

"A free student"

LOGOS

"in a free university"

Vol. II No 5

● THE VOICE OF CSR ●

Mar. 8, 1966

PUBLISH AND PERISH

A frequent cry uttered by universities in recent years has been "publish or perish," put your ideas on the line. People have queried whether unpublished professors were as capable as their vocal colleagues. The silent men, so the argument goes, also may be inactive intellectually. At least we know what the vocal ones think. So the professorial staff has been goaded to publish: promotions, citations, and sundry forms of glory resting on productive, hopefully imaginative creations.

Juxtaposed against this squeezing of the intellectual grapes, however, are those who desire the city dry, e.g., the M.S.U. Board of Student Publications. Their working philosophy, evidenced by the rules they enact and enforce, can be summarized as "perish if you publish." Their business has been to restrict student publications and to quash independent publications (except large city newspapers and commercial magazines).

Within the last few years, a recurring plight has befallen those daring to be controversial. A series of articles by Mary Basing in the State News in 1961 describing the questionable practices of the Department of Public Safety and an East Lansing realtor resulted in restructuring the editorial system and the removal of the paper's advisor, Mr. George Hough, a professor in the school of journalism. The appointment of the present advisor, Mr. Louis Berman, occurred at that time. One might speculate whether anyone coming in on the eve of such an event could feel free to be liberal.

Even the mild-eyed State News consciously felt the pinch of the regulatory vice. Four editors, having previously overlooked censorship of all letters to the editor concerning the Schiff case (the case was regarded "too controversial"), walked out in protest when they were refused the right to print Schiff's rebuttal to the University's charges as had been planned.

While now The Paper, armed with ideas and a good set of eyes (a kinderance to anyone in a nearsighted university), has taken a stand on its own existence. And as before, the in loco parentis atmosphere with its red tape apron strings is successfully strangling The Paper's attempt to survive. The Paper cannot exist without funds, and it may not exist with advertising, doubly damned.

The Paper, however is not entirely without sustenance. It may beg for ten-cent donations to sell it would be against University policy. It may have fund drives and parties. (Note that this approach is not widely used by metropolitan newspapers!) In short, it may stumble along from issue to issue, hoping that by some fluke its readers will have "donated" enough money to keep the tape off its mouth...there is certainly no hope for financial stability.

But the issue is not whether one newspaper should survive. The issue is whether freedom of the press includes not only the freedom to speak, but the right to be heard, especially if the two are one and the same thing. The more particular issue is whether a university should encourage free discussion and creative inquiry. What is the essence of "publish or perish" if it is not to bring new ideas to the market, if it is not to broaden the scope of thought, if it is not to discover hidden or lightly veiled knowledge? If professors should be goaded, why shouldn't students? Ideas often get stale after years of suppression, and eyes become glassy.

● THE ANSWER ●

Thursday the Board of Student Publications will meet. Thursday The Paper will again seek permission to sell on campus. And Thursday, it is rumored, the students on the Board will make suggestions for improving the policy. As usual the air is being glittered with talk of re-evaluating systems, redefining systems, listing the components of systems and finally making new and grandiose systems, infallible and eternal.

Risking simplicity, one might suggest that the same system which has worked for metropolitan newspapers be extended to student publications, i.e., they should be allowed to sell on campus regardless of advertising and without editorial or advisory control. They should also be left to get out of their own scrapes. Recognizing however that even metropolitan newspapers have not been following the system (Secretary Breslin was not contacted for permission to sell), it might be pointed out that no serious incidents have occurred this far, so perhaps a system is not necessary. Only groups nurtured by the University are starving to death.

LOGOS

The Voice of CSR

Published by The Committee for Student Rights

P.O. Box 651

East Lansing, Michigan

Editor Martha Aldenbrand

ON THE RECURRENCE OF NIGHTMARES

In March 1938 a decision was handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case *Lovell v. city of Griffin*. The following is an excerpt of the opinion of the Court delivered by Chief Justice Hughes.

"The ordinance in its broad sweep prohibits the distribution of circulars, handbooks, advertising, or literature of any kind. It manifestly applies to pamphlets, magazines and periodicals. The evidence against appellant was that she distributed a certain pamphlet and a magazine called the "Golden Age." whether in actual administration the ordinance is applied, as apparently it could be, to newspapers does not appear. The City Manager testified that "everyone applies to me for a license to distribute literature in this City. None of these people (including defendant) secured a permit from me to distribute literature in the City of Griffin." The ordinance is not limited to literature that is obscene or offensive to public morals or that advocates unlawful conduct. There is no suggestion that the pamphlet or magazine distributed in the instant case were of that character. The ordinance embraces "literature" in the widest sense...

"We think that the ordinance is invalid on its face. whatever the motive which induced its adoption, its character is such that it strikes at the very foundation of the freedom of the press by subjecting it to license and censorship. The struggle for freedom of the press was primarily directed against the power of the licensor. It was against that power that John Milton directed his assault by his 'Appeal for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing.' And the liberty of the press became initially a right to publish without a license what could formerly be published only with one."

LOGOS

Vol. II No. 4

THE VOICE OF CSR

Nov. 16, 1965

THE QUESTION OF CHARTERS

The Student Board is again faced with a choice which, in essence, is no choice at all. It will decide within the next two weeks, its policy on issuing charters to organizations. Since, however, the "silent charter" of ASMSU binds it to the Administration's coattails, there is no real choice for the Board.

The new chartering proposal concerns itself with membership, local and national constitutions, faculty advisors, affiliations. By dissecting the problem into these categories it is easy to consider and criticize the value of each subproposal--and it is also easy to overlook the question of chartering as a whole. Why should we have a charter in the first place?

If charters are established to inventory the existing organizations on campus so an individual can be directed to clubs which interest him, charters may provide a beneficial secretarial service. If, however, they become the weapon of a censorship board, freedom on intellectual inquiry will be suppressed.

The proposed charter suppresses freedom. By requiring a group to submit its local and, if nationally affiliated its national constitutions, the Board is asserting that it has the right to decide whether or not certain ideas shall be discussed on campus. It is also attempting to decide what actions shall occur on campus. In short, it is trying to decide the future. By attempting to restrict future events, however, the Board will not only be protecting itself against some as yet unrealized evil, but in its paranoia it will also restrict growth. If we may do only that which we can predict in advance, why do anything? Why not just sit and know?

The proposed charter reeks with the in loco parentis attitude. An organization must have an academic advisor in order to be recognized--as if the significance of an issue increased whenever a faculty member was present. CSR feels that while faculty may add good ideas to a discussion, faculty are not necessary for a discussion. A charter might instead, suggest the benefits of a faculty advisor.

The proposed charter would also have us believe that the worth of an organization can be determined by the length of its membership list. If one-tenth of one percent of the University students join an organization, it can be recognized by the Student Board--excluding honoraries for which this restriction is waived. CSR feels all ideas are as honorable as honoraries, and if a group of individuals of any size feels the need to unite interests and ideas, they should be allowed recognition and the benefit of meeting together publicly.

Let us not allow attention paid to academic advisers and membership lists, however, keep us from the real question of the charter itself. In relation to the Constitution of the United States, a charter should not restrict freedom of speech or association. It should not block communication. Thus, recognition of any organization should not be based upon the goals or ideas expressed by that organization. Charters should remain secretarial services.

CSR can point out what the Constitution dictates, but essentially the Student Board is free to ignore the Constitution--unless some wealthy individual challenges it in court. We, therefore, must urge the Board not to try to "get away with" ignoring the Constitution, but rather to attempt to further the goals of the Constitution by putting the chartering system where it belongs--in the filing cabinet.

* LOGOS The Voice of CSR *
* P. O. Box 651 East Lansing, Michigan *
* or call 332-0959 *
* Martha Aldenbrand. editor *
* Gary Sommer. exec. secretary *
* *****

WHEN IS A STUDENT GOVERNMENT NOT A STUDENT GOVERNMENT? by Brian Keleher

This year the students of Michigan State University have been blessed with a new "student government"--the "Associated Students of Michigan State University." Beyond its title, however, one may wonder what ASMSU actually is. Most governing bodies at least pretend to be representative of those whom they govern. Why, then, has MSU failed to respect this criterion?

A student government should not be a vestigial appendage that is formed upon the establishment of any University and is inherited by every student body thereafter. A student government should indeed be the governing body of the students. With respect to this, the following points should be raised concerning the present so-called student government:

1. The ASMSU Student Board neither possesses nor seeks actual power to govern the student body and regulate student affairs. Its competency is mostly restricted to arrangements for such events as Homecoming and Water Carnival. Moreover, even in those matters which fall within its jurisdiction, Student Board cannot act without specific authorization from the respective sub-group of the University Administration.
2. ASMSU derives its support not from the student body, but from the Administration. It is able to exist financially only because the Administration levies a tax on its behalf on each student as he registers. It seems clear that ASMSU is well aware of who supports it, since it is far more sensitive to suggestions from the Administration than to ideas from the student body.
3. The members of the ASMSU Student Board are chosen in a highly undemocratic manner--the Student Board itself elects two of its members. That must be rather unusual among the world's major legislative bodies!
4. The Student Board commonly takes action on the matters which come before it without making any serious effort to ascertain the wishes of the student body--though they are, of course, very careful to find out the wishes of the Administration. The recent disaffiliation with the National Student Association is a case in point.

5. Many meetings of the Student Board which discussed relatively important issues are closed to the student body at the whim of the Board. (It might be pointed out that meetings of the CSR Coordinating Committee are open to all students and any student may speak--as a rule, they are also far better attended than meetings of the Student Board.)

6. Graduate students do not have even the fractional franchise in ASMSU that undergrads possess, but in some matters they are subject to its regulations; and decisions; an example is the area of student organizations.

The Committee for Student Rights is working to establish a democratically constituted student government, as defined in the CSR program, on this campus. It does not claim to be such a government, because it is not endowed with the power to govern. However, it might claim that, were the backing of the Administration withdrawn from ASLSU, a far larger base of student support would be found to belong to CSR than to ASMSU. Right now, it is clear that CSR possesses two attributes that ASMSU conspicuously lacks: democracy and freedom of action. The CSR Coordinating Committee is chosen by interested students (i.e., anybody who wishes to come and vote,) not by the inter-Fraternity Council, MHA, WIC, or other unrepresentative bureaucratic bodies. As for freedom of action, while CSR may lack the plush offices and paid secretaries that ASMSU enjoys, it also lacks the paid University Administrators breathing down its neck and telling it what it may discuss and decide.

CONFLICTING INTERESTS

Paul Schiff's hearing will continue Tuesday, Nov. 16. Having heard the University's testimony, he will now present his rebuttal. What is the University's testimony? What is Schiff's rebuttal? Conveniently, the Administration scheduled a closed hearing, so no-one may listen to the actual proceedings. Closed hearings are said to be in the interest of the student, yet when Schiff asked for an open hearing in his interest, it was denied. For everybody's interest, the charges against Schiff and his rebuttal will appear in ORGANO which is scheduled to go on sale Friday, Nov. 19.

Make folder
CSR

'I wanted to write of the transcendent importance of safeguarding and preserving intact all of our civil liberties, and of my deep conviction that whenever government infringes on any of these rights, it begins with the weak and the friendless, or the scorned and the degraded, or the nonconformist and the unorthodox.'

-Edward Bennett Williams

LOGOS

Vol II No 2

THE VOICE OF CSR

Oct. 13, 1965

OCT. 13, 1965

Campus
Committee
'65

THE NORMAL FLOW

Yesterday five students chose to take a dissenting stand against American foreign policy by declaring themselves against the war in Vietnam. They chose to air their views publicly by distributing literature in the Union, and by distributing it near a symbol of the war effort: A U.S. Marine recruiting booth.

CSR does not concern itself with international issues. It restricts itself to student-centered problems. These include the right of the minority to express itself. Yesterday five students were denied these rights.

Howard Harrison, Bert Halprin, Peter Hornbeck, Jim Dukarm and Fred Janvrin, members of the MSU Committee to End the War in Vietnam, began distributing material at 10 a.m., and were uninterrupted until about 3 p.m., when they were given 10 minutes to cease distribution.

The five continued to pass out their literature, and were subsequently placed under arrest by the campus police. Three of them "went limp", and were dragged to the police car, while the other two were escorted to the car.

At 5 o'clock yesterday evening the campus police chief made a public announcement: all were charged with violating a University distribution ordinance and the state trespassing law. The three who "went limp" were also charged with resisting arrest. All five spent the night in Ingham County jail, having refused bail.

THE UNIVERSITY'S DISTRIBUTION POLICY

Allegedly, the University ordinance prohibits distribution and display of material without prior authorization by "the University". However, as is well recognized by anyone who has attempted to find out what the regulations pertaining to distribution of literature are, they are nowhere clearly and fully defined. University distribution policy was clarified last spring, again last summer, and once again this fall. But major ambiguities still exist. There are apparently different rules governing different areas of the campus. Some rules are made by student groups like MHA, WIC and ASMSU; others by the University administration. Some are listed in student publications; others are mimeographed and filed in the drawers of deans. Some can be found at the campus police station; and others are mystically produced to fit the occasion.

Even if these rules, regulations and ordinances were grouped together and were easily accessible to students, we would still insist that they be in accordance with the first and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution.

** LOGOS: The Voice of CSR **
** PO Box 651 East Lansing, Mich. **
** Martha Aldenbrandeditor **
** Gary Sommerexec. secretary **

Moreover, the policy of a University should be to encourage free and diversified discussion of all issues, no matter how controversial. Hopefully we come to a University to be stimulated to think independently and creatively. Rules which hamper the free expression of ideas cannot possibly facilitate this goal. Why should any literature distributed in a public place like the Union have to be approved by anyone? What do we mean by a free society?

STUDENTS TRESPASS IN STUDENT UNION

Is it possible that MSU students were arrested on the charge of trespassing in the MSU student Union? The State of Michigan's trespassing law under which the five were arrested states in essence that no person shall interfere with the normal flow of business in a public building.

If the five interfered with the normal business of the Union (the Career Carnival?), who complained? Marine Corps recruiter, Captain John Dailey, said: "It doesn't bother us. We're not going to complain. Everybody has a right to be here." Who complained?

Moreover, who conducts the normal flow of business in the MSU student Union? Students or Marines?

IMPLICATIONS

The question is not whether the administration believes in free speech. The question is whether beneath the veneer of self-righteous platitudes the administration has any conception of the meaning of free speech. Experience has shown us the dichotomy between their words and actions: principles always give way to security and expediency.

RALL 4

WHAT IS
FREE
SPEECH

-- MORE DETAILS OF ARRESTS --

-- OPINIONS ON CRITICAL ISSUES --

WED OCT 13

BEAUMONT

' I wanted to write of the transcendent importance of safeguarding and preserving intact all of our civil liberties, and of my deep conviction that whenever government infringes on any of these rights, it begins with the weak and the friendless, or the scorned and the degraded, or the nonconformist and the unorthodox.'

-Edward Bennett Williams

LOGOS

Vol II No 3

THE VOICE OF CSR

Oct. 15, 1965

Michigan State University acted unlawfully by denying readmission to Paul Schiff. This was the decision handed down by the Federal district Court in Grand Rapids today. Ernest Mazey, executive secretary of the American Civil Liberties Union, said, "This is a landmark decision, in that for the first time a Michigan college or university has been judicially required to give a student a hearing before denying him the right to continue his education."

The importance of the Schiff case was further indicated by the fact that three federal judges presided over the hearing and all three participated in the decision. (Legally, one judge is sufficient.) The judges expressed the view that this case could have important nation-wide implications.

The spirit of the hearing may be summed up in an incident from the proceedings: Carr, the lawyer for Hannah and Fuzak, as an explanation for the position of the University, cited some long-standing laws in relation to the broad powers of universities over students. The court asked Carr to produce some more recent examples.

THE NORMAL FLOW

The official decisions of the court included: (1) to deny the University's motion to dismiss Schiff's suit, (2) to deny a temporary injunction to Schiff and instead to (3) instruct the University to send Schiff a list of particulars as to his denial for readmission within 10 days, (4) to instruct Schiff to reply to the list within 10 more days, (5) to instruct the University to hold a hearing to decide the adequacy of the denial of Schiff's readmission within the following 10 days, (6) to retain jurisdiction over the case for 90 days to insure these orders are carried out.

Today's decision puts the University in an awkward light: it must get specific. The ambiguous proclamations which it usually issues must become relevant and defensible. Paul Schiff must be found guilty of rules which were put into writing and which were available to the public. It cannot hide behind terms like "disruptive behavior."

In summarizing his reaction to the hearing, Paul Schiff said,

"I think the reason why the court did not grant a temporary injunction was to give the Administration a chance to save face. But there was clear implication that if the Administration did not change its present arbitrary ways, the federal courts would feel compelled to issue more severe orders than the one issued today."

Tuesday five students chose to take a dissenting stand against American foreign policy by declaring themselves against the war in Vietnam. They chose to air their views publicly by distributing literature in the Union, and by distributing it near a symbol of the war effort: A U. S. Marine recruiting booth.

CSR does not concern itself with international issues. It restricts itself to student-centered problems. These include the right of the minority to express itself. Yesterday five students were denied these rights.

Howard Harrison, Bert Halprin, Peter Hornbeck, Jim Dukarm, and Fred Janvrin, members of the MSU Committee to End the War in Vietnam, began distributing material at 10 A.M., and were uninterrupted until about 3 P.M., when they were given 10 minutes to cease distribution.

The five continued to pass out their literature, and were subsequently placed under arrest by the campus police. Three of them "went limp", and were dragged to the police car, while the other two were escorted to the car.

The 5 were charged with violating the following: a University distribution ordinance, a state trespassing law, and an ordinance prohibiting activities which interfere with the normal flow of the university, namely, "panty-raids". All five spent the night in Ingham County Jail.

THE UNIVERSITY'S DISTRIBUTION POLICY

Allegedly, the University ordinance prohibits distribution and display of material without prior authorization by "the University." However, as is well recognized by anyone who has attempted to find out what the regulations pertaining to distribution of literature are, they are nowhere clearly and fully defined. University distribution policy was clarified last spring, again last summer, and once again this fall. But major ambiguities still exist. There are apparently different rules governing different areas of the campus. Some rules are made by student groups like MHA, WIC, and ASMSU; others by the University administration. Some are listed in student publications; others are mimeographed and filed in the drawers of deans. Some can be found at the campus police station; and others are mystically produced to fit the occasion.

Even if these rules, regulations and ordinances were grouped together and were easily accessible to students, we would still insist that they be in accordance with the first and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution.

Moreover, the policy of a University should be to encourage free and diversified discussion of all issues, no matter how controversial. Hopefully we come to a University to be stimulated to think independently and creatively. Rules which hamper the free expression of ideas cannot possibly facilitate this goal. Why should any literature distributed in a public place like the Union have to be approved by anyone? What do we mean by a free society?

STUDENTS TRESPASS IN STUDENT UNION

Is it possible that MSU students were arrested on the charge of trespassing in the MSU student Union? The State Of Michigan's trespassing law under which the five were arrested states in essence that no person shall interfere with the normal flow of business in a public building.

If the five interfered with the normal business of the Union (the Career Carnival?), who complained? Marine Corps recruiter, Captain John Dailey, said: "It doesn't bother us. We're not going to complain. Everybody has a right to be here." Who complained?

Moreover, who conducts the normal flow of business in the MSU student Union? Students or Marines?

IMPLICATIONS

The question is not whether the administration believes in free speech. The question is whether beneath the veneer of self-righteous platitudes the administration has any conception of the meaning of free speech. Experience has shown us the dichotomy between their words and actions: principles always give way to security and expediency.

* * * * *
*
* LOGOS: The Voice of CSR *
* P.O. Box 651 East Lansing, Mich. *
* Martha Aldenbrand editor *
* Gary Sommer exec. secretary *
* * * * *

(CSR)
SCHIFF VS THE ADMINISTRATION
LOGOS

Vol II No 1

THE VOICE OF CSU

Sept. 27, 1965

SCHIFF vs THE ADMINISTRATION: GRAND RAPIDS, OCTOBER 4

On Monday, October 4, the MSU administration will be called upon in U.S. District Court in Grand Rapids to explain its denial of readmission to Paul Schiff, editor of LOGOS and a former graduate student.

On June 20, Schiff was denied readmission to MSU by the Office of Student Affairs. According to Vice-President John Fuzak: "He urged the violation to university regulations in LOGOS," and violated a new distribution rule by passing out LOGOS in Case Hall on April 22.

Schiff was informed of these charges and the decision not to readmit him without ever having the chance to defend himself. The administration, acting in its typically arbitrary way, refused Schiff a hearing before the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs when he requested one.

A graduate student in economics through winter term, 1965, Schiff applied to the history department and was accepted as a masters degree candidate on June 3. When two weeks later the Office of Student Affairs made its decision, it neglected to even notify the history department.

Faculty reaction to this administrative action was mixed, particularly in the history department. Some felt that the administration was justified in making decisions on "non-academic" questions, while others wished to preserve the right of an academic department to choose its own students without administrative censorship.

The MSU chapter of the American Association of University Professors wrote a letter to President Hannah asking him to reconsider his decision. Other faculty members attempted to express their opinions in the letter column of the State News, but were informed that they would not be printed be-

The Schiff Case will have far-reaching consequences. At stake are the rights of students as citizens: the right to basic American freedoms of speech and press and the right to fair hearings before disciplinary measures can be taken. All students have an interest in the outcome of this case.

CSR RALLY
TO SUPPORT THE CASE OF SCHIFF
VS. THE ADMINISTRATION
2 00 WEDNESDAY BEAUMONT TWR

The Committee for Student Rights is proud to announce the birth of a new publication--OaGANON. It will hopefully provide a forum for the expression of ideas about anything relevant to the life and experiences of the University community. Copies are available at registration and in East Lansing.

```

*****
*
*
*          LOGOS: The Voice of CSK
*
*      PO Box 651          East Lansing, Mich.
*
*
*      Paul M. Schiff.....editor-in-exile
*      Gary Sawatzki.....on campus
*      Mike Price.....off campus
*
*
*****

```


INGHAM COUNTY DEMOCRATS SUPPORT DISSENT

"Since the right of any person to distribute literature, to state and publish what he believes to be true less than libel or slander, and to advocate action less than criminal action in an attempt to demonstrate what he believes to be true, is at worst a cloudy right and at best an inviolatable right,

and since the exercise of a right in such a status can in no way be construed to be cause for denial of further rights of a person,

and since the right to obtain a graduate education at a state university, providing that academic qualifications have been met, is such a further right,

and since the administration of Michigan State University did invoke the exercise of a right in the aforementioned status as sufficient cause for denial of readmission of Mr. Paul Schiff to Michigan State University,

and since said administration did subsequently and summarily deny Mr. Schiff the right of a hearing on the aforementioned denial of readmission,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Young Democrats of Ingham County/Democratic Committee of Ingham County deplore(s) the action of the central administration of Michigan State University in the denial of readmission of Paul Schiff, and strongly recommend that the administration of Michigan State take immediate steps to readmit Paul Schiff to Michigan State University as a graduate student with all the rights and privileges connected with this status,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the administration of Michigan State University recognize in the future the right of all persons connected with the university to dissent."

Jim Dart	Tom Steinfatt
Chairman, Ingham County	Chairman, Public Affairs
Young Democrats	Committee,
	Ingham County
	Young Democrats

for the Ingham County Democratic Committee and the Young Democrats of Ingham County.

BEWARE: ANTI-ADMINISTRATION PROPAGANDA

L O G O S

Orientation Special THE VOICE OF CSR

Summer, 1965

A DECLARATION OF PURPOSE - JANUARY 1965

We students of Michigan State University have formed the Committee for Student Rights (CSR) to defend and promote our legitimate interests as students. We unite to affirm an educational philosophy that is fundamental to the needs of students and consistent with the rights of man.

We state our firm belief in "the doctrine that man is meant to live, not to prepare for life;" in democratic participation, not "training for democracy;" in the understanding that there is no conflict in being a man and being a student; in an atmosphere in which there is no True Value, but one in which there is an unencumbered Search for Values; in a society in which the Administration serves the vital and changing needs of students and faculty, not one in which the scholars are subordinate to "The University."

Inherent in this doctrine is the conception of the student as a human being fully capable of assuming responsibilities in the here-and-now, quite prepared to suffer the consequences of making mistakes; not as a child to be pampered, and spanked when he is naughty; not as an incidental and troublesome element injected into an otherwise smooth-flowing process; not as an apprentice training to take his place in a strictly defined society.

The University is not a "nice setup" as administrative personnel have quaintly put it. It is exploration, it is tension, it is conflict; it is the peaceful, but intense, resolution of common problems by those who are most immediately concerned with the given society.

Our beliefs imply the need for the University to facilitate - but not control - the development of each individual student. Facilitation involves devoting primary attention to the individual student's academic needs, to the material and intellectual resources at his disposal; not to the winning of government contracts; not to projecting a favorable public image; not toward the creation of a Multiversity.

- continued on page two -

When we distinguish between facilitation and control, we relentlessly object to the policy that students can realize their potentialities when they suffer special deprivations because they are students. In essence, what we resolutely oppose is the doctrine of in loco parentis, which asserts that "the college stands in the same position to its students as that of a parent. . and it can therefore direct and control their conduct to the same extent that a parent can."

The University Administration will quickly point out - and correctly so - that the doctrine of in loco parentis has remained substantially intact when legally challenged. But we deny that this is the paramount issue. Rather, we ask: DOES THIS DOCTRINE SERVE A BENEFICIAL EDUCATIONAL PURPOSE? Does it express the most desirable relationship between the students and the administration of the University? OUR REPLY IS AN EMPHATIC NO! This doctrine permits an Administration to formulate a True Value and impose it upon a diverse group of students - forcing them to conform or to forego a University education. Arbitrary rules and regulations which enforce conformity in the personal and social aspects of life inevitably dull individual creativity and an inquisitive spirit in the intellectual sphere.

Thus, CSR arises not only to change the most offensive paternalistic regulations, but also to challenge the University's claim to be paternalistic, and to initiate a fresh dialogue regarding the student, the University, and society.

* * *

THE EXCEPTION PROVES THE RULE. . .

"BY AND LARGE, RESTRICTIONS ARE THE MARK OF SMALL CHURCH-AFFILIATED COLLEGES INTENT ON SERVING IN LOCO PARENTIS, WHILE FREEDOM FOR STUDENTS, DEFINED ROUGHLY AS THE RIGHTS AND CURBS OF CIVIL LAW, IS THE GOAL AT BIG, OLD, AND SCHOLASTICALLY HIGH-RANKING STATE AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES."

--Time, Dec. 18, 1964

LOGOS: THE VOICE OF CSR

P.O. Box 651, East Lansing, Mich.

Editor-in-chief: Paul M. Schiff

WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT (from LOGOS #6, June 3, 1965)

In February a demonstration was novel; today some people think there have been too many. During fall term it was debated whether to establish a "Hyde Park" at Beaumont Tower; this past term four outdoor rallies of various types were held, because people had something to say. The war in Vietnam became a vital issue for MSU students and faculty; both sides initiated discussion and debate and took action consistent with their beliefs. The civil rights forces in East Lansing exhibited greater strength and militancy than ever before. And the once all-powerful administration has been forcefully challenged. In loco parentis is still a reality - still to be disposed of - but somewhat more temperate and less assertive.

CSR began with a statement of principles (see p. 1) to which it has remained loyal; but perhaps if that declaration were to be rewritten today, it would be a little less abstract, and reflect the experiences of the past few months. How much of the activity and the change in atmosphere is attributable to CSR is hard to say. A great deal, certainly. But the important thing is not "who gets the credit" - be it individuals or groups - but the fact that there is now a student movement alive at MSU - a movement which will act and one which is growing continually more confident in its own power to affect change.

CSR is more than an organization or a specific set of goals; it symbolizes the spirit of change that is permeating the American college campus and American society. It is the spirit of impatience. It is the spirit of challenge.

What becomes of CSR per se is not important: it is the momentum that is has generated that counts - and that momentum is not about to disappear.

CSR is not a membership organization, so we have no record of how many people consider themselves "CSR." But we do know that more than two hundred students have been actively involved in CSR activities - and for a previously apathetic campus, this is significant.

On the other hand, two, or even several hundred out of 30,000 is a small percentage. Why so few? Those outside CSR might present a multitude of answers, but we would like to offer some speculation from our perspective.

- continued on page four -

First of all, the issue is not beards and sandals vs. madras and cranberry, but what role we students are willing to assume in the campus society today, and what role we envision for ourselves in the larger society tomorrow.

Basically, most students are "satisfied" in one sense or another with their lives at MSU. They are here to obtain degrees, or perhaps spouses, and to make their futures in the image of society's current values. They are concerned with personal careers, with getting ahead, and thus with conforming to the norms that society has established.

In contrast to the "beatniks" of the 1950's, today's "rebels" no longer aim to escape from society, but to transform it into a better one. We are not content to dissent in a passive way. We are determined to fight for our convictions. Optimism has replaced pessimism. Activists have replaced cynics.

This more than anything else has been the meaning of CSR at MSU and of the student movement in America.

* * *

ONCE UPON A RULE (from LOGOS #3, March 3, 1965)

"Catch-22," the old woman repeated. . . "Catch-22 says they have a right to do anything we can't stop them from doing."

"What the hell are you talking about?" Yossarian shouted at her in bewildered, furious protest. "How did you know it was Catch-22?"

"The soldiers with the hard white hats and clubs. The girls were crying. 'Did we do anything wrong?' they said. The men said no and pushed them away out the door with the ends of their clubs. 'Then why are you chasing us out?' the girls said. 'Catch-22,' the men said. All they kept saying was 'Catch-22, Catch-22!' What does it mean, Catch-22? What is Catch-22?"

"Didn't they show it to you?" Yossarian demanded, stamping about in anger and distress. "Didn't you even make them read it?"

"They don't have to show us Catch-22," the old woman answered. "The law says they don't have to."

"What law says they don't have to?"

"Catch-22."

--Joseph Heller, Catch-22