

Original returned to Checker - Aug 10, 1970...

Mr Moynihan retained the enclosure.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

7/22/70

For DPM

This would be worth your while to scan. It's the summary of that Sizer-Zaccharias session in Cambridge on the National Institute of Education, and I think it's pretty good.

→ cf

Checker -

Should I
write an
article about
all this?

✓

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

8/7/70



For DPM

We've finally got the same Heard report, I think. And I read the whole thing last night.

Either I'm missing your point or you're missing Cheek's, re the Higher Education Opportunity Act. Look again at page 37. It's perfectly clear to me that he's talking about the President's bill. And, although he could have been more explicit, I should think it would nonetheless be reasonably clear to everyone else. He certainly deserves no needling by us, at least not on this point.

cf

Statement by
Alexander Heard
Chancellor of Vanderbilt University

on completion of his mission as
Special Advisor to the President

July 23, 1970

I am issuing this statement pursuant to a suggestion made by the President to me on July 17 that a summary be released of the activities undertaken by my associates and me, along with the texts of the principal memoranda we have sent to him commenting on campus conditions. I am also, with his agreement, including a brief outline of subjects on which recommendations were made, but not the details of the proposals.

On May 8, the President asked that I serve as Special Advisor to help keep him "fully and currently informed on the thinking of the academic community and especially of the young." I was "to help present to this Administration the views and sentiments of the campuses around the country." The President later also asked that I recommend ways he might in the future keep better advised on campus affairs. These two requests constituted my assignment. It was not my function to investigate individual campuses nor to make recommendations to anyone other than the President or his representatives.

On the urging of academic colleagues, who had proposed to the President that he make such an appointment, I accepted the assignment as an adviser on campus affairs to the President (not as his representative to the campuses). The President asked that the assignment run through the summer. I accepted it until June 30. The Danforth Foundation of St. Louis, Missouri, has covered the expenses of the professional staff, through a grant to Vanderbilt University. Salaries of this staff have been paid by their regular employers.

Shortly after going to the White House, I was joined by James E. Cheek, President of Howard University, who since that time has had the same access to the President as I. Working with us in later weeks were John Gaventa, senior student and president of the student body, Vanderbilt University; Miss Gail Gordon, White House summer intern, senior student, Smith College; Charles V. Kidd, Director, Council on Federal Relations, Association of American Universities; and John Searle, Professor of Philosophy, University of California, Berkeley. Supporting clerical and stenographic staff was provided by the White House.

The usefulness of our mission can doubtless best be appraised after a period of time. Even so, observers are likely to measure what they see and don't see against

their own hopes and standards, without knowledge of what might or might not have occurred otherwise. Moreover, events themselves are sometimes the best instructor.

From the beginning, the President and many of his staff have made us welcome and have shown hospitality to the purposes of our novel mission. Dr. Cheek and I have had more access to the President than I anticipated when I came, and all we could reasonably expect. I have spent over eleven hours with him in sessions of various kinds. We have submitted memoranda totalling some 50 single-space pages, not including exhibits, and he gave evidence of reading them. Our exposure to other high officials of the government has been extensive (as detailed below). The President asked me in Cabinet meeting to circulate as "command reading" to all members of the Cabinet the memorandum of June 19 that is quoted in full below. He asked members of the Cabinet to arrange for my colleagues and me to meet with their senior staff in each department, which we did to the extent time permitted. We have been an "embassy" within the White House, courteously accorded opportunities enjoyed by regular staff. In a sense, we have had the privileges of the White House accompanied only by the responsibilities we imposed on ourselves.

I will not attempt to predict what action the President will take on particular proposals made to him or the extent to which we may have affected his general thinking. Nor do I think it useful to estimate what influence Dr. Cheek and I may have had on actions taken by him or others in the recent past. He or I, or both of us, recommended, for example, that the President sign the voting-rights bill, that the tax status of segregated institutions be re-examined by the Internal Revenue Service, that the Internal Revenue Service and the Justice Department work with the American Council of Education to develop guidelines for permissible political activity on campuses, that the Justice Department intervene in Jackson during the tense weekend of the burials of the youths killed at Jackson State College, that the President meet on two occasions with college and university chief executive officers, that he confer privately with students when he visited Knoxville, Tennessee, in May, and that a national commission be created to inquire into the Kent State and Jackson State tragedies.

In some cases, of which these are illustrations, the actions taken accorded with the recommendations. We were pleased with these responses. On other occasions, proposals were made which, for one reason or another, were not followed -- for example, my suggestion made immediately after arriving in Washington that the President confer with

the Special Committee on Campus Tensions of the American Council on Education which had issued an informative report in April, a copy of which I sent to the President.

The President made clear to us his serious concern over campus developments. He has displayed openness and a searching interest in what we had to say about campus beliefs, attitudes and behaviors, the conditions that underlie them, and their significance for public policy and national leadership. I judge the mission to have been worthwhile. If I had known on May 8 what I know now, I would still willingly have undertaken the assignment.

The Commission on Campus Unrest, created under the Chairmanship of Governor Scranton following the tragedies at Kent State University and Jackson State College has, unlike my own mission, a comprehensive charge, including "to identify the principal causes of campus violence, particularly in the specific occurrences of this spring." I believe its work can be a compatible follow-on of my mission. It is equipped to address the phenomena of campus violence in depth and on a broad front. At the President's request, we have made our files available to the Scranton Commission. President Cheek is himself a member of the Commission. Another of our group, John Gaventa, has become a member of its staff. We will forward to the

Scranton Commission future communications sent to my office and will continue to assist in any way possible.

Attached are three addenda to this release: (1) a summary of activities; (2) copies of written commentaries on campus conditions given to the President in recent weeks; and (3) an outline of topics on which recommendations were made to the President.

I. Summary of Activities

A. Input from Campuses

We met with groups from approximately 35 campuses which came to Washington following May 8, along with a large number of individuals familiar with campus conditions. We received several hundred pieces of unsolicited mail conveying views and suggestions, some 40 resolutions and statements from colleges and other organizations, numerous analyses, reports, speeches, and other commentary, and a range of petitions and recommendations.

We held a one-day conference in Washington to discuss ways to improve government-campus communications, and another one-day conference in Washington to discuss ways to expand governmental and political opportunities for young people. Both sessions were attended by individuals invited from in and out of government, in and out of Washington.

Through the U.S. Office of Education a questionnaire was circulated to a sample of 240 campuses across the country soliciting an account of events in May on each of those campuses. Returns were received from 193.

At my suggestion, the American Council on Education commissioned Louis Harris & Associates to survey opinion among a representative sample of students on four-year campuses during the latter part of May. The results of that poll are currently being made public by Harris.

We met with a substantial number of representatives of educational organizations located in Washington, including the President and Directors of the American Council on Education.

B. Consultations in Washington

We have conferred with numerous individuals in and out of government. These individuals included the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Finch; the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hardin; the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Hickel; the Attorney General, Mr. Mitchell; the then Secretary of Labor, Mr. Shultz; and the leadership in the Congress, Senators Mansfield and Scott, Speaker McCormack and Representative Ford.

We conferred from time to time with other Members of Congress, in both parties in both houses, and with officials such as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Thrower; the Director of the National Science Foundation, Mr. McElroy; the Director of the Selective Service System, Mr. Tarr; and Elliot Richardson, first as Under Secretary of State and later as Secretary of HEW. Various meetings were held with personnel from the Department of State, HEW, the Peace Corps, the Teacher Corps, the Civil Service Commission, the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the White House Conferences on Children and Youth, etc.

I had an extended meeting with the Attorney General and senior members of his staff in the Department of Justice. Colleagues joined me for meetings with the Secretary and senior staff in the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce. At the invitation of John Ehrlichman, Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs, on June 11 we also spoke to the "Sub-Cabinet," Presidential appointees below the level of Secretary, meeting in the Department of State Auditorium. We also met with FICE, the Federal Interagency Committee on Education, on June 22.

C. White House Consultations

I met with the President in nine sessions related to our mission. President Cheek has been with me in the seven sessions held since he joined our mission. In each instance, one or more of the President's staff was also present. Two meetings concerned with campus unrest were set up independently, one on May 21 with representatives of the American Bar Association (35 minutes) and one on June 8 with eight young White House staff members who had visited college campuses (75 minutes). Two of the sessions were with presidents of colleges and universities invited to confer with Mr. Nixon, one on May 20 of presidents from predominantly black colleges (125 minutes) and one on June 22 of presidents from a wider range of institutions (90 minutes). Four private sessions were held with the

President, on May 12 (90 minutes), May 28 (45 minutes), July 7 (120 minutes), and July 17 (25 minutes). On June 24, I appeared before the Cabinet in session with the President (65 minutes).

At the invitation of the Vice President, I met with him and two of his staff for a 90-minute conference. I met later with his staff for a conference of similar length. At my request, the Vice President received a group of faculty from the University of Minnesota. I was present when he met them for slightly over two hours.

My associates and I have conferred frequently with members of the White House staff, doing business at one time or another with two dozen or so of them. My most significant relationships were with Messrs. Ehrlichman, Finch, Garment, Kissinger, and Moynihan. At Mr. Ehrlichman's request, President Cheek and I met on June 2 with his Domestic Affairs staff. Throughout, we also exchanged memoranda with members of the White House staff.

We have not submitted a formal, written "report" to the President. Our written communications with him have consisted of several memoranda. Three principal memoranda were submitted prior to appointments with him as briefing papers. It is from those four memoranda that the following pages come. In reading them, please remember

that they were prepared at different times and for different purposes. They were designed to serve as basis for discussion, not as comprehensive treatments of a topic. Since part of my mission was to present information on campus views and sentiments, the observations often simply report attitudes held by others. On occasion, my own conclusions or those of my associates are given. At other times, the "we" means all of us in the country. The context will usually make clear who is referred to.

Please pay special attention to the "Notes to Press" that have been added to the text for the purposes of this release.

II. Commentaries

A.

(Note to Press: Following is given the text of a memorandum from me to the President dated June 19. The memorandum reports certain student attitudes and was given to the President prior to a meeting with a group of college and university presidents held on June 22, to serve as a basis for questions he might explore with them.)

Seven million students enrolled in colleges and universities are on the threshold of adult citizenship. Millions more in high school and junior high school soon will be. What they believe, how they behave, will inevitably shape decisively future life in the United States--and our domestic tranquility this coming September.

We do not believe that our national government really understands that a national crisis confronts us. The condition cannot be conceived as a temporary, aberrational outburst by the young, or simply as a "campus crisis" or a "student crisis." Because of its immediate and potential consequences, the condition we face must be viewed as a national emergency, to be addressed with the sense of urgency and openness of mind required by national emergencies. The characteristics of evolving student thought--the characteristics, not their origins, are treated here--help illuminate the condition we face.

(Note to Press: Please note particularly the characteristics here portrayed are not offered as describing all college students. The student population is itself divided and often intensely polarized. The qualities described below reveal, according to our analyses, present and developing characteristics of a large and important segment of students.)

1. The meaning of May: a big shove Leftward.

The Cambodian action (followed by the Jackson State and Kent State killings) sharply intensified feelings among students already protesting the war and showing disaffection with society generally. More important, Cambodia provoked and exposed anti-war and societal discontents among large numbers of students of normally moderate and conservative political viewpoints.

Before Cambodia, many of us on the campuses believed that deep disaffection afflicted only a small minority of students. Now we conclude that May triggered a vast pre-existing charge of pentup frustration and dissatisfaction.

A poll conducted for the American Council on Education at the end of May provides significant empirical evidence of widespread anti-war feeling, concern over domestic failures, disaffection with governmental leaders, and loss of confidence in the basic institutions of our society. The poll sampled opinion on a representative variety of 50 four-year campuses, seeking thus to reach a representative sample of students. (It was conducted by Louis Harris and Associates, the only organization found able to make the poll on short notice. George Gallup was unable to do so. The full report of the poll will be provided to your staff on completion.)

Of those questioned, 48 percent said they had actually taken part in anti-war protests in May; 62 percent believed themselves more politically active than a year ago; 76 percent said they feel basic changes in the system will be necessary to improve the quality of life in America.

(Note to Press: Many of our conversations and written communications were private ones with students or others who did not claim to speak for their institutions. Dr. Cheek and I have not made any individual institution the subject of any commentary, report, or recommendation to the President. Where institutions were cited for illustrative purposes as in two places in the following paragraph, and the information came from private sources, the illustrations have been omitted in this release. In each case where this is done, it is so indicated.)

The testimony of delegations visiting Washington that we interviewed (from about 30 campuses across the country) and the many hundreds of letters received strongly support these conclusions. Students from agricultural schools (for example, ...) and engineering schools (for example, ...) said they had previously been politically inactive, but were now among the protesters. Some student sentiment favoring U. S. policies in Southeast Asia is visible, but the general effect of May was one of radicalizing as well as politicizing student opinion across the board.

One senses that from the best of our young comes the worst of despair. The University of Minnesota's Regent Professors wrote:

"A frightening picture is seen by those of us who work daily with college students. We find among our bright, hard-working, ambitious, well-read students a widespread distrust of their government, a growing despair about the political process, a mixture of fear and resentment toward America's leadership. These are not lazy, violent irresponsible rebels--they are competent and conscientious young people, quietly pursuing their studies to be physicians, businessmen, lawyers, engineers, psychologists, biologists."

2. The integrity of intentions.

As baffling as student behavior often appears, we cannot discount its motives. "All students want to do is to restore the real ideals of democracy for which the United States has stood for in the past," so said one. Another, crying for what he called a sense of humanity, deplored viewing war solely in military terms (winning or losing) instead of in human terms (death and suffering).

Though often emotional and egocentric, the passions of idealism produce not only brave heroes on the battlefield but also determined fighters in the struggles for social change. Whatever one may think of its origins or consequences, the idealism of college students toward domestic and overseas problems embraces an increasing willingness to abandon the conventional postures of national and personal interest. (The mood is familiar to those of us who went to college in the 1930's.) There is a humane concern for victims of racial discrimination, for those who suffer in the urban ghetto, for the poor in Appalachia, and for those who die--under whatever flag--in Southeast Asia. According to a nationwide survey conducted at Swarthmore College, students' draft status seems to have little relation to his position for or against the war. (Note to Press: The survey was done by Professor Kenneth Gergen and Mary K. Gergen, Psychology Department, Swarthmore.)

The strain of idealism in college students helps to explain the intensity of beliefs and the vigor of actions rooted in those beliefs. Student behavior that to some seems simply

"unpatriotic" may be intended by the student as the highest form of patriotism. Not my country right or wrong, argues such a student, but my country, if she is right, and to set her right, if she is wrong.

3. The emerging class consciousness of students.

The self-identification by college students as a separate class in society is assuming extraordinary proportions. A student class may well become a structural feature of our political scene, remaining after present issues are ended.

Student class "solidarity" stems in important measure from the conviction of many students that they do not find sympathy for their concerns or understanding of their problems among older people, from the belief that older society brings unwarranted sanctions against them for wanting to be different (e.g., objections against unconventional appearance, use of marijuana, etc.), and from the perception that "society" improperly imposes burdens upon them which, having had little part in their imposition, they do not wish to carry (the draft and "irrelevant" college curriculum being most often cited). One student observed that if he were working in a factory he would be viewed as an adult, but while in college, he is "viewed as a little boy."

Whether easily understandable by older persons or not, we are still faced by a new fact of political life: growing class consciousness among students. For effective national government, this constituency requires attention and understanding just as do farmers, organized labor, veterans, blacks, etc. This group, however, has much ambition, much energy, and more future than the others. Student class consciousness has been growing for some years, but the Cambodian crisis catapulted it into something approaching a national political movement. The crisis also threw a sizeable percentage of previously moderate and apolitical students into the arms of the radical elements in the university community. This class consciousness leads very easily to another quality.

4. Fears and facts of repression.

Men of wide experience and goodwill ask, "What is this repression I hear about? Where is it? Certainly no one is repressing criticism of the government. What is being repressed?"

Perhaps the matter can be understood by reference to Jackson State and Kent State. To most Americans, they were exceptional

events, tragic and to be deplored, but accidental and unusual. To the disaffected, they are the norm. The disaffected regard the safe and easy expression of dissent as the exception, and they see the killings as an expression of the American system of authority. Here is a paragraph written by a professional psychologist from Vanderbilt who was reared near Jackson, Mississippi, which he visited after the killings:

"Jackson State College students now find themselves in a great dilemma. They are nearly paralyzed by the fear that any sign of demonstration or protest may be prejudged as a sign of disorder that will result in murder and massacre. On the other hand, they feel an increasing urgency to be heard, to express their feelings as human beings, and to experience the dignity and freedom that characterize the new humanness. Many feel they must bow to the system epitomized in the Mississippi Highway Patrol, or risk death in a struggle for a new level of personal freedom."

Perhaps we understand how this comes to be on a black campus in Mississippi. Yet, with the development of class consciousness, similar feelings of fear and persecution have developed among students in general. The Vanderbilt professor further observes, "I believe these turbulent interactions of fear, anger, shame, and despair on the one hand and the desperate search for personal integrity and freedom on the other hand now characterize a large and rapidly growing nationwide segment of students, other youths, and adults."

Fifty-eight percent of the students in the poll agreed with a statement that, compared to a year before, the United States had become a highly repressive society, intolerant of dissent. Among the goals chosen for many of the student strikes in May appears the demand "that the United States Government end its systematic repression of political dissidents."

Among the evidences of repression often cited are: "police brutality," in a variety of forms ranging from hostility toward demonstrators to the alleged unjustifiable assaults of the Black Panther Party; curfews; prohibitions against assembly of more than a limited number of persons; sledgehammer statements by public officials impugning the motives of dissent; and discouragement of outspokenness on grounds of protocol or propriety.

The arrest of students and faculty after your speech in Knoxville for "disrupting a religious service" is taken as evidence, as are the attacks by construction workers on students in New York and on the veteran and his family in St. Louis.

5. Intellectual intolerance on campuses.

Some students are guilty of a brand of repression of their own. Its roots include distrust and self-righteousness. Intolerance of contrary opinion on certain campuses has become a virulent form of anti-intellectualism, sometimes involving violent and disruptive attempts to silence opposing views. Said a undergraduate: "You can't go around worrying about freedom of speech and of access when something like Cambodia is going on."

This intolerance poses as great a threat from within to the educational freedom of our campuses as they face from without.

In emphasizing campus intolerance, I also emphasize that on many campuses dissent has been expressed with high loyalty to concepts of free speech, open forum, and intellectual freedom. Strong efforts by students and faculty to moderate the heat, restrain emotionalism, and keep the way open to expression of all viewpoints have been notable on many campuses.

6. Lack of "responsiveness" by government.

Young people have always been impatient, if only because of their shortened time perspective.

But even from an adult perspective, educational and governmental institutions are often sluggish. When leaders and institutions do not appear to move effectively toward solution of problems, the result, as expressed by the current President of the Ripon Society, is "a frightening feeling of frustration, betrayal and impotence among students of all philosophical outlooks. Students are exhausted with a war which has offered victory just around the corner for all the years of their political awareness." Says a professor of government from: "If the best of our young men and women now in colleges and universities believe strongly that Government is unresponsive, that it is not an instrument through which they can work, the future of the country is indeed grim."

The apparent ineffectiveness of our institutions in solving the great problems of the day--e.g., the war, racism, environmental decay--is as great a cause of disaffection as are any of the problems themselves.

7. Lack of "credibility" in government.

A student pleaded: He wanted to believe his government, but how could he? It lied when the U-2 was shot down, when the Bay of Pigs was invaded, repeatedly about Vietnam.

Disbelief, added to fear of repression and lack of responsiveness, produces an immense skepticism of government. Only 19 percent of the students surveyed believed that troops would really remain in Cambodia for only six to eight weeks; only 25 percent believed the Administration had been frank with the American public in the handling of the war; only 21 percent thought the Cambodian move would actually shorten the war. Skepticism produces basic distrust, polarization, and disaffection.

8. The "validity" of the whole system.

Students ask: How can a system of government that produces a Vietnam and is unable to rectify it be valid? Are we really a good country? For many, Cambodia was the conclusive negative reply.

About 70 percent of college youth had serious doubts about the action. The war has been going on for nearly all their politically conscious lives. Add to this the other tensions and unfulfilled expectations of the society. Sixty-five percent of students said that our troubles stem from economic competition as a way of life; 78 percent said that the United States lacks a sense of values, is too conformist and materialistic. Serious students of government, including some political leaders themselves, worry whether we can solve the problems of race, poverty, health, environmental contamination, foreign war, and all the rest. Unlike previous crises in our recent history, not just individuals and policies are being questioned, but the political system itself.

9. "One more chance."

Frustrated, disillusioned students are saying, "The system has one more chance." They are not always clear on when and how they will know whether the system has successfully used that chance--except that ending the war this summer would earn high marks. What if the system does not measure up? Some say revolution; some say they will leave the country; others say they don't know.

It does seem clear that the political activation stimulated in May will have a residual effect, leaving students more sensitive

politically, more determined to take a part in the governmental process, and feeling more deeply about a range of issues. At present, a significant proportion of students say that they will direct their energies through ordinary political channels. Fifty-nine percent of those who participated in recent protests, and 39 percent of all students surveyed, say they plan to participate this fall in campaigns for "peace candidates." As one letter put it, "The vast majority of moderate students see this as a desperate effort to challenge the revolutionaries and radicals and to make the system work." If those efforts are condemned, or receive no encouragement, and apprehensions about the war continue to deepen, then, as President James Hester of New York University put it, "We can expect the hard-core radicals to gain influence and increasingly violent demonstrations to take place."

The situation is beyond partisan politics. Not surprisingly, over three-fifths of the students surveyed perceived no real difference between the Democratic and Republican parties. More significantly, few present-day political leaders have extensive student support. Loyalty to existing institutions and faith in the country are crucial contemporary issues.

10. Black students.

The national emergency our nation faces is more acute for black students, by several powers of magnitude, than for other students. The fact of their lives and their sense of deprivation multiply their fears and frustrations and bitterness. We will be addressing you separately about their special emergency.

B.

(Note to Press: A second long memorandum dated July 6 was sent to the President for the two purposes stated below. The material pertaining to the first purpose is here quoted in full.)

This memorandum does two things. First, it states why we believe it essential that you and members of the Administration develop as deep an understanding as possible of moods and beliefs on our campuses -- and in the black community, where attitudes and behavior connect closely with the moods and beliefs of black students. Second, it recommends procedures to help do this during the next 12 months.

Youth and black attitudes are uniquely important to governing the United States in the 1970's.

1. The segment of black and white young people who are baffled, disillusioned, and angered are at a crucial psychological and intellectual stage in their lives, a stage that shapes lasting personal attitudes and convictions. Many talented individuals who have futures of potentially great social influence are affected. That fact alone behooves the nation's leadership to understand them and to be understood by them.

The percentage of students attending four-year institutions who are disaffected is sufficiently large to warrant concern. Look at these illustrative results from the survey made for the American Council on Education by Louis Harris during the period May 20-26, 1970. (A copy of the survey report is attached as Tab A.) (Note to Press: Please don't call us for copies. We have none left.)

Of the students interviewed, 17 percent characterized themselves as "conservative" or "far right" and 27 percent as "middle-of-the-road," a total of 44 percent of the sample. Among these:

<u>Conservative or far right</u>	<u>Middle-of- the-road</u>	
70%	75%	<u>agreed that</u> "until the older generation comes to understand the new priorities and life style of the young, serious conflict is going to continue" (p. 37)
47%	64%	<u>agreed that</u> "our troubles all stem from making economic competition the basis of our way of life" (p. 42)
50%	27%	<u>agreed that</u> "except for a few radicals, most young Americans are satisfied with the direction in which America is heading" (p. 48)
57%	66%	<u>believed that</u> "basic changes in the system will be necessary to improve the quality of life in America" -- 92% of the blacks believed this (p. 55)
62%	45%	<u>agreed that</u> "the recent protests and violence are a sign of serious disintegration of American society" (This and the following responses are not included in the attached report. The tabulations from which they are drawn are available to your staff.)
35%	41%	<u>believe that</u> "it is possible to have a violent revolution in the country which would overthrow our government"
9%	13%	<u>believe that</u> such a revolution "stands a real chance of succeeding"

These are only the conservative and moderate students. The responses from students who classify themselves as "liberal" and "far left" reveal much greater disaffection. Even with substantial sampling errors, the basic point would remain: Among an important segment of citizens on whom the future governance of the nation inevitably will in part depend, there is significant lack of confidence in the present state of the United States.

2. We are warned on all sides that events of this summer will determine which colleges and universities open this fall, and under what conditions. A widening of the war will make it impossible for some institutions to operate normally. The residual activating effects of May promise, in any event, to keep issues alive (e.g., ROTC) and campuses tense. The elections will further agitate and politicize the campuses.

(Note to Press: These comments were made privately. By making them public, we do not wish to encourage the possibilities of their becoming true.)

Several dozen campuses experienced violence in May. The killings at Jackson State and Kent State heighten explosive tensions in many locales. Young blacks are on edge everywhere. Backlash and polarization add to the compound of volatility.

We have been exposed to much sober argument that our international policies simply must in the future take greater account of factors affecting what we shall call internal U. S. security. You are better acquainted than anyone else with the painful competition for the funds that finance domestic programs that affect the social health of the nation, and hence its internal security. On another front, however, the quality of feelings that lead citizens to reject order and normal authority, that lead to violence and other disruptions, are not easy to comprehend secondhand.

That is why we see the need for you to judge at close range the varieties of thought and feeling that pervade the academic and black communities. When disaffection is so widespread among conscientious, patriotic people that ability to govern in accordance with traditional precepts is called into question -- and many believe this is now the case and will continue to be -- the symptoms and the sources of the trouble need your personal analysis.

3. The young may be trying to tell us things we ought to hear. You should have the chance to evaluate firsthand the assumptions of those who reach different conclusions from yours about Southeast Asia. The views of youth and the trends they represent have grave political and social consequences. Effective execution of foreign policy and maintenance of respect in the world are both hampered by dissent at home.

(Note to Press: Please note that the following reference to a "communications gap" does not refer simply to difference in vocabulary but also to difference in assumptions and definitions. See the section following the next paragraph called "A Student's View.")

The "generation gap" and "credibility gap" are really largely a communications gap. A communications gap results when those who seek to communicate use different assumptions and definitions. A nationwide poll taken last October showed 81 percent of respondents saying that "the antiwar demonstrators may not be entirely right, but they are raising real questions that ought to be discussed and answered." It is hard to discuss and answer without a common language. Tab B, "A Student's View," suggests some of the sources of the communications gap and of the seemingly indelible differences over policy.

* * * * *

A STUDENT'S VIEW

This memorandum addresses three questions we have heard discussed around the White House about student attitudes and their relationship to Administration policies. We have sought to compress here the views of a "composite" student. Something like these views are held by significant numbers of activated students, although obviously not by all such students. We report these views as an aid to understanding the questions being asked, not to imply their validity nor to question their validity.

I. Why do the President and disaffected college youth have trouble "communicating" about Vietnam? At least four factors are at work.

First, the President uses words that mean one thing to him but something different to many students. For example, he has emphasized that he and students both want "peace." By "peace" students mean an end to the killing immediately. To them the President seems to mean not that, but "a just peace" and "self-determination for South Vietnam," which they see as probably meaning maintenance of a pro-American regime in Saigon, continued U.S. military presence in Southeast Asia, and whatever military action is necessary to produce these ends.

Exacerbating this difficulty is the belief of many students (shared, it is fair to say, by many nonstudents) that the course we are on has no real chance of success. They do not believe Hanoi can be induced to negotiate. They find unthinkable using enough military power to force Hanoi to negotiate. They believe the longer we keep fighting the more difficult the U.S. position becomes at home and before world opinion. They believe our leaders must understand this, and consequently when those leaders do not act accordingly by "getting out," they must be either blind or evil. Frustration to the point of fury builds up from watching us follow, at an enormous cost in human life, a policy they believe to be leading nowhere. When the President explains that we must act in Cambodia to protect the lives of American fighting men, they argue that it would be better protection to bring the men home.

The President's admirable remarks in St. Louis on June 25, 1970, showed insight into student idealism and compassion for their anxieties. The phrase "to win peace," however, does not describe a proper goal in the eyes of some students.

Second, what the President regards as successes, students often regard very differently. Reducing the troop level in Vietnam by sometime in 1971 to something over 200,000 men seems to many in government a formidable achievement. The President so proclaims it. Yet to the young, who face the draft and think on the time scale of youth, these withdrawals seem wholly inadequate. Their attitude should not be mistaken for that of a draft-dodger in World War II. They are not seeking to avoid personal danger. Rather, they abhor personal involvement in a war they perceive as "immoral." Hence, a plan to have a troop level of over 200,000 men next year, and possibly indefinitely, seems intolerable -- to the point that some of them say they would prefer to kill and be killed in a revolution at home to being involved in an immoral war abroad.

Third, to some students, the President appears not to understand the nature of the crisis that has come over the country. He speaks of "deep divisions" in the country. But "deep divisions" suggests a serious disagreement in a stable society, a matter of different groups holding different opinions, whereas students perceive the situation in radically different terms. They see not just differences of opinion, but rather the whole social order as being in a state of erosion. In the St. Louis speech the President said, "we should do something about it and not allow that division to become something that eventually could erupt and destroy a society." The student says the division is already erupting and destroying the society.

The President's visit to the Lincoln Memorial on May 9 was a splendid act. Reports got about, however, that the President passed pleasant queries about surfing and football. That offended students who felt immersed in a national tragedy, like telling a joke at a funeral.

Fourth, and this really underlies the other points, the President and some students proceed from vastly different assumptions. The President says "America has never lost a war," as if "winning" or "losing" were the important consideration. He seems to them to hold attitudes derived from the Cold War, such as the domino theory, and to view Communism in Southeast Asia as a source of danger to America. Wrongly or rightly, many of our best informed students do not share these assumptions.

The President speaks of maintaining "national honor" and implies that this can be done through military power. Students distressed with the failure of their country to achieve all its ambitious ideals at home and abroad think of "national honor" as something yet to be attained. They see the Vietnam war and its effects at home as obstructing fulfillment of their concept of national honor. Just as an earlier generation fought in World War II to preserve the nation's ideals, they want to end the war to help attain the nation's ideals.

The President presents the goal of "self determination" for South Vietnam as a rationale for our military involvement. To students the cost is too high, so much too high as to make the war "immoral." A faculty member wrote from ..."

" . . . at the root of the opposition to the war in Indo-China is the moral revulsion to the carnage undertaken in our name. Peasant societies are subject to the most awesome destructive technology that man can devise; huge areas are depopulated into free fire areas; defoliants, pesticides, and herbicides scorch the earth, and bomb craters create a moonscape; great masses of people are uprooted from their ancestral lands and turned into refugees in their own countries, and war spares neither the elderly nor the women and children. Surely such death and devastation are out of proportion to whatever objective we might hope to achieve."

II. Why are students not impressed by Soviet atrocities such as the invasion of Czechoslovakia?

The apparent insensitivity of students to Soviet actions and to evils in the Soviet system is at least partly explainable by considerations like these: First, they feel that by the wrongness of our own policies, such as the war in Vietnam, we have lost our moral standing to condemn other countries. Second, there is an obsession with our own problems, a feeling that our own crises should occupy all our attention. Third, the fear of Communism is less than existed a decade ago.

Students perceive the Czech invasion as one more evil action by a powerful imperialist government, but they don't perceive it as a threat to the United States. Since the Sino-Soviet split, they see Communism as consisting of different and often competing national governments and styles. The Russians appear to repress their satellite countries, but students see that fact as parallel to American domination in its sphere of influence (the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, economic exploitation, etc.). They see the Russians as no better than we, maybe not as good, but feel more responsibility for our actions than for those of foreign powers.

III. How do they compare the United States with other countries generally?

Instead of viewing the United States as in competition with other great powers, or as being potentially threatened by them, the students we speak of tend to be suspicious of all

national powers, including the United States. As the President said in his "State of the World" message on February 18, 1970, "Today, the 'isms' have lost their vitality -- indeed the restlessness of youth on both sides of the dividing line testifies to the need for a new idealism and deeper purposes." A generational loyalty appears to develop, a loyalty to young people internationally, that transcends national loyalties.

A tendency toward an absolutist conception of moral values helps to make it impossible for these students to be satisfied with the comparative superiority of the U.S. in striving for social justice and equality. Rather than emphasize what is good about America, most students emphasize what could be better about America (which frequently appears to be merely an emphasis on what is wrong with America). Therefore, any form of injustice and inequality, such as is evident in our racial problems, is taken as an indictment of the entire social system, regardless of its improvements over the past, or its relative superiority over other societies.

C.

(Note to Press: Because Dr. Cheek and I were advising the President, we concerned ourselves primarily with the relationship of Federal Government actions and policies to campus beliefs and events. To put our conversation in broader perspective, I sent him the following statements in a memorandum, dated July 16. All language except that pertaining to specific recommendations is included.)

In seeking to understand the "causes and cures" of student disaffection, perhaps an imperfect analogy to human illness helps. There are symptoms, particular ailments that produce the symptoms, and a general level of susceptibility to illness. Many of the observations and recommendations made by President Cheek and me to you have concerned symptoms--the seriousness of prevailing discontent and hostility. When fever is raging, the first therapeutic need is to reduce it. We have also had a few things to say about the next need, to attack the conditions that produce the symptoms--the policies and actions of colleges and universities, of other types of private institutions in society, and of government. Since our mission has been to advise the President, we have focused our observations and suggestions on what you and the U. S. Government might do, rather than where our attention usually is, on ourselves.

We have not addressed systematically the conditions of "susceptibility," the worldwide assertion of individual personality against institutions and traditions, which sometimes manifests itself as a crisis of authority and self-discipline. I will not speak to this last matter except to applaud your own awareness that we are dealing with a social condition found in all categories of nations. That condition is doubtless related to contemporary existential thinking, and also--among other things--to erosion in all cultures of stabilizing influences of family, religion, education, historical tradition, etc. This erosion, in turn, is probably a consequence of magical increases in mobility, communications, and the rapidity of institutional change.

Certain factors at work are beyond your influence. Certain factors that lead to campus disruption are beyond the control of the college or university president. The painful part is

that when the campus comes apart, regardless of the reasons, the campus president gets the blame, and often the gate--simply because he couldn't make the show go. Even those who think he did right desert him because he could not get enough others to do right, too. (One must not only be right, but also succeed!) Similarly, if the U. S. has a sustained, serious, national campus crisis, an unwelcome share of the "responsibility" may be assigned to you simply because there is a problem and you are in office.

Educators have a lot of work to do for themselves. At my first meeting with you on May 12, George Shultz said, profoundly, that the big question now is "What is a university for?" American colleges and universities are being forced to make basic reappraisals of their purposes and working requirements. If we in education are smart enough and lucky enough, we will largely lead the reappraisal and take whatever actions are indicated ourselves. Much inventive energy will be directed by able and dedicated persons to answering George Shultz's question, and also to creating and maintaining (or recreating) the conditions of intellectual freedom necessary for any of the basic functions of a college or university to be performed well.

Your principle of Federal "non-interference" in internal educational affairs is wise. As educators assess their own processes, however, remember that colleges and universities are so much a part of national life that they can never do this alone. The American university is probably the central secular institution in our society, aside from government itself. In our day, more aspects of our national ~~life~~ ultimately depend on the university than on any other type of institution. Inevitably, many persons outside of education will be involved in the processes of reassessment and change, the Federal Government not least among them.

Federal policies shape higher education, in ways intended and anticipated by both government and educators, and sometimes with side effects not foreseen by either. The G. I. Bill of Rights after World War II, subsidy of medical and scientific research after 1951, subsidy of graduate education through the National Defense Education Act of 1958, construction loans and grants, tax policies to encourage private donations, and all the rest, were designed by the Federal Executive and Congress--in proper exercise of their functions--to achieve national objectives. In clear ways like these, as well as for more

general reasons, Federal policies directly affect what colleges and universities do, and how they do it. In years ahead, Presidents of the United States will probably need to look at higher education through more concerned and sophisticated eyes than deemed necessary or appropriate in years past.

Higher education can accept a share of responsibility for the symptoms that have concerned our mission--distrust of government, frustration on campuses, etc.--but its doing so should not obscure the role of Federal policies in producing these symptoms.

One campus representative after another has emphasized his deeply held conviction that, as long as our "national priorities" remain unchanged, no improved Presidential communications or understanding will soften tensions and dissipate alienation and disaffection. The tough version says that the only communication that counts is action, and the only action that counts is "getting out" of Vietnam and applying ourselves more effectively to home difficulties.

To describe or predict a condition is not to favor it. To foretell the near or distant future is very difficult. It does appear to me and my colleagues that if the Vietnam war is thought to "expand" (as was the case with the Cambodian action), the consequence will probably be further internal campus turmoil, including some violent protest, increased radicalization of many students and some faculty, alienation of large numbers of presently moderate students, and the intensification of hostile reactions both on and off the campuses to these developments. As during last May, it would be difficult for some institutions to operate normally.

When the war is brought to an end, the salient issue, though not the only issue, of radical student protest will have been removed. Only when that happens can steps to restore the confidence of the disaffected young in the political system be most effectively taken. Though most students feel that student activism will continue, an end to the war will reduce the volume and volatility of campus dissent.

If involvement in Southeast Asia continues generally its present course, with periodic, moderate decreases, steps to restore confidence on the campuses in the effectiveness of public policies, and to bring the country together, ought to have, and appear to have, certain qualities.

First, students, blacks, and others who are disillusioned simply must feel that their President has sincerely listened to them, listened with an ear willing to learn from them. They want assurance that he has given thought to their feelings and views, and even though not always agreeing with them, has taken those feelings and views seriously into account in making national decisions.

Second, the policies adopted and steps taken that respond to concerns of the disillusioned must be recognized and understood by them as doing just that--if their confidence is to be restored. In other words, measures taken that benefit, for example, American blacks, must be clearly identified and communicated so that those concerned know what has been done and for what purposes.

Third, the measures adopted must also add up to a sense of national leadership and common purpose. They must also have the subtle psychological element that somehow conveys the feeling that we are moving forward together.

All of this is easier to say than to do. The recommendations in my memorandum of July 7, 1970, and the comments on vocabulary difficulties under its Tab B, are designed to help. So are the recommendations later in this memorandum on engaging youth in government and improving communications.

Some realist might well ask whether the students, faculties, blacks, and the others warrant all this energy and emphasis. They do. The importance of the symptoms that have concerned us, and their causes, goes beyond manifestations of unrest and protest. Power takes many forms in society. We are familiar with military power, financial power, governmental power, political power in organized groups, and other effective influences. Intellectual power ought not to be forgotten. Time and again in the world's history, ideas have prevailed over other forms of power, from the teachings of Jesus through those of Tom Paine and Karl Marx to those of Adolph Hitler. Intellectual power is at work in new ways in the United States. New ideas are challenging established ways--which is the most important fact of all to be acknowledged and understood.

(Note to Press: The following paragraph opened the section as recommendations.)

Young people, in all their variety and conditions of organization, need to be viewed as full-fledged constituents of government. Effective participation in politics and government by them increases their understanding of government (and therefore often their patience with it), increases their acceptance of the results of community decision-making processes (local, state and national), and increases their influence over substantive policy, thereby sometimes improving the quality of public decisions.

D.

(Note to Press: This memorandum was prepared by Dr. Cheek and was dated July 22, 1970. Much of its content was discussed with the President prior to that date. All language except that pertaining to the recommendations is included.)

This memorandum is provided as a follow-up to the several memoranda that Chancellor Heard and I have provided in connection with our special mission on colleges and universities. The justification for providing a separate memorandum on the "Black Institutions and Black Students" lies in the fact that while these institutions are faced with the same general problems and issues that face all institutions of higher learning, they are sufficiently distinctive to warrant special consideration and attention.

No effort is made in this communication to treat the subject systematically or in great depth. What this memorandum does seek to do is to provide you with a quick overview of the context in which the condition of black institutions and black students can be viewed and to highlight some specific aspects, which hopefully, may clarify some questions. Specific recommendations for your consideration are included.

I - GENERAL OVERVIEW

"Campus unrest" among black students has its genesis in and is related to the total socio-economic situation of black Americans in 1970. It represents in microcosm the macrocosm of opinion, feelings and attitudes of the black communities in general across the country. The frustration, anger, outrage, fears and anxieties of black students are expressive of the same feelings and emotions which exist among a large spectrum of the black population--"moderate" as well as "militant." Today there is not an appreciable difference between the feelings and attitudes of these generalized categories; the principal difference may lie in the degree of faith each has in the ability and willingness of the government (Federal) to be responsive to the legitimate goals and aspirations of black Americans.

Black students and black institutions of higher learning also must be understood and seen in the context of the overall contemporary struggle of black Americans.

In the latter 1960's, especially among the college age population, the struggle of black Americans began to shift its focus from that of "civil rights" to "social justice."

This is not to suggest that "civil rights" did not--and does not now--remain a concern, but the ethos and spirit of "social justice" are grounded largely in issues related to equity, opportunity and human dignity. The emergence of concepts of "black power," the increasing emphasis upon black pride, black identity, black unity, black studies in the universities, etc., are all expressive of this changing focus among black college students, and to some extent among other segments of the black population.

It can be said that civil rights dealt with issues of being American citizens and directed its interest toward changes in the law. Social justice, however, grows out of the consciousness of black Americans as human beings and as members of a society whose principles are founded in the honoring and preserving of human rights, human liberties and human equality.

In sum, what has been called the "black revolution" can be characterized as more fundamentally in the spirit and character of the original "American Revolution."

There is among the black students much of the rhetoric, passion and commitment that characterized the original "radicals" in the 1700's who are national heroes and regarded as our "founding fathers."

Black Americans see themselves today in relation to their government in much the same way as Hamilton, Jay, Madison, etc., saw themselves in relation to the "Mother Country." There is beginning to emerge among the black leadership a delineation of the grievances against the "establishment" which echoes the "Declaration of Independence."

The achievement of the goals of social justice will be harder to achieve than those of civil rights. The issue of civil rights addressed itself to changes in our laws; that of social justice addresses itself to the character of the American society. The fulfillment of social justice will require a fundamental redistribution of the nation's opportunities, rewards, benefits, and powers. Such a redistribution must affect all minorities--the disadvantaged and disprivileged segments of our society--but, because black Americans are the largest and currently the most volatile of such groups, immediate attention must be given to their needs and grievances; and, in so doing, the other minorities that are disadvantaged and disprivileged can also be accommodated.

In the struggle for social justice, educational opportunity is vital and strategic. The rewards, benefits and powers of the society--which black Americans now seek--depend for their realization on equity in the opportunity of access to education beyond the high school, and on the successful completion of such education. Higher education leading to the standard or traditional degrees is critical as opposed to technical and vocational training for this segment of the black population. The "Booker T. Washington philosophy" will not do and every effort must be avoided to suggest that this approach represents national policy in educational opportunity for black youth.

II - SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS

The following specific observations may be helpful:

A. The New Black Outlook


There are special characteristics that differentiate the mood and posture of the black college community from the broader higher education community. The attitudes and postures of the black college community are based on past and present experiences with racially defined issues. These issues are more sharply drawn by the fact that most of these colleges are in the South. Though progress has been made, the underlying inequities based on racial issues have been harder to endure. As many students view it, no promises are the norm. Where promises are made, broken promises are the expectation. In any period there is cynicism and skepticism. The students and faculty hope for the best and prepare for the worst.

Against this background the war in Vietnam is an additional issue that aggravates and intensified feelings already there. If the war ended today, however, and the draft ended the day after that, it would not significantly reduce the feelings of cynicism and distrust among black college youth or the potential for more unrest. In fact, the ending of the war without some accompanying dramatic attention to their historic problems would increase their feelings of doubt that the basic institutions in the society will be responsive to their needs and to those of their colleges.

Higher education for many black youth increases their intellectual grasp of the current inequities and how deeply embedded they are in the fabric of American life. Thus they feel more keenly how difficult it will be to achieve equality of income, housing and equal education for their future offspring. A stronger sense of history among this generation of black youth impresses them with how long and hard it has been for their parents and grandparents

dynamite in the hearts of our major cities. Two-thirds of them come from families with less than \$5,200 family income, compared to 60 percent of the national college population with family incomes of \$10,000 or better. Most parents of black college freshmen have less than a high school education, a third of the fathers went only as far as grade school, and a third of both fathers and mothers are domestics or laborers--yet these families are producing college freshmen, not delinquents or welfare cases.

When one talks about initiative, determination, and sheer grit within the American social order, these college freshmen represent tens of thousands of miracles based on just those qualities, and precious little else. Somehow these families have given their children the guts and fortitude to stick it out in poorly equipped and understaffed high schools and to go on to enter college.



The great needs of these students make clear the correctness and foresight of the policy expressed in the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1970 in targeting subsidized loans and outright grants to students from low income families. Implementation of this legislation is vital to maintaining and increasing the opportunity of higher education for black youth.

III. A Note on Recommendations

Detailed recommendations were made to the President on a number of subjects. Some of them proposed particular assignments for named individuals. Implementation of some of the proposals might be handicapped by making them public. All of the recommendations, like the comments on campus conditions reported above, were drafted as private communications to the President.

Among the subjects on which we made recommendations are the following:

A. That the President increase his exposure to campus representatives, including students, faculty, and administrative officers, so that he can better take into account their views, and the intensity of those views in formulating domestic and foreign policy.

B. That the President designate a senior staff member in the White House to have special responsibility for White House liaison with higher education.

C. That the President arrange for the considerable knowledge of higher education already available in United States government agencies, especially the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be put more readily at his disposal.

D. That the President increase his exposure to representatives of the black community and other racial minorities.

E. That the President take initiatives welcoming young people into political and governmental processes.

F. That the President initiate an assessment of youth opportunity programs in the Federal government, looking toward their enrichment and better utilization.

G. That the President take steps to improve two-way communications with the campuses of the country through activities in which he, White House staff members, and others in government participate.

H. That the President and others undertake to understand the fears of "repression" among certain groups in our country and to understand the realities underlying those fears.

I. That the President use the moral influence of his office in new ways designed to reduce racial tensions and help develop a climate of racial understanding.

J. That the President increase involvement of blacks in domestic policy formation and develop an ongoing Federal mechanism for research and action on minority problems.

K. That the President act immediately to provide additional student aid funds for the coming academic year to economically disadvantaged students.

L. That the President seek to provide special additional assistance during the coming academic year to those institutions primarily serving black youth.

M. That the President make a long-term commitment to assist predominately black colleges and universities to enable these institutions to increase their enrollment and improve their academic programs.

From time to time Dr. Cheek and I have made other recommendations to the President, orally or in writing.