



A strike result: The Academic Council meets as 1,500 students look on.

— Photo by Dick Wesley

MSU Faculty News

Vol. 1, No. 28

May 19, 1970

Council OKs bylaw changes

Faculty bylaw changes that clear the way for expanded student participation in academic government are headed for the Academic Senate — after a year of writing and rewriting by two committees, and marathon debate and discussion in the Academic Council.

The Council last Friday completed its deliberations of bylaw revisions that will implement recommendations of the New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government.

The Academic Senate was originally scheduled to vote on the changes tomorrow (May 20), but the Council voted to postpone the meeting in order to give Senate members more time to consider the revised bylaws. This means that the Senate will meet in about two weeks, during the first week in June.

LIKE THE many previous meetings devoted to the question of student participation, last week's Council sessions (Tuesday and Friday) were long ones. But unlike earlier meetings, they were conducted on the floor of the Auditorium while students were able to view the proceedings from the balcony.

The attraction for students, however, was promise of Council discussion of a resolution concerning the campus strike action. Faced with the need to act on bylaw changes in time for the spring Senate meeting, Council members were interrupted occasionally on Tuesday by student galleries impatient for the Council to turn its attention to the strike issues.

An estimated 1,500 students were on

(Continued on page 4)

Mass rallies turn to meetings; Council, trustees hear issues

The rallies were few, but the meetings were many last week, as the student - faculty strike continued on campus.

A rally Monday at Beaumont Tower involved the reading of a statement of the student strike steering committee (now the strike coordinating committee), and encouragement of the 2,000 to 3,000 in attendance to join the committee representatives in a meeting that afternoon with President Clifton R. Wharton Jr. (President Wharton had requested that five members of the strike committee meet with him and representatives of anti - strike groups.)

Rallies Wednesday and Thursday preceded the two marches to the State Capitol.

Meetings, however, were more predominant. There was the meeting of the Administrative Group Monday morning, at which time the strike was discussed. There were the strike committee meetings with President Wharton and Provost John Cantlon Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. There were Academic Council meetings Tuesday and Friday, Board of Trustees meetings Thursday and Friday. There were meetings of the Faculty - Graduate Assistants Strike Committee Tuesday, Thursday and last night (Monday). And the many meetings of the various

student groups and the student strike coordinating committee.

Results of those meetings:

The Council:

ABOUT 1,500 spectators, including students and faculty, sat in the balcony of the Auditorium last Tuesday while the Council members deliberated on amendments to the Academic Freedom Report, the faculty bylaws, and, briefly, on a resolution which basically reaffirmed academic freedom and "freedom of conscience."

By the time that resolution was presented by student members Terry Sullivan and David Snyder — more than two hours after the meeting convened — more than half the members of the gallery had left.

Miss Sullivan and Snyder, whose presentation had been allowed through amendment of the agenda, first asked

several questions of President Wharton and Provost Cantlon:

Q. In reference to President Wharton's statement of May 11, 1970, regarding minority student enrollment, may we assume that existing educational services for minority students are deficient?

Wharton: Yes.

Q. Are they deficient because of a lack of money?

Wharton: Partly, but it would also involve a re-direction of the University's available resources.

Q. If students voted a fee of, say, \$1 a term, for \$30,000 (total), would this have effect?

Wharton: There is no question that this would be significant.

Q. Who has ultimate control over state police?

Wharton: The governor.

Q. Who sends them to campus?

Wharton: A University request, or if the governor decides it is necessary.

(Continued on page 2)

A strike analysis: Alternatives to 'business as usual' on campus

Associate Editor Beverly Twitchell has attended many rallies and meetings concerning the student - faculty strike, including meetings of the Faculty - Graduate Assistants Strike Committee, the Academic Council, the Board of Trustees, the meetings of student groups — both pro - and anti - strike — with President Wharton. She has also talked with individuals both opposed to and in support of the strike. Based on those dialogues, the following is her analysis of the strike.

Although we have seen resolutions coming forth from the top deliberative bodies of this University — the Academic Council and the Board of Trustees — which pertain to the now two - week - old student - faculty strike, it is difficult to determine on the surface what has actually been resolved.

That problem has at least two bases:

- (1) The question of definitions of such terms as "strike," "business as usual" and "shut it down," a problem which has lent itself to views of the strike as an end in itself rather than as a means; and
- (2) the evolution of the strike.

It should be understood that regardless of talk of the strike dying, it is still in effect. Attendance last week, according to figures gathered by the deans for the provost's office, was still about 15 percent below normal, which translates into more than 5,000 students still staying out of class. And there are students and faculty who have said they will remain on strike through at least the end of the term, regardless of what becomes of the strike as an entity in itself.

For that reason, and because of the definition - problem, the stated purpose

of at least one administrator that he wants "to help end the strike," appears to be a pointless assumption.

When the strike began two weeks ago, its announced intention was to close the University, apparently to add the name of Michigan State University to the list of colleges and universities across the country in a show of strong discontent with national trends. (An announcement that Cornell University had shut down for the duration of the war drew cheers at an early rally.) Those national trends are reflected in the list of demands from the strikers, focusing primarily on the war in Southeast Asia, racism and repression. Local issues were added to the demand list shortly after the strike began.

(Continued on page 4)



The strike's week: A series of meetings

(Continued from page 1)

Q. Who could keep them from coming onto campus?

Wharton: I would have to check with an attorney. I'm not sure if we could keep them off.

Q. If there is no emergency, can they come here without your consent?

Wharton: I don't know if they can come if they're not called.

Q. If outside forces come in, can you or the trustees order them to disarm?

Wharton: I doubt it, but I could check with an attorney.

Q. Do the president and the trustees have the power to disarm the campus police?

Wharton: Yes.

Q. If disarmed, would they resign?

Wharton: They would.

Q. Rumor says that phone calls or letters have been sent out asking for names of faculty not in classes. Is this true?

Cantlon: No.

Q. What information are you requesting?

Cantlon: We need to make some internal assessment, so deans are providing an estimate of the percentage of normal attendance each day.

Q. Are there any orders to terminate contracts of non-tenured faculty on strike?

Cantlon: No, nor will they be, provided they continue to discharge their responsibilities.

AT THIS point, Snyder introduced the resolution, which reads:

"The Academic Council reaffirms:

"1) The right of faculty members to conduct classes, and of students to participate in those classes, without interference or disruption; 2) The right of every student to a satisfactory fulfillment of the contract entered into at the beginning of the term; 3) The right of faculty members to dissent without jeopardizing their livelihood, and the right of students to dissent without jeopardizing their degree; 4) Freedom of conscience for all members of the academic community."

Discussion revolved around a point made by Herbert Garfinkel, dean of James Madison College, who said there was a "dilemma" between the points regarding the contractual agreement and "freedom of conscience."

Chitra Smith, assistant professor in James Madison, said that "dissent means opinion, disagreement, words. Under no circumstances would an academic institution worth its name dismiss a person for expressing his opinion."

Miss Sullivan said that "what goes on between a professor and his students is essentially private. There is no single way in which the contractual agreement can be met."

Another Council member pointed out that at any other time this resolution would not be debatable, since it reasserts academic freedom and the civil rights of members of the academic community.

A proposal from Charles Killingsworth, University professor of labor and industrial relations, was accepted as a friendly amendment to the resolution; it added as point 5 that the Council "requests its Educational Policies Committee to recommend policies regarding grades for students who absent themselves from class in order to exercise their right of dissent."

The resolution was passed unanimously.

* * *

FRIDAY'S Council meeting began with nearly an hour of debate over the agenda for the meeting. John Masterson, associate professor of mathematics, read a statement from the Faculty - Graduate

Assistants Strike Committee on the "unresponsiveness of President Wharton, and especially of the Academic Council," to the strike, and he told the Council members: "You need only look up in the gallery to realize how irrelevant we have become to the student body on this campus." (Only about 100 persons, again including both students and faculty, were in the balcony.)

Garfinkel responded that the Council "has not been the kind of body responsive to the kind of pressures he (Masterson) wishes it to be responsive to," and that the Council "is not merely a responsive body, but also reflective and deliberative, which is more appropriate than rallies, slogans, buttons and confrontations."

Masterson responded by pointing out that "anyone who has watched the student demonstrations will realize there were no real faculty leaders. The students are very upset, rightfully angry people, by all of our willingness to continue business as usual."

The only action of the Council directly relating to the strike was passage (with only four voting negatively) of a series of premises, guidelines and recommendations from the Educational Policies Committee which allows more flexibility in grading for this term only. (The EPC recommendations are reprinted elsewhere in the Faculty News.)

The Trustees:

Representatives who had met with President Wharton Monday through Wednesday were allowed to make presentations to the Board of Trustees at its Thursday night meeting.

Rick Kibbey, chairman of the student strike steering committee said the strikers "feel there are ongoing concerns that aren't being adequately dealt with - with the resources the University has to offer. There are certain resources and talent we'd like to use, to divert to the basic issues which are tearing the country apart."

Trustee Warren Huff asked Kibbey how the University could help regarding the Indochina war. Kibbey answered: "The kind of education pursued, the kind of teaching being done here generally doesn't bear sufficiently on the war. The University does have a point of view regarding the war; it has committed some of its resources and talents to helping set up the Diem government, for instance. Right now the problem is ending the war . . . There is a need to free the abilities and talents of the faculty and students to help solve the problems . . . There are a lot of ideas here, and they need to be tapped . . . We need to quit dealing with the rituals of education and turn to the issues around us."

Janice Goldman of the Radical Caucus pointed out that the caucus, a coalition of groups such as Students for a Democratic Society, Weathermen, Workers Opposition, Gay Liberation Front, Committee to Abolish ROTC and a group of anarchists and Social Democrats, has "no group tactics; we are loosely knit. Any actions taken are not as a large group, but by members of factions of our coalition."

Ric Coglianese, representing the Committee to Attend Classes, told the trustees: "The University shouldn't be a scapegoat of one power play or another. Strikers have gotten to people on campus, but not to those in the legislature, or to those off campus. They haven't educated anyone off the campus." He also said the strike had

denied some "some people . . . free choice regarding classes."

Erik Mettala, representing the Michigan Student Association and Students for Rational Action, said: "The seven basic strike demands have some degree of validity, but the University is not in a position to honor them . . . Strikers are using the University to take a political stand. But the institution can't speak for all of its units or elements . . . Despite aims and goals of strikers, violence, intimidation and disruption have taken place."

Harold Buckner, chairman of ASMSU, said: "The strike has focused on issues and underscored the notion that channels weren't working. Its success can be measured not in terms of how many are out of class, but on the issues raised: People are discussing these issues . . . The strike has actually enhanced the instructional processes of the University. It has not faulted, not damaged the University, although it may have disturbed it somewhat."

Terry Sullivan, student representative to the Academic Council, told the Trustees there are two structural problems that they could do something about: Lack of student knowledge about the channels; and the slow operation of the channels.

Basic University documents are difficult to obtain, she said, including the Academic Freedom Report and the faculty bylaws. The bylaws, she pointed out, provide for only faculty approaching the steering committee, which sees the agenda for the Academic Council and Senate, thus when she, a student, appeared before the steering committee, she was doing so illegally.

"Constitutionally," she said, "the channels do not work effectively. Students are almost systematically excluded . . . The Academic Council wants to be a deliberative body, but doesn't want to deliberate. It meets just once a month."

The agenda is prepared in advance, so pressing issues can't be discussed," she said. "Students need a chance to use the channels."

Norman Pollack, professor of history, presented a representative view of the Faculty - Graduate Assistants Strike Committee. He said he was continuing to meet classes, but in his home; he is "defying technicality" - of meeting in an appointed place at an appointed time. And he said he was finding it to be "a more exciting learning experience," where he and his students felt free and were working harder.

Peter Flynn, chairman of the Council of Graduate Students, said he sees the University as "an organic entity, constantly growing, not physically, but in intellectual space. Its students, its products (and the assembly-line mode is with us here), help perpetuate the society around it, a society whose priorities are questionable."

Students, he said, "are dissatisfied, disillusioned; we want to effect change, with you, not as adversaries. We want more control over our lives. I'm not here biding my time until I get my credentials, and then go out and effect change."

The contribution the University can make, he said, involves an individual decision. "We're talking about options, opening things up."

But response, he said, "is not only a listening process, it also involves an action process."

The response of the Board took the form of a resolution, passed

unanimously at its Friday morning meeting. It states:

"The Board of Trustees listened with great interest to a wide range of views from students and faculty regarding the current situation on the Michigan State campus. While we, as individuals, may agree or disagree with the various arguments presented, we respect the views and the concerns of those who appeared before us. None advocated closing down the University."

"Our obligation, as the elected governing body of a public institution of higher education, is to provide educational opportunities for those who attend the University. The Board believes the University must be responsive to constructive change in a changing society and flexible in its methods of dealing with the concerns of students and faculty. If change is to come from demonstrated need and is to lead to specific objectives, it must be achieved through a rational decision-making process. Opportunities to debate the issues are part of that process."

"The Board commends President Wharton for his leadership of the University during this difficult period and supports his May 11 statement on the issues. We believe he has been sympathetic to the legitimate concerns of students and faculty, demonstrating a willingness to move as rapidly as possible toward objectives which can be attained, while maintaining the integrity of Michigan State as a public university."

THE FACULTY - Graduate Assistants Strike Committee's attempt to hold a discussion of the eight issue - demands last Tuesday was aborted by the desire of most of the 150 to 200 people there to break up into committees to begin working on specific projects. The committees are concerned with: Dorm speakers, communications, grading, Critical University, issues, and police (to study the question of disarming police).

Only about 35 persons attended a Thursday evening meeting of the Faculty - Graduate Assistants Strike Committee. At that time, the group approved the writing of a statement concerning what it considered the unresponsiveness of President Wharton and the Academic Council to the strike. Charles Larowe, professor of economics, resigned as steering committee chairman, and the steering committee was to have been expanded at a meeting last night (Monday). The group also established a bail fund.

THE MEETINGS with President Wharton and the representatives from various strike or anti-strike groups had no specific results. In answer to some questions, however, President Wharton said he would make a statement concerning his individual opinion regarding assurances that striking students not be penalized or intimidated.

"If you think in your own consciences that you are acting appropriately," he said, "I don't think you ought to be penalized. But the decision does not rest with me."

Provost Cantlon also said he would make a statement on the same subject.

—BEVERLY TWITCHELL

Military hearing

The Military Education Advisory Committee will hold open hearings on the ROTC question this week in the Con - Con Room of the International Center. The sessions will be at 10 a.m. Wednesday (May 20) and at 3 p.m. Thursday (May 21).

A-P survey reveals some priorities

Results of a questionnaire sent to members of the University's Administrative - Professional Association show that a job security statement, salary improvement and better longevity pay head the list of priorities among those A-P personnel.

Also ranking high among 16 listed priorities were "vacancy notification to facilitate career progression and promotion," a study of the A-P classification system, guidelines on A-P jobs and classifications, an improved University life insurance program and employer - paid life insurance.

Rated number 11 in the priority list

was the need for sabbatical leaves. Assigned the lowest priorities were free parking, and free parking at football games for faculty and staff with permits.

The questionnaire generated responses from 147 persons, about half the membership of the A-P Association.

Respondents agreed overwhelmingly that the association should be represented on "policy - developing councils or committees" such as the Academic Council and committee on business affairs. They supported by 90-51 the notion that all A-P staff

should pay dues to the association, even if they "have not elected to join the association."

They were more evenly divided on whether the association should "be receptive to representing other groups of employees with compatible goals, purposes and policies." Seventy - five persons favored the idea; 64 were opposed.

* * *

AT THE association's annual meeting May 5, newly elected officers and executive board members were announced.

The new vice president is Charles (Bud) Doane, director of the Overseas Support Office. He won over incumbent Paul Rumpsa, University comptroller. Mrs. Doris McNitt, administrative assistant to the dean of social science, was unopposed for a second term as secretary.

LaMott F. Bates, assistant director of the Personnel Center, and Robert Piersma, assistant director of financial aids, were elected to the executive board.

Elections for president and treasurer of the group will be held next spring.

Spring grading policies

(The following ad hoc recommendations on grading were presented by the Educational Policies Committee and adopted May 15 by the Academic Council.)

PREMISES: 1. The responsibility for evaluation and certification through grades lies entirely with the instructor (Academic Freedom Report 2.1.4.9); 2. Fair and equitable evaluation and certification must be extended to all students of the University; 3. Grades should not be used to either penalize or reward a student on the basis of a decision to dissent or not dissent.

GUIDELINES: (The Educational Policies Committee recommends that certain constraints on the use of the following grades be removed for spring term, 1970, with no precedent for future action. Use of these expanded options should be at the request of the student, subject to the approval of the instructor. Decisions should be recorded in writing.)

1. The P-N (Pass - No Grade) system of grading be extended to any course in the University. Present regulations restrict the use to courses, usually field work, which are not amenable to numerical grading. Extension of P-N grading is more desirable than use of Cr - Nc, which is limited to 30 credits, student choice, one course per term and requires the instructor to post a numerical grade.

2. The use of INC (Incomplete) be broadened. Present regulations restrict this grade to students who have completed the class work but are unable to take the final examination and have completed at least eight weeks of the term, have done satisfactory work and can complete the work without repeating the course in class. "Broadened" is interpreted to mean the elimination of all constraints other than having done satisfactory work.

3. The drop period with N (No Grade) be extended to the end of the term through the use of the late drop card. Present regulations do not permit drops after the middle of the term except in special cases such as correcting errors in registration or catastrophic events. Approval would eliminate all restrictions other than certification by the instructor of a grade.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Instructors be encouraged to permit the students to do outside work in lieu of class attendance to establish a grade wherever possible; instructors be encouraged to provide special examinations to establish a course grade wherever possible; instructors be discouraged from giving blanket grades in courses since this procedure is discriminatory; instructors accept the responsibility to make themselves available for consideration of student requests for the above guidelines and recommendations.



Killingsworth



McKee



Meites



Whitehair



Wood



Witt

Distinguished Faculty Awards

The Distinguished Faculty Award, presented since 1952, is given "for outstanding contributions to the intellectual development of the University." Each recipient gets \$1,000. This year's winners: Charles C. Killingsworth, University professor of labor and industrial relations; James

B. McKee, professor of sociology and James Madison College; Joseph Meites, professor of physiology; Charles K. Whitehair, professor of pathology; Lawrence W. Witt, professor of agricultural economics; and Willis A. Wood, professor of biochemistry.



Bruno



Cafagna



Harman



Kelly



Lanier



Trosko

Teacher-Scholar Awards

The Teacher-Scholar Award, for "devotion and skill in undergraduate teaching," goes to instructors and assistant professors who have served at least three terms but not more than five academic years. The recipients each awarded \$1,000, are: Frank B. Bruno, elementary and special

education; Albert C. Cafagna, philosophy and Justin Morrill College; Jay R. Harman, geography; Kevin D. Kelly, sociology; Perry E. Lanier, elementary and special education; and James E. Trosko, natural science and human development.



Carter



Evans



Greenlaw



Horton



Knight



Murphy

Excellence-in-Teaching

The Excellence - in - Teaching Award, given to graduate assistants who have been half - time assistants for at least two terms, is for "care and skill in meeting classroom responsibilities." It includes \$500. The winners: Reginald C. Carter, sociology and labor and industrial relations;

Clyde M. Evans, physics; Marilyn Jean Greenlaw, elementary and special education; Dirk M. Horton, astronomy, and Science and Mathematics Teaching Center; Carl E. Knight, poultry science; and Paul Murphy, mathematics.

AAUP letter seeks salary action

In an open letter to the Board of Trustees released last week, the council of the MSU chapter of the AAUP has urged the Board to act on two recommendations endorsed last month by the Academic Council: Raise retirement benefits for faculty already retired or who will retire under the "old system;" provide a 20.7 per cent average increase for faculty effective July 1.

The letter, signed by AAUP President Jack Stieber (chairman of labor and industrial relations), acknowledges the

problem faced annually by the Board in "trying to tailor the University budget to the inadequate appropriations provided by the Legislature." But it adds that if the full 20.7 per cent increase cannot be granted this year, the Board should, "in addition to granting a substantial increase over and above the rise in the cost of living, make a firm commitment to add the remainder of the increase called for in 1971-72."

The letter also asks the Board, in searching for funds for faculty salaries,

to "consider using money now being expended for non - essential, non - academic activities before considering any reductions in funds for teaching, research and other academic pursuits."

Mideast session

A symposium dealing with the problems in the Middle East will be held this Saturday and Sunday (May 23 and 24) in Rooms 38 - 39 of the Union. Sessions on both days begin at 1 p.m.

MSU Faculty News

Editor: Gene Rietfors
Associate Editor: Beverly Twitchell
Editorial Office: 296-G Hannah Administration Building, Michigan State University, East Lansing 48823, Phone 355-2285.

Published weekly during the academic year by the Department of Information Services.
Second-class postage paid at East Lansing, Mich. 48823.

The strike's week: A series of meetings

(Continued from page 1)

Q. Who could keep them from coming onto campus?

Wharton: I would have to check with an attorney. I'm not sure if we could keep them off.

Q. If there is no emergency, can they come here without your consent?

Wharton: I don't know if they can come if they're not called.

Q. If outside forces come in, can you or the trustees order them to disarm?

Wharton: I doubt it, but I could check with an attorney.

Q. Do the president and the trustees have the power to disarm the campus police?

Wharton: Yes.

Q. If disarmed, would they resign?

Wharton: They would.

Q. Rumor says that phone calls or letters have been sent out asking for names of faculty not in classes. Is this true?

Cantlon: No.

Q. What information are you requesting?

Cantlon: We need to make some internal assessment, so deans are providing an estimate of the percentage of normal attendance each day.

Q. Are there any orders to terminate contracts of non - tenured faculty on strike?

Cantlon: No, nor will they be, provided they continue to discharge their responsibilities.

AT THIS point, Snyder introduced the resolution, which reads:

"The Academic Council reaffirms:

"1) The right of faculty members to conduct classes, and of students to participate in those classes, without interference or disruption; 2) The right of every student to a satisfactory fulfillment of the contract entered into at the beginning of the term; 3) The right of faculty members to dissent without jeopardizing their livelihood, and the right of students to dissent without jeopardizing their degree; 4) Freedom of conscience for all members of the academic community."

Discussion revolved around a point made by Herbert Garfinkel, dean of James Madison College, who said there was a "dilemma" between the points regarding the contractual agreement and "freedom of conscience."

Chitra Smith, assistant professor in James Madison, said that "dissent means opinion, disagreement, words. Under no circumstances would an academic institution worth its name dismiss a person for expressing his opinion."

Miss Sullivan said that "what goes on between a professor and his students is essentially private. There is no single way in which the contractual agreement can be met."

Another Council member pointed out that at any other time this resolution would not be debatable, since it reasserts academic freedom and the civil rights of members of the academic community.

A proposal from Charles Killingsworth, University professor of labor and industrial relations, was accepted as a friendly amendment to the resolution; it added as point 5 that the Council "requests its Educational Policies Committee to recommend policies regarding grades for students who absent themselves from class in order to exercise their right of dissent."

The resolution was passed unanimously.

* * *

FRIDAY'S Council meeting began with nearly an hour of debate over the agenda for the meeting. John Masterson, associate professor of mathematics, read a statement from the Faculty - Graduate

Assistants Strike Committee on the "unresponsiveness of President Wharton, and especially of the Academic Council," to the strike, and he told the Council members: "You need only look up in the gallery to realize how irrelevant we have become to the student body on this campus." (Only about 100 persons, again including both students and faculty, were in the balcony.)

Garfinkel responded that the Council "has not been the kind of body responsive to the kind of pressures he (Masterson) wishes it to be responsive to," and that the Council "is not merely a responsive body, but also reflective and deliberative, which is more appropriate than rallies, slogans, buttons and confrontations."

Masterson responded by pointing out that "anyone who has watched the student demonstrations will realize there were no real faculty leaders. The students are very upset, rightfully angry people, by all of our willingness to continue business as usual."

The only action of the Council directly relating to the strike was passage (with only four voting negatively) of a series of premises, guidelines and recommendations from the Educational Policies Committee which allows more flexibility in grading for this term only. (The EPC recommendations are reprinted elsewhere in the Faculty News.)

The Trustees:

Representatives who had met with President Wharton Monday through Wednesday were allowed to make presentations to the Board of Trustees at its Thursday night meeting.

Rick Kibbey, chairman of the student strike steering committee said the strikers "feel there are ongoing concerns that aren't being adequately dealt with - with the resources the University has to offer. There are certain resources and talent we'd like to use, to divert to the basic issues which are tearing the country apart."

Trustee Warren Huff asked Kibbey how the University could help regarding the Indochina war. Kibbey answered: "The kind of education pursued, the kind of teaching being done here generally doesn't bear sufficiently on the war. The University does have a point of view regarding the war; it has committed some of its resources and talents to helping set up the Diem government, for instance. Right now the problem is ending the war . . . There is a need to free the abilities and talents of the faculty and students to help solve the problems . . . There are a lot of ideas here, and they need to be tapped . . . We need to quit dealing with the rituals of education and turn to the issues around us."

Janice Goldman of the Radical Caucus pointed out that the caucus, a coalition of groups such as Students for a Democratic Society, Weathermen, Workers Opposition, Gay Liberation Front, Committee to Abolish ROTC and a group of anarchists and Social Democrats, has "no group tactics; we are loosely knit. Any actions taken are not as a large group, but by members of factions of our coalition."

Ric Coglianese, representing the Committee to Attend Classes, told the trustees: "The University shouldn't be a scapegoat of one power play or another. Strikers have gotten to people on campus, but not to those in the legislature, or to those off campus. They haven't educated anyone off the campus." He also said the strike had

denied some "some people . . . free choice regarding classes."

Erik Mettala, representing the Michigan Student Association and Students for Rational Action, said: "The seven basic strike demands have some degree of validity, but the University is not in a position to honor them . . . Strikers are using the University to take a political stand. But the institution can't speak for all of its units or elements . . . Despite aims and goals of strikers, violence, intimidation and disruption have taken place."

Harold Buckner, chairman of ASMSU, said: "The strike has focused on issues and underscored the notion that channels weren't working. Its success can be measured not in terms of how many are out of class, but on the issues raised: People are discussing these issues . . . The strike has actually enhanced the instructional processes of the University. It has not faulted, not damaged the University, although it may have disturbed it somewhat."

Terry Sullivan, student representative to the Academic Council, told the Trustees there are two structural problems that they could do something about: Lack of student knowledge about the channels; and the slow operation of the channels.

Basic University documents are difficult to obtain, she said, including the Academic Freedom Report and the faculty bylaws. The bylaws, she pointed out, provide for only faculty approaching the steering committee, which sees the agenda for the Academic Council and Senate, thus when she, a student, appeared before the steering committee, she was doing so illegally.

"Constitutionally," she said, "the channels do not work effectively. Students are almost systematically excluded . . . The Academic Council wants to be a deliberative body, but doesn't want to deliberate. It meets just once a month."

The agenda is prepared in advance, so pressing issues can't be discussed," she said. "Students need a chance to use the channels."

Norman Pollack, professor of history, presented a representative view of the Faculty - Graduate Assistants Strike Committee. He said he was continuing to meet classes, but in his home; he is "defying technicality" - of meeting in an appointed place at an appointed time. And he said he was finding it to be "a more exciting learning experience," where he and his students felt free and were working harder.

Peter Flynn, chairman of the Council of Graduate Students, said he sees the University as "an organic entity, constantly growing, not physically, but in intellectual space. Its students, its products (and the assembly-line mode is with us here), help perpetuate the society around it, a society whose priorities are questionable."

Students, he said, "are dissatisfied, disillusioned; we want to effect change, with you, not as adversaries. We want more control over our lives. I'm not here biding my time until I get my credentials, and then go out and effect change."

The contribution the University can make, he said, involves an individual decision. "We're talking about options, opening things up."

But response, he said, "is not only a listening process, it also involves an action process."

The response of the Board took the form of a resolution, passed

unanimously at its Friday morning meeting. It states:

"The Board of Trustees listened with great interest to a wide range of views from students and faculty regarding the current situation on the Michigan State campus. While we, as individuals, may agree or disagree with the various arguments presented, we respect the views and the concerns of those who appeared before us. None advocated closing down the University."

"Our obligation, as the elected governing body of a public institution of higher education, is to provide educational opportunities for those who attend the University. The Board believes the University must be responsive to constructive change in a changing society and flexible in its methods of dealing with the concerns of students and faculty. If change is to come from demonstrated need and is to lead to specific objectives, it must be achieved through a rational decision-making process. Opportunities to debate the issues are part of that process."

"The Board commends President Wharton for his leadership of the University during this difficult period and supports his May 11 statement on the issues. We believe he has been sympathetic to the legitimate concerns of students and faculty, demonstrating a willingness to move as rapidly as possible toward objectives which can be attained, while maintaining the integrity of Michigan State as a public university."

THE FACULTY - Graduate Assistants Strike Committee's attempt to hold a discussion of the eight issue - demands last Tuesday was aborted by the desire of most of the 150 to 200 people there to break up into committees to begin working on specific projects. The committees are concerned with: Dorm speakers, communications, grading, Critical University, issues, and police (to study the question of disarming police).

Only about 35 persons attended a Thursday evening meeting of the Faculty - Graduate Assistants Strike Committee. At that time, the group approved the writing of a statement concerning what it considered the unresponsiveness of President Wharton and the Academic Council to the strike. Charles Larrowe, professor of economics, resigned as steering committee chairman, and the steering committee was to have been expanded at a meeting last night (Monday). The group also established a bail fund.

THE MEETINGS with President Wharton and the representatives from various strike or anti-strike groups had no specific results. In answer to some questions, however, President Wharton said he would make a statement concerning his individual opinion regarding assurances that striking students not be penalized or intimidated.

"If you think in your own consciences that you are acting appropriately," he said, "I don't think you ought to be penalized. But the decision does not rest with me."

Provost Cantlon also said he would make a statement on the same subject.

—BEVERLY TWITCHELL

Military hearing

The Military Education Advisory Committee will hold open hearings on the ROTC question this week in the Con - Con Room of the International Center. The sessions will be at 10 a.m. Wednesday (May 20) and at 3 p.m. Thursday (May 21).

Analysis: Seeking alternatives

(Continued from page 1)

But the phrase "no business as usual" provides perhaps a more accurate perspective on the purpose of the strike now than the phrase "shut the University down." The strike is a call for a moratorium — more than one - day deal — on "business as usual," on what the strikers seem to feel is complacent preoccupation with isolated daily routine. They want to focus, instead, on the national concerns reflected in the demands, or to at least provide more than usual attention to these national concerns, depending upon the individual's choice of action.

In the context of this University, that has come to mean for some students a preference for various kinds of activity — Justin Morrill College's teach - out to conduct a dialogue with Lansing area residents on the issue - demands; research and canvassing for peace and civil rights candidates for Congress; research for and work toward an economic boycott, etc. — over their routine of classes and course work.

To them it has become a matter of, to paraphrase how some have put it, "not biding my time, waiting until I leave here before I involve myself with the issues of today's society."

It was in the dialogues with President Wharton and student representatives of both pro - and anti - strike groups that the evolution of the strike was most clearly articulated — in the expression by strikers of their desire for the option to carry out actions they believe to be socially and politically educational, while not banning students who choose to go to class from doing so.

Students who have been picketing classroom buildings have been trying, in most cases, to discuss both the issues and the validity of the strike as they see it, rather than trying to keep students out of classes. This again illustrates the difference between this strike and a traditional labor strike, where picketers block entrances.

Also articulated throughout the strike, particularly by striking faculty members, was the idea that the strike activities are educational and should be recognized as such.

So a concern for amnesty became not only (and perhaps not necessarily) concern for avoiding mass martyrdom, but a concern for educational options. The resolutions of the Board of Trustees and the Academic Council address themselves at least to this issue and become direct — and even positive — responses to the strike.

(The trustees' resolution stated in part that "The Board believes the University must be responsive to constructive change in a changing society and flexible in its methods of dealing with the concerns of students and faculty." The Academic Council resolutions provided for an alternative grading system for this term and a study into altering the 1970 - 71 academic calendar to allow a vacation period preceding November elections.)

But has that response been to the strike as an end in itself, or as a means to an end? Or, if the strike has become

both of these, is the question irrelevant?

If indeed the University cannot respond directly to the stated ends of the strike — solution of the problems issued forth in the demands — then the resolutions we have seen passed by the Academic Council and the trustees might be all that can be expected from these institutional voices.

Many of the strikers themselves seem to have been preoccupied with the strike as an end. Most — in fact, nearly all — the deliberations of the Faculty - Graduate Assistants Strike Committee have been concerned with the strike as an end, i.e. through the concern with grading options and alternative curricula, designed to allow more people to join the strike, to keep the strike alive.

And if the interpretation of the strike's evolution is correct — from a "shut it down" attitude, to an attitude of "open it up" through alternative actions allowed — then again, the Academic Council and the trustees resolutions would seem to have set a stage for working out specific details for allowing students and faculty to work in the alternative curriculum areas they choose. And the strike, then, must be deemed a success.

If however, there are those who choose to continue pressing President Wharton and the University administration for specific responses to the specific issues — if they cannot wait for the May 26 ROTC Academic Council meeting and President

Wharton's May 27 foreign policy address at the Johns Hopkins University commencement and the year - long study by the open admissions commission, and if they cannot accept President Wharton's May 11 response to the issues — then it is difficult to determine where the strike shall lead itself.

If the turn shall be toward the sort of confrontation seen Friday night (May 15) at Demonstration Hall, it should be pointed out that few of the strikers seem, at this point, to desire that sort of confrontation, particularly if it is to lead to police involvement and violence.

It should also be pointed out that the window - breaking disturbance at Dem Hall Friday night, which amounted to about \$200 damage, according to Richard Bernitt, director of public safety, was the first such incident of the strike. The incident of May 1, which resulted in several thousand dollars in damage, took place prior to the time that students went on strike.

In short, the strike (as an end) is being offered an alternative system in which to work, which should allow the strike (as a means) to become a working movement toward resolution of the strikers' demands. And this does not appear to be compromise so much as it appears to be a viable educational solution to the situation.

* * *

MISCELLANEOUS impressions:

After watching and listening to some

6,000 students debate — often hotly — the issues of the strike in the Auditorium for six hours May 7, with just one five - minute break and, for most, no dinner, the impression is strong that those striking students are involved as a matter of conscience and not for the lark of skipping classes and exams...

After listening to the words and seeing the self - containment of the crowd, the impression is also strong that anti - violence is an important assumption of the strike for, at least, the vast majority of the strikers...

The march to the State Capitol had several impressive moments...like the quiet of the crowd as it passed Sparrow Hospital, the relative self - containment of the crowd as at least two cars turned into the marchers (one of which resulted in the treatment of at least 17 marchers at Lansing area hospitals), and the soft singing words, heard so often before, of "All we are saying is give peace a chance," and the fact that although at least 10,000 persons gathered on the Capitol lawn, not one tulip was damaged...

The many office workers, watching the march from their several - story office buildings, left this person wondering if this was the "silent majority," and if, in their silence, they were objecting to or supporting the demonstration of concern they were witnessing. But silence says nothing...

Bylaw changes approved . . .

(Continued from page 1)

hand Tuesday when the Council began deliberations of the revised bylaws. But on Friday by the time the group adjourned at about 7 p.m., fewer than a dozen onlookers were scattered in the balcony.

Only minor changes were made in the bylaw revisions as offered by an ad hoc committee headed by Sam S. Baskett, professor of English. Now ready for Senate action, the bylaws package provides for increased student (voting) membership on the Council and on Council standing committees, and it specifies representation for minority students. It also extends voting privileges to all Council members except the presiding officer.

THE MAJOR obstacle in last week's meetings came not in discussion of the bylaws themselves, but in consideration of amendments to articles 2, 5 and 7 of the Academic Freedom Report.

The issue was faculty control over matters that some said pertained exclusively to faculty.

Article 7.1.4 of the freedom report says, in part: "Proposed amendments (to the report) shall not become operative without approval of the University Faculty - Student Affairs Committee, the Academic Council and the Board of Trustees."

Charles C. Killingsworth, University professor of labor and industrial relations, and a leading opponent of many points in the student participation report, said that the section gave veto power to three groups, "but on none of these is there a majority of faculty members."

He moved to add the Elected Faculty Council to the list of groups having power to approve amendments to the freedom report. He contended that some sections of the report center exclusively on faculty rights and responsibilities.

Killingsworth and Chitra Smith,

assistant professor in James Madison College, argued that adding the Elected Faculty Council would merely restore symmetry to the process of amending the freedom report.

But James McKee, professor of sociology and chairman of the committee on student participation, opposed the motion, calling it the reflection "of an overzealous concern for the opportunity of elected faculty to have dominant power."

He said that to view various campus bodies as veto groups was to foster the "politics of suspicion and mistrust, not of cooperation." And he said that adding the Elected Faculty Council would make the amending process more cumbersome and would constitute a vote of "no confidence" in the student participants.

The Killingsworth amendment lost Tuesday by a vote of 30-28.

BUT THE ISSUE was revived at Friday's session — by McKee, who moved for reconsideration of all the previously passed amendments to the freedom report.

He acknowledged that his move was a

political one, but he said it was based on his belief that Tuesday's close vote on the Killingsworth amendment reflected major concern among faculty over the concept of adequate faculty protection. Such concern over that single point, McKee said, would jeopardize passage of the entire package of bylaw revisions in the Senate (which cannot rewrite or revise the bylaw changes, but can only send them back to the Council if it rejects them).

McKee emphasized that he was still opposed to the spirit of Killingsworth's amendment, but he said that reconsideration might improve chances for passage of the revised bylaws and thus demonstrate to students "that we are genuinely concerned for their participation."

The result of McKee's action was revision of article 7.1.2 of the Academic Freedom Report to insure that any proposed amendments that specifically refer to faculty professional rights and responsibilities must be approved by the Elected Faculty Council before they go to the Academic Council.

— GENE RIETFORS

. . . Freedom report revised

IN OTHER ACTION during its two meetings last week, the Academic Council:

— Approved revision of article 6 of the Academic Freedom Report, which prohibits University sponsorship of any student publication, and which clarifies policies and procedures for both student and University publications.

— Approved the amended article 4.1.2 of the freedom report to insure that no student accused of violating a regulation shall be suspended without a hearing under procedures outlined in the report.

— Adopted a resolution requesting the Education Policies Committee to "study the feasibility of rearranging the academic calendar for fall term, 1970,

to allow time for the academic community to work for candidates of their choice in the November election." Results of the study will be presented at the June Council meeting.

— Approved the statement on "policies and procedures on campus disturbances." The controversial point D of the report's policy statement was amended to read: "Finally, the University community recognizes that protest and dissent may be a part of growth and change in any social institution. However, violence and acts of destruction cannot be condoned." The amendment struck out references to agreements "made under duress" and to amnesty.

Family seminars

Walter Thomas, director of research and development for Combined Motivational and Educational Systems, Inc., Des Plaines, Ill., will speak Thursday (May 21) at 12:40 p.m. in Room 300, Home Economics Bldg. His appearance is part of the spring colloquy on "The Family: Perspectives for the Future," sponsored by the family and child sciences department. Thomas' topic will be "Changing Values and the Family."