

Draft

Robert D. Clark(Speech)

10-14-70

Introduction:

-- Problem of disruption and violence on campus of most concern to public.

I would like to make these observations:

1. I understand fully that the public will not - and should not - tolerate the violence, and that if the universities cannot control it, the public will--even, unfortunately, if the methods of public control may seriously injure or even destroy the University.
2. Further, I believe that the universities must control disruption and violence, or cease to function as universities. Above all, a university must be open to a free discussion of ideas. It cannot permit the impairment of that freedom by its own students. It must take the action necessary to protect that freedom -- whether that means the use of police force -- or the suspension or expulsion of some of its members or both.
3. Whatever action is taken, however, must likewise be protective of the rights of students -- which include the right to disagree, to dissent, to dramatize their dissent by demonstrations or protest, and the right, when they are accused, to a fair hearing.

4. The disciplinary procedures at the University last year were ineffective in two particulars: certain types of disruption were not covered in the otherwise excellent code of conduct and the court system was not adequate to the handling of large number of cases. The faculty, by legislation has now repaired both of these faults.
5. With the beginning of a new budget year, we have been able to effect some organizational changes that will strengthen the administration of the code. In addition, the Emergency Board has provided funds to augment our security force to provide for more effective investigation, assembling and presentation of evidence to the student courts.
6. The University code of conduct, from the time of its adoption eight or nine years ago, has made it clear that students will not be protected by the University if they are guilty of breaking the laws of the state or the municipality. This is not a matter of indifference or lack of compassion, but of equity in relation to non-university students and of the students' responsibility to the community at large.

I do not mean to suggest that these measures will stop student unrest, or disruption, or violence. Any more than criminal actions in the society at large can be stopped by the passing of laws. But they do give assurance that the University response will be appropriate, that it will not be a wringing of hands or a lamentation of excuses.

You may wish to ask me specific questions about our policies-- I shall be glad to try to answer them at the conclusion of my remarks. But for the next few minutes I should like to consider a larger context, to discuss issues on which we may join with the young to move constructively towards a better America.

You know that the primary target of protest has been the war in Indochina. I shall not discuss it directly other than to say this: our generation has no real perception of the depth of feeling of the young. We are hardened by the circumstances that have faced us these past thirty years (an entire generation): the brutalities of World War II, the ruthless bombing of London, the retaliatory bombing of Germany, the devastation of Pearl Harbor, the heroic but bloody battles of the Pacific, the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima

and Nagasaki, the terrors of the cold war, the rape of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, have insured us to the sufferings of war. Even those of us who are old enough to remember or close enough to the event to have read the accounts, have forgotten how horrified the Americans were when a German submarine sank the Lusitania with a loss of eleven hundred lives, one hundred and twenty-eight of them Americans. We have forgotten the sense of guilt the post-World War I generation felt over America's participation in that war; we have forgotten the dramatic anti-war sermons of Harry Emerson Fosdick and John Haynes Holmes, and hundreds of others, we have forgotten the anti-war talk of college students, the Oxford pledge never again to bear arms. We have all but forgotten that it was those feelings that the Communists played upon to swell the ranks of the American League against war and Fascism and other front organizations. We must remember if we are to understand the impassioned concern, the anguish, of the young.

But we must remember, also, and try to teach them from our own experiences, that we invite disaster and tragedy if we react to war by withdrawal into isolationism and weakness. It will not be easy for us to learn how to be strong and to use that strength wisely.

One other preliminary consideration: central to the issues I am going to discuss is the angry assertion or the haunting concern that a democratic government cannot manage the problems of a technological society. I believe that it can, but a growing number of the young--not yet large--doubt it. But if we are to manage the technological society, we must understand the dimension of the problems it creates, and grapple with them straight forwardly, even though the results may be painful -- they will be far less painful than our failure to act.

1. The first of these problems is one peculiar to the university, namely, the coercion to attend college. I am not sure that I understand or agree with Vice President Agnew when he asserted that many students are in college who do not belong there. But if he meant that many students who do not really want to attend college or university do so any way, then he is right. And it ought not be so.

The most obvious reason for the presence of unwilling students is the draft. I am pleased by President Nixon's publicly declared intent to end the draft but dismayed by his recent announcement that the end will not come before 1973. That means three more years of coerced attendance and consequent discontent for many young men. But there are other more subtle forms of coercion than the draft.

One of them is social prestige attached to a college degree. Parents are determined that their sons and daughters shall have a better life than they -- meaning a better income and greater recognition or prestige. Commendable, indeed, and understandable that they should force reluctant sons and daughters into college when that appears to be the only open avenue to higher achievement.

We have become a credentialed society and the indispensable credential is the college degree. Robert Hutchins's wry remark made a generation ago, that we could solve the problem by conferring the A.B. on everybody at birth is more relevant today than when he made it. The technological

society, of course, must have highly trained men and it must have means of identifying those who are qualified to meet the exacting demands. But the college degree is not the only mark of achievement. It is simply a convenient one, and because it is convenient it is frequently written into the job description whether it is necessary to the job or not. We need to find alternative ways of recognizing ability and achievement.

An even more coercive factor forcing reluctant young people into college, not at all subtle, but obscure nonetheless, is the unacknowledged need to keep young people out of the labor market. The drop-out is scorned; he ought to be allowed to work, encouraged to find himself on the job or in college. But our technological society is so productive that it is embarrassed by a wealth of consumer goods and a surplus of labor--or so we believe. We groan under the burden of seven million students in college and the prospect of ten million, but we would panic if half or a third of them, were suddenly placed on the labor market. In forty years of public exhortation, we have not been able to match our needs, such as housing, or improvement of the environment, or the minimal wants of the poor, with the reservoir of the unemployed or the reluctant student who wants to work. We have not

learned to manage our technological efficiency, to direct or distribute its products to the people who need them.

Radical students, and an increasing number who are not radical, say that we cannot do it in that the democratic society cannot manage technological change in the interests of humanity, that it treats its subjects, including the young, like stacks of IBM cards to be punched, sorted, and distributed. It is vain to say to them, as I have, that the Communist societies are far more manipulative and coercive, that they are frequently ruthless in their oppression of the individual. The young--or most of them--are not talking about the Communists; they are talking about their own country and its betterment. Some of them are persuaded that the only means to effective change is government control of enterprise--socialism.

I do not agree with them. I believe that the capitalist system is subject to control and direction, some of it self-imposed, for the benefit of the whole society as well as for the individual--without the imposition of a sterile bureaucracy, and without sacrificing the creative energy of the enterprise system. If we are going to improve the system for the dissatisfied young, the place to begin is to give high school graduates



alternate choices, and so long as the draft is in effect, one as free from or subject to the draft as the others.

One such alternate choice that has been widely suggested is that the federal government should require of every high school graduate two years of national service, either in the military or in such peace time enterprises as VISTA or the Peace Corps. I do not like the idea. The element of coercion remains. The young man who goes reluctantly to college might go quite as reluctantly to VISTA, with similar unhappy, and perhaps disruptive, results.

If the national service were voluntary, good. That could provide a meaningful outlet to many young people who are anxious to and capable of serving their fellow men.

A second possibility, open to you as businessmen, is to develop a rational plan, with a stipulated goal, to set aside a given number of positions in your businesses that would be available to young men and women who elect to join your firm. Not dead-end jobs, but jobs with a future; jobs that might require additional training, through independent study or organized courses; jobs that are matched to a man's ability and motivation, and not simply to the hours of college credit he has accumulated. We must

find a way that neither forces a young man or woman into college nor forever closes the door on his aspirations once they are awakened. There is no reason, in normal times, even in this small state why business should not provide for thousands of able young people who elect the job rather than college. But it will take concerted effort and careful planning--cooperation, like that of the National Alliance of Businessmen--or perhaps assistance from the state government in calling businessmen together to develop the plan.

You may say that I am dreaming, but the time has come when we must not only dream dreams, but convert the dreams into action.

A third possibility is to develop social service on the state level. The needs of our society are enormous--from preserving and restoring our incomparable natural environment to rescuing cities and towns from squalor and ugliness, to building low-cost housing, to rendering service to the needy. Costs money? Of course, but nothing compared to the loss of youthful energy and idealism in idleness or coerced attendance in the classroom. And if the costs are coolly calculated against the benefits, or even against the rising investment in higher education, the savings to the state might be considerable.

Let us plan big--not for the young, but with the young, and for our state and our country.

I would not for a moment have you think that I am denigrating the university. It is my life's blood. But learning is a pursuit, not a penalty. It ought to be sought, not imposed.