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FORWARD

Despite a deceptive calm -- sometimes referred to as an "eerie tranquility" -- today's college and university campuses are not quiet.

They are seething with unrest and can explode in unprecedented violence and disruption unless immediate and responsible steps are taken.

As President of The United States Jaycees, I recently led a special study team to 14 representative colleges and universities across the country in an effort to help uncover the root causes of the dissent that has wracked our nation's schools.

The findings of this in-depth study are summarized in this report.

The report concludes with seven key points which, we believe, can greatly de-escalate the feelings of frustration, tension and rage now gripping many of our university and college students.

These recommendations are directed impartially to the federal government, to students, to college and university faculties and administrations, and to the nation's press.

A high priority recommendation is the immediate appointment by the President of the United States of a "young people's Ombudsman" to serve as a direct link between the Office of the President and the nation's 8 1/2 million college students.

Another, of equal importance, is the immediate establishment of a study commission to evaluate all aspects of higher education (tenure, financing, enrollment, curriculum, role of the university in society, etc.). Such a commission would be impanelled to bring forth positive recommendations that would make universities and colleges relevant today and prepared for tomorrow.
The nearly 300 hours we spent with more than 1,400 people on these campuses gave us a new insight into the problems of unrest.

Since campus disruptions began, everyone has tended to overlook the fact that today's students are the same people who will be shaping and running the world within the next 10 to 20 years. The attitudes and beliefs they are now formulating will profoundly affect our society when they assume positions of leadership.

We believe it is critical that these 8 1/2 million men and women no longer be treated as undesirable social irritants, segregated from the mainstream of American society.

There is surely a crisis in our society when the majority of its future leaders have lost faith in the fundamental systems of . . .

- A free and just society
- A credible and representative government
- An objective and responsible press
- A relevant system of higher education
- A meaningful set of social values

Their disenchantment with America cannot and must not be disregarded or treated lightly.

Unlike their predecessors, today's generation of college students will not mellow and accept the world as they found it. They are a force dedicated to change. They cannot and should not be stopped. They must be guided, not repressed. The shape the world will take in the next 20 years will be determined by how well we listen to today's youth and how well today's youth accept the leadership responsibility which must be assumed before positive changes can take place.
We believe there is a serious lack of understanding on the part of the nation as to the true depth and intensity of the feelings of our young people. By "our young people" we mean the "moderate majority," those who are not extremists either of the left or the right. They are those who reject violence as the only alternative left to secure "freedom" for mankind. They are, nevertheless, most concerned about the quality of life in America today.

Tragically, no one seems to be listening to what the students are trying to say. This is rapidly increasing their rage and frustration. It is leading to an increasing radicalization of the "moderate majority" on every campus.

If the older generation continues to alienate itself from the younger and make peaceful revolution impossible, they may be inviting violent revolution.

If today's generation of college students lose faith in what America is all about, then we are indeed headed for serious trouble.

American youth are crying out in despair. We in the United States Jaycees, who bridge the "generation gap," are asking America to listen.

Gordon B. Thomas
President of the
United States Jaycees
April 19, 1971
Purpose and Objectives

This is the report of an impartial study of campus unrest at American universities and colleges conducted by the United States Jaycees as a special project of Jaycee President Gordon B. Thomas. It concludes with a series of recommendations prepared by Mr. Thomas and his staff after having interviewed hundreds of students, faculty members and administrators at fourteen institutions of higher learning. The campuses were selected for their geographical locations as well as for the varied composition of their student bodies. More than fifty-seven hours of interviews were taped by the study team out of some 290 hours of on-campus listening.

The United States Jaycees, an organization made up of young men ranging in age from twenty-one to thirty-five, constitutes a natural communications channel to carry the thoughts and feelings of today's young people to older Americans.

It must be remembered that members of the Jaycees are in the mid-generation group, in age midway between the college students and their parents. Jaycees are, therefore, the fathers of the next generation of college students. Because of this, Mr. Thomas felt it imperative to take an active interest in the future and the quality of higher education.

It was on this premise that the non-partisan, non-political nationwide organization undertook the study. It is the hope of The United States Jaycees that the findings of this study will be useful and instrumental in helping to eliminate violent dissent on our campuses.
The study was undertaken without fanfare or publicity, thus permitting open and honest dialogue with members of the university community. Students, faculty and administrators, appreciating the "off-the-record" technique, responded with a candor that possibly has not existed in previous attempts to document their beliefs.

Because The United States Jaycee study team went to the campuses only to listen and not to discuss or debate issues, there has been an added dimension to the results of the interviews. There were open responses from individuals who normally would have avoided the microphones.

The recommendations resulting from the study seek immediate remedial objectives, as well as offering long-range goals which, hopefully, will result in higher quality education in a vastly improved atmosphere.

It must be emphasized that these findings and recommendations are the result of a distillation and concensus of the suggestions and appeals made by the students, the faculty members and the administrators of those universities and colleges visited.
Strategy and Methods

The fourteen universities and colleges were selected with a number of criteria in mind. Taken into consideration were size and variety of schools, whether or not they were coed, whether or not they had recent histories of violence, and whether they were located in a region noted for its radical approach to academics.

Selected were giant universities, large colleges and small schools representing every geographical location in the nation. Chosen also were schools that had been the scenes of serious demonstrations, as well as those that enjoyed relatively peaceful campuses.

The universities visited by the study team and represented in this report are:

University of Tulsa - Tulsa, Oklahoma
University of Oklahoma - Norman, Oklahoma
San Francisco State College - San Francisco, California
University of California at Los Angeles - Los Angeles, California
University of Wisconsin - Madison, Wisconsin
Stephens College - Columbia, Missouri
University of Kansas - Lawrence, Kansas
Haskell Indian Junior College - Lawrence, Kansas
Kent State University - Kent, Ohio
Columbia University - New York, New York
Yale University - New Haven, Connecticut
University of Alabama - Tuscaloosa, Alabama
Ohio State University - Columbus, Ohio
Howard University - Washington, D. C.

The study team consisted of Gordon B. Thomas, Fifty-first President of The United States Jaycees (1970-71); Herbert Conyers, Administrative Assistant to President Thomas; and Tom Cantrell, a U. S. Jaycees headquarters staff member, himself a college student until just a year prior to the study.
Each of the universities was contacted in advance by a letter which outlined what the team hoped to accomplish, and requested assistance from the administration. The cooperation was granted readily.

A day or two in advance of the scheduled date for the interviews to begin, Tom Cantrell would go to the university to familiarize himself with the campus. He would "study" in the library, eat in the student facilities, and occasionally enjoy a stein of cheer in a neighborhood pub with "fellow" students.

In this way he was able to locate and identify all types of students, revolutionary, radical, liberal, moderate, and conservative. He could also learn of any impending issues that might be of interest to the study team.

As part of their advance preparation, the study team had been given expert background briefings on recent violent campus unrest along with a special orientation about the new active leftist groups.

The team also received instructions in directing group discussions by Dr. Jennifer Macleod, Staff Psychologist of Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey.

After providing instructions on such techniques as generating a desired dialogue and keeping the discussion on track, Dr. Macleod accompanied the study team on several actual campus discussions. These were followed by critiques with the interviewers.

To Dr. Macleod, as well as to scores of others who provided research material and offered time and effort to help in making the study a success, President Thomas and his staff express profound gratitude. It is their sincere belief that the project will not only shed enlightenment on the issues that separate the generations, but will help to eliminate the problems that have led to such tragic disruptions and even to violence.
The students, it may be said, accepted The United States Jaycee study team at face value, and respected the sincerity of these "older men" in trying to establish communication between the generations. Discussion groups and interviewing sessions were markedly devoid of any derision or ridicule on the part of the youth.

President Thomas explained:

"We asked straight questions, and we got straight answers.

"Many of those answers have been summarized and capsulized in this report.

If members of both generations approach this report with the same degree of mutual sincerity as did the study team and the students, faculty and administrators interviewed, there must result a greater understanding of the issues that have for too long separated some present members of the academic world from the rest of society."
Concerns of the Students

With long hair and short hair; with mustaches and beards or clean, smooth cheeks; with granny glasses and dark glasses or with sparkling young eyes, most students, in all peer groups, from freshmen to seniors and graduate scholars, expressed intense concern over numerous aspects of society, the Government, the war, the older generation and the university.

They are, as a group, disturbed, disbelieving and, in several cases, angry. They are energetic, and they intend to correct what they regard to be innumerable ills in the American life style. They may appear to be starry-eyed in many respects, particularly to an older person, but they exude confidence and unshakable belief in their causes.

Many of the students did not seem to be merely cynical or disenchanted. Instead they responded more like confident achievers, still planning their strategy, their goals recognized but the means of winning them still being debated. They feel that they have right on their side.

If they are confused on many issues, they do not know it. If they are inconsistent, they do not acknowledge it. If they are intolerant of the foibles of others, they refuse to admit it.

Almost to a man they are opposed to the war in Vietnam.

*They think it is unnecessary, unjust and apparently unwinnable.
*They think it is nationally frustrating because it is not possible to win it without an unjustified expenditure of both human and material resources.

*They believe we will gain nothing, even if we win.

*They hold that, generally speaking, Americans have not been told the truth about the war or plans for conducting it or for ending it.

*Almost universally they believe that a military draft for such a war is immoral.

The war, however, is only a part -- though a major one -- of their unrest. In broadest terms, here are some of their other complaints:

*The American society is racist and does not foster communication between all segments.

*The news media may not be trusted to give accurate accounts of happenings on campus and elsewhere.

*Justice is not administered uniformly at all levels of society.

*Faculty members have failed to understand the causes of unrest on campus and of social disenchantment.

*College administrators stick too closely with their traditions and resist change in most forms.

Ideologically there are groups of students on the extreme left and others on the extreme right. The "moderate majority" view the extremists as simply being over-involved and emotionally caught up in their causes to the point where they view their remedies as the only way to save the country.
The "moderate majority" does not view either extreme with alarm. For the most part, the interviews were confined to the students of the "moderate majority" as representative of the student bodies at all the universities.

Many of the students frankly admitted that campus is a sanctuary -- from the draft, from the police, from parents, and from work -- a kind of "reservation" for young people.

On the other hand, many said they had come to college to learn how to think or "to be trained for something."

A great many of them criticize the economic structure of America and say they are not convinced that their parents are right in putting so much emphasis on income and security. "The corporate world," (the Establishment) often referred to as something outside the campus, embraces the entire American economy and social structure, and many students question its ultimate value in contributing to a pleasant life style. In their discussions they make it seem like a world of constant pressures, of incessant struggle for power and wealth, and of a general, unceasing conflict.

Among criticisms leveled at the universities were that grades and degrees are considered to be too important, that classes in most universities are too large, that faculty members are too preoccupied with their own careers, that students have been polarized into a separate body on campus, that the democratically-elected student groups do not really represent the student body.

Representative of the moderate majority is this statement by a male student at a midwestern university, transcribed directly from the tape:

"The comment has been made a couple of times about coming here to the university to get away from things. I came here kind of with the idea that I didn't
have to face other responsibilities and I think this is a very important aspect of college attendance.

"I think a lot of kids haven't realized the impact of their lives on other people and their responsibility for it. They haven't realized what responsibilities they really do have. They haven't sought their responsibilities.

"Our black strike here was very unorganized. There was a different leader every day. There was not much discipline within the ranks. There was a lot of factioning and stuff like that. But I think students can take responsibility and be responsible people. It's just that they haven't had the opportunity to take on responsibility.

"In a smaller issue, like in the dorms with the issue of visitation, I have found that when kids make their own rules they are much more willing to obey them and work within these rules. They don't want to offend the other people who had the responsibility of making those rules.

"I think engaging kids or students more in the policy-making procedure of the university is going to be one of the biggest factors in making them realize what responsibilities they really do have."

Said another student:

"I'm here because the corporate world decrees that I go here. I am being trained for a corporate job. We must keep the recruitment pipelines full. There is no place in the world for me unless I learn how to fit into the corporate world, and this is the training ground for it."
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"Added another:"

"My parents believe in the corporate world. They expect me to dutifully go to college and learn how to fit into the corporate world and then after I graduate, take my job in the corporate world and live just as my father did."

In commenting on their relationships with their faculties, the students were likely to be caustic.

"Professors are working only for themselves. They spend more time writing and researching than they do worrying about their students," said one.

Another added:

"Professors have interests only in their own fields. To some extent they use students for possible recruits in their area. They are more interested in the field than in teaching about it."

"When they aren't good teachers, they keep up a lot of pressure on the grades," complained one youth. "If you're just ahead of the draft, you get all kinds of pressure on you, and some members of the faculty take advantage of it."

The re-arranging of national priorities is of major concern to the students. Disbelieving in the war, as they do, they would divert massive defense spending to other areas in the society and the economy.

First they believe that the money should be spent to improve housing and to eliminate hunger, poverty and illness -- to be used, in other words, to meet human needs. They believe in establishing minimum living conditions for all, under which everyone would be properly housed, fed, clothed, educated and maintained. They believe that sickness and health should cease to be profitable commodities.
Then they want to see more money spent on the educational systems, as well as on ecological improvement. The condition of the environment, of air and water and land, is of enormous concern to the students.

White students appear to be just as bitter about what they describe as "racist America" as do the blacks. They believe that the blacks have much less opportunity, either to become properly educated or to become gainfully employed, than do white students. They also remain convinced that there is a double standard for justice, with the blacks and the poor receiving less justice under the law than do the whites and the rich.

However, both white and black students appeared to be hopeful that in the long run, racism will disappear from the land.

Surprisingly, most students are not opposed to the Reserve Officer Training Corps or its role on campus. In many different ways they expressed themselves as understanding that the United States must maintain a military arm, and that it will be served best by having as its future leaders well-educated officers who did their basic training at good schools. The "moderate majority" students resent the polarization by the militants that set the ROTC candidates apart from the rest of the student body.

This tolerance does not carry over to the National Guard or to the police, however. Generally, the presence of police on campus is resented. The students think that neither the police nor the National Guard have proper training in crowd control measures, and that both law enforcement squads and Guardsmen incite more reaction than would be the case if they were not there.
Another serious complaint among students is that the news media are not
to be trusted with presenting the facts. They show no comprehension of or tolerance
for the problems of space or time that require sharp editing in the presentation of
stories. They cite incidents of "staged" confrontations for the sake of the television
cameras and press photographers, and as a result they are prone to mistrust most
of everything they see or read.

Generally they feel that the press does not fully understand the causes of
unrest on the campus and tends to cover its more spectacular aspects with the result
that progress in other areas is retarded.
The study made it very apparent that faculty members on campuses throughout America are mostly dedicated, sincere and competent. Most of them forego large amounts of income so that they may pursue further knowledge in their disciplines and pass their acquired knowledge along to students.

The study disclosed that most faculty members are keenly aware of all of the concerns of the students and are sympathetic to them.

Generally, faculty members believe sincerely that students are not only repudiating the existing social structure, but are actively building a new and better one.

They admit that their role as peacemakers on campus could show great improvement. There is a leadership role in quieting campus unrest that could be assumed by faculty members, but in large measure has not.

The research team found far too many faculty members concerned with their own scholarly experience via research, writing and outside lecturing, than with the learning experience of their pupils. It became apparent that the faculty should provide a way for greater and more meaningful students' input in both curriculum and evaluation of teaching ability. Students have firm and strong ideas about what they want to learn. They also have strong opinions about the teaching ability of their individual faculty members.

In every university covered in the study there were many complaints by students about the few faculty members who use the same old notes, lectures and examinations year after year, with no effort made to update or up-grade the course.
Relevancy is lacking from many such courses, and relevancy is a major point at issue among the students. They don't want to learn things that are unimportant or outdated.

A large number of the faculty members were in favor of having students evaluate them as teachers, and for those evaluations to be considered by department heads in matters relating to salary adjustments and promotions.

Unexpectedly, a large number of faculty members agreed that something should be done about the tenure system which "protects" the jobs of bad teachers while offering little inducement, except job-security, to the good ones. They believe the entire system is in need of re-evaluation.

Looking at the student situation, many faculty members express frustration at trying to teach such large classes. The classes are made too large by the admission of large numbers of students who really don't belong in college, and who wouldn't be there if it were not for the draft and other pressures of the outside world, they say.

As one professor put it:

"Many students are trapped in college by the draft. If it were not for the military involvement, many such students would be seeking a non-pressurized life in Bohemia. That is truly where they belong."

Another complained:

"The universities are being asked to teach skills to young people that industry is equipped to teach better. We have the students here because if they went into industry, where they could learn skills quicker and better, they would be drafted."
America's priorities bother faculty members just as much as they do the students.

One faculty member declared:

"If we could cut that seventy billion dollar defense expenditure from our budget and put all of it, or a good share of it, into our educational systems, we could solve all of the problems. But we're wealthy enough as a society to do it anyway -- to do the job that teachers feel should be done -- if we wished to change our priorities and values.

"There's a fundamental problem, of course, in getting people to think about priorities. Then it means utilizing your public education system as a social device for helping the individual understand the nature of the social system that he lives in, and the nature of that system in its relationship to the world. Throughout time, the school has been an agency for perpetuation of the status quo, and that's understandable. Every society puts most of its energy into maintaining itself.

"But here we are talking about social change. We have allowed technological change to have free rein. We never ask questions about it -- whether we should really have a new weapons system, or whether building a new four-lane highway is best for us.

"Technological change has been a means and an end in itself. To cite a minor example, right here in town we're going to build an overpass over the highway that's going to cost a million dollars, in order to carry pedestrians over the streets. Yet the pedestrians were never asked whether they wanted to take such a secondary place to the automobile. Just because of the supremacy of technology, we willingly go to great economic expense to solve a problem that technology has created.
"If we are going to live in a society of rapid changes, then we'd better learn how to become the controlling agents of those changes, else we will be slaves to change. There was a story in the newspaper just last week about air pollution in Tokyo. Without any excitement whatsoever, they announced that people in Tokyo will be carrying gas masks around just as the British carry umbrellas.

"We've got a generation of kids here who are living as immigrants in a new world. They're trying to shape it into something suitable."

Another faculty member echoed the frustration of the students about the war in Vietnam.

"We're just like the students," he said. "We find the government is unresponsive to our wishes. Nothing we can say can have much effect on the war in Vietnam."

Another faculty member sought to explain some of the basics in the widespread student unrest in the following manner:

"One of the developments of the last two years," he said, "is the emergence of what I'd call 'counter-culture' among the students. In contrast to the way it was in the 1950's and the early '60's, students are denying the cultural values that had been broadly accepted in the United States, and the educational values that had been accepted. The one thing that goes with this denial of cultural values is the denial of authority -- the right or authority to tell anyone how it's going to be.

"They don't think the values of the past are good values. They are going to establish some new values which they will regard as good ones, and from this will emerge the new cultural standards."
In later conversations, he added:

"People don't seem to understand. The establishment of a counter-culture is not a cop-out. It is, in fact, a very systematic attempt to rebuild our culture into something different. We think of youth as having a culture that is taken from something from outside their own generation. But if you consider the family, the church, the school or the society, you'll see that today's kids do not get their values from these institutions. They get them from their own peer groups -- they get them from themselves. Some of it is very difficult to understand, but it is gradually seeping in to me that the youth of today is gradually building its own set of values.

"Right now they are involved in counter-culture movements and they have yet to establish their values. In fact, I believe that if you asked them, they'd say they don't have to have any set of values.

"But right here one of their values is emerging. It is that they insist on their right to be autonomous learners -- that is, to determine what it is they want to learn. I think that is refreshing."

Said one professor:

"We must face the fact that the colleges and universities can't produce what they promised to produce -- that is to keep the economy supplied with available intelligent manpower. Most companies can do it better themselves."

Summed up another:

"The students are forcing us to re-think."
Administrators View The Problems

"The youngsters who were involved in the student unrest will look back in later years with the same sort of feeling that their parents look back on the Depression," said the president of one of the universities covered in The United States Jaycee's study.

"Basically, the worst is over," he added. "Our job now is to try to move ahead -- but we must listen to the students, plan with them, and participate with them. They are going to decide the future."

Administering an American university has evolved into a job of truly massive responsibility and most administrators are quick to admit that the sudden student rebellion caught them by surprise. They are still concerned about its unremitting duration, but they believe that the three major units of campus life, the student body, the faculty and the administration, have been blended into a cohesive force that will permit progress in the educational system.

Operating under awesome pressures from all sides as they handle multi-million-dollar budgets, thousands of employees, hundreds of operating facilities, and strive to maintain an educational program for tens of thousands of students, the administrators are wearied of the problems on campus but know that they are real, and won't go away. They are cheered by the fact that they think many problems are solvable.

The period of unrest and violence has caused much introspective thinking among administrators who realize that something was wrong when the student revolt was allowed to get out of hand.
One effect, it may be assumed from the interviews, is that there is a closer liaison today between faculty members and their school administrators than there was before the student crises struck the campuses. Generally the administrators still feel that most members of their faculties are more pro-student than pro-administration, and many are striving to eliminate differences in attitudes.

Plans are under way in several administrative offices to modernize their facilities, and with modernization will come a new set of rules and regulations from which will have been eliminated all unnecessary and arbitrary caveats and restrictions. However, the administrators say that they will insist that they be made familiar to the students, and that they be observed.

In the future operations of most universities, students will have a say in general administrative policies, among them, in some instances, a chance to review the qualifications of Trustees.

Many administrators recognize the fact that they must devise ways of communication between themselves and the students, bypassing the normal bureaucratic channels which serve to sidetrack student requests and add to student frustrations. It was obstacles to communications that caused problems in the immediate past.

More and more, university administrators -- at least those interviewed in this study -- are coming to realize that while the campus unrest raises questions about the American society, it actually puts American higher education on trial. Administrators recognize the fact that they will play a major role in influencing the verdict.

"The worst is over; the chore now is to keep ahead of the problems," said one administrator.
Perhaps new trends may be sighted in this comment by an administrator:

"Education must be sharpened and oriented toward a goal. It must cease being so generalized."

This same man observed: "Students can tolerate large universities, but they will not tolerate large classes."

It is obvious that these sentiments are not being conveyed to the students, who still feel that administrators, generally, are not aware of what motivates them. They note that it is increasingly easy to talk to administrators -- which was not the case a short time ago -- but that the administrators do not hear or heed what they say. This they call the "Open Door and Closed Mind" policy. There is a suspicion that they are being duped by the administrators. The United States Jaycees' research team, however, felt that the administrators are most sincere in what they say. Perhaps the problem lies in the fact that only one side of the communications gap has been closed -- they are listening to the students but aren't communicating with them.

Most of the administrators feel that the day of massive confrontation is past. They believe that they are now in a period of "eerie tranquility," in which new tactics for change must be devised. They do not look upon the faculty as a major contributor to campus unrest, but do see faculties as playing a role in the fomentation.

"Many of our faculty members are middle-aged adolescents who are extremely idealistic and extremely active politically," observed one administrator. "It is natural for them to be involved with the students, if only in a minor way. But it must be remembered that the students wouldn't be so likely to break laws if an adult did not pat them on the head and tell them it is okay."
Most administrators are agreeable to a system of tenure for faculty members to give them job security and to guarantee their academic freedom. Like the faculty members, however, they would be willing to do away with the tenure system if there were some other way to insure academic freedom for the professor who pursues some unpopular cause or in some other way jeopardizes his standing.

They agree, though, that far too many faculty members abridge the academic responsibility of objectivity which is the cornerstone of academic freedom.

Administrators also expressed concern over the amount of research and writing that occupy many professors. A professor's academic freedom and tenure give him the right to pursue research on any subject. Many do so, administrators say, at the expense of their students.

"Money, money, money," said one administrator. "That's my most pressing problem. We could solve almost every issue on campus if we only had the money."

The size, the financing and the structuring of the university preoccupy most administrators. Universities are too large. More are needed. With growing student bodies, changing curricula, shifting emphasis and limited land space -- as well as limited funds -- university administrators spend increasing amounts of their time with financial and logistical problems.

These are not new problems, but it is their magnitude that troubles today's administrators. They leave little time for anything else, and they realize that there are gravely pressing problems to be solved.

It is because of this that they believe there should be closer liaison between faculty and students on the one hand, and faculty members and hard-pressed administrators on the other. The faculty could provide the communications link that would ease the pressures on the administrators, many feel.
Just as frustrated as the students are the administrators who have had to sit back and watch their rules being broken. They realize that this cannot continue in the future if the "trial of the universities" is to come to a successful termination.

"I believe," said one, "that there must be flexibility in rules, but there has to be an area of finality in the relationship of the administrator or the student. Whether it's in relation to Student Service or whether it's in a department or whether it's a Parking Committee, there must be a final word.

"At this point the administrator very clearly tells the student -- "These are your rights; these are your privileges; and these are your obligations. Here is where they end and here is where I take over responsibility." This is the way it will be. This will make it all less fuzzy in the future."

This essentially is the technique employed by one major university president who found that previous administrations had neither spelled out the basic rules in some areas, nor tried to enforce them. His experience has shown him that most students respond to sets of rules or regulations when they are familiarized with their rights and privileges under them, but also fully instructed as to the limits.

There are other areas where the administrators do not think the students should have a "say," though, as expected, students think they should. They will require thoughtful negotiations before these touchy zones are eliminated from the concerns of the negotiators.

One such area is fringe benefits for the faculty members. In several universities students have concerned themselves with these issues. The administrators believe -- and very firmly -- that such matters rightfully belong on the negotiating table between themselves and the faculty alone, with no student influences
brought to bear. It is the basic function of the management-labor relationship, 
hey say, and that function is impeded by outside influences.

It is in these ticklish areas of prerogatives of administration that the 
administrators resist the intrusion of the students with a deciding or influencing 
voice.

Most administrators would like to think that the evolution on campus (evolu-
tion is preferred to the word revolution) would have taken place anyway, but 
generally they concede that student demonstrations and other expressions of student 
frustrations have caused the universities to move faster than they would have 
otherwise.

But perhaps the basic attitude may be summed up by the statement of one 
administrator who said:

"A generation that believes no one is listening to them must be listened to.
If not by us, then by who else?"
In no way do The United States Jaycees wish to sit in judgement on students, faculty or administrators of the universities of America. Instead let this be regarded as a voluntary and impartial quest for peace on the campus. In the role of listener, we have explored the issues with all three parties involved in campus unrest and would remind them all that not themselves alone, but the future of America if not the world, is involved in the outcome and the resolution of their problems.

This has not been a fault-finding inquiry. We have not sought to pin blame on students for unrealistic and arbitrary views, on faculty members for vacillation or for encouragement of law-breaking, or on administrators for failing to see a crisis developing on their own front lawns.

As middle-generation Americans, only a few years removed from the campus and only a few years away from being parents of children on the campus we strive only to help in solving the problems. We recognize the fact that universities must change. We believe that change will be good. Accepting our own responsibilities, we have thrust ourselves into this situation, and with the resources available to us, have researched it objectively and thoroughly. Therefore, we are prepared to offer specific recommendations.

We do not hold that we alone are right in our conclusions or our suggested remedies. We ask only that all parties concerned, including those in the political, commercial and professional segments of our society, accord our recommendations an impartial assessment.
After weeks of studying the issues and their backgrounds, and after weeks of interviewing hundreds of students, faculty members and administrators, we have arrived at some definite opinions which lead us to make specific recommendations to:

- The Administration and the Government
- The College and University Administrators
- The Faculties
- The Students
- The News Media

We present these views and recommendations herewith in the profound and solemn hope that they will be of value to those to whom they are addressed. We offer them as concerned citizens who accept their responsibilities in a changing democratic society, in the belief that because of our age, intermediate between the young and the older Americans, we can perform a genuine service.

Our recommendations follow:
Recommendations for the Administration

The President of The United States should concern himself directly with the solution to campus unrest. The research disclosed a vast credibility gap between the Administration and the young people of America. Very few students will believe much of anything that is told to them by anyone in government.

Moreover, we believe, as a result of our inquiries, that the government has, in effect, polarized the differences of the young people. We believe that our high officials must choose their words more carefully and use much discretion when addressing or referring to the young people in college today. They care -- intensely.

There is great difference between the small minority of students bent on revolution and the moderate majority who, nevertheless, are sincerely concerned and distressed. All students cannot and should not be described as irresponsible, revolutionary youth.

The students are sincere in requesting a restructuring of priorities in the United States away from the great military and space efforts of the past and into programs to eliminate pollution, poverty and prejudice. The students, we found, are not really isolationists, but they believe that we should cure our own internal ills before we try to become saviours of the world.

We strongly urge the President to continue to bring the war in Vietnam to a rapid and just conclusion. We echo the expressed concern of the students as they relate to our Nation's involvement in Southeast Asia. It is our firm belief, after this study, that ending the Vietnam conflict is the single most positive accomplishment the Administration could achieve in re-allying the generations.
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We further recommend that the President appoint a young people's Ombudsman to be a link between his office and the campuses and other places where young people gather. He would be the student's man in Washington. He would be free to travel to the campuses and to explain administration policies, and to obtain the opinions of the young and relay them to the President himself.

It is possible that in an extension of his role he might become an arbitrator between students and administrators, as a trusted, impartial and knowledgable participant in the evolution that is taking place.

We also recommend the appointment of a commission patterned along the lines of the Hoover Commission, consisting of the highest calibre and most-qualified persons from all areas of American life, to study and analyze and make recommendations for the overhaul of the entire educational process.

This commission would address itself to all of the major problems of higher learning, not only to the size of universities, the financing, the curricula, its role in society, but its internal structure (tenure, for instance) and everything that has to do with the entire scope of higher education.

It was our observation that most universities are organized in the same way, without much variance. The student enters at one end, spends four years "regurgitating information and facts" (to quote the students) and comes out at the other end with a degree. Perhaps there should be universities that offer a more exhilarating learning experience, with less emphasis on degrees and grades. Clearly there is also a need for greater emphasis on junior colleges and on vocational training, as well as on apprenticeships. The whole field of preparation for life, for work, for careers, need not be confined to the universities.
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Recommendations for College and University Administrators

There should be more professional administrators of universities. Too many administrators are college teachers or professors who have been elevated to positions of administration because of their good teaching abilities or their academic achievements. Top-notch professors do not necessarily make good administrators.

We compare this to the situation in hospitals where, years ago, administrators were appointed from the ranks of doctors. Today hospital administrators are trained -- in the same universities that do not have courses to train university administrators.

Inquiries disclosed that small items that irritated students could have been resolved by proper administrative techniques before they were allowed to fester into major proportions of illness on the campus. Sometimes this involved no more than an adjustment in visiting hours in dormitories or other restrictive rules governing day to day campus life.

Therefore, we recommend that courses be established in university administration, with high student requirements and imaginative and creative leadership, patterned along the lines of the courses in hospital administration. The need, we feel, is urgent.

Universities are under the process of modernization. Once they are modernized, administrators must see to it that students are made thoroughly familiar with the new rules. Once that is done, they should be strictly enforced with no exceptions.
Students should take part in preparing those rules, and reasons for specific rules should be explained to them, but once the rules are in force, they should not be allowed to be broken or distorted in any way. In fairness, such rules could be reviewed in joint sessions with students, faculty and administrators, say, every four years.

Where rules affect student lives, living conditions or working (studying) conditions, students should have a right to have an input into the decisions that result in rules or policies. This leads to the conclusion that there should be more student representation on university committees. Bureaucratic obstacles to student participation on administrative committees must be eliminated as soon as possible.

Most universities and colleges today do not have strong or representative student governments. They are either ineffectual bodies that deal with trivia or reorganizations that have been taken over and dominated by radical elements which do not represent the viewpoints and desires of the majority of students.

We believe it is imperative that every university and college administration foster the development and growth of truly representative student government. These organizations can be of immense value in developing and implementing campus policies as well as providing a vital communications link with the entire student body.

We also recommend that there be specific criteria established for membership on university governing boards. Part of the criteria involves an understanding of all the local aspects and problems unique to that particular university, plus a proven capacity to make effective administrative decisions.
We further recommend that the governing boards of universities become more directly involved in university life and campus happenings. This leads us to recommend that meetings be established several times a year between students of the university and members of the governing board (regents, trustees, curators, etc.) at which all the problems as well as the programs of both students and governors would be discussed. Most students have never seen the governors or trustees of their universities.
Recommendations for the Faculties

Faculty members must cease being "remote intellectuals" and must assume leadership roles on campus. Too many faculty members are more concerned about their own teaching experience, research and writings, than they are about the real learning experience of their students. Faculty members are not counselling and guiding students as they did when classes were smaller and student bodies less massive.

The faculty should lead the way in getting students to make a greater input into curriculum, as well as into evaluation of faculty members and teaching standards. It must be admitted that too many faculty members use old notes, deliver the same old lectures and give the same old tests, that they have given for years. Student evaluations should be turned over to department heads and given consideration in the matter of promotions and salary adjustments.

While recognizing the need for tenure systems to protect the academic freedom of faculty members, it must also be realized that the application of tenure as it presently exists, protects the worst teachers along with the best and provides security to lazy and inept instructors.

We recommend that the American Association of University Professors immediately address itself to the problem with creation of a study committee charged with reporting back on alternatives within one year of its appointment. A suggestion is that there be an automatic review process of each tenured college-level teacher at period intervals, say five years.
Recommendations for Students

America is blessed with a generation of concerned and energetic college students. They are impatient, as young people usually are and always have been. Yet they have caused many older Americans to stop, think and reassess their own values. The American society, though it has not shown it well, is appreciative.

Perhaps because they are the children of a technologically-innovative and ever-changing society, they are more impatient than their immediate predecessors--perhaps the most impatient young people in history.

Their greatest failure is to comprehend that technological change does not necessarily go hand in hand with sociological change, and that without the technological achievements, sociological changes could not be considered except at costs that most would be unwilling to pay.

Their second failure is in the lack of understanding of problems that face faculty, administrators, government officials and business leaders.

As intemperate perfectionists, they do not realize that major changes cannot be wrought immediately, and that all systems operated by human beings are endowed with a wide margin of error and large element of failure.

One major problem is that most students do not view themselves as members of the total community but as something apart, with special and urgent demands. This viewpoint tends to be reinforced both by the outside world and by the university structure itself.

This attitude has fostered a situation where students preach activism yet do little themselves to become involved in meaningful activities that would lead to a genuine improvement in the conditions they object to.
Consistently, they have failed to exercise their rights in student bodies and on student committees. After struggling to get student representation on university committees, their attendance at the committee meetings has been exceedingly poor.

We strongly recommend that students take a more active role in the organizations that are open to them to effect the changes they want. New avenues and channels are not really the sole answer when they have the tools at hand to do the job.

The greatest vehicle for change on any campus could be the student government system. It should not be left by default to the extremist who does not represent the interest of the moderate majority, nor left to become a passive arm of an insensitive university administration. It is vital to students, faculty and administrators alike that student government be made into a meaningful and productive system.

We also recommend to university students that they establish student "Community Relations Councils," which would work closely with the citizens in the communities in which their campuses are located to help create a better place to live and work. This would help to make the university a part of the community rather than a secluded and inaccessible and segregated reservation.

On a final note, while being highly critical of a society that they describe as racist, divisive and uncommunicative, they, themselves, while on campus, gather into segregated groups. Blacks gather with blacks, Asians with Asians, athletes with fellow-athletes, Chicanos with Chicanos, etc. They feel they do not need a cross-dialogue, yet believe that matuer non-students do. We urge that the students themselves work toward a greater interaction among their own campus groups.
Recommendations for the News Media

We would not presume to tell the media how to operate their television or radio stations or newspapers and magazines, but feel it is necessary to tell the owners and operators of these facilities that the news media is held in extremely low esteem by students, faculties and administrators at the nation's colleges and universities.

Our research disclosed many incidents of exaggeration in the media of situations on campuses, and, in some cases, totally inaccurate stories.

We recommend that the media reassess its coverage of the campuses and, recognizing its great power and influence, reappraise its techniques as it applies to the universities and the young people on campus. In its own behalf it should seek to re-establish believability with the coming generation of leaders otherwise the "popular press" may be short-lived and die along with the older generation.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) Immediate appointment of a "Young People's Ombudsman" by the President of the United States to be the student's man in Washington and to establish a rapport between the nation's campuses and the White House.

(2) Appointment by the President of a high-level study commission, similar to the Hoover Commission to evaluate all aspects of higher education-tenure, financing, enrollment, curriculum, the role of the university in society, etc. - and to make recommendations for the complete overhaul of our college and university system.

(3) Re-establishment of a vigorous and truly representative form of student government which would play a major role in determining campus policies and formulating modern and relevant campus rules - rules that would be fully explained and strictly enforced.

(4) Establish as a new field of professional competence the role of college administrator - similar to that of hospital administrator - and backed by formal courses and degrees in this area.

(5) Establish specific criteria for membership on university governing boards (regents, trustees, etc.) and encourage a greater direct involvement on the part of these boards in campus life.
(6) Assumption by faculty members of a stronger role of leadership and guidance with students.

(7) Re-assessment by the news media of their coverage of campus activities with major efforts directed toward increasing their credibility with students, faculty and administrators alike through more accurate and professional journalistic techniques.