

Committee for Student Rights
P.O. Box 651
East Lansing, Michigan

March 2, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

A petition signed by more than 4,200 Michigan State University students and calling for more liberal housing rules has been presented to officials of the University's student affairs office by the Committee for Student Rights (CSR).

The 80-foot-long petition was accepted Feb. 25 by John A. Fuzak, vice president for student affairs. It had been rejected "physically but not mentally" two days earlier by Louis F. Hekhuis, director of student activities, at an open meeting of the Student-Faculty Subcommittee on Off-Campus Housing, of which Hekhuis is chairman.

CSR is an unchartered student group organized during January to protest the lack of effective communication between the students and the faculty and administration.

The housing petition was circulated to gauge student sentiment for liberalization of housing rules after Hekhuis' subcommittee asked interested students to present their ideas to help the subcommittee make recommendations for future policies.

The subcommittee includes three faculty members, three appointed student members and two members of the student affairs office--Hekhuis and Patrick B. Smith, director of off-campus housing.

The petition was presented by two members of CSR's 16-member steering committee, who were told at one point, "We want points of view, not votes."

--more--

Bob Harris, president of the All University Student Government and an ex officio member of the subcommittee, said that in effect the petition was useless to the subcommittee, since one person's expression of a point of view is as significant as the support of 4,200 or 30,000 persons.

The 4,200-plus names represent almost 15 per cent of the University's nearly 30,000 students.

The fear was expressed by subcommittee members that acceptance of the petition would imply recognition of CSR, which has refused to seek an organizations charter from the student government despite criticism from University officials. The petition did not carry the designation that it was being circulated by CSR, and deals only with the four housing proposals.

The four recommendations called for by the petition are among 12 proposed earlier by CSR, intended to lead to improvements in the atmosphere for intellectual and social development in the University.

MSU currently maintains an unusually strict interpretation of the traditional "in loco parentis" attitude toward students.

University regulations in some cases claim the right to supercede a student's civil rights, although administrators claim it is usual practice to respect these rights. Housing policies, while not necessarily impositions on students' rights, are in general more strict than those of other comparable universities.

The four proposals are:

1--Students over 21 may live in housing of their choice, subject only to local, state and federal laws.

2--Juniors and seniors, regardless of sex or age, may live in housing of their choice with parental consent, subject only to local, state and federal laws.

3--Senior women, and those women over 21, living in residence halls, shall have no hours; junior women shall have no hours Friday and Saturday nights. Hours for other women shall be 12 midnight Sunday through Thursday, 1 a.m. Friday and 1:30 a.m. Saturday.

4--The University shall respect the students' civil rights and liberties on and off campus; any entrance into a student's living quarters unauthorized by said student shall be in accordance with state and federal laws, especially those regarding search and seizure.

The petition calls for immediate implementation of the four proposals.

##mjk##

Campus Summary

Why I'm In CSR



-----By Michael Kindman

Many students have begun discussing the Committee for Student Rights, questioning the need for such a group and the means it has chosen to implement its views.

I would like to explain my interpretation of the positions CSR has taken in its first few weeks, and to give one person's reasons for joining the group. I am expressing here my own views. I speak not as a State News staff member, nor officially for CSR, although I am deeply involved in both organizations.

The Committee for Student Rights has formed to protest the almost inevitable loss of individual identity which occurs when a campus grows as large as this one has--30,000-plus students, several thousand faculty and staff members, 4,900 acres of main campus, \$146 million in new buildings within a 10-year period.

CSR is founded upon the concept that the growth of the University--a growth which we cannot deny and have no right to condemn--does not have to mean a decline in the quality of the education afforded each student. This means more than updated curricular offerings and an Educational Development Program.

CSR firmly believes that students can be given opportunities to make decisions for themselves, to develop into responsible individuals and to benefit fully from what should be a stimulating university environment, even when the University has grown to 30 and 40 thousand students and beyond.

To accomplish this, at least two things are necessary.

First, the University must modify its outdated conception of the "in loco parentis" policy by which it claims the right to intervene in students' personal affairs. "In loco parentis" is a traditional attitude of colleges and universities and is not about to be abandoned.

But this University has insisted on too strict an interpretation of the policy, to the extent of telling some students' parents that they have less right to decide their children's affairs than does the University administration. A totally disproportionate amount of money and energy goes into the preservation of such institutions as women's hours, liquor prohibitions and alliances between campus and civil authorities to enforce University regulations.

Thus, CSR has made its initial suggestions for liberalization of the "in loco parentis" policy as the first area which must see revision if the University experience is to be more meaningful.

Second, there must be a drastic increase in the amount of discussion of problems both directly and indirectly affecting students. There must be more exchange of ideas, more dissent, even open ideological warfare between factions and departments.

In this area, CSR has already had some success.

The committee has been accepted as a force, however young and small, in University affairs. It has done this without going through the bureaucratic rigamarole of petitioning to AUSG for a charter. It has demonstrated that a group need not be passed upon by the Student Organizations Bureau, a doctrinaire body that has more than once interfered with the establishment of student groups, in order to have meaning.

CSR does not object to official recognition nor to stating its goals openly; it feels, however, that allowing its views to be screened through a committee before exposing them to the outside world would be a compromise of its belief in freedom of expression.

The committee has been authorized by existing student organizations to the extent that it has had representatives speak to a number of dorm councils, has been discussed by many student groups and has attracted sympathy and support far beyond that given most organizations in existence less than a term.

Students, at least partly because of CSR's formation, are thinking a little more about problems affecting them and are wondering what CSR is up to. This is good.

Logos is one way in which CSR hopes to demonstrate that some University regulations are paper tigers, with the effect of intimidating students into submission but with no adequate justification for their existence. (Logos has been distributed "illegally"--that is, without prior approval of dormitory authorities--but has not been repressed and has not offended many sensitivities. The University has lived and let live.)

I have allied myself with CSR because I do not agree with the University's interpretation of its own power in the lives of students, and feel that some sort of activist movement is needed here to alter this interpretation in the near future.

We are "activist" in the sense that we are not afraid to formulate and defend principles in which we believe; "activist" in that we disagree with the concept that we are in the University to take courses and absorb culture and do nothing more. CSR feels students are here to live and grow and experience life, and to do so must have freedom to express their ideas, right or wrong.

Martyrdom is not the goal of CSR, nor is a gaudy display of power seized by immature and sensational means. We hope to establish within the University a point of view which has not frequently been expressed here, and to do so calmly and with discipline.

If Michigan State University, which has been thinking in near-erious terms about educating 100,000 students at a time, is to remain anything more than a prison of the mind, we must move now to allow for individual freedom and dignity, and to do this in a context reater than that of University regulations and the attempts of faculty committees to determine what students want.

MSU Group Asks Student Liberties

Special to the Free Press

EAST LANSING — A new "Committee for Student Rights" on the Michigan State University campus is pledged to oppose the doctrine which gives MSU the right to make rules for students, including civil liberties, "in loco parentis," a legal term meaning "in place of the parent."

State universities differ widely in their application of the State law granting this right.

The committee (CSR), which claims a nucleus of 75 members, distributed a newsletter in MSU dormitories without prior approval by university officials as required by MSU regulations.

* * *

THE CSR PLATFORM, adopted Feb. 7, calls for ending restrictions on student publications not specified by state and federal law. The Lansing chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union has indicated support for the proposal.

The platform also calls for

liberalizing MSU housing regulations as has been done at the University of Michigan.

It would abolish all closing hours for senior women in dormitories and sorority houses and for junior women on Friday and Saturday nights.

The committee asks that students over 21 be allowed to live off campus without parental consent and that juniors and seniors be permitted to live off campus with parental consent.

MSU now requires students to live in university-approved housing until they are 21. Students older than 21 must have a parental permission to live off campus.

The platform continues:

"The university shall respect the students' civil rights and liberties on and off campus. Any entrance into a student's living quarters unauthorized by said student shall be in accordance with state and federal laws, especially those regarding search and seizure."

* * *

MSU OFFICIALS and campus police now enter student living quarters if they receive complaints about noisy parties. MSU forbids all students to have liquor in living quarters.

CSR officers say they do not plan demonstrations like those at the University of California at Berkeley last fall.

The MSU Office of Student Affairs has organized its own committee to investigate housing regulations and recommend possible changes. John A. Fuzak, vice-president for Student Affairs, has characterized CSR as "a junior high effort attempting to gain attention and recognition without going through the proper channels."

CSR, Administrators Debate

3/4/65
Student News
"I think that the administration is concerned with the education of the students. We are on the same team, but we need to get together," said Leland Carr, University attorney, to an audience of CSR members and other students yesterday in Conrad Hall.

Sponsored by the West Fee cultural and scholastic committees, discussions of their organizations' purposes were given by Bob Harris, AUSG president, Bill Floate, MHA president and Paul Schiff, editor of the Committee for Student Rights' "Logos."

Besides Carr, James Appleton, associate director of resident halls and MHA advisor,

represented administration viewpoints.

After short discussions by the panel, questions from the audience pushed the meeting into a debate between the CSR and the administration.

"Maybe there is a cause for a spokesman to rise like a voice from the wilderness, I don't know," said Carr.

"We do think there's room for change, for improvement," he said. "But much time and effort is needed. Many of these proposals (by CSR) have been under study by student groups."

The CSR did not agree.

"The CSR arose because a number of us felt we didn't have a voice in student affairs," said Schiff.

Harris stressed that it was Student Congress that should be criticized, not the executive branch of AUSG.

"Congress won't do anything on its own. It is not representative," he said.

"The CSR is bucking its fellow students," Harris said. "We only ask to be treated like adults. The only way to achieve this is to act like adults."

Schiff wanted to know why the administration didn't revise the

regulations as was proposed in a petition signed by 4,200 students.

The Board of Trustees has to deal with both the students and the legislature, said Carr.

"The legislators pick on the darndest things," he said. They pick out conduct of professors or students and raise this as why we shouldn't be appropriated any money."

"I'm primarily interested in what's best for students," Schiff said.

2/17/65
Letter To The Agitators

Dear Little C.S.R.

Noble effort is not a crude crying out and infringement on the rights of the masses--not a barging in and disrupting meetings. You are (right or wrong) a minority and you are sowing more seeds of havoc than of good ends.

As a student, you are part of a University. You do not run it. You are here to study. You have no rights.

If your mind is to improve in intellect, you must also improve yourself in character. You have none of honor or moral character if you cannot accept the rules of the Institution (again right or wrong) that is making possible your education. Stop and be thankful for the opportunity.

You cannot possibly prove yourself worthy of greater liberty if you cannot live under the rules (right or wrong) now standing.

Only mature people can diagnose the best way of life for themselves. This University consists of individuals of a vast range in degrees of maturity. Supervision must allow for this. A mark of

immaturity is acting or speaking beyond one's capabilities, rational thinking, and common good of the student body.

You represent a minority if only for the fact that no one knows who in God's-Green-Earth you are and what you represent.

For my welfare and out of concern for this school, I should hope you represent a minority judging from the conduct of your representatives at the meeting reported in the State News of Monday. Even allowing for bias in journalism, there was no excuse for such a display as recorded there.

Go home, little children, and learn about just action, about diplomacy and good taste, about the purpose of this University, about how to obey the rules placed upon you, about who and for what you are. Think.

Before you (right or wrong) blow your reeking breath in the face of society (right or wrong) become an honorable part of it. I'm not old and wise, but this morning I sat down and thought for three whole minutes. You try it.

Bill's Liberia

David Splese
St. Joseph freshman

State News
2/24/65

Inside

Language Center, p. 3;
Entertainment, p. 7;
Cisco Kid Fan Club, p. 8.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY



Vol. 55, Number 266

CSR Petition Asks Rules Liberalization

By PHYLLIS HELPER,
State News Staff Writer

A petition signed by 4,202 students and calling for liberalization of off-campus housing rules was presented to the Sub-Committee on Off-Campus Housing Tuesday, in its second day of open meetings with students.

The petition, sponsored by the Committee for Student Rights (CSR), was presented by Michael Kindman, Franklin Square, N.Y., junior, and Marica Klugman, East Lansing senior.

Three of the four points listed on the petition called for age

modification of the present rules and governance of off-campus living by civil laws only.

The discussion of off-campus housing by Kindman led to a consideration of University policy toward the housing problem.

Concerning the parental permission letter presently sent to all parents of students living off-campus, Miss Klugman said:

"My parents didn't sign the letter and nothing happened. What's the point of having this if they don't mean anything."

"I don't think there has been enough information about this

or other off-campus policies," she said.

A disagreement then arose over the problem of student-University communication and where regulations were listed and how to find them.

Bob Harris, president of AUSG, who was sitting in on Tuesday's meeting, explained that the rules of the University, including those on off-campus housing, were listed in the catalog, the Spartan Handbook and the Associated Women's Students handbook.

Gordon Gray, associate professor of television and radio, explained that the problem was not whether or not the material was available to read, but whether or not students read it.

At this point Gray explained that the discussion was veering away from the problem of off-campus housing and that the purpose of the committee was to study only off-campus housing with the intent of making recommendations for change.

However, Gray did say that by presenting the petition, Kindman and Miss Klugman did help the committee "assess the climate for change."

But, Gray continued, "we are looking for points of view, not for votes."

Louis Hekhuis, director of student activities and chairman of the subcommittee, did not accept the petition.

Michael Hannah, Grand Rapids junior, presented the idea of a parental waiver for parents of students not 21 who might live off-campus to sign.

2/17/65
An Ode To CSR

To the Editor:

Oh CSR, repulsed we are,
With your profound display
of campus rights and justice
fights

For students in dismay.

At Bailey Hall you showed to all
Your dignity and poise,
You showed your strength and
helpfulness
To be a lot of noise!

Do riots at "Old Berkeley"
Bring satisfaction true,
To members of your hairy set
Who demonstrate for you?

Your quaint respect to Dellera
Was hardly apropos,
Oh! CSR, those crazy beards
Just simply have to go.

Conditions here at MSU
Are hardly quite so blue;
So do we need a CSR
To create a problem new?

Daniel L. Cobb
Jonesville sophomore

[7-65]

ACADEMIC FREEDOM NEWSLETTER
Vol. 1, No. 1
July 1965

As you may already have heard, two students have recently been subjected to "unusual" punishment by the University. Both the American Civil Liberties Union and the MSU chapter of the American Association of University Professors are examining the incidents. This and subsequent reports will attempt to keep you informed of developments in the cases, to raise some questions suggested by the developments and to suggest avenues of action for those who are concerned.

The two students are Paul Schiff, a former graduate student in the Department of Economics, and Donna Renz, an honors college sophomore. Both were active in students' rights campaigns, Viet Nam war protests and civil rights demonstrations during the winter and spring, but disciplinary action against them took place at the end of spring term and the beginning of the summer term.

There appears to be general agreement on the facts of the situation, which are summarized as follows:

DONNA RENZ was informed by Associate Dean of Students Nonnamaker on June 4 that she would be suspended for an indefinite period beginning with the summer term "for reasons with which you are entirely familiar."

Miss Renz violated women's curfew three times during May (6, 17, 27) in connection with the planning and conduct of civil rights projects in East Lansing. The first violation occurred when she returned to her dorm at 2 AM from a meeting on civil rights strategy. The second violation occurred when she stayed out all night to sit-in at City Hall and then prepare a leaflet (she did anticipate this violation and notified her house mother). Several days after the second violation Miss Renz was questioned at the Dean of Students' Office about the first violation and subsequently was notified of "warning probation." At the time of the first two curfew violations, therefore, Miss Renz had been subject to no disciplinary action. On May 27 she participated in the City Hall demonstration in which she and 58 others were jailed. About June 2 she was again questioned at the Dean's Office but only about the May 17 curfew violation and on June 10 received notification that she was suspended indefinitely. She was never questioned about the third violation and Dean Nonnamaker says that she will not be subject to further University punishment as a result of spending the night in jail.

PAUL SCHIFF, who had finished his normal course work for a master's degree did not enroll in the University during the spring term because of his avowed intention to work on his thesis. During the term he decided to change fields, applied for admission to the History Department and was accepted on June 3.

On the first day of registration for the summer term he received a two-sentence letter from the Registrar refusing him readmission. There was no explanation.

After a week of inquiries by Schiff and three professors the following verbal explanations and administrative procedures were uncovered:

1. The principal administrative officer responsible for rejecting Schiff's application was Vice President for Student Affairs, J. A. Fuzak; further appeal must go to the President.
2. Associate Dean Nonnamaker explained that the University never includes in letters the reason for disciplinary action since they would appear in the file of the student and possibly injure his future.
3. The Dean agreed that Schiff had done nothing "illegal" but did accuse him of having been a disruptive influence on campus while a non-student.
4. He edited LOGOS, distributed it from door to door in Case Hall and did not stop when intercepted by the resident adviser. LOGOS "urged students to violate University regulations."
5. Dean Fuzak reported his action on Schiff to the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs. It seems, however, to have been part of a longer annual report in which special attention was drawn to the Schiff case. Dean Fuzak subsequently turned down a request from Schiff to present his own case to the Committee.
6. President Hannah has thus far refused to reverse the decision of the Dean.

In the meantime at least two faculty members who learned of the two cases from newspapers and informal channels have spoken with Dean Fuzak and found him adamant about his ruling. Some of the questions suggested by these facts carry disturbing implications. They are set forth here to stimulate your consideration and not to suggest a uniform view as to the "correct" answer.

1. The University maintains elaborate means for supervising student academic and social conduct. Is two weeks not an unusual lapse for interviewing Miss Renz about her curfew violations?
2. In view of the delayed reaction of the Dean's Office was University punishment in Miss Renz's case harsh or unusual?
3. Paul Schiff has never been disciplined by the University. Why is he being denied readmission?
4. Should he not have received some formal warning of the intention of the University? Should he not at least have received an explanation for the decision?

5. Is the practice of concealing from the record facts surrounding the disciplinary action always in the long-term best interest of students or does it raise more shadowy doubts for prospective employers? Is it, moreover, a practice consistent with broader legal and administrative due process in America?
6. How did it happen that Mr. Schiff was admitted to study in the History Department by action of its graduate admissions committee yet refused on administrative grounds by the Office of Student Affairs? What are the academic implications of this action?
7. Does the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs exist merely as an adjunct of the Dean of Students or could it hear Schiff on its own discretion? Is there sufficient opportunity for hearing, rebuttal and appeal in the disciplinary apparatus as revealed by these two cases?

The State News of July 6 carried an editorial signed by Susan Filson suggesting a court ruling on the matter, but the newspaper now refuses to print further letters on the subject. It is therefore difficult to know the opinion of members of the faculty. The issue, we believe, is sufficiently important to merit wide discussion in our own community and it is not unlikely that it will be discussed more broadly. Here are some steps that interested faculty might take:

1. Individuals should make telephone calls or write letters expressing their views to President Hannah, Dean Fuzak and Dean Nonnamaker.
2. The Faculty Committee on Student Affairs should be urged to reconsider its somewhat "pro-forma" endorsement of Dean Fuzak's action. Members of the Faculty Committee include:

Dr. Charles Titkemeyer, Chairman (Anatomy) 5-6528	Dr. Walter Johnson (Guidance) 5-6682
Dr. Vera Borosage (Home Economics) 5-1761	Dr. George Martin (Mech. Eng.) 5-5152
Dr. James M. Elliott (Natural Science) 5-3515	Dr. James McKee (Sociology) 5-6637
Dr. Gordon L. Gray (TV & Radio) 5-6558	Dr. Claude McMillan (Management) 5-2414
Dr. Robert N. Hammer (Chemistry) 5-8495	Dr. Woodrow Snyder (Dairy) 5-8446
Dr. Frederick Williams (History) 5-7504	

3. State newspapers including the State Journal and the Detroit Free Press have carried articles and editorials on the Schiff case. Because the State News will not print letters, interested faculty may want to find space in daily papers.

4. Encouragement of both the A.A.U.P and the A.C.L.U in their efforts to redress the injustices in these cases is an obvious action for those who are concerned, whether or not they are members of these organizations. The Chairman of the A.A.U.P is Dr. Victor E. Smith (Economics 5-8382). The Chairman of the A.C.L.U is Mr. George Griffiths (127 Bessemaur St., East Lansing, 332-2339).

Further issues of this newsletter will keep you informed of events as they develop. We will be grateful to hear what steps you take and their results.

J.K. Roberts, Secretary

Committee on the Academic Freedom Newsletter

[1965]
If interested in CSR, contact Charles Gies Rm 260 Ph 37491
or Eric Fisher Rm 267 Ph 37498

A DECLARATION OF PURPOSE (CSR)

We, the 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 men.

We state our firm belief in "the doctrine that man is meant to live, not to prepare for life;" democratic participation, not "training for democracy;" the understanding that there is no conflict in being a man and being a student; an atmosphere in which there is no True Value, but one in which there is an unencumbered Search for Values; 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 administration 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.

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. Be 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.

COMMITTEE FOR STUDENT RIGHTS
P.O. Box 651
East Lansing, Michigan

February 10, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

The Committee for Student Rights (CSR), a newly-formed group at Michigan State University, has adopted a platform of 10 recommendations for changes in University regulations which if adopted would lay the groundwork for a complete modernization of the "in loco parentis" policy at MSU.

In a meeting held Feb. 7 in the St. John's Student Center, about 75 members of CSR voted to adopt 10 of the 13 recommendations proposed by the 15-member steering committee.

The 10 recommendations deal with specific problems arising from the University's current stands on such matters as student housing, off-campus enforcement of University regulations and procedures for punishment of violators on- and off-campus.

An additional recommendation, to which the Greater Lansing branch of the American Civil Liberties Union has indicated it will give support, would remove University restrictions on distribution of written or printed material on campus, subject to federal, state and local laws.

--more--

Current regulations require that any student or students wishing to distribute such materials must first be granted permission to do so by an official of a residence hall or the University housing office.

Most of the 5,000 copies of the first issue of CSR's pamphlet, "Logos: The Voice of CSR," were distributed in residence halls Feb. 3, without permission of housing authorities. No disciplinary action was taken by the administration.

About 7,500 copies of the second issue were scheduled for distribution Feb. 11.

Logos, which in the first issue concentrated on satirizing the University's "in loco parentis" policies, turned, in the second issue, to reprinting the recommendations adopted Feb. 7 and to publicizing CSR's speakers bureau and other information services.

The committee has as yet made no attempt to earn official recognition from the University. It has not applied for a charter from the Student Organizations Bureau of the All University Student Government, and has been called by John A. Fuzak, University vice president for student affairs, a "junior high effort" attempting to gain attention and recognition without going through the proper channels.

CSR cites the case of an earlier group whose goals were similar to its own as a defense for not seeking a charter.

The "Federation for Student Rights" failed last fall to win a charter from the Organizations Bureau. Its petition was never reported out of committee, on the grounds that its proposed charter would overlap with those of AUSG itself and of the now-defunct Basic Action Party.

CSR was organized during January from the remains of this "federation," with the help of a number of other students interested in seeing some more concrete representation of student opinion than the existing student government provides.

Despite the fact that an AUSG reevaluation committee is currently studying a possible revision of student government, the members of CSR feel that only a completely new organization can accurately represent student thought to the administration.

A "declaration of purpose" was adopted by CSR members at an early organizational meeting, and was published as a guest column Jan. 26 in the Michigan State News.

The statement reads in part:

"We state our firm belief in 'the doctrine that man is meant to live, not to prepare for life': democratic participation, not 'training for democracy'; the understanding that there is no conflict in being a man and being a student; an atmosphere in which there is no True Value, but one in which there is an unencumbered search for values; 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.'"

--more--

"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."

Michael Hooten, Tuskegee Institute, Ala., junior and chairman of CSR, has said, "Anyone is a member of CSR, anyone who is interested in students' rights."

At the moment, CSR's recognized membership is growing rapidly, and local organizations are forming in living units to help support CSR's goals. Student groups have asked CSR speakers to present programs and have otherwise indicated support of the committee's policy of opposing "in loco parentis."

mjk

Enclosures.

A Declaration of Purpose (CSR)

We, the 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"; Democratic participation, not 'training for democracy'; the understanding that there is no conflict in being a man and being a student; an atmosphere in which there is no True Value, but one in which there is an unencumbered Search for Values; 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 administration 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.

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.