



EXTRA

University of Cincinnati NEWS RECORD

Published Tuesdays and Fridays during the Academic Year except as scheduled.

Vol. 57

Cincinnati, Ohio Monday, May 18, 1970

Special Issue

University Re-Opens Today

Board Makes Decision

By action of the Board of Directors, the University will re-open today at 8 a.m. At 10 this morning, classes will be suspended till noon to enable members of the academic community to attend an all-University convocation in Nippert Stadium.

At the same time, the Board also suggested to the faculties of the several colleges that they consider modifying some of their regular rules concerning academic credit "for the rest of this quarter."

The former directive applies primarily to the Clifton Campus, as the Raymond Walters Branch, the Tri-County Academic Center, the Ohio College of Applied Science, and the Medical School were re-opened last week.

The Board's decision came at a special meeting held last Thursday; the proposal to re-open the institution was contained in a special report submitted by President Walter Langsam. Dr. Langsam returned several days ago from a trip to Israel, where he represented the University of Cincinnati at the installation of Dr. Albert Sabin (formerly Distinguished Service Professor in the U.C. medical school) as President of the Weitzman Institute there.

The President's report consisted of four recommendations, each devised in accordance with proposals made by the University Senate concurred with by the Academic Cabinet of Deans last Thursday.

One of the report's proposals delineated the existing Board policy "aimed at the preservation of academic freedom." The policy was clarified as follows:

"All persons shall uphold the freedom of each individual within the University in matters of speech, learning, inquiry, hearing, and peaceful assembly; and there shall not be any interference with the rights of others within the University Community to pursue teaching, study, research, learning, and administrative functions.

(Continued on page 6)



PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, Gene Lewis, presides over the University Senate in an emergency meeting Wednesday afternoon to discuss issues centering on the re-opening of the University Monday.

—photo by Bill Heckle

Pass-Fail Option Set for A&S

Pass-fail option for all courses taken this quarter in the McMicken College of Arts and Sciences will be available to all students. Students taking courses in A&S may register for this option through the usual procedure in the college office beginning Wednesday, May 20.

The action came at a meeting of the entire A&S faculty last Friday which was a continuation of the May 5 meeting. This particular provision evolved from a discussion of alternative proposals

the University Senate had suggested. The Senate made its suggestions to facilitate the suspension of regular academic rules as the result of the situation in recent weeks.

Dr. W. David Smith, assistant professor of English and Director of Black Studies Program Development, submitted proposed initial black studies course offerings. His proposals were adopted by the Body.

The courses are all to be scheduled beginning this

September, if the proposed Department of Black Studies is approved by the entire A&S faculty.

Course proposals, all of which are to be included under the departmental notation of "093" include:

"Survey of Black Studies (101, 2, 3): An introductory course that will orient the student to the nature and scope of Black Studies and will explore all phases (interdisciplinary approach) of the unique experience of Black people since their arrival in America from Africa.

"Black Politics (201,2,3): The political behavior of Black people and the Black community involvement in voter registration and the impact of the Black vote on the American society.

"Pan-Africanism (107, 108, 109): A study of the basic concept of Pan-Africanism and its relationship to Black ideology.

"The Black Family (204,5,6): A sociological study of the structure of Black families in the western society.

"Sociology and Psychology of Poverty (207, 8,9): This course will analyze the meaning of being poor and Black in American from a sociological and psychological viewpoint.

"Community Government Programs (210,11,12): The study of various government sponsored programs in the Black community such as welfare, headstart, etc., and their effects on Black people.

"Black identification: Quest for a Model (213,14, 15): The analysis of past identification models for Black people. The contemporary models and the ways to create new Black models.

"Psychology of Black Experience (301,2,3): Course will include the following: 1) self evaluation techniques, 2) exploration and development of individual and group survival techniques.

"Racism (104,5,6): This course will investigate the effects of racism on Black people with respect to housing, jobs, politics, education, public accommodations, athletics, entertainment, etc."

It was also noted that all courses will be programmed to indicate three credits per quarter. In remarks about the proposals, Dr. Smith indicated that qualified instructors are now being sought to teach the courses.

Senate in Marathon Session Passes Legislation Concerning Present Crisis

In a marathon-length session last week, the University Senate approved nearly a score of resolutions dealing with the present situation on campus.

Primarily, the Senate recommended to President Langsam and the Board of Directors that the University reopen today, while making arrangements for a convocation program this morning. These proposals were all adopted by the Board of Directors, upon the recommendation of the President.

In later action, the Senate resolved that it "denounces the war in Southeast Asia," and directed the President of the University to communicate "this resolution to the President of the United States, the members of the Congress of the United States, and to the Governor of the state of Ohio, and to the members of the state legislature."

The operative clauses of the resolution above derived from the premise that "the war in Southeast Asia has become a major threat to the pursuance of higher education in the United States and the state of Ohio."

In a separate item, it was also "Resolved, that the University Senate of the University of Cincinnati express its strong disapproval of the decision of Governor James A. Rhodes to send National Guard troops on the campus at Kent State University with live ammunition;" and it was further "Resolved, that the University Senate express its horror at the senseless killing of four Kent State University students and the wounding of nine others; and further that the president of the University communicate these resolutions to the parents of the students who were killed and wounded at Kent State University, to the administration, faculty, and students of Kent State University, to the news media, and to the Governor of the state of Ohio."

In a similar action, the body approved an

additional resolution whose operative paragraph was the following: "1) that the University Senate of the University of Cincinnati express its deep sorrow to the parents of the students who were killed. 2) express to its sister institution at Kent the hope that the University will recover successfully from this serious difficulty; 3) express its opposition to the presence of National Guard troops on this campus under any circumstances and strongly urge the Administration not to call outside police force on this campus without the approval of the University Senate, if this consultation is at all possible; 4) recognize that the nation-wide campus unrest of which the Kent tragedy was a part is in substantial measure due to the reliance on force to solve the troubles of Southeast Asia and more particularly on the recent move into Cambodia."

Following the adoption of a resolution recognizing "the principle of corporate neutrality," the body debated and later passed a motion resolving that "the University Senate of the University of Cincinnati requests that the Chairman of the University Senate, in consultation with the President of the University, establish a special commission to re-examine the place of ROTC on this campus; and a special commission to consider this said recruitment, in accordance with the spirit of the Bonner report." The reference to recruitment was contained in a prefacing clause to the motion: "Whereas recruitment on campus by the military and war related industries may violate the principle of institutional neutrality."

At the same time, the Senate approved the statement that "these commissions include representatives of the administration, faculty, and students chosen according to

the proportions of each group on the University Senate."

In later action, a resolution calling for the participation of Student Senators in faculty meetings deciding academic policy for the duration of the quarter was discussed at great length and eventually passed Thursday evening.

It was also recommended to the Board of Directors that the name of the new Engineering Building now under construction be changed from "Governor James A. Rhodes Hall" to "Peace Hall."

As part of the report of the Steering Committee Senator Bonner (Vice President and Provost for Academic Affairs) submitted a twenty-three page document to the body for consideration as a "working document for discussion and background information." The document, as revised by Bonner, for the News Record, is reprinted on pages four and five of this issue.

In a morning session on May 13, the Senate considered several, primarily student-presented, resolutions, including recommendations on "institutional neutrality," University stock proxies, day-care centers, displaced area residents, the Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and academic policy decisions for the remainder of the quarter.

After mild debate the Senate adopted a resolution adopting for itself and urging "the Board of Directors to accept the principle of the institutional neutrality of the University... An individual, a group of concerned students, faculty, administrators, members of any organization, or even the entire faculty or student body may choose to debate and take a position on a matter of public controversy, but the University as a corporate and public body may not do so."

(Continued on page 7)

University of Cincinnati NEWS RECORD



The News Record is edited and published by the students of the University of Cincinnati. Editorials represent a consensus of editorial board opinion. Editorial offices are located in Suite 411-412-415 of the Tangeman University Center on the Clifton Campus, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221. Telephone numbers are 475-2748 for News, and 2746 and 2749 for Advertising. Subscription price for one year is \$3.50; second class postage, paid at Cincinnati, Ohio. The News Record is a member of the National Educational Advertising Service, Inc.

Mitchell B. Shapiro
Editor-in-Chief

Lew Moores, Executive Editor; David Litt, Assistant Editor;

Editorial

UC's Political Role

In the midst of great confusion, frustration and fear, the Board of Directors closed the University ten days ago. The decision made was unquestionably a wise one, considering the sickening reality of outside persons on campus who were dedicated to violent revolution, who had no concern for the lives of U.C. students or University property.

Therefore, acting in the best interest of the entire University community, the decision was made, thus avoiding any fear of violence on campus.

In the interim since, concerned and involved members of the University community have been meeting continuously to resolve the issues presented to our community in recent weeks. Admittedly, much of what has been done consists of rhetoric. However, from the mass of opinion, analysis, and discussion, there has emerged a substantive resolution of the crisis we have become embroiled in. The University Senate, during its almost marathon session last week, has provided the response to those students who were sincerely committed to peace in Southeast Asia, who were sickened (as all Americans should be) at the atrocities committed in Northeast Ohio two weeks ago, and who were determined to insure that the University commit itself to upholding the rights of all members of American society.

With an extraordinary number of resolutions submitted by dedicated and responsible members of the University Senate, that body was able to fulfill the University's political function. In this sense, the series of demands were extremely important, for they served to stimulate the University politically.

With these resolutions and the Bonner document, the University has effectively averted the need for any more fear of violence on this campus. The demonstrating students can now return, satisfied that they have broken the political maidenhead of the University community.

Devotion and the Senate

Members of the University community can once again return and maneuver themselves into the final, and for some, agonizing throes of the academic year's end.

As business returns to normalcy however, we can all observe the evidence that exists to show how our representatives, particularly in the University Senate, have dedicated themselves to the welfare of the entire community.

While the majority of students spent last week as a well-needed vacation, members of the Senate, especially those comprising the Steering Committee, and those from Student Senate, spent the entire periods in meetings, caucuses, and discussions to facilitate the construction of legislation that would be most advantageous to the entire University. They have achieved their tasks; the only qualm we might have would be the complaint that some pieces of legislation were watered down by amendment procedures, and thus lost a considerable amount of effect.

This is to be expected, however, as political pressures are brought to bear upon representatives of each constituent group by persons and situations involved in external matters. For most, vested interests and ideological commitments stemming from these interests motivated their actions.

For some, however, their participation may be considered on a scale whose proportions approach the magnanimous. In particular, we must applaud the dedication that led Thomas N. Bonner, Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs to devise the lengthy position paper used by the University Senate and the entire community for reference to the University's political position.

In addition, Mike Dale, President of the Student Body, and Artie Cohn, Vice-President, along with University Senators Bonhaus, Painter, Reich, Rubin, Schneider and Tate, whose efforts in constructing viable, organic legislation clearly show their devotion to student and University interests.

Professor of Philosophy

End of a Dream

Rollin Workman

The invasion of Cambodia was a brilliant tactical move and a strategic mistake. Whatever the original purpose, the seizure of vast amount of supplies cannot help but put the North Vietnamese temporarily off balance. Perhaps that will give the United States more time to concentrate upon reorganizing the South Vietnamese army so that U.S. forces can withdraw more rapidly. That is what President Nixon now says he hopes will happen.

In the long run, however, the invasion may do more harm than good. The communist forces will simply have to set up their headquarters and supply bases farther back into Cambodia. That might entail overt military conquest of the Cambodian nation. In any case, the invasion

will result in spreading North Vietnamese presence over a larger area of Cambodia. I hope that that will not lead to spreading the war over an ever larger area.

More important, perhaps, than the tactical and strategic considerations is the fact that the Cambodian invasion destroyed a hope and a dream, both of which were stronger on college campuses than anywhere else. The hope was for a steady de-escalation of the war; the dream was the eternal dream of peace. People had begun to think that the United States would leave Vietnam after awhile, no matter what the enemy did. There would be threats of staying on if the communists didn't behave, little lies about how unimportant this or that enemy action really was, and big lies about how competent the South

Vietnamese are. But, in spite of everything, the U.S. would leave. Now it is not so obvious that withdrawal is automatic after all. Thus the hope is shattered and the dream is lost. It is no wonder that there was such an explosion of anger and frustration. Fortunately, the so far largely magnificent protest seems to be having an effect upon President Nixon's thinking.

An analogous situation occurred in the fifties. When World War II ended, everyone assumed that peace had at last been achieved. It was not long, however, before Russia began to menace Berlin, and communists tried to seize Greece and Italy. The result was a rapid buildup of anger and frustration which culminated in the great emotional explosion

(Continued on page 3)

Power to the People?

Greg Rose

"All power to the people"—all who have noted the philosophical aberrations of the New Left have, at one time or another, been subjected to this demand for absolute democracy.

Yet there has been precious little conservative rebuttal of this nonsensical notion. Indeed, Philip Luce, often considered the ascending star of youthful conservatism, feels it sufficient merely to inquire as to the definition of the term from any New Leftist brandishing it. One fails to comprehend how any, save the most cerebrally lacking, revolutionary could be confounded by so simple a retort.

It appears to one incumbent upon conservative intellectuals to formulate cogent alternatives to absolute democracy, preferably by demonstration of the inevitability of aristocratic

governance.

Indeed, one must maintain that aristocracy is an absolute necessity in human society; there has never been an advanced civilization in which the intellectually superior have not monopolized exercise of the fundamental functions of government. There cannot exist a society in which power is thoroughly diffused through the masses, *Deo gratias*, for it is contrary to the nature of the human creature.

It is in the direction of the functions of government that real power lies, for the ability to grant or withhold essential services supplies the controlling body with coercive influence over the society served. Historically the direction of governmental functions has been monopolized by elites, for the nature of those functions

required the supervision of the intellectually gifted.

One cannot expect society to entrust its vital services to those incapable of adequate supervision. Thus power has gravitated toward intellectual elites. One would maintain that this process is, indeed, essential to the preservation and advancement of civilization.

By these criteria power may be given to the people only if the people *en masse* possess the intellectual superiority which the exercise of power demands. Surely no rational individual would assert the intellectual superiority of the masses; it would be a denial of all human experience in history. In consideration of the nature of functional power one must deny the possibility of an advanced

(Continued on page 3)

Let's Be Open

Mark Lindberg

"Let's Be Open," the theme of Monday morning and the rest of the quarter, has several messages which are obvious. Most obvious is the simple fact that the University is reopening. Secondly, this is a grand opening of a total community. U.C. previously consisted of a cluster of fragmented groups, including students, faculty, and administration, but since the Kent State disaster, virtually everyone on campus has stood together and spoken loudly on many issues, at the core of which is non-violence.

By opening peacefully, we can reconfirm the norm of non-violence. This is an opening in the sense of new honesty, new communication, and new willingness to peacefully share ideas among every segment of the university community. This third opening may sound platitudinous, but it is not. Never before has the administration seemed so receptive to student views. Never before has the student body seemed so willing to use established channels for dissent.

The establishment of the University Senate, for example, has clearly shifted the points of decision down from the administration, away from faculty or student groups, and into a common forum where everyone is represented. The effect will be to prevent many policies from being made by bodies which are isolated and therefore insensitive to the needs of the total university

community.

The activities of "Let's Be Open Day" are another step in this direction. The hour may be unprecedented in which every person on campus will be given an opportunity to input his ideas, but by providing this opportunity, the community on campus is reaffirming its cohesion.

We must go beyond a mere opening. We must in some way institutionalize our full participation, our cohesion, and especially our orientation towards action. There are four suggestions for implementing these goals; the first two pertain to full participation, and the second two relate to action.

First, there should be established regular surveys in the campus community. We need to know things such as what are the opinions of everyone on issues that effect the University. We should ask some questions time after time, to see how opinions are changing; other questions should be asked only when an issue is pertinent. We also need to know what is the composition of the University in terms of race, sex, and other characteristics which are not gained from ordinary record-keeping. We could then respond to the needs of every sub-group, not just cross categories such as the "student body".

Second, we should implement a system of representative government which is based in the

real grass roots of the University. Every person should belong to an established group where he can effectively channel his ideas to members of a larger body. Representative government as it now stands on campus is not representative enough.

For institutionalizing a greater orientation towards action, the University Senate should establish a commission to study where and when the University may take a stand on public controversies. There is too little clarity, even after the Bonner report, about whether or not U.C. already propagates values related to public controversies (e.g. the war in Asia), and about where the boundaries lie for action on these issues.

Secondly the University should establish an "office of propaganda" which would help campus groups to legitimately organize for some cause. For example, there is legislation in Washington now pertaining to the tax status of graduate assistants. Graduate students should have resources available to them so that they might promote a cause which is clearly in accordance with educational interests, and which facilitates the spirit of free inquiry, perhaps the most salient value that a university holds.

Only after lasting mechanisms are established, such as the University Senate and the proposals stated above, can U.C. be sure that it is open in every way.

'Return to Normalcy?'

Jon Reich

Welcome back, friends. All rested after the week's unexpected vacation and ready for the "return to normalcy"? Then perhaps we can also, in, let us hope, the calmer mood that prevails, be ready to deal with the unresolved problems.

Item: why the Hell were we closed down, anyhow? We know part of the answer—that the presence of demonstrators in Beecher and Van Wormer Halls, the supposed influx of outsiders, and the possibility of violence all added up to an unhealthy situation.

But the University Senate, which was scheduled to meet Friday morning, and could have met earlier, was never consulted, nor was its steering committee. The decision was made in secret and was a total surprise. Why was the decision made in such a manner?

Item: the demands were answered during the week by a position paper bearing Dr. Bonner's name; that paper was transmitted to the U. Senate by the steering committee and was received as a working position paper by vote of the Senate.

But now there is a revised version—a version that makes some significant changes. Yet neither the steering committee nor the U. Senate was consulted—on its own working document. Why was the revision made in such a manner?

Item: several committees and, finally, the U. Senate spent several days agonizing over a policy on demonstrations that would provide workable guidelines but

not provoke unnecessary confrontation.

Yet the Board of Directors has chosen to interpret the policy in a manner so rigid that confrontation is all but assured. Why did the Board so act?

Item: the University administration has given evidence of being willing, not only to negotiate with the demonstrators, but to move toward meeting the demands.

Yet re-occupation of the buildings is (as of this writing) being planned. Why do our dissident contemporaries insist on forcing the University's hand?

And there are other issues that demand resolution: the University Senate is supposed to be a body constituted to represent students, faculty, and administration in a common forum. Its powers are not yet clearly delimited. Yet its members seemed determined to avoid committing the Senate to the kind of firm stance it should take. And they eschew anything other than mild stands on what Bonner's paper calls "burning issues of the day." Why is this?

Perhaps there are other questions that might be put. But the point is this: that this campus cannot be "free and open" until there is an improvement in the process of communication, in the achievement of mutual understanding. And such an improvement will never take place so long as decisions are made in secret, behind closed doors, by an elite few.

It is only insofar as the entire

campus community is brought into the decision-making process, its educated opinion actively sought to the fullest feasible extent, that its welfare may be properly and truly advanced.

All this is not to impugn the motives of those who have, under trying circumstances, sought in the last two weeks to keep this University on an even keel. But the very fact of distance itself brings on dissent.

When, as is now the case, the society is sorely beset by problems that seem to defy solution, and the very leaders who should help alleviate the collective distress instead contribute to it, then dissent is necessary and, indeed, welcome. In any case it will be present, and when the society gives evidence of being pathologically maladaptive, that dissent may well transcend the limits of polite criticism and pose a threat to the collective order.

At such times a certain cool is called for. It is hard to achieve, though, when a Board of Directors remains remote from its campus and wields power imperiously, when students and faculty are denied meaningful redress of legitimate grievances, when a University Senate is hampered by mistrust and factionalism.

As Quintus Septimus Tertullian put it some eighteen centuries ago, "Truth persuades by teaching, but does not teach by persuading." Or in the American idiom, "if we don't all hang together, we'll all hang separately."

Workman...

(Continued from page 2)

called the McCarthy era.

The result of the explosion on the right in the fifties and the explosion on the left this year was a demand that the universities take moral stands. In the fifties, universities were pushed officially to condemn communism and also to condemn physicist Robert Oppenheimer who strongly opposed use of nuclear bombs. Today, universities are pushed officially to condemn the Vietnam war and also Governor Rhodes who strongly supports use of the National Guard.

In the fifties, the universities wavered; they almost gave in to those demands. In the end, fortunately, the universities successfully resisted. They resisted because such moral stands are a direct threat to academic freedom. If communism is morally wrong, then why should universities not forbid communist speakers on campus. And why should they not root all communist sympathizers out of their faculties? Forceful demands were made that such actions be taken; and all kinds of threats were made against universities which refused or dallied in the process.

The same thing will no doubt occur today, if the university

wavers toward an official stand on the war or Governor Rhodes or any other issue. Pressure accompanied by various threats will be put on the university to prevent any advocate of slow withdrawal or no withdrawal from speaking on campus. Universities will be pushed to see that no hawks are ever hired or allowed to teach if they are already present. As I see it, the ROTC pressure is the step in such an attack upon academic freedom.

The United States is of course not the only place where academic freedom has been attacked through the demand for official moral stands. Czechoslovakian universities have been forced to condemn Alexander Dubcek and forbid professors of his views' entrance to the campus. The German universities were pushed to official condemnations of Jewish subversion.

This historical analogy places me in opposition to any official condemnations by a university, no matter how morally outraged I might personally be by the proposed object of condemnation. Every such stand is a threat to my academic freedom. The only official stand a university can safely take is for academic freedom itself.

Rose...

(Continued from page 2)

culture in which all power is concentrated in the masses.

However, this is not the only argument which may be introduced against absolute democracy. If the democratic absolutists alter their original proposal to mean complete popular control over the actions of those entrusted by popular consensus with limited directional authority over governmental functions, they ignore the fundamental requirement of sophisticated civilization: stability.

If government officials serve only at the whim of any popular movement, the consequent instability of their service is manifestly detrimental to the performance of their duties.

A man fearful of immediate popular censure is not quite so audacious in his pursuit of excellence and efficacious reform as he who is assured of a term-of-office of set duration. This is the premise upon which representative democracy operates: the whirlwinds of public opinion create an immediacy of emotion which is not conducive to competent and effective government. Complete and

immediate power of recall in the hands of the masses would be catastrophic.

Lest anyone mistake this for an advocacy of tyranny, it does not deny the people a voice in their destiny. However, democracy must be limited, tempered by the demands of history and the individual situation.

One may answer the advocates of "all power to the people" with a more reasonable proposal: "limited power to the people, limited power to the aristocracy." The rhetoric is, perhaps, not so appropriate for a rabble in the streets, but it is by far a better philosophy of government.

It is in a balance between the legitimate concern of the people for their future and the necessity of intellectual superiority in the exercise of power that a governmental *summum bonum* may be found.

It would be well to remind the advocates of "all power to the people" that, as Edmund Burke remarked, tyranny is tyranny, whether despotic power is exercised by a single man or the multitude. They should beware lest they establish a tyranny infinitely more cruel than that they allege in the present.

Letters: UC This Week

O.S.U. Riot

Sir: The recent riots which have broken out at Ohio State have not been, in my opinion, effectively communicated to the people. I am writing this letter for a friend who sent me a letter describing the true events. This friend (I will not mention her name so as not to frighten her parents) was a typical Ohio conservative, and always respected the police. To reinforce my deep disgust I now have toward Governor Rhodes and other administrators, I will quote passages from her letter, which is a combination of Wednesday night and Thursday.

Many people have described the situation as a hippie-orientated clash. My friend characterized herself with the following passage in regards to the initial demonstration. "It all started this afternoon. There was supposed to be a student strike for certain demands by the blacks and whites. I did not really intend to take part since I felt I should go to class because I couldn't afford to stay away." This statement proved that this person was not an active demonstrator.

The letter continues and described the demonstration as "very organized with demonstrators at each building peaceably going around in a circle." Newsmen stated that there was a shortage of teargas. Reasons for this shortage are established in this letter. "The cops were just throwing teargas bombs at kids who were doing nothing. The police were just throwing gas bombs for no reason. They wouldn't say anything and kids were just outside enjoying the weather and still would get bombarded." She also related to the bombing of fraternities and sororities by stating, "kids just come out to see what was happening and they were gassed". Why? No one knows.

The following description which will be related has turned my stomach. This account must be printed. This event takes place after my friend had attended a class. "After class another kid and I went outside and could not

decide whether to go back to the dorm. All of a sudden a National Guard threw a bomb into a crowd. I was a pretty good distance away but as I turned around a gust of wind, full of the pepper gas, hit the left side of my face. I started running but all of a sudden was blinded and the pain was terrible."

This is a tactic used by a militant state. Innocent people are getting hurt because of these damned law enforcement officers or Gestapo, I see no distinction. Some people wonder why students are rebelling, there is one reason. My feelings and the attitudes of many students are being changed, not by the radicals of SDS but the militant reactions of police toward us.

Well, this is her letter and I am appealing to your conscience. This is a true account and please print this so people really know what happened and the reasons students riot and are disgruntled.

Gary Mueller
Teacher's College '73

Constructive Force

Sir: Your editorial of May 6 ("The Governor's Actions") was patronizing to the intelligence of your readers! Its blatant one-sidedness betrays the very real grievance we have against Governor Rhodes' tactics. Just when did destruction of National Guardsmen with rocks become MORAL? That kind of "commitment to PEACE" is well-disguised! And let's cut the dramatics about students "lying murdered" and "sick, repressive attitudes". The real gem is the bit about the authorities' lack of "perception" in answering students' demands at Kent. Just when did true perception become the exclusive domain of students. Grow up, grow up! You're right, the American university has become a big force—it could also be a CONSTRUCTIVE one.

Look at our case. Marchers carried the cross—a sign of sacrifice. What's the sacrifice we offer, what the commitment, the

personal stake? The Administration has their dead. We offer nothing. What kind of a sacrifice is cutting classes unpenalized? Let's stop living on grand illusions! The nation is tired of war, but we'll have to offer more than this to make the point. And that 'more' is not "violence for violence", "impatience for impatience". And maybe this is the whole point.

We espouse "LOVE" in large gold letters and make a travesty of the ideal by ignoring the ways of love: going the mile the other side won't go, the sacrifice, the dedication and total commitment, and, not least, the patience. Instead, we scorn, we antagonize, we're violent, we turn in historical ignorance to the old slogans of "fascist violence" and "comradry" and coat it all with a colossal self-righteousness that we're young and right. The potential of youthful idealism is unlimited.

Let's not throw away these years to find that later we've burned all and built nothing. The cause of peace is surely important enough to justify spending extra hours promoting it to the public in INTELLIGENT articles, speeches, and petitions or whatever means offer any promise of breakthrough, as well as marches and protests.

Nixon has said he won't listen to student opinion—he will indeed listen if he must. But the selfishness, the parroting of slogans, the rockthrowing, building-burning, and the insulting, one-sided, and melodramatic editorials like that of May 6 are a damning indication of immaturity and lack of influence for all the world to see.

If we're children playing "follow the leader with the peace sign", all right. But if we're not kidding, let's act like it, get back to classes and start some constructive as well as vocal programs to bring public opinion around to the side of peace willingly.

Karen Arnold
Graduate College

'Kent State Massacre'

Some students were shot
At Kent State, today,
By a sniper?
Some killer?
No, guardsmen,
They say.

Oh, I was not there, but
Can report anyway,
For on T. V.
They told it—
Was, guardsmen,
So they say.

Four students were killed
At Kent State, today,
By one bullet?
From one rifle?
Weren't they blanks,
Anyway?!

Were guardsmen
That loaded
Blank rifles, today;
But, the bullets
Killed children—
Wasn't there,
But they say.

And what were they guarding
At Kent State, today?
Our freedom?
Or liberty?
All those pat phrases
They say?

But humans shot humans
At Kent State, today.
Are we cave men?
Savage warriors?
No, we're "cultured,"
They say.

But children were murdered
At Kent State, today!
For so little?
Maybe nothing.
Time tells,
So they say.

But Americans were killed
By Americans, today,
At Kent State,
For everything worth living,
Let us pray.

Allen Morrison

We commend the Student Body of the University of Cincinnati for the peaceful and controlled manner in which they expressed their dissent with U.S. involvement in Cambodia.

We hope that this attitude will continue to dominate future demonstrations regarding the freedom of expression and defense.

Board of Directors
Women's City Club
of Cincinnati
Mrs. Frank Rodgers—President

Abridged Version

Position of the

FORWARD: *In response to many questions raised in the last week about the University's position on public issues, including proposals made by spokesmen for last week's strike, the Steering Committee presented to the University Senate the following position paper. On May 13, 1970, the paper was received by the University Senate as a working document for discussion and background information.*

In this time of crisis on the campus, no university can carry on its affairs as usual. None has escaped the pressures that arise from sources beyond the campus. The major problems facing the University of Cincinnati and other universities today — the impact of the draft, the efforts to achieve social equality for blacks, the effects of a bitterly divisive war, the campaign against the despoliation of the environment, the recent reactions to the invasion of Cambodia and the killings at Kent State — have their origins outside the university. The membrane separating the university from its environment, always a permeable one, has been rent recently on scores of the nation's campuses.

At U.C., however, the student body has been able to achieve meaningful protest without violence or disruption. It is the policy of this University to encourage those members of the academic community who wish to express their concerns over the widened conflict in Indo-China, the slayings at Kent, the racial tensions in our society, and the pollution of the environment. We remain the only large university in Ohio that has not had police or guardsmen on its campus. There is universal pride that we are the largest university in the country that so far has not seen outside forces brought in to preserve order. It is the hope of all of us—students, faculty members, and administrators—that we can keep it so. To do this, we must continue to be creative in our responses to the deep concerns that are felt by many on our campus. In the future, as in the past, we must not confront those who feel strongly about events beyond the campus with the alternatives of either bottling up their feelings or else using force or violence to achieve their ends. In a spirit of seeking to provide the entire community with clear guidelines on the University's position regarding issues beyond the campus, this paper is written.

I. Can the University Be Neutral in a Time of Crisis?

The "ivory tower" is already an outmoded figure. In fact, the University never has been completely isolated from its social environment. A half century ago, a president of the University of Cincinnati proclaimed that the future of higher education lay with the urban university. The University of Cincinnati, he said, should strive to be not only a university in the city but a university of the city.

It is now even more clear than in President Dabney's time that universities cannot remain isolated from the burning issues of our time. The question is how they will deal with them. So involved have our universities become in the communities of which they are a part that the boundary lines between them has become increasingly ill-defined. The relationship is often so intimate that the university may seem to be in danger of losing its essential character and of becoming a pawn in a bitter struggle for power among social, economic, and political forces which would capture and use it to their own ends.

In recent years student protest has turned many American campuses into arenas of political conflict. To many people both in and out of the universities, the very idea of the politicization of the campus is abhorrent, for it conflicts sharply with a cherished image of the university as a forum for free inquiry, academic values, and civil discourse; in short, an institution whose fundamental concerns transcend politics. The idea of the University as a **community**, sharing common values and standing apart from both internal political conflict and external political influence, is imbedded in academic tradition, and often in law. This tradition has given a kind of sanctity to the special character of the university as an institution. To some students and professors, on the other hand, the image of the university is that of an institution which functions as a basic cog in the "system," providing that system with the skilled personnel and technical assistance required for furthering its political objectives; hence their opposition to ROTC and defense-related research at a university.

But a distinction must be drawn between involvement in the community or larger society by student or faculty individuals or groups and the commitment of the university's legal or public authority to one or the other side in a current controversy. To decades ago, faculties and student bodies unsuccessfully fought off the efforts of those who would politicize the university in quite another way by requiring loyalty oaths and limiting freedom in the classroom. Those who risked their careers and livelihood by refusing to sign a loyalty oath argued that the scholar must be free of any imposed authority that constrains his intellectual options. One cannot argue to politicize the university on one's own terms, while opposing it on another's. How can the teacher or student use the argument of impartial scholarship and objective teaching to free himself of imposed authority (such as test oaths) if, at the same time, he asks to be bound by any master other than truth freely sought? He cannot have it both ways, for to argue in behalf of a current cause for politicization of the university, however righteous the cause may be at the moment, is to compromise his basis of appeal from oaths and other limitations imposed by those bent on blunting inquiry and the free flow of ideas. Certainly the strength of the university is in its detachment and freedom of its members to express any point of view, however right or wrong it may seem at the time. The longer view tells us that crusaders, however filled with passion and righteousness, have not always been judged right in the long sweep of history. On the contrary, the university has been right to resist such past crusaders as the anti-evolutionists, the Know-Nothings, and other extremists. To submit to one pressure group, no matter how highly motivated, is to invite other groups, perhaps diametrically opposed, to try their hand at swaying the University.

THE POSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY

Is there a way out? Can the academic community, through its

students, faculty members, and administrators express its concern at what happens beyond the campus without endangering the hard-won freedoms of the university in the community? This University believes that the answer is yes. No limitation should be put on the expression through lawful and peaceful means of the public concerns of individual members or groups within the academic community. An individual, a group of concerned faculty members, or even an entire faculty or student body may choose to debate and take a position on a matter of public controversy, but the University as a corporate and public body may not do so. Thus, the Harvard faculty may speak out against the war but the Harvard corporation has not done so. Kingman Brewster may provide leadership to dissenting members of the academic community at Yale but he must also say that "The University as a corporate body cannot take stands on controversial public questions but individual members and groups within the Yale community should be encouraged to do so."

This is the position of the University of Cincinnati. If it is argued that the University is already politicized because of research contracts from the Department of Defense or because of the presence of ROTC on the campus, then let the case be made and full debate follow.

It is thus possible that individual faculty members or students, or groups of them, may wish to condemn actions taken by the Governor or the President, but the University may not do so. It is possible that they may wish to condemn imperialism in certain forms, but the University may not do so. Neither will the University, on the other hand, defend the actions taken by a public official or the policies of the United States in any part of the world.

The University is not neutral but committed to academic freedom. It is committed to freedom of inquiry and to educating persons to play their role as citizens in the world beyond the campus. We encourage all members of this community to become involved, thoroughly informed, and active in the affairs of their city, state, and nation. We will defend both types of commitment for all members of the University, whatever their political views or beliefs.

II. What is the University's Position on ROTC?

It has been argued on this campus and other that the existence of ROTC is evidence of a connection between the University and the "industrial-military complexes" which is alleged to be responsible for many of the controversial foreign policy actions of recent years. It is important that the existing facts on this matter be widely disseminated and discussions held throughout the University.

The purpose of ROTC is to provide a civilian source of college-educated officers to serve in leadership positions in the armed forces. The service academies supply only a small percentage of the total requirement. An additional objective of ROTC is to maintain in the civilian community a pool of university-trained citizen-officers ready to serve in times of national crisis and general mobilization. During the Second World War, approximately a hundred thousand ROTC graduates served in responsible command and staff positions and military historians have concluded that their availability accelerated the mobilization of the American war effort.

ROTC units nationwide are on campus at the invitation of a university under contractual agreements whereby the university provides certain necessary facilities, such as classrooms and offices, but does not pay salaries of ROTC personnel. All faculty members in the ROTC units possess, at a minimum, baccalaureate degrees plus varying levels of post-commission and postgraduate service schooling, and most hold either advanced degrees or have accomplished work toward gaining them. ROTC faculty members are approved by the University prior to assignment. Customarily this approval has been given by the President of the University after consultation with other University officers. It should be noted that the Air Force now has a policy that all instructors in AFROTC must have at least a master's degree.

Policies of institutions are relatively uniform on the question of academic rank and privileges of military officers assigned to ROTC units. The commander of each unit is normally designated a full professor, according to requirements of the law. Other members of the staff are usually given the rank of assistant professor or instructor. In most cases, all enjoy essentially the same status, rights and privileges as civilian faculty, except for tenure and certain financial fringe benefits.

However, this pattern is not inflexible. The Benson Committee noted that "despite the wording of the public law, the Department of Defense has not insisted on a special academic title for ROTC department heads," and has permitted the use of other designations in some instances.

The Army ROTC has been at U.C. for 50 years and the Air Force 21. Both programs are entirely voluntary and are taken by students on an elective basis. Army ROTC enrollment at the beginning of the fall quarter in recent years has averaged about 300 cadets and Air Force enrollment 350 cadets.

The program is designed to qualify the cadet for commissioning and active duty only. Qualification to perform special technical and Army branch assignments occurs at summer camp, and at military service schools after graduation and commissioning.

Army Cadets incur a two-year active duty service obligation upon graduation and Air Force Cadets incur a minimum for four years' obligation.

ACADEMIC CREDIT

Credit awarded for ROTC Courses at U.C. is nominal when compared nationwide and is awarded at the discretion of each college. However, all U.C. colleges allow credit in arriving at the quality point average. Credit is given for classroom work only.

Generally, over 50 percent of the U.C. students enrolled in the program carry ROTC as an overload with no academic credit awarded toward graduation.

At the great majority of institutions belonging to the Association of American Universities, ROTC courses carry some academic credit, and specific policies concerning credit toward degree requirements are set by individual departments, schools, or colleges of the university.

Only seven institutions reporting in a recent survey by the Association of American Universities maintain university-wide policies

University



Dr. Bonner, Academic Affairs Provost

governing the question of academic credit for ROTC. Each awards at least some credit toward graduation for ROTC courses.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Army ROTC officers two, three, or four-year scholarships, while Air Force ROTC offers one, two, three or four-year scholarships. These pay tuition, books, and lab fees plus \$50 per month. Currently, 50 U.C. students are attending the University supported by this program. Non-scholarship Advanced Course cadets receive \$50 per month in either the Army or Air Force Programs.

CURRENT RE-EVALUATIONS AT U.C' AND ELSEWHERE

As might be expected, many institutions have ROTC under review. Some of these reviews are raising issues which have led to serious differences with the military services, as at Harvard and Brown. Academic credit for ROTC courses and questions concerning academic rank and qualifications of ROTC instructors are the most frequent sources of concern.

At U.C. and AAUP faculty committee to "examine the academic merit" of the ROTC curricula offered at U.C. has been appointed but has not yet reported. In response to the Benson report, the Vice Provosts for Student Affairs and Undergraduate Studies have agreed with the commanding officers of the military units on the appointment of an advisory faculty committee to the ROTC and AFROTC units. In the recent reorganization of its curriculum, the Arts and Sciences faculty voted to continue offering credit (elective) for work in ROTC.

In the fall of 1969, a committee of Student Senate which had been investigating ROTC recommended to the full Student Senate an endorsement of the ROTC program and recommended retention of both ROTC units in their present form. The Senate supported the resolution by a vote of 22 to 5.

THE POSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY

1. On this campus, the most recent actions of official bodies, e.g., Student Senate, A&S Faculty, indicate a sentiment for retention of ROTC.

2. Under our present Board rules, individual faculties have the right to determine the academic status of ROTC programs within their respective colleges.

3. Questions are properly being raised with respect to academic rank, qualifications of instructors, and academic control of courses.

4. The disposition of the faculty and ROTC units and students toward discussion on resolution of the questions is good. Deliberations already underway give promise of productive results.

5. The position of the Military Science Departments in the University organization is uncertain. There is tacit agreement that the two departments are A & S Departments and the staffs (at least the commanding officers) are invited to A & S faculty meetings. On the other hand, the programs are clearly all-University and the Commanding Officers of the units are also listed in various catalogues as belonging to other faculties, e.g., Engineering. From a budgetary point of view, the cost of the programs are borne mostly by the Department of Defense, and to a very small extent by University general funds, (e.g., supplies and non-military equipment). Although the units may think of themselves as Arts and Sciences Departments, they report not to the Dean of that College, but directly to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies.

6. In the light of the above, it would seem that problems associated with ROTC require somewhat different treatment than would those associated with a more orthodox academic department. It seems clear that the problems must be dealt with on a University-wide basis. The recently established University Senate could be an appropriate place to which to refer the problem. An alternative, used at other

of Cincinnati

Thomas N. Bonner

institutions, would be an ad hoc Presidential Commission.

III. What is the Status of Defense-Related Research at U.C.?

Research work relating to the needs of the Vietnam War or the Department of Defense has been a source of controversy on other campuses. Such research, it is argued, belies the non-political nature of the university and allies the university with the military-industrial complexes. Whatever the case elsewhere, this has not been a serious charge at the University of Cincinnati. According to the Research Office, all secret or classified research of a military nature sponsored by the government ceased at U.C. about 1947.

THE POSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY

In May 1969, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Research recommended the adoption of a policy relating to research that contained the following recommendations:

1. The aim of university research is to enrich and enhance the culture and survival of the human race.
2. The university will assume no responsibility for any government research if its existence or its results cannot be made public.
 - a. The university will not accept support or provide any service for classified research.
 - b. The university will not accept classified research as part of the requirements for any degree, unless the research became classified after it was initiated and its classification could not reasonably have been foreseen until it was so far advanced that its modification would result in substantial inequity to the student.
3. Under exceptional circumstances, such as a grave national emergency or state of war, the university will consider assuming responsibility for classified research only if a joint administration-student-faculty committee appointed by the President of the University approves.
4. This policy shall not affect the freedom of anyone in the university community to participate in classified research outside the university, provided such activities do not interfere with nor are inconsistent with the performance of the individual's university duties.
5. This policy shall not be retroactive.

These recommendations were subsequently approved by the President and form the basis for the policy statement which appears on page 36 of the current issue of Faculty Facts.

IV. How Does the University Community Stand on Environmental Pollution?

THE POSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The recent efforts by students and faculty members to bring attention to the poisoning of our human environment by pollution have been strongly supported by all segments of the academic community at the University of Cincinnati. Provost Bonner agreed to transmit a request by the faculty-student committee on Earth Day that faculty members urge their students to participate in the several activities being planned that day and the rest of the week. He promised further that he would meet with the committee responsible for planning the environmental program at U.C. to plan further teaching and research efforts aimed at education of our students and resolving some of the environmental problems of the community. As a leading national center for environmental teaching and research, the University of Cincinnati is committed educationally to studies and research efforts that are certain to have impact on the world beyond the campus.

So far as information on securities in automotive and other industries is concerned, this information is already a matter of public record. A list of bonds and shares of stock owned by the University is available in the office of the Associate Vice President for Business Affairs and Director of Finance, and we are prepared to make this information more readily accessible.

The University of Cincinnati Student Senate recently adopted a motion urging the Board of Directors to cast its General Motors Corporation proxy vote in favor of the Project on Corporate Responsibility which is concerned with the matter of pollution by industrial concerns.

The Budget and Finance Committee of the Board of Directors will consider this request at its next meeting and establish the principle which it will follow in the General Motors' case and other similar cases.

V. What Commitment Has the University Made to Improving the Educational Climate for Black Students?

One of America's greatest internal struggles focuses on the Black-White issue. At the University of Cincinnati, the entire academic community has felt keenly the obligation to use facilities and manpower in the introduction of new courses and programs relating to the Black contributions to American society, in the dissemination of information designed to correct misconceptions held by Black and White alike, and in combating racism, Black or White, conscious or unconscious, wherever it exists. The magnitude of the problem, and the challenge presented to solve it, are great.

We have already expanded our academic programs to include, among others, courses in Black History, Literature, and Music, and the Psychology of Inter-racial Relations. A Black Studies Department has recently been approved by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences and recruitment of faculty members for the department is in progress. Efforts have been initiated and mechanisms provided for the continued recruitment of Black faculty, staff, and students. Though we have thus far recruited the largest number of Black faculty members of any predominantly white University, our recruitment efforts are being further strengthened. A considerable number of new Black faculty members, including several full professors, have accepted invitations to begin teaching in the fall. It is our expectation that the University will have more than one hundred full-time Black faculty members and professional staff in September, 1970.

THE POSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The University is committed to the implementation of a long-range program by allocating funds for hiring faculty, providing financial aid to students, providing additional tutoring and counseling, and implementing the Black Studies Departmental program. As a result of efforts underway, we fully expect the number of Black faculty members and students at U.C. to reach national ratios of Blacks to Whites within the next five years. The University, through a paper distributed to Black student and faculty leaders, has made known its commitment and has pledged simultaneously to make every effort to improve generally the academic climate for Black and White students alike in the months ahead. In the meantime, we are continuing the special program for recruiting Black faculty and staff, the special student recruiting program in the Department of Admissions, and trying to be responsive and sensitive to the special needs and situations of students now on the campus. All students are encouraged to avail themselves of the opportunities present in the Black Studies Department.

VI. Is the University Committed to Uphold the Charter of Students Rights and Responsibilities?

One of the issues raised in the discussion of the U.C. campus last week was the extent to which the University community was committed to uphold the statement of student rights and responsibilities adopted last summer by the Board of Directors. At that time the University indicated its agreement that U.C. students should have substantial autonomy in their non-academic activities, that they should participate effectively in institutional decision-making, that they should be afforded means of redress for grievances, and that their civil liberties should not be abridged because of their special status as students.

POSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The University of Cincinnati reaffirms its support for the Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities. It was the clear understanding at the time of its acceptance by the Board of Directors that if it was to be a living document that changes would be necessary and that these would come through recommendation by the Student Senate.

The University is continuing to move toward the "direct and significant" participation by students in decision-making in all areas of the University that is provided for in the Charter. The University Senate is the vehicle for recommending action regarding its further implementation.

VII. Should the University Provide a Co-operative or Other Form of Day-Care Center for Children for Its Students and the Community?

Discussions of the possibility of a Day Care Center in Corryville were initiated by community representatives some time ago but have not yet resulted in specific plans or recommendations for the location, organization, and financing of such a Center. There is no day-care center in the immediate vicinity of the University; the closest is the Hale Avenue Center in Avondale.

POSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The University is prepared through appropriate officers to enter into discussions with interested students relative to the establishment of a day-care center for children of students; and it is equally prepared to discuss further the matter of a community day-care center with representatives of the community.

VIII. Should the University Seek Housing for the Families Displaced When Land Was Acquired in Corryville to Establish the Federal Environmental Health Center?

University officials have discussed this matter with appropriate officials of the city, since this is an activity of the city, not the University. The city has for many years conducted a relocation service. We are advised that many of the residences which eventually will be taken for the environmental health center in Corryville are still occupied by the owners and tenants, and that to date no insoluble problems in finding housing have been encountered by those who have begun to relocate. Relocation stipends are provided for those persons who experience financial loss by reason of property acquisition. The University, through its Office of Community Relations, has sought to keep abreast of this problem and assist in every way possible. It will continue to do so.

IX. What is the Position of the University Regarding the Use of Outside Forces in Preserving Order on the Campus? Forces in Preserving Order on the Campus?

POSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The record of the University of Cincinnati in preserving an educational climate on the campus without resort to force is clear. We remain virtually the only large university in the nation that has not used police or state forces to restore order on its campus. It is our strong belief and expectation that this will continue to be true. We are committed to the peaceful resolution of conflict, to the protection of orderly discussion and dissent, and to the use of external assistance only when there is imminent threat to human lives, safety, or property on the campus. Even in these instances, in the spirit of the faculty resolution of May 7, 1970, every effort will be made to consult the University Senate, if this is at all possible.

X. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We are strongly committed to the central values of the

(Continued on Page 6)

Bonner's Statement of The University's Position

(Continued from Page 5)

University, including freedom of inquiry, the right to dissent, and the importance of criticism. Aware of the strong record of our student body in achieving meaningful protest without violence or disruption, it is our policy to encourage members of the academic community who wish to express their concerns about events beyond the campus. An individual, a group of concerned faculty members, or even an entire faculty or student body may choose to take a position on a matter of public controversy, but the University as a corporate and public body may not do so. We are not neutral but committed both to free inquiry and to playing our role as citizens in the world outside the University.

2. In regard to ROTC, the problems connected with its place on the campus should be dealt with on a University-wide basis. The University Senate, or an ad hoc commission established by the President, would be appropriate bodies to study the questions raised on this campus, and elsewhere about academic rank, professorial appointments, curriculum, and location of facilities. It is urged that deliberations go forward at the earliest possible moment.

3. The University is opposed to secret or classified research and is committed to accepting support for only that research which fulfills an educational purpose and can be used to meet the requirements for a University degree. The aim of research at the University of Cincinnati is to enrich and enhance the culture and survival of the human race.

4. The University of Cincinnati is committed to establish a superior educational climate for all its students, Black and White, and will continue to move vigorously to recruit Black faculty, staff members, and students, and to implement the work of the recently approved Black Studies Department.

5. The University reaffirms its support for the Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities approved last summer by the Board of Directors.

6. The University is ready to discuss both with students and community representatives the possibility of a day-care center for children on or near the campus.

7. Every effort is being made to keep abreast of the problem of relocation of families from Corryville for the federal Environmental Health Center, although we have no direct responsibility for any decisions made here. The Office of Community Relations will assist in any way practicable and invites suggestions.

8. As an academic community, the University is committed to the peaceful resolution of conflict, to the protection of orderly discussion and dissent, and to the use of miniman force when there is an imminent threat to human lives, safety, or property on the campus.

We at the University of Cincinnati continue to be optimistic that we shall weather the challenges of preserving academic freedom in a time of greater involvement in the world beyond the campus. Criticism from within an institution is always more meaningful and acceptable than attacks from without; and this University is now engaged at all levels in a searching self-examination. In dealing with unrest, we shall avoid firmly the role of adversary and seek constantly for methods of providing a creative response to the feelings and concerns in the campus community. When problems are brought to our attention, we must have the courage to do what is right educationally and morally, regardless of what others may say. We must always be ready to listen; yet resist unsound proposals which are backed only by pressure or by threats.

None of us has lost faith in the young people who are the brightest hope of the future. For all their passionate intensity, they have not really lost faith in the American experience or the values that guided it. They are simply more insistent, more demanding, less experienced perhaps, in drawing the attention of all of us to the darker lining of the American Dream.



Thomas N. Bonner

Autumn Quarter Registration

GRADUATE DIVISION:

All graduate students, part-time and full-time, may take advantage of advance registration any afternoon, 1:30-4:30 p.m., May 18-28, or June 1-5.

UNDERGRADUATE DIVISION:

Arts and Sciences

Senior
Tues., May 19
Junior
Mon., May 25
Sophomore (A-L)
Mon., June 1
Sophomore (M-Z)
Tues., June 2

College-Conservatory of Music

Senior
Mon., May 18
1-4:30 P.M.
Junior (A-L)
Thurs., May 21
1-4:30 P.M.
Junior (M-Z)
Fri., May 22
1-4:30 P.M.
Sophomore
Thurs., May 28
1-4:30 P.M.

Education and Home Economics

Senior
Wed., May 20
Junior
Tues., May 26
Sophomore
Wed., June 3

Engineering

Senior
Mon., May 18
8:15-11:30 A.M.
Junior & Prejunior
Thurs., May 21
Sophomore
Wed., May 27
8:15-11:30 A.M.

Business Administration

Senior
Mon., May 18
8:15-11:30 A.M.
Junior & Prejunior
Fri., May 22
Sophomore
Wed., May 27
1-4:30 P.M.

Design, Architecture, and Art

Senior & Presenior
Mon., May 18
1-4:30 P.M.
Junior & Prejunior (A-L)
Thurs., May 21
1-4:30 P.M.
Junior & Prejunior (M-Z)
Fri., May 22
1-4:30 P.M.
Sophomore
Thurs., May 28
8:15-11:30 A.M.

Pharmacy

Senior
Mon., May 18
1-4:30 P.M.
Junior & Prejunior
Wed., May 20
1-4:30 P.M.
Sophomore
Thurs., May 28
1-4:30 P.M.

Nursing & Health

Senior
Tues., May 19
8:15-11:30 A.M.
Junior
Thurs., May 21
Sophomore
Thurs., May 28

University College — Consult bulletin board posting of schedule
Special Students

All
June 4-5

Students who are unable to register on their assigned day, may register on any later day, however, students assigned for that day will have first preference. June 4th and 5th are available for any student.

Hours: 8:15-11:30 A.M. and 1:00-4:30 P.M. daily except Saturday.

Advance registration closes on Friday, June 5, 1970; and re-opens on Monday, July 20, 1970.

I.D. cards for 1970-71 will be prepared and distributed to all full-time students as they take part in advance registration for the Autumn Quarter.

Board Pronounces on Limits of Dissent

(Continued from Page 1)

“Appropriate persons or groups of the University are prepared always to confer with those on campus urging change, and will consider carefully and fully their proposals. After a reasonable period of deliberation, these persons or groups will respond to the proposals.

“Disruptive demonstrations or other actions that go beyond the limits of orderly dissent will be dealt with promptly through campus resources if possible; should these prove inadequate, then external assistance will be sought. Where possible, efforts will be made to persuade persons intent on disruption to disperse or to convert their activity into peaceful expression; meanwhile the necessary steps will be inaugurated to protect persons and property. This paragraph will be interpreted to include the following:

“a) No one may forcibly or physically disrupt, either by action or noise, the regular business or function of the University.

“b) Picketing as a non-violent means of advocating differing points of view may be utilized outside University buildings. No one may block stairs, doorways, or walkways to buildings.

“c) Persons may not coerce or intimidate students, faculty, or administrative personnel in their entering or leaving of the campus, its buildings and classrooms.

“Any violation of these regulations or of any municipal, state, or federal laws, or any disruption or interference with the University's attainment of its educational objectives, or any interference with the rights of others within the University Community to pursue teaching, study, research, learning, and administrative functions shall be considered misconduct. (Ohio Revised Code 3345.21).

“In case of such misconduct, appropriate disciplinary or legal action shall be taken promptly by the President or his delegate(s) pursuant to the University Statement on Student Conduct adopted by the Board of Directors in June, 1969, to restore the rights of all members of the faculty, student body, and public to pursue their legitimate University endeavors.”

Also included as an additional stipulation in this proposal was the fact that in addition to concurring with the above, the Academic Cabinet “wishes to remind the campus of existing University policy regarding the use and hours of buildings.” The Cabinet is composed of the Deans of all colleges in the University, all Vice-Presidents and Vice-Provosts, along with the President.

The official policy, published in 1969, states:

“Building hours are generally controlled by the overall University schedules. Some buildings, e.g., Library, D.A.A., C.C.M., have requirements necessitating deviation from the University schedule and are established by the college Dean or Building Head. The Physical Plant Department is advised of these deviations and effects appropriate openings and closings. Authorized use of University facilities outside of pre-arranged schedules should be cleared through the Campus Calendar office which will coordinate with the Physical Plant and insure building security.

The above recommendations were unanimously approved by the Body; consideration of the proposal for the convocation today followed. The original convocation proposal was suggested in a resolution before the University Senate; the program was formulated by a group of interested persons under the leadership of Dabney Park, Assistant Professor of History, President of the Junior Faculty Association, and University Senator.

The Board's approval of the program was prefaced with the following statement:

“That, since, a) we cannot reopen the University as though nothing had happened during the past two weeks; b) it is important to inform all concerned of the actual problems and events that faced the institution; and c) we wish to create a campus climate conducive to the pursuit of educational objectives, opportunity be afforded for the prompt presentation to all of a special program being planned by several committees representing all segments of the institution.”

The program this morning will tentatively consist of two parts. First, the following individuals are scheduled to speak: Wilber R. Lester, Professor of Law and University Senator; Dabney Park, Assistant Professor of History; Michael Dale, President of the Student Body; Michael Gray, leader of Students Concerned About Mobilizing the People; Thomas Bonner, Vice President and Provost for Academic Affairs; Thomas Banta, Professor of Psychology; Gene Lewis, Professor of History and President of the University Senate; and Walter C. Langsam, President of the University.

The second portion of the program, which will also take place in Nippert Stadium unless the weather makes it impossible (in which case the Fieldhouse will be used) is to consist of group discussions between returning students and those involved in the demonstration and representatives from the governmental bodies on campus.

SCAMP Reviews Incidents Leading to UC Shutdown

Editor's Note: The following is a statement presented before the University Senate last week by Michael Gray, for the Students Concerned About Mobilizing the People.

Students Concerned About Mobilizing The People, (SCAMP) is a coalition of undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, and other interested citizens who are concerned and angry about the United States Policy in Southeast Asia, genocide of black and brown people both in the United States and out, "The repression of dissent in the United States, and the University of Cincinnati's relationship to the events of the past few weeks and years. We are the people who supported the strike, occupied the University buildings, and presented the demands to the administration.

Feeling that Student Senate in actions May 4th had not acted vigorously enough, nor that it had addressed itself to issues at hand, a group of students met to formulate demands, which are as follows:

1. That the University of Cincinnati condemn Governor Rhodes and the murder at Kent State.
2. That the University of Cincinnati condemn the Nixon Administration's invasion of Cambodia.
3. That the University of Cincinnati condemn the American imperialism in Asia, the world, and in national Black communities and other forms of imperialism throughout the world.
4. We demand the removal of all forms of ROTC from the University of Cincinnati and that the University disassociate itself from this program in every aspect by June 15, 1970.
5. That the University Senate be advised of all proxies received by the University of Cincinnati. That the University Senate have the right to direct the finance committees of the Board of Directors to cast proxy votes as the University Senate sees fit; the University Senate shall use this right to help end environmental pollution, social and economic discrimination unfair consumer practices, and defense and war manufacturing processes.

The group also made the decision to add three demands to the previous five. They are as follows:

1. That the University should provide a co-operative or "other form of day care center for the community and the students.
2. That the University act positively on the overwhelming mandate received via referendum last year in support of the student bill of rights.

3. That the University actively seek housing for the 245 families displaced when 70 acres of land were acquired in Corryville for establishing an environmental health center.

On Thursday, May 7th, the occupation of the Administration building continued under the sanction of the administration without incident. In an attempt to continue to demonstrate to the administration the desire of the group to have the demands answered without escalating to violence, a group of students moved to occupy Beecher Hall and the Registrar's office. Once again the intent was to merely sit in the building and not to disrupt the workings of that office or that building. This group also resolved to remain in the building until the demands were answered.

That evening, upon the request of the administration, a team of about 15 negotiators were sent from those occupying the buildings to meet with the university with the purpose of discussing the demands. At that time agreements were made with the university to continue negotiations at 8:30 a.m. Friday, May 8th for the purpose of discussing any changes or revisions in the demands. The agreement was also made to meet at 11:30 a.m. after the University Senate meeting. It was hoped, at that time, that the university was serious about making a response to those demands.

On Friday, May 8th, however, the Board of Directors closed the university, breaking off all negotiations and breaking the agreements previously made. At 6:00 a.m. those in the buildings were awakened and notified to leave campus. The demonstrators complied without incident. All university buildings were locked and dormitory students were directed to leave campus by 6:00 p.m. Then dorms were also locked.

Since the May 8th closing of the University by the Board of Directors, and the disruption of the learning process which has resulted from that closing, we are adding one further demand and

we are placing it at the top of our list:

That the University population shall not be locked out of the university except by order of the University Senate. The acceptance of this demand will be of paramount importance for any further discussion.

We do this because we believe that the Board of Directors—a group of men of questionable credentials as educators, the majority of which represents powerful corporate interests only—committed the grossest violation of academic freedom when the unilaterally closed down this university, thereby breaking off negotiations over the demands put before them. In this act, it is they who have infringed on the rights of all of the students and faculty to continue their education both within and without the classroom.

Let us be clear about one thing further: As students concerned about mobilizing people we are obviously concerned about the "silent majority". It was the tyranny of the silent majority that allowed the liquidation of the Kulaks in Soviet Russia, and it was the tyranny of the silent majority that permitted Hitler and the Facists in Europe to commit systematic and LEGALIZED genocide against the Jews.

We will not allow ourselves to be cowed by the repression in this country which has led to the existence of a silent majority. According to the best principles of pacifism we have placed ourselves between the attacker and the attacked: the Board of Directors have attacked, and all of the students and faculty, as well as the community at large has been attacked by being deprived of their open forum.

To quote Ghandi: "Nonviolence is not passivity in any shape or form. It is the most active force in the world... No power on earth can stand before the march of a peaceful, determined, and God-fearing people." When we say that we are committed to the tactics of non-violence we are in no way condemning ourselves to a spectators role on the sidelines of the parade of life.

Senate Hears 'Education First'

Editor's Note: The following is the statement presented by members of a group called "Education First" before the University Senate last Thursday.

We, the members of "Education First" subscribe to the following policies in the interest of maintaining an atmosphere conducive to Education while

maintaining academic freedom.

1. NO NON-UNIVERSITY STUDENT should be allowed to participate in any demonstration on campus. Students may be asked to show current, valid I.D. cards. Failure to comply should result in immediate removal from campus. We do favor an open campus but we do not favor

outsiders imposing their wills on U.C. students.

2. NO DEMONSTRATIONS OR DEMONSTRATORS should be allowed in University Buildings.

3. WE WISH to maintain true academic freedom on Campus for ALL STUDENTS. This is possible only if the University as a whole, remains neutral on all political issues. This should not be construed to prohibit any organizations or individuals within the University from taking a firm and public stand on any issue.

4. No organization can function without an efficient, aware and responsive Administration. No Administration can function efficiently without support. The Faculty and Students of U.C. have failed in their responsibility to support the Administration by not letting their views be known to the Administration. It is time for the Administration to take its backbone out of the closet and stand up. It is time for the Administration to enforce the rules and maintain order on campus.

5. Unless the Administration is willing to maintain order on campus to prevent the disruption of Education, unless all of the Faculty and Students express their support for the Administration, stand behind and cooperate fully with the Administration in maintaining order, unless the Administration is willing to guarantee they will use whatever means are necessary to insure the continued operation of the University, we oppose the reopening of the University at this time.

Combined Groups Issue Statement

Editor's Note: The following is an official statement released last Thursday by a number of students concerned with the present situation on campus. These proposals were presented before the University Senate by David Altman, Graduate Student, representing the efforts of members of many groups on campus including: The Cincinnati Experience, the United Christian Ministry, the UC Veteran's Club, and ad hoc student committee representing a varied cross-section of student interests, and students from the College of Business Administration, along with other groups.

1. That a free and open campus be maintained.
2. If school is not opened the university issue some type of grade for the quarter.
3. If the university is opened classes should be strictly voluntary and students should be permitted to take deferred or take-home exams; or, the university should issue pass-fail grades but continue holding classes on a voluntary basis.
4. That the University administration seriously negotiate with those students who have made demands.
5. That the University Senate have the power to close the university acting through the president of the university. Students and faculty are the primary groups effected by the closing of a university.
6. All proposals pertaining to a free and open campus should be seriously considered. They should be addressed to the University Senate.
7. That students may request of individual administrators of the university a policy statement on key issues as individuals holding a university position and that it be clear that the requests are not to the administration as a whole but to the administrator.
8. That there be a group of neutral student observers regulated by the University Senate to maintain a free and open campus, to protect the rights of those who wish to dissent, and to get the facts to prevent the

maligning of any one group; and that the observers work with the leaders of individual groups; and that until a more representative University Senate is established student observers be set up to observe and advise university personnel and others, and that they operate by means of verbal persuasion only. The observers shall report regularly to the University Senate.

9. That every demonstrating group elect a spokesman for the group, their own marshalls to keep order, and that the be in communication with neutral observers and appropriate groups.

10. That any law enforcement official or law enforcement personnel be fully trained and that those responsible for making the "call-in" be also responsible for knowing the control and arrest procedures of the group called in. Because of dangers resulting from these procedures not being followed and unfortunate incidents resulting, those responsible will be under penalty of criminal negligence. The national Defense Department guidelines for riot control should be followed.

11. All forms of dissent not disruptive of the administration of the university or the educational process be allowed; in cases of dissent which take the form of civil disobedience traditional rules of civil disobedience will apply; and student observers shall be present at demonstrations and report periodically to the University Senate.

12. The university as a whole shall remain politically neutral on all issues so as to allow freedom of discussion on all issues.

13. That a committee of the University Senate composed of students and faculty be set up to analyze the use by the university of its stock options, proxies, and public statement to see if they maintain the position of neutrality.

14. That the composition of the University Senate be restructured to include twenty (20) faculty members, fifteen (15) undergraduates, and ten (10) graduate students, with the administration acting in the important role of non-voting consultants. All non-administrative members of the University Senate shall be popularly elected.

15. That referendums shall be a gauge of campus-wide opinion. They should not violate the policy of neutrality. All appropriate groups should be allowed to vote, only after the University Senate conducts a period of education and debate on the issues presented.

NOTE: On Neutrality
The silence of the over-all university community should be taken as a reflection of neutrality not as support or dissent on a given issue.

Stock Proxies, Student Rights Topics of University Senate Legislation

(Continued from page 1)

The Senate adopted four resolutions concerning University stock proxies. Easily passed were two resolutions calling for the Board of Directors to "make more readily accessible a full listing of all stock and bond holdings of the University." Copies of these listings were requested for the University Senate, the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, the Executive Branch of Student Government, and the News Record. The second called for the Board of Directors "to seek the advice of the University Senate in casting all proxy votes."

Hotly contested was a resolution, proposed by Senator Larry Bonhaus, which urged the University Senate to "advise the Budget and Finance Committee of the Board of Directors to vote proxies in a manner designed to help put an end to environmental pollution, social and economic discrimination, unfair consumer practices, and defense and war

manufacturing processes." The resolution was amended, replacing the particulars of recommendation to a more general statement advising the Board of Directors to "vote proxies in a manner designed to benefit mankind." Over the objections of Senator Bonhaus, who withdrew support for the resolution, the resolution was passed.

A specific stock proxy proposal was adopted, recommending that the University cast its proxy votes in the upcoming General Motors stockholders meeting in support of the Project on Corporate Responsibility.

The Senate further recommended establishment of a committee to "investigate the feasibility of establishing a day-care center for the University Community." The alleged displacement of Corryville residents by the Environmental Health Center was discussed and resolution passed urging the University to seek housing for

those displaced.

A resolution expressing the full and unqualified support of the University Senate for the Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities was passed, leading to speculation by many Senators that the University Senate would become a vehicle for the enforcement of the Charter.

President Langsam announced that the All-University Faculty Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, May 19 has been rescheduled to Tuesday, May 26 at 12:30 p.m.

The decision was made following recommendations for rescheduling by Dr. Louis M. Lavshay, Chairman of the Faculty, and members of the Faculty Executive Committee.

Dr. Lavshay stated that the one-week delay was recommended to yield the Tuesday free hour on May 19 for College and Departmental Faculty meetings.

Details on the May 26 meeting are being mailed to all faculty members.

EXAM SCHEDULE

The Committee on Calendar and Examinations has approved the following ruling on the use of the final week of the Spring Quarter (June 1-6)

"That the regular examination time schedule be eliminated and that the week of June 1-6 be used as a regularly scheduled class week. If any instructor desires to give tests or quizzes during that week, a schedule will be provided for the giving of such tests or quizzes within the regular class time."

This ruling applies to all the colleges of the University except OCAS, Raymond Walters Branch, Tri County Academic Center, Evening College, Medicine College, and Law; which colleges were given permission to make their own decisions relative to the examinations week.



photos by dave kessler, barry kaplan, ray weiss, mike schwartz, and frank lupu.