165, for example, a male was suspended from college for spiriting his girl friend to and from his dormitory room at a time not authorized for such visits. The man chose to have his case heard by a dean, but then
exercised his right of appeal to a student-faculty judicial board. The board set aside the suspension for reasons that differed among the majority. Several reported feeling that suspension was too harsh a penalty when there was no proof of sexual intercourse having occurred. The decision of the board was the third in as many months in which it had deviated from suspension from college, the traditional penalty for violations of the institution's very few rules. The ensuing furor involved most members of the community in a reassessment of their personal values and the expectations of the university; it disclosed shifts that were not visible a year before when the faculty had considered what the policy on coeducational visiting should be.

A similar institutional reexamination occurred at University 145 after two junior men "had stolen chemicals from their chemistry laboratory supplies and used them to make tear gas in a freshman men's dormitory which caused pandemonium there but insignificant damage." In the previous case extent of punishment was the problem; in this case the debate only touched on that issue and centered on judicial process and jurisdiction. Before it blew over, the debate had involved the following individuals and groups: the two malefactors, their parents and close friends; the Administrative Council which suspended the two; the campus newspaper and its editor who wanted the case handled by the "struggling men's student government organization in the dormitory"; the dean of students who was retiring that year;
individual members of the faculty who introduced a resolution in the Faculty Senate, which differed extensively from the Administrative Council; a Committee on Jurisdiction previously appointed by the president but now thrust into the forefront; the Student Court which "had never had cases other than those dealing with plagiarism or cheating"; "a young and very able professor . . . who was guiding [the Student Court] in a study of their function and a complete self-evaluation"; members of the Chemistry Department "loudly supporting" the suspension; the counselors in the freshman hall, under a great deal of pressure to recommend leniency, who "quietly stuck to their original assessment of the misconduct as being 'serious'"; a physician who stated that "even a small amount of the tear gas could have created a critical condition for one of the residents . . . [with a] peculiar respiratory condition"; the President who spent many hours hearing appeals from the men and their parents— he upheld the penalty of suspension. Both universities, after the protracted discussions, were able to move ahead with consensus as to institutional values and disciplinary procedures to be followed. The controversies seemed unavoidable, desirable in the long run though enervating at the time.

Sometimes such a shift of values renders one or more of a college's rules on student conduct obsolete. If so, it is well to detect the conflict between stated regulation and practice and begin a reassessment before a crisis
develops. College 122, for example, maintained a prohibition of alcoholic beverages. "The degree of violation became so great we felt a change was necessary," wrote the dean of men. "Extensive discussion" ensued at all levels, formal and informal, until the rules were brought into line with the values of the community.

In most institutions of higher learning, strong student feelings have recently found outlet in picketing. Where feelings of others produce counterprotesters or where the rights of other people have been hindered by demonstrators, explosive possibilities are inherent. At University 120 after the first such scramble between anti-war picketers and Viet-nam veterans, the dean of students wrote, "Urgent requests were brought to my attention that we needed to establish clear cut rules for picketing."

Within three weeks the student government was able to respond to the need by passing what the dean regarded as "a workable policy and procedure for both demonstrators and for other members of the community who might agree with or disagree with the demonstrators, and might be inclined to express their agreement or disagreement actively."

Finally, in responding to a subcultural shift, a dean acted much more forthrightly. The case, already detailed, concerns the ultimatum laid down by the dean of students at University 121 on the day after a water fight. Determined that tendencies toward such activity must be repressed, the dean decreed that there be no further fraternity participation
in water fights on the threat of "closing the doors of any group that was not able to impose an adequate discipline upon its members." This dean, recognizing the regressive nature of the waterfight behavior, acted to prevent its recurrence while in the two previous cases the deans took no stand; they simply set in motion forces to respond to the changing conditions. Often the tug of forces opposing the change will be about equal and opposite. Such situations can be very volatile and must be watched almost constantly in an era of massive change and accompanying turmoil.

Protests as highly valued elements of subculture

With great numbers of young people going on to colleges and universities and more dollars to support them there, the public has much more concern about higher education than it formerly did. To the extent that campus protesters oppose institutions and attitudes which pervade society at large, the latter feels threatened and curious. Reporters of the mass communication media know of this interest and seek to satisfy it in their news coverage. A student group planning a demonstration will invariably notify the local press and television stations and sometimes the national media. The result: something vague but tremendously exhilarating and satisfying happens personally to the individual protester. He has made the vast, impersonal society pause from its getting and spending to take note of his objections. The protest demonstration becomes
a highly personal part of the lives of the protesters and as such takes on functional autonomy. Just like the panty raids of the 1950's, protest demonstrations are almost required if a student body is to feel an adequate amount of self-respect. This institutional predisposition to keep up with their counterparts at other schools, to be known as a lively, concerned student body is certainly an element in the communication situation.

Closely coupled with the protest mode of a significant segment of students is the guiding principle of the radicals to seize upon any discontent or protest in order to seize power from the "establishment." Berkeley Sociologist William Petersen in discussing this phenomenon, paraphrased the principle:

If the whole of American society is evil, if our "alienation" from "the system," "the power structure," is total, as speaker after speaker blares forth through FSM loud-speakers, then where one begins to attack this monstrosity is important only in a tactical sense: the issue should be one able to attract the broadest support. ¹

That there was before the Berkeley crises of 1964-65 a plan to "begin an open, fierce, and thoroughgoing rebellion on this campus" is generally well known and is documented by Petersen and others. In the summer of 1966 at a conference of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in Iowa a working paper was presented by SDS regional organizer

Carl Davidson. It was entitled "Toward a Student Syndicalist Movement or University Reform Revisited" and was widely read. In it he proposed that such a movement dedicated to the "ideology of participatory democracy" try to avoid the mistakes of the past which he enumerates:

Forming Single Issue Groups . . . (dress regulations, only the hippies are bothered), . . . Organizing around Empty Issues (rules that aren't enforced anyway), . . . Our Fear of Being Radical . . . (We spend more time assuring our deans that 'we don't want another Berkeley' than we do talking with students about the real issues), . . . Working through Existing Channels (This really means, 'Let us stall you off until the end of the year') . . . Waiting for Faculty Support (like asking Southern Negroes to wait for White moderates), . . . Legal Questions (whether or not the university can legally abolish *in loco parentis*), . . . Isolate Ourselves (should see ourselves as organizing committees for the entire campus rather than retreating to our own 'happy hangouts'), . . . Forming Free Universities (We may be liberated . . . but . . . the "unfree" university . . . goes on cranking out corporate liberals), Working within Student Government (We should do this for one and only one reason--to abolish it).

Davidson proposes "that the student syndicalist movement adopt as its primary and central issue the abolition of the grade system." He sees grades as having the most potential appeal among students; and it "should serve as the 'umbrella' issue."

By the Summer of 1967 these radical observations and doctrines had been softened and incorporated into the National Student Association (USNSA) program for Student Power. NSA, in a fight for its life after disclosure of financial dependence on Central Intelligence (CIA), held a November, 1967, conference in Minneapolis. Delegates were
instructed in tactics of achieving what were called student rights and freedoms (speech, press, privacy of room and record, judicial, etc.). The emphasis was on wooing the majority of students who should want complete control over their non-academic lives and shared responsibility with the faculty for governing instructional matters. The Student Power, like other stages of the campus revolution, has its close parallel in, and takes its cue from, the civil rights movement.¹

All of this is in support of the point that the issue is not important except that it provides a vehicle for an attack on the power structure—that this rebellious, dissenting mentality has become an important part of academe. In his annual report for 1967 Harvard President Nathan M. Pusey contrasts orderly protesters with "a small group of overeager young in evidence on many campuses in recent years who feel they have a special calling to redeem society." The protests "are seen as so many battles in a great revolutionary war they hope and fondly imagine is

¹Cf. excerpts from this article by a black teacher at California State College at Los Angeles, Jerry Farber. "Students are niggers. When you get that straight, our schools begin to make sense. It's more important, though, to understand why . . . (and get) past the zone of academic bullshit, where dedicated teachers pass their knowledge on to a new generation, and into the nitty-gritty of human needs and hang-ups. And from there we can go on to consider whether it might ever be possible for students to come up from slavery."
already taking shape." Calling them Walter Mittys of the left, he continues:

Their arguments start with the assumption, which they invariably call their 'analysis,' that western society, and especially American society, is rotten through and through and that, this being so, all a sensible person can do is to wish for and to do whatever he can to hasten its demise.

After studying the carefully prepared, forty-five page report of a commission on an outbreak at University 86 a further comment seems necessary. Even though protesting is the popular and expected behavior of many college students, all but the most hardened activists seem to feel considerable unease. The forces toward resolution ultimately overpower those which set off the warring students as the cognitive dissonance¹ becomes intolerable. There undoubtedly are not the close relationships there once were between teachers, students and administrators. Indeed the size and complexity of many universities coupled with competing demands for professors' time has created a sense of alienation among students. They are angry because they feel alienated. Still, and this is difficult to document, one gets the impression from reading of these student controversies that most still would jump at the opportunity to resolve a crisis—especially when their teachers were to be involved. The need to be noticed by the faculty comes on as one of the strongest subcultural forces on American campuses today.

¹See Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance and Conflict, Decision, and Dissonance.
Institutional expectations emphasized

The force of traditions, where these exist, is a tremendous one to be used in coping with controversies. At University 113, two strong traditions were focused as forces in a major melee. One was the tradition of faculty legislative power, the other of responsible protest and orderly disagreement through normal channels. One of the main functions of the president and chancellor who refused to be drawn in to the fray was to articulate and invoke these valuable university traditions. To the extent that these are traditional to all American higher education and useful in disturbances threatening to get out of hand, one or both these traditions could well be invoked for almost any university in time of crisis. For example, at University 44, a less developed institution in many ways, a similar plea was made based on such traditional values and expectations, to head off a panty raid. Indeed these can be codified as they are at University 75 so that when a controversy is brewing all of the expectations are there to be consulted and hopefully followed: everyone who wants to protest, picket, etc., will apply for a license from the dean of students. Similarly, even if no explicit rules governing protest have been passed, ad hoc guidelines can be useful if they grow out of a set of principles shared within the institution. Except in extreme instances when protesters are too angry at "the establishment" to behave according to
its traditional expectations, such guidelines can be drawn up quickly and serve effectively to avoid a major embrangle-
ment. Such was the case at University 113 and College 166 where similar expectations were articulated and agreed upon.

The antithesis of such agreement occurred at University 129 and was intolerable in a university. Student agitators were taunting and harassing deans and professors who were unable to keep order and enforce their rules. According to one professor, a refugee from Nazi Germany, such a situation is the mark of a totalitarian society, reminiscent of the Hitler Youth and the Red Guards. If such a pass is reached at an American university, the fear of what it represents can evoke a reaction from decent students and faculty into a common position against the taunters.

*Communication and frame of reference*

To state explicitly what is implied above, effective communication may be possible in student controversies if both sides are operating within the same frame of reference. As a college administrator sitting in on student senate meetings over a period of years, this writer has heard a myriad of discussions on recurrent subjects. On a given proposition, for example, the outcome (if any) might be quite different if one side fails to grant the efficacy of faculty power than if both sides assume it as part of the game. Take the aforementioned University 113 Selective
Service squabble, for example. The general student opposition to Korean War policies took different forms: the moderates were eager to have the faculty revise the policies along the lines of the student desires; but the militants, hostile to the concepts of faculty government, selective service and war, were trying to provoke a crisis that would serve to transform society in general and the university in particular. The key to such an equation, as will be discussed later, seems to be to negotiate with the moderates while combining with them to keep the militants bottled up.

At Berkeley in 1964 a new era in American higher education was ushered in. The prime value was no longer placed on law and order as it had been during the decade of the 1950's when President Eisenhower so often demonstrated a preference for upholding the law than for transforming the status quo on principle. As Sociologist Nathan Glazer observed a few months after the Berkeley turmoils began:

... the present student constellation differs markedly from that of only a few years ago, and thus a radically new style was adopted for this newest conflict with the administration over political activity.

The great new factor has, of course, been the civil rights movement, and particularly the development of the new techniques of civil disobedience, which opened up the lunch counters of the South. . . .

Never before had American students dissatisfied with university policies asserted, as Mario Savio did, that they would grind the machine to a halt.

---

1Glazer, "What Happened at Berkeley?" p. 42.
As was mentioned earlier in the section on Language, the Berkeley fracas became the prototype for such conflicts that are perceived by one side from a frame of reference different from the other. This problem will be dealt with also in the discussion of principal communicators in college controversies. It should be stressed here that flexibility is required: clearly, from studying the data, administrators trying to deal with student radicals intent on toppling old assumptions (and maybe old administrators too!) must behave differently from the days when "keeping the lid on" referred to one night water fights or panty raids. Thorough understanding of law enforcement and judicial procedures, careful rehearsal of his own role and a cool head seem essential. The administrator needs to decide often on the field of battle whether or not meaningful communication at the personal level is possible and if not, how best to use the power and resources at his disposal. Before proceeding with the alternatives let us consider an extreme point of view. It grows out of a frame of reference quite hostile to present day American society, its war and its universities. The writer, a Midwestern Mario Savio, has permitted it to be excerpted here from a letter to a professor at an Eastern University. The latter had spoken on improving the quality of the university that the student had been visiting. In his letter he contends, at great length, that the society and the university are too bound up in each other to make possible the "purifying" of the university while the society
is so corrupt. He is discussing freedom and "the meaningfulness of the choices involved."

... there is no right or freedom to do unjust and inhuman things. No Marine has the right or freedom, if properly defined, to burn a village in Vietnam. Nor is their [sic] any right to recruit for inhuman ends. Determination of the meaning of morality and liberation is not capricious; and for that reason, we can make judgements of right and wrong. One is free when he does things which are humanly beneficial and unfree when he does things which are humanly repressive.

Personnel and institutions which act against human ends do not have the right or freedom to do so. More properly, in their activity, they are doing unfree things in that they are themselves unfree and often may deprive others of their freedom. The Marines do not have a right to recruit or kill on the behalf of American repression and enslavement. Students and all human beings have the right to oppose domination of human life and in fact are free to the extent that they act in opposition to the repression of others. At the same time, people can be said to be acting in order to become free in that their action in opposition to the repression of institutions or personnel devoted to humanly destructive ends is the result that they are unfree as long as destructive institutions or personnel exist.

Students are free to and freed in the blocking of American military recruiters on campus. The recruiters are not free to engage in destructive ends like the war in Vietnam or to solicit personnel to continue that destruction and negation of freedom. ... Any kid who would enter ... the Marines to kill someone in Vietnam or act on behalf of the repression of American established power is enslaved by the irrationality of power and becomes less free as he continues to engage in the destructive unfreedom of the military institution. Persons blocking the recruiters should emphatically explain that the Marine Corps has no right to recruit, that only those who oppose institutions like the Marine Corps are becoming freer. The University is unfree to the extent that it represses its students for acting freely. Students who block the interviewers are not interfering with anyone's rights; in fact they are asserting themselves on behalf of rights and freedom.
A few weeks before the preceding words were written, their writer played a major part at University 167 in one of the most bloody protest-riots in the current rash. One can imagine that he was not to be reasoned with as his forces moved to block the way between recruiters and those who would be interviewed. Later as forces were out of control, militants attacked policeman and nightsticks were flying, the young writer was heard yelling wildly, "You [blankety blanks]! you goons! We'll come back and kill you! . . . violence has always been successful in this country! . . ."

Contrast the kind of "communication" that would be required in dealing with someone operating from such a frame of reference with the communication that might be effective with a second student, a pacifist, on the same unhappy day. He reported,

A person can become lost when bombarded with so many ideas. I picketed but didn't go inside because I kept thinking about getting kicked out of school. I decided to wait until we were asked to disband, then I would leave. When I heard those unbelievable screams and nightsticks I felt sick. Then I saw my friend Steve practically in shock, wandering away from the building with blood all over him. I felt hatred toward the whole situation, not just the cops. Then the paddy wagon came up close to the building. It was so exciting I couldn't leave. I can't explain why I couldn't leave. I hated what was happening to the cops as much as to the students.

Many people felt they were pacifists until they saw the violence; then they entered in. For me it was the opposite. If I picked up the bottle and started swinging it would be part of the game: violence just isn't the way of achieving your aims. But I was so mad at the situation. . . .

1These reports are quoted from a symposium on "The Sociology of the ________ Riots," present by the
The point of these contrasting testimonies is to show the range of receptivity even among protesters in a single out-of-control melee. When an administrator, or policeman, finds that communication is indeed possible in such a situation (and therefore in a less violent controversy as well) he should work to modify the other side's frame of reference by persuasion; if he cannot, he should be legalistic and use whatever force he has to. These six cases describe such attempts to explain and persuade; they are followed by three in which legalism and force were used.

In the Berkeley Free Speech struggles it became apparent that neither the administration nor the FSM steering committee was going to persuade the other to change its frame of reference so that reconciliation and peace could occur. While the chancellor alternately remained obdurate and equivocated, the radical leaders managed to get the attention of the Passive Giant, the Berkeley Faculty. As discussed earlier in the section on Timing, the dimensions of the controversy were changed quickly when the faculty finally listened, accepted the students' substantive (if not procedural) frame of reference. Force, violence and legalism were no longer needed by the students as the faculty took up the cause legislatively.

The same sort of persuasion is occurring on many campuses in controversies over parietals, drinking rules, Lawrence University Speakers Forum at Appleton, Wisconsin on December 3, 1967.
women's hours, and the like, as the old idol *in loco parentis* comes toppling down. At College 168, alternating between angry violence, impasse and effective negotiation, the student body succeeded after four years of sustained effort to bring about changes in College drinking and visiting rules. They also succeeded by involving a faculty, like Berkeley's, long dissociated from problems of student life. Seldom did one see an issue of the student newspaper without coverage of one of the two issues—usually both. In less than a year after an editorial demand for the resignation of the president and deans, one of the deans was gone and there was legal drinking and visiting in student rooms. The change was approved by the trustees in spite of a preference poll of alumni opposing the liberalization. The students were indefatigible, if at times impatient, in working to change the college's frame of reference from one of Puritanical moralism acting *in loco parentis* to one where students were "free to experiment" and "develop their personal relationships in private." The administrative attitude changed from "repressiveness" to "reasonableness."

At nearby College 159 the students had won a campaign for coed visiting only to lose it when a new administration took over. A sustained attempt to regain the visiting privileges four years later ended in frustration and demoralization, so force was attempted. When a "visit-in" failed to change the policy and resulted in disciplinary action, there was talk of mass transfers; but
soon both sides went back to trying to change each others' (and those few neutrals') frame of reference.

A slightly different twist occurred in a squabble, previously described, at College 83. The announced decision of a dean of women was savagely attacked by some students whose special interest would be diminished. After much confusion, during which too much attention centered on personalities and behavior and too little on the merits of the question, the president decided the question in favor of the dean. To clarify the situation she quietly reasserted the rationale for her original position and her willingness to review it in the future.

Applicable here is the case already discussed in the section on Amount of Communication concerning publicity vs. privacy in disciplinary cases at College 91. The dean described their "very rigid policy against putting out any information publicly." Their feeling "that we must protect the interest of the student involved and the confidentiality in the situation often put us in the position of being unable adequately to counter the wild rumors that constantly flew around the campus when such episodes occurred." As was emphasized earlier, much time was devoted by the deans "with student leaders in confidential sessions over the process and our reasons for refusing to reveal information."

We spent endless hours on these cases and leaned over backwards to give the student every break we could. Sometimes we were in the position of seeming to defend somebody that the students thought should have been much more severely disciplined. It seemed
that no matter what we did because of lack of communication we were always in the wrong so far as the rumors were concerned. It wasn't a happy situation, but eventually it won us the respect of the students and I think basically their trust as well.

This case seems particularly important here because not only did the deans do what they felt they had to do in any given case, and maintain the privacy of the disciplined students in spite of the different frame of reference of the students at large, but they also succeeded in changing the frame of reference.

A number of cases concerned controversial speakers--most of them the late George Lincoln Rockwell. From them one might infer that he was one of the most educative forces in America--so many post-World War II student bodies, eager to test speaker policies and derive some public excitement, found their frame of reference radically changed by the Rockwell experience. At University 72, for instance, "the majority of the audience [had been made] knowledgeable of the propaganda devices used by Rockwell to denunciate [sic] democracy . . . and . . . to anger and incite them. . . ."

At College 170, after trying unsuccessfully to dissuade a student organization from sponsoring a Rockwell performance, a handful of students and faculty succeeded in building a frame of reference optimum to their purposes. The Interfraternity Council officers sponsored a film rented from the Anti Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. A group of faculty liberals put out flyers, rented a full page ad in the local press and picketed the hall in sub-zero weather.
One professor, at his own expense, had reprinted and widely distributed copies of an exhaustive interview with Lincoln Rockwell by a Negro journalist writing for *Playboy*. All of this was seen as preferable to the demands of other faculty and trustees that the student group not be allowed to bring Rockwell. It was also seen as better education than the proposal on the other side that nothing much be said to attract attention to the event. Because of the way it was handled, the Rockwell presence was anticlimactic in the frame of reference that had been built.

And finally in this group of cases is one in which a reasonable, but unsuccessful, attempt was made by a dean to change the students' frame of reference. The case, at College 42, concerning the introduction of women to a small campus of science and engineering students, is reported by the dean.

**The Setting**

The language problem at [College 42] has always been present. We are a predominantly male society, with the resulting borderline obscenities accepted in casual conversation. Our few women students have either ignored it or participated as equals, depending on their own desires. This past year, however, we added some 150 girls to the campus environment when we agreed to feed this number of students from adjoining [insert college name]. The initial reaction was favorable; language and conduct improved, and the campus lost some of its "stag" qualities.

This spring matters changed suddenly when two of the dormitories sang "off color" songs at the Spring Sing—sufficiently so, that even some of the participants regretted the choice of songs after the fact. Then came the episode concerned.
The Episode

A small group of students posted large signs in the dormitory area of the College announcing that a "Schwantz" contest would be held next Saturday night. While the wording was vague, the common desired interpretation was that the dorms were to compete to see in which dormitory the [most] number of women could be "conquered." There was in almost no one's mind, I think, any feeling that the contest would actually be held; it was instead something proposed to shock the girls who walked through the dorm complex on their way to and from meals.

It succeeded. One girl wrote a letter urging all her friends to stay away from the dorms that Saturday and sent copies to some male students. They responded by an open letter which included slander, and vulgarity. The campus took sides: many students, including some who had tried to prevent the distribution of the letter, felt it had gone beyond the limits of decency, while others thought it was all good fun. The Dean's position was obvious; starting with the Spring Sing, the matter of language had to be faced!

Communications

For what the Dean thought were valid reasons, he decided to give the case of the "letter" to the student Judiciary Board. Concurrently, he and his assistant made a point of talking with as many students as they could, both individuals and groups although not directly with the members of the Judiciary Board. Few if any minds were changed: I doubt if any person really changed sides. And the Board, composed of some of the most responsible students on campus--some, indeed, in whom the Dean has the most confidence--voted unanimously to dismiss the case and to make only a very weak statement about improving the tone of student language in the year ahead.

Analysis

In retrospect, I feel confident that communication failed to change minds because we were talking without any prior agreement as to definitions. Once in an emotional crisis situation, definitions are hard to achieve; we could not define the "right" or "wrong" of certain language when it means in effect the judging of conduct. I think we could have made these definitions if they had been made without the judgement factor involved.
We all know that the area of student values is a tough one to arbitrate—probably the hardest any Dean faces. And communication in this area is undoubtedly the most difficult. Somehow we must, I think, try to agree on definitions not about what is best for an individual but rather what is best for the total campus, and hope that the student population can realize that the total campus includes more than students. And so it might also be that in the case above, we (the administration—the students) differed on the basis of our decisions and were unable to gain objectivity in this area: the Dean asking what was good for the College, and the students asking what was right for the individual. We had not only failed to define our terms in advance, we had failed too, to define our frame of reference adequately. [emphasis added]

This case, along with the fraternity obscenity case at College 28 and the hell week episode at College 171 (see below) show how easy it is to be operating in a different frame of reference, faculty from students. The faculty and deans, without "prior agreement," cannot club students to accept institutional expectations all at once. So the choice becomes one of giving up and waiting till another day, as the dean at College 42 did, seemingly thankful for the lesson learned; or, if one judges that he cannot wait (the principles involved are too urgent!), to use force.

At College 28, in a case of obscenity already detailed in other parts of this chapter, the Dean of the College worked carefully with and through his assistants, his faculty Committee on Administration, the student government and IFC. When it was clear he could not reach agreement as to acceptable conduct, he took the matter to the faculty committee who overruled the puerile action of the student judiciary. By so doing the faculty standards were
established, but the last item in the dean's journal of this affair reads, "Dean meets with [student government] to begin picking up the pieces."

At College 171 two hazing incidents occurred one night; both were clearly at variance with the Preinitiation Creed agreed to five years earlier by the fraternities and the faculty Committee on Administration. The implementation of the creed had called for adjudication by the Interfraternity Council and review by the Committee. The document in which the creed was embodied had been reissued annually to all new fraternity men and the several chapters, so there was no secret as to its precepts and provisions. The dean of men and his assistant had known of no incidents of violations in the intervening five years and were genuinely surprised and concerned when the two miscarriages were made known. They were even more concerned when, in spite of their forthright urging, the IFC declined in three successive meetings to acknowledge that disciplinary action was in order: their frames of reference were simply too disparate. Reluctantly, then, the dean of men referred the case to the Committee on Administration which proposed to the faculty that all hazing be prohibited and that no period of intensification be allowed. Whether the power to handle violations should be taken away from the IFC was the only question seriously debated in the faculty meeting. This case, which comes from the professional experience of this writer, demonstrates how difficult it
is, even by such decisive legislative action, to reen- 
culturate a student population. Two years after the afore- 
mentioned events, some fraternity men were still complaining 
about their deprivation. Predicting that the lack of group 
spirit previously engendered by the hazing would mean the 
death of fraternities, the most vocal were citing the 
"legitimate needs" of the freshman pledges (to be hazed) 
in order to establish the validity of hazing a pledge class. 
Among the fraternity men there were three frames of reference: 
(1) that of men who agreed with the faculty point of view 
and action and who decried the lack of imagination shown by 
the fraternities in finding alternate means of developing 
fraternal spirit; (2) one that disagreed with the faculty 
strenuously but did not approve of rule breaking; they 
proposed requesting the faculty to modify the legislation 
to allow "controlled" hazing; and (3) one disposed to push 
the rule as a means of saving the fraternity movement on 
the campus and, by common practice, erode the rule pro-
hibiting hazing. As the dean in this case, this writer can 
testify how time consuming it is to get a student population 
to accept a new frame of reference when the old one has 
meaning for them. No matter how much communication is tried, 
what is probably required is force in holding the line while 
an entire student generation is replaced by neophytes who 
know not the old.

Finally in this section are two of the several 
cases involving the New Student Left; as much as any segment
of the university their frame of reference is likely to vary from that of the dean. Given their fundamental assumptions (1) that the university is too much a handmaiden of a sick society dominated by an entrenched power structure and (2) that individual freedom is of higher value than any institutional rules, especially those made without the consent of the governed, there are bound to be numerous instances where normal negotiation and persuasion will not work. The handling of these two cases, both at large universities, commends them as models of modern decanal diplomacy. For the first, already reported in detail, the reader is referred to pages 119-21; it is the case of the defiant lady editor at University 43. When the student editor seemingly "broke off communications in order to test the limits of authority in the dean," the latter was troubled but knew he must act. For his forthright handling of the situation he seemed "to have come out of this as a dean with an enhanced reputation among both students and faculty. . . ."

In the case of a direct, public confrontation, the dean must be even more careful to find the narrow path between illegal misuse of his power and failure to use it when it is needed. The case at University 47 involving members of the hard leftist W. E. B. DuBois Club is a good example. It occurred in the context of a statewide furor over the recognition by the state university of "any group whose Parent national organization has been declared by the Subversive Activities Control Board to be Communist-
dominated or as to which such charges have been formally filed before the SACB by the Attorney General. . . ." The situation attracted the attention of practically everyone on the campus, so when the dean of students walked up to the table where two men (one student and one university employee) were illegally distributing DuBois literature, he was very much in a campus- and state-wide spotlight. For an example of how carefully he introduced himself by position and arranged his remarks, please see the excerpt from his report quoted in the section of this chapter on Arrangement of Communication, page 38. Throughout, the dean applied the rules firmly, very deliberately and legalistically. He spelled out orally what he was doing at each step and followed through with a written record for the offenders of what he was doing. He was in close touch with the university counsel whose job it might be to defend the action in the courts. The excessive legalism which characterized this case as it dragged through the Student Conduct Committee is a bit frightening to read. It goes beyond the purview of this study and its text is too long to reproduce here. None the less, whether the truth lies with "the establishment" or the civil liberties lawyers, the frames of reference are widely different and communication must take the difference into account.

Summary

This section includes an examination of some assumptions, expectations and values which provide the cultural
background for the communication in contemporary college and university controversies. Included too were some of the myths and distorted perceptions that emerged from the data. Several cases were cited to show the importance protesting has assumed and several more dealt with old and new institutional traditions of handling discord; their usefulness in keeping protests in check was manifest. Finally several cases were used to show how important it is to assess the frames of reference of the various participants in controversies.

**Type and Pattern of Communication**

This section deals with the form the communications took during the controversies reported. The number of possible patterns is almost infinite. At the outset a suggestive list for this study was compiled.

**Forms of Written Communication:** letter, memorandum, notice, news story, feature story, political satire, letter to the editor, guest editorial, cartoon, open letter, minutes of a meeting, placard, etc.

**Forms of Oral Communication:** public address, debate or discussion (public, committee or private, in person or broadcast), dialogue, press conference (or other form of question and answer), counseling, institutionalized free speech area (e.g., Hyde Park Corner), legislative session, social or political drama.

In addition we knew there would be many homegrown mutations deriving from the needs of a particular campus or controversy. Some of these did emerge from the 170-some controversies. Still others were mentioned in commentaries sent
by correspondents who, for one reason or other, chose not
to send a case but instead to describe how they communicate
on their campuses. Some of these have already been included
in the section on Channels; others are included here in the
subsection on Innovative Types, of which nine are given.

Altogether there were ninety-one descriptive state-
ments or learnings about communicative types, forms or
patterns. More had to do with speech forms than written
ones. The largest number, nineteen, described ad hoc, one-
time, invitational meetings called to deal with a controversy.
Only six statements made mention of regularly constituted
committees and councils. Eleven involved public meetings
of various kinds. Four concerned conversation, private one
to one counseling, etc. Among the written forms, six are
grouped in a category "Written Recommendation or Request";
eight under "Prepared Statement with News Value"; and eleven
were noted because someone kept a written record of the
controversy. Nine were grouped because of a change that
occurred in the communicative pattern during the controversy
(there is necessarily some overlap here with the "Innovative
Types" group). One protest was notable, and has been singled
out in several sections previously, for the effective use of
a combination of demonstration guidelines and continuous
personal contact between the protest leaders and top admin-
istrators. Finally, six of the statements included here
earlier were found, on further examination, not to be primar-
ily applicable to this section.
**Single, ad hoc conferences**

To the extent that the cases studied for this dissertation are representative of controversies involving students in American colleges and universities, it seems clear that one of the best, if not the best, devices to deal with unrest is a simple conference. The instances in which administrators and students sat down to explore a problem together, with perhaps faculty members and others concerned also present, were among the most satisfactorily resolved. Admittedly there may be some spurious factor operating in the way the data were solicited, provided or analyzed, as discussed in the chapter on Methodology. The overwhelming evidence seems to favor someone's inviting students and others concerned to hear the facts, or explore the problem, examine various ways of proceeding, chart a course, or a combination of these. Reasons why such meetings seem to work will be suggested as each case is presented briefly. Other possible factors will grow out of the discussion in the next section on the Communicators themselves. Surely an attitude in administrators of willingness to meet with troubled students is significant; so is the dignity accorded students by the fact of such meetings and the demeanor of administrators in them. The feeling of their lowly estate is a difficult one to live with for students brought up in a democratic society. The impersonality and complexity of the society and the university create feelings of alienation and lack of control over their destinies. So,
when a problem arises, if they, or their spokesmen, are invited to discuss the matter in good faith, much reassurance can be gained. Furthermore, if the problem is resolved as a result of the meeting, the feelings of satisfaction and tension reduction are even more concrete. The nineteen cases will be presented in this order: first twelve quickly called meetings to discuss significant, but not earth shaking, problems; three top-level meetings involving the president of the institution or other ranking dignitaries (one of these was replicated for several groups of students); and third, three instances of more serious problems at large institutions where the attitude of the president toward meeting with students was a key factor in the outcome. This last group will be introduced here, to be discussed more fully in the section of this chapter on the president as communicator and in the chapter on conclusions. First let us consider the dozen quickly called, not-so-high-level meetings.

At University 1 what appeared to be a power-consolidation was under way in the student council. One evening the party in power, within minutes, proposed and passed a measure requiring candidates for student body president to have served one year on the council. The adviser, new to the position, "felt it unwise to express himself on the matter during the meeting." After the meeting, however, he called the dean of students. It was agreed the adviser would talk to the student president and point out the
disadvantage of ruling out ninety eight per cent of the seniors each year from running. The president, however, was too committed to the plan, "because of both personal feelings and because he was a member of the party in power," to reconsider. At this point, as a tempest was brewing over the matter, the dean of students called a meeting with the council president and adviser. After considerable discussion the dean proposed an alternate plan for special training sessions to be required of candidates. It was made evident to the president that his plan would likely backfire, as indeed it was at that moment in the editorial room of the student paper. After a scathing editorial, the dean's compromise plan was unveiled and the matter was resolved as hoped for in the dean's meeting.

A similar compromise was effected in a case at University 18. The problem involved a service project to aid displaced people in South Viet Nam which was unfortunately dubbed by its student sponsors as "Peace Offensive." This theme "was viewed as somewhat controversial by members of the administration."

After discussing the project with members of the student personnel staff, the students agreed to change the name of the project and proceed with the collection. Although the discussion . . . resulted in increased understanding of both sides of the question, the students had changed the name of the project somewhat reluctantly. The project itself proved to be a tremendous success.

At College 27 such a meeting was preceded by a private session at which the Dean of the College spelled
out for the chaplain the relationship between organizations and their advisers. The problem had arisen when the chaplain collaborated with the student senate to call a meeting of housing unit presidents to discuss dress regulations. The plan ignored the senate adviser and the fact that Associated Women Students (AWS) had the topic under study.

The meeting resulted in further suggested meetings to be called as well as an assembly... the faculty sponsor of the Student Senate... resigned, students were disturbed, action was impeded, and animosities were created. The AWS felt their just rights had been infringed upon.

The Dean of the College then took over, advised the chaplain on the nature of things, and called a meeting of all concerned. They agreed "to suspend further action until the AWS could offer their suggestions. The sponsor of the Senate was reinstated..."

In an incident at University 87 already described in the section on Timing, the dean of students by a succession of conferences solved the problem.

Our librarian decided to close the library one hour earlier during weeknights last year. Operating funds were limited. No conferences or public explanation preceded the occasion. A student sit-in was planned and ready for action. A quickly made phone call to student leaders urging delay in action and conferences with student government leaders, the librarian, the president and business manager resolved the financial need, retained the library hours and averted a library sit-in for longer use of the library.

A case at University 88 will be described here and referred to later in our treatment of written forms of communication. The meeting was quite satisfactory, but an
open letter to students was delayed twice: twelve days elapsed between the meeting and its being written, and it spent another fourteen days in the mimeograph room. The context of its issuance was thus different from what was intended three weeks before. The case is reported chronologically by the dean of students.

October 11, 1966

Eight hundred students were milling around a bonfire blazing illegally on Fraternity Row. When the firemen arrived to put out the flames the students responded by throwing rocks and bottles at the firemen.

October 16, 1966

Four hundred residence hall men made a half-hearted attempt to conduct a panty raid on the women's halls with bullhorns and much shouting. Not much happened but the students enjoyed the excitement and couldn't understand why the residence hall administration was concerned.

October 21, 1966

Alarmed by the casual attitude students were seemingly taking toward unruly mass crowd activities and related near-violence the Dean of Students called a meeting with top student leaders, Fire Department, and Police Department officials. After much discussion the Dean agreed to distribute an open letter to the student body pointing out the problems and penalties involved in this type of behavior. The letter . . . did not specifically ban impromptu rallies and bonfires but did say that certain specific behavior could lead to disciplinary action. In addition the letter called the attention of the reader to current police practices and policies which might affect students in crowd situations. The letter was written on November 1 but was held up in the mimeograph department. The student leaders at the meeting were to discuss it with members of their groups.
November 11, 1966

While the letter was being mimeographed a group of students held a spontaneous demonstration (picketing) at a Navy on-campus exhibit of a guided missile. No University action was taken.

November 14, 1966

The letter was distributed to fraternities, sororities, residence halls, and student organizations. Most of these groups had been informed of its contents in advance and had discussed it. No mention was ever made of the letter in the student newspaper but, despite the widespread distribution, the following interpretations were made by a number of students:

a. The Dean had banned all spontaneous rallies and bonfires, a cherished tradition.

b. The Dean had banned all orderly campus demonstrations or picketing.

The reaction in both instances was "Well, we'll show him!"

Epilogue: The letter was explained to those angry enough to check on it and the furor died down. No tests of the supposed "new" administrative rule eventuated.

Sometimes such a furor is necessary, this writer would observe, in order to have students notice such a policy, especially when the student newspaper declines to give it coverage. In any case, the dean's meeting and letter, with or without the delay and the changed context, seem to have been effective in calling attention to the problem. And, as noted in the section on improvised human communication channels, the student leaders at the meeting made it so.

A much simpler case of a problem-solution meeting is here reported in the words of a student.
BASIS OF CONFLICT:

The students of [College 104], an all-female institution, desired a smoking area on campus; the College administration considered smoking "unladylike" and thus did not favor the project.

COMMUNICATION OF PROBLEM:

Complaints by neighbors who saw girls smoking on the curbs outside of school were registered with the Police Department.
At Student Council meetings the problem was discussed.
At Alumni meetings the problem was discussed.
At informal meetings of students the problem was frequently discussed.

SOLVING THE PROBLEM THROUGH COMMUNICATION:

A Committee composed of administrative and Student Council members researched the feasibility of establishing ventilation in the non-resident student lunch room, so as to handle smoking. It was discovered that the project was neither involved nor costly. Shortly thereafter the Student Council voted and approved the establishment of a smokers lounge in the lunch room available to all students who wished to use it.

University 103 concerns a new administrator's reinterpretation of drinking rules. In effect he created a new rule, although he claimed not to have. The uproar was predictably loud, both to the rule and the method. In the new vice president's own words,

The leaders of student organizations were invited to a hurriedly called conference chairmained by the Vice President for Student Affairs, attended by the Chief of Police and by the Director of Student Activities. At this spontaneous venture policies were explained and questions answered. A second meeting to be held the next night was arranged and again more questions and answers were waged.

... the ultimate outcome seemed to have been one of favor through understanding and cooperation than
if there never had been an explosion. Good faith was established and a basis for future dialogue was achieved.

One wonders, from the facts given, how this happened. Perhaps the cognitive dissonance developed by the policy "interpretation" was a factor; perhaps also the newness of the vice president who succeeded an overly permissive vice president whose tenure had created very bad morale on the campus. In any event the meetings seem to have achieved their purpose and the vice president seemed unlikely to surprise the students with more new policies without consulting them in advance.

A rather straightforward case happened a number of years ago when student rivalries were apolitical.

At [College 112] we have had considerable rivalry among the classes, particularly between the junior and senior classes, as they have vied over the years for possession of an 800# cement slab known as "the senior bench." . . . rivalry over possession of the bench has caused much activity and some resultant danger to the participants. Accordingly, it seemed necessary to establish some ground rules for junior-senior class rivalry. The former Dean of Students appointed a committee chaired by one of the most respected seniors . . . to draw up clearly defined rules or guidelines which would govern the rivalry over the bench and other class activities. The committee, composed of members of both the junior and senior classes, drew up the guidelines which were then submitted to members of the class and have been used over the years as a standard for class rivalry.

One of the most remarkable of ad hoc meetings to this writer has been mentioned earlier in this chapter. It is also applicable here. The problem grew out of a "mid-spring water fight" at University 121. The fight
which began among the fraternities and sororities spread through most of the small university campus. In anticipation of more such adventures, especially among those who had missed the first show, the deans called a meeting of fraternity presidents

and told them flatly that we expected them to be able to keep their brothers at the fraternity house and away from campus gatherings and that further we would expect that there would be no involvement on the fraternity property with the throwing of water. We told them flatly that we would close the doors of any group that was not able to impose an adequate discipline upon its members.

Having described the meeting, the dean of students wrote, "As you may expect, nothing happened the following evening. . . ." One suspects such direct dicta are unusual on the contemporary college scene; maybe there should be more tough deans and threatening meetings.

College 153 was reported to be in a period of transition. Forces of the new and the old were on a collision course and the old seemed bound to lose; except the collision of ideas and ideals seemed never to come. One fraternity, sustained by its alumni, encouraged by its faculty adviser and abhorred by much of the rest of the campus, seemed to attract the minority of playboy holdovers from "the bad old days" who seemed to pop up in each incoming class in spite of the best efforts of the admission committee. In recent years the fraternity had led a boycott against the hundredth anniversary of the college, originated the forces which had led to the dean of men's ignominious
departure, broken every college rule and all with the ultimate impunity that comes from being the oldest chapter on campus with half the board of trustees among their alumni. Each year their antics seemed more at variance with the aims of the college community. One spring, as it appeared the problem would go unsolved for yet another year, the offending chapter caused a further outrage. It was much more than a fraternity offense, so the new dean of men convened a joint meeting of the IFC, the Student Judicial Board and the Faculty Disciplinary Committee for a preliminary hearing to discuss jurisdiction. After the hearing, which was not definitive, the dean hit upon the idea of a secret meeting. He invited the IFC chairman, the chairman of the Disciplinary Committee (a physics professor in whose home they met one night), a young professor also on the committee, and the dean's assistant, a recent alumnus. A compromise objective was formulated and strategy was devised. The plan involved the President and Dean being asked to take certain positions and a measure of bluff, but it reportedly was successful. Each of the principals present agreed later that the nocturnal meeting was invaluable. It strengthened their ability to work within their separate groups to overcome the opposition to disciplining the errant fraternity. The technique seems to recommend itself when disparate elements share general objectives but no common plan for achieving them.
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At another college a dean of men reported what seemed a solid impasse with another fraternity. It was College 154 and the issue was whether the chapter would have to adhere to the college requirement that each house employ a housemother; the chapter proposed instead a young (male) art teacher from a nearby high school. The president of the college, who had weakened the dean's ground with some equivocating statements, suggested the dean of men meet with the whole chapter.

The fraternity and I had both taken positions from which we didn't seem able to retreat. I was new and didn't want to lose my first big battle. The other fraternity housemothers were wailing in the wings like a Greek chorus claiming to see the end of the world if housemothers were allowed to go; it was rumored that if this chapter "were allowed to get away with it" another fraternity was ready to fire their housemother.

I was escorted to the house one evening for the meeting by the outgoing president of the student body. Ordinarily he was a reasonable sort, but on this question of having another housemother in his fraternity he was rabid. It was he who had cut my ground out with the president while I was at the NASPA meeting the week before. In all fairness, he said, he would not oppose me at the meeting, having said all he had to say many times (a promise he could not constrain himself to keep, unfortunately).

The meeting developed as a debate between me and vocal minority of upperclassmen obviously jaded by their past experiences. Unfortunately the faculty member who had stood in that year as their "housemother" was not there that night, for his testimony would have been strong on my side. Apparently he had never told the chapter how unsatisfactory he had regarded the arrangement.

Both sides remained intransigent for an hour and a half. Finally from the back of the room a sophomore allowed as though he didn't believe all housemothers would be as bad as the spokesmen had declared.
When no chorus of opposition silenced him, the young man continued while I wondered if somehow the issue were more my handling of the matter than the substantive issue. So at the first opportunity I asked to be excused because of the lateness of the hour and suggested their housemother committee meet with me the next day.

The committee turned out to be one junior (now in captivity in North Viet Nam) with whom I was able to speak frankly about the impasse. He told me that the fraternity had been more opposed to letting me win this one than they had been to having another housemother. So we agreed that he could quote me as believing I had not handled the matter as tactfully as I might have, in return for which the fraternity could gracefully give in. Fortunately we were able to get just the right lady, and four years later she is still holding forth.

The combination of the large, long meeting, ending at the right moment, and the private concession meeting the next day, seems to have been propitious for breaking the logjam.

Lastly, in this group of cases describing *ad hoc* meetings called to deal with controversies, this one from University 85 is told in the words of the Dean of Student Affairs.

A couple of years ago the Student Association at this school chose not to honor some contracts that had been made with artistic performers to appear on our campus. They apparently had some animosity toward the programs which stemmed from the presentation of an opera which they didn't appreciate. The Student Government chose to use their funds to support a University Rodeo Club rather than make their customary contribution to the Fine Arts Program. It would have been possible for this office to lift the funds from the Student Association and put them into the Fine Arts Program by virtue of the contracts that had previously been signed. However, instead a conference comprised of both faculty and students was called with one of the students serving as chairman. All aspects of the situation were discussed, that is the legal aspects, the necessity for Fine Arts Program on a campus such as ours as well as the desirability of
supporting a new Rodeo Club. At the conclusion of
the conference the student faculty committee voted
unanimously to recommend to the Student Association
Committee that they restore the funds to the student
Fine Arts Program and find another source of revenue
to support the Rodeo Club in the future. After
listening to the case presented by the Student Com-
nittee the Student Association voted to increase
their allocation to the Fine Arts Program a sizable
amount.

This case would seem to represent a classical instance of
untoward student action being averted by student-faculty
inquiry followed by student to student persuasion; admin-
istration fiat will seldom work so well. The total experi-
ence of these twelve cases would suggest strongly that a
committee convened in such a spirit is likely to yield a
reasoned response.

Top level meeting

Of the three cases in this section, two have already
been reported in other sections of this chapter. All three
are in most respects like the twelve described above. In
each case, a matter was of such gravity that the president
of the college or university, or other high ranking officials
as appropriate to the problem, were included. One, at
University 5, concerned the problem of the hamburger stand
being built near the campus; it has been reported in the
sections on Timing and Situation. The meeting in question
resulted in a compromise between the owner of the establish-
ment and university personnel. The second case given in
its entirety on p. 131 concerns Xenophobe College's plan to
become coeducation and the resistance of its men and their
"Committee of a Thousand." The top level meetings to inform the students did much to consolidate broad support for the reasonable and timely change being proposed.

The third case is distinctive because of the calm way the dean of students at University 2 convened the high level meeting, with refreshments, to let student leaders learn hitherto unpublished plans and transmit them to misinformed demonstrators. In the dean's words,

... a couple of hundred students observing earth-moving equipment leveling several houses in an area near the residence halls assumed that the area was being cleared for additional asphalt parking lots, and demonstrated for more grass.

I was alerted to the situation just prior to the beginning of the demonstration and was able to ask a number of student leaders to meet with several University officials in a conference room in the Student Center, and there over coffee and doughnuts University officials presented some long-range plans for the physical development of the University which had just been approved by the University Board of Directors and for which several drawings and artist's renderings of campus areas including that of the residence hall area were available. It was quickly realized by the student leaders that the parking area being created was to be temporary in nature and that within the next two or three years not only that area but several other parking areas adjacent to the residence hall complex would be made into attractive campus areas with trees, grass, shrubbery, etc.

As soon as the leaders realized what the University's plans were several immediately went out to where their fellow classmates were demonstrating and with a brief explanation of what was to be, ended the demonstration.

Finally in considering ad hoc, invitational meetings mention should be made of three presidential reactions to gauntlets thrown at their feet. Since the attitude of the
president in each case seems the key variable, they will be discussed in greater depth in the next section. For comparative purposes they seem valuable here to the consideration of meetings.

At University 113, as already detailed under Timing, the president was confronted with a series of communications from various members of a nonregistered student organization, the Committee on the University and the Draft.

Various demands were made, including one that he answer immediately. To newsmen the group promised a sit-in. There began what this writer judges to have been superb handling by a university of a student protest-challenge. Within two days a meeting was held in the President's Office. The administrative officers present behaved in a thoroughly reasonable way with touches of good humor. Prior to the meeting the president had prepared a public statement of his own which he presented to the SDS committee.

At University 89 a week or so earlier similar fomentations were occurring on the same subject. A similar letter was sent by a similar committee (primarily graduate students with some faculty members). The reactions of the president are described in the words of a past student body officer visiting the campus during the fracas that followed. He took it upon himself to record events.

Shortly after the letter was delivered, the President issued a memorandum stating that he would not meet with the GFCSS membership or review the decision to give the exam in May and June on the _____ campus. The GFCSS [Graduate-Faculty Committee on
Selective Service looked upon this action by the President as a violation of academic principle as well as an affront to the committee. Thus, a meeting was called for Thursday, April 28, to see what action was called for by the committee to "force the President's hand." The membership concerned themselves chiefly with the question of whether to demonstrate immediately or to approach the President a second time. They resolved they would give the President another opportunity to discuss the matter after which they would "sit-in" if he did not agree to speak with them and/or not accede to their demands.

When approached the second time President ______ agreed to meet with the GFCSS on Monday morning, May 2.

**Monday, May 2**

Thirty-four members of the GFCSS handed the President personal letters containing suggestions for alleviating the inequities inherent in the draft and requesting him not to give the deferment exam on campus. They were pressing for immediate action.

At this meeting President ______ stated that he personally didn't know who made the decision adding that, "All I know is what I read in the papers." He did repeat that it was a routine decision that would stand, and he refused to hold an open meeting to discuss the decision.

The president's refusal first to meet, and then his obdurate refusal to discuss issues, set University 89 off on a week of rumbling until the GFCSS had a ground-swell of campus opinion behind them. Then the president did take part in a series of meetings, which led up to one main meeting at which the issues could be discussed with "the other side" in a spirit of conciliation. These meetings were forced by campus opinion tired of the angry impasse, annoyed with the rigidity of both sides and the apparent communication problems of the administration.
The onus to do something was now clearly placed upon the shoulders of the President. He was issued an ultimatum by a large gathering of students. His authority as head of the institution was literally challenged and it was now his move to do something constructive or lose the already dwindling respect of the community which he headed.

The President proceeded to call an emergency meeting of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, the Dean of Students, Assistant to the President, President and Vice-President of the Student Association. Leaders of GFCSS were not invited. The reason for this, and this is mere speculation, was probably because the GFCSS is not a recognized organization fitting into the channels of communication as defined by the Administration. It will be remembered that one of the reasons the whole issue was escalated in the first place from the Selective Service policies to the more fundamental questions was the apparent lack of provision for communication and dialogue between interested parties. Now the GFCSS was once again alienated from the community, binding its members into an even stronger . . . "out group," feeling the martyr-role and even more determined to get their way.

The meeting . . . was called to discuss the happenings of the past week to see if any satisfactory solution could be found to avert a full scale "sit-in" and take over the administration offices on Monday. Uppermost in everyone's thoughts were the riots at Berkeley, and, since the students, faculty and administration liken themselves after Berkeley they wanted to avert similar riots at . . . . It was less than a week before the start of finals and such times are notoriously riot times on campuses across the country. Also in the air was an intangible something that was pervading the more powerful campuses across the country most dramatically demonstrated at the University of Chicago where the students literally invaded and took over the administration buildings not even allowing the president himself to enter. The students and faculty at the University of Rochester succeeded in scuttling a proposed honorary degree for Richard Nixon because of his stand on the Viet Nam issue. There was talk of a group of students walking out on Robert McNamara at New York University when he received an honorary degree at that institution. There was word that the president of a college in California had ripped up the contract
with the government for the draft deferment test upon demand of students and faculty. All of this gave an air of urgency to the emergency meeting.

The President of the Student Association suggested that the President appoint a committee of faculty, students, and administrators to study the campus situation and make recommendations concerning improvements in interaction and government. Thus, the President agreed to establish a Task Force Committee "to study the role of faculty and students with respect to their participation in formulation of academic policy." This action was similar to that taken by [Acting] Chancellor Meyer-son at Berkeley after the riots had occurred.

The assembled body further decided that the Faculty Senate should meet with the President at the earliest time possible to discuss the draft deferment test issue.

Immediately following that meeting another special meeting was called by the President with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to discuss the Selective Service issue. The President at this meeting told the Executive Committee that the draft test issue was not necessarily a closed one. The Executive Committee suggested that the President call a meeting of the Faculty Executive Committee, the Undergraduate and Graduate Student Association Executive Committees to review the matter and reach a formal decision. The President agreed and called the meeting for Thursday, May 12, in the evening, explaining that he would be in Los Angeles until then. The Executive Committee agreed and the matter was deferred [from Saturday] until Thursday.

There followed, during the president's five day absence, a tension-packed succession of meetings, sit-ins, reports, threats, resolutions, requests, proposals, demands for satisfaction on proposals, picket lines, negotiation committee, telegrams to and from the president.

Further evidence of the high tension in which impromptu meetings must sometimes be conducted is shown in this excerpt.
The administration had gained some experience it would seem, for Monday's performance was flawless; it was handled with finesse and tact, avoiding any major flare-ups. The group was again large and was again feeling rather emotionally powerful demanding things from supposed authority figures, watching the community around them take notice of their power to say things that had not been "formally" said before on this campus. The demonstration could easily have gotten out of hand. The leaders of "the movement" met with administration officials in the morning with the expectation of being treated rather harshly and condescendingly by the administration. They fully expected to be rebuffed by the Assistant to the President who up to this point had taken a hard line, with no room for compromise, stating that the decision had been made, it would stand, and no discussion was necessary. The leaders of the movement counted on the same type of performance so they could go back to the body of "the movement," which was at this time picketing outside the administration building, and report a failure to comply with their demands, whip up the crowd a bit and lay siege to the building. It must be remembered that a "sit-in" was scheduled for the same morning and that "the movement" thought they were bending over backward to give the administration a chance to change their minds, i.e., "the movement" used such "restraint" in demonstrating, they then felt that a "sit-in" would be justified. They fully expected the administration to turn down their demands, especially the deferment test demand. When the Assistant to the President agreed to all three demands, pending approval of the President, there was little the leadership of "the movement" could do. They went back to the body, reported approval and the demonstration disbanded.

The important thing strategically is that the momentum of "the movement" was halted long enough to avert a major flare-up.

Now we have reached the main point of this case for consideration here--the meeting finally agreed to by the president, and what it symbolized to an academic community whose president had first refused to meet and second curtly refused to discuss, indeed acknowledge the
existence of, issues. After reporting on some of the specific points made, our chronicler observes,

The meeting was orderly with the participants seeming to respect one another's views even if they did not agree. The discussion was frank and transacted on a fairly high plane. Nothing new was said, however, with each group repeating what was by then a hackneyed line. The meeting was, for all intents and purposes, a formality or rather a move on the President's part to show the community that discussion can take place and that he was willing to listen to the voices in the community. It is not likely that anyone at the meeting really thought that the President would revise the decision but it was a giant stride forward in that the groups actually were carrying on a dialogue over a serious matter. . . .

Perhaps symbolic "formality" is the main function of many such meetings; whether they are held at the incipient stage of a student controversy, or after it has become a roaring inferno fed by hurt feelings, a demonstration is sometimes necessary by the president "that discussion can take place and that he [is] willing to listen. . . ."

The third presidential meeting in this set has already been described in the section on Timing and will be only briefly reviewed here. It occurred in 1965, the year before the previous two, but after the Berkeley Free Speech Movement (FSM). The Rational Action Movement (RAM) at University 86 bore unmistakable resemblance to the FSM except that its complaints were many. Taken together they constituted a scathing commentary on the gaps in growth of an energetic new university. Along with their petition signed by 3000 students and a letter setting forth their discontent, the RAM requested "that an open forum be
arranged ... between the President, the University's four vice presidents, and members of R.A.M. "Such an invitation was extended to the President with the expectation he would reject it because of the defensive position an open forum would place him."

The president replied almost immediately, affirming his concern for students, outlining three ways (the Student Council, direct meetings, by petition) of communicating with the administration; open forum was not one of these. Most important, he specifically suggested a meeting with a group not to exceed 25 students and faculty members. That meeting began on a Thursday evening, resumed Friday and again Sunday morning at 9:30 A.M. and adjourned finally at 1:30 A.M. the following day. As mentioned in the earlier section, the meeting accomplished much by way of increased understanding and resulted in a Commission to Study the Role of the University in Society and the Role and Participation of Students in University Affairs. So much for the variety of possible ad hoc meetings and their possibilities as we turn now to the function of regularly constituted committees during campus controversies.

Established committees and councils

Perhaps most notable in this regard is the paucity of references that the data yielded. One is inclined to wonder if some filtering action occurred during the process of analysis. A quick check of a sample of cases, however,
reassures that a low proportion of the controversies studied were referred to regularly established bodies. At Berkeley, for example, the student senate was spinning its wheels and issuing pronouncements, but was by no means decisive, while a succession of special committees, administrators, police, public officials and municipal judges, carried the burden. Something significant about established groups seemed to emerge from only six cases.

The first case presents clearly one of the chief problems with untutored student task forces: the combination of their ineptitude and impatience is often their undoing; hence the advantage of a student-faculty committee. At University 53 a group of students was concerned about student rights and set about to develop a charter. After several months work "the motivators of this program graduated and turned their unfinished document over to the Junior Class who considered the job complete. . . ." The dean of students took it, with some misgivings, to the appropriate faculty committee where it was declared to be "far from complete and totally inadequate." It was then sent back to the juniors to rework. The next time it was sent up "... again the language of the document left a great deal to be desired. Shortly thereafter, this student group organized a small demonstration to evidence their unhappiness." After discussion the juniors and the dean of students agreed that the project should be turned over to the regular Student-Faculty Committee. A year later
that committee reported back with a charter of student rights "finally in acceptable form." When acting with high motives and in good faith on a difficult assignment, if students become frustrated, lest they become demoralized or angry it is well to have a regular student-faculty committee on student affairs to refer the matter to for putting in final form.

Two cases disclose communication problems with student-faculty committees. At University 97, in a situation already described in the section on Channel, a proposal for increased visiting hours in fraternity lodges was referred to the Council on Student Affairs. Apparently the student body did not guess that the proposal might be rejected. When, after months of hearing testimony and deliberating, it was rejected (on a tie vote), the cries of foul were deafening. As suggested earlier, such a committee might well have considered its campus relations

\footnote{This story has recently been approximated in the experience of this writer. A student senate officer just back from a Student Power conference proposed that a college demonstration policy be formulated to protect the rights of those who would demonstrate. He was named chairman of a committee to prepare such a policy. After two meetings what they proposed was so rough as to defy administration or implementation. After much reworking (in a regular student-faculty committee) it was ready to be recommended, several weeks later. The utter frustration of the young officer was terrible to behold. He was running for the presidency of the student body with very little to show for his vice presidency, he needed the demonstration document and viewed the deliberations of the stu-fac group as part of a conspiracy against him.}
as it went along and prepared its constituencies for any eventuality.

Another principle fundamental to the operation of an established student-faculty committee was evident last year at Lawrence University where this writer is a member of such a committee. At the beginning of the school year and under the leadership of a new chairman the committee received from the Student Senate a mandate "to extend and liberalize the Invitational Open House [open dorms] program." The matter got off to a stormy start because of the tactics of two senior students. They assumed the dean of women would be opposed to any change they might favor (she was not, actually). Hence they, both men, decided to counteract in advance the dean's presumed "extreme [negative] position" by first taking a radical stance on the other side; the group would, they reasoned, strike a mean and they would have achieved their real end.

The result of their plan was to throw the newly-formed group into near havoc. The first meeting was so fiery that one faculty member threatened privately to resign if the unpleasantness persisted. Everyone was shaken by the experience and after the meeting, also in private, the two men confessed what had been their purpose. At the next meeting, after some instruction on the nature of such a committee and the necessity for trust among its members, things were considerably better. Snyder stated the principle when he said, "Where trust between persons exists, dialogue
is possible; where trust no longer exists, negotiation is the instrument used— with bargaining, withholding of facts, and hammered-out details of compromise."

Lest the reader surmise that we consider all student legislative efforts either inept, shifty or politically motivated, let us consider a case where student government responded well to a request for legislation. The problem grew out of a rash of picketing by anti-war elements and counterdemonstrations by veterans. At several points "language became less than pleasant" and there were "threats of violence." In the words of the dean of student affairs,

Urgent requests were brought to my attention that we needed to establish clear cut rules for picketing. The need for established procedures in all anticipated conditions of picketing was deemed advisable. The subject was taken to Student Government. Within a matter of three weeks, the Student Government leaders created and passed a workable policy and procedure for both demonstrators and for other members of the community who might agree with or disagree with the demonstrators, and might be inclined to express their agreement or disagreement actively.

Perhaps the answer to why student government is sometimes able to function responsibly lies in its relationship to the central university administration and how firm a hand some respectable dean has on his tiller. Two contrasting cases seem to suggest that the dean may be the key variable. In both cases emotionally unstable and

1Benson R. Snyder, "How Does the Educator under Stress Align His Personal and Professional Priorities?" Address given at the 20th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, March 9, 1965.
rebellious student presidents seemed intent on breaking
the rules of their universities and the major organizations
of which they were the presidents. In one case, a power
grab in the Men's Residence Hall Association at University
13, after communications with the dean of students, the
student president boycotted a meeting. It was held without
him; the representatives acted to undo the unconstitutional
damage of their president and in the next election all of
his cohorts were defeated: an example of excellent decanal
leadership and responsible student government leadership.

At University 16, on the other hand, the women's
student government took the side of an errant president
for reasons not clear from the text. It concerns the demand
of the AWS president that she be allowed to break her
Residence Hall Occupancy Agreement (requiring students to
live in campus housing for the academic year if they elect
to move in in September—"exceptions are rarely made").

As told by the dean of women,

The Dean of Women attempted to counsel with
her and to point out that as AWS president she is
expected to uphold the regulations contained in
the AWS Handbook. She really had no real reason
to break her Agreement except she wanted to move
out of the residence hall. Emotionally and now
physically sick, upon the advice of her physician,
she was permitted to move into a private home.

The Dean of Women pointed out that, if she were
so ill she could not live in the Residence Hall,
she must be too ill to remain as AWS president with
all its responsibilities. Her behavior had been

\[1\] Case presented in detail, p. 250.
observed and commented upon by four of the offices on campus as very objectionable.

There was a great deal of communication between the president of AWS and the Dean of Women, the president and the Health Service, the president and Food Service, and president and AWS.

AWS members were given the facts by the adviser to AWS. AWS knew the president had broken, not one but several, AWS regulations. In fact she had been before the Judicial Board. However, AWS felt she was a strong leader and that her errors should be overlooked.

Communication failed, in my opinion, because the most "responsible" women's group on campus was not willing to look at the Council's responsibility to all the women and to the College because it might look like it was siding with the Administration against the president of AWS.

That estimate is probably a good one, but one wonders why it occurred. We can only point to the cool-headed, rather detached statesmanship of the dean of students in the previous case for a possible answer.

Open meeting, public hearing

In the previous discussion of ad hoc meetings we mentioned that the president of University 86 was asked to appear with his four vice presidents at a mass meeting. The students of the RAM knew he would not appear because it would put him on the defensive, hence at a disadvantage. Certainly the strategy chosen by that president was successful in enabling him to deal with both the RAM and the problems that were troubling them. So the question becomes, are all university mass meetings likely to be disadvantageous to the cause of solving weighty and complex problems?
Are they likely to put university officials on the defensive and weaken their authority? After examining several instances we may conclude that there are many complex variables, but that there are some situations in which there is no good course of action and in which an open meeting may be the best way to keep the situation from getting worse; or in which to appear in an open meeting, even a hostile one, to demonstrate good faith.

Timing the announcement of a program of integrating men's and women's residence hall complexes at University 99 caused problems already reported in the sections on Timing and Amount of Communication. The conclusion at University 99 was that it had been "a mistake to delay from spring to fall in making the announcement about shifting residence halls."

When the decision was announced, however,

there immediately followed a series of protest meetings instigated by the men living in the halls where the shift was to occur. The protests concluded with the Dean of Students appearing before a specially called meeting attended by some 400 students at which time he attempted to defend the reasoning involved in the shift. During the course of the meeting the Dean's Office was accused of bad faith with students because of failure to do greater sharing of plans with the students directly involved. The fact that there had been a period of five years' discussion with students on the problem did not seem to satisfy them.

Curious about this open meeting, what might have been achieved by the dean's appearance and, alternately, what loss there might have been if he had not appeared, we wrote again to him.
Did you go with misgivings? Did it seem the logical and most advantageous way of communicating? Did you consider other ways of getting the message across? If so, do you remember what they were? If you had it to do over again would you have attended the meeting, and if not, what might you do?

In his reply the dean of students wrote,

I can answer your questions by merely saying that under the manner in which the problem developed, I think I would still have appeared at the general meeting called by the students. Of course I went with misgivings; but not to have appeared, would have created only more clamor from the dissident few who felt they had a quarrel to pick with the university administration. ... The greatest mistake was in the delay of the announcement and this will not be repeated.

At College 57 a very successful general college meeting was called when the student president seemed unable to explain the new college policy on open doors during dormitory visiting "(I believe he thought it inexplicable)." This case has already been discussed in connection with the Message, the speaker's Language and the Arrangement of his points. Clearly the communicative success of this meeting could not have been achieved by other means.

A similar meeting at College 90 concerned a new policy on the student linen service. It also has been set forth earlier in this chapter, in the section on Channels ("The Dean of Men thought I had lost my mind completely, but I finally agreed to appear before an open meeting to discuss the linen issue and the tuition issue"). It seems that in the press of dealing with a state-imposed tuition, for the first time in history, the dean of students had
neglected to inform students of an adjustment in the charge for linens. The double problem, like the one at College 57 just discussed, seemed to justify the meeting and the dean's appearing to explain belatedly. In this case, moreover, the dean used his remarks at the meeting to point out "that the students had not gone through the usual procedure to obtain modifications of policy, and we indicated that on the linen issue we would be very glad to receive their representations through the proper channels."

The upshot of the affair was that the students complied with the procedures that had been established, and the ruling on the linen service was rescinded. We were doing it simply to tidy up administrative processes, and really didn't feel that strongly about it. The tuition issue of course was quite another matter, but the public meeting and the accurate reporting of it later in the student paper did serve to quiet a good many unwarranted fears with respect to it.

Two other general meetings, one of them involving a whole college community and the other townspeople as well, similarly served to reduce high feelings. The first involves the dynamics between "liberals" and "conservatives" and shows the educational value for students and townspeople in having a mass meeting. The controversy grew out of an invitation to a high political figure of the conservative stripe to speak on campus and is described by the dean of students.

... The person is controversial to say the least and the liberal element made immediate noises about picketing to the point of embarrassment, etc., etc. As a part of their harassment techniques they also wanted to invite a speaker of opposite viewpoint for the same evening in the same place and immediately
following the speech of the political figure. While the College policies on the speaker were quite clear there was no absolute prohibition about such a practice, the College felt it was extremely undesirable and that the likelihood of the political figure cancelling altogether was very high. After some deliberation we elected to allow the students the second invitation. It was extended and the first speaker promptly indicated that it was best for all concerned if perhaps some more thinking were done. We discussed some more and again without going into details, let it be said that the first speaker was not to come. By this time the community, the newspapers, trustees, etc., heard about the change of plans due to the invitation of the second speaker the screaming was probably heard up your way. In order to clear the air, and in an attempt to communicate with all elements, a mass meeting with the entire student body was called with spokesmen from all sides and the community welcome to come.

The overwhelming majority of the students were bitterly opposed to the liberal crowd that had gone ahead in the face of overwhelming evidence as to the effects of their actions and this became visible the night of the meeting. The townspeople got a chance to see the students in action and also to hear both sides of the question. The student body had a good chance to see first hand some of the thinking of the other point of view. . . . While no action was taken at the meeting, other than the usual descriptions of ways in which the College could go about studying the matter so as to avoid a repetition, the clearing of the air and the gaining of understanding of all points of view was well worthwhile. I think it fair to say that because the entire incident was condensed in time to perhaps 72 hours, the written word which was tried, the small groups which was tried, and the rest proved relatively unsuccessful and for once the large scale approach worked [emphasis added].

This writer attended an undergraduate college in which such public discussions were an integral part of the institutional culture. Whenever an issue arose, usually the speech department, student senate or men's union would provide a public forum for airing the issues and venting feelings. Usually the program started with a symposium,
colloquy or just a presentation of recent history—the facts not twisted by the campus grapevine. In more recent years such occasions have been variously termed teach-ins and bitch-ins and have often served the same function as the well-timed general meeting at College 50.

The situation at College 59 has already been mentioned in connection with previous discussion of Channel and Amount of Communication. It was the case of the prolonged siege of thievery in dormitories on a women's campus. Everyone's feelings and suspicions were heightened. So after the mystery was solved the whole story was told by the president in a campus meeting. The details of that meeting have already been written on page 133. It "cleared the air, told the truth, explained what the college was going to do and why, and eliminated the need for further talk and speculation."

At University 113 where the president responded to the initial communications from anti-draft protest leaders with an invitation to his office, there was also a mass rally before the week was over. Again administrators and a faculty member took part willingly and served to keep anti-administration feelings from being added to anti-draft feelings. The university president, as mentioned in the section on Language, used very personal language in introducing the campus chancellor and stressing the traditions of free and open discussion involving all segments of the university. The chancellor also spoke of the
traditions and praised the students for their disciplined dissent. He described the existing policies and plans that were under way in the Student Association and Faculty to reconsider them. Subsequent speakers, a history professor and a graduate student, "lauded the students for the way they had approached the issues and for their courage to stand for a moral position which actually was prejudicial to the students themselves."

That the praise and invocation of tradition was successful was obvious too from the reactions of the sit-in leaders. One is said to have remarked that the only result of the meeting was that "6,000 people recognized that nothing was said." The dissenters continued their sit-in but were not joined in any anti-administration feelings by the majority of students.

At College 22 there are reportedly few controversies that cannot be solved in a meeting or two between the dean of students and student leaders. The dean attributes the tranquility to smallness (1300 undergraduates plus graduate students), and regular monthly meetings of a student-faculty committee and a president's luncheon monthly. Whenever a problem of all-consuming interest does occur, "a special assembly for all interested students has been called so they could hear first hand from the administration. This occurred when our new degree program was announced, but very much misunderstood [and] when a carillon was installed ... and was resented by many students."
A few years ago the undergraduates at University 80, feeling the expansion of the graduate school and its effects on their education, held what was called a Student Rally. It was, according to a report to parents by the vice-president, "carefully planned and . . . executed in an orderly fashion with full knowledge of the Office of the Dean of Students, the faculty, and the administration of the University. Our students conducted themselves in an exemplary manner." And afterward so did the faculty and administration, in this writer's eyes. These will be presented in the next (and last) section of this chapter in a consideration of the communication of the chief campus officer.

Last in this portion let us turn to a consideration of the public hearing as a part of the legislative process. In 1966 Tigar wrote a paper on Student Participation in Academic Governance.\(^1\) In it he came out strongly for consulting with students before making rules as well as for student participation in the decision making process itself. Public hearings, previously announced as in civil processes, have been almost unknown in the academic legislative processes. At most, in our experience, occasionally a questionnaire would be sent to a sample of "the governed." Tigar observes, In the academic community, a hearing upon proposed rules is helpful to administrator and student alike. For the administrator, rulemaking procedures

ensure that the best thinking on the campus goes into decisions. The student is given a sense of participation that conduces to the trust and confidence upon which a healthy academic community ought to rest.¹

During the past academic year when one of the Lawrence University student rules was up for review, after considering the Tigar paper we held a public hearing. The problem (concerning motorcycles) was well known. It was stated in a public announcement of the meeting ten days in advance. The hearing was sponsored by the Student-Faculty Committee on Student Affairs as part of their mandate from the faculty to review the policies of cycles; the car rule had been liberalized but no one had been sure of what to do about cycles, at the home campus or the overseas center. A subcommittee of four was appointed. We received a written statement signed by thirty-four neighbors to the east of the campus and one from a professor with small children who played near the fraternity quadrangle. In addition forty-some students and faculty members appeared at the hearing. After the "depositions" were read and a general statement of the history of the problem presented, there was general discussion, some of it heated, some defensive and some conciliatory. The result was a joining of hitherto isolated cyclists into what was thence known euphemistically as "The Motorcycle Community." They proposed to prepare a bill to deal with the problems if the committee

¹Ibid., p. 4.
would not recommend total outlawing of cycles. They selected a spokesman (a pre-law student, not a cyclist, who was sympathetic) who two weeks later presented their bill. It was thought to be too restrictive and actually softened by the committee, the Student Senate and the Faculty. The problem, one of our most vexing, has been dealt with more satisfactorily than any in recent years. Public hearings have become established in the legislative process of this institution. As a closing note, lest the reader see the public hearing as a panacea, we turn again to Tigar.

I do not know that power at all times and in all contexts tends to corrupt. Power accountable to no victims of its exercise does undoubtedly conduce to a certain arrogance. Administrators are, on the whole, dedicated men. But their dedication may be accompanied by such a firmness in the right, as they have perceived the right, that even procedures for consultation will not ensure that all views are not only expressed, but listened to. In times of stress, when mutual trust between administration and students is needed most, the pressure to disregard student opinion may be greatest.

Private conversation, counseling, etc.

In this group are four cases, each involving the travails of a different administrative officer—a president, a chaplain, a dean of students and a dean of men. All deal, however, with a crisis of sorts, three of which became all-consuming because of what seems from this distance to have been insufficient consultation with colleagues and superiors.

1Ibid., pp. 7-8.
The chaplain at College 27, as was mentioned earlier, injected himself into a controversy on student dress regulations. He did so without consulting his administrative colleagues or the adviser to the Student Senate, through which he was operating. When the situation got out of hand the dean of the college did meet privately with the chaplain to help him understand his place in the local scheme.

The principle that an administrator should consult his colleagues and advisers before taking action hopefully was clear from our lengthy narration of events at University 89. There the president refused to meet with anti-draft committee members, his refusal coming quickly and without any consultation with his student affairs advisers or the testing center director who had made the decision to hold the draft tests. Not only did the president inflame the anti-draft committee but he created serious misgivings about the administrative machinery which involved the entire community in enervating and time-consuming turmoil. The comparison was made on pages 221-28 of the handling of similar draft committees at Universities 89 and 113. The consultation that took place at 113 was evident at each stage, from the very first when the president had the chancellor, dean of student affairs and student body president with him when he met with the committee.

On this subject of consultation, by way of introducing the other two cases in this set, a comparison may
help. In its foreign policy the United States has been pledged for almost two decades to support certain states threatened by internal or external forces. Presumably our government acts according to principles set forth in certain regional defense treaties and doctrines (e.g., SEATO, Monroe Doctrine). Obviously this country cannot react to every stimulus by every guerilla band crossing the border or attacking from the mountains of every nation in whom we have an interest. Certain priorities and limitations have to be invoked; certain consultations, within our government and with our allies, must occur. So it is in college administration, or so it should be. An administration, after consultation within and perhaps with students and faculty concerned, must decide which is the best provocation, on which to move—to take a stand; or, after a series of incursions against an important principle, hopefully with ample warning to students, the next instance will cause an appropriate reaction in defense of the principle. The result of such prior consultations, and this is the important point, will be a sense of support for the administrator who makes the stand. His is likely to be a troubled world; he will be attacked and accused of all sorts of things; unless he has the support of his colleagues (within and without the administration) he may be beaten down, emotionally frazzled to the point of losing his dignity and rendering himself useless for future service to the institution. Furthermore, he needs to rely on
personal support during the onslaught of abuse, if there is one. If he has support on the issue he is more likely to get the personal support, often tacit, he needs. This feeling of lonely defense of principle is best described in the words of the dean of students at University in Appendix. It is not clear from the report whether the dismissal action was taken after prior consultation with colleagues and superiors; neither is it clear whether the dean received supportive counseling during the hurricane that followed. The point is, he should have, and hopefully did, consult in advance, and should have been able to count on, and hopefully got, aid and comfort during the crisis. If, after discussing such a stand with one's colleagues, it appears that substantive support will not be forthcoming it is well to wait for an event better suited to the defense of principle ("to choose our battlefield," as was said about Viet Nam). Indeed, in this writer's opinion, such decisions should be staff decisions. They should not be made by one perhaps harried dean in defense of a pet principle not shared by colleagues, or at a time when other significant causes will be weakened. To put it succinctly, as a young assistant once said to this writer in just such a consultation, "I agree on the principle but it is not one I think the deans' office should go to the mat for."

The application of this principle was well made at College 14. The case concerned a taunting underground
paper and has been described in the sub-section, Stop Communicating and Take Action. The dean of men wrote, "The twenty men whose names appeared on the masthead . . . were summoned to appear before me, although I did not take this action alone. The decision was made by the President, the Dean of the College, the Dean of Women, and myself." Too many actions are taken without such consultation and support; too many deans are slaughtered by the results; and perhaps too many able men and women decline to consider a stint in administration because of slaughters they have known.

Written recommendations and requests for support

These five cases suggested valuable applications or procedures of standard written communication. All of the cases have been used earlier. In an interesting, though comparatively inconsequential case at University 101 the students in an advanced seminar were dissatisfied with the course. After one meeting of the class the students remained and drafted some observations and recommendations which were presented to the course coordinator at the next session. At the following meeting the coordinator commented favorably on them although the course was too far gone, he thought, to change. At the final session he solicited other suggestions in a critique from each student. The student reporter closed by saying, "During the next term several of the suggestions were incorporated into the
program. Some of them which involved more work on the part of the faculty, were ignored." In this day of student critical concern of the curriculum, this method seems quite appropriate.

As has been discussed in the section on Effects of communication, after the anti-draft disturbance at University 113 a letter was sent to embody the corporate convictions of the university. The president of the university wrote to the president of the United States and the state's congressional delegation.

At College 160 when a protest demonstration went further beyond the line of legality than administrative officers felt they could tolerate, they took this action. They composed a letter to students known to have violated the rules on visiting (it was the "visit-in" described earlier). An individually typed letter was sent to each of ninety-seven students with a copy to their parents and a copy in their folders. In addition an official notice was published. In it the deans commented on the protest and their decision "to initiate no disciplinary action on this occasion." They asserted the unlikelihood that they would "not take a similar view of any repetition . . ." and reminded students that the faculty and trustees had the power to change the rules. The letter seemed like a suitable compromise between no action and mass retribution against a large number of students. The copy to parents served to remind the students that they had other
responsibilities than might be apparent in the heat of their anger against faculty intransigence.

At University 77 the dean of students office depended on the union director to enforce the policy on keeping partisan politics out of display cases. During the 1964 campaign organizations in favor of and opposed to Senator Goldwater's candidacy seemed unable to adhere to the rules. There were numerous telephone calls, violations and even a sign saying "censored" on one showcase. Apparently the union man charged with the display cases was feeling harried by it all. The assistant dean of men who administered the policy incorporated a chronicle of events and statement of policy into a long memorandum. It reviewed which organizations were barred from using the case, put matters in a more detached perspective than was possible on the firing line and promised a review of the procedures and policies. Too often, we suspect, staff members not accustomed to dealing with permissively raised students determined to have their own way in spite of the rules, are frustrated in their roles and a little afraid of the situation. Such a supportive memo can serve to ease their anxiety, thereby enhancing their effectiveness. In this writer's experience they tend to become excessively annoyed at the law bending students, the deans or both. Where frequent personal contact is not practical between the dean's office and the union (or placement office, physical plant department, etc.), a memorandum can be very useful.
A classic case of challenge of authority at University 13 discussed above in connection with the challenger's boycott of a council meeting. Also of note was the exchange of open letters between the usurping Men's Residence Hall Association (MHA) president and the dean of students. They are both reasonably short and are set forth below as models of their kind.

OPEN LETTER TO THE DEAN OF STUDENTS

MAY 14

DEAN _______

I RECEIVED YOUR TELEGRAM. I WILL NOT ATTEND A CONFERENCE WITH YOU ON MONDAY OR ANYTIME CONCERNING THE NEW CONSTITUTION. IT IS PRECISELY BECAUSE OF THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE NEW CONSTITUTION THAT I HAVE MADE THIS DECISION. ANY DISCUSSION, ANY CONCLUSIONS, THAT YOU, ME, OR ANYONE ELSE ARRIVED AT THROUGH SUCH A CONFERENCE WOULD BE VOID. THE ORGANIZATION I REPRESENT HAS PROVIDED AMPLE CHANNELS THROUGH WHICH COMPLAINTS AND CHARGES MAY BE ROUTED AND, AS PRESIDENT OF THAT ORGANIZATION I MUST UPHOLD THOSE CHANNELS. THE PERSONS WHO APPROACHED YOU ON THIS MATTER WERE IN ERROR BY DOING SO IF THEY EXPECTED YOUR OFFICE TO DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT.

Frankly, it is my considered opinion that these charges should be referred to the residence halls judicial committee and it is my duty, not yours to do so. If dues-paying members of the residence halls association refer the question of error in the passing of the new constitution to the judicial committee then that body will take action, not before. The office of the dean of students has no right to precipitate action of its own authority. If you disagree I suggest you refer that to judicial as well.

I am truly sorry to end the year on such a sour note but whether it be now, next week, next year, or ten years hence, the administration of this university will have to realize that while there are many things it can do and much power it does possess there are spheres of student authority which will remain inviolate.
IF STUDENT GOVERNMENT IS TO BE A GOVERNMENT
AND NOT A PUPPET OF THE ADMINISTRATION THEN OUR
CASE WILL BE UPHeld.
LET'S FIND OUT NOW.

RESPECTFULLY,

/s/ John __________
JOHN __________
MEN'S RHA PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS

May 16, 1966

John __________, President
Residence Halls Association

Dear John:

Thank you for your open letter of May 14. I am
bewildered.

The new Constitution of the RHA was approved on
representation that it had been passed by the
membership of the Association. Approval of the
RHA Constitution was in part contingent on every
member of the organization having his proper say
and vote. I am sure you would have it no other
way.

Within the last week, some voting improprieties
have been alleged. A petition is being circu­
lated to have the Constitution put to a referen­
dum. This has raised our concern about the report­
ed vote on which we based our approval; all the
more since the RHA has compulsory membership and the
University collect the fees for the Association.

No one has passed judgment on the allegations.
We are of one mind that the Judicial Committees
of the RHA or, for that matter, a referendum, are
the proper remedies for grievances. But until
these appeals are heard we have no choice but
consider our approval conditional. It is to that
end I asked you to attend a meeting in my office.

While not at issue, I should like to speak to your
observations on the exclusive purview of the RHA
and the RHA President in some spheres. The preambles to the Constitution of the Association stipulates: "We, the members of the Residence Halls Association at __________, by authority of the Chancellor and subscribing to the regulations and policies of the University, etc." For that matter, the Men's Residence Halls Regulations provide that referrals shall be accepted from any number of sources including the Dean of Students Office.

All this, I believe, is not cause for a call to the barricades but rather demands our common cause to ensure that the will of the majority of the Association is followed.

Cordially,

/s/__________

Dean of Students

cc: RHA Members

The failure of the student president to have the new constitution ratified (except by "an 'informal poll,' chiefly of his cronies"), the protests of "several delegations," and finally his defiant open letter, seemed grounds for the dean's marvelously lucid and restrained reply which he "gave . . . the same circulation" (i.e., all the men's hall residents of a large university).

Prepared statements with news value

The first communication in this group is much like the one just above. It is the open letter the dean of students at University 88 agreed to write, the one held up in the mimeograph room while the context was changed by ensuing events. None the less, exigencies of duplicating rooms notwithstanding to the contrary, the idea of such a letter, conceived in a meeting of responsible
student leaders and to be conveyed and interpreted by them, is a good idea fundamentally. The entire statement will not be quoted here. The first and last paragraphs capture the tone. The document begins:

Office of the Dean of Students November 1, 1966

TO: The Students of the University of __________

FROM: _______________, Dean of Students

Because of several unfortunate incidents associated with disorderly crowd activities in recent weeks I think it may be well to call to the attention of _______ students some of the problems involved and the University's position.

After two sets of three contingencies which make clear the kinds of things that might happen and the possible "disciplinary sanctions," the statement concludes,

I regret that it appears necessary to repeat these admonitions but those who participate in unruly crowd behavior should be fully aware of the possible consequences. They then participate at their own risk. However, it is my hope that a prior understanding of the serious problems which seem always to accompany mass disturbances will reduce their frequency.

Two careful statements, of the many that were issued, during the Berkeley Free Speech year deserve mention here. Both have been discussed in the section on the Message in connection with the type of appeal they used; but both represent significant forms as well. They are the January 3, 1965, introductory statement of Acting Chancellor Martin Meyerson and the March 1, 1965, "informal statement from the Emergency Executive Committee, Academic Senate, Berkeley Division."
A faculty resolution, especially one passed unanimously at a special meeting called to discuss a particular problem, can be a very powerful document. The case in point is the situation at University 3 already described in Amount of communication. The situation was precipitated by a student house of representatives attack on the assistant dean of arts and sciences for his alleged belligerence and harshness. The faculty of arts and sciences passed their resolution, the dean of the college wrote the speaker of the student house of representatives; in addition to an explanatory letter from the speaker there was no further mention made of the incident. As observed earlier, however, we can speculate that the assistant dean was less belligerent and harsh in his dealings with students thereafter. So the students made their point and the faculty stood by their colleague.

Another kind of public statement with great utility in a student controversy is the interim policy statement. Two such documents have already been mentioned in connection with their timing and the feedback they evoked. The one at University 40 was a draft midway along in a complex series of legislative machinations on a Free Speech Area. Before submitting their report to the faculty the student-faculty committee wanted to get campus reaction; so they issued the interim policy. It was in force until the faculty acted on the final version which benefitted by the additional time and feedback. Likewise at College 164
a "first draft" of a drug policy statement was issued, except that it stood for almost a year. At that point a second interim statement was put out, also from the dean's office. The campus was still waiting for a recommendation from a committee appointed by the student government ("No one who knows about the problem will be willing to serve," was the prediction when such a committee was formed on another campus).

As mentioned in the section on Interference with communication, manuscripts serve to prevent distortion of oral remarks. The dean of College 28 made a point of preparing such a text of what he intended to say when he appeared before student government during the fraternity obscenity brouhaha. Copies were available for the secretary in preparing the minutes of the meeting, and for the student press and radio. This writer, in his professional capacity, has also prepared such written texts. In addition to the benefits noted by the dean at College 28 should be added the higher quality of the oral statement which results from earlier and more careful preparation, rehearsing into a dictaphone, editing, etc.

Finally in this group let us examine a slightly different kind of prepared statement. After the draft demonstrations at University 113, the Regents assembled were reviewing the situation. One of the regents asked the president if he thought the press coverage had been fair. The latter answered that he thought that it had been except
for some photographs. Whereupon another regent, prepared for this and perhaps set up for it by the foregoing exchange, produced two sets of photographs and made a speech on the subject of press fairness.

**Combination written guidelines and continuous meeting**

During the actual sit-in of the Administration Building of University 113 by the anti-draft group, there obtained a remarkable and delicate communication combination. It was perhaps more likely to have occurred because of the setting—so near the campus administrative offices; but it represents an ideal of its kind and is singled out here as such. The sit-in began later on the day of the meeting in the president's office described earlier in this section. The chancellor "formulated guidelines for the protest and invited the group to send representatives to his office to receive them before the scheduled closing time (5 P.M.) of the Administration Building." As has been emphasized in various parts of this dissertation, the administrative officers of University 113 were in almost constant touch, night and day with the demonstrators. Various offices concerned had skeleton representation at all times, and student leaders were "shuttling back and forth" between the sitter-in and the administrative officers.

The Chancellor's statement was taken to the "sit-in" by representatives of the protest group, debated at great length through the evening and into the night. The group finally declined to accept the Chancellor's message but agreed to
consider its guidelines and overwhelmingly voted not to interfere with University operations.

Almost every night of the sit-in, the question of initiating some interference was raised, debated at great length, and the idea defeated by overwhelming vote.

The constant dialogue between the two groups, each keeping pressure on the other (i.e., communicative, not violent, pressure), was perhaps the redeeming element of this extremely tense situation. This writer and his colleagues tried to replicate the situation at University 113, with some success. During demonstrations against CIA recruiters in November, 1967, at Lawrence University, two of us moved our office, in effect, to the union building where the placement interviews were occurring. Eighty copies of guidelines had been distributed the evening before. A faculty member who had been in the CIA for two years and detested it (but who detested violence more) was there as an adviser to both sides. After both sides held their breath to see if the mode of demonstration (lying down across the threshold) would go according to the guidelines, the rest of the demonstration proceeded much better than it might have. This principle of combining a set of reasonable written expectations with close, hopefully amicable, personal contact, is a commendable one.

A written record

In this era of student controversy, sometimes on a grand scale, the value of a journal of events is considerable: Each day, who did what? Who said or sent what to whom? What
effect did it have? Why was one tack taken instead of another? What was the transcending purpose of the administration, of various student and faculty groups? How did various behaviors tend to serve their purposes or to subvert them? Such a daily record, coupled with a review of events, forces and effects after the controversy has ended, can be most helpful and educative. A number of variations will now be examined briefly.

The first, and probably most valuable kind of record during the controversy, is one kept by a leading member of one of the "teams." Although it may lack a historian's objectivity, such a personal journal surely makes the participant himself more objective: feeling as if he is living in a hurricane, the journal causes him to step occasionally into that point of absolute calm at the center of the storm while all is swirling about him. A small notebook in his pocket and a large measure of determined persistence are useful for the task. Such a journal provides raw material for an official version of the crisis, should one be sought by higher administration, trustees, faculty or state committees.

A variation on the daily diary is an account kept by someone assigned to the task but not directly involved in the events. The dean of students, vice president or president might ask someone attached to his office to serve as chronicler. Such a person might make it his business each day to make contact with all the principals. Such an
administrative figure might be viewed by students or faculty as a spy not to be trusted with certain items, however; a faculty member, history student or graduate assistant might be less likely to evoke distrust in student circles, but might not warrant, at first anyway, the confidence of the deans et al. A good compromise choice of someone to serve as reporter has sometimes been a writer from the alumni magazine. Perhaps trained in objective reporting, working for an office with an interest in having a fair account and likely to be trusted by both sides, such alumni office historians can be very successful in capturing events for the record. Two notable instances are known to this writer of alumni magazines that carried complete accounts of actual events. There has to exist, however, a tradition of openness to alumni. Alumni offices accustomed to letting their constituents view the campus only through refracted glass would not serve well in the scholarly work that is envisioned here.

One alumni association executive director wrote these editorial comments as introduction to a highly factual and complete "Anatomy of a Protest."

In May, [University 113] was once again in the glaring light of national publicity as students on the campus staged a sit-in protesting the University's cooperation with the Selective Service System. We are featuring a complete report of the sit-in demonstration in this issue. Our story . . . is perhaps longer than is generally the custom for the coverage of such events in our magazine, but we feel that it is important for us to print as complete a report on the May happenings as is possible because the demonstration raised larger
questions than just how much cooperation should the University extend to Selective Service officials. The student sit-in, and the subsequent reactions to it, we think, made most people aware of the question--What is the nature and function of a great educational institution?

This is an open-ended question, one which has no definitive answer. The important thing is that the whole problem should be constantly re-evaluated. [University 113] is an organic creature that grows and changes with the times. Our alumni take pride in the University because it is an institution which has been able to attract an excellent faculty and outstanding students, and to maintain a wide-ranging curriculum. These qualities establish [it] as one of the nation's distinguished universities.

The freer an alumni office to act as an eye on the campus for the alumni rather than a public relations agent for the administration, the better the function of reporting controversies can be served.

Other chroniclers of controversies examined for this study but prepared previous to the inquiry from this writer were:

At one university there exists the Office of the University Proctor; in the best traditions of a policeman keeping order and a police investigator, the proctor and his assistant kept a record of events and communications during one crisis studied--presumably such a record is standard procedure for them.

At another university a former student body officer was visiting the campus. With his competence both as knowledgeable observer and graduate student in history, he prepared a narrative which the dean of students' secretary typed. It was not without flaw, however, for the
following notation appeared over the dean's initials at the end of the report.

On page 25 Mr. ________ discusses the meeting in the President's office on Thursday, May 12. His account must be based on hearsay reports from others, since he was not present. My own understanding as to the nature of that particular meeting distinctly conflicts with his, but I was not present either.

At College 28, on the day after an extended controversy was ended, the dean of the college dictated "To: The Files" a memorandum "Re: Student Government Handling of Fraternity Obscenity Issue November 15, 1965-January 11, 1966." Such a memorandum with the relevant documents attached (none of the pornography, however) was hopefully as useful to the authorities at College 28 as it was to this writer.

At various colleges special commissions, task forces, study committees, etc., are created after events which disclosed serious weaknesses in the institution. As part of their mandate they prepare searching reconstructions of events, rather in the spirit of the Warren Commission on the national scene. At one college benefitting from the presence of an American Council on Education (ACE) administrative intern, the president appointed the intern (a professor of English at another college) to a two-man task force to record and evaluate the conduct of a major controversy.

In instances where the controversy is waged largely within formal meetings, if the secretary has one eye on
history, the minutes of the meetings can be a useful record, augmented later by newspaper reports and the like.

As already mentioned, a number of administrators in the heat of the battles reported, managed to find an early opportunity to dictate for the written record accounts of what had transpired. Such a practice is almost mandatory when on-the-spot disciplinary action is taken, such as a dean at University 47 suspending a student for failure to comply with his oral directive. The most pragmatic reason for keeping a written record is to answer criticism. In response to some questions about his handling of a controversy over speakers, the former dean of students at College 48 wrote:

The only thing which I would have done differently is to have made a record of my conversation with Fulton Lewis III. I did not realize the nature of this man and the facts that he charged and statements that he attributed to me were completely false but could not be proven inasmuch as I did not make a record of my comments with him or did not have my secretary take the conversation down.

Perhaps the knowledge that a stenographic or electronic recording was being made (beep, beep) would serve to keep someone who thrives more on controversy than accuracy closer to the facts.

Before leaving the subject of written records of controversies, one word of caution from personal experience is appropriate. In his days as an undergraduate, this writer was involved in some events rather unusual to their time (the early 1950's) and our generation ("Silent"). After weeks of inquiry, meetings with faculty, trustees,
students, administrators and each other, a small band of upperclassmen were much involved in an intense struggle. It concerned the *modus operandi* of a new, young president in dealing with the retrenchment caused by the Korean War draft and the Depression Baby cycle hitting a small college simultaneously. The personal values and behavior of the president also became an issue. One weekday afternoon five of us were invited by the vice president to talk with the president in the latter's home, to discuss all the things that were being said in other quarters. The president's secretary was there to take everything down, for the record; we were to have been supplied a transcript of her shorthand notes. The session lasted three hours. Many feelings were aired and it was a most trying afternoon. The transcript never was issued and the existence of it somewhere constituted an inhibiting and rather frightening force in subsequent activities. Holding it back, especially without saying why, seemed then, and still does, ethically wrong.

*Change of form or type during controversy*

Nine separate statements were placed in this category, four of them from Berkeley-FSM. The first is a general proposition which overtakes one as he reads the record of events on that campus in the autumn of 1964 and winter 1965: When a crisis persists it is best to introduce new forms and faces in the hope of (1) losing negative valences impeding a solution, or (2) finding a new combination that
will work, or both. At many institutions the faculty has retained control over student life. At Berkeley they had given it over to the administration in the 1930's. When the administration and FSM reached an impasse, a tripartite committee was formed with the students, faculty, and administrators each having one vote. At the point it seemed to be getting nowhere (e.g., one vote yes, one no, one abstention) the chancellor and president declared the FSM to be in default of the compact by which the committee was set up; they dismissed the committee. Shortly thereafter the faculty itself assumed more power, set up the Emergency Executive Committee and acted more as an arbiter than a mediator. At one point along the way there was formed a committee of all the department heads of the University. They met with President Clark Kerr and called the fateful meeting in the Greek Amphitheatre to announce their agreement. Unfortunately it was after this meeting that Mario Savio was dragged off the platform by two guards, angering students and faculty and thus vitiating the effect of the agreement.

Task forces and study commissions have been mentioned. The most famous perhaps is the Forbes Committee of the California Regents. The committee hired an independent special Counsel with a staff of six and authority to retain consultants. Jerome C. Byrne, a Los Angeles attorney, was the Special Counsel; after months of thorough and impartial investigation, he proposed reorganizing the university by decentralizing power.
At University 56 a 46 page report also made careful recommendations for sweeping changes, many of them incorporating ideas of the Rational Action Movement (RAM). In that case a professor was temporarily assigned to the President's Office as chairman of the Commission.

At College 147 after a binding legal interpretation by the state of its liquor laws forced a change in the character of student social life, the president appointed a long-range student-faculty study committee.

At University 56 one administrative officer unilaterally promulgated a speakers policy. It was highly unusual and repugnant to the students, so much so that the student body president conspired to break it and was dismissed from office. Whereupon "the President of the University asked that an ad hoc committee of students and distinguished faculty be developed to establish a speaker's policy."

At College 132 after years of sparring by two groups with overlapping concerns and competing philosophies, the president appointed a coordinating committee. It included both elements and neutrals as well, and had power to control. And finally, at College 61, as mentioned in the section of feedback, a discipline committee was so feared and despised by students, largely because of the reputation of its chairman, that it was reformed: students were added, a new chairman was appointed, the name was changed—and the "negative valences" dropped away. All these are examples
of changes in communicative pattern during a student controversy. Of course many others could be given—the possibilities are infinite in number.

Other innovative forms and types

Necessity is often the mother of some invention of better social behavioral patterns as well as better mouse-traps. Most of the new ideas to emerge from the data have already been introduced. In the subsection just above, various blue ribbon committees were described; they were appointed to study controversies and the problems that caused them. Also discussed were such unusual patterns for higher education as a council of department heads and a regental committee turning loose an independent team of investigators with no holds barred. Let us briefly examine a few more, then consider a warning relevant to much in this section, and a possible solution to the problem of finding a form for campus communication. The point to be remembered is that if one form is not working, another should be tried.

Several innovations were introduced by Berkeley Chancellor Roger Heyns who arrived from Michigan to replace Acting Chancellor Meyerson in 1965-66. Upon his arrival Heyns entered into a virtually unending round of conversations with all elements in the academic community, and some with the City of Berkeley as well: weekly brown bag lunches with student leaders and his staff, open air receptions, monthly town-gown luncheons and informal strolls across the
campus. The trust felt by the student body, faculty and larger university community in this man must have been engendered, at least in part, by these contacts. This trust, combined with the fear of more protracted altercations, enabled him to survive a succession of anti-war recruiting demonstrations. The Berkeley campus seems to have consolidated behind his leadership.

Consider also three other novel notions for improving the quantity and quality of campus communication: at College 34, a college with a strong Quaker tradition, there exists an open Opinion Board; at University 125 weekly all-college afternoon discussion sessions on announced subjects often last far into the evening; at University 86, as part of the commission's intensive study, it was discovered how poor communications were on the campus. To help remedy the situation they brought in the National Training Laboratories with their T-Groups (Training Groups) for greater "sensitivity" in "human relations."¹

In his questionnaire study of organized student protest, Peterson issues this warning. He discovered some of the respondents (who were largely deans of students) using terms like "'channeling,' 'draining of student excesses,' 'hostilities,' and the like." He warns:

However, the new forms for "recognizing the student"—faculty-administration-student seminars, student representatives on policy committees, and so forth—

unless they truly allow for real student participation, may or may not prove to be wise where a critical student intelligence is present. Sophisticated strategies for manipulating the students are likely to be seen for what they are, and the entire situation will be worsened.¹

Then in a footnote he adds, meaningfully to our concern:

In the words of Weissman and Tuthill (Weissman of the FSM steering committee), "These benevolent bureaucrats . . . have brought 'student leaders' onto the rule-making and rule-enforcing committees. This practice has been called shared responsibility by some, co-optation or Uncle Tomism by others, it has also been called student freedom. . . . Freedom in America, on or off campus, too often means a choice between predetermined alternatives rather than participation in forming those alternatives, acting within a context fixed and manipulated by others rather than taking a hand in the definition of that context." (Weissman, Stephen & Tuthill, Doug. Freedom and the university. Motive. October, 1965, pp. 6-7)

Intensely aware of the danger of this charge being leveled, this writer believes that the best pattern might be a community forum sort of government, such as Antioch College has had for thirty-five years. It could be adapted to an individual campus. To ensure against sudden "reconstruction" or legislative revolution by the community council, it could evolve in stages like the British House of Commons which over the years has evolved to a state of virtual independence of the House of Lords (college faculty) or sovereign (chancellor, president, trustees or regents). During a period of growing maturity the independent power of the student-faculty-administration community council

¹Richard E. Peterson, Organized Student Protest, pp. 46-47.
could be increased at intervals. At Lawrence University such an idea is, at the time of this writing, in the legislative process with three such stages over three terms (one year). It bodes well for an institution that trusts the maturity of its students and/or the processes of deliberative discussion and debate with checks and balances.  

The Communicators

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, in this study of communication, we come to the people involved. In this section we are concerned very broadly with the communication behavior of speakers and listeners, writers and readers, controversialists, disrupters and facilitators, leaders and followers, students, teachers, administrators, trustees and others in the panoply of personnel in campus controversies.

Before setting out to analyze the cases, the investigator listed these factors within the communicators: knowledge, preparation, resources, past experiences, credibility, purposes, responsibility, values, attitudes (toward himself, his role and position, other communicators, toward subject and occasion), his emotional stability or need state (e.g., the needs to be right, to be listened to, to

1February, 1968.

2The Lawrence University Community Council (LUCC) was approved by the faculty and president in April and began its legislation and overseeing of student life and concerns in May, 1968.
be appreciated, to see the status quo remain), voice, appearance, mannerisms, perceived attitudes, heuristic or eristic tendencies, strategies, tactics and flexibility. The list was meant to be suggestive rather than all inclusive, and it admittedly has some overlap among items. It grew out of the conception of communication as a process of interaction among human beings with the emphasis on the intended effect and the influence of these other learned variables within the communicator and communicatee. After two decades of studying communication, teaching others, and working in communicative positions, this writer cannot identify the sources of many of the components of this broad conception of communicators. For further orientation to this view of communication as learned, social behavior, the reader is referred to Berlo (1960), Baird and Knower (1963), Ross (1965), Knower and Wagner (1959), Hovland, Janis and Kelley (1953). Other concepts germane to specific discussions in this section (e.g., heuristic-eristic) are developed in connection with those parts of the section.

By far the largest number of statements from the data were concerned with the Communicator. Initially, they were grouped according to the communicative function of the communicator (i.e., speaker, listener, writer, reader, facilitator, disrupter). Approximately two hundred fifty items of the total six hundred were about the communicator; most were restatements of points about other elements in the communication process. Indeed the size and complexity
of dealing with the mass of data required a reassessment. The decision was made to group the statements having to do with communicators according to their positions or roles within the college or university. Many of the items tended to cluster about a concept or problem, and they are handled accordingly. A considerable number, as suggested above, were duplicates that had been adequately covered elsewhere, or that were duplicated in this section (e.g., speaker and listener). In the interest of brevity seventy eight of these were pruned. Of the remaining they will be presented as follows:

The Administration (or Faculty-Administration)—20
The Faculty—5
Individual Faculty Members—4
Central Administration (of a university system)—4
Chief Campus or College Officer (President, Chancellor, Dean)—12
Dean of Students (or someone so functioning)—12
Other (or all) Student Personnel Workers—4
Students—9
Student Body Leaders—3
Trustees, Regents, Legislators—2

Threats, ultimatums—5
Trust—4
Living with controversy—2
Antagonist Principle—9

Communication Adviser, Spokesman—4
Facilitator—25

For a time the plan included a section on militant radicals and their communication. This was finally abandoned after being relocated several times. The decision to abandon was based on three factors: the extent to which the material would overlap with ideas dealt with in other sections of the paper, the existence of a growing body of literature on the
"new breed," and the difficulty in treating that segment with the data from this study. Gathered as it was largely from deans, the data, as analyzed by a dean, might be considered too biased to justify their inclusion as a separate topic. How others react to the militants will be discussed; how they act and react will not be as such within the purview of this chapter, although in many ways their attitudes and behavior would make for more interesting reading.

The administration (or faculty and administration)

What the administration does or says, how it views itself, its role and its milieu, are hard to get at. The results of this study are necessarily painted with a large brush in very tentative strokes. In general it seems that the administration (or faculty-administration) should assume this sort of a role: have only as many rules for students as are necessary for maintaining the character of the institution, uphold them with firmness yet reasonableness, and allow students to handle their own affairs whenever possible. The Berkeley Free Speech episode illustrates a need for this kind of administration role. In the light of later experience the rule against students mounting off campus campaigns from the campus seemed unnecessary and unfair; by the end of that episode virtually no one was defending the position that students' rights should be so limited.

1See Mallery (1966), Cohen and Hale (1967), Katope and Zolbrod (1966).
But given the rule, the Berkeley administration was unreasonable to eliminate suddenly the one exception it had, perhaps inadvertently, allowed. The Bancroft strip served as a safety valve and its closing served to create the Free Speech Movement. But since the avoidance of controversy is not within the stated province of this paper, these observations are prologue. They are necessary to make the point, however, that certain administrative predispositions (attitudinal and organizational) make difficult any satisfactory handling of crises. If the hierarchy is staffed with inept or powerless people, if it has unreasonable rules, if it, or the rules, lacks support, and if it is caught up in an organizational structure unsuited to modern problems—there is an inevitability of enervating embrazlements. If all of these conditions obtain, as they seem to have in varying degree at Berkeley, there is little an administration can do by way of varying its communication behavior to get out of a bad situation. Norman Cousins writing in the *Saturday Review* at the time stated:

No one can contend that the letter of the law was not on the side of the school and state authorities. The students violated a school regulation, archaic and unsound though it was. The authorities acted to punish the violators. Then ensued a grim escalation of force on both sides, the students attempting to block the normal operations of the university, and the administration bringing in the police and putting large numbers of students in jail. The fast-spiraling action and counteraction found the administration flailing about in the attempt to uphold its authority and the students reacting extravagantly to the punitive measures.
Inexorably and inevitably, there developed at Berkeley a condition akin to war, in which soldiers fight to avenge the death of buddies more than to advance an abstract cause. Each side at Berkeley seemed more intent on crushing the other than on finding ways in which the original problem could be resolved without humiliation or defeat. The administration mistakenly allowed itself to become a full antagonist in a war, marshaling all available forces, including outside police, instead of creating a new context for reasonable solution [emphasis added].

Of all the points expressed about the Berkeley fracas, none seems truer than this last. And we would add that such a context can often be fostered by a frank admission of administrative errors. Errors were made at Berkeley but never admitted during the struggle. That they had erred was implicit as well in their several retreats from previous positions; but there was throughout all of their communications a self-righteous air that simply was not conducive to the creation of "a new context for reasonable solution."

There was none of this self-righteousness at University 113, where (as has been observed several times) the administration resisted attempts to draw them into the fray. Instead they worked unceasingly to achieve the kind of "new context" Cousins cited. The role of this administration as a third force, not a "full antagonist," will be discussed later under the heading "the Facilitator." Undoubtedly the administrators at University 113 had studied the Berkeley

1 "Escalation in California."

2 See the Byrne Report to the California Regents.
situation and were the beneficiaries of its experience. One could also suspect that they had carefully read Blaine who cited cases at Brandeis and Yale. Dr. Blaine, chief of psychiatric services at the Harvard-Radcliffe health service, mentions these cases in defense of his plea for "firmness combined with reasonableness." These cases were described on pages 64-65. In both, dissident students were angry about a campus issue. They threatened strikes in support of their position. In one case they were told that striking students, no matter how many, would be suspended, but that their complaints (about a new rule on visiting) would be presented to the trustees. Likewise in the other case (a faculty tenure protest) the administration communicated a reasonable set of ground rules. Their doing so served to head off precipitous action based on the misconception that the administration would give in. They also assured the students that complaints would be heard through proper channels. Blaine, in discussing these cases and the Berkeley crisis, writes of the need of students to identify with "... elders who are concerned and at the same time wise and resolute."\(^2\)


Education Harold Howe II in a speech August 22, 1967.

Speaking at a session of the National Student Association at the University of Maryland, Howe was reported as saying that an area

"noticeable by its absence" is "a rational, informed concern for student growth in that somewhat frightening and highly personal matter of feelings and emotions." He said he did not know whether this calls for new educational programs, or whether the problem can be handled by "a more sophisticated attitude" on the part of college and university administrations. "I do believe . . . that faculty and administrations must recognize the profound influence their attitudes toward students have on emotional and personal development. It makes a great difference, for example, whether a college president regards a sharp manifestation of student dissent as a revolt of the palace serfs to be put down as rapidly and quietly as possible, or as a legitimate protest from full citizens of the academic community who are entitled to be heard and negotiated with—not just dealt with".¹

A number of cases exemplify good and bad attitudes which motivated administration response to student protest. At College 160, in an incident similar to the dorm visiting incident above from Blaine, a student protest was planned. The militants were gathering support from the moderates by deftly suggesting that disciplinary action would not be taken against illegal protesters if their number was large enough. In response the administration issued a statement rationally discussing the situation and indicating where the students' freedom to protest would stop.

In yet a third co-ed visitation case, an enlightened administration emphasized that the issue "was non-negotiable

and why—that various alternatives such as coffee house, union parlors, etc., were either available or projected with reportedly good results. This case, at College 35, points up the need for frankness when the issue is "non-negotiable," giving reasons and alternatives. To let futile discussion wax on, raising hopes that will only be deflated later, or not to give reasons or offer alternatives, would not serve the development of campus morale or student respect for the administration.

By contrast, the study commission set up after the RAM at University 86 discovered that students "are insulted when administrators give logical reasons, but not honest reasons for making or not making decisions influencing their welfare. Students want to be consulted, and they want administrators to level and be honest with them." A rather sketchy report from University 64 suggests that prudish administrators, intent on keeping power and unskillful in communication will only yield tense standoffs, lack of respect and low morale among students and faculty members. One professor wrote,

Student council sponsored an activity entitled a "Bitch-in." It was reported by that name in the student newspaper. When the paper submitted its periodic application for corporation status, and therefore greater freedom from administrative control, the administration council denied the petition citing the term "bitch-in" as an instance of the general charge of poor taste. The newspaper wrote an editorial condemning the administration position and continuing to use the term. The newspaper remains in its original status.
Reminiscent of the non-negotiable issue at College 35 is the situation at College 151. For months discussion took place in a student-faculty committee on student affairs on problems relating to the drinking rules; but no one made this known to the president who considered the rules not timely for change. The resultant blow-up, when the president received a proposal for change and refused it, was seriously damaging to the institution. It would have been better not to negotiate, and such a committee erred in not keeping the president informed of their agenda and their thinking. The outcome of this unhappy deception and commotion included removing from his job the dean of men who served as chairman of the errant committee. In this case the president was the victim of a closed channel and his ultimate action had profound repercussions for years. If the dean had admitted his oversight the situation might have been tempered. For example at University 78 the administration found itself in difficulty for a similar failure to check. The students aggrieved by the inadvertence were "quite reasonable in the long run" after the administration admitted they should have consulted in advance. Such frankness by busy administrators who slip up is apparently beneficial in evoking a good response from students who otherwise might be hurt and angry.

A bit of self-spoofing too can be useful in breaking a logjam. The chapel hymnbook case discussed on page 40 demonstrated how a humorous tack can ease a serious situation
and gain the desired result better than "chewing out" the students.

A speaker controversy at College 48 was mentioned in the previous section in connection with a dean's regret that he failed to keep a record of a key telephone conversation with Fulton Lewis III. Appropos here is this writer's observation that the dean might well have stayed out of the situation. If the faculty and administration seek to minimize the proportions of such a controversy and publicity, they ought not enter in. Their machinations to stop forces already under way will almost always yield more controversy of the kind publicity feeds on. Certainly in this case involving Fulton Lewis III such was the result.

Two administrative principles were observed by Chancellor Heyns during his first major confrontation with the Berkeley radicals (the Naval Recruiting incident, Autumn, 1966). First, non-student and former student agitators provide a troublesome force whose existence should not be encouraged by the faculty and administration agreeing to negotiate with them, either as a segment of the community or as spokesmen for student interests. Heyns "refused to deal with non-students at all, shunned any discussions in which non-student Mario Savio, who tends bar at a near-campus student hangout when not agitating on campus, would take part, if only as a silent observer."¹ Also, as

¹Time, December 16, 1966, p. 110.
discussed in the section on Message, Heyns made clear that his administration had "no intention of accepting a pattern of granting general immunity to all violators of student rules just because the situation gets confused or passions are aroused." It was clear to this writer from contrasting Chancellor Heyns' handling of the recruiting incident with the earlier administration's performance during the Free-Speech debacle that at least two important lessons had been learned:

1) In a controversy with students, an administration should adopt a consistent, decisive (but not rigid) position (and spokesman—see later), and devise strategy and tactics to carry their position; and

2) the will of the faculty must be reflected in what the administration does so that the support of the faculty can be maintained. It is essential.

To conclude this discussion of faculty-administration communications during controversy with students we turn again to events at College 28 during the fraternity obscenity episode. The behavior of the deans and their faculty colleagues on the Committee on Administration seems wonderfully to typify the ideal suggested in the lessons from Berkeley just above. Rather than having such a problem be handled by a dean, the existence of a faculty committee to oversee student life and to recommend policy seemed to free

1Ibid.
the dean from role conflicts. A framework of faculty-administra-


tion seemed well suited to the vexing problems that


arise in dealing with students. In whatever the deans do they at least reflect the policy of the committee. Indeed the committee, as the agent for the entire faculty, has probably had one or more meetings to decide a policy. Such a modus operandi is expensive of faculty time, admittedly. If each faculty member serves on the committee for a few years, but not indefinitely, he will have made his contribu-
tion to the stability of the college and the wisest admin-


istration of student affairs. In subsequent years he will still have a sense of simpatico with the committee and the deans and, most importantly, be able to understand and support the stands taken. Faculty-Administration becomes "we" rather than we-they. Furthermore, at College 28, they saw themselves as educators. Their mission extended to the limits of the college and student life. Their authority was omnipresent; even in areas where they had delegated authority to student government they reluctantly recalled it and acted in an instance of student toleration of conduct at variance with college objectives as they saw them. In their collective role as educator, their communications were, as mentioned earlier, candid and straightforward; they did not equivocate; neither were they vindictive, angry or disrespectful of the students whose actions they decried. As evidence of the firm, restrained joint faculty-administra-
tion handling of assertive and irresponsible students, the
following excerpts are quoted from the committee's report and the dean's memorandum of transmittal. The dean wrote:

January 7, 1966

TO: Members of [Interfraternity Council Judiciary Committee] and [Student Government]

FROM: Dean

The enclosed document represents the most recent (I started to write "final") chapter in the incident which has occupied so much of our mutual concern during the past month. I am anxious that you have a copy before this action is reported in the press.

I want to assure you that the Committee has spent easily 20 hours of discussion on this matter and that it has not reached this conclusion lightly. As there has been misunderstanding on both sides, so is there disappointment, I know. I hope you realize that you have won your point and the Committee has accepted your recommendation that no disciplinary action be taken against [Fraternity x].

Because the Committee has no confidence in the capacity of the IFC-JC to conduct a proper investigation or reach an objective conclusion, the Committee's ultimate responsibility to the Board of Trustees left them with no alternative but to assume full responsibility for disciplinary matters affecting fraternities. Our specific concerns were the following:

1) Three of the seven members of the IFC-JC were the presidents of the offending houses; no effort was made to disqualify them from the deliberations.

2) The chairman of the JC had not read through the primary documents of the case.

3) Whereas the JC chairman reported that the [Fraternity x] president was not present during the performance of the skit, it was later established that he and other officers of the house were sitting in the front row. There is no suggestion that misrepresentation was involved, simply it is apparent that the JC had not properly investigated the incident.
Finally, the testimony of __________________ concerning the conditions on Sunday afternoon of big weekends was so lurid that the Committee was compelled to reaffirm the obligations of chaperonage in order to spell out to fraternities and their chaperones the responsibilities expected.

I know that we will be discussing this issue and its ramifications at a meeting of [student government] on Wednesday, and I will be happy to discuss this action with any member of the IFC-JC at their convenience.

And this is the committee pronouncement:

FACULTY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION

January 6, 1966

PREFACE

The recent presentation of a lewd and obscene skit before guests of [College 28] at the fraternity house, taken together with other blatant instances of performed and published obscenity, have made it unmistakably clear that the College must address itself both to specific cases and to the larger question of the deficiencies in the form of social life now customary. . . .

There is increasing evidence that current forms of social life, especially in some fraternity houses, tend to establish behavior goals and patterns which are not consonant with common-sense norms of gentlemanly behavior and are at odds with the educational, moral and social goals of the College.

It is also increasingly evident that the fraternity system has been unable or its members unwilling, to devise means of self-government effective enough to enforce IFC regulations and uphold the standards of [College 28].

Therefore the following actions are taken:

(1) VOTED that the Committee on Administration register its concern that the Interfraternity Council's Judiciary Committee conducted an improper and inadequate investigation and took no disciplinary action in the [fraternity x] case; and that [the student government] misunderstood their authority by assuming that this disposition of the case
was final and binding. Nonetheless, the Committee accepts the IFC-JC and [student government] recommendation in order to give these bodies full benefit of the doubt.

(2) VOTED that the Committee on Administration will take direct jurisdiction in future disciplinary cases involving behavior in fraternities; that it will welcome responsible opinions from the IFC-JC; and that it leaves to IFC-JC cases involving the internal organizational life of the fraternities (rush violations, etc.).

(3) VOTED that Sunday fraternity parties on major weekends are permitted only if the chaperones or the fraternity adviser are present at all times.

Firmness and reasonableness were the qualities called for by Blaine; surely they were characteristic of the communications above in this exemplary joint faculty-decanal refusal to tolerate inferior standards or sloppy handling by student government.

The faculty

The data gathered for this study did not yield a great amount of information on the role of the faculty per se in contemporary student controversies. The faculty at Berkeley had, as we have mentioned, long since given over their authority over student life and discipline to the administration. Langer\(^1\) observes, "If generalizations about the students are risky, generalizations about the faculty are impossible. About the only safe one, in fact, is that a majority of the faculty became so involved . . . that

\(^1\)Langer, "Crisis at Berkeley: (I) The Civil War," p. 4.
relatively little scholarly work was done." Langer points out that "the faculty took two lines of action." The first, the attempt by the departmental chairmen to mediate, ended in fiasco when Mario Savio grabbed the microphone after a mass meeting and was dragged from the stage of the Greek Theatre. The other, the faculty resolution endorsing the FSM stand, will be discussed later in the section under the heading "Facilitator." Significant here from Berkeley are two lessons about the faculty role in controversy. The first was discussed earlier under Cultural Background. The point was made that the faculty often lags behind the students in their frame of reference for a student problem. This lag is attributable to a generation gap. But when the students do finally attract the faculty's attention and demonstrate the validity of their position, as they did at Berkeley, the realization may be fairly sudden. Such a sudden realization by a significant portion of the faculty, or at least their opinion leaders, may result in almost a missionary zeal to correct the "wrongs" seen by the students. The rush following the realization, in other words, may create a momentum for change. Perhaps it is also furthered by feelings of guilt for not having stopped their own work to listen to students.

Langer also examined "the informal transformation" in the Berkeley faculty.

The transformation is, first of all, personal. Older relationships have by no means been completely altered—older professors, department chairmen, and
other traditional campus leaders are still treated with the respect to which their intellectual attainments, personal distinction, or age entitles them. But there is a tendency to judge people in ways, not only on their political position (as tested in the crisis) but on their ability to make speeches to crowds of students, their skill in mobilizing support from the faculty, their finesse in negotiations behind the scenes . . . the individuals who combine these qualities with concern for what was going on around them came swiftly into new positions of authority.1

By way of contrast, as before, with events at Berkeley, at University 113 during the Selective Service crisis, the administration assiduously avoided assuming an adversative position. They deferred to the faculty and urged the student government to formulate recommendations to the faculty. In such a situation, judged ideal for the handling of these controversies, there should be a committee of faculty members to serve as spokesman and manager of the faculty involvement. It should not fall to the administration serving as facilitator to speak for the faculty. At University 113 there exists "the University Committee, most powerful . . . faculty committee." It drew up the resolution on which the whole faculty voted and its chairman served as spokesman for the faculty.

Since the data for this study were collected in the autumn and winter of 1966-67 there have been a number of large-scale and public controversies. Most of them have involved protesters against the Viet Nam war. In one, also at University 113, events did not proceed in so orderly

1Ibid., p. 5.
a manner as in the Selective Service protest. Final reports are not in as to why events got so far out of hand. One report compiled at the request of the university News and Publication Service is "based primarily on testimony before [a state legislative] Committee which investigated. . . ."

This observation about the role of faculty members when communication problems exist between students and administration is pertinent here.

There existed and apparently continues to exist a serious communication problem between the . . . campus administration and the student body. There seems to be a similar problem in administration-faculty communication. The limited number of administrators who deal with student affairs cannot hope to reach many students. They may send materials to the Daily ________, mimeograph policy statements, and attempt to locate student leaders by going to the [student union gathering place] (which members of Dean ________'s staff frequently do). But they cannot reach the bulk of the students. The only possible way of reaching these students is with the help of the faculty members who see them every day. These faculty members, if they believe it is important to both preserve the integrity of the University and to prevent violence on the campus, should make it clear to the students what the possible consequences are to themselves and to the University if they act irresponsibly. . . .

Dean ________ states that his efforts to persuade the faculty that they must play a role in the efforts to reach students have been unsuccessful. The great deal of criticism by faculty members of the . . . campus administration at the faculty meeting following the protest makes it clear that the administration has failed to persuade at least some of the faculty that it deserves their support in this matter. . . . every conceivable effort should be made to reach the student. . . . Such an important task must be shared by all responsible members of the University community. . . . A more strenuous effort to point out that the issue also involved the integrity of the University might have been made. . . . The faculty appears to be the only vehicle for the presentation of such ideas to students.
A provocative analysis of the faculty role as communicators in student controversies was made by Fogarty. A Professor of American Thought and Language at Michigan State University, he proposes

... that the faculty must decide whether it will perform a clerical or a critical function, and by so deciding recognize that the answer will determine the nature of its professional life style. It must choose between allegiance to institution and job or profession and discipline. If they choose to be clerics then they are bound to obey and transmit the creed of the church. If, however, they choose to be critics then they must expect to find themselves occasionally excommunicated. One of the problems in communication at present is that the life style of most teachers is deplorable. Both students and administration view the faculty as mere functionaries who willingly carry out tasks assigned to them. This functionary role is both passive and predictable since few teachers have any sense of their own moral or educational power.

Faculty members are content to be personnel and what we call aloofness is, in reality, an academic justification for a clerical job. The failure of the academic community to convey its ideas, aspirations and goals to our best students is the result of a lack of the critical style and the pervasiveness of the clerical role. Institutions may have a style, but clerics may not. Critics do have a style because it is they and their ideas that count, not their "job."

In general this writer agrees with Fogarty's strong assertion. It is becoming a major thesis of this paper that faculty involvement is a significant variable in educationally sound management of student controversy. In fairness to faculty, however, we should temper Fogarty with the suggestion that there may be personal reasons why some

faculty members cannot serve as "critics" as he, and student critics would have them. Here we quote Kennan\(^1\) in a recent evaluation of the radical left in America today. Although he acknowledges his generation's responsibility for today's problems and stands ready to join the young in solving them, he offers this interesting explanation of faculty and parental "inhibitions and restraints . . . ."

\[\ldots\] attributed by many members of the student left to be a sweeping corruption of our moral integrity. 
\[\ldots\] In this . . . . there is . . . an element of justification. There is a point somewhere along the way in most of our adult lives, admittedly when enthusiasms flag, when idealism becomes tempered, when responsibility to others . . . compels greater attention to the mundane demands of private life . . . impelled to place the needs of children ahead of the dictates of a defiant idealism and to devote ourselves, pusillanimously, if you will, to the support and rearing of these same children--precisely in order that at some future date they may have the privilege of turning upon us and despising us for the materialistic faintheartedness that made their maturity possibly.

Let us reserve our conclusions for later and look now at a few learnings about the part of individual faculty members in student controversies.

**Individual faculty members**

Four communication behaviors were placed in this category. Two were similar moves of professors acting privately, one was of professor serving as formal adviser and one as private adviser. At Berkeley during the latter stages of the Free Speech crisis, five concerned professors

took it on themselves to publicize and interpret the proposed Academic Senate resolution that served as a basis for ending the conflict. Quoting from the California Monthly narrative account for December 14, 1964, we read:

... The Academic Information Committee, an ad hoc group, began distribution of pamphlets entitled "A Message on the Proposed Solution to the Free Speech Controversy." The pamphlet is sponsored by Professors Henry Nash Smith, William Kornhauser, Sheldon Wolin, Charles Muscatine, Charles Sellers and David Freedman. It was prepared by a volunteer committee of the University professional staff.

According to Jay Levin, professor of English and Information Committee Secretary:
"Our main purpose is to publicize the position taken by the Academic Senate. ... We are in no way connected with the FSM. ... Our fund is being used entirely to inform the public of the nature and grounds of the resolution. We're not persuading anyone to do anything."

Professor Levin seems to have strayed from strict accuracy in the last sentence of his statement. By its very nature a booklet setting forth a proposed faculty resolution and under the sponsorship of several distinguished professors, could only be persuasive to a crisis-weary campus.

At College 170, with no pretense of nonpersuasive intent, an assistant professor took a similar step. It was during a George Lincoln Rockwell controversy where a majority of the faculty and student senate were trying to convince a senate-sponsored speakers committee not to sponsor an address by the American Nazi Party chief. Most students were unfamiliar with what Rockwell stood for and voted in a referendum not to ban his speech. "Therefore, in order to

1P. 71.
place the controversy in perspective, the young professor acted. He sought and received permission from the publisher and had reprinted at his own expense a twelve page "Playboy interview" with Rockwell, subtitled "a candid conversation with the fanatical fuhrer of the American nazi party." The reprint did serve its purpose. By the time the Rockwell show arrived the students of College 170 were well informed and prepared to react appropriately to the venom of the nazi leader.

Two other learnings concerning individual faculty members grew out of the role of adviser. At University 148, a rapidly growing, municipally sponsored institution, the student government's emergence as a force occurred because they had an adviser other than the official whose power they were sharing. The experience at that school suggests that if the power over student life lies with the faculty, the adviser should be from the administration in order to avoid a conflict of interest. Or, conversely, if the administration holds the trump cards, a strong faculty adviser will best serve the fledgling student government. The point being, as a new student government struggles within the context of unfamiliar controversies to gain respect, power, and sophistication, they will be better served by an adviser who is not the one who also has to say no on occasion. On

---

1Full citation not available. Reprint was introduced thus: "The following interview with George Lincoln Rockwell originally appeared in Playboy Magazine; Copywrite [sic] ©, 1966 by HMH Publishing Co., Inc."
reflection, perhaps the best answer lies in having two 
advisers, one from the teaching faculty and one from the 
administrative faculty.

Although not relating to a particular controversy, 
these comments from a veteran adviser seem appropriate here. 
The writer, a faculty member at University 117, reports 
having been deeply involved in controversies involving 
individual students experiencing "certain types of conflict 
with the system." After a number of these he reported,

As you may well imagine, one gets a belly full of 
students in those circumstances and, accordingly, 
I've steered away from students in raging conflict 
against the world for the last several years. Mean­
while, I've taken on a fraternity which has its own 
problems.

With that background he makes two observations: (1) In 
talking with individual students experiencing problems, 
"I've been quite careful to avoid having records kept of 
the conversation. . . . I have found that by not keeping a 
record of the specific communication I've been able to get 
more rapport established than when I have tried to keep 
some record of certain notes . . ."; and (2) " . . . I've 
found that my dealings with students seem to operate at 
their best level when I listen fairly sympathetically and 
respond bluntly and honestly; giving as many reasons as 
logically as possible for my statements." As a former 
colleague who has seen this professor working with students, 
this writer can testify to his success and demand in helping 
students.
Central administration

Three of the universities whose controversies provided the material for this study are characterized by a central administration and several campuses. What then can be learned about the communication of the central administrator (usually called the president) in controversies that embroil one of the units in his university system? It seems clear that a situation on just one campus can best be resolved if the president stays out of the fray. His being able to do so is dependent on the chancellor (i.e., chief campus officer) having enough power to deal with problems on his campus without invoking the president. If the president is a former chancellor and/or if his offices are on or near the troubled campus, like the retired fire horse of old, he may find himself drawn toward the fire; he must resist the temptation as long as possible. If the chancellor should mishandle the situation, as happened at Berkeley, then the president may need to join the battle at his side. As soon as possible, however, prudence would indicate that the president return to his central office.

None of this is to say that the central administration cannot be useful during a student controversy. As a counselor to the chancellor he may serve his best function. The role of the top man in any embattled unit is likely to be a crucial and lonely one ("the buck stops here"). Having both the power to decide and a detached and trusting superior with whom to consult could be most helpful to the chancellor.
In addition, as overseer of the whole university the president can keep an ear and an eye cocked to its various publics. If the legislators, alumni and citizenry are in doubt he can interpret what is going on and reassure them. To the extent that he shares [this] public relations function with trustees or regents, and perhaps the state governor, he will need to keep those individuals apprised and coordinate their efforts. Herein lies a main advantage of a decentralized system and an obligation of its central administration. Because of his consultations with the chancellor he will be able to interpret events on the campus. During them he will be able to filter some of the information to the chancellor and protect him from undue criticism at the wrong time. If the president himself is leading the forces in battle he is lost to these other important tasks. This excerpt from a public statement of the president of University 113 approaches the ideal drawn above. The reader may remember that an ad hoc committee on the Selective Service tests first communicated with the president and that he invited them to his office where the chancellor, dean of students and student body president had also been included. Two days later in a short speech introducing the chancellor to a mass meeting, the president added this clarification of his role:

I should explain that my responsibilities as president of the University . . . extend beyond this campus to all University installations. . . . Chancellor ______ is the chief administrator of this campus. Thus he has been dealing most directly with you. And thus he will give you our reaction—his and mine—to some of the things which so deeply concern so many of you.
At University 89 in the other Selective Service altercation discussed in this study, the system president was not on the same campus, nor indeed in the same part of the state. One can only surmise that he intervened to soften the local president's obduracy. The sequence of events seemed to suggest that the students' telegrams to the governor and central president may have stimulated some intervention. In any case, a change was indicated and if advice was offered there was no public indication of it, leaving the campus president in a comparatively strong position on his own campus when the air cleared. Had the local leader been effectively bypassed, as happened at Berkeley, there might have been nowhere for him to go but out. In summary, let the president select chancellors he can trust with sufficient power to control their campuses; during major controversies let him resist being drawn in as a combatant but instead function as counselor-interpreter, as a fleet commander for the lonely man on the bridge.

Chief campus (or college) officer

As suggested just above, the chief campus officer, by whatever title, has usually been the key person in the controversies studied. Whether he is the president of the institution, the chancellor of a campus or the dean of a college, if the imbroglio becomes big enough, the behavior of this person will likely be the key variable in achieving resolution. This is not to say that deans, vice presidents,
student body officers and senates, faculties and committees cannot be, and are not, vital. As has been seen, and as will be seen, they are. But as Douglas M. Knight, president of Duke University, emphasized in discussing the place of students in the governance of a university, no matter how many committees and councils considered a problem and made recommendations, on crucial matters the president would ultimately have to decide.\(^1\) A number of cases showed how desperately a campus community can crave such a decision by the ultimate authority. Even those who do not favor the substance of the decision will welcome the relief of knowing a matter is settled. Beyond that, the president sometimes has to remind dissenters who is president and where the power lies in an American college or university. Cases at Universities 62 and 86, already described, were settled because the president, at an appropriate time, asserted the fact of his authority.

Clearly, however, a willingness to talk is just as vital as strength, or as Dr. Blaine advocated, combined firmness and reasonableness.\(^2\) These cases demonstrate it. The president of University 26 refused to talk with anti-Selective Service demonstrators while they occupied his offices during a sudden Spring 1966 sit-in. But, as described


\(^2\)Blaine, Youth and the Hazards of Affluence.
previously (see Channel), a university vice president and two security officers alternately were in touch with both the demonstrators and the president. After some equivocation on their part, but none on his, a meeting was held in a neutral location: a show of firmness and reasonableness. Similarly the president of University 86, after his gentle reminder (to the RAM) who was president, invited them to send a delegation to marathon meetings. Meeting most of the time over one weekend, they exchanged perspectives, agreed on the nature and limits of the problem and drafted a public statement calling for a major task force to make a thorough study and recommendations. The same pattern was followed at University 80: a task force to look into problems articulated by a massive student demonstration of discontent with undergraduate teaching. There the students were less militant, so the dean of the college had no occasion to be firm. As is shown in his statement (Appendix D) the dean, with dignity and tact, acknowledged the problem and described the plan to deal with it.

As noted in several earlier references to College 57, the personal force, credibility and speaking ability of the leader are of crucial importance. The reader may recall the general meeting to deal with a student morale problem. "The Dean . . . a very direct and forceful person . . . talked with great frankness to the students, not trying to gloss over any of the difficulties and problems that faced the college (see page 74 on Message and page 38 on
Organization). Surely the qualities of the speaker combined masterfully with the content and organization of his message to achieve the result sought—to reassure the students of that college.

The Byrne report after the Berkeley FSM episode discussed this element of leadership. It stated this principle: "A litmus test of leadership is the capacity to secure the willingness of others to follow in meeting a challenge or a crisis."\(^1\) The Berkeley and the central administrations both came off badly in retrospect, according to the report.

... the students were far more skillful—and, in the short run, successful—than the University. Even though the student protestants represented a great diversity of views and persuasions, and against the fact that hours of debate preceded most of their decisions, the leadership was capable of decisive action rooted in genuine support from its constituency.

The same cannot be said of University leadership: we refer to the President, the Chancellor, and the officers of the University in combination. University leadership was indecisive, uncertain, split in several dimensions, uncoordinated, and unable to gain the support of its own constituency.\(^2\)

Other comments on the Berkeley Chancellor should be helpful in understanding the failure of his leadership during the hectic weeks of Autumn, 1964. No claim is made that these few observations are pervasive or conclusive; the situation was very complex. Lack of authority, credibility and technique were all mentioned.

\(^1\) Byrne Report, p. 15. \(^2\) Ibid.
On December 9, 1964, the Berkeley Chapter of the American Association of University Professors heard a statement by its executive committee which included this observation: "There must always be the continuous possibility of direct and human negotiation between students and a local administrator who has full authority commensurate with his responsibility for order on the campus." This lack was also detailed in the Byrne Report on the Berkeley crisis in a section entitled "Tensions between Statewide and Local Administration" in which is discussed the decentralization of the University of California after 1950.

It had not, however, transferred authority over many matters of policy, nor over many major operational decisions, to campus administrators.

Many essentially routine matters . . . still require approval. In many other cases . . . policies have been drafted in such detailed and restrictive fashion that exceptions are constantly required. . . . As a result, statewide officials are constantly involved in many campus matters, both large and trivial.

Reluctance to delegate authority from statewide offices to the various campuses appears in part to reflect a lack of confidence among statewide officials in campus officials. Fearing that campus officials would exercise faulty judgment if allowed more discretion, and abuse their power if given more of it, these men could do by circumscribing their authority. The limits placed on the authority of campus officials have obviously been a major obstacle to recruiting more highly qualified individuals for key jobs.2

---

1Quoted in narration "A Season of Discontent," p. 70.

2Byrne Report, p. 8.
Considerable overlap of authority and responsibility between the Berkeley chancellor and faculty committees was also demonstrated, further reducing his strength in a crisis. The main point here is the need for "direct and human negotiation [by] a local administrator who has full authority commensurate with his responsibility for order. . . . " Chancellor Edward Strong's having to turn so soon and often for aid to President Clark Kerr was to this writer one of the saddest parts of the Berkeley drama.

Other criticisms of Strong and his staff were leveled by responsible Berkeley sources at the time. An "administration source" told Minneapolis Star reporter Alvin Remmenga,

"If Dr. Strong had just said, 'Look, fellas, we've got a problem here. You're not going about this in the right way, but let's sit down and talk it over anyway,' the problem would have ended right there." But he didn't and it didn't.

Instead Strong suspended eight protest leaders—including Savio—on October 1. They, however, were reinstated on recommendation of the faculty and approved by the board of regents.1

Examining this charge of non-communication in greater detail, Professor Louis Feuer reflects on great presidents who had been great teachers.

Imagine a student demonstration confronting a Charles W. Eliot, or a James Burrill Angell, or a Woodrow Wilson. They would have gone out to meet the students, summoned the leaders at once for a personal discussion, and addressed the crowd themselves. First and foremost, the great presidents were teachers, and their conception of their office was shaped by their conception

of themselves as teachers. But until the October uprising all the administrators reacted like billiard balls to the impersonal forces of the Multiversity. No president, vice-president, chancellor, or vice-chancellor went out to face the students. Each kept a vigil in his office, ensconced by a protective moat of secretaries and aides.

A vacuum of communication with the students was created. In the confusion, various professors came forward, most of them appalled by the irrational rigidity which had settled on the students and the administrators, other perhaps inspired by the prospect of dangling chancellorships and emoluments which they saw as the outcome of a successful debut as mediator. . . . they heard rules recited and one phrase repeated, "non-negotiable."¹

The contrast is marked between the performance described above and that of the president and chancellor at University 113 during the Selective Service protest there in 1966. Ample authority for the chancellor, direct and personal confrontation by the chancellor introduced and supported by the president, combined to make a significant difference. In sharp contrast in the other direction, as set forth in the section on Amount of Communication and elsewhere, is the president who refused even to talk about a decision to hold Selective Service tests. His rigid insensitivity to student concerns served to alienate virtually a whole campus. Of course in each of these instances there were predispositions which served as context for the communication behavior for the president, chancellor or dean. But in each case the role perception,

attitudes and practices of the leader played a crucial role in the outcome of the controversy.¹

Dean of students

The label for this category is a tenuous one. It is intended to include learnings about the role of the chief student personnel administrator: the dean of men or dean of women, the dean of students, dean of the college, vice president for student affairs. In the past several decades since the administrative and counseling functions having to do with student life began breaking away from the presidency, the titles and patterns have been constantly shifting and almost endless in variety. This group is distinguished from The Administration (above), The President, Other (or All) Student Personnel Workers, and the category which cuts across all of these—The Facilitator. Here we will be concerned with the behavior of the student personnel administrator in roles other than as a facilitator, although the lines between categories are necessarily blurred just as are the divisions between offices and various roles of any one administrative officer. Furthermore, it seems

¹An extension of this topic could be whether, or when, to call in outside police during riotous controversies. Purposely not included, this question could serve as the basis for a doctoral dissertation in social psychology. A rule of thumb would be, when anticipating trouble, prepare for the eventuality that the police will be needed and coordinate campus plans with the local chief, but when in doubt, do not call the police. Their presence seems often to inflame passions and increase resistance to an orderly conclusion.
after reviewing the data applicable to this section that the position of dean of students is altogether too difficult to pin down in a situation like this. One is reminded of the title of a chapter "How to Be Nonparanoid though Dean" in Mallery's *Ferment on the Campus*. After talking with personnel deans of more than thirty colleges, Mallery quotes one of them as to the "murkiness" of contemporary controversy situations.

... student personnel people obviously do not agree on "what to do about" political and social action and interest in their students. Each has a highly individual network of people and issues to deal with, and these do not yield easily to formulas and diagrams. One dean spoke of the "murkiness of a lot of this. You can get into things which the principle or the issue still doesn't clarify. They get submerged in so many variables, rumors, personalities--or you see yourself as students see you, some kind of conservative clod taking papa's place and saying, 'My God, you can't do that!'

After discussing the diversity of the tasks and roles, Mallery concludes that the dean has to be more than a passive reactor to crises. He must become involved in the educational process.

How to take part in this educational process in a constructive way, suggesting without intruding, protecting the university and the individual student at the same time, separating the spurious issue from the genuine concern, helping students experiment and make mistakes which somehow will not be disastrous, working to develop a morale on the campus in which freedom and responsibility keep each other's company, all these challenges provide as tricky a network of tightropes as any diplomat has to negotiate and

---

1Mallery, *Ferment on the Campus*, p. 93.
surely more of a one than many a professor of Humanities 3 or Biology 4 has to walk.¹

Such was surely the case at College 142. The story, however interesting, is too long to relate here. It involved a dean of students in a complicated field of conflicting forces. The right course of action was easy enough to see but took courage to follow. A comparatively minor, local situation in a women's residence hall erupted into an all-campus power play. It grew out of a dilemma facing a freshman who had feigned illness in order to punish her boyfriend for dating another; having begun she had to decide whether to persist or admit her hoax. To persist meant a charge against the dormitory director of failing to call a physician. The brouhaha that followed involved (1) the reluctance of local doctors to go out at night except in a genuine emergency, (2) the integrity and competency of the head resident, (3) the telephone hookup to that residence hall, unique on the campus, (4) the incommunicado condition of the college president, seriously ill, (5) the free-wheeling tendencies of a new student body president, (6) the hypersensitivity of the acting president to the reports of the student president that the students were "up in arms" over the incident, (7) a report, fraught with inaccuracies, in the student paper, (8) the inability of the dean of students and the student president to get together before the dean had to leave campus for three days at the height of the fray.

¹Ibid., pp. 94-95.
When he returned, he was told that [the student president] had gone to see Acting President ______, and said that students were "up in arms" over this issue. ______ had then scheduled a cancellation of all classes for ten o'clock Monday morning and had arranged for a mass meeting of students in the auditorium. As ______ outlined the plan to the Dean of Students, he expected that the College Physician, the College Nurse, the Director of the Women's Residence Hall and the Dean of Students to be seated on the stage and answer student questions while he acted as moderator. The Dean of Students stated as forcefully as possible his belief that this procedure would inflate what was fundamentally a localized problem into one involving the whole campus, that it would be difficult to keep the issue from becoming clouded, and that finally he and his staff would be put in the position of being "on trial." Dean [Acting President] ______ reminded him that he was, after all, Acting President and therefore responsible for the final judgment. He, _______, would therefore proceed as planned.

Dean _______, the Dean of Students, was faced with a real dilemma. Had it been President ______ who had made these decisions, he would have submitted his resignation. President ______, however, was ill and not to be disturbed. Dean ______ had no intention of submitting his resignation to Acting President ______.

There lies the problem, not unique in its complexity among those facing deans of students. To deal with them requires a cool head, a firm set of principles and courage.

Here is how the dean of students in this case decided to proceed:

He first informed ______ that he would under no circumstances attend such a meeting, and advised him to cancel it. He said that the problem was not the business of the entire campus but only of those students who were living in the women's residence hall, other living centers having quite different telephone arrangements. He informed ______ that he had requested his residence hall director to meet with the Residence Hall Council and to attempt to work out possible solutions with that body. The Residence Halls Director, Miss ______, had informed
him that there was very little active opposition to the system as such and that most students were merely apprehensive that should they be ill they might be denied the services of a physician.

The outcome for the dean of students in this case was satisfactory. The mass meeting was regarded by the student council as a fiasco and they were angry at their president for precipitating it. The dean of students and Residence Halls Council worked out a solution to the telephone problem. The important fact is that the dean had the wisdom to see the situation more clearly than others and the fortitude to defend his staff and his principles against a procedure that he considered patently ill-advised. He was firm in his principles yet willing to concede on details and to explain— but not in a star chamber. Let us see briefly how other deans of students also put into practice some of these difficult expectations. Most of the cases have been introduced earlier in connection with other of the communication elements.

At University 108, a new vice president for student affairs succeeded a lax and erratic vice president. The latter was discharged and after an interim the new man came into a difficult position, not quite sure what the rules and expectations were, for student or dean. Not afraid to take a stand the new vice president when he realized how fragmented and inadequate were the institution's rules on student drinking parties, set out to make order out of the legislation. The result "was not a new one but a combined
statement of existing written policy, of informal unwritten policy and state statutes." Out of the uproar that followed came a good deal more meaningful communication between the new administrator and his students. If there had been time for more consultation in advance on this explosive topic, one wonders if the outcome would have been either as much rapport or so good a policy. The strong stand evoked much cognitive dissonance, the resolution of which yielded good rapport.

In a similar case already detailed (see Appendix E and discussions of Amount and Pattern of Communication) the dean of students at University 107 took an unpopular action on principle. The dismissal of a student employee caused a protracted tempest. The lesson here is that the dean should not lose his perspective about himself or the situation, should admit being wrong to the extent he decides he is but should not give up on his principles. We said such a dean should rely for counsel and support on his superiors and colleagues and talk with students and critics judiciously only about principles and power, but not personalities.

In effect the ideal standard for deans suggested here is similar to the one Blaine set forth for college presidents: firmness and reasonableness. The absence of these qualities in the communication behavior of deans of students tends to yield unhealthy results. In the case at
University 16 where the AWS president wanted to break her residence hall contract, equivocal talk by the dean of women seemed to increase the student's irresponsible insistence on her own way. By giving in to them, the dean encouraged temperamental outbursts. Firm adherence to principle would, it seems to this writer, have been preferable to trying to "counsel" the student to do what she should have done anyway. This is not to say that a dean should be obdurate and unwilling to explain policies. Indeed a willingness to explain, sometimes endlessly, indicates an attitude that students will respect. The authorities at College 17 introduced a new policy one summer without consulting students. It required two family style meals per week with students wearing "semi-dress-up" clothes. A new dining room made it possible to deviate from cafeteria style. Most upperclassmen were "quite vocal in their resentment" of the extra time required and of the lack of consultation. In conversations with student leaders, an offer to appear at a public meeting, appearance at student senate and in the dining hall at one of the dinners, the dean demonstrated his willingness to explain the rationale. He also admitted the policy had been badly introduced. The combination of his explanations and admission seems to have satisfied the students; the controversy ended but the policy was not changed.

If the dean of students can contrive the explanation so that it comes from other (student) sources, it is more
likely to be accepted, we suspect. In the case at University 85 (abandoning fine arts series in favor of a rodeo club) a student-faculty committee was arranged by the dean. With a student in the chair and without taking a dominant position himself, the dean, by means of committee, achieved his purpose. He ran a minimum risk of having his position viewed as an administration notion to be automatically opposed. Ultimately when the student-faculty committee reported to the student government, it acted to give more money to the fine arts program.

Indeed many deans of students see their roles not as maker of rules and punisher of violators but as interpreter—they interpret faculty and trustee policies to students and student life to faculty and administration. Such middleman deans usually sit on student-faculty councils, as advisers to student senates and as members of faculties and faculty committees on student life. They also serve as a complaint department and suggestion box for both segments of the university. For example, at University 8 in a case already set forth (vending machines) a complaint was received by the dean who must have studied the technique of Operations Research. Before acting on it he gathered data on the problem in all residence halls. On the basis of these he formulated a series of recommendations both to the students and the vendor.

This writer can remember a myriad of instances when explanations offered frankly in student senate, in the
deans' office, over tea or meals, has kept a controversy from becoming a crisis. One outstanding incident surpasses all the others. A college in a far northern clime with no student cars can have problems during the winter; there is no place for a couple to get away from "the madding throng." After careful research and deliberation a residence hall visiting privilege was legislated with ample safeguards and student leaders willing to enforce its provisions. It worked well for two terms and campus morale was high. During the Christmas vacation, just before the winter term was to begin, the Board of Trustees without warning cancelled the visiting privilege. In addition they also announced that longstanding visiting privilege in honors houses would also be ended at the end of the year.

The college had a new president that year. He agreed to meet with the student-faculty committee whose brainchild the cancelled program had been. Bitterness and resentment abounded. After explanations an agreement was made as to how to announce the news to the students. The president left to prepare the announcement, but it was never made. A communication-channel delay meant that a story reached the public press before the on-campus announcement. Student hurt and wrath could not have been greater, especially since the new president was viewed as the author of the trustee action. The former president clearly was the "good guy" in the piece.
With both the cancellation and the badly handled announcement to rile students, when the student senate met two days later the room was packed with disaffected students. The student president, ordinarily a peacemaker, felt betrayed. The mood was tinged with both abject resignation and rebellion; there were no positive voices heard. The dean of men asked if the group would like him to try to explain the situation as he saw it. There followed a twenty-five minute historical and cultural analysis of the problem. In was valuable not only for the increased perspective it gave the disappointed students but also because it represented "someone up there" caring about their feelings. Significantly, when the story of that school year was recorded in the pages of the yearbook, the section on student government began with a picture of the dean addressing the crowded senate chamber about the trustee action.

Although such speeches are extremely useful in crises of the type described, deans of students are well-advised to institute communication of a more routine and preventative sort. Williamson and Cowan, in suggesting means for establishing student rights and freedoms, call for "continuous or periodic informal conversations or consultations between those who possess authority and those who wish to influence. . . ." Such communication, they say, calls for a quality of human relationships more in keeping with the character of institutions of higher learning. "Such a means permits . . . confrontation of ideas, not persons, which takes place in
a more viscerally relaxed situation, one in which cerebra-
tion replaces hatred and abuse of opponents.1

Butler, like Williamson a distinguished dean of
students, also advocates regular opportunities for inter-
change of opinion between students and administrators. He
contends that youth in its search for individual self-
identification are in need of more adults "to share more
frequently with students their own standards, values and
ways they feel personally about different social cultural
and personal issues." He observes further, "Society pre-
viously hasn't permitted open and frank discussions, let
alone rebellion."2

Clearly such frank discussions are needed between
generations and groups in American colleges and universities
today. By whatever title he is known, the dean of students
should be an instigator and participant in them. They will
vary in makeup and pattern according to the organization
of the institution, they will change organically, once they
are started, to meet evolving needs. But they should happen
in some meaningful pattern. In another place Williamson
comes out strongly for the dean of students and his staff,
as part of their responsibility to teach about rights and

1E. G. Williamson and John L. Cowan, "The Role of
the President in the Desirable Enactment of Academic Freedom
for Students," The Educational Record, XLVI (October, 1965),
351-72.

2William R. Butler, "Student Revolts for Freedoms,"
Ohio University Alumnus Magazine, September, 1964, reprinted
in Journal of College Student Personnel (November, 1965),
pp. 324-30.
responsibilities ("academic citizenship education") to institute a continuous seminar by means of student membership on faculty committees, off-the-record background sessions and Kaffee Klatsches with troublemakers between riots.¹ Let us turn now to the learnings from this study concerning other student personnel workers, or all—including the dean of students.

Other (or all) student personnel workers

The attitudes and behavior of the various deans and other student personnel workers can have marked effect on the outcome of student controversies. In addition, of course, they help build the climate of a campus that is conducive to spawning or minimizing outbreaks between various segments of the community. It is not within the province of this study, nor especially of this section, to deal with that topic except by implication.

An attitude of receptivity to student concerns can provide for releasing irrelevent anxiety and possible solutions to controversy. For example at College 156 the Interfraternity Council (IFC) was trying to clean up rushing violations. Their council actions seemed capricious to many other fraternity men. One day a senior student who had served with distinction on the IFC for two years met the

dean of men crossing the campus. The senior just elected to Phi Beta Kappa and primarily involved with matters other than fraternity rush was none the less latently troubled by his own inability to comprehend what the IFC was doing.

When they met on the path the dean stopped him to ask about a freshman student from the senior's hometown. After a short exchange about that unhappy fellow and his plans to transfer colleges, the dean asked, as he often did, "What else is on your mind these days that we ought to talk about?" The senior responded by sketching his perplexity over the IFC campaign. Unable to get a satisfactory explanation from his fraternity's representatives, he wondered if the dean could elucidate. Just a few words of explanation clarified the situation for the student and he departed on his way with expressions of great gratitude. He was glad there were a few people around who would listen to someone's concerns; too few seemed willing to listen. A week later this student's handiwork was evident in the IFC when his fraternity's representatives made an analysis of the rush violation problem that led quickly to a solution satisfactory to all.

This case suggests another principle that is also brought out in an incident that happened at University 146. There a dean began to suspect that one student, whom we shall call George L., was seriously disturbed emotionally and likely to be a source of major trouble to the campus. At first one student and then a professor called on the dean
to discuss their relations with George L. A brilliant mathematician with disruptive Machiavellian tendencies, George had a way of endearing himself to people and then involving them in sordid affairs that met his needs but were at variance with theirs. Before this pattern was clear to anyone, the dean was careful in his consultations not to intervene directly in anyone's relations with George. He strived to help each person develop his own mode of proceeding and see what meaning his interaction with this unusual boy had for each. In each instance the dean remained available for future consultation. Eventually he did have to intervene when George's behavior became severely disruptive of the educational objectives of the institution. By that time he had rather a clear understanding of the problems and had in the meantime helped several others cope with what were essentially their own personal problems in managing their relations with George and the impulses he evoked in them.

The reputation a student personnel worker enjoys on campus will determine whether students and faculty members come to him with such problems. For example if he is primarily perceived as an agent of university discipline, students will be less likely to talk with him about personal or group problems. The fear will exist that he may "find out something."\(^1\) Although a dean can, in our opinion,

---

operate so as to minimize the effect of such a tendency, it can be disabling to some and needs to be considered. The case discussed earlier under Amount of Communication and elsewhere, of the assistant dean for fraternities provides an instance of this. At University 69, to recall, after a funeral procession to demonstrate the death of a fraternity tradition,

It was discovered that the key staff member responsible for the communications with fraternities had lost rapport with the fraternity leaders, and because of this, communications had essentially ceased. The fraternities felt that they had no one who was really representing their views in the administrative circles of the University.

Steps were taken to improve the image of the staff member. His job was refined to take him out of disciplinary matters and to place him essentially in an advising role. This helped his work immensely.

It is the opinion of this writer that although such changes may be necessitated in certain situations involving some student personnel workers, the separation of advising and discipline is by no means a universal requirement. Communication can serve the need within students, individually and in groups, to develop self discipline and to live within the behavioral expectations of their own subcultures and those of the institution and society. Where conflicts exist, the student personnel worker can help mediate and explore the meaning of alternatives. The essential proscription on his conduct would seem to be against judgmentalism. If he has a positive regard for students and their trying to do the right thing, he better can manage himself in his many sided
role. This case at College 102 is illustrative of the impact an administrator's attitude can have as it is manifested in his communication. It took place at a dormitory house meeting and is told in the words of a student.

The Assistant Dean of Men in charge of all men's housing gave a speech to a group of freshman men. The topic was essentially that of individual and group responsibilities in a group living situation. Delivery and content of speech was excellent and the Assistant Dean of Men obtained the response he desired from the men—that of fuller cooperation in group responsibilities, etc.

Conflict occurred when the director of freshman dorms, a subordinate to Asst. Dean of Men, piped up at the end of his superior's speech and said, "I want you men to pick up all bottles around the pop machines, or we'll have them taken out; this isn't just a threat, it will happen."

Needless to say, the reaction of the men was negative to this type of remark. Some of the men's attitudes changed from the response previously obtained by Asst. Dean. In this case an additional, unnecessary comment nullified some aspects of previous speech . . .

Indeed the student response to positive statements of expectations, even by one whose job it is to deal with deviations, can be very favorable. Increasingly as student dissent turns into lawless defiance, some of us see an increasing and important role for student personnel workers, or other faculty, to articulate expectations, to prod students to develop their convictions and take appropriate stands. One example of such prodding is offered here. It is part of a letter that went out over the signature of this writer while the present study was in progress. The idea developed while considering this
section on the communicative role of the student personnel

dean. At the time the student body president at Lawrence
University was the former spokesman for the local SDS
chapter and he was most responsive to the militant activists
in the Senate. The letter was written late in August, 1967.
The primary purpose of this annual communication is to
announce the opening dates of school, announce room assign­
ments, procedural changes, etc. In 1967 something was
added, contrary to the expectations of some students, i.e.,
the activists. We included these observations, some of
which were quoted in a similar letter from the dean of
women.

Finally, before another school year gets under way,
let's take a look at student government. The several
agencies of student government, each in its own
sphere, should provide formal channels of commu­
ication to the faculty and administration. Student
government should be a vital resource for us in
meeting our responsibilities—and it will be if it
attracts the participation of competent leaders of
diverse opinions and abilities who are responsive
to the student body, in academic, political and
social matters. Nothing is more pleasing than when
the Senate works through the deliberative process
to incorporate student concerns into coherent, if
sometimes controversial, legislation. On the other
hand, there is nothing more disappointing than find­
ing the Senate, through haste or faulty communica­
tion, having maneuvered itself out onto a limb.
In one sense last year I was less critical of the
activists than some other members of the Senate and
their constituencies. The committed activists
pursued their convictions vigorously and courageous­
ly, although not always carefully. Too often the
majority of the senators sat by, perhaps bewildered
by parliamentary machinations or the newness of
issues, sometimes resigned to letting their active
colleagues work the Senate into an unworkable situa­
tion, maybe in the hope that the faculty or deans
would call a halt.
These senators abrogate their responsibility (1) to test the climate of opinion on campus and in the world at large, (2) to take part in committee work, (3) to deliberate intelligently on the Senate floor, (4) to vote in an enlightened way and (5) to interpret new legislation to their constituencies.

Similarly I wonder if a large number of other students aren't failing to meet their responsibilities to the body politic. Are the most able presenting themselves for election to the Senate and the other organs of student government? Are the electorates picking the best qualified to serve? Once elected, are the senators getting the backing they need? In other words, as we become increasingly aware of a growing crisis of mistrust between segments in American universities, are we at Lawrence putting into, and deriving from, our common enterprise what we should?

So I urge each of you, as you wind up what I hope has been a refreshing summer, to consider your place in the Lawrence scheme of things, both as a scholar and as a member of the community. Do so with the assurance that your teachers and deans are trying to do the same.

In response to an inquiry from this writer on this and related topics, Fley wrote,

I see a real role for the student personnel worker in prodding the "majority of students who stand back" (to use your phrase) to take a stand on their beliefs. Too many of them, as you suggested, do stand back and wait for the administration to fight their battles or save them from extreme stands. On our campus [University of Illinois] it appears that the graduate students are moving into some of the student activist groups and are pirating them away from the undergraduates. This again puts the undergraduate in a passive position.1

Further opportunities for the student personnel staff will be explored later in the subsection on the Facilitator.

1Letter from Dr. Jo Ann Fley, Assistant Professor of Higher Education, University of Illinois, Champaign, March 4, 1968.
Other staff

The attitudes and behavior of other staff members are also significant factors in student controversies. Only two cases of the 170-odd examined for this study shed light specifically on the place of "other staff" in these affairs. At University 9 in a controversy over food service, the day to day behavior and manner of food service employees proved to be more significant than the policies of the management. Weeks after a settlement at a series of high level meetings with student leaders, a spontaneous demonstration took place in the cafeteria. The embarrassment of this event to the administration caused a significant change. Staff began to give the impression that they understood the causes of the problems and were "working consciously to prevent a recurrence of [the] demonstration," which presumably means giving better food and service, although that was not specifically mentioned. The other case here concerned secretaries and staff people not going the extra mile to help a student with a problem. The case, at University 45, concerned the frustration of a student reporter. Having sensed a story in the report of a trustees meeting he called several offices in an effort to get the facts. The run-around he got has been told earlier. It would seem from these two incidents that lower level employees in educational bureaucracies are subject to the same tendencies as is usual in other large organizations: first, to lose sight of the service goal of the organization--the tendency is to
make the operation of the office or division the primary goal; second, to avoid getting oneself involved in anything controversial—the tendency is to view the problem as out of one's bailiwick and pass the buck rather than risk making a mistake. The combination of these can be a very angry student editor and a scathing editorial blast in spite of latter day attempts by a sensitive dean to solve the problem. Educational administrators may overlook how important a part the service employees (maids, custodians, union, dining hall and office staffs) play in the climate of an institution. These people who place such a high premium on the orderliness of their operation forget that the students are their raison d'être of the job.

Students

Out of so many controversies involving students it may seem strange that only a few are included here. This is actually a left-over category, since many learnings about students and their communication have already been related; and more will be subsequently. None the less there prevails the suspicion that the researcher is a primary reason for the paucity: although a former activist of sorts, more than a decade as teacher and dean have tended to influence perception in favor of non-student participants. Although this and related possible flaws in the results are discussed in the chapter on method, the paucity of items on students suggests they be mentioned here.
Two cases previously described in detail describe situations (at Universities 5 and 2) where student controversies were resolved at ad hoc meetings with high administrative and civic officials. The lesson here is that students should be instrumental in the planning, conduct and report of such meetings. It was clear that student participants and outsiders alike would enter in in better faith if students had significant roles (e.g., spokesman, chairman, convener) other than listener.

Two other cases at University 80 and College 83 disclose significant differences in student preparation and ethics in a controversy. Actually these two are in some way similar to the two contrasted in the section on the Message at University 66, where the quality of research was a significant factor in whether or not a council passed the proposal. At University 80, as described in the treatment of mass meetings under Type and Pattern of Communication, a model of careful preparation produced a student protest rally that attracted broad support. The planners even received public praise from the university vice president for the responsible manner in which they proceeded to call attention to deficiencies in undergraduate education. On the other hand, at College 83 a similar student endeavor failed. Surreptitious and unethical in their methods, five women students conducted a pressure campaign that aroused the feelings of the entire campus. The reader will find it discussed at greater length on page 39.
Erroneous implication, fuzzy facts and misrepresentation of their number gave their surprise letter to parents quite a different effect than if they had been more scrupulous and open in their communications. Had they spoken with administrators to check their facts and procedures in advance, as had done the planners of the mass meeting at University 80, the outcome could have been quite different. As it was the president felt he had no recourse but to continue to endorse the plan the five were opposing. In addition they were required to send a second letter to parents setting the record straight. In reporting this event one of the deans remarked,

*I am confident the housing plans might have been changed if the students had not resorted to unethical means to gain their ends. The President and the Dean of Women felt that at this point the students must learn from this that to gain their requests they must communicate honestly and openly and not resort to unethical pressure methods.*

Even when trying to be careful and ethical in their preparation and presentation of a case for change, students seem to have to guard against other pitfalls and foibles. Cases at University 113 and College 155 illustrate. These involve the often lengthy and unwieldy character of student planning. Less experienced in the art of mounting a campaign than their elders, willing to take more time, and less mature than their faculty colleagues, concerned students are likely to move swervingly toward a perhaps vague objective. The process often includes discussing and debating endlessly, taking votes, and the next day repeating
the process. For students with a cause this method is novel and exhilarating and sometimes takes on functional autonomy. That is, the movement becomes its own motivating force as the social or educational ills which stimulated it become secondary (so frequently do the academic responsibilities of the participants). That such involvement can be instructive and productive is not here disputed; but that is another question, out of the province of this paper. What we are concerned with is the effect these protracted and unguided parleys have on the perceptions and attitudes of the students in them and, therefore on their communication. An example of this phenomenon occurred in this writer's own undergraduate college to a group organized with only the highest of motives. We started meeting during the second year of a four year presidency that was to see the college degenerate badly. Sensing that the corporate spirit was increasingly troubled, we met to try to delineate the factors. We were three concerned, rather idealistic upperclassmen who felt strongly enough about our college to want to do something to stem the tide if we could. Meeting weekly, as we began to comprehend some of the forces at work in the situation, we invited other students to join us in discussing elements on which they were more expert. A few of these stayed on, and the group grew. As it did, and as we began going back over the same ground for the second or third time, subtle changes occurred. For part of each session or, more often, at the end, we would subtly slip from the high plane of scholarly
inquiry. Various kinds of low humor emerged, much of it fantasy, with the president and his "henchmen" serving as the villains—which in some ways they had become in reality. Gallagher describes this mentality as eristic, in contrast to the heuristic mode of inquiry and argument. He quotes The Concise Oxford Dictionary in defining "'eristic' (noun) as 'an arguer aiming at victory rather than truth'" and asserts, "Eristic controversy uses data not as material to be examined but as selected weapons of disputation."

To the eristic, persons cease to be individuals clothed in dignity, they become objects of personal attack and character assassination, because failing to win an argument, the eristic arguer makes the opponent his target. In short, as the Berkeley professors have put it in their defense of academic freedom and of the arrested students, "the educational dialog deteriorates into monolog, arguable hypotheses harden into dogma, and the will to stimulate active inquiry yields to the demand for passive acceptance." Aiming at victory rather than truth, eristic controversy destroys academic freedom.

So, as our inquiry continued so the behavior of the president became increasingly unsatisfactory to us, causing us to lose sight of what had been our goal: to engage in constructive conversation with the president. His mistakes fed our negative impressions, which in turn pushed us more and more into the eristic mode. In our minds his continuing as president became less and less a satisfactory option. Although we may never have uttered that feeling, our speech

---

and other behavior must have reflected it. As more of the campus became concerned with the problems of the college we were thrust into a whirlwind of meetings with trustees, faculty members and large groups of students, as well as, finally, an all-afternoon session with the president (see pp. 262-63). Surely our private slips into the eristic must have affected our perceptions of "the other side," hence our behavior, hence our credibility as statesmen-leaders of what was essentially a just cause. In a tense meeting of concerned, yet immature, people, the line between comic relief and eristic ridicule is hard to see. Such a group can pass it without even knowing it was there. In so doing they jeopardize, as Gallagher says, much that is inherently precious in the academic community. What was possible to occur in this writer's little college in the early 1950's is difficult to avoid in the post-Berkeley era.

The willingness of students to hold many long sessions deliberating on a problem presents a related difficulty. This was well brought out in the Selective Service sit-in incident at University 113. Untold hours were spent by the leaders before they made their first approach to university authorities. Then each night for a week they argued substantive and procedural questions while the sit-in was in progress. Simultaneously a faculty committee was also meeting to prepare a report to the faculty on what should be the university's stance relative to the draft, reporting rank in class, administering the draft test, etc. The
length of their deliberations was not disclosed, nor perhaps considered by the student anti-draft committee who expected the whole faculty to consider at great length this important matter. As a result of orderly committee work and discussion in offices and lounges, the faculty did not need to go on into the night. "The speed at which the faculty had moved and the almost unanimous adoption of the resolution was taken as a shocking slap in the face by the student protesters."

For many students, probably for most, the drive toward resolution of a controversy, harmony with and attention from their teachers and deans, is stronger than the need to win. One senses from reading accounts of these controversies that much of their power comes from feelings, usually unarticulated, of being ignored. Often bizarre in their attempts, such students need to be understood not only for the content of their protest but also the feeling stuff behind it. Much has been written about the Berkeley FSM crisis to attribute it to the alienation of students. This writer does not conclude that that was the most significant factor. The civil rights orientation combined with the clumsy, arbitrary and then equivocal performance of the administration seems a more valid, if simplistic, explanation. But there is no doubt that at Berkeley and elsewhere (although perhaps less so at Berkeley which attracts a certain independent sort of student), students do crave notice.
After he succeeded Edward Strong as acting chancellor at Berkeley, Martin Meyerson wrote:

The more I met with discontented students the more I realized that they were ... objecting to being neglected. This was true for graduates as well as undergraduates ... they did not have an opportunity to discuss the new ideas that were troubling them ... they felt that they never got to know their teachers as persons and were not known as persons to their teachers. ¹

A clearer example of this feeling of being unloved and unnoticed comes from the events at University 69, a "major conflict ... between the administration and ... the fraternity system" previously cited in this study. In the words of the dean of men:

It is difficult to say when the conflict first started, but it is clear that it had been brewing for a number of years due primarily to the feeling on the part of the administration and faculty that fraternities were not measuring up to the intellectual objectives of the institution. ... As I look back on the situation, I think the major difficulty was that communications had broken down. Because of this, anxieties and tensions began to develop. In addition, members of the fraternity system saw the institution growing rapidly and they did not feel that they had a part in this growth. ... [When they lost any rapport with the assistant dean of men for fraternities] the fraternities felt that they had no one who was really representing their views in the administrative circles of the University.

The protest stunt was extremely forceful in attracting the attention of the administration. Rather restrained disciplinary action, followed by arranged conversations and adjustment in the duties of the assistant dean...

served to restore communication and rectify the situation.

In the earlier section on Resistance to Communication a case at College 33 was described. It concerned the quiet introduction by certain faculty members of false interpretations to the president's suggestion that fraternity rush be deferred until the second semester. The "confusion, resentment and anxiety . . . created" were difficult to cope with, even once they and their source were identified. The dean of men, who reported the incident, observed:

There was really no way that he (the president) could convince students that deferred rush would not be used to sabotage the fraternity system. Most students were oblivious to any distinction between intent and probable outcome simply because the latter was so very threatening.

In this writer's experience there have been numerous instances like this. Uninitiated as they often are to the ways of the adult and academic worlds, even without faculty fearmongers, students feeling threatened can accept fantastic fiction. There seems no good solution to this problem except to include them as much as possible in the governing counsels of the institution and try to keep the channels of communication open. If a credible source of verification or debunking is available, wild and divisive rumors can be snipped in the bud. Students must be able to trust their leaders, representatives, teachers and administrators (see subsection on Trust among Communicators).
To round out this section we have decided to include two paragraphs from a professor whose judgment we have come to value. These were written in response to our request for data for this study and to some extent probably describes "normal" (nondoctrinaire, nonmilitant) American undergraduates at all colleges and universities.

Our school is a very liberal-minded one in most other areas and the problems of the kind you describe are usually caused by two simple factors. First the students are not particularly mature because they don't have any responsibility. They are fed, housed and moneyed by their parents and the institution and so do not "have to put their money where their mouth is." They can argue for any nutty scheme because they won't be affected if it goes wrong. The second problem they have is that they are, for the most part, still going through the phase of rebelling against authority for the sake of rebellion. This means whatever the administration feels ought to be done, the kids think the opposite just to argue.

Actually we don't have very many rules and so this makes it all the worse for the students because there isn't much for them to argue over. This frustrates them no end. Therefore they dream up tempests in teapots just for fun. We have had a few of grand squabbles over women's hours, upper class keys, pass/fail only grades in courses, and the right to live off campus. For the most part, the school's tendency is to be liberal in these questions so they let the students decide these things for themselves.

For a description of the militant, his motivation and ideology, we turn to Professor Lewis Feuer of Berkeley who quotes Mario Savio, perhaps the most articulate leader of the FSM.

In physics, the law holds that to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction, and this is often true in social reality. To the trend toward the Impersonal Managerial Multiversity, there corresponds the uprising of the alienated, seeking a sense of
their personality in the impersonal setting which emasculates their idealism at manhood's beginning. This is Mario Savio telling of his search for an ideology:

"As Max Eastman pointed out, a lot of Hegel got mixed in with Marx's notion of history. The dialectic was a way in which Marx made the course of world history coincide with his unconscious desires. Nevertheless, the most important concept for understanding the student movement is Marx's notion of alienation. Its basic meaning is that the worker is alienated from his product, but the concept is applicable to students too, many of whom don't come from the working class.

"Somehow people are being separated off from something. We have so many bureaucracies; their mechanical functioning makes for splits in people's personalities. Marx's concept of alienation has worked out for a two-class society. But it applies equally to our bureaucratic society where there are several centers of impersonal power. The labor movement has taken on the same impersonal quality. The students are frustrated; they can find no place in society where alienation doesn't exist, where they can do meaningful work. Despair sets in, a volatile political agent. The students revolt against the apparatus of the university.

"This is the motive power of the student movement. I thought about it and my own involvement when I went to Mississippi where I could be killed. My reasons were selfish. I wasn't really alive. My life, my middle-class life, had no place in society, not it in me. It was not really a matter of fighting for constitutional rights. I needed some way to pinch myself, to assure myself that I was alive. Now we will have to break down barriers set up in a lot of people's personalities. That is what drives the student movement on."

For a more recent commentary on the state of student activism we turn to Fley. Excerpts follow from the letter quoted earlier. It was sent in answer to some questions raised by this study.

One thing that comes through loud and clear to me is the fact that the student activism picture changes from year to year, almost from month to month. Most generalizations that we make at one point in time have limited application a semester or year later. . . .

I quite agree that we are seeing more "SDS types" elected as student body presidents. . . .

It appears to me that the student activists have fallen into a state of disarray and disorganization. Those who have long championed civil rights and helping the disadvantaged seem to have become disillusioned and disenchanted with the Black Power Movement. I have suspected that the issue of Vietnam this year is in some ways an attempt to mobilize the student activists behind one cause thus gaining some unity in the group. I think the march on the Pentagon last fall illustrated the lack of unity among these groups. From the reports that I received, I concluded that they were not at all unified on either their objectives or the means by which they hoped to accomplish those vague objectives. The students I see who belong to these groups seem to be quite diverse, ranging from 1) what might be called the "ACLU type" who wish to conduct their protests within the limits of the law or at least within certain rules of civil disobedience and 2) avowed nihilists and anarchists. I think that the ACLU types are reluctant to throw their support and weight completely behind those of the second type. And, I must be frank to admit that I hope they continue to show this kind of hesitancy.

I still believe that one thing I said in my speech two years ago is applicable today. As you recall I said then that if the Negroes in the South became militant or violent, the white college students from the North would probably pull out and return to their own campuses to concentrate on university reform. I think we are seeing this happen now. In some ways the Vietnam issue has still given us a chance to play for time. However, if we should pull out of Vietnam--then what? Will there be any other cause except university reform?

1 "Student Activism As It Relates to the Small Campus," an address to the student personnel deans of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest meeting, Monmouth, Illinois, November 8, 1965.
She then goes on to speculate about the future interaction between student activism.

The thing that worries me more at the present time than anything else is the reaction to student activism by the extreme right wing elements in this state and country. I still see these groups as being far more dangerous to our democratic way of life than the majority of the student activists. We have already seen in Illinois, and I think in California, too, the crystallization and mobilization of these groups. My fear is that the student activists in their exuberance will trigger a concentrated right wing reaction which could throw us back into a kind of McCarthy period. This, as I say, is the thing that concerns me most at the present time. The public I find is extremely naive and poorly informed about the purposes of higher education and the meaning of academic freedom with responsibility.

Let us now conclude this portion on students by examining three cases concerning the communication of student leaders during campus controversies. They have a most difficult—perhaps the most difficult—role expectations. Caught with very little actual power between the power structure (trustees, faculty and/or administration) and often restless student masses, the student leader has to rely on logic, persuasion and mediation. With less experience than he needs and with less time than he needs for his academic responsibilities, his leadership and his private life, he often feels frustrated in all three areas.

In the section of Feedback was described one problem experienced by a student president. For some reason he had not done his homework on a proposal for change. Although he understood well enough how the new program

\[ ^1 \text{Fley, March 4, 1968, letter.} \]
would work he had failed to master the reasons for abandon-
ing the status quo. Neither did he have at his side anyone
else who could speak intelligently on that subject. When
it was questioned, he floundered (not once, but on two
occasions) and so did the program. But perhaps this case
is not typical, for the reporter does not tell us that the
proposal (for a merger of men's and women's dormitory
councils) did indeed have merit. But in any case the
importance of thorough preparation for public meetings,
including analysis of audience and anticipation of feed-
back, cannot be over-emphasized in working with developing
leaders.

Strong expressions of opinion by a student leader
are likely to mean stronger leadership; but they open the
leader to charges of "dictatorial methods." Such was the
experience of a student president at University 143. The
case involves election to membership in a prestigious
leadership honorary. The details seem unimportant, but
in general outline: two girls were viewed as highly suited
for the group when only one opening existed. After careful
consideration one of them was elected. Everyone present
was disappointed not to be able to take the other (Nancy).
Just a few weeks later another vacancy opened and the group
was about to elect Nancy by acclamation when the meeting
took an unexpected turn. A girl who had not been present
at the previous meeting brought up a name (Carolyn) that
the rest had not considered seriously the previous time.
She managed in a short time to sway the majority. The vote was 22-18 for Carolyn.

Thunderstruck, the president and secretary conferred with the adviser before announcing the results. The student president's instincts told her the vote was a mistake and the result of having none of Nancy's virtues recalled to neutralize all the favorable comments about Carolyn. So screwing up her courage the student president announced:

I know that what I am going to do is breaking all parliamentary procedure and everything else, but I just don't understand this vote and I'm wondering if you all do. The vote came out twenty two to eighteen in favor of Carolyn Wills. (A hush falls over the group, and there are a number of 'No's!') Neither I nor the Sponsor understand your reasoning and, frankly, we are rather astonished by the results.

After that there was a motion to reconsider and, after more discussion, the vote was reversed thirty-two to eight. A few days later the president learned that several members were unhappy with her dictatorial methods in handling the meeting.

The tendency of students (and others!) to become carried away in the excitement of a meeting calls for leaders who can keep a sense of perspective and place matters in it for the group. To do so calls for a strong and alert leader. The presence of an adult adviser or student elder statesman is a big help of course. The ability and willingness to be more than just a moderator, but instead to help formulate the group's objectives and to speak out to show the way toward
them, is crucial to strong student government. Not all student leaders are willing to risk their popularity for their convictions; and the respect and increased effectiveness that will accrue are hard to anticipate for many young people.

The above case is, however, rather prosaic when contrasted to many contemporary student leadership situations. The principle is no less valid but simply more difficult to apply when the "new breed" of student activists is involved. Even when their ends are the same, the means they will consider are enough to divide a meeting and test severely the skill of a leader. Such is likely to be the case even in a meeting of the SDS.

Alumni, trustees, legislators, citizens

The data of this study did not yield many references to groups and individuals off the campuses where the controversies occurred. Increasingly, as emphasized by Fley in her letter (page 333), a right wing public reaction to the New Left is a distinct possibility. She finds the public "extremely naive and poorly informed about the purposes of higher education and the meaning of academic freedom with responsibility." Sensitive to their constituents, many legislators feel compelled to articulate pronouncements threatening to the university community, whether or not they believe them. Some trustees or regents, including governors, whose job it should be to provide for university
governance and interpret it to the community, also seem to foster opposition and hostility to academic freedom. These instances illustrate. During an anti-draft sit-in at one state university a measure was introduced in the state legislature to increase out-of-state tuition from $1,050 to $1,500. One prominent legislator was quoted in the newspaper as saying, "We shouldn't have so many New Yorkers sitting in buildings who should be in class." To him any move to deter enrollment of students from other states (e.g., New York) was desirable. A few years later this same legislator was pushing a bill to limit to twenty per cent the students from out of state who could attend the university.

On October 18, 1967, in connection with a recruiting visit by representatives of Dow Chemical Co. which manufactures napalm for use in Viet Nam, there were violent demonstrations at the Madison campus of the University of Wisconsin. Afterward they were perhaps the most intensively and publicly investigated university events in history. A select committee of eight state senators, presided over by the lieutenant governor, was quickly formed to determine what legislation, if any, would be appropriate to prevent future such occurrences. Hearings were conducted by the committee with a staff from the attorney general's office. These were broadcast for four hours a night two to four evenings a week for several weeks over the Wisconsin State Network. They were fascinating and at times frightening to hear. Questioned in turn were the chairman of the board
of regents, the president, the chancellor of the Madison campus, the dean of student affairs, the chief campus police-man, the chief of the city police, several members of the press and some leaders of the student protesters. Lawyers from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) were also there to represent the rights of the student radicals. All in all it was an illuminating, although laborious, enterprise. The senators and their committee counsel were, by and large, exceedingly courteous to the university personnel, one of whom underwent several nights of questioning of the most penetrating and often hostile kind. It was clear that some senators felt under great pressure from their people at home to root out the dissent at the state university. All of this went on while the governor was out of the country leading a trade mission. The legislative hearing seemed quietly to end when the governor returned to the capitol and let it be known he would veto the kind of repressive legislation for the university that was being discussed.

If the new chancellor at Madison was culpable of anything it was of bringing the Madison city police onto the campus too soon—in the words of his predecessor, "in

\footnote{Former Chancellor Robben W. Fleming, on the occasion of his departure to become president of the University of Michigan was interviewed over the Wisconsin state radio network on July 29, 1967, from four to five o'clock. He had this to say about mass action by students: "There is no good way to stop mass action by large groups, whether it is students, laborers or racial activists, unless you are prepared to handle it in a totalitarian way. So you tolerate a lot that you wish you didn't have to."}
a totalitarian way." The burden on the chancellor from the public and their legislators clearly was to maintain the recruiting interviews and maintain order. At San Francisco State College a month or so later, similar disaffection resulted in a major incident. In the words of one editorialist,

... when glass was smashed at San Francisco State College last month, the alarms that were raised in the state assembly and in special sessions of the state college board of trustees, and in the editorial pages of the California newspapers, were not only because the Movement Against Political Suspensions and the Black Students Union had gone so far as to smash glass but also because San Francisco State College President John H. Summerskill had not gone so far as to order heads smashed in retaliation. Members of a ways and means subcommittee on higher education in the assembly said they would vote against any pay increases for state college faculty until the "reign of violence" had ended. "The professors brought this upon themselves," said an assembly leader, indicating as plainly as it could be said that the questions in the mind, and not the bricks in the glass, are seen as the primary offense.

President Summerskill was praised by police advisers on the scene for not requesting city police to help put down the disturbance. "Had the police entered the campus, it would have resulted in hundreds of arrests and far more damage to campus property and many injuries," said San Francisco Police Chief Thomas J. Cahill, but the politicians didn't see it that way. Encouraged by the governor, who had been serving the people of California at public appearances in Connecticut and rushed back to attend the state college trustees' meeting, the board overruled a minority that wanted to fire Dr. Summerskill out of hand and instead appointed a task force to investigate his handling of the instant demonstration and events of the last several months.

In 60 days, the task force will report and the trustees will decide whether Dr. Summerskill can keep his job. ... Meanwhile, the committee on
education of the assembly is conducting a similar investigation, with a similar objective.\footnote{Editorial, \textit{College and University Business}, XLIV (January, 1968), 4.}

A post script: before the sixty days had elapsed President Summerskill had, on his own initiative, resigned. Such an act communicates to legislators and trustees in California and everywhere that a proven and self-respecting academic administrator should not have his decisions second-guessed by threatening politicians outside the academy. This brings us to the subject of threats by students during campus controversies.

\textbf{Threats, ultimatums}

Although the data are insufficient to be conclusive, it would appear that faculties and administrations should not, and in most cases will not, cave in under a student ultimatum. Actually there seems no good solution once such a threat is laid down. Both sides feel they cannot back away and the stronger side, usually the faculty-administration, feels it cannot afford to lose. So reluctantly it refuses, on principle, to give in and then prepares to sustain whatever reprisal was threatened. This was the texture of the trouble at College 151 a number of years ago, when, as recounted earlier under "The Administration," the college was approaching its one hundredth anniversary. Ill-timed discussions on drinking policy had been held for weeks, unbeknownst to the president. That gentleman, not
fond of turning down recommendations of his student-faculty
committee on student affairs, none the less could not jeop­
ardize a fund raising campaign for a new library building,
he felt. Especially when the powerful IFC publicly threatened
to boycott the anniversary celebrations, the president could
not give in—even though the change really making legal
that which had been occurring _sub rosa_ for years at frater­
nity parties. There followed (1) a successful anniversary
and fund drive, (2) an administrative shakeup to put in new
faces to deal with the errant fraternities and (3) a crack­
down on their drinking. The wounds were slow to heal, how­
ever, and reportedly for years thereafter any mention of a
possible threat of student boycott brought prompt reaction,
old-timers persuading headstrong youngsters of the folly of
backing a strong president into a corner. "How would you
react to such an ultimatum if you were he?" they would ask;
"How else can he react?"

During the Berkeley FSM crisis, on December 17, 1964,
at a news conference in connection with a meeting of the
Board of Regents, President Clark Kerr emphasized that the
Regents "will not respond to threats."¹ Anticipating that
students might make threats, a president is wise to issue
such a warning.

At University 113, where so many things were managed
so effectively, the faculty, through their steering committe,

¹"Three Months of Protest," _California Monthly_,
LXXV (February, 1965), 73.
made very clear to the student protesters their position on untoward pressure. A statement was issued declaring that the faculty assembled to decide policy on Selective Service would likely react negatively to pressure from the sitters-in, before and during the faculty meeting. The latter were asked to desist and "advise us of their intentions." Some authorities do perhaps buckle before ultimatums; many parents, we suspect, are afraid of their offspring. If so when these people find themselves as students confronting the paterfamilias universitas ("in loco parentis") they may naturally try the same tactic. Prudent is the spokesman for the authority who advises students that such performance will not be successful. No more than the students would like an ultimatum from on high, they should be given fair warning that the faculty also would not react favorably to student threats. Ultimata are anathema to academia.

Trust

When this investigator backs away from the cases submitted for this study and views them at a distance, certain recurrent issues are evident. One of these is trust. It is mercuric and difficult to incorporate in one's thinking, both in a research study about student controversies and in the arenas of the controversies themselves. Byrne found the quality of trust relationships at Berkeley to be one of the "underlying and persistent faults" at Berkeley.
In discussing Trust Relationships he wrote:

Trust is possible only between men who have hope for themselves and each other. Distrust is a denial of hope.

Perhaps the elemental tragedy of the events of the fall was the clear revelation of the deep mistrust of the young for their elders and the implicit denial of hope in one for the other. In denying the possibility that students would behave responsibly and impose their own sanctions on each other, the University helped maintain a system held together by mistrust.

In taking direct action as the primary method for redress of grievances, the students denied all hope in the ultimate dignity of University leadership. Each trained and supported the other in this process of reinforcement.

We reluctantly conclude that the seeds of distrust—between the Regents and the academic community, the Administration and students—were planted long ago. Just such distrust was described by a dean at University 51; the dean's own distrust of contemporary students is implicit in what he wrote. This commentary grew out of the failure of fraternity leaders, advisers and housemothers to report that plans were afoot to renew some illegal activity which the dean had tried to stamp out. This "failure to report" was equated as a lack of confidence in the administration.

Where mutual confidence breaks down between all parties concerned in University administration, negative activities are the inevitable result.

This same flaw in mutual communication can be found to be evident in racial, political and social riots, demonstrations and student revolts.

---

1 Byrne, "The Byrne Report," p. 15.
2 Ibid., p. 16.
What are some of the apparent causes for this breakdown? This administrator has observed the following:

A. There is a lack of confidence on the part of the student for the motive of the University administrators and Faculty Advisors when objective information is given to them in which a restraint on their individual activities are requested.

B. There is still evident an attitude of adolescence in the minds of the students even though they demand to be treated as mature adults. They are not willing to objectively debate issues because they fear their inability to cope with pure logic that may lead them to agree with their adult advisors or leaders.

C. They are often misled by adverse outside influences whose sole purpose is for self-exploitation or a distorted sense of freedom without social responsibility or concern for the general welfare.

Often, complete and satisfactory communications within large Universities breaks down because of self assumed points of view of the other parties. Where common objectives within the University are accepted by all concerned; where open and free discussion of all issues are encouraged; where confidence, faith and truth are paramount in the thinking of all parties and where fairness, justice and integrity become the characteristics of the University community in all of its complex areas appropriate communications will be established and positive programs will exist that removes the use of irrational demonstrations as a method of accomplishing results.

Apparently the failure of students to adopt his administration's "objectives" (which not even all his staff were accepting), has been parlayed by current complexities and student unrest into an unhealthy measure of distrust within this dean. One would not be surprised to learn of a Berkeley style escalation of some rather routine campus controversy at University 51.

An example of the unhappy results such an attitude in a dean can yield, occurred at College 152. Like the
dean at University 51 quoted above, the dean of men at College 152 had become cynical and defensive after several instances of uncooperativeness by fraternity leaders. When at the height of one fit of pique he publicly communicated his lack of hope that the dilatory fraternity leaders, or their successors, would ever act responsibly, all was lost for the dean. He saw no recourse but to resign: the bitterness and distrust he had developed toward himself had invalidated his future as dean.

At College 159 while deliberating in search of a policy on open dorms (student visiting in residence hall rooms of members of the other sex), a faculty committee raised these questions about trust:

What kind of **trust** ought we to extend in our dealing with students in social realms?
What kind of trust are the students asking?
Is trust in social realms comparable to trust in the academic realm?
Is trust in the social realm conducive to the best academic relation between teacher and students?
What is the relation between responsibility and trust?
Would any change in the rules demonstrate trust?

How tricky such questions can be is demonstrated in the following excerpt from the record of the committee's discussion of these questions. The implications for student-faculty communication during controversy are manifold and manifest.

It was asked whether total trust in the social realm is the only kind of trust students will perceive as an adequate expression of trust. Another member held that the kind of trust that had just been defined is completely mutual and wondered whether
or not there is another kind that isn't quite so mutual. Some students want "equal" trust but others are willing to accept the "captain/crew" kind of trust. The deans illustrated with reports of interviews with students.

In the search for a degree of reciprocal trust, the Committee considered the parallel of the academic honor system. The latter is based on an acknowledgment that "we" not only trust "you" to be honest people but also to be people who can maintain standards that are publicly known and that do exist. It was questioned whether or not to expect students to accept some role in the establishment of social rules and in the enforcement of them would convey a sense of trust to students. Would they accept that kind of responsibility? Mr. ________ asked whether we are really talking about how free we are going to let the students be. In the present atmosphere, it was thought, to restrict freedom is to defy students to act irresponsibly. Would they accept a social honor code? This brings up the position of an honor council, another set of judges.

Mr. ________ enunciated what he sees as a dichotomy: one must have freedom to act responsibly, but it is necessary to have some criterion by which to judge responsibility. Is it necessary to state social standards to have responsibility in the social area? What are or would be "accepted" criteria? We assumed academic honesty and, it was pointed out, spent the better part of a year imposing that assumption and certain related conditions on the students. Need we ask students whether or not they ought to accept certain standards? Ought we and they work out together the standards of behavior they would accept? Would they accept the responsibility to govern themselves with this set of standards?

The problem of the extent of the representativeness of the voices we hear came into the discussion. Can "we" speak for the students who do not speak out, even in the Committees of which they are members? There was a reference to the kind of trust that develops among the members, both student and faculty, on a committee and to evidence that even in this privileged relationship areas of mistrust or lack of trust become evident.

Can we avoid embarrassment in accepting a position of leadership? Do we have the right to teach students our principles?
Mr. ________ replied that it doesn't seem desirable to do so. What may be needed, he suggested, is to discover a way to allow them to develop respect for the procedures of developing standards and respect for standards themselves. "Someone ought to formulate a structure that would encompass the accumulated wisdom of mankind!" said the quiet voice behind the desk. But large order or not, there was a feeling that there are degrees of freedom to be given and there must be ways of establishing the best educational environment. Mr. ________ questioned any attempt at the collective writing of ethical codes: individuals write their own.

Broderick examines the ambiguity of the concept trust as it is used in discussions like the one above. Recognizing the appeal the concept has for educators he contends that students use it as a rallying cry—"a banner, not a defined position." They do so, he contends, because of the variety of meanings the word enjoys. As an example he evolves a dialogue that constitutes blackmail. "What is being said, freely translated, is: 'Unless you give me what I want today, unless you yield to this immediate request, you will have shown that you do not trust me. . . ." He concludes:

This rhetorical gambit is blackmail, and it should be resisted—both because the charge is wrong, and because yielding is unsuccessful. The charge is wrong, for at most institutions certainly and at all institutions possibly the messages have come through that an institution gains by eagerly engaging students in the educational process at every level, and that rights, privacy, and trust are central to the educational process. Every institution has to decide—in the rough play of dialogue, or by a many-sided institutional evaluation—how far it should go. To make the whole concept of trust hinge on what one articulate group, or one noisy individual, demands today is folly.
Worse than folly—it is unsuccessful. For there is no limit to the demands that can be implemented under the rubric of trust, and someone will always be found to make the next demand—and the next—and the next. And finally when unwary adults have given away everything, their students will reproach them yet again: "Why couldn't you trust us to understand that there is a limit to the yielding, that there has to be a limit to the yielding? Why couldn't you have trust us to have enough sophistication to see that?"

Trust is important. Everybody agrees on that. And the areas of trust should probably be expanded in response to the felt needs of students and to the faculty's sense of security in its own educational process. The process will move more smoothly if faculties clarify what they mean when they use the word trust. The curious ambiguities now surrounding the word trust should not bamboozle either side into unwarranted assumptions or defensive positions or unwise decisions.¹

Lunsford in examining the most recent transition in student protests from dissent to defiance uses the word trust in another context that affects communicators in campus controversies. In advocating honesty and openness as well as involvement by academicians in social issues, he observes:

It is not because the leaders of nation and campus have been truthful and worthy of the "trust" for which they long. News manipulation, the "credibility gap," the exposure of secret spying in the U-2, Bay of Pigs, and numberous other CIA affairs, have all been well publicized on the national and international scene. On the campus, official double-talk, outright public untruths, and transparent fictions of impartial benevolence have marked many a student-administration conflict.²


In view of the importance of trust as a major, yet uncertain, influence on human communication, Giffin and his colleagues at Kansas are embarked on "a long range investigation of interpersonal trust in the communication process."¹ Their "efforts are being carried forward on three related areas: (1) conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal trust, (2) identification of variables related to trust in the communication process, and (3) relationship between interpersonal trust and speech anxiety."² In examining factors which influence interpersonal trust he discloses that research has indicated three sets of factors: (1) interpersonal perceptions, (2) situational conditions, and (3) personality characteristics of the person doing the trusting.³

In discussing Interpersonal Perceptions, Giffin contrasts Aristotle's ethos with Hovland, Janis and Kelley's source credibility, and examines research by Deutsch "to support the point that the trusted person's intentions are perceived as a separate variable." Deutsch's⁴ findings could have applicability for students, faculty and


²Ibid.  

³Ibid., p. 6.


administrators in public or private communicative situations.

Giffin finds "additional support for the importance of the trusted person's intentions" in research by Gibb.

Gibb found that trust is increased by communication which showed a person's intentions to be (1) non-evaluative, (2) problem-oriented rather than oriented toward social control, (3) spontaneous rather than strategic, (4) empathic rather than neutral, (5) between equals rather than between persons of unequal status, and (6) provisional or tentative rather than certain.¹

In analyzing these and other studies of interpersonal perceptions as they relate to interpersonal trust, Giffin found the evidence "not entirely clear." Trust seems "to be influenced by the listener's perceptions of the following characteristics . . .":

(1) **expertness** relevant to the topic under discussion; this expertise may be in the form of quantity of pertinent information, degree of ability or skill, or validity of judgment;

(2) **reliability** as an information source; this reliability may be perceived as dependability, predictability, or consistency;

(3) **intentions** toward the listener, perceived by him as favorable or unfavorable;

(4) **dynamism**, that is, behavior perceived as more active than passive;

(5) **personal attractiveness** of the speaker for the listener.²

"On the other side of the coin," says Giffin, "variables which are influenced by changes in interpersonal


trust . . . have not been given a great amount of study."¹ Reviewing studies of small-group interaction "has tended to show that changes in interpersonal trust apparently produce changes in (1) interpersonal relationships and (2) personality characteristics."² Increased cooperation is an important result of increased trust, according to the studies by Deutsch.³ This finding, as well as a related one by Gibb, should be of interest to those working with students in campus conflicts, as well as to students themselves. Giffin reports:

From work reported by Gibb it appears that the following interpersonal relationships are changed as interpersonal trust is increased: (1) acceptance of "legitimate" influence by others, (2) acceptance of perceived motives of others, (3) acceptance of diverse (deviant) behavior by others, (4) acceptance of lack of trust by others, (5) shifting of emphasis on control over process rather than over people, and (6) increased interpersonal trust. As previously indicated, Gibb's findings are more in the form of theoretical formulations rather than quantified data; they need further verification.

With regards personality dimensions, Giffin has this to say.

Changes in personality dimensions are not easy to produce; changes in behavior which seem to indicate changes in personality structure may be only temporary. Even so, the work of Gibb tends to indicate that two very important changes may occur in the personality of a person as his trust of others is increased: (1) greater feelings of personal adequacy, and (or) (2) easier acceptance of one's own

feelings and conflicts. Obviously, these suggested hypotheses need very careful testing.¹

To conclude our considerations on trust we must cite the problem of distrust as one of the most difficult problems on the collegiate scene. There is an almost general malaise felt among intellectuals in the winter of 1968 about the Viet Nam war. This is shared by many students whose education and lives may soon be interrupted; they find it easy to focus their distrust of authority on the national scene onto campus authorities. Extraordinary study is needed to understand the nature and dimensions of the problem and to counteract it. By getting to know each other as persons, by having facilitators trusted by both sides, students and their teachers and deans must enter into the "rough play of dialogue" where each campus will come out on each of its problems. To increase the probability of trust on both sides of such dialogues these qualities should be sought in the representatives sent by both sides: open, honest, non-evaluative, problem-oriented, spontaneous, empathetic, egalitarian, tentative, expert, reliable, dynamic, attractive and favorably disposed to the other side.

Related to the above considerations of trust is another problem. What should one side do when the other side does not want to sit down in the classic search for truth?
Internal resistance to honest dialogue

The interrelatedness of personality configuration and communication is well known and should not need to be reviewed here. Likewise the impact of the social context on personality and hence on communication has received widespread attention in the literature of social psychology, social psychiatry, and speech persuasion. The point of this part on the Communicator is that some people do not want to confront the other party in a dispute. It is very difficult, for example, to ask, "Just what is your point of view?" Because of these individuals' psychic predispositions, it is even more difficult to engage in the give and take of discussion about a problem. More likely, if they do get together with someone on the opposing side of an argument, they will want that person to accept their viewpoint and modify his policies and conduct accordingly. To illustrate the variations of disposition to discuss, here are four students who thought they disagreed with a public statement by a new dean.

When he arrived to assume the position of Dean of the College, he took on for many students a bright halo as well. In the college where this writer serves as dean of men there had not been a dean of the college for almost a year. The new man had an aura of liberalism and openness that was very appealing to virtually everyone in the campus community. After a distinguished record as teacher, scholar
and writer of fiction, he took his attractive family to Africa where he directed Peace Corps affairs in Ghana. A Kennedy Democrat in the years just after the president's assassination, he filled an important void in the lives of students. He threw himself into the life of the campus—teaching a history or Freshman Studies course each term, delivering lectures, listening to students. Very rarely did he have the opportunity for pronouncements on the controversial campus topics—no one asked him; most just assumed he was a liberal in all areas where they wanted him to agree with them. Imagine the corporate shock, then, when one evening he was invited to answer questions over the campus radio station on the subject of visiting in residence hall rooms of the opposite sex (open dorms). No opportunity had arisen for him to make known his views, which were rather decidedly against any extension of visiting hours. Moreover, when pushed by stunned and antagonistic student questioners, the new dean left no room for doubt that he opposed a good deal that corporate wishful thinking had ascribed to him. The honeymoon suddenly was over. Let us now look at the reactions of four archetypal but actual students.

The first two called the deans' office as soon as it opened the next morning after the radio broadcast; they asked to see the dean of men as soon as possible. The first, a sophomore on academic probation, was virulent in his criticism of the dean's message and motives. This student could not, he asserted repeatedly, remain at an institution with
such a person as dean. The second also talked with the dean of men who was by that time, not having known of the radio interview, incredulous at the first student's performance. A freshman whose older brothers had written outstanding records at the college, Number Two reported himself unable to comprehend the dean's remarks over the air. Would the dean of men be kind enough to place them in some meaningful context? After ten minutes or so of explication, the student asked several more questions for clarification, declared the interview to have been extremely helpful and left. The first had not wanted to hear any other views but condemned the ones he did not like; the second also did not want to discuss but simply sought information and interpretation.

The third student, a long-haired young lady, made an appointment directly with the dean of the college. She could, she remarked sweetly at the outset, only believe that the dean was misinformed in holding his [misguided] beliefs. She had come in, therefore, to tell him about things as they really were. She expounded the thesis that "the only thing that would make this place tolerable" would be to retreat with one's special friend away from the cloying Middlewestern atmosphere into the privacy of one of their rooms. Close personal relationships just could not be made and unmade, she further asserted, with 1300 pairs of prying eyes spying curiously. When the dean tried to interject the reasons for his demurrall on open dorms, her sweetness gave way to angry denunciation of "the administration" for
its failure to understand students' needs. After very little
more substantive discussion, she left, muttering dire predic-
tions of mass disaffection and transfer to other institutions.

The fourth member of this comparison was less hasty
in phoning for an appointment although probably no less
disappointed to realize that the New Hope within administra-
tive counsels was not in agreement with students' aspira-
tions on all subjects. Frank and respectful in his approach,
this man set up a genuine dialogue with the dean. Honest
about his convictions he was none the less willing to listen
to the dean's points. Before they were finished talking,
their conversation had explored their previous understandings
and had gone on to new breadth and depth for them both.
It was, they both reported, a satisfying learning experience
for them; both were grateful for the presence of the other
on the scene.

These were four reactions to a single controversy:
one came to condemn, one to inquire, the third to influence,
and the fourth came to see what a mutual effort could save
from the ashes. Keeping the fundamental proposition (Many
people do not want to sit down in the classic search for
the truth—to ask what the other's point of view is) and
its corollary (More likely, if they do get together, they
want the other side to accept their viewpoint and change
his policies to fit), let us look at several of the cases
that have been elsewhere described.
At University 43 occurred the case of the provoked dean finally closing down the student newspaper. As quoted in the section on Amount of Communication, the dean of students reported an exchange that epitomized the attitude of the editor.

... [she] once said to me that she knew I was wondering why she avoided my office. She told me it was because when she or her managing editor came they learned too much. They wanted to represent what they took to be the student's point of view and how could they do that, she asked, when they could find out everything by simply asking me? In response I simply laughed and said I hoped she would find it both helpful and interesting to know more about ramifications and details of the situations which interested her.

This exchange, and many like it, we suspect, could be cited on both sides as students and administrators hide from each other behind signs which declare, "Don't bother me with the facts; my mind's made up." In other words, some members of the academic community seem to have greater needs to be right or to disagree than they do to communicate effectively or to resolve dissonance. The outburst of the dean of women and honors dorm residents at College 27 was a case in point. It too has been covered in the section on Amount of Communication. Judging by her angry flareup and failure to respond later as the students were moving out, the dean seemed overly suspicious and hostile. Similarly with the students, they seemed almost to expect and welcome arbitrary and capricious behavior from their dean. Perhaps the climate at College 27 was indeed not conducive to cross-generational communication. In most cases, one would hope, someone should have observed
aloud something to the effect, "We seem to have a problem here. I wonder what we can do to resolve it."

A simple application of this principle is evident from an incident at College 12. It shows that students sometimes do not ask if they fear that the answer will be no. This incident concerned co-educational housing.

A small, ad-hoc group of students conceived a plan for a house on campus to become co-ed. They wrote up their ideas, and began discussing them with faculty. They went so far as trying to find someone who would serve as Head Resident. Administrators were eventually approached. There were many technical impossibilities which were pointed out. The students did not listen to what was said, however, and their concerns finally were answered by the President, who said "no." Here is a case of mis-directed energy which brought disappointment in spite of attempts to bring greater objectivity into the picture.

A latter-day convert to the General Semantics point of view supplied a case that has already been presented in the section on Language. Communication foibles of both speaker and listener are mentioned. In this case of angry fraternity spokesmen and faculty member, both sides were motivated "to create an effect" and "to reveal . . . feelings" but not "to reach the other person." The young faculty member had contrived a skillful bit of satire in the style of Jonathan Swift; he sent it to the letters to the editor column of the student paper to call attention to certain high pressure and, he thought, anachronistic fraternity rushing techniques. A delegation from the fraternity called on him in his apartment in a freshman residence where he had been learning of the evil practices from
freshman men. The "dialogue" seemed not to be motivated by a desire on either side to reach agreement, he reported. Both sides were sure they were right and angry at the other. Both were intent on getting their feelings expressed with no real thought of accepting the other's. Rather than trying to imagine how the other side felt and what motivated his loaded assault, each side took increasing umbrage, reloaded their own guns with more heavily charged emotional words and fired back. Perhaps that exchange was desirable since it was useful in getting angry feelings expressed on both sides—they were angry at each other anyway and not likely to agree. Others were to legislate a set of reforms. But the case points up the problem in human communication of a need to express one's own feelings transcending any need there might be to reach an accommodation based on understanding the other fellow's position in the dispute.

That this phenomenon can occur en masse was demonstrated at University 113. During the Selective Service episode there, the faculty meeting was broadcast into a large hall so students might hear the debate. Before long the need to express their already established feelings created a situation that resembled a Saturday matinee: loud choruses of cheering and booing for the "good guys" and "bad guys" but no careful listening to the other side's ideas as they came over the loudspeakers.

Given this predisposition in human beings, then, what is to be done? A case at College 172 suggests the
advisability of consciously recognizing in certain antagonists the tendency to submit to their less wholesome motives. These individuals could well be kept in the background, content if possible in the knowledge that their cause was represented by someone not likely to lose cortical control on a given subject in dealing with particular people. The controversy at College 172 concerned personnel forms completed by women's residence hall counselors on each of their freshmen. The forms were designed both to sharpen the observation of the counselors and provide the dean of women with a better knowledge of woman students. Over the decade of the 1960's minor discontent with the system grew into a crescendo of opposition. The students, men as well as women, regarded the behavioral descriptions as subject too much to the subjectivity of the untrained counselor-observer. The forms were also alleged to be possible barriers between counselors and freshmen. The dean rather jealously guarded the system reportedly for two reasons: (1) for its worth to her in having a fairly consistent set of data to write letters of recommendation, to anticipate and deal with personal crises, etc.; and (2) because she regarded as her prerogative, not the students', to decide whether or not the form was to be used. In an era of "the vanishing dean of women" the forms and her power to require them became an important symbol to the dean.

When the matter of requiring the forms was brought up in the student senate of that college, a coeducational
institution, the big guns were held by idealistic men and women, with an unhealthy mixture of voices just a little too intense or sarcastic. The danger signals were evident. The observer had the feeling neither side was likely to change, that both were philosophically committed to their side. The affair lasted for several weeks but was managed so as to avoid a public confrontation between the sure-to-clash adversaries. Nothing seemed likely to be gained by a predictable airing of anti-other side impulses. The dean of women was fortunately not free to attend the senate meetings but the more moderate assistant dean of women did appear on one occasion. Then various leaders of the women's counselors and women's student government moved between the warring parties and claimed jurisdiction. They made their claim stick. While this process was occurring the dean of women offered to appear at the senate meeting should her presence be needed. Each week she left phone numbers where she could be reached, for she felt an obligation to represent her position openly and honorably. Given an understanding of the "vanishing dean of women" feeling, other members of the administrative staff quietly decided she should not go to the senate on this issue if an appearance could be avoided. A little sophistry and a lot of temporizing by one administrator who was present at the key meeting enabled the crisis to pass its peak without the dean of women and her antagonists going "to the barricades" over the counseling reports, which
were quietly modified by the women and all but forgotten by the rebels.

By implication we could suggest here an outgrowth of Williamson's doctrine of "continuing conversations" and "kaffee klatches between riots." If communication has been going on routinely, when trouble comes there should be personnel on hand with proven ability to communicate. Rather than entrusting the peace and sanctity of a campus to predisposedly hostile antagonists, send spokesmen used to communicating who have no unhealthy inner needs to serve at the moment. This topic also will come up later in the discussion of the Facilitator. The wider implications of Williamson's communication suggestions are discussed in the conclusion.

Attitude toward controversy

In the introduction we presented as one of the underlying assumptions of this study the idea that controversies can be educational. Students today tend to be concerned about the problems and shortcomings of society and their college. A college or university, we said, should welcome scrutiny by the young of old ideas and practices, lest it grow sluggish and complacent.

The difficulty with this notion is that not everyone even recognizes it. Some others do not agree with it. A

---

1E. G. Williamson, "Students' Rights Modified by Correlative Responsibilities," Order and Freedom on the Campus, Knorr and Minter (eds.).
good number, we suspect, pay lip service to this doctrine that campus controversies can be educational but are not able to live comfortably with them. A caricature might be of a trustee, administrator or professor whose personality structure depends on the university quietly to meet certain of his needs; so when students question, indeed seek to subvert, certain practices and values fundamental to his gestalt, he is threatened psychologically and manifests irrelevant anxiety reactions. Older people especially may want the institution to remain as it was when they went to college. For it to change, especially at the hand of long haired "hippie" rebels, threatens something very dear to them. Many members of the faculty have built their lives within a university populated with complaisant undergraduates and eager but servile graduate students. For students now to question the scholarly or professional detachment of the professor from their midst is terribly threatening to him. The large scale controversies that envelope the campus eventually affect even the most detached scholar and he wishes, sometimes with great emotion, that it were not so. If the controversy verges on his bailiwick, moreover, he may resent it greatly. Many deans and other administrators also have an emotional stake in the status quo. Their lives have been built around making systems work, systems often of their own devising, and for them "the play's the thing." Some with a need to be needed by students are increasingly hostile to a generation that declares dead the concept of
in loco parentis and demands rights and emancipation. Even some students are emotionally tuned to a certain order; they too suffer and bristle at mavericks and their controversy.

Two cases seem to bear on this problem and the kind of attitude toward controversy that is healthy and productive. In the section on Cultural Background a case was presented of disciplinary action at University 145. Two students were suspended for making tear gas with stolen chemicals and releasing it in a freshman dormitory. The point was made that the furor after such an action reveals sometimes subtle subcultural shifts; so that campus watchers should have their seismographs tuned sensitively during such periods. Here we would emphasize that valuable learning from campus wrangles can only come if there is an ethic of accepting controversy, indeed welcoming it for what can be learned from increased involvement or heightened sensitivity. Such learning seems to require (1) that a few people, at least, keep one ear above the commotion and (2) a guiding hand on the tiller. In other words there has to be leadership that understands the value of lively discussion over controversial issues. In this regard it was written of College 145 and its president:

The atmosphere was so informal that "incidents" often became campus-wide "issues." Frank and open criticism flowed between faculty, students and members of "the administration," both as groups and from individuals within all three groups. . . . The President was an experienced administrator. He believed that the trying and tedious features
of all this free criticism were more than outweighed by the long-term gains in freedom of expression and mutual understanding. Of course some of the criticism was just old-fashioned "gripping," but much of it created a wholesome kind of ferment.

Often during student controversies, like in wars, this writer has observed, a well timed remark of reassurance can be extremely effective in sustaining the principals in a controversy. A recent controversy involving this writer is a case in point. At issue was whether or not the majority of a student-faculty judicial board was acting responsibly in the degree of punishment handed down for violations of college rules. These events transpired: an exchange of memoranda, a news story and editorial in the student paper, an editorial over the campus radio station, a two hour meeting of the several parties to the dispute, a report of the latter meeting to the student senate, an account of the report in the minutes, and a report of the controversy to the whole faculty and also carried in the student press. At two points in the fast-moving succession of events, the dean of the college who was coordinating the administration strategy in the affair remarked that he considered it one of the most productive campus discussions he had seen--a well managed controversy. When one provokes a scuffle on principle and against popular opinion he runs the risk of getting hurt. This writer can testify that it is indeed reassuring to have one with "at least one ear above the commotion" comment that the trouble does seem worth the time and anxiety. Even the knowledge that such controversies can
be useful does not always make them easy when one is thoroughly embroiled in and getting burned.

**Communication advisers and spokesmen**

After extensive study of chronological reports and commentary of the FSM period at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, the realization came strongly to this investigator that a communication expert could have been exceedingly useful to the authorities at Berkeley. There in 1964, and presumably at other institutions in large scale controversies, the combination of a consistent, decisive (but not rigid) policy, a communication adviser and a spokesman might have avoided many of the mistakes that escalated the squabble into a major war. The expert-adviser and the spokesman might be the same person much as President Eisenhower's press secretary James Haggarty served both functions for the White House. A unified policy with one spokesman for a university administration, or for a student protest movement, precludes the other side's circumventing one office to gain an advantage by appealing to another. This end can be achieved by designating one person—the public information officer, one of the deans or vice presidents, or even the president himself, to speak for the institution on a given problem. All calls are referred to him and he remains available and communicative so that the news media, faculty, parents, trustees, legislators, townpeople, et al, do not feel the university is trying to hide its problems behind a
blanket of "no comment." Similarly a student or faculty protest group would be well advised to be represented by one well-versed, cool headed leader.

This device enables an organization discreetly to remove from public scrutiny a leader whose credibility is then low or whose abilities are not so well developed in spontaneous speaking especially in answer to searching questions. The separation of the top policy making function from the meet-the-press function may well ensure that both will be served better.

In any case, since the president, chancellor, or whoever is the top ranking general, cannot avoid completely the communicative function, he should learn to monitor his own speaking and writing. By having a comparatively detached communication expert attached to him as adviser, moreover, he will have certain other benefits. Not only does the embroiled leader have someone to help prepare his communication strategy and tactics and his utterances, but when face to face with the other group he can consult his adviser perhaps with just a glance.

This "expert" need not be someone highly specialized in human relations or communicology; he could be someone knowledgeable about the campus, cool headed in a crisis and one whose judgment the leadership trusts. Often, we suspect, graduate assistants and faculty members serve in such a capacity for student leaders. At one institution, however, Ohio University, a position has been created to help deal
with communication problems in controversies. He is a graduate student in the Center for Communication Studies.

Facilitator

As explained in the chapter on the method of this study, the early plan did not make provision for a "facilitator" of communication during campus controversies. As the analysis of cases proceeded, however, two tendencies were noticed in the emerging data: (1) a number of communicators seemed to be playing key roles in the controversies studied but were not easily classifiable in either of the organizational schemes under consideration and (2) a number of other campus squabbles seemed to grow larger than necessary, out of control often, because there seemed no third force in the picture. The attempt to conceptualize and label this third force yielded terms borrowed from group dynamics, labor relations, general semantics, speech discussion, counseling and human relations. Distinct from the communication expert who advises one side, the facilitator functions as an observer, reminder, expediter, negotiator or counselor for all sides. He subjugates any bias or interest he might have to the end that the problem is resolved and the controversy ended in the best interests of fairness, justice and the whole institution. He may enter the field as soon as the difficulty becomes evident, maybe even before opposing sides begin to be formed. Or he may step into the fray at its height. Or after the situation has worn on into
a standoff and it is apparent that the sides cannot satis-
factorily settle the dispute, the "third man" may come on.
He may be a student, faculty or administrative staff member,
or someone from outside the university community such as a
consultant or arbitrator. Or, as in the case of the Williams
College fraternity controversy of the 1950's, the facilitator
could be a blue ribbon panel of alumni, trustees, students,
faculty and administrators. Whoever it is, he (or they)
should be sensitive, aware of the problem and the dynamics
of the situation, and committed to a just solution.

Most of the cases that demonstrated the need and
usefulness of such a facilitator have already been cited
in other connections. They will be mentioned here to but-
tress our case for this function to be served during student
controversies:

1. At College 112 the dean of students saw inter-
class rivalries getting out of hand. He convened an ad hoc
committee to draw up guidelines for conducting these tradi-
tional college competitions without bloodshed or undue
disruption.

2. At College 58, similarly, a committee was set
up by the deans' office there to deal with the growing
crisis over chaperonage at student parties. Both faculty
and student discontent had created hardened positions on
how to resolve the disagreement. With emphasis on examining
the problem rather than anyone's particular solution, the
administrators were able to create a setting in which strong
feelings were expressed and discussed, understanding increased and a compromise effected. The matter did not become, as it had threatened to, "a scramble for ultimate authority."

3. At College 159 a battle was brewing between the open dorm forces within the student body and the anti-open dorm president and board of trustees. It was to be a campaign by some students for support from the majority of students and the faculty. Knowing the depth and intensity of feelings on both sides, the deans decided to remain neutral. They could, they felt, perform a more useful service by expediting the debate than if they, individually or collectively, came out on one side or the other. None of them knew for certain, they confessed, how they felt without hearing the debate. In view of this uncertainty and the explosiveness of the issue, their roles as referees were potentially more valuable than if they had themselves taken up the cudgels. While the matter was under discussion in a student-faculty committee of which they were members, two of the deans had to alternate as facilitators and devil's advocates (the latter in order to compensate for the absence of any real "conservatives" in that group). In the privacy of the all-faculty committee on administration, these same two deans took part in a searching inquiry into questions that underlay the issue. The third dean, from the chair, assumed the role as facilitator which he performed flawlessly. Until votes were cast in the faculty meeting his own position
on the question was not known to anyone on the committee which held some fifteen meetings on the subject. He served as an overall "manager" for the committee proposal even while the advocates on both sides were preparing their cases for and against its passage. When the proposal failed (the secretive dean voted with the majority) he continued to exercise responsibility for shepherding the problem until a proposal that could pass was formulated.

5. At University 1, in a case already described in the sections on Timing and Pattern, the dean of students played a significant role as facilitator. At issue was the student body president's plan to change the requirements for his succession so as to favor the members of his own party. By quickly arranging a meeting of the principals, and himself coming with an impartial analysis of the situation and a compromise plan which, when adopted, saved everyone's face.

6. A case at University 114 shows the need for a facilitator when none was forthcoming. It was described earlier in connection with the amount of communication and concerns the demise of a fraternity chapter caught between its national restrictive membership clauses and its university's deadlines against such clauses. No one held out any hope for a waiver for the chapter and when one was forthcoming from the national fraternity at the eleventh hour, it was too late. The chapter had failed to attract enough members to survive. If either the dean of men or the general
secretary of the fraternity had assumed the role of facilitator, the fraternity might have survived as did others on that campus in similar straits.

7. At Universities 70 and 131 there occurred similar cases. The function of the debate coach in one instance and the dean of students in the other have been depicted as channels of communication and discussed in our sections on Channels. In addition to serving as human channels between troubled students and their troubling reality, the intermediaries also can serve in a more active role to facilitate a solution. The distinction between strictly communicating and manipulating the students' environment is an important one. It lies somewhat outside the scope of this study but is covered in the literature of student personnel and counseling psychology. For an underclassman, a faculty adviser can be useful in both capacities and should consciously consider how far to go beyond being a channel into becoming a facilitator for an advisee with a problem. The questions, "Do you want me to see what I can find out?" and "Do you want me to see what I can do?" often can serve as a basis for mutually deciding what the extent of adviser's role should be in communicating on the student's behalf.

8. Also in the realm of counseling is the case at University 136. It involved a foreign student and was covered in the section on Cultural Background. When the international student was embroiled in controversy, the one person with whom he seemed to have good relationship
was briefed and arranged to drop in on him. He not only served to clear up some misunderstandings of the foreign man but also effected changes in conditions encountered by the student: very much needed facilitation. The visitor adjusted and became a part of the campus community once key obstacles were removed.

Five cases not done in earlier sections will now be presented. Three concern the role of student personnel workers as facilitators, one faculty members' and the last the administration's serving in this capacity.

1. The situation at University 140 was a complicated web of human interaction. It concerned women's dormitory government, late penalties and dorm elections. The details are interesting, especially for members of the gender uninitiated to the intricacies of women's hours, rules and interrelations; they seem to be not important enough to our purposes here even to summarize, however. It was clear to this analyst that the quality of the student personnel worker's communication was exemplary under the troubled circumstances. Assessing it as a controversy strictly among the coeds and involving their student government, but with personalities having entered in, she managed not to get involved directly in the substance of the dispute. She was concerned with the effect on the relationships of the students and helped both sides to understand the other's position. Largely through her counseling efforts the students themselves were able to resolve their differences.
2. Similarly at University 141, another residence hall graduate assistant managed to facilitate the resolution of an undergraduate dispute without himself joining one of the sides. This one was a men's dormitory and the wrangle was over a suspected election irregularity. When the underclassmen who first suspected chicanery came to the resident assistant, the latter decided it should be his function mainly to advise them as to how to proceed. He might, he thought further, go so far as to speak with the student election officials to ascertain the facts but not to rectify the situation nor discipline the malefactors. If action was needed, the students—their house council and judicial board—should take it.

3. Contrast the conduct of the previous two facilitators with the inability of a similar graduate assistant in a dean of men's office. The young assistant was a former interfraternity council (IFC) president. The incident occurred during formal pledging of new fraternity members. The young assistant had developed an unhealthy suspicion of Fraternity x. When the IFC officers and the leaders of the several fraternities arrived at the dean's office to learn the preferences of the freshmen and to make their selections, the IFC president reluctantly disclosed that Fraternity x had been accused of violating one of the IFC rules on rushing. Hitherto in the background with no real claim to a part in the discussion, the assistant started asking questions. Soon he had supplanted the IFC president and was behaving like a
prosecuting attorney. Whereupon the president of Fraternity x turned to the embarrassed IFC president and demanded to know of the graduate assistant, "What's his part in this anyway?" It was reportedly a degrading moment for the assistant. He had exceeded his only legitimate role, that of facilitator, and become a combatant in a strictly student affair. His own zeal and his only recently having been an undergraduate IFC president combined to confuse his role perception.

4. A classic example of facilitators mediating between contending factions occurred at University 10. Like the Berkeley FSM fracas in which students and administration were unable to agree, faculty members comprised the pacifying force.

Some years ago at the University of ________, behavior at a fraternity dance was considered to be improper. A strip-teaser gave a performance and the drinking was excessive. Since in the State of ________ the minimum age for drinking is 21, the police brought the matter to the attention of the University authorities including myself. We worked quickly and called a meeting of representatives of all the fraternities and fraternity faculty advisers. Talks were given by the President, the Vice President and I, Dean of Students, explaining that fraternities must obey state law. We asked them to draw up safeguards to insure that only guests at their dances who were 21 or over could drink. We gave those in the audience a chance to raise questions and we tried to explain the reasons for the college action.

I should stress that this was a gathering of approximately 75 people. They walked out of the meeting disgruntled and the next day there was a mass meeting of fraternities in which they condemned the administration and in one instance a fraternity refused to go along with a volunteer community project to which they were committed.
Later in the day the students converged in front of the Administration Building chanting, "We want booze!"

The President and I appointed two faculty members to work with three fraternity members and a non-fraternity representative of the Student Council to draw up a plan to work out the problem. The faculty members were known for their good relations with the students. The hub-bub died down, the plan was worked out in which the Interfraternity Council agreed to take responsibility for the enforcement of the state laws. Actually it didn't mean very much because fraternities are still having parties in which liquor is being served to minors. The University has shifted the responsibility for the behavior of the fraternity parties from the administration and chaperones to the fraternities and the Interfraternity Council.

5. A conflagration at University 115 was put out by the joint mediating efforts of the dean of students and student government leaders. In addition to showing the function of facilitator, this case demonstrates the difficulty of communication on a large campus, especially when opposing sides differ significantly in principle. The compromise reached was interesting because each side conceded the other's most prized principle but held firm on its own. Fortunately the two were not opposing versions of the same principle.

Because of the removal of a stop sign from a student room by a Residence Halls employee, the students of a particular house in our residence halls took up the cry of "illegal search and seizure" and it soon spread to become an issue with the over-all student organization in the residence halls and the all-campus student government. As is usually the case, it was difficult to get the right people together for the first day or two to discuss what the issue was in the minds of the students and what the issue was in the minds of the administration. The students felt that rooms were being purposely searched for stolen goods or illegal articles. The administration knew that the rooms were not being purposely
searched, but did expect the maintenance and housekeeping employees to report any obviously stolen articles or articles that might endanger the health or welfare of other residents. The chronology of handling the matter went something as follows:

1. The administration attempted to communicate directly with the employees and students immediately involved to find out exactly what had happened.

2. In the meantime, articles and editorials in the campus student paper were presenting a crusade for student rights without being entirely clear as to what rights were being violated or how....

3. Attempts were made by the administration to contact individual leaders who seemed to be prominent in the issue and try to find out what they felt the issue was. There were indications that some felt the University had no right to inspect rooms for any reason. Others felt that inspections for housekeeping and maintenance purposes were all right, but that nothing should be removed from a room or reported elsewhere. At the same time, an attempt was made to inform the same leaders about the facts of the case as viewed by the administration.

4. A meeting was called including top-level student government officers and top-level administrators in the Division of Student Affairs to discuss the whole affair. Reporters from the student paper were present. As an outcome of this meeting, it was agreed that maintenance and housekeeping personnel would continue to inspect rooms and report their findings. It was further agreed that no items, including stop signs, would be removed from student rooms without a search warrant.

5. The student leaders seemed quite satisfied with the way in which the conflict was resolved as a result of the meeting. The student paper played up the fact that items would not be removed from rooms by Residence Halls employees and the whole fuss died down quickly.

Several observations of the 1964-65 Berkeley controversies contribute to our understandings here. With the
student Free Speech coalition and the President and Chancellor having reached an impasse, it took the faculty's analysis and advocacy to resolve the situation. As described in the previous section on Communication Patterns, several formats did not succeed whereby the faculty could function as facilitator. The first, a student-faculty-administration advisory committee, was set up as part of the October 2, 1964, truce. Prognoses of its effectiveness varied when the president and chancellor became angry with the FSM, declared the truce violated and dissolved the committee.

The other major attempt by the faculty took the form of a committee of departmental chairmen collaborating with President Clark Kerr. It announced its results in the outdoor amphitheatre to a huge crowd of Berkeley students and faculty. The outcome seemed favorable until an unexpected happening devaluated the attempt within seconds after it had seemed to be successfully completed: Mario Savio, the charismatic leader of the FSM, took the microphone to announce a meeting to discuss the matters before the university. Before he had a chance to state his purpose he was grabbed and dragged off-stage by two campus policemen. When he finally was given a chance, by President Kerr's order, to speak, the martyr syndrome had undercut the effectiveness of the department heads' efforts.

The third, and successful, attempt by the faculty to facilitate a solution was the Emergency Executive Committee. Their report was approved overwhelmingly by the
Berkeley faculty and sent to the Regents. Although not accepted in full it was, by and large, the basis for ending the series of active hostilities and temporary truces.

In colleges and universities where faculties have not so completely given up their control over student life and discipline, the arousal of a faculty would not be so difficult as it was at Berkeley with its twenty-six year era of administrative control. The fact remains, when animosities are strong and the truth seems to lie entirely on neither side, the faculty is needed to enter the fray between students and administration, to analyze the situation, propose a situation and influence its adoption. In addition, the faculty forces or whoever assumes the role of facilitator, probably need to perform other communicative tasks. Studying chronology and commentary of the Berkeley events suggests this: there should be a mechanism to get various forces to assess their own motives and feelings. Each bloc, or leader, needs to look beyond the immediate issue as a symptom of some deeper problem. Three months of turmoil at Berkeley seemingly concerned a small strip of land at one corner of the campus and student freedoms there. What it came to symbolize was the arbitrariness of the regents and the rules, the influence of powerful offcampus forces (e.g., Former Senator Knowland and his *Oakland Tribune*), the comparative ineffectuality of the deans, the impersonality of the university, etc., etc. Probably President Clark Kerr's book *The Uses of the University* in which he labelled and
described "the multiversity" had much to do with the controversy. The realization by students that the institution was, as they were wont to caricature it from Kerr's book, a "large, impersonal machine" must have been disenchanting for them. So they identified themselves as computer punch cards ("Do not fold, spindle or mutilate") or vowed "to grind the machine to a halt." Whatever the underlying frustrations or motivations, at Berkeley or elsewhere—the assassination of a popular national leader, the nearby nomination by avalanche of an unpopular one, a summer spent in Mississippi, rebellion from one's own parents, a breakup with one's girl friend—their identification can lead to self-understanding. A mediator who can counsel each side on the nature of the conflict can also, it would seem, draw out some unrecognized insights about one's own or group's motivations. Assuming most people in an academic community are committed to the use of their intellects to deal with problems, they should be grateful for a leader or mediator who helps them return from irrational attitudes and behavior. Lest the reader think we are underestimating the difficulty of this part of the job, let us acknowledge how hard it often is to establish communication in a controversy if the principals do not like each other, do not want to communicate and if the frustrations are real and relevant to the issues.

Finally we turn again to the Selective Service sit-in of 1966 at University 113. It seems a model of how a facilitator can function in a controversy. The issues were
significant, frustrations real, and dimensions sizable. Yet by their astuteness the chief administrators of that university succeeded in minimizing disruption. The conflict was dealt with, it would seem, satisfactorily, without the administration succumbing to the student provocateurs' taunts to battle. The specific details of this case have been told in earlier parts of this chapter as they illustrated principles of Timing, Patterns, Message, Channel, Cultural Background and others. The reader may remember that the president of the large university received a letter, then a telegram, and finally a third version captioned "A copy of the final draft of the letter sent to President ______ from the Committee on the University and the Draft." These made demands for change in university policy with regard Selective Service—protest, non-cooperation, etc. The dissenters "demanded an immediate answer and, to newspapermen, promised a 'sit-in.'"

Fundamental to this model is the power structure of University 113. Policy making power over most internal matters reposes with the faculty, subject to review by the regents. This scheme is, we think, more workable and desirable than either a regentally dominated university, one that is administration controlled, or a combination of the two. At University 113 decisions affecting the educational enterprise were made by the faculty; the administration was free from taking sides to be able to function as facilitators; and the regents kept their detached perspective, always
ready to be consulted if forces on the campus went out of control. Afterward they had a full review of "the sit-in activities and the way they were handled by the University Administration." For the administration to be free to assume the role as facilitator in a controversy over policy, it cannot also be the policy maker. Let us then note some other characteristics of such a role as facilitator.

The administrators at University 113 were scrupulously careful not to disclose their own bias, if any, on the questions under consideration. Indeed they stressed throughout that they thought the issue a worthy one. They dedicated themselves to an orderly process of faculty and student senate review within the traditional spirit of the university for "sifting and winnowing," which they repeatedly invoked. They dwelt in minute detail on the procedures to be followed, drawing up guidelines for demonstrators, negotiating over their content, cajoling leaders to ensure implementation, inviting student representatives to address the faculty. Not only did they exhibit a sense of fairness but also injected a sense of calmness and good humor into the tense situation—the administrators at no time "lost their cool." Such a force just naturally seemed to evoke that sort of a response in the student leaders and the faculty. It was difficult for the demonstrators, angry at the war, the draft, the Selective Service tests and policies on releasing class ranks, to become angry at the firm yet friendly president and chancellor and their staffs.
It was this impartiality, coolness, and strength that epitomized the facilitator and saved the university from debilitating rancor, perhaps from bloodshed. Not only did it prevent negative effects, it promoted a policy change and a recommendation by the faculty that affected noticeably the outcome of legislation in the national congress.

For the administration, or anyone, to function as facilitator, however, requires willingness to communicate on the part of the controversialists. Sometimes, for example, student protesters are intent on blocking industrial or military recruiters, willing to be charged with disorderly conduct, and unwilling to communicate. This sort of matter falls outside the province of this study—a matter for decision on whether to abandon the recruiting interviews or call the police. But, we suspect this spring of 1968, man's innate desire for order and consonance will prevail more often than not; and, except in those few instances when certain campuses go the limit through non-communication and limp resistance to arrest, all the way to fighting the police, some sort of communication will usually be possible. The climate must be cultivated and the attitudes of the parties to the dispute must be shaped. These jobs, without a facilitator, may go undone. The facilitator may well then be the crucial variable in contemporary campus controversies.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The general purpose of this dissertation was to see what could be learned from analyzing contemporary student controversies according to the elements of communication. It was based on two premises: (1) that controversies are likely to remain a part of the campus scene and (2) that they can be made a productive part of the educational process. We were attempting to see how, through communication, this might occur.

Reports of controversies were solicited by means of a letter sent to some 300 deans, teachers and others in higher education. Other cases were found in books of case studies, the press and in the experience of the writer. The cases, 173 of them, were analyzed according to twelve variables of communication: Cultural Background, Situation, Communicators, Message Content, Types and Patterns, Arrangement, Language, Channels, Amount, Feedback, Interference and Time. Results and discussion were presented according to these twelve variables and are summarized below.
Arrangement of communication

1. Juxtaposing something enlightening and inspiring against something more common can place the latter in a different frame of reference and be useful in making difficult explanations across a generation gap.

2. When being legalistic, as at the scene of a protest demonstration, a dean should have his behavior carefully delineated and outlined.

3. When seeking a rhetorical device to end a controversy everyone agrees has outlived its usefulness, a speech built in a semi-serious way toward a suspenseful climax can break the tension with an unexpected spoof on the speaker himself.

Interference with communication

1. On a persistent and controversial problem, let one person or office be appointed to cut through the interference, filter out misinformation, clarify rumor.

2. To minimize distortion in minutes of meetings, press coverage, etc., deliver important statements from prepared text which can be distributed to secretary and reporters.

3. To help students unfamiliar with bureaucracy to operate efficiently in college or university, staff should be trained in an orientation of helpfulness in cutting red tape.
Language of communication

1. There is utility to catchy labels and phrases.

2. As in other labelling, the catchy title can mislead and so be a detriment to a program or movement.

3. A college officer in a legal showdown with demonstrators should select his words with infinite care lest he violate due process and give ground for a miscarriage motion before campus misconduct committee or the civil court.

4. Top administrators of institutions large and not so large can cut through the distance between themselves and their students if they will lace their speeches with personal pronouns and direct, informal oral style.

5. Likewise with written communication: personal, direct style suggests to the reader that deans are human beings not bureaucrats.

6. In a hot controversy combatants should realize how language can be used to get feelings off one's chest at the expense of any solution.

Feedback, Evaluation and Adjustment

1. An administrator can anticipate when there will be non-compliance with a controversial rule and listen for feedback.
2. It is folly to assume one meeting with student leaders will solve a problem. Listen for feedback from the general student body and continue to make adjustments.

3. Interim policy statements on controversial issues can produce good feedback to be used in drawing up more permanent policy.

4. A most successful case of student statesmanship featured an early proposal with ample time to hear the feedback, persuade the persuasible and make compromises in order to win the necessary votes. A student leader not prepared to deal with feedback to his plan, on not just one but two occasions, failed to win support for it.

5. Professors should be sensitive to feedback about their courses: acknowledge, discuss and, when possible, adapt to any they get.

6. While controversial legislation is in process someone should listen for feedback from all sides and try to adjust the bill for optimum effectiveness balanced with fairness.

7. Students of the New Breed can be masterful in adapting to feedback. Faculty and administration often do not listen so carefully to what student protesters are saying. So often they do not hear until it is too late, so entranced are they marching to the beat of another
drummer. They should listen until they understand and then communicate that they have, even though they may not agree.

8. A journal kept during a controversy will enable one to monitor and evaluate his own communication.

**Message content**

1. Administrative communication should exude firmness and reasonableness: sound and honest reasons without bluff or sophistry.

2. In anticipation of questions, interviews, impromptu press conferences and public statements during a controversy, a text should be prepared in advance and carried on one's person to ensure maximum accuracy of message.

3. If a dean has power to close down a student group (e.g., a fraternity) and no other appeal promises to work, the threat to close down the group, although harsh, may be effective in deterring detrimental conduct by the group (mob action, etc.).

4. Where the dean does not have unlimited power, simply the threat of referral to a conduct committee may be better than the next best thing he could think of in the heat of the moment.

5. It is well for a president or dean to state plainly what the consequences may be (1) for students who might follow the glib assurances of protest leaders that
"Nothing will happen" and (2) for a faculty that is reluctant to support its administration in carrying out established policy during a crisis situation.

6. Pride in belonging to an academic community based on responsible dissent can be a strong appeal to keep a controversy from getting out of hand while a solution is being sought.

7. Similarly a leader can appeal to the need for esteem in his audience by showing that he respects and trusts them enough to speak frankly about the problems facing the institution. Students want to be trusted "to have enough sophistication . . . to understand . . . that there has to be a limit to the yielding." Alumni too can and should be trusted with the facts of campus controversies.

8. Careful research and presentation of a case for change will more likely pay off, students should learn.

9. Accuracy of messages from potentially biased sources should be checked during controversies.

Situation for communication

1. The physical setting can play a part in communication during controversies and should be chosen with care, if possible.

2. An ill-considered, and forgotten, remark can do much to damage fragile climate of communication in contemporary colleges.
3. Similar problems can have quite different outcomes according to the quality of the climate of trust and respect on the campuses.

4. At a meeting of hostile elements during a controversy, great care should be taken to build a climate of goodwill.

5. A climate for resolution will likely emerge from too much bitterness. Student protesters come to feel "abandoned by society . . . desperation and insecurity."

6. A campus community tends to react against either a surly demonstrator or surly administrator.

7. The climate of a faculty meeting can be affected by feedback from noisy students listening outside to the meeting ("Chaos is at the door!").

8. Meaningful communication is unlikely to occur in a hostile context; better to rebuild the context first.

9. Dealing too harshly with students in revolt against one of its policies may create a context of anger and resentment where everything will backfire on an administration.

Time

1. If an important conference is called to deal with a controversial matter, set aside plenty of time and instruct the principals to clear their calendars.
2. On some campuses protracted discussion of policies is still possible when students propose a change; on many Student Power forces are impatient and pressing for immediate change.

3. Timing is an important, yet elusive, variable. It should be planned carefully from the outset of a controversy—not to commit oneself too soon until later reports are in, but to bring as much intelligence to bear on the situation as soon as possible, preferably before active hostilities break out. Conferring promptly with colleagues and advisers seemed advisable; hasty response based on signal (angry) reaction to a perhaps provocative stimulus did not.

4. If an issue is "non-negotiable" say so and explain why at the outset and suggest alternatives. Don't wait until long discussions have proceeded.

5. The effect of campus calendars (exams, vacations, etc.) should be studied and used in controversies.

6. A new administrator should not move against old forms immediately upon arrival. He should wait until he understands their tradition and utility.

7. Often one has to live with irresolution over a period of time. It is well to create a standoff and let time (and cognitive dissonance) do their work.
8. Delaying an announcement of concern to students can lead to charges of bad faith.

9. When anticipating a controversy over a speaker, the best way to handle the situation is to announce the event early and let the fury spend itself so the occasion itself will be relatively an anticlimax.

10. Interim progress reports and tentative policy statements can be valuable in keeping a campus posted on deliberations when a controversy is referred to a committee for a recommendation.

11. In preventing mob action when it is threatened, careful analysis of the group can result in a number of communications directed at various groups and timed according to their receptivity.

12. Student affairs in general, and the handling of controversies in particular, would be improved if sensitivity to process and time were more widely learned.

Amount of Communication

1. Deans and members of disciplinary boards must be discreet even when controversy surrounds one of their decisions: all right to discuss principles but not cases lest the campus get the idea privacy is not respected. This raises serious problems when a dean is under attack, is bound to remain quiet and no one takes up his cause.
2. In a controversy over a policy one does not intend to change, he should admit whatever fault was made but should not go on explaining. The matter should be allowed to blow over—if it will. If it will not, other principles can be invoked.

3. In a student vs. student controversy, even where the administration has a stake in one side it should not get into the fray too soon lest it turn the matter into administration vs. underdog.

4. Two cases suggested that administrative response should be very limited to student complaints about faculty members. It is better to work behind the scenes, if at all.

5. Several cases were given of effective action by administrators when it was clear that errant students were not responding to communication. In each case the forceful action communicated more meaningfully to the errant ones, and presumably to the whole campus community.

6. If campus debate seems unable to resolve a matter too inconsequential to be discussed endlessly, let someone assert the power to decide; his decision probably will meet with no strenuous objection from the majority, tired of the debate.

7. When a third force (e.g., the faculty) is using its good offices to help resolve a major dispute, it is
imprudent for an administrator to call off the committee on a technicality when no plausible alternative exists except to shout further recriminations or bring in outside police.

8. The evidence suggests administrators should cultivate more sensitivity to other people's feelings and less for their own rules, fear of committing themselves, etc.

9. There is the suggestion that chance encounters will yield meaningful communication if pathways and meeting grounds are propitiously arranged.

10. On any campus the first attempts at any inter-group type of communication is difficult and has to be carefully nurtured.

11. After a suspense filled episode, gripping an entire campus, is solved, the tension can be relieved by assembling the community and judiciously providing an explanation of the unanswered questions.

12. Evidence exists that university administrations under fire from students tend to make too few attempts to explain their positions.

13. In some detail, the handling of one major sit-in demonstration was described to show how a great amount of communication kept a volatile situation in check while forces for resolution were operating off stage. A
chilling epilogue to this ideal approach was added lest the reader be encouraged to think that any campus has all the answers to contemporary controversies.

**Channel of communication**

1. In a controversy where protesters are trying to operate out of normal channels, one approach is to insist that substantive issues go through normal channels. An administration can at the same time deal with procedural matters of the demonstration outside of normal channels.

2. Some controversies are exacerbated by the absence of channels for communicating or appealing decisions: people do not know whom to go to for what.

3. If communication isn't getting through, reassessment of channels will sometimes disclose that one or more are not operating (i.e., someone is not passing the word).

4. Care in building new channels for dealing with new problems is well worth the effort for the future.

5. Fortunate is a school that has an ethic of fairness and accuracy operating in the news and editorial pages of its campus and surrounding papers. The press can sometimes be appealed to in terms of desire for accuracy to ensure fair coverage during controversy.

6. Young faculty and staff members, residence hall counselors and advisory councils attached to various
offices and academic departments are useful channels.

7. Channels become ineffective through disuse or obsolete in terms of new communicators and issues. Be prepared to vary and improvise. Several cases were reviewed in which a variety of channels were suggested.

8. Wise is the would-be communicator who takes time to learn channels of communication and authority so that in time of crisis he will be able to make a wise choice of channels.

Cultural background for communication

These assumptions and values seem to be important factors in contemporary colleges and universities:

1. There is an endemic distrust of people in the role of administrator.

2. Students have a desire to be "clutched to the bosom" of the faculty and feel a sense of alienation when they are not close to their teachers; they assume professors are "liberal" and in agreement with them on controversial issues.

3. The assumption is no longer valid that students in general, and student leaders in particular, will take responsibility for institutional rules with which they do not agree and which they did not help make.
4. In a fast changing society, change is inevitable in institutions of higher learning. New controversies will disclose shifting values on old questions.

5. Protests are a highly valued part of student subculture.

6. The academic tradition of free inquiry, free speech and responsible dissent belongs as much to students as to professors.

7. Some students have a different frame of reference than faculty, administration, trustees, alumni, townspeople and other students. The difference makes communication difficult; but both sides in a controversy should err, if at all, on the side of trying too hard to understand each other's frame of reference and communicate effectively before a situation deteriorates to the point force is needed.

Type and pattern of communication

1. Most widely used and perhaps best device to deal with controversy is a simple conference.

2. A combination of types and patterns can often be used to good advantage, e.g., meeting, letter, delegates to meeting serving as interpreters of letter to their constituencies.

3. It takes courage to do, but with an eye on Festinger's cognitive dissonance theory, some deans act to
create a furor, call a meeting, ask people to state their positions and let cognitive dissonance work to resolution. Such a procedure often makes for better decisions and better relationships afterward.

4. A private meeting can be useful for disparate elements in a controversy when they share general objectives but no common plan for achieving them.

5. Evidence indicated that administrative fiat will not work so well to produce a satisfactory resolution as a student-faculty meeting, student chaired, student reported.

6. In this era of impatient students, they should be brought into faculty deliberations to see how long they take when things are handled thoroughly.

7. When an administrator has erred and students are clamoring, his appearance at a public meeting should at least demonstrate good faith. When student masses are so stirred up about something that they all want to talk about it, a public meeting is wise to let them hear directly from the proper spokesman to understand how leaders feel, react to problems, etc.

8. The same is true with townspeople; where they are aroused and there is going to be a campus meeting, invite them to see the student generation in action.
9. Public hearings can be good, but the power structure must listen, not just attend *pro forma* and disregard student opinion.

10. Before taking a stand on anything that will embroil a campus, one should consult with appropriate colleagues.

11. Letters and memoranda can be useful in supporting other actions, buttressing creaking defense walls, etc.


13. Written and negotiated guidelines were combined effectively with almost constant personal contact between protest leaders and administrators on one occasion.

14. Keeping a written record of controversies, along with documents, letters, etc., is highly recommended.

The Communicators

1. Administrators' becoming creators of new contexts, not full antagonists in controversies is suggested. Work to create "new context for reasonable solution." Avoid getting drawn into the fray.

2. Students have "the need to identify with elders who are wise and resolute." Faculty and administrators must "recognize the profound influence their attitudes toward
students have on their emotional and personal development. "Students want administrators to level and be honest with them" and admit inadvertencies, mistakes. Being able to laugh at oneself is extremely valuable for administrators dealing with student controversies.

3. Being able to stay out of a controversy can also serve to keep it simpler. Before entering in, administrator should be sure what he is doing and why.

4. An administration should adopt a consistent, decisive position which reflects the will of the faculty so that faculty support can be counted on. If possible involve faculty in policy making for student life.

5. Firmness and reasonableness again and again were stressed as desirable qualities for college administrators.

6. Beneficial and deleterious behaviors for faculty were examined in various models of campus government and during various types of controversies.

7. In the most contemporary, defiant protests (e.g., blocking recruiters), faculty support seems essential for whatever policy is to be implemented. Faculty must also try to communicate with students in the interest of the integrity of the university. They can function as counselors,
regular or impromptu advisers and instructors in the larger classroom of controversy.

8. In a university system, the central administrator should delegate enough power to the chief campus officer to enable the latter to keep order. The central man should stay out of controversies except as a counselor to the officer on the spot.

9. The ability to get people to follow in a crisis is "the litmus test of leadership."

10. The dean of students must be more than "a passive reactor to crises." He must become involved as an educator in a "tricky network of tightropes" of the extra-curriculum. He should possess a cool head, a firm set of principles and courage. He should enter into "periodic consultations or continuous conversations" permitting "confrontation of ideas" and "share more frequently with students his own standards. ... ."

11. Student personnel workers should have an attitude of receptivity to student concerns without entering in to all student affairs.

12. In a crisis, if there is no student force for moderation to counter a radical action group, someone from the dean's office may have to provide a counterforce to the
radicals. This should not be a permanent stance, however; work to develop the moderates in the student body.

13. Some staff members view their own operation as a primary goal, losing sight of their objective to provide service to students; others cause trouble by viewing problems in related areas as out of their purview and not related. Students in controversies do not make these fine distinctions.

14. For many students, protesting is a novel and exhilarating experience that takes on functional autonomy; it becomes its own motivating force as the evils that prompted it become secondary or even obscured.

15. Long, intense meetings can jade students’ perceptions. The line between comic relief from the intensity of group planning and eristic ridicule is hard to see. Many protest groups take on qualities of negativism that all but make communication impossible.

16. Many students feel neglected, unnoticed, not known as persons by teachers. They are often suspicious of adult authority figures, even those whom they personally like.

17. There is an increasing awareness and concern about higher education among parties outside the university.
A threat to the integrity and freedom of the academy seems to exist.

18. Faculty, administration and trustees, like students, will not react favorably to threats; they cannot afford to. All groups in the university should consider this principle in their dealings with others.

19. The war in Viet Nam has set up a barrier of distrust unprecedented in recent decades. When entering into "the rough play of dialogue" on various campus issues, certain characteristics should be sought in representatives sent by both sides.

20. It is evident that many people do not want to sit down in the classic search for the truth, rather than listen to the other's point of view, they would rather try to get the other side to accept their viewpoint and change his policies to fit. This condition in human relations must be allowed for (and educated against).

21. In major controversies there are manifest advantages to selecting communication advisors and spokesmen, the latter to represent a university or a protest group during a time of controversy.

22. Someone (or group) should serve as a third force (facilitator) in campus controversies. The facilitator can help each side see the nature of the conflict, see their
(his) own motivation; he can remind them of the commitment that should exist within academia to settling things by rational argument; he can deal with communication problems growing out of genuine frustrations and animosities.

23. There seems to be overall advantage in having legislative power in the hands of the faculty with the administration free to serve as facilitator. In a major controversy the administrators are then free to serve as facilitators.

Conclusion

It should be clear to the reader as it long has been to the writer that no hard conclusions of the "how to do it" sort are justified in the present study. The generalizations and suggestions found in the Analysis of Data and Summary sections can, it is hoped, be helpful to those who will read them. In the fast changing world of American higher education, such findings cannot be represented as eternal nor as verities. Indeed, to the extent they are true in terms of the cases from which they emerged, some are probably already dated for the campus where they happened. Forms of controversy seem to be in constant flux.

Furthermore, the data from these 173 cases were almost unmanageable; they were both too large and too diverse. No pretense is made that a thorough analysis was used. Rather than like comparing apples and oranges, it was like oranges and sea lions sometimes. The controversy cases were gathered from the experiences of more than one hundred
people at many different places. Each reporter laid
different facts, found different nuances. Moreover each
institution was at a different stage in its controversy
development. So, as is stated in the chapter on Method,
scientifically there is much with which to find fault.

The generalizations on the foregoing pages are
offered with some confidence, however. Much is represented
there that is theoretically sound and valuable in a practi-
cal sense—especially for the uninitiated. Particularly
are the last generalizations, about the need for a facilita-
tor and for faculty-student involvement in the governance
of student affairs, endorsed. This writer advocates strongly
that patterns of government be devised to enable student,
faculty and administration representatives on each campus
jointly to make policy and rules on virtually the entire
extracurriculum and on at least part of the curriculum as
well. Here we agree with Woodrow Wilson in a 1909 address:

The comradeship of undergraduates will never breed
the spirit of learning. It must include the older
men, the teachers. . . . So long as instruction
and life do not merge in our colleges, so long as
what the undergrads do and what they are taught
occupy two separate air-tight compartments in their
consciousness, so long will the college be ineffec-
tual.1

We contend that such communication will produce better delib-
erations, better legislation and education, and a much better
sense of community than do the parallel, dichotomous, we-they

1"The Spirit of Learning," quoted by Eric R. Rackham,
NASPA, III (January, 1966), 35.
models of student, faculty and administration government.

Cole has recently written:

Across the land college students are speaking out on a variety of issues that affect their lives. Much of the dialogue to date grows out of an atmosphere of mistrust and much of the communication is abrasive and demanding. It need not be. The underlying student motive is a genuine interest in the welfare of our society and a particular interest in the nature of the university that plays such an important role in preparing them for a place in society. It is our responsibility to recognize this interest and to channel it into productive efforts. Obviously this calls for a change in attitude. The student must be accepted as an equal partner in the enterprise and ways must be discovered to permit him to influence the shaping of the university. And more frequently his contribution must be from a base of contributing partnership, rather than as a complaining and criticizing customer.1

The main contributions seen for this investigation, however, are methodological and attitudinal ones. It has demonstrated the efficacy of communication analysis for a great variety of student controversies. Presidents, deans, faculty members and students would be, the present writer now maintains, more effective if they assayed the communications field, variable by variable. Whereas the cases become passe, the method, by its very time and process orientation, stands the test of time. It will enable tomorrow's deans and students to study the effects of their communication as we have done for today's and yesterday's campus controversies and communication. In fact, as

communication theorists continue to refine their analytical instruments, let them keep colleges and universities in the forefront of their studies. It is becoming almost commonplace to predict that a new generation of "post modern" youth is testing its style in the colleges and universities of the land (and of the world) as a prelude for confronting the larger society with the hypocrisies and injustices of its corporate life. As this is written, hard after the death of twentieth century prophet and provocateur Martin Luther King, Jr., we sense a new day dawning. Infinite patience, wisdom, skill and flexibility in interpersonal and group relations will be required. The communicologist's analytical framework, it now seems, can contribute substantially to that era.

In the meantime, we propose to use the contents of this study to prepare training devices for those who would learn more about communicating effectively during controversy. We see learning aids taking the form of case studies for groups and self-administering tests for private study. Courses in professional education, seminars for deans and leadership training for students all could make use of such cases. Hopefully they would be so constructed to teach the method of analysis, to stimulate increased self understanding by the student and to propagate the valid ideas emerging from this study.

Finally, let future students of communication and student controversy each use this method to make an exhaustive
study of one case at a time. Let that be the ultimate value of this dissertation— to make careful, thorough, on the scene studies of ongoing controversies. Such analysis by a communication expert can yield, at the time, suggestions for the addition or modification of key variables. By changing behavior according to a scientific study and rational plan, campus controversies should be more productive, cost less in irrelevant anxiety. There may be found a golden mean between campus lethargy and turmoil: involvement without enervation, genuine difference of opinion without eristic derogation, and the satisfying uplifting feeling that comes from entering into a mutual inquiry toward a greater good. In a society that seems on the brink of solving problems of warfare, poverty, ignorance and racial prejudice, to contemplate such an era of human relations does not seem too visionary.
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LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY
Appleton, Wisconsin 54911

August 25, 1966

Mr. Mark W. Smith
Dean of Men
Denison University
Granville, Ohio

Dear Mark,

I am writing to NASPA deans and other friends in higher education for help as I gather data for my doctoral thesis. Unlike many, mine is not a questionnaire study. It concerns communication in situations of conflict. I hope you will become intrigued with it, as I have, and will be willing to help.

Under the direction of Dr. Franklin H. Knower, professor of speech and psychology at Ohio State, I'm trying to learn how and why, in student controversies at colleges and universities, communication does or does not produce beneficial results. Would you be willing to describe a situation you know at first hand in which communication, or an attempt at communication, did or did not yield a change for the better? The incident should bear on the work of the student personnel deans, either directly or indirectly. It might involve a squabble between a student group and the administration or faculty, between an individual student and a faculty member or dean, between students and other students or townspeople, fraternity, etc.

The task as I foresee it involves only a few minutes of dictating or jotting time. Simply report the chronology of an episode in which segments of an institution disagreed about how to proceed and in which some kind of written or oral communication was tried, successfully or otherwise, to resolve the conflict. Conferences, memos, official notices, public meetings and radio appeals are examples of the kind of communicating that often occurs.

In addition to your providing an incident or two (perhaps one where communication worked and one where it failed), I'd
appreciate your soliciting the help of a colleague or a student. I particularly want incidents from responsible students. Perhaps too you have some case studies which you use in staff training that might fit the bill. I've perused those in the NASPA Casebook and some used at the Harvard seminars; many of them will be useful.

After analyzing quite a number of incidents, I hope to share my findings in this important problem area. Of course the anonymity of institutions and respondents will be guarded. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kenneth R. Venderbush
Dean of Men

LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY
APPLETON, WISCONSIN 54911

Deans' Office
Lawrence University
Appleton, Wis. 54911
To: John Blackburn, Alabama; Doris Stout, Ashland; Jim Foy, Auburn; Jorgen Thompson, Augustana, S.D; Keith Briscoe, Baldwin-Wallace; Kenneth Collier, Ball State; Philip Paquet, Boston U; Alfred Wolff, Bridgeport; John Hayward, Bucknell; Arleigh Williams, Berkeley; Merrill Jarchow, Carleton; John Courter, Carthage; Milt Pike, Central Michigan; Warner Wick, Chicago; Neal Berte, CEEB; John Wittich, CSPI; Juan Reid, Colorado College; Francis Smiley, Colorado School of Mines; Dick Perchlik, Norman Oppelt, Colorado State-Greeley; Jean Tompkins, Cornell College; Mark Barlow, Stanley Levy, David Lasher, Cornell U; Ethel Kaump, Culver-Stockton; Thaddeus Seymour, Dartmouth; John Hocutt, Stuart Sharkey, Charlie Scruggs, Delaware; Mark Smith, Denison; Tom Emmet, Detroit; E. G. Curtis, Earlham; Rod Shearer, Eastern Michigan; Mel Hardee, Eric Collins, Florida State; Les Hale, Florida; Bill Lacy, Franklin & Marshall; Alice Manicur, Frostburg State; Hadley DePuy, Hamilton; Eugene Hotchkiss, Harvey Mudd; Glen Nygreen, Hunter-Bronx; Dick Hulet, Dick Trumpe, Illinois State; Miriam Shelden, Illinois; Bob Shaffer, Indiana; Bill Pillsbury, Knox; Howard Hoogesteger, Lake Forest; Jane Matson, Los Angeles State; Arden French, Louisiana State; Harry Mc Closkey, Loyola-Chicago; Robert Thomas, MacMurray; Norb Baumgart, Mankato State; Eldon Nonnamaker, Michigan State; Dennis O'Brien, Middlebury; Bill Crafts, Monmouth (Ill.); Noble Hendrix, Moorhead State; Bob Ross, Chuck Gruner, Nebraska; Joe House, Newark College of Engineering; Chuck Tucker, Northern Illinois; Jim Davis, Northland; Jim McLeod, Northwestern; Tom Dutton, Oakland; Rick Rieke, Bob Ringe, Ohio State; Robert Goyer, Don Faules, Alan Kemp, Ohio U; Bill Zerman, Phi Gamma Delta; O. D. Roberts, Bill Brown, Purdue; Ira Harrod, Rensselaer; Joe Cole, Rochester; Tom Mc Manus, Sacramento State; Robert Helsabeck, Pete Van de Water, St. Lawrence; Levinia Anderson, Saint Olaf; Vic Yanitelli, Saint Peter's; Merrill Baker, Van Johnson, South Dakota; Herbert Wunderlich, South Florida; Paul Bloland, Southern California; Bob Kibler, Claude Coleman, Southern Illinois; Allan Jackson, Mary Richardson, SUNY Binghamton; Al Cameron, SUNY Brockport; Allan Schramm, SUNY Oneonta; Ivan Putman, SUNY Oyster Bay; Fred Hecklinger, SUNY Stony Brook; Charles Lewis, Jane McCormick, Tennessee; Jim Allen, Texas Tech; John Stibbs, Tulane; B. F. D. Runk, Virginia; Jack Clevenger, Tom Glover, Washington State; Rupert Cortright, Ray Ross and students, Wayne State; Bill Buys, Western Michigan; Hal Homann, WSU Oshkosh; Nancy Knack, WSU River Falls; William Stielstra, WSU Stevens Point; Dick Gross, Wheaton; Joe Kauffman, Pat Tautfest, Ted Zillman, Newell Smith, Joe Ripley, Larry Lichty, John Tolch, Wisconsin; Goodwin Berquist, Frank Dance, Dave Robinson, Wisconsin-Milwaukee; Robert Long, Wittenberg; Ralph Young, Wooster; Pat Ratterman, Xavier; Kenneth Potter, Muskingum

December 5, 1966
Scott W. Sturgis

From: Ken Venderbush

Thank you, to 116 educators mentioned above, for your response to my earlier letter. I know it presented a demanding request. Around Thanksgiving I went into seclusion for 10 days to study the incidents you sent this fall. Forty-nine respondents described one episode in which someone's communicative efforts succeeded or not in coping with a student controversy; 17 described two or more such incidents; nine others sent extended chronologies and documents covering situations at Berkeley, Dartmouth, Rochester, St. Lawrence, Wisconsin, Indiana, Cornell, Saint Olaf and Purdue, all of which will be exceedingly useful; 22 have indicated their intention to write something, but by late November had not yet done so; 19 replied with their regrets, commentary or bibliography on the topic or criticism of my methodology.

To all I am grateful for your interest. I am now even more hopeful that this study will be valuable in our era of active, concerned and often contentious students.

I'm now analyzing the data according to the many variables of the communication process; for this purpose I've adapted a model from those published by Knower, Ross and Berlo. I trust that tendencies will emerge indicating how communication problems and successes occur.

For you who have written, again my warmest thanks. To those who still plan to do so, I hope you will; considerable time will pass before I've analyzed all the incidents plus the cases accumulated over the years. Further, is your campus now experiencing a student controversy? Irrespective of whether you share it with me (although I hope you will), I suggest that there is much to be learned from a journal of who said and did what to cause and cope with the conflict.

In any case I wish you the infinite wisdom and patience it often takes as we work on college and university campuses.
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Allen, James G., Dean of Student Life, Texas Technological College
Anderson, Carl E., Associate Dean of Students, Howard University
Anderson, Mrs. Lavinia, Dean of Women, Saint Olaf College
Baker, Merrill T., Administrator for Institutional Studies, University of South Dakota
Barlow, Mark, Jr., Vice President for Student Affairs, Cornell University
Barry, Miss Ruth, Writer and Consultant in Student Personnel, Rochester, New York
Baumgart, Norbert K., Dean of Students, Mankato State College
Berquist, Goodwin R., Jr., Professor of Speech, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Berte, Neal R., Assistant Regional Director, College Entrance Examination Board
Blackburn, John L., Dean of Men, University of Alabama
Bloland, Paul A., Dean of Students, University of Southern California
Brice, Beverly, Assistant Dean of Women, Bucknell University
Briscoe, Keith G., Director, College Union and Student Activities, Baldwin-Wallace College
Brown, C. William, Assistant Dean of Men, Purdue University
Brown, George K., Dean of Student Affairs, Carnegie Institute of Technology
Brugger, A. T., Dean of Students, University of California, Riverside
Clevenger, J. C., Dean of Students, Washington State University
Cole, Joseph W., Vice Provost for Student Affairs, University of Rochester
Coleman, Claude, Professor, Southern Illinois University
Collins, Eric, Graduate Student in Department of Higher Education, Florida State University
Cook, Charles W., Dean of Men, Carroll College
Cortright, Rupert L., Professor of Speech, Wayne State University
Courter, John F., Dean of Students, Carthage College
Curtis, Eric G., Dean of Students, Earlham College
Dance, Frank E. X., Professor of Speech and Director, Speech Communication Center, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Davis, James R., Dean of Student Personnel, Northland College
Denman, William F., Dean of Students, University of Arkansas
Putton, Thomas B., Dean of Students, Oakland University
Etheridge, Robert, Executive Dean for Student Relations, Miami University
Evans, Thomas D., Assistant Dean of Students, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville

Faules, Donald, Associate Director, Center for Communication Studies, Ohio University
Foy, James E., Dean of Student Affairs, Auburn University
French, Arden O., Dean of Men, Louisiana State University

Goyer, Robert S., Director, Center for Communication Studies, Ohio University
Gross, Richard, Dean of Students, Wheaton College (Illinois)
Gruner, Charles R., Associate Professor of Speech, University of Nebraska

Hale, Lester L., Dean of Student Affairs, University of Florida
Hansford, R. L., Dean of Students, University of Akron
Hardee, Melvene D., Professor of Higher Education, Florida State University
Harrod, Ira E., Dean of Students, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Hayward, John C., Dean of Student Affairs, Bucknell University
Hecklinger, Fred J., Director of Student Housing, State University of New York at Stony Brook
Helsabeck, Robert E., Assistant Dean of Men, St. Lawrence University

Hocutt, John E., Vice President for Student Affairs, University of Delaware
Homann, Harold, Assistant Professor of Speech, Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh
Hoogesteger, Howard, Dean of Students, Lake Forest College
Hotchkiss, Eugene, Dean, Harvey Mudd College
House, S. Joseph, Dean of Students, Newark College of Engineering

Hulet, Richard E., Vice President for Student Services, Illinois State University

Jackson, Allan S., Assistant Professor of Theatre, State University of New York at Binghamton
Jarchow, Merrill E., Dean of Men, Carleton College
Johnson, Van C., Dean of Student Affairs, University of South Dakota
Kauffman, Joseph P., Dean of Student Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Kaump, Ethel A., Professor of Speech, Culver-Stockton College
Kemp, Allen, Graduate Student in Speech, Ohio University
Kibler, Robert B., Associate Professor of Speech, Purdue University
Knaak, Nancy, Dean of Students, Wisconsin State University-River Falls

Levy, Stanley R., Associate Dean of Students, Cornell University
Lewis, Charles L., Vice President for Student Affairs, Pennsylvania State University
Lichty, Lawrence W., Associate Professor of Speech, University of Wisconsin
Long, Robert O., Dean of Students, Wittenberg University

McCloskey, Harry L., Dean of Students, Loyola University (Chicago)
McCormick, Jane E., Associate Dean of Students and Dean of Women, University of Tennessee
McLeod, James C., Dean of Students, Northwestern University
McManus, Thomas R., Associate Professor of Speech, California State College, Sacramento
Manicur, Alice R., Dean of Students, Frostburg State College
Milligan, Mrs. F. E., Dean of Women, Carnegie Institute of Technology

Nonnamaker, Eldon R., Associate Dean of Students, Michigan State University
Nygreen, Glen T., Dean of Students, Hunter College (Bronx)

O'Brien, Dennis, Dean of Men, Middlebury College
Oppelt, Norman T., Dean of Students, Colorado State College

Paquet, Philip R., Graduate Assistant to the Dean of Students, Boston University
Perchlik, Richard A., Professor of Education, Colorado State College
Phillips, Wilbur F., Dean of Students, Knox College
Potter, Kenneth, Associate Dean of Men, Muskingum College
Putman, Ivan, Director, International Faculty and Student Exchange, State University of New York

Ratterman, P. H., S. J., Vice President for Student Affairs, Xavier University
Reid, Juan J., Dean of Men, Colorado College
Rieke, Richard D., Associate Professor of Speech, The Ohio State University
Ringe, Robert C., Graduate Student, The Ohio State University
Ripley, Joseph, Associate Professor of Broadcasting, University of Kentucky
Robinson, David W., Dean of Student Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Rodgers, Allan W., Dean of Men, Indiana State University
Ross, Raymond S., Professor of Speech, Wayne State University

Scruggs, Charles, Assistant Professor of English, University of Arizona
Seymour Thaddeus, Dean of the College, Dartmouth College
Shaffer, Robert H., Dean of Students, Indiana University
Sharkey, Stuart J., Assistant Dean of Students, University of Delaware
Shearer, Roderick C., Dean of Students' Staff, Eastern Michigan University
Shelden, Miriam A., Dean of Women, University of Illinois
Siggelkow, Richard A., Dean of Students, State University of New York at Buffalo
Smiley, Francis E., Dean of Students, Colorado School of Mines
Smith, Mark W., Dean of Men, Denison University
Smith, Newell J., Director of Housing, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Stibbs, John H., Dean of Students, Tulane University
Stielstra, William, Vice President for Student Affairs, Wisconsin State University, Stephens Point
Stout, Doris C., Dean of Women, Ashland College

Tautfest, Mrs. Patricia, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Thomas, Archie M., Dean of Men, Heidelberg College
Thomas, Robert K., Dean of Students, MacMurray College
Thompson, Jorgen S., Vice President for Student Affairs, Augustana College (South Dakota)
Tinkle, Wayne F., Dean of Men, Marquette University
Tompkins, Mrs. Jean B., Dean of Women, Cornell College
Trumpe, Richard, Associate Dean of Students, University of Iowa
Tucker, Charles, Assistant Professor of Speech, Northern Illinois University

Wick, Warner, Professor of Philosophy and Dean of Students, University of Chicago
Williams, Arleigh, Dean of Students, University of California, Berkeley
Wittich, John J. Executive Director, College Student Personnel Institute
Wolff, Alfred B., Dean of Students, University of Bridgeport
Wunderlich, Herbert J., Dean of Students, University of South Florida.

Yanitelli, Victor R., S. J., President, Saint Peter's College
Young, Ralph A., Dean of Men, College of Wooster
Zerman, William, Executive Secretary, Phi Gamma Delta
Zillman, Theodore W., Assistant to the Vice President for Business and Finance, University of Wisconsin
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STATEMENT RE. STUDENT RALLY--

OCTOBER 30, 196_

When the Deans responsible for the administration of academic policy in the College of Arts and Science learned of undergraduate student discontent with the College's educational program, they took immediate steps to contact leaders of student opinion and activity in order to ascertain the specific nature of student complaints. These efforts on the parts of the undersigned and Associate Dean ___________ to reach the students occurred shortly after the official announcement of an increase in tuition for next year and shortly before the student rally which took place on _______ Quadrangle on October 30. These efforts were made, not to stifle an organized student rally, but to channel directly to the Faculty and academic deans the specific charges relating to alleged deterioration of undergraduate education. It was felt that only by getting the complaints directly to the Faculty members concerned would effective and constructive results be accomplished.

To this end a faculty-student committee has been formed, known as the Faculty Student Policy Review Group, and consisting of the undersigned, Associate Dean __________, Professor ___________ (Chairman of the College's Committee on Academic Policy and Chairman of the Department of Mathematics), and the following students: Donald __________, Class of 196_; Christine __________, Class of 196_; Alan __________, Class of 196_; Robert __________, Class of 196_; Vicki __________, Class of 196_; Robert __________, Class of 196_; and Murray __________, Class of 196_. This group has already met in three sessions of about two and a half hours duration each. Further meetings are planned.

So far the only thing that has been decided by this group has been that the conclusions drawn from its deliberations should be presented to the student body at the earliest appropriate time. The vehicle by which these conclusions should be discussed and explained to the student body has not been determined, however. Nevertheless, it is believed by the group that an announcement concerning its findings should await a thorough and serious exploration of the issues. When a consensus has been solidly reached, it
will be set forth to students, faculty, parents, alumni, and trustees.

For the time being, it is safe to say that the group takes very seriously any charges of deterioration of undergraduate education and feels, therefore, that such charges must be adequately supported and considered in the light of the general development of the College of Arts and Science. It is also safe to say at this time that both Faculty and student members of the group believe that we have been remiss in developing effective communication concerning academic policy between student leaders and Faculty. The experience of this group will undoubtedly lead to an improved understanding by the undergraduate student body of the exact nature of the development of the College of Arts and Science, and to improved awareness by academic administrators of specific complaints about the teaching program and its facilities during this particular phase of the College's development.

Dean, College of Arts and Science

November 9, 196_
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Late last January, I dismissed a student assistant in the women's residence hall . . . because of her participation in campus groups and publications which were vulgarly and tactlessly critical of the administration of the University. I told her that I could "hide behind" an evaluation of her performance on the job which left much to be desired, but my real concern was with what I regarded as disloyalty to her employer. I informed her at least twice that I was in no way interfering with her freedom of speech as a student, but I did not feel that she should accept payment from the University when she was so negative toward (and in some cases uninformed about) its policies. She consulted several faculty members following out interview on the grounds that she didn't understand the charge, appeared again for an explanation with her roommate present as a "witness", and talked to a minister in town. Roommate wrote wrote a letter of protest to the student, minister a letter to all faculty members who were members of his church headed "a matter of fairness", and faculty members presented the matter to the AAUP. The Student Senate asked for a written explanation which I refused to give, and by a slim margin, voted to report the situation to the state ACLU. The AAUP worried about the issue until May when it finally decided to condemn my decision. I told the editor of the student paper that I refused to discuss the matter for publication but that I had not refused to discuss the principles involved with any interested student--so he thereby so classified himself and I talked freely (though profession-ally, I thought) "off the record". A summary of our conversa-tion was front page news the very next week. Throughout the whole affair, the former student assistant, a pathetic looking sort of waif, protested that she did not "understand" the reasons for her dismissal--but at no time did she dis-cuss it with the staff members in the residence hall who might have clarified for her what she claimed I had not. She is not enrolled this year, by the way, because she is marrying the boy who helped wage her protest campaign this weekend--and though she has been in town for the past two weeks, she has studiously avoided contact with me during the rare occasions when we've been coincidentally in the same room

. . . My name appeared in the student paper so regularly I began to have all sorts of symptoms every time I read it!
So—how was conflict resolved? AAUP took its action and dropped the matter. I know of no follow-up from ACLU although that might have been because I'd been reported to them by the Student Senate earlier in the year and they'd written a letter of inquiry to the president but dropped it there. The minister and I are painfully polite to each other, and most of the students so anxious to protest the injustice are not on campus this fall. I "sat it out" despite frequent efforts to explain my stand to sundry individuals, and it can't really to said that the problem was resolved but only that it fell by the wayside. . . .

In response to a letter asking how the situation affected him at the time and how he felt in retrospect, the dean of students at University 107 wrote the following.

You posed some interesting questions . . . and I was sort of interested in my own first response to 'would I do it again?'—since I really didn't hesitate in giving a mental yes. Yes, I believe in pronouncing principles, and I've always wondered if I'd hang on to one in which I professed to believe when things got a bit sticky, so it was an interesting test which, to my mind, I passed—while flunking several others, I suspect. . . . Just this very noon, a faculty member reminded me of the " __________ Affair" and observed that had I only charged her with poor job performance (which was also a factor, but a secondary one), I could have saved myself a great deal of discomfort—but said faculty member also happens to agree with my concept of loyalty and was not entirely serious about it all.

How do I feel in retrospect, and did I feel persecuted? Good grief, I thought I'd gone whole hog toward the paranoid scale. When students neglected to answer my greeting on campus, I assumed that it was a deliberate neglect. When faculty members steamed into the office, I braced myself for a discussion of student rights. On another day this week, the editor of the local paper asked me if I was "up at the school" since he hadn't noticed my name in the campus paper's editorials recently. I lost a great deal of self confidence—wondering if I really was the counselor I'd started out to be, and wondering if I'd lost all tolerance for the sophomoric. I'm still wondering—although there are funny, equally 'filmy' clues that I may have gained some respect along the way from the students who still are silent. . . .

In the long run, it has left a campus impression that I have some sort of unidentified power which is to be feared by the rebels—and the uncertain are a little leery of me too—but I am almost regularly brought up short by students who either don't remember, didn't know, or possibly don't care—and they're quite as open and friendly as ever. During the tumult itself, I don't think it influenced my
effectiveness greatly in individual contacts: some who braved the lion's den to question my sanity seemed to leave with a swatch of surprise that I could be reasonable. I have no way of knowing how many decided against coming in because of the uproar. I find more and more that a dean must take unpopular stands, and sometimes must ask for the role of villain in order to do some good. . . .

. . . I'd do it again, it made it harder to be a "counselor" at the time, it created a suspiciousness between me and the students which has not yet disappeared, but it had some good results which are slow in being evident. I began this job in 195—knowing I could never satisfy everyone all of the time and wondering how I'd survive the sticky wickets. I had a surprisingly long period of euphoria before the boom was lowered—and in a way, though I caused the whole mess by acting when I could have ignored—I also felt that it was about time to "stand for something". I think the issue was an important one—and worth the reaction and the aftermath. It was expensive, though—as far as self concept was concerned—but it was important enough to repeat if necessary. . . .
APPENDIX F

At the request of a student's married sister and his mother, I was asked to talk to a man undergraduate about a belief that he was taking a psychodelic drug. Information given me by the family identified that their beliefs might have some foundation.

Not wanting to alarm or cause anticipation in the student, I arranged quietly to meet him in a class situation. From class we proceeded to my office, there to discuss several subjects which led to a conversation on his participation in psychodelic drugs and other possible drugs. At the urgent request of the family I could not and did not disclose my source, but identified to the student that the inquiry was couched in the orientation of counseling and had no allusion to censure or potential discipline.

The student received the discussion very actively. He communicated freely and to a surprising degree, added more to the conversation than what might have been expected.

He noted that he had become interested in drugs after being enrolled in a series of programs sponsored by the "Free University" under the direction of the campus SDS chapter. His interest was mainly in psychodelics, but he denied ever taking any of them or any more serious dangerous drugs. Further, he noted that one of his professors in a creative course encouraged free expression and interpretation of beliefs.

The conversation was concluded quite amicably. No reference was made to a follow-up discussion.

Within a day or so from the discussion I began receiving many comments about what I had allegedly done in suppressing a man's freedom and imposing upon his individual liberties. I was told that because I had not disclosed my source of allegation, he was going to see an attorney. Actually, the husband of one of the professors was to plead his case. I was contacted by the "teacher" of the Free University course on drugs and the student's professor in the creative course referred to above. When the subject of my suppression of liberties was not resolved to their satisfaction, they and the student went to the student newspaper with a complete story asking for an investigation.
As a dean, I note the word "fortunately," for indeed it was fortunate that the student writers were willing to listen rather than to write their article and then attempt to seek facts. When presented with the information that I could ethically communicate, the report was worded carefully and well. Actually, I had advance knowledge of the complete article and approved its being written.

Since then several other conversations have been stimulated by the family of the student involved. At my request, they did take him to the family physician during the Christmas holidays. From that, it was identified that the student had participated in the psychodelic experience. Later he reportedly volunteered having taken it on several other occasions. The family did identify to him that they were the source of my information. Since then I have received no further word from the student or his self appointed defenders.

I wonder if all communications breakdowns are really unintentional? How many might be stimulated by desires for attention?
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