

The following are verbatim copies of letters, memoranda and notes received by the President or by the Secretary of the Faculty Council from members of the Faculty with respect to campus incidents of October 30 and 31, 1967, related to protests against placement interviewing by the Dow Chemical Company and a convocation address by Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

This letter is intended as an informal, personal one, whereby I can discuss with you a matter that is just as important to me as a person as it is to me as a faculty member of Indiana University.

First of all, like Bob Byrnes, I want to thank you for setting the stage for our Faculty Council discussion of the picket-demonstration issue, on November 7. Not only did the reasoned, objective nature of your statement impress me (and obviously the others who attended), but also your positive awareness of possible modifications that we may wish to consider for the future handling of similar problems. I believe that your statement, together with the positive attitude reflected in the Agenda Committee motion, set the tone for the whole meeting so that most of the statements by faculty members were generally likewise objective and dispassionate.

I could not agree with you more than when you referred to such things as the Dow Demonstration and the Rusk Demonstration as "not a dissent, but a calculated disruption", and I certainly savored the meat and wisdom of Chancellor Wells' statement.

Second, as a former administrator in South Dakota and as a present part-time administrator of sorts at Indiana University, I appreciate the fact that administrators are called upon to make decisions under all sorts of circumstances, for which they have been unable many times to anticipate all of the angles of the problem as it develops.

I also appreciate the fact that on occasion these decisions must be made rapidly--even on the spur of the moment. As Ralph Fuchs said at the November 7 meeting, we faculty persons, who enjoy the protection from having to make these decisions because you administrators are there to do it for us, should be willing to accept your decisions as the best possible course of action under the circumstances and within the existing guidelines (although these, too, may be inadequate).

Third, like George List, I am a parent of teen-age children, one of whom is in college. These children are attempting to find their identities in this society of ours whose values seem to be changing so rapidly (it seems to us) but not rapidly enough (it seems to them). These children are going to be forced to make more and more of the decisions that we today are making for them, as they assume more and more responsible positions in our society. We recognize that we must help them as they try their wings (or flex their muscles) and attempt to reach out beyond what we have taught them, for unless they do this we have not taught them properly the meaning of the term, "an inquiring mind". I attempt to do this with my Junior High Sunday School class as we try to decipher, within the Christian context of a belief in God, what it means to be alive today, what we are here on earth for, and how selfish we really are as we speak of "one world" yet always seem to consider what effect issues will have on us, personally.

And this last remark, I feel, is part of the problem with our young people (just as it is with us adults, too)--they want to "relate", to be a part of "movements" particularly as these movements will help solve some of the urgent problems of today, yet they are confused and unsure about how to accomplish this. In an attempt to help them understand some of these problems, and at the same time to re-establish the dialog between faculty and students--between adults and young people--, I have been a member of the Campus Ministry Study Commission along with Ken Schmitz, Bill Madden, and others, as we examined last year new ways that our religious backgrounds and philosophies can be put to use in a non-denominational way in helping students see where they are going.

Fourth, as you are well aware, student unrest is being examined these days not only by social scientists and humanists, but also by scientists (Science, 27 October 1967, p. 477-479 and editorial on p. 443). Nevertheless, we scientists are not doing as much as we should, as Ralph Cleland has pointed out recently in talks and in committee meetings wherein he challenges scientists to get more involved in society and its decision-making and other dealings.

Fifth, my comments and recommendations regarding the specific Dow Demonstration and Rusk Demonstration:

1. Re the I.U. Safety Division, the administration should (a) make these appointments as full-time positions, with adequate pay and eligibility requirements, and (b) provide them with riot-control training, so that they will be able to handle problem situations more adequately than in the past. This would delay a decision to call in the Bloomington City Police.
2. Re the Bloomington City Police, the University should urge that (a) an investigation of "brutality" charges in the Dow Demonstration be conducted, in an attempt to determine if the police could have acted in a more reasoned and humane manner, and urge that (b) the City police likewise be trained in riot-suppression measures so that they too could more adequately control potentially dangerous situations.
3. Student demonstrators and pickets should be aware, as you so aptly stated, (a) that along with their right to dissent goes the responsibility for their actions and the willingness to accept the consequences (however unwarranted) of their actions (see enclosed statement by Baptists), (b) that "peaceful demonstrations" can quickly get out of hand and by mob psychology or mass hysteria can become unwanted riots, and (c) that University rules and regulations are for the protection of the rights of others and are not vindictive promulgations of a "father-figure" against his "children" in an effort to hamstring them and their opportunity for freedom of speech.

Sixth, we faculty must recognize that these demonstrations have provided us with the opportunity to grow--the privilege to change with the times, indeed, to help the times change--and we should be leaders in this changing scene; however, we must recognize that this does not give us license to perform unlawful acts, or acts disruptive to our educational purpose, or acts that may provoke civil or criminal action because of their possible harmful effect on others. Thus we must use this opportunity to re-examine our rules and regulations governing pickets and demonstrations, and our enforcement of them; re-examination at any time is a healthful thing, and at this time it is mandatory.

And last, I remember a remark that Joe Sutton made a few months ago, when the University was under the gun because of Indiana citizens' and legislators' reactions to a fracas of some kind at I.U. Joe said, "You academic types are pretty secure, sitting back and letting the administration run interference for you. One of these days you're going to have to get out of that pocket and stand up and be counted." I think that this is what we are doing now.

You can be sure that, from the reactions at the Faculty Council Meeting on November 7, we will stand up and be counted, whether with you or against you, or some of both, on any particular issue. You can see from my foregoing remarks that I am with you.

Knowing something of the many decisions that you are called on to make, and knowing the huge amount of time that it takes from you and Jim Jordan, as well as others in high administrative posts, to arrive at these reasoned decisions, I want to express my personal thanks for what you are doing for I.U. And particularly I want to commend you on your sincerity and open-mindedness, and on your fortitude in not only attending but also in guiding the Faculty Council Meeting on November 7 when you obviously did not feel in tip-top physical shape.

It reminds me of the two hymns on facing pages of an old Methodist hymnal when I was a kid; the one on the left side was, "Will There Be Any Stars In My Crown?" and the one on the right-hand page was, "No, Not One."

Allen F. Agnew, Director
Water Resources Research Center
and Professor of Geology

(Enclosure: CONCERNS FOR CHRISTIAN CITIZENS, Publication of the Division of Christian Social Concern--American Baptist Convention, October-November 1967, pp. 1-3 marked.)

* * * * *

(To the President)

November 21, 1967

In these troublous times I write to add my voice to what I hope are many endorsing your stand for real freedom of discussion and open debate and your deep understanding of the fundamental issues involved and your courage in stating and standing by these principles.

I hope you will always feel free to call on me if there are any ways in which I can be of assistance.

With real admiration and respect,

J. W. Ashton
University Professor of
English and Folklore

* * * * *

(To the Faculty Council)

(no date)

Freedom of speech, vital to free men everywhere, is especially vital to a university. An enlightened university administration must do everything within its power to guarantee its students and faculty the right to consult with whomever they please. This must necessarily include the right to meet and talk with representatives of unpopular causes and unpopular companies.

If the events of October 31st are as reported to this council, the actions of the University Safety Department seem appropriate for the protection of free speech. (1) No attempt was made to interfere with a peaceful demonstration which did not impede the normal pursuits of this university. (2) When those demonstrating decided to interfere with the freedom of speech of others it was made clear that this could not be done with impunity. (3) When coercion was used to prevent others from speaking to a representative of an unpopular company, the Safety Department used the resources at its disposal to hinder such coercion.

We resolve: (1) The Safety Department should be commended for its firm action in upholding freedom of speech in this university. (2) Those students who attempted to use force to prevent free assembly and free speech should be disciplined in such manner as to illustrate this university's resolve to protect its members from coercive inhibition of free speech.

We wish the Faculty Council to investigate also the events of November 1st when it is reported that one group of students were harrassing another group who were demonstrating outside the Administration Building. Was the Safety Division as vigorous in defending free speech as they had been the previous day?

Our university has a commendable record of upholding the rights of free inquiry and free speech. We hope that the Faculty Council will make every effort to insure that this record be maintained and that the defense of free speech be maintained equally for all groups.

Donald Ary, David Gliessman, John Svaan, Hans O. Andersen, Mary Rouse, Mac Fleming, Laurence D. Brown.

* * * * *

(To the President)

November 9, 1967

The enclosed piece on Dow at Harvard suggests a possible means of averting violence.

Perhaps a volunteer group of concerned faculty could be on call for such occasions, the purpose being to discuss or debate all of the issues which are tangent to the demonstrators' primary concern, yet which are central to the ideals of the university in a free society.

If, for example, such a group had been in existence at the time of the School of Business incident, students might well have been dissuaded from entering the placement office and all parties might have gained from the experience. I believe that the greater number of our student political demonstrators are motivated by idealism and that it would be a major failing not to respond in kind.

William Bailey
Fine Arts

(Enclosure: NEW REPUBLIC, November 11, 1967, "The Right to Recruit On College Campuses" by Maurice Ford, pp. 11-13.)

(To the President)

November 9, 1967

I am enclosing a Xerox copy of two articles found in the November 6 issue of The Chemical & Engineering News, an official organ of the American Chemical Society, which I thought you would like to see. I have underlined some well expressed comments which fall in line with your attitude.

It is perfectly obvious that a line must be drawn at some point. Appeasement merely delays the act. The world is well aware of what happened to Great Britain in the 30's through appeasement. Fires are easiest to put out when they start. If established rules and regulations are violated, the violator must pay the price for no institution can stand for individuals allowed to take the law unto themselves. This merely leads to chaos and anarchy. Freedom of speech must be preserved, but such freedom does not entitle someone to cry "fire" in a crowded theater when there is no fire.

I am firmly behind your strong stand to preserve the rights of individuals and also protect the reputation of Indiana University. I can assure you that, regardless of what you do, you will always find someone who will disapprove of your act. Therefore, do what you believe to be right and best for the welfare of the University.

The innuendo which was made the other day at the meeting to the effect that the members of the Chemistry Department disapproved of the Dow interview is not true. A vote of the Chemistry faculty was taken, and the results were overwhelming in favor of permitting the Dow Company to hold their interview-- 26 were in favor while only 4 disapproved. This is a far cry from the impression given on Tuesday.

John H. Billman

(Enclosures: CHEMICAL & ENGINEERING NEWS, Nov. 6, 1967, "Napalm on the Campus", editorial, p. 5; and "Students picket Dow Chemical recruiters on six campuses", article, p. 24.)

(To the President)

November 1, 1967

Everyone over 30 years of age is not wrong, neither are all those under 30. But there are some on both sides of that "magic" age who act rudely, break rules and break laws.

The time has come for all those who oppose such actions to stand up and be counted. Those students who have acted in an undignified and unlawful manner in the past few days, as well as those faculty members who have supported their actions are not representative of Indiana University. Perhaps we should say it is past time to stand up and be counted, but those who are working hard at their jobs, trying to cope with heavy class loads and counseling students have little time for causes.

We have a job to do and most students feel they have one, too. Educated men and women don't act like some have on this campus this week. Freedom is something for all of us, not the minority or the majority. I want the right to hear a speaker, particularly a distinguished one such as our Secretary of State. If I disagree with him, I either don't have to go, or simply not applaud when others might. Tuesday marked a black day in Indiana University's history of freedom of thought and speech.

Also, I hope that the decision will be that those who disobeyed the rules of this University and invaded an office of the School of Business to obstruct the freedom of other students in their job interviews will face full charges in the courts for their actions and disciplinary action by the University. I served on the Student Affairs Committee in my own I.U. student days, and I know the difficulties of taking such action.

One of my students put it well in class today, "Attending Indiana University isn't a right guaranteed to me, it's a privilege." If the University does not stand firm in this situation, then it ignores the rights of those thousands of students who feel privileged to receive an education and are here for that purpose.

They want to learn, we want to teach. It would be best that we get on with it.

Marjorie Blewett
Lecturer in Journalism

(To the President)

November 1, 1967

As a visiting (English) faculty member of this University, I have been deeply shocked by the recent violent events on campus. I was under the impression that the United States was an enlightened and civilised country, but to my mind enlightenment and civilisation are totally incompatible with the brutal actions of the Bloomington police towards student demonstrators on Monday, 30th., October.

Those who demonstrated against Dow Chemicals certainly appear to have put themselves in the wrong, but this is surely no excuse for Gestapo action by the police. I can not understand why it was necessary to use violence, or why the matter could not have been dealt with by the campus police alone. Incidents such as these leave me, and I feel sure other visiting teachers, with a most unhappy impression of Indiana University.

Some control of student demonstrations is clearly necessary, but it should not be beyond the powers of this University to exercise such control effectively and peaceably.

Alan C. N. Borg
Fine Arts

(To the President)

November 27, 1967

We regret not having written this much earlier but recent events and comments about the campus indicate to us that we should correspond our feelings to you.

Everyone connected with the University is painfully aware of the strains imposed on your administration within the last month. There is little to be gained by finger-pointing or name-calling. We deplore the senseless comments of some members of the university community whose fulminations add nothing to either the stature of the university or the serious resolution of the pressing problems besetting us all.

The undersigned members of the Department of Police Administration wish to take this opportunity to express to you our considered feeling of appreciation of the turmoil your office is undergoing, and further, our absolute and unqualified support for the position you have taken and each and every statement you have made concerning events of the past month. Indeed, and we are sorry to have delayed telling you, we wish to indicate our support of your office in many troublesome events prior to October 30th as well.

The hard cold facts of life, which we understand, is that the university, if it is to mean anything at all, must abide by its own rules for serious debate and intellectual exchange. If the final product of Indiana University is to be rational, intelligent men and women who will be the leaders of the future, it is imperative that they learn here that orderly debate and adherence to reasonable rules of social behavior are vital in a crowded world. The requirements imposed on ladies and gentlemen in terms of their behavior are the same, regardless of the emotionality of the particular problem. Feelings about the Dow Chemical Company or any other public question is not the main point; the basic problem is that all such questions must be discussed within the confines of reason and decent behavior and respect for rights of others. We believe this is the point you have been trying to enforce, and we wish you to know that we support that point and your actions wholeheartedly.

Robert F. Borkenstein, Lawrence E. Brown, G. E. Davila, Bernard Dolnick, Kent B. Jocelyn, John H. Kragie, Mary Ann Miller, Hillard J. Trubitt, Walter B. Ziel.

Department of Police Administration

(To the President)

November 10, 1967

The past week has undoubtedly been a most difficult time for you and I imagine that you have been disturbed by the attitudes displayed at last Tuesday's open faculty council meeting.

It is my considered opinion that the faculty against the resolution to administer student actions represent but a small fraction of our faculty. Obviously some members of our faculty are self styled crusaders who exhibit little regard for rules and regulations, civic law and are void of empathy for those in administrative positions of responsibility.

I can assure you that my personal support and all those who work near me in the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation support you and your position.

Yours is a most difficult task and I merely wished to acknowledge the support of the Brogneaux family to you and your office.

John Brogneaux
School of Health, Physical
Education and Recreation

(To the President)

November 6, 1967

The Teaching Associates' Committee of Concern, Henry A. Bassin, Chairman, is not a spokesman for me. It is my belief that you and your administrative officials are thoroughly capable of enforcing democratic rules and regulations on our campus and I am convinced that you do so.

If certain faculty members, teaching associates, and students were to expend energies on their instructional and academic pursuits to the same degree that they invade the responsibilities of you, our leaders, they would be far more effective members of our university community in several respects. Surely they are not fulfilling, to an honest degree, the tasks for which they are employed or committed. The only reason for retaining these mutineers in the university is to attempt to educate them in the democratic procedures which will continue to make our university, state, and nation great. Otherwise, my recommendation would be to dismiss these recalcitrants so that the sincerely dedicated personnel may proceed with their forward-looking endeavors with fewer disruptive interferences.

Godspeed and best wishes to you in fulfilling your assignment as the leader of all faculty, staff, and students.

Frederick L. Brumbaugh
Teaching Associate
School of Education

(To the President)

November 4, 1967

I write to ensure that you hear from a supporter as well as from your critics, apropos the recent demonstrations, "demands," etc. As I size up the situation you are leading and coordinating a measured defense of the civil rights of most of us in the University community against the interference of a small but noisy group of students. It seems also that important rights are at stake. The right of a student to keep an appointment and have an interview he has scheduled with Dow Chemical Co. is every bit as much a right as that of a peaceable demonstrator (we still have a few left!) to demonstrate peaceably. Other rights now under attack seem to include the University's right to bring here an indisputably authentic spokesman for a controversial national policy, together with the right of his audience to hear him when he comes. I believe you are defending these rights, and I want you to know that there are faculty members who view your actions and utterances in this light, and support you.

I have been a member of the American Civil Liberties Union for over twenty years. For most of that time, in most cases, it has been the demonstrators of today and yesterday--the members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and their like--who have most needed and deserved the ACLU's help. It would appear that the shoe is now on the other foot, and that the majority now needs protection from those who cannot distinguish moral pressure from force and violence, and who aggrandize their own right to demonstrate into a license to thwart the civil rights of others.

Roger C. Buck
Department of History and
Philosophy of Science

(To Dean Robert H. Shaffer

November 21, 1967

CC: President Stahr

Richard L. Turner, Secretary, Faculty Council)

I was quite disappointed in the relatively neutral tone of statements made by President Stahr and by the Faculty Council regarding your actions in disciplining students involved in recent demonstrations on the campus.

I strongly support the stand that you have taken in this matter, and believe that it is high time that all members of this University community, including the President, the Deans, and faculty members begin to think seriously of the danger of allowing anarchy to supplant our regular rules of behavior on campus.

I believe that you will find that the majority of the faculty stand four-square behind you in your decision, concerning these rule-breakers and civil rights violators.

Keep strong.

E. Campaign
Department of Chemistry

(To the President)

October 31, 1967

I was unable to attend the Rusk lecture, but I heard the last portion of the address and the question period. May I say, your statement prior to the questions was masterfully done.

Byrum E. Carter, Dean
College of Arts and Sciences

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

After the open meeting of the Faculty Council yesterday, I felt compelled to write you a letter to let you know that many of us whole-heartedly support your efforts in regard to maintaining law and order on the campus. Some of us were ashamed and embarrassed to have faculty members openly condone the action by the students that took place during the recent happenings. Also we were deeply distressed to find faculty members totally uninformed as to what actually occurred in relation to the altercation between the police and the students. Upon good authority, I have been told that most of the aggression was initiated by the students.

Those universities who have had experience with lawless students have found that drastic measures have had to take place in order to prevent academic chaos. I believe such action is needed now at Indiana University.

Your speech was a masterful presentation of the feelings of many thoughtful university people. Please continue your forthright statements and actions.

John M. Cooper
Director of Graduate Studies
School of Health, Physical
Education and Recreation

(To the President)

November 9, 1967

I have already signed a letter prepared by others which protests the precipitous action by Dean Shaffer against the student demonstrators. I feel, however, the need to express my own view individually and personally to you.

Dean Shaffer has a distinct advantage when he says he acted in the spirit of the general meeting of the faculty council on November 7th, because it is unlikely the proceedings of that meeting will ever be made public (I mean fully so). The one thing clear about that meeting was that there was no agreement or consensus, that there were in fact two opposing views receiving approximately equal support among those present: the one urging restraint and clemency, the other demanding immediate and stiff reprisal. How the Dean can assume that his action is justified by Tuesday's meeting I cannot imagine. His action and consequent statement to the press seem to suggest a contempt for the views of those faculty members who expressed their concern over the extreme complexity of the situation and their sense of a moral imperative upon us to proceed with care and compassion. I grant that the opposite view was as strongly voiced at the meeting, one the Dean might well think supported his action. But in no sense has he acted in the spirit of that meeting. This fact ought to be made clear.

My letter is unfortunately too late to have any bearing upon the decision already made. I am more concerned however that action was taken even before the facts were fully investigated and made known.

Jared R. Curtis
Department of English

(To the President)

November 9, 1967

Although I am not normally given to sending off angry letters, I feel I must record my concern about the timing of Dean Shaffer's announcement of penalties against the demonstrating students.

The Faculty Council meeting on Tuesday was admirably conducted. Your own statement was relevant and meaningful, the mechanism for recognizing speakers was both fair and practical, and the large number of speakers reflected a variety of views. I was much impressed by the serious and thoughtful concern over the problem and the tendency toward equitably benevolent solutions which permeated the meeting. I felt that the Council had received valuable guidelines for its further deliberations.

I was therefore startled last evening to read about the penalties in the paper. I have no quarrel with the penalties as such: students deliberately violating regulations must expect some kinds of sanctions, and the ones imposed are actually quite moderate. I feel most strongly, however, that they should have been imposed either on the day after the incident or, preferably, after the criminal charges have been dealt with. To report them as they were reported opens the way to two misconceptions: 1) that the faculty voted them at the meeting on Tuesday; or that 2) Dean Shaffer's action constitutes a gratuitous slap at the faculty and its serious deliberations of the day before.

Since, unlike many of my colleagues, I tend to discount conspiracies, I do not seriously believe either interpretation. The only explanation remaining is grossly ill-advised administrative action, and it is to communicate my deep sense of regret that this should have happened that I have availed myself of your invitation to write.

Philip B. Daghlion
Professor of English

* * * * *

(To the President)

November 13, 1967

Please accept my sincere congratulations on the manner in which you conducted the Faculty Council Meeting on Tuesday, November 7, 1967. Too, I am happy that this meeting was open to the entire faculty.

To be understanding without agreeing, to be conciliatory without appearing to be acquiescing, to be polite in an occasional framework of rudeness, to be demeaning in an atmosphere of censoring, and to demonstrate composure while listening to the tirades of emotionalism are all marks of a great man. You demonstrated these characteristics and I am proud to have you as the President of our great University.

Each of us must be a defender of a principle. However, it seems rather paradoxical that such an august group as that which met last Tuesday should, at times, give vent to irrational behavior and arrive at illogical and anserine conclusions. Many years ago two wonderful parents taught me that every privilege had a parallelling responsibility. How easy it is to lose sight of our responsibilities in our quest to seek a scapegoat for our pseudo democratic actions. Ironically, police brutality, the logical scapegoat, was not at the meeting to defend itself.

I have a great respect for the Thomas Paines and the Thomas Jeffersons. I have an equal disdain for those who would besmirch the name of a great University under the guise of academic freedom.

A year ago I had two opportunities to leave the University. In each instance my prestige, responsibility, and financial remuneration would have been greater. My decision to remain here was predicated on the leadership associated with my University. Your actions last Tuesday and again Thursday in your State of the Union message furthered the confidence I have in your leadership.

As an aside, may I compliment you and hope that you continue never to lose sight of all campus pulses. Your ability to make the transition to "Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp, Or what's a Gonso for?" would meet plagiarism forgiveness from the late Robert Browning.

Jack B. Daugherty
Professor of Physical Education

(To the President)

November 6, 1967

Since last Thursday afternoon, 1-November-1967, I have written drafts of memoranda to six different members of the faculty and administration. Over the weekend I tried unsuccessfully to "tone-down" these memoranda and still retain my full feelings.

I very much appreciated receiving the notice and attached papers from the Agenda Committee of the Faculty Council concerning the open Council Meeting. It is very clear to me that the students involved with the "Dow Chemical Affair" are in breach of University Regulations and civil law. I believe that the action of the University officers was proper and that their action must have the support of the faculty.

If the action of the civil authorities follows action taken recently by some courts in similar situations, these students will be given a "stern" lecture and the charges will be dropped. I have begun to lose respect for our judicial authority in this regard. I certainly hope I do not end up losing respect for the integrity of Indiana University. I do hope the University has the guts to act with strong conscience. The disobedient students (and accessory "before and after the fact" faculty) are now considered by some to be martyrs. May I suggest that these people "earn" their martyrdom by "paying" an appropriate price. In the students' case, any price short of suspension from the University will be a terrible joke at the expense of the integrity of Indiana University.

I have been urging all faculty that will listen to me to attend the open meeting Tuesday. I firmly believe that you and the University Administration will receive an overwhelming blessing for your past action and a dictate to pursue vigorously future action.

J. B. Droste
Department of Geology

(To the President)

November 3, 1967

This letter is prompted by the "irate student" article in last night's HERALD-TELEPHONE and happenings of the past few days. If there are faculty members on this campus who will support this type of student behavior there are also faculty members who will oppose it. I have some deep-seated convictions about such "goin's on" and if the time ever comes that you need someone to stand up and be counted you'll find me as close as the nearest telephone.

Frederick C. Ebbs
School of Music

(Enclosures: JOURNAL HERALD, Dayton, Ohio, 10/27/67, "After the March Came Disillusionment, Disgust", news article.
"A Plea For Support", mimeographed, two pages, representing a recount of the events of the afternoon of October 30, 1967.)

(A Statement--Copy to the President)

(no date)

It seems fairly clear that the growing spirit of revolt on the campuses of America is directly linked to the fact that President Johnson since his overwhelming election victory in 1964 has carried out the very policy of escalation in Vietnam that was rejected at the polls. The campus dissenters now say that their efforts to influence the administration's Vietnam policy through

voting, debate, and all the usual forms of constitutional action, have failed. Now, they say, they must resort to other measures.

Two diametrically opposed forms of "other measures" are possible. One is nonviolent civil disobedience along the lines developed by Gandhi in India and applied by Martin Luther King and his followers in the civil-rights movement in the South. By nonviolently opposing governmental actions that they consider wrong and by their willingness to accept physical suffering rather than inflict it, the practitioners of nonviolent resistance attempt to force a government to bring its actions more nearly into line with the nation's professed moral principles or else risk losing the support of its constituency. The other form of extralegal action is, of course, the old-fashioned resort to violence, which is usually aimed at undermining and challenging the authority of the established government and ultimately at taking it over.

In the heat of their strong moral opposition to the war some students with a fundamental commitment to the nonviolent type of extralegal action have been drawn into protest and resistance movements with supporters of extralegal action based on violence. The result has tended to be utter confusion--confused action by this uneasy coalition and confused reaction by the authorities and the general public, both those who defend and those who condemn the participants. What is needed now is some effort to see clearly what is going on and what is at stake.

My understanding of the issues has led me to my own personal bias, and I will try to make it clear at the outset. Presumably those who protested in the School of Business last week against the Dow Chemical Corporation are opposed to the making or using of napalm by anybody. I am too, but I go much farther than that. I am against all war--the Vietnam War, colonial wars, so-called wars of national liberation, those civil wars that go by the name of revolution, and the war that the Students for a Democratic Society have publicly declared against the administrations of American universities.

But the issue here is not whether all the rest of you agree with me that napalm is wicked. The issue is whether any self-appointed group of individuals shall be allowed to impose its own censorship upon our university community. Four of our colleagues sent us a letter on November 1 in which they justified the demonstration against Dow Chemical by saying that the demonstrators acted "out of intense moral and intellectual conviction." But intense moral and intellectual conviction is not enough. Most of the despotic movements throughout history have been led and supported by people who were acting out of intense moral and intellectual conviction.

The real test for civil liberties is provided by whatever case we personally find the most repugnant. The makers of napalm provide an excellent test case for me, because I think napalm is diabolical. But if my hatred of napalm leads me to accept the right of one group to prevent recruiting by the company that manufactures napalm, then I logically have to accept the right of all other groups to prevent recruiting for whatever they happen to dislike. I could not then object, for example, if a right-wing isolationist group tried to obstruct recruiting for the Peace Corps, or if the Women's Christian Temperance Union tried to obstruct recruiting by some liquor manufacturer, or if members of the John Birch Society, full of intense moral and intellectual conviction, decided to disrupt the activities of the DuBois Club.

That is the main issue at stake here, but there are also two other issues that must not be lost from sight. The first of them will already be clear to those of you who may be keeping yourselves informed, as I do, by regularly reading the publications of the revolutionary Left. The weekly paper of Students for a Democratic Society, New Left Notes, makes it clear that the purpose of such campaigns as the one SDS is supporting around the country against Dow Chemical is not primarily to stop the manufacture of napalm, or even to bring peace to Vietnam, but rather to build support for a revolutionary movement in America.

Last week's issue of New Left Notes, for example, which is dated October 30, drew the following lessons from the big demonstration at the Pentagon on the weekend of October 21:

Tactically, we must plan more adequate tactics for large group disruptions and resistance. It is conceivable that we may decide that disruptions with large groups of people in one place are

unfeasible. For example, if we wanted to shut down a major city, Newark, say, we might divide into 50 groups of 20, some of the groups doing very public things (e.g., blocking intersections), while others committed inconspicuous acts of sabotage (e.g., cut wires), while still others provided drama and color (e.g., hippies flying over the city in big balloons throwing peanuts to policemen) Strategically, several things are becoming clear. The more sacred cows we can desanctify, the easier our organizing becomes. . . . We must aim at making draft boards, recruiters, university administrators, cops, senators, and Chase Manhattan seem like very silly things rather than objects to which awe, respect, and legitimacy should flow.

Now, for those of us who spend most of our professional time keeping up with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe, or who still remember the 1930's and 1940's in our own country, all this can't help reminding us of a late-show television movie. We've seen it all before. I have thought a good deal about the statement I am now about to make, and I make it in all seriousness: the only two real innovations I can discover in New Left thought and action--the only two things that are not to be found, for example, in the revolutionaries of the 1920's--are a certain casual attitude toward drugs (several of which were then not yet invented) and a tendency to use toilet-wall language in public communications. Everything else in the New Left has a quaint, old-fashioned air about it. (Even the bold new freedom in sex calls up reminiscences of the early Soviet "glass-of-water" attitude, which Lenin with his revolutionary puritanism sternly condemned.)

I find it highly significant that the Soviet Union and the other Communist countries of Eastern Europe have their New Left too; but what the New Left in the Communist countries is struggling for is freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom to travel, freedom from the arbitrary power of a bureaucracy uncontrolled by a system of constitutional government, by equal justice under law--in other words, the young dissenters in the Communist countries are struggling to achieve the very rights that the revolutionary Left in America seems to dismiss as bourgeois prejudices standing in the way of its effort to destroy what it calls the American power structure.

By the way, you will find it especially useful to read New Left Notes in December, because at that time the National Council of the SDS will take a vote on whether to call a national student strike in the spring, which it proposes to develop into what it calls "multi-issue struggles" around such issues as "the presence of the military on campus, the draft, student power, and local working class insurgencies caused by the war." The strike is planned to last only two days "except for those campuses that have enough student support around local demands, such as keeping the CIA off campus, that they have a chance of winning. In those cases, national organization would lend special assistance, if requested, in helping those campuses prolong the strike until their demands are met." (New Left Notes, July 10, 1967, page 3.)

The campaign against Dow Chemical can be used very effectively by the revolutionaries to build support for themselves, because of the fact that so many people--faculty and students alike--have the same strong convictions I have against what is going on in Vietnam. But this makes it all the more important for us not to allow ourselves to be cleverly manipulated by groups that are seeking to exploit our moral convictions for the sake of building their own political power.

The third issue that is now involved here on our campus is the issue of alleged police brutality. Here again, I am against police brutality--or brutality by anybody else--wherever it may occur, and I look forward to what the trial in court will bring out about what really did take place last week in the School of Business. But here too we must see the issue of police brutality in context. Every revolutionary movement needs police brutality to feed on in its effort to break down loyalty to existing institutions. If it is accurate to say that the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church in the early history of Christianity, then it is equally accurate to say that police brutality in our day is one of the seeds of revolution. The Communists have so effectively associated the word "police" with brutality that in Communist countries the very name for police has been changed to "militia"--a term that incidentally reflects the essentially military nature of Communism.

Since every revolutionary movement needs police brutality to feed on, it will almost inevitably be tempted to provoke police brutality by its actions. And here is the challenge to all of us who are committed to civil liberties and to the rule of equal justice under law for everybody. The immediate issue is for the appropriate authorities to examine the charges of police brutality last week with the same scrupulous care that would have been imperative if the police had been accused of brutality in handling a demonstration by the Ku Klux Klan, or the Anti-Saloon League, or the American Society for the Suppression of Pornography. The long-range issue is to provide the kind of police recruitment and training that will assure effective riot control without brutality and without infringing on the civil liberties even of persons who do not believe in civil liberties.

The still uncorrected injustices in our society and the world at large are so great that any faltering in our efforts to remove them will drive many of the best and most socially sensitive of our students toward the warmed-over despotism of the revolutionary Left. In this situation it seems to me that we who are members of the scholarly community have a dual obligation: as citizens, to think and work as hard as possible for the removal of those injustices; and as scholars, to use our knowledge and experience in whatever way we can to help our students understand the nature of society and face the political and moral issues of our time clearly and responsibly. If we do this, the extremists of the Right will no doubt call us wild-eyed radicals, and the extremists of the Left will condemn us as faint-hearted bourgeois liberals--and we can wear both labels at once with the sense of humor they deserve.

It is my personal opinion that the Students for a Democratic Society have indirectly performed a real service to our university by stirring up controversy and provoking our students to serious thought about political principles. I think it is useful to have a few members of the SDS and the DuBois Club on our campus for the same reason that the shrewd North Sea trawler captain in Arnold Toynbee's famous anecdote found it useful to throw one dogfish into his trawler tanks along with every thousand herring he caught. The dogfish would eat a herring now and then, but the rest of the herring kept so busy staying out of its way that they came into the harbor as vigorous and healthy as if they had just been pulled out of the sea.

The course of action I should like to recommend here is that the students and faculty of Indiana University steadfastly support the civil liberties of the revolutionary Left--and of everybody else--by steadfastly refusing to join in any common action with the revolutionary Left.

William B. Edgerton
Professor of Slavic Languages
and Literature

(To the President)

November 1, 1967

In view of the tragic events of this week, and of what I understand was a trembling discussion of them by the Faculty Council yesterday, I am taking the liberty of writing you directly a series of recommendations which I think might help.

They amount to a firmer stand in dealing with non-peaceful demonstrations which interrupt, for whatever the reason, the rights of others:

1. POSSIBLE EXPULSION. Any student convicted of a civil or criminal offense, or for a flagrant violation of accepted student conduct, should automatically be considered for permanent suspension from the University.

JUSTIFICATION: The University is not obliged to tolerate those who break the laws of the State, or of the University itself. Last year's "Bird Man of McNutt," for example, was tracked down and expelled for what was essentially a college prank. Panty raiders, parking violators, even--have been placed on probation or expelled outright. If the University will not condone this type of activity (which, too, is well outside the classroom), then it should not tolerate other, graver types of civil disobedience.

Peaceful demonstrations should never be discouraged. But breaking up an orderly convocation, wrecking job interviews, sit ins and the like simply cannot be rationalized as "free speech." The classic example applies: "Freedom of speech does not mean the freedom to shout 'Fire! Fire!' in a crowded theater." The Secretary of State, students who want to interview with a corporation, even persons who had business in Bryan Hall Monday and couldn't get in--these individuals have some rights, too.

2. TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT. Teaching associates, research assistants, etc., are--like it or not--employees both of Indiana University and the State of Indiana. The employer is within his rights to expect employees to obey the laws of the land and of the state. Staff or faculty members convicted of civil or criminal offenses should expect prompt review of their employment status by the University.

JUSTIFICATION: None would seem to be needed. The University terminates appointments for a variety of reasons. Certainly it can reasonably expect its staff to respect the rights of others.

3. CAMPUS SECURITY. The Safety Division should be augmented and improved with the addition of six, eight, or perhaps ten men--well paid and highly trained in the tactful handling of demonstrations and riots. Perhaps even more men could be trained on a part-time basis and kept in a reserve pool, available if needed.

JUSTIFICATION: The extra men are probably needed anyway. More important is the uneasy feeling--confirmed by my own observations and those of others--that the Bloomington police, like small-town police everywhere, have too much temper and too little patience. They are just quick enough with the night sticks to make a "police brutality" charge seem plausible. They should be called upon only in a real emergency.

Again, none of this should be construed as an attempt to discourage freedom of speech and freedom of peaceful assembly. To the contrary, it is precisely to maintain these freedoms that these steps are needed.

There might be some of my faculty colleagues who become irrational at the thought of any restriction whatever. (This is the Lee Harvey Oswald theory of intellectual integrity.) But if they can not or will not understand the difference between a protest and an insurrection, then let them quit.

I can assure you that if the environment here degenerates into anarchy, other faculty members, many of them valuable men, will resign for precisely that reason.

Forgive me for presuming to offer gratuitous advice to the President of Indiana University. I, too, cherish the magnificent tradition of freedom we have here. It could be, however, that this freedom is in grave danger--either because of the excesses of a few, or because of a McCarthy-like over-reaction by the majority to the excesses of a few. The foregoing steps strike me as reasonable and necessary, and I suspect that others on the faculty share this view.

Ronald T. Farrar
Department of Journalism

(To the President)

November 3, 1967

I will be out of the city next Tuesday when the faculty meets to discuss the University's policy with respect to student demonstrations, but because I believe every member of this faculty has a responsibility to stand up and be counted on these issues and because I have great admiration for the way you handled the difficult situations which developed during the past week, I feel a brief note to you is in order.

Your statement at the Convocation regarding the limitations on the right of dissent could hardly be improved upon; this comment, together with your later admonition to those who were inclined to fall back on force as a reply, were exactly the right messages delivered at exactly the right times. I think these

remarks, along with the magnificent patience and forbearance exhibited by yourself and the Secretary, served to transform this occasion from a messy incident into a triumph for intellectual integrity and the democratic process. I could almost feel the change in the campus climate occurring as the meeting proceeded. I think the realization has struck deep that the campus community has a fundamental obligation to protect the processes of a free educational institution, and that every member of our educational community, whatever his beliefs on particular issues (e.g. VietNam) may be, has a responsibility which he cannot dodge or shift to stand against those who would destroy the process. You gave us great leadership this week, Dr. Stahr, and I believe you will find that support for the positions you espoused is overwhelming.

I believe that the "Regulations Affecting Student Life" are good rules and that they ought to be enforced. I think that proved violators ought to be suspended by due process. Our justice should be even-handed; it should be firm; it should be dispensed with all deliberate speed. This society has a right and a duty to protect its essential processes, and I think we have reached the point where we must insist that these be respected by all individuals and groups which claim membership in that society and the protection of those processes.

It is popular in some quarters to claim special immunities for those who are moved to commit acts of civil disobedience in the name of high moral principles or the compulsions of their private consciences. That claim is indefensible, whether it is put forward on behalf of the SDS or the Ku Klux Klan. Even Thoreau, who made the moral case for the tactic of civil disobedience, never contended that he was above the law, or that his motives entitled him to special treatment under the law. He expected to pay the prescribed penalties for violating the law, and he did pay them cheerfully; he never argued that he was entitled to an immunity which was not available to the rest of his fellow citizens at the same time.

I do not believe we should give ground either to the rightists who want instant vengeance against the "bearded radicals" or to the leftists who would have us appease the SLS element for the sake of a little peace in our time. The hard core revolutionaries of the right and of the left cannot be appeased; their goals have nothing to do with equity, free inquiry, peace, or any of the other values of this society; they want chaos. We have got to stand firm for order, freedom and equity.

I hope we will not drop our disciplinary charges against those who disrupted the School of Business the other day, and I hope we will not make apologetic defenses of the presence on our campus of Dow Chemical recruiters, Marine recruiters, or any other legitimate entity. I hope, too, that we will censure with equal vigor those who disrupted the Rusk convocation and those who might try to disrupt the talk of the anti-VietNam speaker scheduled to appear in December.

I know you don't need advice from me on these matters. My purpose here is not to advise, but to let you know where one member of your faculty stands on the issues. I hope you will see these remarks as an expression of firm support and deep appreciation for your position as I understand it.

Donley F. Feddersen, Chairman
Department of Radio and Television

(To the Secretary of the Faculty)

November 14, 1967

I was not able to attend the November 7 meeting of the Faculty, but because I felt all members of the Faculty should make their positions known on the student demonstration issue, I wrote a letter to Dr. Stahr stating my views; a copy of this letter is appended.

We have since had a report of the actions taken at the Faculty Council meeting, November 9. The first, second, and fourth of these resolutions seem to me to be appropriate affirmations of support for the principles of free discussion on campus and for the authority of the Dean of Students to initiate the disciplinary actions described in his earlier statement. The third resolution, by contrast, seems to this observer to blur the issue it was meant to clarify.

Dean Shaffer's statement reported an impression, clearly labelled as his own, that the steps he had initiated "reflect the judgment of the vast majority of the faculty as to a sound manner of dealing with both the past and any future situations of this kind." The Council, in the second resolution, expresses its own view that the action "lies within the center of the range of Faculty judgment expressed at the meeting of November 7." Both statements report impressions. They are not contradictory; both may, in fact, be entirely accurate. It is hard for me to understand why the Council felt impelled to express "regrets" because somebody may have concluded that the Faculty is supporting Dean Shaffer; it is harder for me to understand why the Council saw fit to offer its own interpretation of Dean Shaffer's words and intentions in a transparent effort to make them more digestible to Dean Shaffer's detractors.

The third resolution can do nothing but cast doubt on the degree of Faculty support which Dean Shaffer really has. This weakens his position. If the Faculty Council has hard evidence to show that Dean Shaffer does not have the vast majority of the Faculty with him, it has the responsibility to produce such evidence forthwith. If the Council is aware of any really widespread sentiment for changing the current rules under which Dean Shaffer is operating, it has the right and perhaps the obligation to say so. Until such hard information is produced, I think Dean Shaffer and everybody else has a right to assume that he will of course have the full support of the Faculty in carrying out his legal responsibilities under the rules now on the books.

I think it is very dangerous practice for the Faculty through its Council to try to run the Dean of Students office by remote control. An administrator in that position must be able to make decisions quickly; he must know that the policies under which he operates are not going to be yanked out from under him in the middle of a difficult situation; he must have authority to act which is commensurate with his responsibilities. The Faculty has a very clear role to play in the establishment of policies; however, when it starts trying to preempt the roles of its administrators the results are likely to be catastrophic.

It may well be that the full account of the November 9 Council proceedings will put the third resolution in fresh perspective for those of us who are somewhat concerned about its implications. Nothing would please me more than to learn that my fears are groundless.

Donley F. Feddersen, Chairman
Department of Radio and Television

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

I wish to express my wholehearted support for your handling of the "Business School", "Dean Rusk", and subsequent incidents. Frankly, I do not see how you could possibly have handled the events with more consideration, fairness, and firmness.

During Dean Rusk's talk I was appalled at the rudeness displayed before an invited guest in our finest assembly hall. The fact that the display occurred where thousands could view it can only lend support to the reports of trespass, rudeness, and lack of respect which occurred in the Business School. Again, I do not see how the "Dean Rusk" incident could have been handled better.

I attended the open meeting of the Faculty Council on Tuesday p.m. and remained until nearly six o'clock. My observations resulting from this meeting are as follows:

1. The meeting was conducted with great fairness, sincerity, and order.
2. I think the focus on the "Dow Chemical" incident by many faculty was perhaps too much on the so called police brutality (the effect) and not enough on the cause of the incident.
3. Undoubtedly we need to do the best job of keeping the University House in order, but I don't think we can adopt an "isolationist" policy of keeping the city and state police off the campus except in the so called dire emergencies. We should work with local officers rather than apart from them.

4. The recent problem requires both immediate as well as long range attention:

a. Short Range - Handling the "Dow Chemical" demonstration with great fairness, sincerity, and a firm due process of law. I feel that students recognize both fairness and firmness and will respond much better to this than to the extremes of harshness and rigidity on the one hand and indecision on the other.

b. Long Range - The University has in the past shown tremendous flexibility, real concern, and interest in students and for student problems. We need a flexible system which will continue to do this, a system that will continue to grow and develop with the changes that inevitably come to a society.

5. It is my honest opinion that some faculty have lived in their ivory tower so long they really are out of touch with many problems of the real world. Their proposals, therefore, are idealistic and inspirational but difficult, if not impossible, to put into action by an administration which has to face the hard realities of life.

Again may I add, you have my complete support for the action you have taken to date, and you have my confidence in the courses you chart for the future.

Clarence M. Flaten, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Audio Visual Center

(An Open Letter to the Faculty Council)

November 8, 1967

Perhaps the most significant indication of the November 7 meeting of the Faculty Council was the great concern which was expressed by the Faculty at large with regard to the events of October 30 and 31 and the University's response to such events in the future. It becomes at once a question of conscience and of policy. With regard to the latter, I believe that the very necessity of calling such a meeting points to the inadequacy of the present rules and regulations governing student behavior and, most definitely, of the means of implementing them. Indeed, President Stahr has himself expressed some doubts by calling into question the necessity of campus security forces carrying weapons while at the same time asking that the present force be "beefed up" both quantitatively and qualitatively.

While I do not disagree in principle with the general guidelines governing personal conduct of students, I do have several observations regarding picketing and other forms of demonstration. First, the statement should include some reference to the actions of counterpickets and to harassment by the public. Secondly, there should be a clear statement with regard to the designation of authority with the understanding that only those administration officials have the power to call in outside police forces. Finally, the city and state police should only be called when all alternative forms of action have quite clearly been exhausted.

With regard to the question of conscience, I believe that enough doubt has been cast upon the relationship which exists between the Bloomington police and the University community to warrant an investigation, particularly into the role of city police on the campus and their general treatment of University personnel. Furthermore, while the prosecution of this case is now in the hands of civil authorities, the University could certainly let their wishes be known--including a request to the public prosecutor that he drop the civil suit against the students if this be the preferred form of action. In any event, the University could show its good faith by refraining from any further disciplinary action at this time.

Finally, it is my hope that the Faculty Council act with all haste on the suggestions and recommendations of the Faculty at large--that is before the case is tried in civil court. The seriousness of the events are not

called into question by our expression of concern. On the contrary, our own careful deliberations may have some effect upon the actions of the civil authorities. In all certainty, a painstaking re-examination of policy is in order so that these unhappy events need not be repeated.

The meeting of November 7 has initiated a heartening dialogue between administration and faculty. The best that we can hope for is that this dialogue be extended to the students so that mutual trust and understanding will remain an integral part of the University community.

Shepard Forman
Assistant Professor
Department of Anthropology

* * * * *

(To the President)

November 10, 1967

At a recent faculty meeting on November 7, Director Carl E. Bickley's announcement of our President's "State of the University" message generated further discussion regarding your treatment of recent student demonstrations on campus. Although we recognize your fortitude and independence in such matters, we wish to convey the positive attitudes of faculty and staff at the Division of General and Technical Studies at Fort Wayne.

It is our common feeling that you have exhibited remarkable constraint and tact in dealing with such potent situations, neither inflating them beyond proportion yet confronting them with whatever firm respect and authority they merit. We have unanimously resolved that this division's faculty go on record, indicating our approval of your procedures and our support of your administrative decisions in cases of this nature.

Your outstanding leadership is appreciated, and we join hands with you in pursuing sustained, healthy growth for our university as it strives to develop and enrich the lives of young men and women who come seeking wholesome experiences.

Wade Fredrick
Faculty Secretary
Indiana University, Fort Wayne

* * * * *

(To the President)

November 6, 1967

Since I am on sabbatical this semester and am working with a Wall Street investment banking firm trying to learn more about the problems of entrepreneurial capital formation, I was not on the campus last week to observe the activities, and I will not have an opportunity to be on hand Tuesday at the faculty meeting to give you personal support.

In reviewing the situation, I think you and our colleagues have handled the problems extremely well. I urge that your sensible approach be continued even though certain members of the faculty may present vigorous arguments to alter existing programs. I should also add that I was in town over the weekend to enjoy the fun and would judge that the out of town Indiana residents and the members of our faculty that visited my home would not only continue their support should you become firmer in your dealings with these problems, but might also respond by increasing their already well established confidence in your strong leadership.

To close with a personal commitment, if I can be of any service in any capacity such as adding teaching load or making personal contacts about the state or campus to carry out any objective which you might think desirable, I will rearrange my research program to free time for this purpose.

William L. Haeberle
Professor of Management and
Director, Indiana Executive Program

(To the President)

November 13, 1967

Just a word to say how very much I, for one, appreciated the thoughtful and carefully reasoned statement you presented at the open meeting of the Faculty Council last Tuesday afternoon.

Those of us who agree with the policies of the University often are not as vocal as perhaps we should be.

With that thought in mind, I just want to say I fully support the fair and firm stand expressed by you, Dean Shaffer, and the administration as you have dealt with the problems resulting from the October 31 disorder that took place during the demonstration in the halls of the School of Business.

Jean C. Halterman
Department of Marketing
School of Business

(Enclosure: Copy of Memorandum to Dean Robert H. Shaffer, "The Demonstration Problem," November 13, 1967.)

(To the President)

November 3, 1967

I wish to express my firm support of the University's action in connection with the civil disobedience manifested by students who demonstrated in the Business School Building on October 30, 1967.

I am in complete agreement with your November 1 response to the "demands" made by three students who visited your office on October 30. Finally, I favor prompt dismissal from the University of those students whose utter disregard for legally constituted authority has resulted in their arrest.

Donald E. Hattin
Department of Geology

(To the President)

November 17, 1967

Let me express complete confidence in the manner in which you have handled the so-called "Business School Incident." I was heartened by the firm stand manifested in your Nov. 7th statement to the faculty. I am totally in sympathy with the rights of students, or any other persons, who express dissent through peaceful and non-disruptive means, but believe that dissent accompanied by force or violence must be dealt with harshly.

At the Nov. 7th meeting one professor reminded us that most significant social change has been brought about by revolutionary action. He, in turn, should be reminded that these revolutionaries were willing to suffer any and all consequences of their actions.

I regret that our dissenting students chose to champion a "second-hand" cause when demonstrating in the Business Building. Nothing could do less to excite my imagination. Still less impressive is the obvious fact that some of these students know little or nothing about the napalm they find so offensive.

Donald E. Hattin
Department of Geology

(To the President)

November 2, 1967

Circumstances prevented my attending the Convocation on Tuesday last at which Secretary of State Dean Rusk spoke but I was fortunately able, thanks to our Department of Radio and Television, to hear a broadcast of the

Convocation. It gave me a feeling of admiration and pride to observe the splendid manner in which you and Secretary Rusk performed under most trying circumstances. I want you to know of that admiration and to send you my hearty congratulations. At the same time I must say that what occurred at that Convocation in the way of preventing Dean Rusk from stating his point of view and in attempts to humiliate him caused me considerable humiliation that such a concerted and apparently prearranged disruption could occur on this campus at one of our public affairs. For that reason, though I was glad to hear the broadcast, I was sorry that it was aired to the public.

I want in this same letter to commend the handling of the sit-in affair in the School of Business and to assure you of my complete support in the way in which you are meeting that situation. You have proved your dedication to the right of free speech and orderly dissent on many occasions. Neither free speech nor orderly dissent can survive if lawless anarchy prevails. If we are to prevent that on our campus, firm and rigorous, though just, measures must be taken against those few who in the name of free speech and the right of dissent would trample the rights of others. I hope the University will let the law take its course against those who were rightfully arrested in the School of Business affair.

Hubert C. Heffner

Department of Speech and Theatre

(To the President)

November 14, 1967

As a member of the faculty of Indiana University I would like to express to you my full support of, and confidence in, the administration and administrative officers of Indiana University, from your office on down.

I am deeply disturbed by the apparent lack of support on the part of a minority of the faculty, as expressed in comments at the November 7 meeting of the Faculty Council. I cannot accept, however, any contention that these voices, however vociferous, do in fact represent more than an extremely small group of individuals.

It seems to me that the reasoned and reasonable statement read by you at the Faculty Council meeting in essence, and in fact, fully expresses the responsibilities and obligations of the university and the faculty. I am confident that a vast majority of the academic community will support, without reservation, that statement.

Bernard L. Hinton

Assistant Professor

Personnel & Organizational

Behavior

(To the President)

November 3, 1967

Just a note to say I am with you. I appreciate your logic and patience. I wish I had some good advice to give.

Please do not bother to acknowledge this note.

H. W. Hofstetter, Director

Division of Optometry

(To the President)

November 1, 1967

I want to register my support for the firm action taken at the School of Business Monday. Judging from what I have heard from Daily Student reporters and others, the demonstrators clearly stepped over the line that divides legitimate protest from gross disregard of the rights of others. I hope that you, or someone, will make clear that students who cross that line in the

future can expect the same kind of treatment. Further, I would urge that those students who are convicted of disorderly conduct be expelled from the University. In my opinion, they clearly demonstrated that they do not believe in the freedom of inquiry, freedom of choice and freedom of speech that are the earmarks of a great university. In the name of demanding these rights for themselves, they would deny them to others. This is not freedom. This is the same attitude of mind that produced a Hitler in Germany.

I was appalled at some of the suggestions made in Faculty Council yesterday. If Dow Chemical is barred from the campus because of the objections of one group of students, where do we stop? Do we bar armed services recruiters because some students object to military service? Or do we bar Chicago Tribune recruiters because others object to that paper's editorial policy? Or should we go all the way and require that all recruiting be done off campus? This would be like saying that the University should never, never have anything to do with the real-life world off campus, that there is something disreputable about business and that we are not preparing our students for useful careers. Nor, to cover another point raised yesterday, do I think the University should offer legal counsel to the arrested students. They placed themselves in an adversary position when they acted as they did. They rejected advice offered to them in advance. I would give them none after the fact. If they are honest in their professed principles, they ought to reject such an offer anyway. I would help them keep their principles.

If I sound harsh, it is because I am fed up with the self-professed superiority of the vocal left. I think it is time we began to focus our attention, and our concern, on the overwhelming majority who are here because they want to take advantage of what this University has to offer and who are willing to abide by the rules that were in effect when they chose to come here.

Ralph L. Holsinger
Department of Journalism

(To the President)

November 2, 1967

I have read a number of your statements during the past two or three years about the obligations of the university, the obligations of students, what makes for an effective educational enterprise and what hinders our main purposes. I thought every one of your statements to be sound in position, forthrightly stated, and reasonable in tone. I was more than once at the edge of telling you this, and now regret that I did not do so long ago.

I want you to know that I am 100% with you in the current trouble. I stand ready to do what I can to lend a hand. I want you to call on me when you see how I can help.

Sincerely, and in admiration.

Charles S. Hyneman
Department of Government

(To Professor Richard Turner
Secretary of the Faculty Council)

November 27, 1967

To the Council's deliberations on the adequacy of policies governing student demonstrations, I would like to add some thoughts pertaining to enforcement procedures and, more important, to so-called "double jeopardy."

A petition circulated under my name for the open meeting of November 7 garnered some active support for three points. The first two concerned university use of civil police, and police abuse of civil power: it was my sense of the sentiment of the meeting that a significant amount of concern was generated around these two points, and that reconsideration and reform of enforcement procedures was under way. So much was evident from President Stahr's opening remarks concerning the disarming of campus policemen and the delegation of authority for calling local police.

Such reforms are important, for it is likely that active dissent for and against a variety of causes will increase rather than decrease in the immediate future, and the university must have enforcement techniques at least as sophisticated as the techniques of civil disobedience which have developed over the last decade. Without them, an established institution is embarrassed at its powerlessness or horrified by its over-reaction. Some minimal force--like a door pushed open--is often evident in "peaceful" demonstrations, but the proper way for an institution's officers to respond to such force is not with "riot control" counter-force, nor with legal fine points about forced entry, but with something in the spirit of the avowed, evident, and predominant peaceful intent of the demonstrators. If they court arrest or discipline, let them be arrested or disciplined, but in a way that maintains the dignity of the institution.

(Legal fine points should legitimately come into the assessment of penalties, but they should not be interpreted in advance by enforcement officers seeking to restore order. At the Dow incident on October 30, officials seemed to watch closely for the moment when force was technically evident, in order to justify their own show--and use--of counter-force. Force was used by the demonstrators, and officials acted within their rights, but reference to technicalities to justify enforcement action seems to have caused a gratuitous rhetoric about "violence" to spring up about the initial event, and one wonders if, on the scene, such vocabulary, inserted at every point to justify each police action, did not contribute in some measure to the advent of the deplorable moment when, in Dean Shaffer's finely understated phrase, "a melee ensued.")

However these matters are settled, they are to me--and to many other signers of the petition--less important than the petition's final plea:

"we urge that the University, having decided to call in civil authorities, refrain from academic disciplinary action against the arrested students."

It is of course abundantly clear that the university is perfectly within its rights, under present policies, in assigning its own discipline, and that there is, technically speaking, no "double jeopardy" involved, since different jurisdictions and distinct legal traditions obtain. Furthermore, it may be that the sentiment of the November 7 meeting was in favor of disciplinary action, though this was more difficult to determine than the evident dissatisfaction with the behavior of the police--and certainly could not be interpreted as a sentiment favorable to the hastiness with which action was then taken. Nevertheless, it is to these policies, traditions, and sentiments that I address myself.

That the stated policies controlling picketing are too rigid is easy to feel but difficult to argue,* so I pass over them to larger considerations which should govern our formulation of specific policies. These concern the nature of the American university in the second half of the century.

"Multiversity" is by no means an honorific term--yet--but it describes an educational reality with which we are all familiar and which we know to have many salutary qualities. The primary characteristic of the multiversity is not size, impersonality, or even diversity, but, as defined by ex-Chancellor Kerr, the intermingling of the academy and the society around it. Were Cardinal Newman alive today, and an American, he might be a supporter of his government's war policy, but he would strongly oppose the use of university facilities by representatives of industry, business, and government (whether for recruitment or research) and be shocked at the thoroughness with which

*Since there are several iterations in the rules about the overriding importance of protecting normal operations, is it necessary to require in addition that all demonstrating be confined to the exterior of buildings? (Rule 1.) Must dissent suffer, willy nilly, the discomforts of inclement weather? Why should pickets be forbidden to "exhort" others to join, so long as they do not "harass" them? (Rule 6.) What is picketing if not exhortation? Finally, it is the argument of the main body of this letter that violent and destructive acts need not be doubly threatened (Rule 9). Let punishments be as severe as is appropriate, but let them be single.

American universities seek to provide space and services for non-academic, even non-intellectual, elements of society at large. Certainly the cross-fertilization of society and university can be defended as fruitful in the end, and Cardinal Newman's idea of a university is no doubt outmoded, at least in the form in which he proposed to manifest it. But, granting this, we should also grant that the classic doctrine of university discipline, in loco parentis, is outmoded, or cannot be implemented in its pure form as it could, without contradiction, in English and American universities of the nineteenth century. If the texture of the university is radically altered, shot through as it were with foreign elements, what can we expect but that traditional modes of behavior in it must change as well?

Hence I come to the conclusion that the modern American university, faced with students who disobey laws and rules in the cause of what they conceive to be overriding moral issues, must make every effort to assess the intent and object of such protest actions in addition to evaluating their standard of behavior. Insofar as students mean to be acting as citizens rather than students per se, they should be aware that they may be treated as citizens. Making these decisions is a responsibility of the university deriving from its evolving and expanding willingness to open the university to society. Of course, the university has long been "open," but it is a mark of the multi-versity that society's "representatives" are not transformed into members of the university community, for however short a time, but are allowed, often for lengthy periods of time, to remain apart and distinct from the community of scholars. That is to say, many visitors on our campuses are not concerned with the discovery or the dissemination of truth, but rather with the use of knowledge toward other ends. For them, the university is neither alma mater nor ivory tower, but, in Kerr's ambiguous phrase, a "knowledge factory." Students have shown themselves aware of this distinction, and the university at large should recognize it officially.

This does not mean that the university should restrict its right to allow anyone on campus or to cease to assure its visitors of their safety. The recent decision at Harvard on this question, though popularly viewed as a "get tough" policy, sprang directly from this premise, that no segment of the university community should seek to put the university in the position of judging the morality of any of its official visitors. If some segment of the university community protests actively against a university visitor, their protest should be judged in accordance with the foregoing distinctions. Students protesting the presence of Dow Chemical Co. on campus were acting as citizens, having decided at meetings on October 30 and 31--one of which I attended--not to demonstrate against the university for allowing Dow's presence, though there was considerable support for such a demonstration. In other words, they directed themselves against a primary moral problem, the manufacture of napalm, not a derivative one--an institution's attitude toward manufacturers of napalm. Their strategy of protest may have been ill-conceived, but that is not the issue.

One refinement is necessary, however. To treat students as citizens automatically when they act as citizens is to abdicate the university's greater responsibility as alma mater. In loco parentis is not to be abandoned altogether. On the contrary, it is to be held fast as long as possible, not to punish students but to protect them. The university must strive to maintain jurisdiction over difficulties within its walls (as Harvard did)--strive much harder than it did last October 30, must give up its jurisdiction unwillingly, only as a last resort, and must make every effort to maintain a voice in decisions even when civil jurisdiction has been invoked.

The petition asked that there be no university discipline; this request has been rejected, precipitously, and we are offered as a consolation the fact that the students' punishment was not as harsh as it might have been. The administration's handling of the October 30 incident is cause for immediate concern, but in the future I believe the university, at the critical junctures in actions of this sort, should seek only one punishment, either civil or academic, but not both. In all but flagrant criminal cases the university should keep jurisdiction, and seek to regain jurisdiction even after it has called for outside help. The decision to change jurisdictions is not as irrevocable as it has been represented to be. Although the public prosecutor is technically the presser of charges, the law has a spirit; charges can be dropped or modified at the intervention of concerned parties, as they were in the DuBois affair of 1966-67. Only in the most serious cases will the public prosecutor insist on retaining power over the offenders; he will happily be rid of actions which involve essentially parental discipline.

My plea, then, is not for leniency, but for rationality and consistency. If the University can keep sole jurisdiction over its offenders it will find it much easier to be true to its own best spirit. At the very least, by applying rational penalties on defensible grounds, it will avoid offending many of its faculty members, and it will not be put in the position in which it finds itself at this moment: meting out penalties to satisfy some parts of the university community while representing these penalties as "leniency" to others. No one is satisfied by such compromising. This is not the inevitable, considered kind of compromise which administrative officers must constantly strive to achieve in the very nature of their work, but rather the kind of compromise which bespeaks indecision and weakness at the very heart of the policies which dictate administrative functions.

Finally, let me admit that my argument is based on expediency and present realities. Bringing our attitude toward student behavior into line with the existing characteristics of the university is necessary, but it is a relatively easy task, compared to the ultimate issue to which the university community must eventually address itself. Namely, can the modern university continue to exist, meaningfully, in the complex relationships it has established with society at large? If we are willing to reconsider, transform and curtail these relationships, we will find that we have changed student behavior in the process, since actions are to a great extent determined by the nature of the arena in which they transpire. Lacking energy and initiative for this heroic reconsideration, we should for the present face up to the idea--or the brute fact--of the multiversity and attempt to achieve a consistency of policy within it.

Kenneth R. Johnston
Assistant Professor and
Assistant Director of Under-
graduate Studies
Department of English

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

Since you will most likely receive letters (anonymous and otherwise) from the protesting faculty members, I thought it was not out of place for some of the 80% of the faculty who support you, to write a note of confidence. I am in agreement with course which you are following in handling the regulations concerning such student activities. I thought the talk which you gave was a masterpiece in summarization of the situation and the reasons for the policy being followed by the University.

I am in agreement with the University policy of free assemblage and discussion by student groups, but when groups attempt to force their way on others, then they have lost this privilege. Those students who participated in this recent disturbance were not innocents or naive as some faculty have attempted to play up. The leaders are taught by the professionals directing these national groups not to listen to the other side and not to allow a law to stand in their way.

The meeting yesterday was run in an excellent way. If it had not been carried on this way the protesting faculty would have attempted to control the meeting. It was no coincidence that those trying to use more than the three minutes, were those trying to uphold the action of the student agitators.

Also, I would like to point out that the statement at the meeting, intimating that the chemistry faculty supported the students in regards to Dow Chemical. This simply is not true; there are only about three in the group.

C. E. Kaslow
Department of Chemistry

(To the President--Addendum)

November 8, 1967

This addendum is being added because I just heard at noon the action being taken by the University. I approve fully of the disciplinary action. I hope the University stands by the action.

***** C. E. Kaslow, Dept. of Chemistry

(To the President--Addendum) November 9, 1967

Attached is an editorial and an article (xerox copies) from this week's Chemical and Engineering News.

I thought that these might be of interest.

C. E. Kaslow
Department of Chemistry

(Enclosures: CHEMICAL & ENGINEERING NEWS, Nov. 6, 1967

"Napalm on the Campus", editorial, p. 5

CHEMICAL & ENGINEERING NEWS, Nov. 6, 1967

"Students picket Dow Chemical recruiters on six campuses" article, p. 24.)

(To the President) November 14, 1967

Although I greatly sympathize with you in the difficulties of mediating between the University and the state and of finding a consensus of opinion even within the faculty, I feel impelled to register with you my belief--widely shared by a large circle of my colleagues--that the University's handling of the Dow chemical incident and subsequent related problems has worked to diminish confidence in the administration, to create an atmosphere of confusion and distrust and (for many students) fear on the campus, and to lessen the possibility that the campus may be a place of genuine freedom of expression.

I want to make it clear at the outset that my expression of sympathy with you in the problems is not merely rhetorical. I do not know what, under the pressures of the moment, I would have done about the demonstrations or in the administering of punishment. The atmosphere of near hysterical response around the state to the badly reported actions of our students must certainly be exerting severe pressures on you. One Lafayette editorial, reprinted in the Herald-Telephone, explicitly endorses the idea that "the need for freedom is not so pressing as the need for a little less of it" (Thursday, November 9, page 13). Frankly, I am rather frightened by this reaction, and all the more disturbed by it because I don't myself approve of the students' attempt to shove into the inner room in the Dow incident or of their heckling Secretary Rusk.

It is nevertheless important for the University to understand that a very large proportion of the students who were engaged in these activities or who now express sympathy for them and feel alienated from the University community are among the very best students we have here: not only academically, but morally as well. They have learned through hard experience that to be in a position of dissent in the Bloomington and University community, either in dress, politics, or grooming, is automatically to undergo discrimination in wide areas of ordinary life. It is ironic that this very small minority of students should be accused of opposing free speech when their own position is almost never heard unless they act indecorously, while their opponents' position is spread all over the front and editorial pages of the newspapers every day. I don't mean to excuse their mistaken behavior. The critical thing for the University community is to understand it and to view it with compassion.

That, indeed, is the core of the difficulty. It would be impossible to argue that the University has anywhere seriously violated its own regulations. But it has seemed to act--even in its clemency toward the demonstrators--without sufficient awareness of the implications of its actions, and without an effort to clarify to those very good students the fact that it really is as strenuously opposed to disorder from the right and middle as it is to disorder from the left. Whatever the intentions, the statement of Dean Shaffer, the resolution of the faculty council as it was publicized in the papers, the calling of the police, the acceptance by the administration of the rhetoric of the press has created an atmosphere of fear and distrust.

A very large proportion of the faculty was stunned (if by nothing else than) by the timing of Dean Shaffer's announcement that the demonstrators were

being placed on probation. It was, indeed, within his rights; but the faculty has a right to assume that the administration is committed to the implementation of its views. Even the clemency which apparently resulted from the expression of those views at the faculty meeting was premature. One thing was certain: a very large proportion of the faculty at the meeting felt that more had to be learned about the incident, the rules, and the implementation of the rules before any action was taken. Moreover, the language and perhaps intent of Dean Shaffer's statement implicated the faculty in his action in an unacceptable way, and helped to create an atmosphere--even if unjustified--of threat and repression. Why the whole student body should be treated as second offenders in future incidents is not clear to me.

As I see it, there are three crucial problems lying before the university: first, efforts must be made to cut off future difficulties of the kind created in the Dow demonstration at the Business Building, and those efforts must not be through threat and repression but through making it clear that this is a University where dissent is honored and, more important, where the faculty, administration, and student body genuinely talk to each other. The fine students who feel that the establishment has failed them must be made to see--through imagination and even greater energy on the part of the administration--that they can work through the establishment, that they don't have to polarize it; second, there must be a much closer rapport between the administration and the faculty, an effort by both parties not merely to respond to events, but to ward them off and prepare alternatives; third, the university ought to wear other than purely official clothes in relation to both faculty and student. We are obviously in the midst of a national crisis, one brought about not by conspirators but by some among us who are deeply engaged morally and are finding it difficult to make themselves heard through channels. I.U. must attempt to meet its part of the crisis, not by falling back on the outlines set up by the regulations, but by remaining alert to the ideas and attitudes of the students and faculty who have brought the crisis to the campus. The university must assert its unwillingness to be complicit in the blind and brutal responses of police and, at times, community, to the "bearded" and "unwashed," must explicitly and actively reject the cliches that these people are all of one kind (dirty, arrogant, anti-intellectual, etc.). We must recognize that the presence of many such students here is a direct result of our having become a great university. I should like to be able to believe, for example, that the university would be as much concerned to defend my right to picket outside the auditorium and to stop the ruffians who insulted and threatened the picketers as it would be to allow Dean Rusk to be heard; without that assurance, the university has failed in its commitment to genuine freedom.

George Levine

Department of English

(To the President)

November 6, 1967

In rebuking the hecklers at Secretary of State Rusk's speech Tuesday, you implied that you thought it was a mistake to use force to suppress dissent and hence that it was a mistake to call in outside police to deal with an incident on campus. I am writing now to tell you that I agree wholeheartedly with that implication. I think the decision to call in city and state police was an unwise one, and I have several different reasons for thinking so.

I was down at the Court House bailing students out last Monday evening and had occasion to speak with several of the local policemen there who were, apparently, protecting the jail from some kind of assault. I was, frankly, amazed at the truculence of the local police, who were themselves looking for any excuse first to arouse and thereafter presumably to club the 100 or so people standing outside the Court House. This incitement took the form of calling the people there "cowards" because of their views on the Viet Nam war and of moving through the crowd in an attempt to clear a corridor, but purposely and unnecessarily bumping into people while doing so. Their fairly quiet attempts to antagonize the crowd were at one with their entrance into the Business Building with clubs. I do not know whose decision it was to call in outside police, but I feel certain that if he were a member of the University administration or safety patrol, he did not want the students--no

matter how vociferous or annoying--hit over the head with clubs the size of baseball bats. My experience here and at Berkeley several years ago leads me to believe that city and state police are incapable of dealing with civil disobedience without clubs and violence of their own. This being so, outside police cannot be trusted to handle incidents of civil disobedience on campus.

From a more general viewpoint, the use of city and state police to handle an incident, and especially such a small one, can do the University no good at all. Reliance upon police inevitably creates a major issue for the press, and the resultant publicity can only hurt the University's standing in the eyes of the people of Indiana. It is about time that we as a university began to learn from the mistakes of university administrators at Berkeley and Wisconsin. We are going to have to learn how to cope with civil disobedience in the next few years; reliance on police force and intimidation has done little good in the past and is not likely to achieve much of a positive result in the future. If anything, the specter of police carrying clubs three feet in length simply suggests to dissenting students the need and justification for outright violence on their part.

If the students in a sit-in are courting arrest, they ought to be arrested, but arrested in a way that does not involve violence and physical intimidation in the form of clubs. If there is no way of arresting them without threatening them with, or using, clubs--and it appears that the use of outside police inevitably involves use also of clubs and of violent methods of arrest--we ought to find some other way of handling such incidents. Since in this particular case the mistake of calling in outside police has already been made and the students have been subject to violent forms of arrest, the University would only be compounding its mistake by taking any further disciplinary action against the students who sat in during the Dow Chemical interviews. The case of these students is before the courts; the trial and probable sentence the students face because of their action is sufficient punishment in itself. Any attempt by the University to expel, suspend, or limit these students in any way would suggest the University's total inability to deal reasonably with such problems and would provide definite evidence of the University's attempts to silence dissent. I urge you, therefore, to see to it that no further action is taken against those students.

Peter Lindenbaum
Lecturer
Department of English

(To the President)

November 3, 1967

I enclose for your information a statement which Robert Johnson has drawn up concerning the events which led up to his arrest in the Business Building in connection with the demonstration there. Mr. Johnson is a Negro and was evidently the only Negro involved. Last year he was my assistant and had a desk in my office throughout the year. I feel that I know him very well. I regard him as completely reliable and truthful, and I am disposed to accept his version of what happened to him as a faithful recording of his recollections of it.

There are some items of interest which are not included in the attached statement and are given here as stated orally to me by Johnson:

1. Johnson went along with the group (which started from Ballantine Hall), as a spectator. He saw the meeting in progress in the patio, and when he heard that the group was going to the Business Building, he joined them to see what would happen.
2. When the students in the room were told they were under arrest, and could either leave of their own accord or "get hurt," (as Johnson has it), Johnson stood up along with most of the students and intended to walk out. After the first six or seven left, he says that the police closed up the exit and advanced on the twenty to twenty-five remaining students without giving them any further chance to leave under their own steam.

3. Johnson says that he knows of at least ten other persons who remember the cry, "get the colored boy."
4. He is strongly opposed to the Viet Nam War and it was this fact which caused him to remain in the room in the Business Building after he was, as he says, pushed into it by those behind him.

As I have said, from my knowledge of Mr. Johnson from a year of rather close association with him, I am inclined to view him as a person of fine character and high integrity. It is naturally quite difficult for me to believe that the serious criminal charges that have been filed against him are warranted.

A. R. Lindesmith
Department of Sociology

(Enclosure: Deposition of Robert L. Johnson, 10/31/67.)

(To the President)

November 9, 1967

I have been extremely disturbed by the recent action taken by Dean Shaffer regarding the students involved in the Dow Chemical incident. Besides objecting to the specific action taken, I strongly oppose the implication given in the article appearing in the Daily Student on Thursday, November 9, that it was Dean Shaffer's clear impression that this is in agreement with the vast majority of the faculty who attended the recent faculty council meeting. I attended that meeting and certainly did not come away with a clear impression favoring either side. It seems to me that an explanation to the faculty from Dean Shaffer is in order. I personally resent being implicated in what I consider his unreasonable decision.

Morton Lowengrub
Associate Professor of
Mathematics

(To the President)

November 13, 1967

This letter may, I hope, serve a double purpose: first a ventilation for the incensed reactions to the events of the past two weeks, and secondly, an opportunity to add one more voice to the many who have expressed faith in your integrity during trying situations.

May I react specifically to issues concerning the Rusk speech and the November 7 Faculty Council meeting which I did attend and the student "entries" at your office and at the School of Business for which I have only hearsay evidence.

1. That a small group of insolent students can, in the name of freedom of speech, set themselves up as the judges of what the rest of us may hear in the auditorium seems inconsistent with the essence of the democratic idea. That they can subject the Secretary of State and the top administrator of their university to public indignities seems intolerable in a civilized society.
2. That a minority can subject the Dean of Students to public indignities after storming the President's Office again seems to me to smack of anarchy, not righteous dissent.
3. That any group can be allowed with impunity to break the specific rules regarding demonstrations and force their way into any university building will make no office, classroom, or laboratory safe from a dissenting few. When rules are broken, those who have the responsibility and the facts must mete out the consequences without, I might add, taking a vote of the uninformed.

4. That members of the faculty can be so naive as to condone boorish, illegal behavior excusing irresponsibility either "because they are just kids who really didn't realize the seriousness of their actions" (on which they took a calculated vote in two instances and were organized for disruption on the third), or "because the right of dissent is a healthy show of involvement" seems unbelievable.

5. It was obvious that the minorities (and I believe they are minorities) of both students and faculty were well organized for their campaigns. The majorities were not prepared to speak, even at the faculty meeting. Many of us had not taken the time to set down forcefully our disgust and dismay or our concern at the evidence of outside involvement in organizing of campus protests. Isn't it a bit ridiculous to suppose that reactions to Dow Chemical are spontaneous across the nation? Why not "spontaneous reactions" against Standard Oil or the many other companies profiting by the war effort?

6. Those who suggest a vote by observers, clearance through the Board of Trustees, and similar "safeguards" before the Dean of Students or the Campus Safety Division may perform their duties, would resist having to "clear" their classroom conduct with anyone. We have people who have been given administrative responsibilities. If we give them responsibilities and no authority to execute those responsibilities we will soon find ourselves with men of lesser competency in those positions. That situation we cannot afford.

Yours is, at times, a thankless job--a tightrope taut with the tensions of serving legislators, students, and faculty. May I extend personal thanks for your intelligent and sensitive statement at the faculty meeting. I am confident that a vote of the total faculty would show complete support of your position and applause for your responsible action. Please don't let a few "vocal frogs in the pond" speak for all of us.

Janet R. MacLean
Professor of Recreation

* * * * *

(To the President)

November 4, 1967

You have my support and cooperation for your policy with respect to student demonstrations.

The faculty members of Indiana University are expecting you to maintain a climate conducive to study, teaching, and research. We stand with you and the administrative officers of the university both now and during your future responsibilities.

John F. Mee
Mead Johnson Professor of
Management

* * * * *

(To the President)

(Received Nov. 8, 1967)

Sufficient words have been spoken. I share your concerns and convictions. You have my trust and support.

W. G. Meinschein
Department of Geology

* * * * *

(To the President)

November 14, 1967

The social unrest on campus has disturbed many of us but has been particularly threatening for the university administration. I was delighted with your historical review of the situation during the Tuesday afternoon meeting, and I am pleased that the university is supporting the administrative efforts of our dean of students.

Dean Shaffer has always demonstrated wisdom in dealing with students as well as a sincere interest in their welfare. He has always dealt with students' beliefs in a straight forward manner and yet has been considerate of their feelings. On a number of occasions my colleagues in other universities have commented on Dean Shaffer's excellence as a dean of students, and it upsets me when he or any of our other administrators are mauled psychologically while carrying out their duties.

Robert Milisen, Professor
Speech Pathology

(To the President)

November 2, 1967

I just want to record a vote of confidence in your position that disruption of University operations by sit-in demonstrations or invasion of University buildings will simply not be tolerated, and that any such activities will be dealt with vigorously and decisively. The handling of the Business School affair was entirely appropriate to the situation.

Best wishes,

Taulman Miller
Department of Economics

(To the President)

November 2, 1967

A few spectators and radio listeners may have thought that the shouters carried the day in the Auditorium. For me, and I'm sure for 99% of the audience, President Stahr and Secretary Rusk won new honor and respect. You handled an intolerable situation with magnificent and munificent tolerance and dignity. In any final judgement, you can be sure, Elvis Stahr and Dean Rusk carried the day.

At the command of each new crisis you seem to come up with new courage and new wisdom. But as much as my admiration for you may grow with each of these difficult confrontations, I don't need the reassurance and I could wish you spared the senseless torment.

If at any moment my help can serve you in any way, I think you know, I'm ready.

Dick Moody
University Theatre

(To the President)

November 9, 1967

By means of this memo I wish to express my full support of the Administration of Indiana University in taking whatever action you deem necessary to control the conduct of the students of the University.

The incidents of this past week appear to have served notice that we are not immuned to disruptive, rude, and abusive action by a small but active minority who display utter disregard for the rights of others and the objectives and principles of the University. However, I have complete faith in you and other members of the Administration, and will vocally support any action taken to prevent the reoccurrence of this nature.

My congratulations to you and the faculty council for the well-run meeting Tuesday afternoon. Your opening remarks were excellent. In the hours since, I have found myself and others quoting phrases from your remarks as though the ideas and expressions were originally ours. I sincerely believe that you captured the thoughts and concerns of a large majority of the entire faculty of Indiana University.

Malcolm L. Morris
Department of Marketing

(To the President)

November 15, 1967

I hesitate to trouble you with my inexperienced viewpoint on recent events on campus, and indeed do so only in consideration of your request at the open council meeting and of my own increasing uneasiness. I realize that these events must be far more troublesome to you than to me, but hope that should you be uncertain at various points, faculty expression may aid you in making complex and sometimes difficult decisions.

My greatest concern has been with the charges of police brutality. I was encouraged by your statements both at the council meeting and previously in response to the student "demands" ("The Dean of Students is currently ascertaining the facts surrounding the incident Monday afternoon and will report them to me and to the faculty.") I trust that the promised report will be forthcoming at the earliest possible date and hope that it will indeed be a presentation of facts rather than a summary of the Dean's conclusions therefrom. In view of the detailed statements circulated by the "Committee to End the War. . .," I feel that only a detailed report can fully allay my own doubts in this regard.

The second point which I wish to discuss was raised by another faculty member during the discussion and, fortunately, has not been expressed by any member of the administration. This point concerns the delegation of authority and the subsequent support of administrators. It was suggested that since the campus police and deans involved clearly were acting within the limits of their authority, they must be supported in their actions. Insofar as this means they should not be dismissed or publicly rebuked, I am in full accord. But if this means, as I think the speaker intended, that their decisions are irrevocable and the subsequent consequences on student lives automatic and not subject to question, I am diametrically opposed!

My third concern is with the details of the punishment decreed for the students. Dean Shaffer explicitly stated (News Bureau Mimeo, 8 Nov.) that more severe punishment was given to those who "resisted arrest following warning by authorized University staff." I do not see why this constitutes a further violation of University regulations and am thus inclined to view it as an explicit statement of "double jeopardy" as a University policy. I should certainly be pleased if you or the faculty council would appoint a faculty committee to consider under what circumstances a student should be liable to both the University and to civil authorities. I am inclined to feel this particular application unwarranted. I also question the advisability of making disciplinary probation for political acts a part of the public record and wonder if that part of Dean Shaffer's decision might not best be modified.

As a final point, I was somewhat startled to note that Dean Shaffer invoked "the judgment of a vast majority of faculty" from a meeting where I thought the majority of faculty was in agreement on principles (which you succinctly summarized) but far from even simple majority agreement on specific details. This apparently also perturbed the faculty council. It might be best if "vast majorities" of faculty agreement were cited only when they had been formally determined.

Craig E. Nelson
Assistant Professor, Zoology

* * * * *

(Faculty Council, Agenda Committee)

November 9, 1967

In regard to the Faculty Council Meeting on November 7, 1967, and subsequent action by the Council I should like to make the following comments:

1. I am dismayed by the presentation of conflicting evidence about the Dow-Chemical disturbance on October 30 concerning the origin and extent of the violence that occurred. I think that the Council should make a strong effort to determine at least an approximation to the truth of the matter. Were there no innocent bystanders who could give evidence?

2. I find Professor Lauer's suggestion to arrange for "neutral observers" during demonstrations very interesting. This is not going to be easy to implement, but the Council ought to look into it seriously.

3. Yesterday's announcement of the students' penalties by Dean Shaffer surprised me. While I don't think that probation is too harsh a punishment, Dean Shaffer's precipitous action strikes me at least as a discourtesy to the Faculty Council. He should have waited for the discussion at its next meeting.

R. G. Newton
Department of Physics

* * * * *

(To the President)

November 13, 1967

It is quite probable that your mail has been flooded with the writings of the discontented, the malcontents, the protesters, the misplaced, and the plain "kooks" of the student, faculty, and lay-public groups. I hope that this is but one of an even larger collection of letters which comes to you in complete support of the notion of law, order, consideration of others, and just plain decency. I suspect that those of us who feel strongly about the latter concerns are not as apt to be as vocal as are these protesting minorities and if so, we are permitting the voice of the consistent protester to have far more weight than is appropriate.

I was again impressed by your State of the University message and by what you said so very well in regard to recent events on campus and the need for responsible freedom of expression as well as responsible academic freedom. I am proud to be associated with Indiana University and proud to be an associate, in a relatively minor role, of the great president of a great institution.

Emotionally I am inclined to action on the side of decency, law, order, and consideration of the rights of others individually as well as collectively. Emotionally I can consider the formation of classes in sign construction and painting; marching in peaceful picket lines for anti-protest demonstrations; and even a study of appropriate sartorial splendor--perhaps a shaved head and Buddhist monk garments. But my grandpappy once said to me as a little boy: "Never get into a urinating contest with a skunk!" Support for the University and for the President cannot lower the dignity of the institution, nor of the President's office, nor of the President personally.

Just as is true of the protesters who so frequently offer little that is constructive but usually only the sounds of braying jackasses, I cannot think of anything positive to suggest on the other side. I can and do offer my unswerving loyalty to you and to the University. I can and do offer my service in any way you might see fit. I can and will respond to any call on me that you may wish to make. I do wish to convey my support, my admiration for the manner in which you have dealt with many sticky situations and I close with that old familiar Latin phrase - *Illigitimi non carborundum est!*

Arthur H. Oestreich, Ph.D.
Professor of Education and
Director, Division of
University Schools

* * * * *

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

I certainly do not wish to burden you with more thoughts on the incidents involving students in the past month. However, the remarks made during the past Faculty Council meeting cause me to reflect that I would like to make my position known (for what it is worth).

It was pointed out that the University policies dealing with the personal conduct and picketing are general enough to allow for a wide latitude of interpretation and certainly allow considerable freedom for students to express their rights of free speech and assembly. I became increasingly dismayed, however, with the apparent opinion of some members of the faculty that 1) activities bordering on violence are well within the rights of the student body and 2) that police brutality was the real issue. The fact that the demonstrations infringed upon the rights of others--a clear violation of civil rights of the majority--was apparently ignored. This is the long-term viable issue to which we must attend.

Thus, I must cast my vote strongly in favor of the motion made by the Faculty Council. The protection of the rights and privileges of all the members of the University community is vested with the chief administrative officers of this institution. They cannot do so without guidelines which clearly spell out the policy of this University. The enforcement of this policy must ultimately rest with these officers and the faculty should support such action. To do otherwise is to lose control of our community and its operation.

L. Richard Olikier
M.B.A. Office

(To the Secretary, Faculty Council)

November 9, 1967

In accordance with the request of President Stahr and the faculty council, I write to offer my views on student demonstrations.

I deplore the treatment accorded Secretary of State Rusk, and have gladly signed a petition saying so.

I do not regard myself as a radical, and I have no personal contact with any individual or group associated with the recent demonstrations.

I believe students should have the right to be interviewed by any corporation invited to this campus by the Business School or other divisions of the university.

I believe that those students who disrupted regular procedures during the visit of Dow Chemical representatives clearly violated university rules. I also regard these rules as reasonable and sensible.

Accordingly, I recognize the right, while deploring the timing, of Dean Shaffer to take some kind of disciplinary action.

BUT, I am not yet convinced that the decision to call in local police was either necessary or wise. It is indeed fortunate that no one was permanently injured. Accordingly, I make two recommendations;

1. That the facts surrounding the Dow Chemical fracas be gathered either by the regularly constituted student-faculty committee or by a special body named by the faculty council.

2. That a special faculty committee be named by the council to consider the writing of more explicit guidelines for administrative action in future demonstrations. These guidelines might require on the spot observation (except in truly extraordinary circumstances) by top-ranking university officers. They might require that these officers handle demonstrations by university rather than civil means wherever possible. And they might ask that these administrative officers observe the behavior of students and police, and submit to the faculty council a written report of such behavior, should the council so desire.

James T. Patterson
Associate Professor, History

(To the Faculty Council--Statement)

November 9, 1967

No one is more unhappy and shocked than I at the increasing resort to violence in our country and throughout the world. Interference with recruiting efforts of the Dow Chemical Company when invited here would seem reprehensible. On the other hand, such recruiting on university property was, to say the least, unwise and under the circumstances a provocative action.

I submit that in this fast-moving world the old rules will not do for today's crises. The old rules were all right for a world in which the under-privileged were crushed and students especially at this university were docile and handed back to their teacher whatever he requested in the way of facts and information. Such students graduated, got their jobs and earned more money than high school graduates. Eureka and a nostalgic tear for a former Horatio Alger day.

Although a minority, some of today's students are thinking for themselves, are doing what students come to a university for. Judging by the results in terms of the mess the world is in, I wouldn't say our old rules are good for much. It is the students and young people who will live in the future world and it is their fate which is being decided. They can't be fooled by the old cliches and prevarications. It is this "minority" rather than the docile majority, playing the old game, that may well be tomorrow's leaders. We ignore them at our peril and that of our world.

It's a practical world and we must take practical action to operate in it. However, I think it highly dangerous for an intellectual community to ignore moral considerations. Building as our colleges and universities did so often on religious foundations, it is only in the universities that the search for objective truth is a fundamental motivating force and a force that must be reinforced by a higher morality.

Many of us--old and young--believe that the Vietnam war is an extreme folly. Our government is compounding its terrible mistake by using immoral and savage measures to achieve an allegedly moral end--to stop communism. Of all governments in the world which cannot adopt the rule of any means to an end it is ours. In carrying on a crusade against communism, our government is acting contrary to the spirit of American democracy which is so important a part of our Constitution, as well as to the unwritten Bill of Rights of all humanity. While we criticize extremism, our government in the Vietnamese war is exercising extreme measures and lying about it in the process.

Lidice during World War II shocked our nation and yet today Lidices are happening every day in Vietnam and that majority that wanted to be courteous to Dean Rusk has condoned it (because Rusk came not as an individual but as a spokesman for the administration whose views have been repeated again and again, broadcast everywhere by the press).

Every day we are confirming the fact that Nuremberg trials are for losers. That so long as your country is powerful, carrying out bloody orders is routine. The flier whose plane releases bombs does not see them land and or the havoc they bring. Besides, hasn't he been told they will land only on military targets. None is so blind as he who will not see.

The regulations regarding picketing are very nearly a prescription for ineffectiveness. They ask for a remarkable restraint not evident in any other walks of life. And they also provide police the excuses necessary to make arrests. Had I not indirectly known of the events that took place in Indianapolis on the occasion of President Johnson's last visit, I might be more impressed with these regulations. At the state capital, in spite of the fact that all legal and necessary requirements had been met by demonstrators well in advance, busloads of anti-war demonstrators were arrested on arrival and taken to the police station immediately. Because our President and/or his secret police sent word ahead that they wanted streets cleared of demonstrators and didn't want them there. Reasons for arrest are easy to manufacture when needed. And one naive policeman in answer to a question about freedom from arrest for those carrying pro-war and "patriotic" signs, said that the latter were "good signs."

Everyone who reads knows that the distinguished literary critic Leslie Fiedler was arrested for daring to speak out in defense of youth's use of marihuana, even though he himself never had anything to do with it. The charge against him was for possession of marihuana when planted police evidence was used. In contempt of the law, police even admitted as much. If ours is a government of laws, not men, then let it be so. Let not the older generation try to fool the thinking and intelligent young people when so much is at stake. I don't deny that these are extremely difficult days for administrators and people in power. The times call for extraordinary, even heroic judgments and a flexibility and restraint in the use of power that are almost beyond human capacity.

Bernard Perry, Director
Indiana University Press and
Professor

(Enclosure: Statement, Professor John K. Galbraith, Harvard University, regarding demonstration against the Dow Chemical Company at Harvard)

(To the President)

November 10, 1967

As a faculty member of Indiana University I wish to state my full support for you and those who share your administrative duties. I am confident that you will resolve the issues connected with and arising from the recent student demonstrations in a manner that is equitable to all parties concerned and fully in keeping with the role and purpose of a great university.

I fully concur with the opinions you expressed at the open Faculty Council meeting on November 7 and am confident that this concurrence is shared by the vast majority of my faculty colleagues. While the purpose of a University is to encourage orderly and reasoned debate, it is essential to the fulfillment of that purpose that all the activities of that University be kept free from interruption by disorderly or violent conduct.

Michael F. Pohlen
Assistant Professor
Production Management

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

This letter is to express my appreciation of your method of handling the Faculty Council meeting of November 7 and recent events related to student demonstrations on this campus. I support your action and give you a strong vote of confidence.

In September, 1965 it was my pleasure to join this faculty and during the two years of association I have become convinced that Indiana University is a great university. Your ability to "keep your cool" is evidence of your contribution to its stature.

It appears to me that a very small group of students are somehow bent on destroying what has taken so many years to build. A dissident faculty, an outraged legislature and electorate and a disgruntled alumni can result from the actions of a few students. These results will, of course, injure the University.

To have a society there must be order and order is based upon some rules and regulations. If present rules governing student demonstrations need changing I believe your administration and the Faculty Council possesses the wisdom to bring about such change. To ignore the rules (just because a few do not agree) may destroy the very order they were designed to protect.

I have confidence in your ability to deal with the current events. Surely you will not please all; in your position your action can only be for the good of the total University.

Kennon H. Shank, Ph.D.
Director, Speech, Language and
Hearing Clinics

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

As an emeritus faculty member I would like to congratulate you on your handling of our student demonstration problem and to assure you of my support against the kooky minority of students and faculty members, who by their unbelievable manner of expressing their dissension are doing harm to the image of a great university.

Richard S. Sherman
Associate Professor Emeritus
Department of Spanish and
Portuguese

(To the President)

November 15, 1967

I would like to summarize my position on the matter before the recent faculty council meeting, while I hope adding only a minimum amount to your already heavy reading burden. I hope that some of what I have to say will be useful.

I personally do not have any particular sympathy with those students who organized the recent demonstration. I am quite prepared to believe that they are part of a national conspiracy whose aim is to shut down and/or take over the University and that they are prepared to use violence in this undertaking. The overriding problem in dealing with them is that of foiling their primary aim, which in my judgement they can only approach by alienating at least a significant minority of the faculty from the majority and from the administration. At the same time we must counter by moving to isolate this small activist group from the sympathies of any larger fraction of the student body. The achievement of both of these goals is better served by cautious deliberation and restraint than by giving the appearance of a "crackdown" on any but the most flagrant violators. Thus I think it important to maintain a clear distinction in punishment between the organizers and instigators of trespass and violence, and those who may just have been duped by them. I seriously doubt if the thirty or so who peacefully submitted to arrest are among the "hard-core" of organizers.

I stress again that it is far more important to foil the disruptive aims of those activists than it is to give them or their fellow travellers "what they deserve."

V. J. Shiner, Jr.
Department of Chemistry

(To the Secretary, Faculty Council)

November 8, 1967

I am writing because you solicited further response from those who did not speak during the meeting, and because I believe the individual voice is as necessary at this time as the chorus.

I agree that conditions allowing orderly demonstration and dissent should be sustained. I agree that disturbance is to be prevented, but I would be quick to add that disturbances caused by hecklers and counter-demonstrators are as much to be noticed and prevented as the disturbance caused by demonstrators.

I agree with those who spoke against the methods used to control the "Dow" demonstration, and I am on record in one of the petitions as feeling that the bringing in of Bloomington police was uncalled for. Needless to say, if the brutality charges are proved factual, this must never happen again on our campus.

Those who spoke from first-hand knowledge of the character of the participants in the Dow demonstration, including one faculty member who is a parent of a demonstrator, made clear that this is not an isolated incident nor are these ordinary students. Of those participating in the Dow demonstration of whom I have personal knowledge, I would affirm with no hesitation that they are persons of great integrity and unimpeachable moral character. In some cases they are intellectual leaders. What they did was clearly, as I see it, against University regulations, but the power of moral integrity which led them to this kind of "disobedience" separates them from the usual felon or hardened case that the Bloomington police may have to deal with. These students are antinomians. Are we to banish them from our community as the powers of Massachusetts banished Anne Hutchinson? I pray not.

David E. Smith, Director
Graduate Program in American
Studies

(To the President)

November 15, 1967

I wrote earlier to the Secretary of the Faculty Council stating my views concerning the handling of the recent Dow demonstration. You should have received a copy of this letter which was addressed to the Secretary of the Faculty Council. In the meantime and during a period when I was absent from the University attending a meeting in another city I have learned of the action taken against some students by Dean Shaffer and Dean Shaffer's statement that his action was a reflection of "the judgment of the vast majority of the faculty."

In a letter to you dated November 10, my colleague Professor Alfred David has in my opinion expressed his views concerning these matters so forcefully that I wish to subscribe fully to Mr. David's position. As a faculty member I, too, wish to dissociate myself from the statement released by Dean Shaffer and also from the stated interpretation placed upon the results of the recent Faculty Council meeting.

David E. Smith, Director
Graduate Program in American
Studies

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

I will not begin by describing the hesitation with which so new and such a junior member of the Faculty as I am undertakes to write to you, since I think you can easily imagine it. I venture to write both because of the obviously sincere invitation you expressed at the open meeting of the Faculty Council and because I feel strongly that one particular point should be made in connection with the business of the Dow demonstrators which comes with special immediacy to the mind of a younger member of the Faculty.

That point, perhaps too briefly put, is this: although I know none of the demonstrators, or anyone in SDS, I very strongly suspect that those present on October thirtieth were willing to ride so rough-shod over regulations on student conduct, and to blind themselves to what under normal circumstances they would themselves strongly claim to be the rights of the Dow interviewer and of the students who wanted to talk with him because they were driven by a concern and an emotion which run far deeper than routine regulations and the duty of politeness. I am very far from wishing to imply that I think such regulations and duties can be lightly thrown off; I mean only that those students seem to have been gripped by a moral concern which demanded of them immediate, unequivocal reaction. I suppose--in fact I would assume--that it was the vision of burning bodies, the bodies of innocent civilians in both North and South Vietnam, that was in their minds. To say that this was a case of emotion--youthful emotion--breaking down before it the rules of civilized behaviour would be to miss the point that their very emotion, if I read it correctly, was the most civilized fact about this whole business. Their actions were, of course, wrong, and had in any case no hope of gaining the students' object; but I think the obvious impracticality of their action is one sign of its fundamental innocence, just as was their unthinking impetuosity in demanding to see you immediately the next morning. I take such actions to be characteristic of people driven by conscience, not of those who calculate the likelihood of their actions' having any effect.

I would, therefore, respectfully suggest that perhaps the students involved, and certainly a great number of the students and faculty not involved, are far more concerned with the charges made against the Bloomington police than with the matter of further disciplinary action being taken against those who were arrested. I do think that the threatening divisions within the student body and the faculty, and the students' wary attitude toward the administration, would very largely disappear should you take the lead in forming a committee of the faculty to investigate the students' charges, and at the same time make clear that the administration realizes that the demonstrators were not acting out of contempt for university regulations or the just rights of others, though this does not mean they can be exempted from the discipline required by the circumstances.

I would like to add that I do agree with most all that you said in the open meeting of the faculty, and would only like to see the third section of the resolution proposed by the agenda committee wait until some investigation makes clear beyond reasonable doubt whether the very serious charges made by the students against the Bloomington police are valid.

Peter M. Smith
Lecturer in Classical
Languages and Literatures

P.S. In reading over what I have written, I realize that one side of my point was perhaps not well brought out; and that is that, if my reading of the students' motives is at all correct, no amount of refining of the rules relating to student conduct (and it is at least not obvious that there was anything terribly wrong with them to begin with) will get at the heart of the problem. This I take to be that persons driven to express the most basic feelings of their conscience (but in the nature of things unable to confront directly the situation which concerns them) will instinctively reject debate which deals only with the level of their actions--which they themselves well know to be only indirectly related to the level of their motivation.

How the administration might deal with some students' profound concern over some aspects of the war in Vietnam is perhaps an impossible question; certainly it is one for which I have no ready answer. But I do think that the university would unite behind you as one man if you publicly recognized the motives of the demonstrators as fundamentally moral, and took action to see that their very serious charges against the police are investigated--and, if shown to have any truth, strongly pressed. I do not think that many would then question the university's right to discipline those who knowingly broke regulations, especially if their motives are taken into account. The real threat to the university community, it seems to me, is not that respect for the rights of others is breaking down, but that there appears no healthy outlet for moral outrage--justified or not.

(To the President) November 7, 1967

This note is prompted by the open council-faculty meeting of 7 November and a subsequent chance encounter with a member of the Board of Trustees who likewise was in attendance, as well as by a number of your public statements over the past two years.

First, I am certain that the problem of which student demonstrations are but one manifestation will be increasingly upon us. The more enlightened among the population have been fostering "freedom of thought and action" without concurrently encouraging assumption of responsibility. The relatively high percentage of faculty children among those students involved speaks eloquently to this point.

Second, it is nonsense to assert that students are emotionally or morally different from the remainder of the population. A certain number at the lower ends of the continua have obviously been screened out, but we now have and will continue to have our share of abnormal cases among the student body. These persons will necessarily increase in absolute numbers as our enrollment increases.

Third, we will continue to have faculty members, mostly younger ones in search of a following, who will assume leadership functions for any dissident group. If no real grievance exists, a false one will be created.

We are all concerned, and I am sure that you have far more support than you may sometimes believe. I offer a few suggestions for whatever they may be worth.

First, one or two trained police personnel of the highest calibre might be added to the office of the Dean of Students to serve as advisors for that office as well as to coordinate activities between university administration, the Division of Safety, and local and state police.

Second, if on-campus police are to be deprived of their side-arms they should by all means be given substitutes, such as the new harmless paralytic gas guns. We should be equally concerned about the welfare of all arms of the academe, including our law enforcement arm.

Third, students are being urged, excited, and incited without aim or direction. It is reasonable to expect and anticipate problems stemming from excess energies until such energies are directed. Perhaps, and I suggest this more than half seriously, the university needs a return to a one-hour per day strenuous physical education requirement for all able-bodied students. The need is for socially acceptable outlets. I don't believe that the basic problems will be solved until the students, themselves, are somehow involved in the solutions. Control of the forces we have loosed must come from within rather than from above.

Finally, and this constitutes my real purpose for sending this note, I wish to express the conviction that you have personally exercised admirable restraint, demonstrated remarkably good judgment, and have been as near correct in your decisions in concerns both off and on campus as anyone in your position could be. Let me urge you to hold to your intellectual and moral commitments despite any and all degrees of pressure from highly extreme groups of every age and persuasion. If there is any justifiable ethic upon which to ground difficult decisions, it is the one you have professed and have followed--that the rights of individuals and minorities must be fully and unequivocally guaranteed to and only to that point where they begin to infringe upon the rights of others. * * * * *

Raymond G. Smith, Professor
Department of Speech and Theatre

(To the President)

November 1, 1967

I share with my colleagues in the Department of Journalism a deep concern with the twisting of values noted on campus, especially during the last few days. This concern is increased by the kind of arguments reported from the Faculty Council discussion yesterday and the failure of those who hold fast to basic concepts of good living to rise and protest.

I have never understood the philosophy of a few that being a college student or a teacher exempts one from obedience of law and observance of the normal amenities of decent living. A riotous celebration of a football victory or a violent political demonstration equally peril life, property, and the normal conduct of business.

My own belief as to the role of the University, developed out of experience within and without the academic cloisters, is simply this--and I am willing to state it publicly: * * * * *

1. We must maintain the freedom that has been traditional at Indiana University--the right to speak or not to speak, the right to agree or to disagree, the right to read or not to read, the right to listen or not to listen, the right to decide whether to accept the curricular wisdom of those competent to make decisions in that area and to earn a degree or to reject curriculum and degree, the right to assemble, and the right to petition.
2. The University must protect one person's freedom against interference by or with another person's freedom.
3. The University must be on the side of law and order.
4. The University must seek to encourage the education of man, and the educated man seeks the truth, weighs the evidence, makes his own decisions, advocates his position vigorously, and defends the right of others to do the same.

I support you and the administration in whatever it takes to implement these basic concepts. Persons may dissent, but when they violate the rights of others and the law, they must accept the strictures and the punishment that society has established.

John E. Stempel
Department of Journalism

(To the President)

November 9, 1967

I have followed with great interest the policy set forth by the Administration concerning the disturbances caused by a few on our University campus.

I highly commend you and your staff for the firm stand that you have taken.

You have my full support in the way you have handled the recent situation.

V. K. Stoelting, M.D.
Professor and Chairman
Department of Anesthesiology

(To the President)

November 2, 1967

I do not question the decision of the University's officers to call in civil authorities in the case of the recent Dow demonstrations. Rather, I think that the application of civil law is precisely the way that problems of student conduct within the University community should be handled. The main virtue of such application of civil law is that the University can thereby retire altogether from its customary and rather questionable participation in non-academic disciplinary activities.

But I feel strongly that the University cannot operate under two systems at once; that it must handle student discipline either under civil law (in which case students will receive the guarantees of civil law) or under existing University regulations (in which case students will not be subject to civil arrest). Now that it has called in civil authorities, the University should consider the case of the Dow demonstrators closed as far as University action is concerned.

Paul Strohm
Assistant Professor of English

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

The recent disturbances on the campus and the scandalous way some students behaved during the visit of Mr. Rusk are a matter of serious concern and should be met with stern reaction. The University cannot let itself be terrorized by a noisy handful of leftist provocateurs who request freedom of speech for themselves but do not extend it to others. On the part of the administration of the university, moderation is a virtue, but too much patience and leniency is often misunderstood and may encourage the hecklers and troublemakers to further abuses, display of lack of culture and disregard of the law and university regulations.

It is unfortunate that a few faculty members, mostly young and newcomers to Indiana, seem to take the same stand as the provocateurs. They should leave Indiana until they mature.

I urge you not to tolerate disruptive behavior and not to yield to any pressure on the part of the troublemakers who bring disgrace to our University. Otherwise, we will have further problems, similar to the ones which arose at the University of California.

W. J. Wagner
Professor of Law

(To the President)

November 10, 1967

You are to be congratulated upon the way you are handling the student demonstration problem on campus. Be assured that you have my support in your efforts to prevent this small minority group of students and faculty from further blemishing the image of our great university.

Leah E. Weidman
Department of Home Economics

(To the President)

November 10, 1967

Just a note (no answer expected) to express my enthusiastic approval of your firm stand on the matter of student protests. From my conversations with many faculty members, I am convinced that the large majority of the faculty are in complete agreement with the actions taken and proposed by the administration.

E. D. Weinberg
Department of Microbiology

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

I thought the meeting on Tuesday afternoon went very well indeed. Everyone had a chance to speak his piece and no one abused that opportunity. In short, the divisiveness within the faculty, which was very real, appears to me to have been substantially reduced. Furthermore, there was no "confrontation" with the administration. I felt a distinct feeling of relief after the meeting which I'm sure you shared as well.

It was particularly useful for you to review for the faculty the actions taken with respect to the Ginsburg, Aptheker and DuBois Club affairs over the past few years. The faculty in general needs to be reminded of how well the administration has performed in these contexts. In short, you did it again!

George W. Wilson
Department of Economics

(To the President)

November 4, 1967

It is my conviction that no student or group of students has the right to interfere with the operations of the University, however just their cause may be. Using force is not consistent with the purposes of an academic community.

I call your attention to a recent statement of the American Association of University Professors which appeared in the October 31, 1967 issue of the Christian Science Monitor relative to tactics of students who disrupt university operations or prevent invited campus guests from speaking. Such action "is destructive of the pursuit of learning and of a free society. All components of the academic community are under a strong obligation to protect its processes from these tactics."

Fred Witney
Professor of Economics

(To the President)

November 6, 1967

Violations of laws or rules which are allowed to go unchallenged make those laws and rules inoperative. These violations undercut the authority of the University including its ability to guarantee free inquiry. If those students who flagrantly and systematically violated the rules of the University are allowed to remain, I will support any sanctions against these students which you and the other school authorities deem appropriate.

Leslie A. Wood
Associate Professor of Education

P.S. In no way should this be construed to mean I think they should be permitted to remain in school.

(To the President)

November 1, 1967

At a time when you may or may not want nor need more advice:

I am personally up to here in the kooks who demand one set of values and rights for themselves to the detriment of the rights of others.

There is nothing illegal or immoral about (1) seeking an armed service recruiter (2) any job interview by any company on any level (3) listening to a speaker on any subject at any time (4) any speaker making his views known in a rational and orderly manner (5) going into and out of a campus building on any legitimate errand, etc., etc., etc.

The Secretary of State, George Wallace, Herbert Aptheker, and even you and I have some rights too. They have a right to try to persuade, and I have a right to hear them talk. The Dow chemical corporation wants good personnel, and students have a right to try to get a job with them.

Your remarks during the Secretary of State's speech were most apt. Let's make them work. This University is our University, all of us who have an interest in education belong to it and want it to move forward.

Whatever action you take will be understood. . .as for me, if you expelled them all it wouldn't be too harsh.

Richard D. Yoakam
Department of Journalism-Radio TV

P.S. You don't, for heaven's sakes, have to answer this. . .after hearing a report of the deliberations of the faculty council yesterday and some of the kookie things that were said there, thought you might want to hear another point of view.

(To the President)

November 22, 1967

Too frequently, only the extremists mount the podium to make themselves heard. The silent, hard-working moderates of both conservative and liberal persuasions, on the other hand, go about the task of conducting the business of the day efficiently, but quietly. I am certain that you are intellectually aware of this effect. Emotionally, however, even the President of such a strong university as ours may occasionally have feelings of doubt and frustration. Let me attempt to alleviate just one bit of such possible doubt by indicating my whole-hearted support for you, as an individual, and for the directions in which you are going. Your emphasis on the rights and responsibilities of both proponents and dissenters, the use of due process of law when it, unfortunately, becomes necessary, and the need to develop greater student-faculty interaction are all worthwhile goals. Please count on me to support you, both intellectually and emotionally, as you work toward these goals.

R. Reid Zehrbach, Ph.D.
Acting Director, Institute for
Child Study

***** University Schools

(NOTE: Permissions to reproduce the following communications were received from the writers after the copying of above had been completed.)

(To Secretary, Faculty Council)

November 3, 1967

Apropos of the faculty discussion to be held Tuesday, November 7, in regard to student demonstrations, I would like to make the following comments:

1. I think that inviting the entire faculty to this meeting of the Council is a wise move.
2. I believe that the actions and attitudes of President Stahr and the other members of the administration recently have been exemplary.
3. The "Regulations Affecting Student Life," as distributed with notice of the meeting, are reasonable, sensible, and fair.
4. There is no question that these regulations have been broken (a) by invasion of university buildings by demonstrators (both the Business School and the Administration Building), (regulation 1-3), (b) by the heckling which occurred in the Auditorium on Tuesday (regulation 3).
5. I believe that the University is justified in taking a firm stand in the enforcement of its regulations and urge it to do so.

Irrespective of one's views on the war and other matters, demonstrations are not justified where the freedom of those who differ from us is infringed, and they should not be tolerated in a community composed of persons who are supposed to be governed by their brain and not their spleen.

Dr. Ralph E. Cleland

Department of Botany

(To the President)

November 10, 1967

I would like to express to you my shock and dismay upon hearing of the administration's decision in regards to the students who demonstrated against Dow Chemical. Dean Shaffer was quoted as saying "It was my clear impression at the conclusion of the faculty meeting Tuesday. . . that the above steps reflect the judgment of the vast majority of the faculty. . . ." To anyone who was present at the faculty meeting, this is clearly a falsehood. The colleagues I have talked with and myself are insulted by Dean Shaffer's misrepresentation of our opinions and the action taken by the administration in obvious disregard of general faculty feeling. We shall not be so easily fooled next time a faculty meeting is suggested.

David L. Colton

Assistant Professor, Mathematics

(To the President)

October 31, 1967

To paraphrase a great statesman, this day will long live in infamy in the history of Indiana University. Today I listened in shocked amazement, humiliation, and disbelief to the turmoil, discourtesy, and downright insults that greeted a most distinguished and honorable statesman, one who holds the second most important office in the government of this nation, as he strove with nobility and dignity to perform a service which had been requested by this University.

In your introduction of Secretary Rusk you referred to "Indiana University's long tradition of free speech". Mr. President, with half a century in the field of education, twenty-seven years on the faculty of Indiana University, I too have had adequate opportunity to learn the value of free speech, independence of thought, and honest dissent in a democratic form of government. And in the process I believe that I also learned to distinguish, perhaps vaguely, the line that separates these noble attributes from a spirit of blatant anarchy. For me it is most ironic that you, a former Secretary of War and now the chief administrator of this University, were either unable or unwilling to make this distinction; to exercise the responsibility of your high office by interrupting the program and asking the police (who were present) to eject this group of punks from the hall in order to protect the rights of the vast majority who wished to hear the speaker; and to give to this speaker (and to any others who may come here in the future) the courteous reception to which they are entitled.

To say that the vast majority of the audience was sympathetic will be of small consolation to Secretary Rusk. What he and the thousands of supporters and admirers of this University will remember most is the unbelievable discourtesy to which he was subjected.

If my guess is correct, it is high time, Mr. President, that this University offer to a handful of unruly students and a few "sophisticated" professors who are encouraging their "development" a most valuable course in social conduct and behavior, or the alternative of working elsewhere.

H. H. Cook
Department of French and Italian

(To the President) November 9, 1967

May I take this opportunity to tell you I think that you have done a simply magnificent job in handling the most recent set of difficult episodes. Your statement before the Faculty Council, with the faculty present, was absolutely superb.

S. F. Otteson
Department of Business Administration

(To the President) November 10, 1967

Because of an out-of-town lecture engagement I unfortunately missed the big faculty meeting Tuesday, but I understand that you said you would welcome letters from the faculty. So this is to say that I am among the many who disapprove the administration's treatment of the student demonstrators, in particular calling in the local police and then soft-peddling their pretty brutal behavior. Now I join the protest against Dean Shaffer's official announcement, with the claim that it reflects "the judgment of the vast majority of the faculty," before the faculty came to a decision.

I should then add that I do not myself condone the demonstrators' defiance of university regulations, and I agree that they must be required to keep their demonstrations peaceful and orderly. But in your necessary concern over these troublemakers I think there's a serious danger of not respecting enough their genuine moral and intellectual indignation, and of implying too much respect for students--the great majority--who in my opinion are much less thoughtful and earnest, and more disposed to be "anti-intellectual." The little patriots in the fraternities, the Bong the Cong boys, can be rowdies too, usually without interference by the police. I can't much respect their patriotism because I'm quite confident that most of them have only the foggiest notion how the war in Vietnam got started, how and why we got so deeply involved in it, why it is deplored by most people all over the world, etc. In general, I think we should be less troubled by the small minority of radicals on this

campus than by the complacent majority who have little interest in the crises of our time. Not to mention the values of the local community, the editor who deplored the demonstrations because they were spoiling the favorable (attention) Indiana was getting by its football team.

I might also add that I have Dan Kaplan in an honors seminar, and have acquired a considerable respect for him. This even though I suspect he has identified me as just an old liberal, which I gather is the dirtiest word in the lexicon of the "new Left."

Herbert J. Muller
Department of English

(To the President)

November 10, 1967

The faculty council meeting of last Tuesday provided the faculty as a whole with a valuable opportunity to discuss a complicated and sensitive issue. The resulting dialogue was enlightening and indicated that a significant proportion of the faculty is deeply concerned about the issue of dissent and more specifically regarding the handling of the Dow Chemical "sit-in." The wisdom of involving civil authorities was questioned by many, there was grave concern over the indications of police brutality, the uniqueness of the situation was noted, and there was a general feeling that consideration of all of the complicated parameters dictated that further steps be taken only after careful deliberation.

It is virtually impossible to comprehend what has ensued. I am referring specifically to the penalties announced by Dean Shaffer and the attitudes that he has attributed to the faculty. My reaction to his press release was one of utter disbelief, especially considering the tenor of the open meeting. I am concerned about the unduly severe penalties meted out (in contrast to Harvard where the transgressions were greater), at the alacrity with which decisions were made, at the fact that different penalties have been applied to those who are alleged to have resisted arrest, and at the fact that faculty feelings have been blatantly misrepresented. I feel that an incalculable disservice has been done to both students and faculty.

I therefore wish to voice my strong objection to the manner in which the administration has acted, both during and after the Dow incident. I think that a careful reconsideration of the entire situation is necessary.

Donald R. Whitehead
Associate Professor of Botany

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

Having slept on yesterday's extraordinary (in several senses) Faculty-Faculty Council meeting, I shall try to respond to your invitation to write you concerning it. My appointed duties as a "marshall" debarred me from other participation but in their nature encouraged, even necessitated, a close attention to the audience. So I shall try to communicate my sense of what was happening in it.

To begin with, it was my observation that the whole affair was a kind of triumph. The atmosphere and perspective of reasonableness, fair dealing, and free communication were as right as could be. In some day which I have no desire to see the faculty and students may conduct themselves in the modes of "honesty" typical of group therapy sessions; but I do not believe one can operate either a community of scholars or the essential institutional base for such a community in that way. I thought the liberal, parliamentary traditions of our country and university well vindicated by yesterday's events.

In passing I should note that I thought I was aware, in certain colleagues, of a frustrated passion to burst out against and through what seems (I suppose) to them a trap, a net of intellectuality imprisoning their gut feeling that the whole intellectual-institutional fabric is wrong and ought to be destroyed. I felt that they felt, on the whole, ambivalently baffled and reassured: they had come, with quite unrealistic forecast, to confront "fascist" passion with "radical" passion. They encountered reason, openness, pragmatism, and humanity instead. I was aware that some of those "loaded for bear" were hastily changing the charge; others just racked up the gun.

Since I regard inhibition of radical passion and openings toward humanism as desirable, I thought the meeting on the whole a huge success. No little of the success was the product of the tone, substance, and reasoning of your "backgrounding." I hope you are aware that you met with swift, overwhelming, positive response from the great majority (and a certain curious despair from a small minority, see above). The faculty accepted your leadership of the heart as well as head. Had there been a vote, the kind of sentiment spoken by Bob Byrnes would have won decisively.

But I think I approve the wisdom of not having a "division." The opposition, for its self-respect, was early reduced to peripheral sniping. The corporate sense of a university in being and settled on policy while open to dissent was a valuable gain from the session.

One concludes the obvious from such an affair: it might be of the greatest usefulness to have future similar meetings, though the voice of old disillusion says--not, of course, always on the same topic; and not if it threatens to frazzle out to a series of nit-picking forums for those professors whose careers have become centered on corridor politics.

I have long wondered if the Faculty Council (which seemed too small, too unprofessorial when we had 13,000 students) ought not be enlarged and redirected.

Finally, I should perhaps say a word about my opinions concerning the substance of the discussion. I am firm in the sense that nobody on a campus may be permitted to disrupt by force, direct, indirect, or implied, the ordinary teaching, learning, research pursuits of the community, and nobody may deny another's right to speak and hear. I think our present, carefully premeditated rules, written and revised on the bases of experience not nearly so obsolete as certain of yesterday's speakers assumed, are sound. If we revise again, we shall only do what we have done and no doubt will do; but I see no reason to change the grounds of understanding on which they rest. I make no doubt that after any such incidents as those in question (as after the Cuban missile crisis affair), one or more select faculty committees ought to enquire closely into the details and report.

I have a good deal of sympathy for the man who as a policeman subjects himself to the likelihood of attack and suffering in the line of duty. I

understand why, once the fighting starts, he is inclined to take the best possible care of himself by putting the quickest end to it and even so to inflict punishment as to lessen the likelihood of the next fight. I don't think Campus Police should really be combat police; so we must rely on others.

However, there seems to be a good deal of agreement that the police officer in charge made a mistake, perhaps on orders, in undertaking to move arrested students from the Business building. If he said, in warning arrested students (and testimony seems clear that he did), something to the effect that those who did not leave voluntarily were going to get hurt, his whole approach was wrong for reasons which seem obvious to me: he was provoking violence, and it ought to be his business to avoid it.

But the facts of the case are properly a matter for the courts and their special advantages in getting at facts. As to institutional sanctions against the Dow protesters in particular, I was struck by the clarity and justness of Professor Tischler's remarks yesterday. We have carefully evolved procedures and structures for dealing with such questions. They are designed to deal with individual cases on their merits. It is my sense, from two of my own students who were involved, that there were indeed large variations of intention and awareness among the protestors and that some were carried by events much further than they wished. I suppose the Student Conduct Committee exists to make discriminations. If it can't handle the problem (and I see the difficulty about the involvement of graduate students), perhaps there should be an ad hoc committee.

I think I know, and I regret, the political effect of all this around the State. Nevertheless, given a problem no administrator could prevent, please accept my congratulations on the way it has been handled. I think sound sense will prevail at Indiana, and I shall be glad to help in any way I can.

Edwin H. Cady
Rudy Professor of English

* * * * *

(To the President)

November 8, 1967

Following your suggestion during the open meeting of the Faculty Council yesterday I take this opportunity to make four suggestions:

1. That the University, through every means at its disposal, in an orderly and legal fashion, press toward a judgment regarding the conduct of the students and the police during the Dow demonstration. The University should be prepared to assist the students in any court action that might be entailed.
2. That the University proceed with the enforcement of its existing regulations. If fair and equitable enforcement leads to severe penalties the students are free to appeal as described in the regulations. The University should stand ready to accept the final judgment produced by present regulations.
3. That the University, sensitive to the anxieties and deep concerns of students, faculty, and administrators regarding the role of the University in current affairs, examine carefully its rules and regulations with a view to making the University more responsive to the concerns of its many constituencies. Such an examination should involve students, faculty, administrators and public.
4. That the University initiate a series of discussions, lectures, debates, seminars, etc., involving students, faculty, administration, as an educational device to bring out and clarify issues involved in institutional change, the use of due process, civil disobedience, value crises etc., using as a starting point the events on this and other campuses.

* * * * * Michael Chiappetta

(NOTE: Communications were received from two other faculty members from whom no response was received with respect to permission to reproduce their writings. Five faculty members declined to permit the reproduction of their communications.)

* * * * *