

A DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY OF CAMPUS ACTIVISM

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

by

Paul Robert Falzer

Submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Bachelor of
Arts in Speech and Drama with
Honors

Redacted Signature

Instructor in Charge

For the department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 - Introduction.1
Goal of the project.1
Name of the movement2
Justification for study.3
Definitions.4
Chapter 2 - The Movement.7
History.7
Purpose of the movement.10
Causes of the movement11
Military-Industrial Complex.12
Political Establishment.14
Social Establishment.16
Administrative Establishment17
Characteristics of the movement.18
Channel.19
Visibility and Ideology.20
Membership and Size.22
Demographic Factors of the movement.24
Chapter 3 - Activism and the University of Kansas.29
History.29
Methodology for demographic study.31
Chapter 4 - Results of the Study.34
Demographic Factors of Individuals.34
Demographic Factors of Parents37
Choice Demographic Factors of Individuals.42
Chapter 5 - Conclusions, Discussion and Summary	
Affluence.48
Politics48
Religion49
Grades.50
Selective Service Status50
Housing51
Impressions51
Summary52
Bibliography	
Appendix A - Rhetoric of the Movement55
Appendix B - A Comparison of the Demographic Factors of Several Groups of Young People, grouped by ideology.58
College Students.58

Non-College Students.59
Young People.60
Appendix C - Questionnaire.61
Appendix D - Cover letter	65
Appendix E - Sum of Tallies of Each Question.	67

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Virtually every college campus in the country has seen the rise of a social movement that, at one time or another, has challenged those societal elements which we call the "American way," and offered in their place an alternative to established political, social and economic order. Unlike similar movements, this movement is differentiated by three factors: (1) it is comprised of young people, both in membership and leadership, (2) it is grounded on the nation's campuses, (3) it is idealistic in nature. As well, it is a growing movement and cannot be expected to wither away because of society's non-recognition or aspersion: it is too large, its ideas are too firmly entrenched in both protagonist and antagonist to be ignored. It behooves us, therefore, to learn about its nature and its people.

Goal

The goals of this project are two-fold: First, to present a picture of the movement in an understandable form; second, to determine what demographic factors differentiate the activist from the general population of the campus, and to find what part these factors may have played in the movement's establishment and purposes. In consideration of this goal I have divided the paper into five chapters. Chapter One provides an introduction into the paper. Chapter Two is the movement study, including its history,

purpose, factors contributing to its rise (causes), and characteristics, including those demographic factors which facilitate our understanding of the movement. Chapter Three is a study of the movement at the University of Kansas, and an explanation of a demographic statistical study of two campus populations. Chapter Four contains the results of the demographic study. Chapter Five is composed of inferences and conclusions based on the data in the paper.

Name of the Movement

Since the movement is not monolithic in structure, but rather is composed of a series of organizations called "activist subcultures" by Kenniston,¹ there is no consistent nomenclature, or name, for the movement. A survey of the names attributed to the movement would include "activist," "anti-war," "Socialist," "Hippie", "Yip-pie," "student," "student power," "anti-establishment," "up against the wall," "Maoist," etc., depending upon who is talking. For purposes of consistency and expediency I shall refer to this movement as the "campus movement." Note the name does not imply any particular leaning, ideology, or value judgment. It does imply that its origins are found mainly on the nation's campuses.

Let us remember that this movement is not singular in the sense that it has a unified membership, ideology and organization. Rather, it is an amalgam of ideas, people and sketchy organizations, sometimes working at cross-purposes, other times contradictory in both goal and method. The similarities in terms of membership, goals and methods justify viewing this amalgam as a super "holding company" type, loosely constructed movement.

Justification

I see six essential reasons for pursuing a study relating to the campus movement. First, it is an event of considerable political importance. Knowing that it strikes at the roots of our political structure we can hardly consider ourselves knowledgeable political animals if we ignore the existence and characteristics of this movement, or refuse to take it seriously.

Second, the rise of this movement allows us to understand our own political structure more completely and, more importantly, allows us to observe and correct the faults of the system. The rise of the movement itself is a sad commentary of the establishment's choice to ignore social problems. Blind opposition has been counterproductive both in the long and the short run, and if the voice of the campus movement would awaken people to the problems we do indeed face then everyone could be better off knowing that the movement may eventually die from having nothing to shout about.

Third, since this movement is centered around youth, it should be obvious that we need to discover what motivates the youth of this country: we need to discover where their priorities lie, or in their own jargon, "what turns them on." These activists and dissidents are the future establishment and their ideas will not expire as they receive their diplomas. Thus, our referents of study should include the campus movement.

Fourth, the movement ought to be of primary interest to the scholar. We know that mass movements are an integral phenomenon in the historical process, and, as such, warrant ~~such~~ a study. Studies have been made, books have been written about the nature of

movements and of specific movements, but no one professes to have a formula which characterizes all of them. If we choose to ignore this movement we are ignoring an important development in what will one day become American history.

Fifth, demographic factors are, to some degree and in some respect, related to the inception, cause and structure of the movement itself, and I shall establish a correlative relationship between activism and certain demographic factors later in this paper. Thus, I feel justified to pursue a demographic study of campus activism.

Finally, the University of Kansas is moderate, state-supported university which has seen some activist responses to university policy. And though this campus is not in the tradition of the Columbia, Wisconsin or Berkeley riots, the tactics, causes and characteristics of the campus movement, wherever practiced, are somewhat similar. Therefore, I feel justified to analyze the movement in microcosm by concentrating on one university campus.

Definitions

For the purpose of clarification the terms "activist," "dissident," and "establishment" will be explored and operationally defined. Kenniston defines a campus activist as a person who:

- (1) acts together with others in a group,
- (2) is concerned with some ethical, social, ideological or political issue, and
- (3) holds liberal or radical views.²

This definition, though having specific criteria, is not exclusive: it would include the A.D.A., the "Old Left," the "Intellectual Socialism" movement and, possibly, a political science class project. Also, Kenniston ignores one crucial aspect of campus

activism: the confrontation by the activist with the existing social structure or "establishment." This confrontation runs on a continuum from Ghandi-like passive resistance to violence. The former takes the form of the sit-in and mild forms of civil disobedience. The latter takes the form of armed takeovers, building occupations and campus revolutions.

For the purpose of this paper, therefore, a campus activist will be defined as "a person operating on or near a college or university campus who acts in a concerted effort with others to confront the establishment and who favors radical solutions to perceived problems." Eric Hoffer characterizes the radical as follows:

The radical. . .loathes the present. He sees it as an aberration and a deformity. . .(he) has a passionate faith in the infinite perfectability of human nature. He believes that by changing man's environment and by perfecting a technique of soul forming, a society can be wrought that is wholly new and unprecedented.

The difference between the activist and the dissident is largely a matter of degree. First, the dissident acts alone rather than together with others. Second, his confrontation tends to be milder than the activist. Third, his solutions may be liberal or radical. In characterizing the liberal, Hoffer distinguishes between the two:

The liberal sees the present as the legitimate offspring of the past and as constantly growing and developing toward an improved future: to damage the present is to main the future.

Thus, the radical is revolutionary, the liberal is not, and the dissident sympathizes with the radical and the movement but is not directly involved with it.

In defining "activist" I referred to that structure which he confronts as the "establishment." This term "establishment" is

quite elusive; however, I shall attempt to describe and define it. The establishment has been called "the structure," "the hierarchy," and "the system." In reality it is all of these and more. The establishment encompasses politics, business, industry, the military, the educational administration, even the church. I shall define it as "the structure of ordered society which attempts to perpetuate itself by replacing its cadres with people of like political, economic, social and moralistic leanings." The outstanding characteristics of the establishment defined in this way is that it resists change. The definition does not convey a monolithic nature, nor is it necessarily bad. It is easy to join, difficult to change, and virtually impossible to avoid.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 1

¹Kenneth Kenniston, Young Radicals (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968), p. 311.

²Ibid.

³Eric Hoffer, The True Believer (New York: Harper and Row, 1951), p. 71.

⁴Ibid.

CHAPTER 2

THE MOVEMENT

Chapter Two of this paper is divided into four sections: In the first section, I shall show its history; also, I shall project its goals and purposes. In the second section I shall discuss the movement's reaction to the establishment. In doing so I shall divide it into components and issues, and show how these issues contributed to the rise of the movement. In the third section I shall describe the important characteristics of the movement, demonstrating how this movement is differentiated from other movements. In the final section I shall show how demographic factors contribute to the movement.

History

The date of the movement's inception is cause for considerable controversy. Some use the advent of the sixties as the date of the "new look" on the campus. Others see its origins in the fifties. For purposes of this analysis we shall consider 1965--date of the Students for a Democratic Society Port Huron statement--as the date of its inception. Until then, S.D.S., the foremost of activist organizations, worked within the existing social structure to effectuate change. In the 1964 election, S.D.S. even went "part of the way with L.B.J.," seeing Johnson as the only realistic alternative to Goldwater. Then in 1965, frustrated by the Johnson administration and the decision to escalate the war in Vietnam,

the S.D.S. leadership met in Port Huron, Michigan, and began a program of radicalism and militancy leading to socialism.

The movement spread and splintered. There are several reasons for its splintering: First, there was great disagreement among activists with respect to goals, ideology and tactics. Even the S.D.S. is badly splintered along these lines. The Progressive Labor Party, which existed as a separate entity until recently melting into the S.D.S., is a Peking-oriented, Marxist dogma group. The national office contingent, seeks to unite S.D.S. under its reign and throw out the Progressive Laborites. The anarchists, or as they call themselves, the "up against the wall motherfuckers,"¹ comprise the third faction.

The second reason for this disunity is that no clear leadership emerged nation-wide. True, Berkeley had its Mario Savio, Columbia its Mark Rudd, but these leaders were campus-wide and not respected nation-wide. With no leader to rally around, each campus sought its own leaders, and the movement inevitably split.

Third, its devil, the establishment, offered no consistent reaction to the movement's attempts at confrontation. At Columbia and San Francisco State, administration was changed and police were called in. At Harvard, where S.D.S. members occupied buildings, no police were called and university business went about almost as usual. At Denver, everyone involved in a demonstration was expelled. It became evident that each campus had to handle its "establishment" in a different way, and national directives would not work.

Fourth and finally, unity implies a hierarchy, a structure, an "anti-establishment establishment." Unity, therefore, is not a goal of the movement. "If anything, (S.D.S.) is an organization whose members shy away from organization."² This fact is what I

term the "paradox of consistency." To be true to its goals the movement must be disunified, but to gain singular recognition and pursue its goals it must be unified. This paradox is one of the key problems which the movement must confront.

Activities of the campus movement have been confined thusfar to the campus. The movement has concerned itself with the administration, the curriculum and other campus problems. It has fulfilled its goal of confronting the establishment only where the establishment confronts the campus. For instance, activists' concern with minority groups is manifested by demands for Black Studies programs and remedial programs for minority group members. At Columbia, students rioted partially because the University wanted to extend its campus into Harlem, and in the process wipe out homes of the poor. The movement has confronted the military-industrial complex by demanding an end to R.O.T.C., disrupting recruitment by the military and by "war businesses" such as Dow chemical. Note that there has never been a truly concerted effort on the part of the movement to extend beyond the campus.

However, this campus-limit phenomenon is expected to change, as activists will attempt to infiltrate high schools and labor unions. William Bruce Cameron, speaking recently at the University of Kansas, stated his belief that the movement might have greater success in the high schools than it has had on the campuses. His reason: high school youth is more impressionable, less mature, thus more apt to join such a movement.³

The movement's attempt to infiltrate labor unions was expected to begin this summer; however, as of this writing, nothing of

significance has been reported. I perceive three reasons why the movement will fail here. First, the activists must confront and defeat the most powerful and cohesive "establishment" it will ever face: the union leadership--a group of people who are professionals at what the activists are amateurs. As Cameron stated, "I would pay money to see that (the confrontation)."⁴ Second, though union members are liberal in the sense that they are Roosevelt Democrats, they will never accept the liberal tenets of the campus movement, especially those tenets which deal with minority rights, and disrupt "law and order." Third, with paychecks and fringe benefits increasing and with working hours decreasing, one would be hard-pressed to find dissatisfaction among the workers, and without dissatisfaction there is no reason to change. Concluding the point, Edgar Sampson has stated, "the contemporary activist student groups find it almost impossible to get any rise out of the very people they hope to help."⁵

The future course of the campus movement remains, at this point, in abeyance. The tactics of the movement depends, to a great extent, on present successes, on its membership and leadership, and on the reaction by the establishment. New proposals for tougher laws and enforcement practices may force it to become more rebellious than ever. Since none of the indicators are, to this point, clear, the future of the movement remains largely in the hands of its membership and in the course of future events.

Purpose of the Movement

We have established that the campus movement is an amalgam of groups having no consistent goal or purpose. Thus, to analyze one

such group or "sub culture" and portray it as typical of the movement is an inaccurate representation and belies the movement itself. As one journalist so aptly stated, campus demonstrators are "rebels with not one cause, but at least a score."⁶ To some, the movement's ultimate goal is socialism, to others it is Communism (from Titoism to Maoism), to others yet it is anarchy. To all, the goal is change--radical change. The membership will not accept change by bits and pieces: they regard evolutionary change as accommodating the establishment; the establishment being the devil. In the sense that they are dedicated to immediate change and regard themselves as the leading cadres of this change, they are, save for ideology, Leninist. This is not to say they are un-American, for our country was founded upon the same revolutionary principle. In fact, they regard themselves as true to the American principles of freedom and self determination. The principle means by which the movement achieves its goal is confrontation, a means which the movement regards as the only way of effectuating change. Power is the common denominator and power is achieved through confrontation.

Causes

Having considered in overview a picture of the movement's rise and brief history, we now turn to the causes of the movement. I shall argue that its fundamental cause is the inflexible nature of the establishment. In describing the establishment I shall subdivide it and show how its components affect the people of the movement. I shall attempt to look at the underlying causes--the feelings that underlie the events, for it is the feelings and not the events which caused the movement:

They are right when they argue that our problems lie deeper than a particular war in Southeast Asia or a particular election. They are asking the basic questions, making the mistakes, and our survival may rest on their search for the answers we desperately need.

Within the elements of the establishment are issues, within the issues lie the basic causes of activism. I shall concern myself with four elements of the establishment: the military-industrial complex, the political establishment, the social establishment and the administrative establishment.

Activists view the establishment as a totalitarian devil--a mighty, encompassing octopus that tells us what we can and cannot do, allows us to make money and spends it for us, demanding in return both body and soul. The tactic is confrontation and the goal must be destruction of the establishment. Actually, few of the activists are so revolutionary as to call for complete destruction of the establishment. Rather, the goal of most is to revise that part of the establishment that infringes upon them most. The following statistics show the reaction of certain groups of young people toward the establishment:

Question: How do you react to the following question: "The Establishment" unfairly controls every aspect of our lives; we can never be free until we are rid of it.

<u>Results:</u>	Revolu- tionary	Radical Reformer	Moderate Reformer	Middle Road	Conser- vative
Strongly agree	53%	35%	11%	8%	9%
Partially agree	47	48	53	42	38 ₈
Strongly disagree	--	15	36	46	52

The Military-Industrial Complex

The Military-Industrial Complex actually suggests two elements: the military, or "war machine," and industry. Here the two

will be considered together because to the activist mind they are inevitably tied. Within the "war machine" there are three issues confronting the movement. First is the war in Vietnam. Most Americans consider the United States presence in Vietnam as senseless. Unlike most people, however, the youth of the nation is conscripted to fight and die, and have no voice in the decision. Inevitably, protest ensues. Not surprisingly, the activists, who themselves carry the most extreme views toward the war, and who believe in and practice the tactics of confrontation, find cause to dissent from the "machine" which, despite public opinion and sheer logic, perpetuates the war:

This is a war surrounded by rhetoric that young people don't understand. These are the children not of the cold war, but of the thaw.

Yet to say the war itself is a cause of the movement is to miss the real point: the fact or illusion (depending on your point of view) is that the war machine--the military, industry and government--can begin a war and demand that people fight and die for the perpetuation of its imperialism and pride. Correlary to the main issue are the issues of the draft and the United States as a world policeman. The draft is the mechanism by which the Military-Industrial Complex conscripts people to die and perpetuate its evils. America's role in the lives and destinies of others is what brought about the war in the first place; thus, the movement opposes both. The Yankelovich study shows the following results of questions dealing with the war and the draft. These results in Table 1 appear on the following page. Table 1 shows that a majority of dissidents are hesitant in supporting the war and an even greater

majority support draft resistance:

TABLE 1

ACTIVIST AND LIBERAL REACTION
TO THE MILITARY

Question	Revolu- tionary	Radical Reformer	Moderate Reformer
Draft resistance is wrong.	58%	45%	33%
Draft resistance is a moral issue and is not wrong.	98	55	67
The war in Vietnam is pure imperialism.			
Strongly agree	75	34	20
Partially agree	25	42	61 ¹⁰
Strongly disagree	--	23	19

Industry perpetuates the war machine by contributing to the violence and incidence of war. It does so by creating the weapons of war and by profiting from them. The activists believe that industry has a genuine interest in war and its perpetuation; thus, both the military and industry--the Military-Industrial Complex--must be "destroyed" or changed if the nation is to be viable and humanitarian.

Political Establishment

Under the political heading there are two main issues, poverty and racial injustice. With respect to the "poverty" issue, the movement is unable to see why a country of our size and wealth allows poverty to be perpetuated. Rather than spend money on social programs, the government ignores the problems, rationalizes that progress is being made and spends the money on the war. Industry is at fault because it does little to hire or upgrade the poor. This issue strikes at the heart of our economic system and the movement

views capitalism as immoral and unable to solve the present problems:

What we are witnessing and participating in is an important historical phenomenon; the revolt of the trainees of the new working class against the alienated and oppressive conditions of production and consumption within corporate capitalism.¹⁴

The Yankelovich study found the following data with respect to the activists' reaction to big business and capitalism:

TABLE 2
ACTIVIST AND LIBERAL REACTION
TO BIG BUSINESS

Question	Revolutionary	Radical Reformer	Moderate Reformer
Big business needs:			
No substantial change	2%	20%	13%
Moderate change	12	43	40
Fundamental reform	44	28	43
Done away with	42	9	4
Business is overly concerned with profits and not with public responsibility.			
Strongly agree	90	72	63
Partially agree	10	23	34
Strongly disagree	--	5	3

Table 2 shows a significant dissatisfaction with big business on the part of all three groups.

The other political issue is racial injustice. The government assumes primary guilt in the perpetuation of discrimination by ignoring the real problems of the races and allowing institutional racism. Yet, to consider these issues as reason for cause of the movement is myopic: the real issue is the inability or unwillingness of our government to solve these problems:

Democracy as a realistic means of altering our political system is becoming less and less viable, at

least for the short run, and it is with the short run that the student activists are concerned. We will not have the time to wait 15 or 20 years.¹³

The Yankelovich study also found significant dissatisfaction with this nation's racial attitudes and policies, as shown in the following table:

TABLE 3
ACTIVIST AND LIBERAL REACTION
TO RACIAL PROBLEMS

Question	Revolutionary	Radical Reformer	Moderate Reformer
Basically, we are a racist nation.			
Strongly agree	85%	51%	42%
Partially agree	14	32	47
Strongly disagree	2	17	11
What is your impression of what this country is doing now for black people?			
Too much	--%	16%	13%
Enough	--	17	17
Too little	32	20	21 ¹⁴
Wrong things	68	47	48

Table 3 shows that most liberal young people believe the country is intolerant to blacks, and is either on the wrong track or doing too little to solve the problems.

Social Establishment

The third element which confronts activists is the social establishment. By "social," I mean the relationships among people, families, cities, social and demographic classes. Here, two issues are prevalent. The first is affluence. The young person, disgruntled by his affluence and the poverty of others, sympathizes with the poor and works to improve their lot. But more to the point,

the fact that our society is affluent allows its younger people to become more socially conscious, and, as such, affluence is viewed as a factor contributing to the rise of the movement. "These more advantaged youth demonstrate not because their own interests are threatened, but rather because they see others as the unwilling victims of societal injustices."¹⁹

The second issue is the generation gap. Obviously, one of the causes of the gap is differing opinions on social issues. My point here is that once the gap is created, issues tend to polarize and where once there may have been agreement on other issues, disagreement, hence the gap, sets in. The result is a feeling of alienation and the belief in the injustices, harms and wrongs stated above. "What draws young people into S.D.S. is a desire to translate their sense of alienation from society into 'a political thing'."²⁰ Certainly, this factor is secondary to others I have mentioned, but it is in evidence if not to cause the movement, to perpetuate it. Hence, issues and beliefs polarize on both sides. As a result, while the movement grows revolutionary, society grows reactionary, each side unwilling to communicate to the other. The activists, in desperation, cling to each other and the movement is perpetuated.

Administrative Establishment

The last contributing factor that I shall consider here is the administrative establishment; specifically, the university administration. The issue is the revitalization of an antiquated university power structure. The underlying cause behind the issue is the administration's unresponsiveness to change. The following

table shows the degree of dissatisfaction with university structure and that fundamental reform is needed:

TABLE 4
ACTIVIST AND LIBERAL REACTION TO
THE UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE

Question	Revolutionary	Radical Reformer	Moderate Reformer
Most of what is taught in universities is not relevant to today's needs.			
Strongly agree	68%	33%	17%
Partially agree	27	48	52
Strongly disagree	3	19	28
The Universities need:			
Moderate change	--	22	14
Fundamental reform	14	48	44
Done away with	3	1	2 ²¹

Few of the students are satisfied with the university curriculum. Most see the necessity of change in the university, although very few would see the university eliminated.

I have attempted, in this section, to portray the conflict between the movement and the establishment. I have shown the sources of this conflict and that, to some degree, demographic factors play a part in the conflict. Now we concern ourselves with the characteristics of the movement and how demographic factors effect them.

Characteristics

In searching for an understanding of the movement's characteristics I have considered a number of factors descriptive of any social movement: channel, visibility, ideology, membership and size.²² By applying these characteristics to the campus movement I hope to

gain a knowledge of it which, combined with its history and contributing causes, will present a picture of the movement in an understandable form. By analyzing these characteristics we shall discover its tactics and faults.

Channel

By channel, I refer to the movement's modes of communication, its rhetoric and its tactics. The campus movement refuses to utilize the traditional channels of communication. A look at its history showed that before its inception, campus dissenters actively sought change within the system, utilizing elections, campaigns and traditional communication channels such as letters to congressmen, lawsuits and bargaining. Discouraged by the failure of these channels to gain needed change; indeed, discouraged by the very institutions with which communication is effectuated, the activists abandoned their attempts to change from within. Encouraged by their perception of the establishment "devil" they saw the possibility of change through confrontation: one system against the other, power as the common denominator.

But power is not merely physical, brute power. Some of the elements of power are the degree of conviction, public opinion, degree of response from the establishment, and all of these are based on their perception of what they have to lose in such a confrontation. The movement is firm in its conviction, in many cases has public opinion on its side, has a negative response from the establishment to rally around, and has nothing to lose. Thus, its members view their position as powerful and do not hesitate to confront. This confrontation runs the gamut from passive resistance to armed

occupation and insurrection. The choice depends on the philosophy of the activist and the threat posed by the establishment. Generally, if the establishment plays brinkmanship the movement will deliberately cross the brink to call their bluff. Thus, the activists will not be intimidated or stopped by a "get tough" policy.

Visibility and Ideology

I shall consider visibility and ideology together because they are inevitably related. By visibility I mean the degree of which the activities of the movement are open to the non-member. The degree of visibility depends to a large degree on the organization, the location and type of meeting. At the University of Kansas, S.D.S. and Voice meetings were public but there was a great deal of back-room "ideologizing." The important decisions were made in private; the public meetings were forums of discussion where little was accomplished. At the last national S.D.S. meeting everyone was excluded but members and the "non-capitalist" (underground) press. I would therefore characterize the movement as being highly invisible.

This relative invisibility is the tactic of not tolerating dissident opinions while policy is being formulated. Dissident views are tolerated only when they can be confronted. Gus diZerega, himself an activist, claims that the movement is non-ideological:

To the Student Left, such terms as "ideology" carry innuendos to dogmatism, doctrinaire rigidity, lack of responsiveness, and the misuse of intellect; hence, the Movement is fundamentally and consciously non-ideological.²³

However, I believe that there is a definite ideology present in the movement. diZerega speaks for himself and his statement shows the

non-monolithic nature of this ideology. It is so polycentric that one is hard-pressed to find any philosophic center. However, what seems to be in common with most movement rhetoric is the desire for socialism--both political and economic. The degree of socialism desired is the variable factor. The continuum runs from Puritan Communism (Maoism) to an increased emphasis on social programs while maintaining a mixed economy.

Another ideological characteristic alleged by diZerega is that, to many, the movement is becoming totalitarian in nature:

Their battle with the American Establishment often is looked on as a holy crusade, a jihad in which the Forces of Darkness (read Monopoly Capital) must be routed forever. The moralistic commitment, admirable as it may appear, is the basis of an increasingly totalitarian outlook on the part of many in the movement.²⁴

I believe that a movement cannot be totalitarian in itself, but is part and parcel of a totalitarian system. Further, few in the movement call for "exclusive acceptance of (its) philosophical and moral tenets"²⁵ by society. Rather, the activists view the establishment as totalitarian.²⁶

²⁶I would make the following comments in relation to diZerega's points. First, in relation to the "non-ideological" nature of the movement, diZerega himself tacitly admits to an ideology when he refers to the movement as the "Student Left": "left" having an ideological denotation. The rhetoric which appears in Appendix A is a slice of Marxist-Leninist dialectic: We are the proletariat being oppressed by the capitalist (bourgeoisie) and the instrument of oppression is capitalism. The solution is revolution leading to socialism. Unlike Marx, the movement makes no claim that the downfall of capitalism is inevitable. But like Lenin, it claims that the way toward revolution should be paved and the proletariat should be given a gentle shove in the right direction.

Second, I think diZerega has inaccurately described the phenomenon of totalitarianism and overstated his point. Professor J. Piekalkiewicz of the University of Kansas defines totalitarianism as follows: Totalitarianism is a system controlled by a political movement which denies the moral or ideological neces-

Membership and Size

I shall concern myself with three different levels of membership: the hard-core (leaders), the activists (not identical with the term "campus activists" which I have used interchangeably with "members of the movement"), and dissidents (sympathizers). I shall consider size and unity in conjunction with membership. As well, I shall point out some problems posed by the membership and their implication for the future of the movement. More than any other characteristic, membership most readily lends itself to a demographic analysis. I shall describe the membership by demographic factors in section four of this chapter.

It is impossible to discern between the demographic characteristics of the hard core and the activist. The difference between the two is that the hard core furnishes the leadership of the movement: it started the movement on the campus and leads in its perpetuation by formulating policy and tactics which (hopefully) are carried out by the activists. The hard core is bound to be more revolutionary than the activist group, but to consider all hard core as more revolutionary than all activists is fallacious because the degree of commitment is relative on each campus. Thus, an

sity and obligation to tolerate ~~which~~ other parties or groups offering different solutions to political, social and economic issues, and a movement which proclaims as its ultimate goal the creation of a society which a total and exclusive acceptance of the movement's philosophical and moral tenets.

By this definition it is obvious that a movement cannot totalitarian in itself, but is part and parcel of a totalitarian system. Further, few in the movement call for its exclusive acceptance by society. Piekalkiewicz's definition does show how the activists define the establishment and they, in fact, regard the establishment as totalitarian. (Cite the Yankelovich study on page 12 of this paper.) Perhaps this view is what causes the movement to react in a likewise manner. Thus, to the activist mind, the movement is indeed totalitarian.

"activist" at Columbia may be more revolutionary than a "hard core" at the University of Kansas. The activists as such are the workers of the movement, taking orders from the leadership. The activists may move up to assume a leadership role, but do not move down to assume a supportive (dissident) role. There is a marked ideological difference between the dissident and the other two. The dissidents rely on both the hard core and the activist camps for leadership. They will support--sometimes formally, sometimes informally--but they will not initiate. Obviously, their degree of commitment is much less than either the hard core or the activist. Oftentimes, a majority of a campus may support a tactic of the movement. For instance, a significant minority, or even a majority of the students may have supported the Columbia riots.²⁷ In other cases these dissidents may be non-existent. Fluctuating as it does, the dissident element can never be relied upon either to carry out directions or actually join the movement.

The Yankelovich study disclosed the population distribution of youth along these ideological lines. Their findings, based on a nation-wide statistical study, is as follows:

1% Revolutionaries
10% Radical Dissidents
25% Reformers
<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
34% total

48% Moderates
19% Conservatives
<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
67% total ²⁸

The top three categories are those which I consider to be in the "anti-establishment" categories: the revolutionaries and radical dissidents are the hard core and activist elements; the reformers comprise the dissident category. I shall discuss membership in

greater detail in the section on the demographic factors of campus activists.

In this section we have seen a discussion of five characteristics: channel, visibility, ideology, membership and size. In doing so, we have learned about the movement, its members and policies. Now I shall turn to the relationship between the history, causes and characteristics and demographic factors.

Demographic Factors

I wish to establish a correlation between activism and certain demographic factors. I shall, first, consider the relationship between affluence, education and concern for social issues. Second, I shall ascribe demographic characteristics to the ideological divisions in the Yankelovich study, which in turn shows at least a partial relationship between these demographic factors and the causes, characteristics and purposes of the movement.

In analyzing the social establishment we found that the activist youth are relatively more affluent than their non-activist peers. There may be a relationship between material affluence and (1) concern over the welfare of others and (2) belief in a non-materialistic idealism. Indeed, a primary reason for these beliefs may be the presence of material affluence:

Protestors have been brought up in comfortable, indulgent, permissive, upper middle-class homes. They take affluence for granted, so they go from materialistic concerns to "morality" or "brotherhood."⁴¹

Also, this affluence among the young may be a primary cause of the generation gap. The parents of these activists were, for the most part, children of the depression and, therefore, were primarily concerned about their own problems. Contrastingly, their off-spring

are concerned about the problems of the poor, the disenfranchized, as well as the problems of society as a whole. This social concern is shown by the following table:

TABLE 5

RESPONSES FROM YOUTH AND PARENTS OF
YOUTH ON SELECTED ISSUES

Topic: More interested in money.

Respondents: Youth falling into these categories.

Category	Revolu- tionary	Radical Reformer	Moderate Reformer	Middle Road	Conser- vative
More true of parents	68%	47%	43%	34%	28%
More true of youth	5	19	25	27	33
No difference	25	34	32	39	39

Respondents: Parents of youth falling into these categories.

More true of parents	18	37	26	27	25
More true of youth	55	12	19	30	19
No difference	27	47	54	43	52

Topic: More fearful of financial insecurity.

Respondents: Youth

More true of par- ents	88	39	53	44	34
More true of youth	9	14	17	14	14
No difference	9	29	34	35	21

Respondents: Parents of youth

More true of par- ents	82	57	49	51	61
More true of youth	9	14	17	14	14
No difference	9	29	34	35	21

Topic: More concerned with what is happening to the country.

Respondents: Youth

More true of par- ents	8	31	23	25	21
More true of youth	54	28	39	27	30
No difference	37	41	38	48	49

TABLE 5 (CONTINUED)

Respondents: Parents of youth					
Category	Revolu- tionary	Radical Reformer	Moderate Reformer	Middle Road	Conser- vative
More true of par- ents	18%	32%	28%	37%	31%
More true of youth	45	9	15	15	12
No difference	36	58	58	48	53 22

Table 5 shows some interesting discrepancies with regard to the opinions of the parents and their off-spring. With only three exceptions, the youth consider themselves less interested in money, less fearful of financial insecurity and more concerned with what is happening to the country. The exceptions are as follows: conservatives on the first^{two} topics, radical reformers on the third. However, parental reaction was not nearly as consistent: on the first topic, parents of revolutionaries and middle readers thought their off-spring was more concerned about money. And on the third, all but parents of revolutionaries thought they were more concerned about the status of the country than their off-spring. Thus, while the youth believe that they are more politically and less materially oriented than their parents, the parents do not always agree.

Another reason why the generation gap has become an issue is the demographic factor of education. Statistics show that each generation is better educated than the previous one, and, as well, the present college generation is more social-problem oriented. Thus, there may be a relationship between education and social concern. The statistics are as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Median School Years Completed</u>
1940	8.6
1950	9.3
1960	10.6 ²³

<u>Year</u>	<u>College Population</u>
1950	2,214,000
1955	2,379,000
1960	3,570,000
1965	3,675,000 ²⁴
1966	6,085,000

Education of Parents

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total Parents</u>	<u>Parents of College Youth</u>	<u>Parents of Non-College Youth</u>
Some College/Graduate	30%	58%	22 ²⁵
No College	70	42	78

The Yankelovich study disclosed demographic data on the groups divided along ideological lines. The important similarities and differences among those groups are as follows:

The college revolutionary is disproportionately higher than other college students in the following characteristics: nonwhite, male, age 20 to 23. One striking characteristic is that very few revolutionaries come from the 10 to 15 thousand dollar income bracket. They cluster about evenly above and below this range.

They have about the same proportion as other college students in relation to marital status and father's occupation, which is white collar. There are proportionately fewer Protestants and Catholics. Unlike other college students, a majority of the revolutionaries have no religious preference.

The radicals have one striking characteristic: blacks are disproportionately represented in both the college and non-college groups. The college radicals have proportionately fewer Protestants and more with no religious preference than the college youth as a whole. In most other respects they are like other college students. The non-college youth have proportionately more 20 and 21 year olds and fewer 22 and 23 year olds. They tend to a greater degree than other non-college youth to come from lower income parents, but this is probably due to the large proportion of nonwhites. As a group they have proportionately fewer fathers in blue collar occupations, but this is probably due to the unemployment of a large proportion of this group. They also have a larger proportion married than either non-college youth.

.....
Numerically, there are more non-college than college moderate reformers. However, there are proportionately

more in the college group. The college reformer is an excellent cross section of all college youth, that is, the proportions of age, sex, and other demographic characteristics is the same as total college youth.^{26,27}

You will recall that the different groups profess different views on impressions and social issues. I can conclude, therefore, that there is a correlative relationship between the demographic factors stated above and views of traditional values, the generations, society, institutions, restraints, activism and involvement.²⁸

In this section we have seen that demographic factors do play a part in the causes, characteristics and purposes of the movement. The purpose of this section was not to establish a causal relationship between activism and demographic factors; rather, it was to show that since demographic factors play a part in the campus movement then additional study of demographic characteristics is justified.

In our discussion of the movement we have discovered that it does not have a single or consistent purpose or goal. We have found that the inflexible nature of the establishment and its components is a primary reason for the movement's inception and perpetuation. Finally, we analyzed the various characteristics of the movement and found that it is composed of a special type of young person, differentiated from his peers, has an ideology which is disunified but tending toward socialism, and resorts to confrontation because it regards the establishment as inflexible and totalitarian. With this understanding as a basis we shall now concentrate on the movement as it has manifested at the University of Kansas.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 2

¹Harrison Blaine, editor. New Republic, (Washington: New Republic Publishing Company, Inc.), June 29, 1968, p. 13

²Peter Stone in Hedley Donavon, editor. Time, (New York: Time, Inc.), May 24, 1968, p. 53.

³William Bruce Cameron, speech before second annual symposium at the University of Kansas (unpublished).

⁴Ibid.

⁵Edgar Sampson, Journal of Social Issues, (New York: SSSI) July, 1967, p. 3.

⁶"Dissenters: Rebels with Many Causes" in Harrison Blaine, Op. Cit. July 10, 1967, p. 30

⁷Kenneth Kenniston, Op. Cit., p. 290

⁸Daniel Yankelovich, Inc. Generations Apart, (Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 1969), p. 67.

⁹Robert F. Kennedy, "What Can the Young Believe?" How Harrison Blaine, Op. Cit., p. 11. (Vol. 156)

¹⁰Yankelovich, Op. Cit., p. 54.

¹¹Carl Davidson. New Radicals in the Multiversity. (Chicago: S.D.S..Print Shop, 1968), p. 17.

¹²Yankelovich, Op. Cit.

¹³Gus diZerega, "Focus: The New Radicalism," The University Review, Vol. I, November, 1968, p. 3.

¹⁴Yankelovich, Op. Cit.

¹⁹Sampson, Op. Cit., p. 3

²⁰"Why Those Students Are Protesting," in Donavon, Op. Cit. May 3, 1968, p. 25.

²¹Yankelovich, Op. Cit.

²³diZerega, Op. Cit.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵J. Piekalkiewicz, lecture, March, 1968.

²⁶Refer to footnote in text.

²⁷Mark Jacobs, New Leader, (East Stroudsberg, Pa.: American Labor Conference on International Affairs), May 20, 1968, p. 14.

²⁸Yankelovich, Op. Cit.

²¹Donavon, Op. Cit.

²²Yankelovich, Op. Cit.

²³Department of Commerce. Statistical Abstract of the United States, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 114.

²⁴Ibid., p. 110.

²⁵Yankelovich, Op. Cit.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Refer to Appendix BQ for further demographic information.

CHAPTER 3

ACTIVISM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

To anyone who has surveyed the political scene at the University of Kansas, the terms "activist" or "dissident" would, until recently, be virtually meaningless. The S.D.S. chapter at the university has been in existence for several years, but its presence was not felt until 1966. Actually, the first hint of activism was created by the Kansas University Progressive Alliance. A group of All Student Council representatives formed this political coalition and sought a more realistic distribution of voting power, and a revitalized political structure which emphasized more student power. K.U.P.A. introduced a resolution to that end and the resolution lost by one vote. K.U.P.A. lost its viability in 1966 with the fall election. The tone of the university at that time was one of apathy and K.U.P.A.'s appeals for "student power" fell upon deaf ears. The membership of S.D.S. rose in 1966 and 1967 until its president, Don Olsen, was critically injured in an automobile accident. At that point S.D.S. fell apart, later trying to revitalize itself under the leadership of Dave Bailey. The organization, however, never regained its vitality and disbanded in 1969.

Meanwhile, in the spring of 1968, an organization called Voice, which was composed of students interested in campus politics, formed to demand a reorganization of university politics. The Voice members assumed that their demands were unmeetable,¹ and when Chancellor

Wescoe agreed to most of them, and when the changes were instituted, Voice became a meaningless organization. Voice made two mistakes; first, its goal was to talk to the administration, not to confront it, and second, it had meetable demands. The organization's name was changed to People's Voice, but when the executive committee resigned late in 1968 the organization fell apart.

In 1969 a few activists disrupted the spring elections by upsetting tables in voting areas. A couple of bombing incidents followed and suddenly the campus was aware that the activists were primed for action. A movement to end R.O.T.C. on campus was begun by circulating a petition and climaxed by disrupting the Chancellor's Review, an annual R.O.T.C. parade. As a result of the Chancellor's Review disruption, approximately fifty students were suspended from school.

At this point the future of the campus movement at the University of Kansas remains in doubt. Many of the activists were suspended for participating in the Chancellor's Review disruption. Thus, those activists who responded to the demographic questionnaire represent the past and if new activists take their place, they may be of a different genre altogether. Also, the individuals at the demonstration were a loosely-knit group amassed for that particular demonstration, and it is doubtful that an organization could be constructed which would incorporate all of them: it seems that the

¹Actually, in comparison to demands made on other campuses these were quite mild in that they were negotiable. Further, Voice demanded only an equal representation on faculty and administrative committees. They were later to compromise their position and agreed to leave some committees unchanged. After the resolution was drawn up by a combined group of students and faculty and put to a vote of the student body the result was an extremely "watered-down" version of the original demands.

activist camp at the University of Kansas is comprised of loners, thus dissidents, rather than activists. Consequentlally, the demographic study is based on "active dissidents": dissidents who occasionally operate in concert with others, but who owe no allegiance to any activist organization.

Methodology

The goal of the following study is to compare the demographic factors of campus activists to those of the overall student population at the University of Kansas. To select the activist population I compiled a list by talking to known activists and sympathizers. The list reached approximately sixty. Then I randomly selected sixty students from the roster for the fall semester of 1968. The data was collected by questionnaire² and accompanying the questionnaire was a cover letter³ which explained the purpose of the study, stated that all information would be maintained confidential and no names would be used. The purpose of the cover letter was to gain the trust of the respondents.

The questionnaire was mailed to the general population and to approximately thirty of the activists. Accompanying the questionnaire was a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Forty-five of the sixty general population responded. Approximately five returned their questionnaires unanswered with a comment saying they were not, at that time, students, or were too old. No further attempt was made to contact them.

Few of the activists responded to the mailed questionnaire. Three returned their forms unanswered. Hypothesizing that they were fearful of an establishment "plot" or simply did not trust a

non-activist, I did several things. First, I told my activist friends what I was doing and encouraged them to spread the word. Second, I went to activists personally and succeeded in getting a few responses. Third, I handed questionnaires to some activist friends and they distributed them to some of the activists that my methods could not reach. Of the original list of sixty, my final tally of activists was thirty-four. Considering the problems in finding respondents and compiling questionnaires, I was content with this number. Taking these completed questionnaires, I shall compare the responses on identical questions from both populations to determine if a significant difference exists between them.

Throughout this project three problems have challenged whether this is a fair representation of both populations. First, I have no way of knowing whether the answers were truthful. I anticipated this problem at the outset and believed that if the questionnaire were truly non-objectionable and understandable the changes of misunderstanding or deception would be decreased substantially. To reduce these potential problems I gave the questionnaire to a number of activists and non-activists as a pre-test, and asked for critical comments. None of the persons taking the test thought it was objectionable and through suggestions for revision I was able to make it clear and understandable to all.

Second, it was impossible to contact some of the activists because they are highly mobile. Some like to travel, others are "hot," but for whatever reason they could not be traced. This fact would not be a serious problem if those who did respond are a fair representation of the whole. Since this group contains a disproportionate percentage of the "pushers" or "heads," I truly question

whether the responding population is a fair representation, but whether there are any significant demographic differences between the responding group and this mobile group is unknown.

Third, this study has a disproportionate representation of whites: among the control group there was only one black; there were no blacks in the activist respondents. There are several black activists at the university, but they refused to respond to the questionnaire and one black was vehement and bitter about his refusal. Naturally, I feel the study would have been more valuable with a fair representation of both races. Thus, I am forced to term this paper a comparative study of two white populations at the University of Kansas.

The questionnaire elicited thirty-eight responses from the respondents. In all cases there were several choices, ranging from two (sex) to open-ended (hometown). Any questions having more than seven choices were compressed into a smaller, more workable size. I then tallied the responses for all of the choices.⁴ Finally, using the Chi-square contingency table I compared the frequency distributions of both groups on each response and determined if there was any significant difference between them. (The level of significance I utilized was .05.) If there was a significant difference between the two I returned to the tally sheet (see Appendix E) to determine the meaning of the difference.⁵ The results of this study are explained in chapter four.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 3

¹See explanation on page 30 of the paper.

²Refer to Appendix C for a copy of the questionnaire.

³Refer to Appendix D for a copy of the cover letter.

⁴Refer to Appendix E for the tallies of the responses on each question.

⁵William L. Hays, Statistics for Psychologists, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 336-343, 675-676.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section, questions 1-10, concerned the demographic factors of the individual that he had no choice in determining. The second section, questions 11-17, concerned demographic factors of the parents of the respondents. The third section, questions 19-33, concerned those demographic factors of the respondents that they had a choice in determining. In analyzing the data I shall divide my discussion into these three sections, explaining the results and making conclusions and suggestions based on the results.

Demographic Factors of Individuals

Table 6, which appears on the following page, shows the results of the analyses on questions 1-10. Table 6 shows the following results: There is a significant difference between the ages of the two groups. The difference, shown by Table 6, is significant at the .001 level. Appendix E shows a concentration of the general population around the 18-19 age group. In fact, 25 of 45 or 55.5 per cent are under 20. In contrast, only 10 of 35 or 28.5 per cent of the activists are under 20. The largest concentration of activists lies in the 22-26 category: 16 of 35 or 45.7 per cent. In these categories the general population leads: 9 of 45 or 16.4 per cent. Thus, the activists tend to be older than the general population. However, there is no significant difference between the two

populations with respect to the factors of activism and gender. In both populations, males comprised the majority of respondents: 60 per cent of the general population, 67.7 per cent of the activists.

TABLE 6

RESULTS OF QUESTIONS 1-10

No.	Question	χ^2 Score	Degrees of Freedom
1	Age of Respondent	21.3 [#]	5
2	Sex of Respondent	.45 [*]	1
3	Hometown and State	8.21 ["]	2
4	Selec. Service Status (males)	5.45 ⁺	2
5	Size of Hometown	6.62 [*]	5
6	Type of High School Attended	1.14 [*]	2
7	Per Cent of Negroes in H. S.	1.35 [*]	3
8	Predominating Race	---- [*]	-
9	Number of People in Family	4.31 [*]	4
10	Order of Respondent in Family	6.49 [*]	4

Interestingly enough, there is a difference[§] (.025 level) between the two populations with regard to the factors of activism and hometown area. The general population overwhelmingly came from the Midwest: 42 of 44 or 95.4 per cent. A majority of the activists also came from the Midwest: 24 of 34 or 70.6 per cent, but the difference lies in a relative concentration of activists from the East: 9 of 34 or 26.4 per cent for the activists, 2 of 44 or

*No significance (above $P < .1$)

[#] $P < .001$

["] $P < .025$

⁺ $P < .1$

[§]No computations were done as there was obviously no significant difference.

4.6 per cent for the general population. None from either population came from the South and only 1 (an activist) came from the West.

There is a marginal difference (.1 level) with respect to activism and Selective Service status. The only real differences emerging were in the category "ineligible" (meaning that they were veterans or classified 4F). One of 25 or 4 per cent of the general population fell into this category but 5 of 31 or 23.8 per cent of the activists fell into the same category.

There is no significant difference between the two populations with regard to size of hometown and activism. The exception to this is that the general population drew heavily from the 250,000 to 1,000,000 category (most of the respondents in this category were from the greater Kansas City area): 19 of 44 or 43.2 per cent, whereas the activists drew only 6 of 34 or 17.6 per cent from this category, but this difference was not great enough to be statistically significant.

There is no significant difference between the two populations with regard to activism and the type of high school attended. Appendix E shows that most of the respondents graduated from public high schools. A few graduated from parochial high schools and fewer yet from private high schools. Also, there is no significant difference between the racial composition of the high schools from which the two populations came. Of the entire sampling population, only one person was black and he was from the general population. Appendix E shows that most of the members of both groups (36 general population, 25 activist) came from primarily "white" high

schools (0 to 10 per cent Negro). A few (5 general population, 1 activist) came from the 26 to 50 per cent category. The one black student came from Biafra, Nigeria, and went to a 100 per cent black school. As implied above, there is no significant difference between the racial composition or racial background of the activists that gives a clue to why they are interested in social--civil rights--issues.

As well, there is no significant difference between the two populations with regard to activism and family size. The general population has a larger proportion of families of from 2 to 5 than the activist population: 35 of 45 or 77.7 per cent, compared with 21 of 34 or 64.7 per cent. The activist population has a larger proportion of families from 6 and up than the activist population: 13 of 34 or 35.3 per cent, compared with 13 of 34 or 22.3 per cent. However, these differences are not great enough to be statistically significant. Similarly, there is no significant difference between the two populations with regard to activism and the respondent's order in the family. Eighty-five and two-tenths per cent of the activists were either first or second children and 82.2 per cent of the general population were either first or second children.

Demographic Factors of Parents

Table 7, which appears on the following page, shows the results of the analyses on questions 11-17. Table 7 shows the following results: There is no significant difference with respect to activism and parents' occupation. Appendix E shows that the occupation of both the father and mother are similarly divided between the activists and the general population. However, there is a significant

difference (.001 level) between the two groups with respect to parents' income.

TABLE 7
RESULTS OF QUESTIONS 11-17
(11-22)

No.	Question	χ^2 Score	Degrees of Freedom
11a	Occupation of Father	3.50*	4
11b	Occupation of Mother	3.26*	4
12	Income of Parents	25.25#	6
13	Education Level of Father	17.77 [†]	6
14	Education Level of Mother	10.55 [†]	5
15	Political Preference of Father	10.13 [†]	5
16	Political Preference of Mother	6.30*	5
17	Political Activity of Father	2.76*	4
18	Political Activity of Mother	6.90*	4
19	Religion of Father	34.39#	5
19m	Religion of Father (male)	12.92 [†]	4
19f	Religion of Father (f)	4.79*	3
20	Religion of Mother	5.80*	5
20m	Religion of Mother (male)	5.17*	4
20f	Religion of Mother (f)	7.48 ^{††}	3
21	Participation in Religion of F.	16.27 ^{††}	3
21m	Participation in Rel. of F. (m)	10.24#	3
21f	Participation in Rel. of M. (f)	3.06*	3
22	Participation in Rel. of Mother	8.34*	3
22m	Participation in Rel. of M. (m)	13.10 [†]	3
22f	Participation in Rel. of M. (f)	5.13*	3

Appendix E shows that the activists come from more affluent families than their non-activist peers. Twenty-one of the 29 activists reporting, or 79.3 per cent, had parents earning more than \$10,000 a year. Ten, or 34.5 per cent, had parents earning over

* No significance (above $P < .1$)

$P < .001$

* $P < .005$

" $P < .025$

[†] $P < .1$

\$20,000 a year. Only 2, or 7.6 per cent, had parents earning \$5000 or less. By contrast, 21 of the 41 general population, or 56.0 per cent, had incomes of \$10,000 or more. Nine, or 21.9 per cent, had incomes of over \$20,000. Five of the general population, or 12.1 per cent, had incomes of \$5000 or less.

There is a marginal difference (.1 level) with respect to activism and parents' education level: The activists' parents tended to be better-educated than the parents of the general population. Nineteen of the 34 activists, or 75.9 per cent, had fathers with at least a Bachelor's degree. Only 5, or 15.7 per cent, had fathers with less than a high school education. By contrast, 16 of the 34 general population parents, 47.0 per cent, had at least a Bachelor's degree and ten, or 26.4 per cent, had less than a high school education. There is a similar difference (.1 level) with respect to the factors of activism and the educational level of the mother. Sixteen of the 34 activists, or 47.0 per cent, had mothers with at least a Bachelor's degree. Only 3, or 9.0 per cent, had less than a high school education. Of the general population, 9 of the 44, or 20.4 per cent, had a Bachelor's degree or better and 4, or 9.0 per cent, had less than a high school education. In both cases the difference is not significant at the .05 level and further research is needed to confirm or reject this conclusion.

There is also a marginal difference with respect to the factors of activism and fathers' political preference. The activists' fathers tended to be more Democrat-oriented (12 of 33 or 39.4 per cent) than the general population fathers (7 of 47 or 14.9 per cent). The general population fathers tended to be Republican (27 of 47 or

57.4 per cent) or Independent. I suspect, nevertheless, that the fathers' political preference is an important demographic factor in differentiating the two populations, but with a difference at only the .1 level, the results are not significant for this study and additional research is needed. There is no difference with respect to the factors of activism and mothers' political preference. As with the fathers, the general population mothers tend to be Republican (23 Republicans, 8 Democrats), but the activist mothers also tend to be Republican, though to a lesser degree (15 Republicans, 12 Democrats).

There is no significant difference with respect to the factors of activism and parents' political activity. On the fathers' side, 5 non-activist fathers are "very active" as opposed to none for the activists' fathers, but the remainder of the categories are split proportionally and no significant differences developed. On the mothers side they are markedly more non-activist mothers "sometimes active" (16 to 6, 36.4 per cent to 17.6 per cent) but the other categories were proportionately represented and no significant differences developed.

A significant difference (.001 level) did result with respect to the factors of activism and fathers' religion. The activist fathers tended to be more Atheistic (none from the general population, 3 from the activist), more Roman Catholic (11 from the general population, or 25.0 per cent, 10 from the activist, or 31.2 per cent), and more from "other" religions (none from the general population, 3 from the activist). However, there was no significant difference with respect to the factors of activism and mothers'

participation. Sensing that the male respondents might be more sensitive to their fathers' religions and the females more respondent to their mothers', I split the respondents according to sex and compared male activists to male non-activists and female activists to female non-activists. The results are as follows: There was a significant difference (.025 level) with respect to the factors of the male activists and their fathers' religion. There was no difference between female activists and their fathers' religion. There was no difference between male activists and their mothers' religion, but there was a marginal difference (.1 level) with respect to female activists and their mothers' religion. It seems, then, that the young identify more strongly with the parent of their own sex than with the parent of the opposite sex.

There was also a significant difference (.025 level) with regard to activism and the amount of fathers' participation in religion. The activists' fathers tended to participate less than the fathers of the general population: 12 of 32 or 37.5 per cent of the activists' fathers are "very active" or "sometimes active." Contrastingly, 32 of 43 or 74.4 per cent of the general population fathers fall into the same categories. At the same time, 20 of 32 or 62.5 per cent of the activists' fathers are "seldom or never active," but 11 of 43 or 25.4 per cent of the general population fathers fall into these categories. As with the preceding question I divided the two groups by sex and compared them with the following results: There was a significant difference (.001 level) with regard to male activists and the lack of their fathers' religious participation. However, there was no difference between female

activists and the lack of their fathers' religious participation. The result of this study lends credence to my claim about dependence upon the parent of one's own sex.

No significant difference was found with respect to the degree of mothers' participation and activism. This phenomenon was true for both males and females.

Based upon the results of this section, the following conclusions are in order: First, the activists' parents' occupations are typical of the general campus population but their income is significantly higher. They may be better educated; their fathers may be more likely to be Democrats, but their mothers' education is typical of the general population. The political activity of the parents is typical of the general population. Although their mothers' religion and degree of religious participation is typical, the degree of religious participation of their father is likely to be significantly less than parents of the general population. Moreover, their fathers' religion is more likely to be Atheism, Roman Catholicism or a non Judeo-Christian religion.

Choice Demographic Factors of Individuals

Table 8, which appears on the following page, shows the results of the analyses on questions 18-33. Table 8 shows the following results: First, there is a significant difference (.001 level) between the factors of activism and religious preference. There is a marked difference in all categories: 10 of 33 or 30.3 per cent of the activists have no religion, whereas only 2 of 45 or 4.4 per cent of the general population responded accordingly. None of the activists are Roman Catholic, but 26.6 per cent of the general population are

Catholic. Only 6 per cent of the activists are Protestant, but 40.0 per cent of the general population are likewise. Finally, 58 per cent of the activists profess to religions in the "other" category. (Some of the "other" religions are Agnosticism, Pantheism, Transcendentalism and Buddhism.) However, only 22.2 per cent of the general population had religions falling into the "other" category.

TABLE 8
RESULTS OF QUESTIONS 18-33
(34-38)

No.	Question	X ² Score	Degrees of Freedom
23	Religious Preference	36.78 [#]	4
24	Religious Activity	10.31 ⁺	3
25	Enrollment Status	2.33 [*]	1
26	Year in School	43.94 [#]	4
27	Number of Hours	17.50 [#]	3
28	School Enrolled In	14.45 [*]	5
29	Type of Residence	40.37 [#]	3
30	Cumulative Grade Point	10.92 [!]	4
31	Perception of Himself	10.63 ["]	3
32	Marital Status	4.09 [*]	2
33	Holding Elected Office	8.00 ⁼	1
34	Holding Non-Elected Office	.15 [*]	1
35	Experience in Non-Campus Politics	8.67 ⁼	1
36	Participation in Demonstration	13.36 [#]	1
37	Being Arrested in Demonstration	11.79 [#]	1
38	Being Convicted in Demonstration	4.24 ⁼	1

Furthermore, there is a marginal difference (.1 level) between activism and religious participation; the activists tend to participate less than the general population. Twenty of 31 activists responding, or 64.5 per cent, participate "often" or "sometimes,"

*No significance (above P .1)

[#]P .001

⁼P .005

["]P .025

[!]P .05

⁺P .1

whereas 35 of the 41, or 85.3 per cent of the general population, fall into the same categories. The differences, however, are marginal.

There is no difference between the factors of activism and percentage enrolled in school. More of the activists were non-students, but the percentage differential, 20.6 per cent to 8.7 per cent, was not significant. However, there is a significant difference (.001 level) between the factors of activism and year in school. The activists tend to be further advanced, either seniors or graduate students. Twenty-four of 28 (only students responded to this question), or 85.7 per cent, fell into these categories. That figure is contrasted by 13 of 42 or 30.9 per cent of the general population. There was only 1 activist freshman, but 11 general population freshmen.

There is a significant difference (.001 level) between the factors of activism and number of hours enrolled. The fact that some of the activist questionnaires were filled out in the summer school session might have affected the results, but since only four of the respondents were in the "fewer than five hours" category, I suspect that the effect was not serious. Rather, I suspect the reason for the difference is that many of the activists are graduate students, who, traditionally, take fewer hours: only 27.2 per cent of the activists were enrolled for more than 10 hours, whereas 66.9 per cent of the general population fell into this category. There is no significant difference, however, with respect to activism and school enrolled. There were some difference, none of which were significant. Six from the general population were enrolled in the Schools of Engineering, Architecture and Pharmacy, while no activists

were enrolled in these schools. Also, 5 from the general population were enrolled in the School of Education, while none of the activists were so enrolled. Finally, 9 activists were enrolled in the Law and Graduate Schools, while only 3 of the general population were so enrolled.

There is a significant difference (.001 level) with respect to the factors of activism and place of residence. All but 1 of the activists live in apartments or other off-campus housing; the one remaining lives in a sorority house. Contrastingly, 48.8 per cent of the general population live in dormitories, 23.2 per cent live in fraternities or sororities, 23.2 per cent live in apartments, and 4.7 per cent live in scholarship halls.

There is also a significant difference (.025 level) with respect to the factors of activism and grades. Part of this difference may be explained by the fact that graduate students must maintain a high grade point (2.0 or better) to stay in school. Nevertheless, a clear majority of the general population students fell in the 1.0 to 2.0 range: 26 of 41 or 63.4 per cent, whereas only 37.0 per cent of the activists fell into this category. However, 55.5 per cent of the activists fell into the 2.0 to 3.0 category and 26.8 per cent of the general population were in this category.

There is a complementary difference (.025 level) with respect to the factors of activism and the respondents' perception of themselves as students. Only one general population student rated himself as "excellent," whereas 8 activists rated themselves "excellent." In fact, 24 of the 32 responding, or 75.0 per cent, rated themselves "excellent" or "good." By contrast, 24 of 44 or 54.5 per cent of

the general population rated themselves in these categories.

There is no significant difference with respect to the factors of activism and marital status. More of the activists are married than the general population (3 general population, 10 activist), and more were separated or divorced (0 general population, 3 activist), but the differences are not significant.

There is a difference with regard to the factors of activism and holding an elected campus office: 62.3 per cent of the general population had held an elected office; 32.3 per cent of the activists fell into this category. However, there is no difference between the factors of activism and holding a non-elected campus office: 26.4 per cent for the activists, 22.7 per cent for the general population. Further, there is a difference between the factors of activism and participation in non-campus politics: 43.7 per cent of the activists have participated, only 13.6 per cent of the general population have participated. (Much of this participation was in the 1968 election, supporting Gene McCarthy for President.)

There is a significant difference between the factors of activism and demonstrations; that is, all three questions asked regarding demonstrations--participation, arrest and conviction--showed a significant difference between the two populations. In fact, only 3 of the 45 general population had participated in a demonstration, none had been arrested or convicted. In contrast, 30 activists had participated, 8 had been arrested and 3 had been convicted. Thus, it is fair to conclude that the activists and not the general population utilize the legal and illegal tactics of "body rhetoric" and confrontation.

Based upon the results of this study, the following conclusions emerge about the activist-dissident at the University of Kansas: He may be male or female, is white and comes from the East or Midwest. The size of his hometown, high school and family is typical of the general campus population. As well, the racial composition of his high school is typical of the general population. He tends to be older than his peers and, if male, is more likely to have served in the armed forces or is ineligible for service. He tends to be Atheistic, Agnostic or prefer a non Judeo-Christian religion such as Buddhism or Pantheism. However, his activity in practicing the religion is typical of the general campus population. He tends to be in an upper division year in school, enrolls in fewer courses, but the school in which he is enrolled is typical of the general population. He lives in an off-campus residence and is somewhat more likely to be married. He has a higher grade point and perceives himself as a better student than the general population. He has probably never served in an elected campus office, but is more likely to have been active in non-campus politics. He has probably participated in a demonstration, and may have been arrested and/or convicted of a violation while participating in a demonstration or protest rally.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

Based upon the results presented in the preceding chapter several conclusions are warranted. I shall group these conclusions into six areas: (1) affluence, (2) politics, (3) religion, (4) grades, (5) Selective Service Status, and (6) housing.

Affluence

In Chapter Four of this study we discovered a significant difference with respect to the factors of activism and parents' income. This difference was confirmed on a national level by the Yankelovich study in Chapter Two, and was confirmed at the University of Kansas in question #12 of the statistical survey (Chapter Four). I believe the situation of parental affluence creates the following behavior pattern in the affluent off-spring: The presence of income in the family of the activist allows him to perceive the faults of our materialistic culture: He sees society in overview and, paradoxically, can afford to fight traditional material values. Moreover, his affluence demands him to perceive the faults of a materialistic culture because he conscientiously views his affluence as a predication for social concern, *af-*viewed also as a gift which allows him to concentrate on those not so fortunate.

Politics

We found that parents' political preference or activity not to be a factor in determining why the activist joins the movement. The possible exception is the marginal difference between the two groups

with respect to political preference of the father. If this difference were validated it would justify the conclusion that the fathers' liberal tendencies are a breeding ground for concern over social problems.

We did discover a significant difference between the two groups with respect to the type and degree of political activity of the young. We found that the activist group tends to participate in non-campus politics and not on campus. Conversely, the general population tends to participate on on-campus politics and non off campus. These differences indicate that the two groups have different attitudes toward political participation. Most of the off-campus participation by activists was during the 1968 Democrat convention, and, with the exception of that period, the activists participated very little. If indeed the activists as a rule do not participate in off-campus politics, then this study would confirm the pattern that the activist participation is through demonstration and protest rather than from within the political process.

Religion

Third, the results indicate a series of significant differences between the two populations with respect to the factor of religion. The fact that none of the activists are Roman Catholics may be due in part to the nature of the church's policies and dogma, particularly the social issue of the ban on birth control. The Catholic church is the most constricting of all the Judeo-Christian religions and perhaps the dedication required to either the movement or the church thereby excludes the other. Perhaps also, the activists resent the authority figure that the church represents.

In addition, many activists who do profess a religion fall into the "other" category. This category combined with those who claim no religion includes the majority of the activists. Perhaps the activists regard the church as part of the establishment, and, as such, it is an evil which should be avoided. It may also mean the activists are searching for a new religion uncorrupted by society.

Grades

The results from questions #25 and #26 indicate significant differences with regard to grade point and perception as a student. The activists are better students and they realize it. This fact may mean that they consider themselves as the elite of the university community, and, therefore, the leaders of the university. Or, perhaps, they consider themselves aloof from the rest of the students. If they are, indeed, aloof, I cannot determine from this study the source of the aloofness.

Selective Service Status

We found a marginal difference between the two populations with regard to Selective Service Status, discovering that many of the activists are ineligible, fewer are under student deferments. If this difference were significant it might show that the activists, being ineligible, have less to lose than do the deferred students who risk reclassification by protesting. Another possible conclusion is that since several activists are veterans, their military experience was so repugnant that they were led to join the movement. Both of these conclusions are based on the assumption that a significant difference exists and additional

study is needed to confirm or reject the analysis.

Housing

The analysis of question #24 found that activists prefer non-campus residences, while the general population lives both on campus and off-campus. This difference may be due in part to the fact that older students prefer off-campus residences. Alternately, since activists resent structure, rigidity and rules they may shy away from a type of residence that has all three. It would be interesting to determine what role, if any, the dormitory experience plays in causing the individual to join the movement. My experience with seeing others in the dormitory experience suggests that activists view the experience as an establishment plot to fit everyone into a norm.

Impressions

I shall now make one conclusion based upon the results of this study and my impression of the movement. The results of this study show that the activists generally do not respect the traditional political process, and therefore, censures and dictates from the legislature of the executive will not intimidate the movement. Thus, the establishment should abandon the thought that a "get tough" policy is a panacea for curing campus disruptions. The "get tough" policy is fallacious because it is predicated upon the assumption that disturbances are the result of a breakdown in law and order, when, in reality, disruption occurs partly because of the presence of law and order, which to the movement represents the worst of a bad system. Therefore, the movement will not be maced, clubbed or tear-gassed out of existence. Further, for three reasons, a "get

"tough" policy is actually countproductive. The effect of a police "crackdown" has a similar effect on the students as bombing has on a nation: The people forget their individual differences and unify, completely forasking their own safety. The results are as follows: First, considering that unity is one of the movement's greatest problems it would seem rather obliquitous to encourage unity, as this tactic does. Second, the harder the establishment's line, the more militant and extæeme the response from the establishment. Third, a "get tough" policy divides the establishment. Contrary to the belief of the movement the establishment is not totalitarian and, however infrequently, there is dissention in its ranks. With the influence of mass communication, the whole country can view the brutality and beatings which are inevitable elements of a "get tough" policy. Physical brutality is repugnant to many who represent the establishment and, right or wrong, the police are usually viewed as the "bad guys." Thus, the movement gains sympathizers and the establishment is weakened. I think it is fair to cånclude that the "get tough" policy is not advisable.

Summary

This paper was divided into five chapters. The first chapter introduced the paper, stating its two-fold goal: (1) to present a picture of the movement in an understandable form, and (2) determine what demographic factors differentiate the activist from the general campus population, and to find what part these factors may have played in the movement's establishment and purposes. The movement was named, the key terms were defined and I stated the justifications for studying it.

Chapter Two was divided into four sections: In the first section I showed its history, goals and purposes. In the second section I showed how the issues surrounding the establishment contributed to the rise of the movement. In the third section I described its characteristics, and in the fourth I related demographic factors to certain phenomena in the history, causes and characteristics of the movement.

Chapter Three discussed the movement as it has manifested at the University of Kansas. I determined that the referents of my demographic study would be "active dissidents" and not true activists. In addition, I stated the methodology of the study in Chapter Four. The goal of the demographic study was to compare the demographic factors of campus activists to those of the overall student population at the University of Kansas. I found this study would be "white" as only one black returned a questionnaire.

Chapter Four discussed the results of the demographic study. I divided the questionnaire into three parts. One concerned demographic factors of the individual that he had no choice in determining. Two concerned demographic factors of the parents of respondents. Three concerned those demographic factors of the respondent that he had a choice in determining. I found significant differences between the two populations with respect to the following factors: age, hometown and state, parents' income, religion of father, religious participation of father, religious preference of the respondent, respondents' year in school and number of hours, type of residence, grade point, perception of himself as a student, holding an elected campus office, experience in non-campus politics, participation, arrest and conviction of participation in a

demonstration or protest.

Chapter Five discussed six areas of difference: affluence, politics, religion, grades, Selective Service Status, and housing, and determined to some degree the reason for the differences. In addition I gave one opinion of the movement gained by my impression and ^{by} the demographic data.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Kenniston, Kenneth, Young Radicals. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.
- Hoffer, Eric, The True Believer, New York: Harper and Row, 1951.
- Blaine, Harrison, editor. New Republic, Washington: New Republic Publishing Company, Inc., June 29, 1968.
- Donavon, Hedley, editor. Time. New York: Time, Inc., May 24, 1968.
- Cameron, Wm. Bruce, speech before second annual symposium at the University of Kansas (unpublished).
- Sampson, Edgar, Journal of Social Issues, New York: SPSSI, July, 1967.
- Yankelovich, Daniel, Inc., Generations Apart, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 1969.
- Davidson, Carl, New Radicals in the Multiversity, Chicago: S.D.S. Print Shop, 1968.
- diZerega, Gus, The University Review, Vol. I, November, 1968.
- Piekalkiewicz, J., lecture, March, 1968.
- Jacobs, Mark, New Leader. (East Stroudsburg, Pa.: American Labor Conference on International Affairs, May 20, 1968.
- Department of Commerce. Statistical Abstract of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.
- Hays, William L., Statistics for Psychologists, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Kenman, George F., Democracy and the Student Left, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968.
- Morse, Warner and Haiman, Franklin. Critique and Answer to "Rhetoric of the Streets," First Annual Speech Colloquium, University of Kansas, 1968.

APPENDIX A

RHETORIC OF THE MOVEMENT

The movement has abandoned traditional rhetorical patterns. In their place we find tactics of confrontation or "body rhetoric" as it is often, but inaccurately, termed.¹ What rhetoric is present in the movement is largely a communication from member to member, keeping the member convinced that he belongs. It is not surprising that this rhetoric is characterized by generalities, tacitly hoping that the gaps will be filled in by the listener or reader. The effect^{of} the rhetoric on the nonmembers may be one

¹Professor Warner Morse of the University of Kansas, in response to the principle of "body rhetoric" stated by Franklin Haiman, made the following statement:

...not all acts of protest can profitably be viewed as exercises in rhetoric. . . Though rioting, looting, and burning may be "intended as means of persuasion" the term "persuasion" here is, of course, a euphemism for force. . . No doubt it would be usually better to substitute reasoned pleas for looting, burning, and killing, but these latter are not simply poor versions of the former. We can no more say that rioting is judged by the canons of rational discourse than we can say that the American Revolution was a sound, well-stated argument. Professor Haiman is thus right not to examine this kind of protest from the point of view of his profession, but not because their inclusion would be stretching the definition of rhetoric; it would be to give up altogether. . . Just as I might start a riot to prove to you, persuade you that a riot could be started, so I might, if I were a black, try to eat lunch at a segregated lunch counter to prove to you that all hell would break loose if I did so. And if this is rhetoric, we'll have to say that the experimental scientist is primarily a rhetorician. On the other

of two things: It may introduce him to ideas he has not considered before, or it may polarize him against the movement. Mark Rudd, leader of the Columbia riot, speaking at the University of Kansas in 1968, loaded his speech with obscenities. His choice of words offended many people, in effect "blowing their minds," a phenomenon of which the activists are proud. They do not actually want non-members to polarize against them, but they believe that their purpose is better served by a reaction of some^{kind} than no reaction at all. As a result, the movement gains publicity and notariety, increasing its potential membership and unifying its present membership against the establishment "devil." Some examples of member-to-member, intellectually-oriented rhetoric are as follows:

Does it require any technical skill to recognize the gross inadequacies and injustices of this society? In the name of reason imperialism abroad and repression at home continue to escalate. . . Cloaked in the armor of law, order, reason and God, we engage in world-wide repression, all the₂while ignoring the pressing demands of our own society.²

With universities becoming increasingly service stations for military and corporate interests, it is likely that retreat even into the most "academic" disciplines is itself, consciously or not, interest-laden and even beneficial to an oppressive status-quo.³

But the corporate ruling class is not primarily interested in containing and pacifying us as intellectuals. Their

hand, and finally I shall become quite serious, a sit-in may be simply an exercise of a man's rights. In such a case the moral justification need not tough on the ethics of rhetoric at all.

Professor Haiman's response to this criticism was quite surprising:

Strange as it may seem I'm going to agree with everything that has been said here. I think it₄ was beautifully stated . . . I think he's absolutely right.⁴

real concern with us lies in our role as highly skilled members of the new working class. (Andre) Gorz (points out) "the problem of big management is to harmonize two contradictory necessities; the necessity of developing human capabilities, imposed by modern processes of production and the political necessity of insuring that this kind of development does not bring in its wake any augmentation of the independence of the individual, provoking him to challenge the present division of social labor and distribution of power."

From this analysis, we can understand the student revolt in its most strategic and crucial sense. What we are witnessing and participating in is an important historical phenomenon: the revolt of the trainees of the new working class against the alienated and oppressive conditions of production and consumption within corporate capitalism. These are the conditions of life and activity that lie beneath the apathy, frustration, and rebellion on America's campuses.

Activists regard their tactics as confrontations: their rhetoric is the rhetoric of confrontation, riots and armed occupations are confrontations. What does this tactic mean? It means, first of all, that they do not seek conciliation; in fact, they do not seek dialogue. Second, they will not kowtow to anyone, least of all the establishment, but rather meet them on equal grounds. Power is the essence of confrontation; the more powerful side is the winner.

FOOTNOTES TO APPENDIX A

¹Refer to footnote in text.

²Alan Finder in George F. Kennan, Democracy and the Student Left, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968), p. 52.

³Andrew Levine, Op. Cit., p. 37.

⁴Warner Morse, Critique to "Rhetoric of the Streets," First Annual Speech Colloquium, University of Kansas, 1968.

Franklin Haiman, Ibid.

⁵Carl Davidson. New Radicals in the Multiversity, (Chicago: S.D.S. Print Shop, 1968), p. 17

APPENDIX B

A COMPARISON OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS
OF SEVERAL GROUPS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS
GROUPED BY IDEOLOGY

Factor	Total College	College Revolu- tionary	College Radical Reformers	College Moderates
Sex				
Male	56%	67%	58%	52%
Female	44	33	42	48
Marital Status				
Married	7	8	26	26
Not married	93	92	74	74
Age				
17 years old	1	--	22	--
18-19 years old	47	31	31	47
20-21 years old	36	44	23	37
22-23 years old	16	25	24	16
Race				
White	93	81	90	91
Non-white	7	19	10	9
Parents' Income				
Under \$10,000	30	40	53	28
\$10,000-14,999	32	13	29	33
\$15,000 or more	38	47	19	39
Fathers' Occupation				
White collar	65	69	35	66
Blue collar	25	23	51	23
Other	10	8	14	11
Religion				
Protestant	48	8	61	43
Catholic	24	4	28	20
Jewish	10	15	3	16
Other	2	10	2	3
None	15	63	6	8

A COMPARISON OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS
OF SEVERAL GROUPS OF NON-COLLEGE STUDENTS
GROUPED BY IDEOLOGY

Factor	Total Non- College	Non-College Revolu- tionary	Non- College Radical Reform- ers	Non- College Moderate Reform- ers
Sex				
Male	42%	*	40%	49%
Female	58		60	51
Marital Status				
Married	26		16	25
Not married	74		84	75
Age				
17 years old	22		22	20
18-19 years old	31		29	21
20-21 years old	23		36	33
22-23 years old	24		13	26
Race				
White	90		72	94
Non-white	10		28	6
Parents' Income				
Under \$10,000	53		61	39
\$10,000-14,999	29		23	34
\$15,000 or more	19		16	27
Father's Occupation				
White collar	35		40	32
Blue collar	51		29	60
Other	14		31	8
Religion				
Protestant	61		55	52
Catholic	28		25	34
Jewish	3		8	6
Other	2		5	*
None	6		7	9

*Base too small to be meaningfully percentaged.

**A. COMPARISON OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS
OF SEVERAL GROUPS OF YOUNG PEOPLE
GROUPED BY IDEOLOGY**

Factor	Total Youth	Total Revolu- tionary	Total Radical Reformers	Total Moderate Reformers
Sex				
Male	45%	71%	44%	60%
Female	55	29	56	50
Marital status				
Married	22	7	15	19
Non-married	78	93	85	81
Age				
17 years old	18	2	18	13
18-19 years old	35	29	33	30
20-21 years old	25	49	34	34
22-23 years old	23	20	15	23
Race				
White	91	81	74	93
Non-white	9	19	26	7
Parents' Income				
Under \$10,000	49	36	55	35
\$10,000-14,000	25	20	24	34
\$15,000 or more	22	44	21	31
Fathers' Occupation				
White collar	41	58	46	44
Blue collar	46	31	27	47
Other	13	11	27	9
Religion				
Protestant	58	7	50	49
Catholic	27	7	25	29
Jewish	5	12	8	9
Other	2	14	5	1
None	8	61	12	12
Education				
College	20	81	20	34
Non-college	80	19	80	66

Political Affiliation				
Republican	25%	--%	9%	22%
Democrat	47	20	52	43
Liberal	--	--	--	--
Independent	3	3	3	3
Conservative	--	--	--	1
Other	1	34	4	1
None	19	31	22	27
Youth's occupation				
Not employed	45	54	45	36
White collar	29	39	15	33
Blue collar	27	7	40	31
Youth's income				
No income	45	54	45	36
Under \$3000	28	42	34	34
\$3000 to 4900	14	3	17	12
\$5000 or more	13	--	3	18
Region of Country				
Northeast	25	24	25	30
Midwest	26	24	23	28
South	30	17	26	19
West	18	36	26	22
Draft Status				
Eligible	19	36	26	23
Deferrrd	45	50	38	52
Ineligible	14	2	7	12
Indeterminable	22	12	29	14

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age _____
2. Sex M F
3. Hometown and State _____
4. Males: What is your current Selective Service Status? _____
5. Size of your hometown:
_____ under 5,000
_____ 5,001 to 50,000
_____ 50,001 to 125,000
_____ 125,001 to 250,000
_____ 250,001 to 1,000,000
_____ over 1,000,000
6. Type of high school you graduated from:
_____ public
_____ private
_____ parochial
7. What percentage of your high school student body was ~~N~~ Negro (approx)?
_____ 0 - 10%
_____ 11 - 25%
_____ 26 - 50%
_____ 51 - 75%
_____ 76 - 90%
_____ 91 - 100%
8. Your predominating race (if no single one predominates, circle the 2,3, etc. which predominate)
_____ Caucasian
_____ Negroid
_____ American Indian
_____ Latin American
_____ Mongolian
9. How many are in your family (including parents)? _____
10. Starting from the oldest, are you the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. born in your family? _____
11. Occupation of parents:
Father _____
Mother _____

12. Total yearly income of parents:

- _____ 0 - \$3000
- _____ \$3001 - 5000
- _____ \$5001 - 7500
- _____ \$7501 - 10,000
- _____ \$10,001 - 20,000
- _____ over \$20,000
- _____ don't know

13. Education level of parents:

- | <u>Father</u> | | <u>Mother</u> |
|---------------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| _____ | Advanced college degree | _____ |
| _____ | Bachelor's degree | _____ |
| _____ | Advanced high school | _____ |
| _____ | (inclu. jr. college & secretarial) | _____ |
| _____ | high school graduate | _____ |
| _____ | elementary (8th grade graduate) | _____ |
| _____ | elementary school attend. | _____ |
| _____ | other (specify) | _____ |

14. Parents' current political preference:

- | <u>Father</u> | | <u>Mother</u> |
|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| _____ | Am. Independent Party | _____ |
| _____ | Republican | _____ |
| _____ | Democrat | _____ |
| _____ | Socialist | _____ |
| _____ | Independent | _____ |
| _____ | Other (specify) | _____ |
| _____ | Don*t know | _____ |

15. Degree of parents' activity in politics and/or local government:

- | <u>Father</u> | | <u>Mother</u> |
|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| _____ | very active | _____ |
| _____ | sometimes active | _____ |
| _____ | seldom active | _____ |
| _____ | never active | _____ |
| _____ | don*t know | _____ |

16. Religion of parents:

- Father _____
- Mother _____
- don*t know _____

17. How actively do your parents participate in their religion?

- | <u>Father</u> | | <u>Mother</u> |
|---------------|-----------|---------------|
| _____ | Often | _____ |
| _____ | Sometimes | _____ |
| _____ | Seldom | _____ |
| _____ | Never | _____ |

18. What is your religious preference? (include agnostic and athiest) _____
19. How actively do you participate in your religion?
_____ Often
_____ Sometimes
_____ Seldom'
_____ Never
20. Are you presently enrolled and/or ^{on the} staff at K.U? yes no
21. (if enrolled) what year in school?
_____ freshman
_____ sophomore
_____ junior
_____ senior
_____ graduate
22. (if enrolled) how many hours are you taking this semester? _____
23. Which school in the university are you enrolled in?
_____ College of Liberal Arts
_____ School of Engineering
_____ School of Architecture and Urban Design
_____ School of Fine Arts
_____ School of Education
_____ School of Pharmacy
_____ School of Business
_____ School of Journalism
_____ School of Medicine
_____ School of Law
_____ Graduate School
24. What type of residence are you living in while you attend K.U.?
_____ live with parents
_____ dormitory
_____ fraternity or sorority house
_____ apartment (away from parents; includes sleeping room (and house)
_____ scholarship hall
25. Approximate cumulative grade point average (leave blank if a 1st semester freshman) _____
26. How good a student do you perceive yourself?
_____ Excellent
_____ Good
_____ Average
_____ Fair
_____ Poor
27. Marital status
_____ single (never married)
_____ married
_____ divorced or separated

APPENDIX D
COVER LETTER

My name is Paul Falzer, and I am a senior majoring in speech communication and human relations. As a research project I have undertaken a study of campus activism at the University of Kansas. The purpose of this project is to compare the background of student activists with that of the general student population. In connection with this project I am requesting your cooperation in filling out the enclosed questionnaire.

All I am asking you to do is this: Please fill out the questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope.

For this study to be successful it is vital that you fill out this questionnaire completely and return it to me. I have made every effort to make this questionnaire understandable, complete and non-objectionable. If you find any question difficult, please respond as best you can.

Finally, I would like to assure you that this proejct is concerned only with students as a group. Therefore, NAMES WILL NEVER BE USED IN ANY CONNECTION WITH THIS STUDY! I have made a list of the persons who are to receive this questionnaire. The number written on the return envelope corresponds to the number on this list. The purpose of this identification is to place the right person in the right category. After the questionnaires have been returned this envelope will be destroyed. Except for me, no one - absolutely no one - will see this list.

Once again, your cooperation in this study will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Redacted Signature

APPENDIX E

SUM OF TALLIES OF EACH QUESTION

FOR BOTH GROUPS

No.	Question	Tallies	
		General Population	A Activists
1	Age of the Respondents		
	18-19	17	3
	20	8	7
	21	8	7
	22	4	5
	23-26	5	11
	27 up	3	2
2	Sex of the Respondents		
	1. Males	27	23
	2. Females	18	11
3	Hometown and State of Respondents		
	1. 1. East	2	9
	2. Mid-East	--	--
	3. Mid-West	13	6
	4. West	--	1
	5. Kansas	29	18
4	Selective Service Status (males)		
	1. Eligible	1	2
	2. Deferred	23	14
	3. Ineligible	1	5
5	Size of Hometown of Respondents		
	1. Under 5,000	9	9
	2. 5,001 to 50,000	10	11
	3. 50,001 to 125,000	2	1
	4. 125,001 to 250,000	1	2
	5. 250,001 to 1,000,000	19	6
	6. over 1,000,000	3	5
6	High School of Respondents		
	1. Public	37	29
	2. Parochial	2	2
	3. Otherprivate	6	2

No.	Question	Tallies	
		General Population	Activists
7	Percentage of Negroes in High School		
	1. 0-10%	36	29
	2. 11-25%	5	4
	3. 26-50%	3	1
	4. 50% and above	1	0
8	Race of Respondent		
	1. Caucasian	43	34
	2. Negroid	1	0
9	Number of People in Family		
	1. 2-3	7	4
	2. 4	11	9
	3. 5	17	8
	4. 6-7	7	6
	5. 8 and above	3	7
10	Order of Birth of Respondents		
	1. first	19	26
	2. second	10	11
	3. third	2	7
	4. fourth	3	0
	5. fifth	0	0
	6. sixth	0	1
11a	Occupation of Father		
	1. Professional	7	9
	2. Executive	8	7
	3. White collar	17	10
	4. Blue collar	10	5
	5. Military	0	1
11b	Occupation of Mother		
	1. Professional	7	2
	2. Executive	1	1
	3. White collar	7	10
	4. Blue collar	2	2
	5. Military	0	0
	6. Housewife	24	19
12	Yearly income of Parents		
	1. 0 - \$3000	3	0
	2. \$3001 - 5000	2	2
	3. \$5001 - 7500	4	2
	4. \$7501 - 10,000	4	2
	5. \$10,001 - 20,000	14	11
	6. over \$20,000	9	10
	7. Don't know	4	5

No.	Question	Tallies	
		General Population	Activists
13	Educational Level of Father		
	1. Advanced college degree	7	15
	2. Bachelor's degree	9	4
	3. Advanced high school	8	3
	4. High school graduate	9	7
	5. Elementary school grad.	8	5
	6. Elementary school attd.	2	0
	7. Other (specify)	1	0
14	Educational Level of Mother		
	1. Advanced college degree	2	3
	2. Bachelor's degree	7	13
	3. Advanced high school	13	7
	4. High School graduate	18	8
	5. Elementary school grad.	1	3
	6. Elementary school attd.	3	0
15	Political Preference of Father		
	1. Am. Independent Party	--	1
	2. Republican	27	15
	3. Democrat	7	12
	4. Independent	7	4
	5. Other	1	--
	6. Don't know	5	1
16	Political Preference of Mother		
	1. Republican	23	15
	2. Democrat	8	12
	3. Socialist	0	1
	4. Independent	7	5
	5. other	1	0
	6. don't know	5	1
17	Political Activity of Father		
	1. Very active	5	0
	2. Sometimes active	7	6
	3. Seldom active	21	15
	4. Never active	6	10
	5. Don't know	3	2
18	Political activity of Mother		
	1. Very active	0	1
	2. Sometimes active	16	6
	3. Seldom active	18	14
	4. Never active	7	12
	5. Don't know	3	1
19	Religion of Father		
	1. None	0	3
	2. Catholic	11	10
	3. Protestant	30	13
	4. Jewish	2	3
	5. Other	0	3
	6. Don't know	1	0

No.	Question	Tallies	
		General Population	Activists
20	Religion of Mother	0	1
	1. None	0	1
	2. Catholic	10	5
	3. Protestant	29	18
	4. Jewish	2	3
	5. Other	0	2
	6. Don't know	1	0
21	Religious Activity of Father		
	1. Often	22	7
	2. Sometimes	10	5
	3. Seldom	8	11
	4. Never	3	9
22	Religious Activity of Mother		
	1. Often	27	16
	2. Sometimes	13	4
	3. Seldom	4	6
	4. Never	1	5
23	Religious Preference of Respondent		
	1. None	2	10
	2. Catholic	12	0
	3. Protestant	18	2
	4. Jewish	3	2
	5. Other	10	19
24	Religious Activity of Respondent		
	1. Often	29	14
	2. Sometimes	16	6
	3. Seldom	6	3
	4. Never	1	8
25	Present Enrollment Status		
	1. Yes	42	27
	2. No	4	7
26	Year in School for Respondent		
	1. Freshman	11	1
	2. Sophomore	10	3
	3. Junior	8	0
	4. Senior	10	12
	5. Graduate	3	12
27	Respondent's Number of Hours		
	1. 1-5	1	4
	2. 6-10	0	2
	3. 11-15	21	10
	4. 16 and over	29	6

No.	Question	Tallies	
		General Population	Activists
28	School Enrolled In		
	1. College of Liberal Arts	21	17
	2. Engineering, architecture, and pharmacy	6	0
	3. Fine Arts	3	1
	4. Education	5	0
	5. Business, Journalism	3	1
	6. Law, Graduate	3	9
29	Type of Respondent's Residence		
	1. Dormitory	21	0
	2. Fraternity or Sorority	10	1
	3. Apartment	10	31
	4. Scholarship Hall	2	0
30	Cumulative Grade Point		
	1. -1-1.0	4	2
	2. 1.01-1.5	12	4
	3. 1.51-2.0	14	6
	4. 2.01-2.5	8	9
	5. 2.51-3.0	3	6
31.	Perception of Himself as a Student		
	1. Excellent	1	8
	2. Good	23	16
	3. Average	19	7
	4. Fair	0	0
	5. Poor	1	1
32	Marital Status of Respondent		
	1. Single (never married)	42	21
	2. Married	3	10
	3. Divorced or separated	0	3
33	Elected office on campus?		
	1. Yes	29	11
	2. No	16	23
34	Non-elected office on campus?		
	1. Yes	10	9
	2. No	34	25
35	Experience in non-campus politics?		
	1. Yes	6	14
	2. No	38	18
36	Participation in a demonstration		
	1. Yes	3	30
	2. No	38	18
37.	Being arrested in a demonstration		
	1. Yes	0	8
	2. No	45	26
38	Being convicted in a demonstration		
	1. Yes	0	3
	2. No	45	30