

1973

# A comparative analysis of the student movements in the United States and Japan, 1964-1970

Charlotte Jackson Lerch

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses>



Part of the [Comparative Politics Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Lerch, Charlotte Jackson, "A comparative analysis of the student movements in the United States and Japan, 1964-1970" (1973).  
*Master's Theses*. 1338.

<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses/1338>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu](mailto:scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu).

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE STUDENT  
MOVEMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES  
AND JAPAN: 1964-1970

BY

CHARLOTTE JACKSON LERCH

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND  
IN CANDIDACY  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

AUGUST 1973

**University of Richmond**

**Richmond, Virginia**

**Department of Political Science**

**APPROVED**

Arthur B. Swartz  
John W. Outland  
John T. Whelan

## PREFACE

Student movements have existed for years and are dynamic forces which challenge the social and political structures of many nations. I chose to write about the causes of student movements in order to better understand what the students of today want, what they feel, and what they hope for. It is impossible merely to look at the causes of student movements without first clarifying the term student movement itself and learning about the students involved in the movements. Therefore, I have tried to give the reader a clearer picture of the student movement structure, the types of students involved, and finally, the causes behind the movements.

In order to avoid confusion and possible misinterpretation, certain ideas must be clarified. From necessity, I have omitted the Chicano, the Black, and other minority protests from the student movement mainstream. While white student protestors and minority group protestors do have certain objectives in common, their goals, intentions, and sources are fundamentally different.

Certain terms which will appear throughout the paper must also be clarified. When referring to the terms "radical", "revolutionary", or "left activist", which I use interchangeably, I am speaking of the extreme students who resort to violent activities to further their aims. When referring to the terms "moderates" or "center activists", I am speaking of those students who use peaceful protests and demonstrations to further their goals. Three other terms also appear in the paper, and, although they are not an integral part of the paper, they do need to be explained. These terms are "student sympathizers", "culturally alienated students" or "hippies", and "right activists". The term "sympathizers" refers to those students who are in empathy with the causes and goals of the radicals but do not take part in any demonstrations, violent or non-violent. Reference to the "culturally alienated students" or "hippies" is equated with students who simply drop out of the entire social and political establishment. They do not participate in any form of demonstrations, completely reject the establishment as a whole, and are apolitical. "Right activists" are those students who support the status quo or who seek change gradually but only within the existing framework of our established society. Since this paper is concerned with the active leftist students involved in student movements, I

have not discussed in depth the roles played by the sympathizers,  
the culturally alienated, or the right activist students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
 Chapter	
I. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENT MOVEMENTS . . . . .	4
Central Issue	
Continuity	
Organization	
Gerontocratic Societies	
Interdependency	
II. TYPOLOGY OF AMERICAN STUDENTS INVOLVED IN STUDENT MOVEMENTS . . . . .	12
Culturally Alienated Students	
Center Activists	
Radicals	
III. CAUSES OF STUDENT UNREST IN THE UNITED STATES . . . . .	28
Psychological Factors	
Societal Factors	
Universities	
IV. CAUSES OF STUDENT UNREST IN JAPAN . . . . .	46
Society	
Universities	

Chapter	Page
V. STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS AND TACTICS IN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN. . . . .	56
Student Organizations in the United States	
Student Organizations in Japan	
Tactics of Student Revolts	
VI. FUTURE OF STUDENT MOVEMENTS . . . . .	74
CONCLUSION. . . . .	84
APPENDIX. . . . .	89
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	102



LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Synthesis of Characteristics Attributed to Radicals . . . . .	25
2. Percentage of Protest by Size of Institution (Urban Research). . . . .	42
3. Percentage of Protest by Size of Institution (Hodgkinson). . . . .	43

## INTRODUCTION

In the 1960's the United States of America witnessed a great and violent rebellion among its college students. Although the majority of the adult population of the United States was amazed and somewhat stunned at the new, active interest students were taking in current social problems they nevertheless tended to ignore the peaceful protests and demonstrations of the students in the early 1960's. The 1964 Free Speech Movement at the University of California in Berkeley shocked the populace out of their complacent attitudes toward the protests of the students and, for the first time, made the adult population take notice of the students' complaints and outcries.

Since that time, numerous articles and books have been published analyzing the general unrest of the young people today. Basically, two approaches were employed by scholars: the student protest approach and the generational conflict approach. The generational conflict was the earliest approach employed. This approach seeks to explain student unrest in terms of a political and cultural discontinuity which springs from

the different historical and societal experiences between young people and their elders. Rather than examining specific demonstrations and protests, the generational conflict approach sees student unrest as an antagonism which stems from the opposition of young people to the values and established institutions of their elders. This approach poses broad questions and ideas which deal with the processes of change in an advanced society and the impact of this change on youth. Conversely, the student protest approach attempts to examine immediate as well as cultural, social, and political causes of student activism. Not only does this approach allow for an examination of the total student movement but also the issues which ignite the movement.<sup>1</sup>

Generally speaking, I employ the student protest approach in this paper as it best suits my purpose: a descriptive and analytic work aimed at understanding the causes of student unrest and not primarily a psychological or sociological analysis of student movements. It is my intention to seek the causes of student movements in two modern nations, Japan and the United States. Both of these countries are technological advanced nations undergoing tremendous social and cultural changes.

---

<sup>1</sup>Philip G. Altbach and Robert S. Laufer, eds., "Introduction," Annals of American Academy, CCCXCV (May, 1971), ix.

I am not unaware of the problems that are often encountered in cross-cultural comparisons. It is easy to assume that there are meaningful similarities in cross-cultural comparisons because we think there are similarities.<sup>2</sup> The basic question seems to be this: are there, indeed, any experiences similar enough to say that the basic causes of student unrest in the United States and Japan are the same? I would hypothesize that there are. It is my thesis that student unrest and the causes of student unrest in highly advanced countries are similar. While students may be dissatisfied with the political and social structures of their countries for different reasons, they are all dissatisfied with the same structures within their societies. Therefore, I intend to demonstrate in this paper, my thesis that student unrest and the causes of student unrest in modern countries are similar.

---

<sup>2</sup>Jack D. Douglas, Youth In Turmoil (Chevy Chase, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crimes and Delinquency, 1970), p. 89.

## CHAPTER I

### CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENT MOVEMENTS

Almost every advanced or developed nation in the world has experienced, at one time or another, a rebellion or revolt of its college students. These movements by college students are strange and unique in that they have very few, if any, characteristics which are typical of other movements, such as a labor movement or a civil rights movement.

#### Central Issue

The first, and probably the most important, difference between a student movement and other movements is the presence of a central issue. For instance, a labor movement revolves around one basic, central issue and that is the attainment of better conditions and security for the entire labor force. The entire movement is concerned with one basic issue and everyone involved rallies around it. On the other hand, a student movement seldom has a central issue to bring all the students together. By its very nature, a student movement is not capable of attaching itself to one issue. Since students have so many

ideas, impulses, and non-materialistic ideals, it is difficult for them to find one central issue to agree upon, to bind them together, and to give them specific goals to work toward. The emotions of students are often vague and undefinable and seem to account for their inability to state a definite aim which they are striving to achieve.<sup>1</sup>

#### Continuity

Continuity is a second difference between student movements and other movements. Labor movements are capable of being continuous over a period of time for there will always be a labor class which will continue to try and further class causes; thus, they are continuous movements. In contrast, a student movement is transient by nature. Student status is a temporary one, and, in a few years, a new generation of students with different attitudes and ideas will have emerged. Thus new issues and causes are continually evolving.<sup>2</sup>

#### Organization

A third way student movements differ from other movements is the ability to organize its members effectively. For instance, labor groups are frequently well organized with effective local,

<sup>1</sup>Lewis S. Feuer, The Conflict of Generations (New York: Basic Books, Incorporated, 1969), p. 10.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

regional, and national units. Unlike labor groups, students are seldom capable of organizing themselves on a regional, much less a national, basis. The reason for this goes back to the fact that the students do not have any central issues. The interests and aims of students vary not only from region to region but also from campus to campus. Attempts have been made to organize students into national interest groups with elected officials and representatives as illustrated by the Students for a Democratic Society in the United States and the Zengakuren in Japan.<sup>3</sup> Inevitably, these national organizations are not very effective and are often short lived. Students seem unable to agree upon what the main purpose of the organization should be. Consequently, the organization simply splits into various competitive factions within the organization itself. An indication of this is illustrated by the fact that in 1964 the University of California in Berkeley had thirty-four national student organizations active on campus and most of them had different goals and aims.<sup>4</sup> It is true

---

<sup>3</sup>Frank Langdon, *Politics in Japan*, Little, Brown Series (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967), p. 116.

<sup>4</sup>Byron G. Massialas, *Education and the Political System* (Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 133-34.

that some of these organizations did have the same goals, but the divergent methods employed in attaining these goals prevented the organizations from joining forces.

Occasionally, a national student organization is formed, and for a time, seems to satisfy the wishes and demands of the majority of the students and is capable of holding the students together in a cohesive fashion. The Zengakuren in Japan from 1948 to 1960 is a primary example. After twelve successful years of adequately representing the students, it also succumbed to the fate of other national student organizations. Beset by excessive rivalry among the smaller groups within the national organization, Zengakuren in 1960 became badly split into many factions, and Zengakuren, as it was from 1948 to 1960, ceased to exist.<sup>5</sup> Thus, the conclusion can be drawn that student movements must be classified as anomic interest groups and that they are not "explicitly organized groups . . . and have failed to obtain adequate representation of their interests in the political system."<sup>6</sup> As Gabriel A. Almond

---

<sup>5</sup>Langdon, Politics in Japan, p. 117.

<sup>6</sup>Gabriel A. Almond and G. Bingham Powell, Jr., Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach, Little, Brown Series (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1966), pp. 75-6.



and G. Bingham Powell, Jr., pointed out, anomic interest groups usually attempt to penetrate the political system through such means as demonstrations and riots and "are marked by limited organization and a lack of constant activity on behalf of the group."<sup>7</sup>

Even though student movements are not like most other movements, there are certain characteristics common to all student movements.

#### Gerontocratic Societies

In general, student movements are likely to be found in gerontocratic societies, societies in which the older generation owns or exercises the greatest share of the social, economic, and especially the political power of the country. This, in itself, seems to be quite a paradox, because in many societies the culture is overwhelmingly youth-oriented. In many instances members of the older generation or the "establishment" emulate the youth of today. The dress, music, and jargon of the youth are frequently imitated by the older generation. Economically the younger generation has more

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

money to spend than ever before, and a great percentage of the mass media advertising is directed toward the young people.<sup>8</sup> Politically the older generation continues to dominate. In the local, state, and federal legislative and judicial branches of government, the older generation has almost all the power, excluding youth from any major influence. Also, the political realm is probably the most important, for here laws and rules are made and changed that affect the whole nation. From 1947 to 1966 the average age of the party leaders and committee chairmen in the House of Representatives and the Senate was in the sixties. This provides an excellent example of political dominance by the older generation.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, when the major influences upon a society such as religion, ideology, families, leaders, and political power are used to further strengthen the position of the older generation, there is likely to be a student movement.<sup>10</sup>

A gerontocratic society alone is not always capable of producing a student movement. Another common characteristic that appears to be related to all student movements is that of interdependency.

---

<sup>8</sup>Feuer, The Conflict of Generations, p. 12.

<sup>9</sup>Barbara Hinckley, Stability and Change in Congress (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971), p. 128.

<sup>10</sup>Feuer, The Conflict of Generations, p. 12.

## Interdependency

It is generally accepted that the participants in student movements believe that there is an underlying causal relation among all student movements and, that therefore, they should look to other revolts for ideas and inspiration. Many expressed ideas, tactics, and ideological attacks are similar. Students from various countries watch, admire, and copy methods of others. They use the same personnel for guidelines such as Cohn-Bendit, Herbert Marcuse, and "Red Rudy".<sup>11</sup>

Certainly there are other factors which contribute to and link student movements. Student movements are characterized by a rise of intellectualism, an opposition to the status quo, a general feeling that the elder generation has failed to provide a secure society, and political apathy. Most of them have a populist ingredient indicated by the students' frequent concern with the advancement of certain classes of minorities, such as the Negro in the United States and the middle class in Japan.<sup>12</sup> The students involved in these movements often see their respective societies dominated by

---

<sup>11</sup>Jack D. Douglas, Youth in Turmoil (Chevy Chase, Maryland: National Institute of Health, Center for Studies of Crimes and Delinquency, 1970), p. 94.

<sup>12</sup>Feuer, The Conflict of Generations, pp. 12-20.

huge, impersonal institutions which are continually trying to impose the norms of the older generation upon young people. Many students say they are alienated from their societies. This alienation, as it appears relevant to them, encompasses every situation the students seek to define.<sup>13</sup>

What, then, is a student movement? How can all these characteristics be summed up in one definition? Lewis Feuer's definition is perhaps one of the best:

We may define a student movement as a combination of students inspired by aims which they try to explicate in a political ideology, and moved by an emotional rebellion in which there is always present a disillusionment with and rejection of the values of the older generation; moreover, the members of a student movement have the conviction that their generation has a special historical mission to fulfill where the older generation, other elites, and other classes have failed.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 506-08.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

## CHAPTER II

### TYOLOGY OF AMERICAN STUDENTS INVOLVED IN STUDENT MOVEMENTS

Is it possible to identify the types of students<sup>1</sup> who become involved in student movements? Is it possible to predict whether or not a student will become a radical by examining his background, his attitudes, and his commitments? Several scholars believe there are certain student types and they attempt to distinguish the various traits and characteristics of the students involved in the movements.

#### Culturally Alienated Students

Some of those who have studied student movements have classified students according to the degree to which they are alienated from their society. Culturally alienated students are characterized by a tendency to live in the present and to avoid commitments to people, causes, and ideas. Kenneth Keniston calls this private, non-conforming behavior. He describes these students as being the type who would rather drop out of society than to change or reform it.<sup>1</sup> Richard Peterson calls this type

---

<sup>1</sup>Kenneth Keniston, "Sources of Student Dissent," Journal of Social Issues, XXXIII (July, 1967), pp. 110-111.

of student "the hippie". According to Peterson, "the hippie" is completely estranged from any American values and institutions. He is apolitical in that he rejects traditional student roles, and is committed to complete withdrawal from all the pressures of life.<sup>2</sup>

Mark Gerzon also classifies this type of student as "the hippie". Gerzon states that this type of student sees and dislikes society for political and psychological reasons. "The hippie" cannot abide organizations of any kind and therefore functions outside of any socially accepted institution. He tends to use drugs extensively, is influenced by Oriental ideas and philosophies, and is seeking to escape the pressures of modern life.

Franklin Ford has developed another theory on students. He perceives students are falling into one of four concentric circles. Students are not necessarily confined to one circle but are usually moving in toward the smallest circle or out toward the largest circle. The first two circles contain those students who fit into traditional student roles, are unhappy with

<sup>2</sup>Richard E. Peterson, "The Student Left In American Higher Education," Daedalus, XCVII (Winter, 1968), pp. 299-303.

<sup>3</sup>Mark Gerzon, The Whole World Is Watching: A Young Man Looks at Youth's Dissent (New York: Wiking Press, 1969), pp. 245-54.

conditions existing in our present society, but do nothing to change these conditions. The third circle encompasses dissenters who are unhappy because of various conditions and intend to act on them some way. Some students react to unhappy conditions by simply withdrawing. They do not attack society but they do not accept it either. They merely withdraw and attempt to create their own world and their own way of living. Also included in this circle are the dissenters who do intend to act on the conditions which make them unhappy. They do not attack society in all its aspects and they intend to bring about change within the existing framework of society. They are often called moderate or center activists.<sup>4</sup>

#### Center Activists

Richard E. Peterson classifies the center activist as "the intellectual". This student is committed toward ideas and issues which are not necessarily connected with the curriculum. He is highly individualistic and liberal in his political beliefs, is not motivated by grades, and will only participate in the protests and demonstrations that he personally believes in.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Franklin L. Ford, "To Live With Complexity," in The Radical Left, ed. by William P. Gerberding and Duane E. Smith (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970), pp. 4-12.

<sup>5</sup>Peterson, "The Student Left," pp. 299-303.

youth he polled as "radical dissidents". These students often verged on political alienation and wanted sweeping changes in our society. Their beliefs were less extreme than the radicals but they frequently sympathized with radical beliefs and activities.<sup>8</sup>

#### Radicals

In his studies, Richard E. Peterson has concentrated on the radical students. They are those students who are more passionate toward issues and ideas than center activists. They are committed to personal involvement in demonstrations which aim at reforming some facet of the American way of life. Greatly outraged by hypocrisy and injustice, they intend to act upon it.<sup>9</sup>

Mark Gerzon classified students as radicals as those who see the hypocrisy and inequities of society and reject them. They seek to create ways to alter various aspects of society as an entity.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Howard D. Mehlinger and John J. Patrick, American Political Behavior (Lexington, Massachusetts: Ginn and Company, 1972), pp. 143-44.

<sup>9</sup>Peterson, "The Student Left," pp. 299-303.

<sup>10</sup>Gerzon, The Whole World Is Watching, pp. 245-54.



Franklin Ford places the radicals in the fourth and smallest circle of his circle theory of students. This fourth circle encompasses students whose behavior is definitely provocative because they are unhappy with all aspects of society. They avow to wreck the entire system and have no plan for rebuilding after they tear down the existing structures. (Ford calls them politically doctrinaire revolutionaries or "wreckers").<sup>11</sup>

Samuel Lubell found that there were five distinct groups that made up the mainstream of the radicals. They were: (1) draft dodgers, (2) career rebels or students who reject money-making pursuits and want to work with people and ideas, (3) children of one-time Communists, Socialists, or other radical groups, (4) drug-using beatniks, (5) Christian radicals or those who as children were strongly religious but were now breaking with their faith.<sup>12</sup>

Kenneth Keniston believes that the sources of student dissent are found in the loss of many American virtues as (1) breakdown of the American family, (2) a high divorce rate, (3) a soft mode of living, (4) parents who are inadequate, (5) parents who overindulge and spoil their children, and (6) children

---

<sup>11</sup>Ford, "To Live With Complexity," pp. 4-12.

<sup>12</sup>Lubell, "That Generation Gap," p. 59.

who are undisciplined.<sup>13</sup> Keniston classifies those students who participate in violent demonstrations and riots as radicals. In an address before the American College Health Association, Keniston told his audience that the first step toward raising a radical is for the parents to have high ideals and a strong sense of values. According to Keniston radicals come from families where the parents (1) have high principles and strong religious affiliations, (2) have communicated to children that actions in accord to ethical principles are what matters the most in estimating a person's worth, (3) have had warm open relationships with their children, and (4) have encouraged their children to achieve academically and to be independent. Consequently, these children will feel different, exceptional, and separate from others-intellectual elites.<sup>14</sup>

Byron Massialas' research on the traits of radicals provides some revealing observations. Massialas states that for the most part radicals usually come from moderately well to do families, are upperclassmen or graduate students, make very good grades are quite intelligent, and usually major in social sciences or humanities.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup>Keniston, "Sources of Student Dissent," pp. 110-111.

<sup>14</sup>Dr. Keniston, New York Times, May 3, 1968, p. 53.

<sup>15</sup>Byron G. Massialas, Education and The Political System (Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969) p. 147.

A study by Mark and Kenneth Gerzen led them to hypothesize that radicals usually (1) come from prosperous homes, (2) have parents who are well educated, (3) have fathers who are professionals or in the higher echelons of business, (4) have no church affiliation, and (5) tend to major in the social sciences.<sup>16</sup>

A Harris Poll of Students in 1970 indicated that radicals usually (1) come from upper income homes, (2) have fathers who are professionals or are in management positions, (3) have liberal mothers, and (4) major in humanities or social studies fields.<sup>17</sup>

The Yankelovich study revealed that radicals usually (1) are 20-21 years old, (2) come from families with incomes over \$15,000, (3) come from families in which the father is a white collar worker, and (4) have no religious affiliations of their own.<sup>18</sup>

David L. Westly and Richard Braungart also analyzed the backgrounds of radical students. They chose two groups which

---

<sup>16</sup>Seymour Martin Lipset, Rebellion in the University (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), pp. 90-94.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Mehlinger and Patrick, American Political Behavior, pp. 143-44.

they thought represented the extremes of political opinions on the left and on the right. To represent the left, they chose students affiliated with the Students For Peace (SENSE) and to represent the right they chose students affiliated with Young Americans for Freedom (YAF). Their findings were that the predominately upper-middle class background, high income origins of the leftist members contrasted greatly with the generally lower-middle class background, low-income origins of the rightist members. The political affiliation of the left activists was that of Democratic or Socialist backgrounds of the parents and the right activists was that of Republican backgrounds of the parents. Westby and Braungart speculated that the leftist members could afford to deviate from conformist attitudes because they were already members of the upper-middle class, a fully arrived stratum, whereas the rightist members were not.<sup>19</sup>

Richard Flacks and Milton Mankoff are two scholars who reviewed and found wanting the descriptive literature outlining the typical radical. They state that the prevailing portrait of the radical is that of one: (1) who comes from upper-middle

---

<sup>19</sup>David L. Westby and Richard G. Braungart, "Class and Politics in the Family Backgrounds of Student Political Activists," *American Sociological Review*, XXXI (April, 1966), pp. 690-92.

class families that live in urban areas, (2) whose parents tend to be involved in professional careers, (3) whose parents are likely to be liberal, (4) who has little religious training, (5) who was raised permissively and allowed to develop his own values, ideals, and life styles, (6) who is intellectually and academically oriented, (7) who specialized in humanities and social sciences, and (8) who does not seek material success. Flacks and Mankoff refute the prevailing picture based on a study they did of Wisconsin students. They found that: (1) although radicals may have come from liberal, permissive, well-educated parents who lived in large, urban areas, a large porportion of radicals came from other backgrounds, (2) more students joining the activists were from smaller towns and had definite Christian upbringings, (3) fathers were not always college educated, and (4) difference in upbringing was not statistically significant.

20

Richard M. Kahn and William J. Bowers conducted a series of studies to test four hypotheses considering the background of students. Their first hypothesis was that activist students come from high status families. Their findings based upon a

---

<sup>20</sup>Richard Flacks and Milton Mankoff, "The Changing Social Base of the American Student Movement," Annals of American Academy, CCCXCV (May, 1971), pp. 54-67.

study of four variables among activist students, indicated that the organizers and leaders of activist protests tend to come from higher status families but the rank and file members of activist protests do not reveal any social class bias (see Appendix A).<sup>21</sup>

The second hypothesis tested was that activists come from students who have very strong academic commitments. Using the variables of study habits, grade averages, and quality of schools attended, they found that the relationship between activism and academic performance varies with the quality of the schools. The academic context itself at the nation's quality schools tends to encourage activism among the more academically oriented students (see Appendix A).<sup>22</sup>

Their third hypothesis was that activists come from those students whose main interests are in the social studies or humanities areas. Using the variables of field of study and school quality, they found that students majoring in social sciences or humanities had higher rates of activism in all contexts. They believe that this hypothesis is confirmed but

---

<sup>21</sup>Roger M. Kahn and William J. Bowers, "The Social Context of the Rank and File Student Activists: A Test of Four Hypotheses," Sociology of Education, XLIII (Winter, 1970), pp. 38-55.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

qualified. They suggest that a third variable—awareness of students in social sciences and humanities fields as opposed to awareness in physical science and pre-professional fields—could possibly affect their conclusion (see Appendix A).<sup>23</sup>

The fourth hypothesis was that activists come from students who have strong intellectual orientations. Using the variables of three indicators of intellectual orientation and school quality, they found that without qualification, students who were more intellectually oriented were definitely more likely to be activists than the rest of their classmates (see Appendix A).<sup>24</sup>

Larry Kerpelmann also made a detailed and in depth study of 229 students at three schools. These students were given a two hour battery of attitude, intelligence, and personality measures. These measures covered a broad psychological range, and also included measures that would give quantitative indices of the variables of activism and ideology. After analyzing his studies, Kerpelmann drew the following conclusions:

(1) the personality characteristics of students appear to be the same no matter what the political ideology of the students

---

23Ibid.

24Ibid.

may be. The left activists, who propose to radically change society, the center activists, who propose to quickly change the system by working within it, and the right activists, who propose to keep the structures from rapidly changing by working within the system, are all more alike in their personality characteristics than they are unlike. In fact, Kerpelmann found that there is little difference between politically aroused students, be they right or left, and non-politically aroused students. Activists have a tendency to be more sociable, assertive, and ascendant, and less needful of encouragement than non-activists but they do not appear to be different on emotional stability, restraint, responsibility, or intellectual bases.

(2) Left activists do not have any personal qualities that make them unique. Kerpelmann's findings indicate that the previous speculative endeavors that have given certain unique characteristics to left activists students have been incorrect. In not one of many personality, demographic, and intelligence measures did Kerpelmann find the left activist to be much different from any other subgroup.<sup>25</sup>

Table I synthesizes the characteristics several authorities have attributed to radical students. What can be seen from this

---

<sup>25</sup>Larry C. Kerpelmann, Activists and Nonactivists: A Psychological Study of American College Students (New York: Behavioral Publications, Inc., 1972), pp. 112-18.



TABLE I

SYNTHESIS OF CHARACTERISTICS ATTRIBUTED  
TO RADICAL STUDENTS\*

Characteristics	STUDIES CONDUCTED							
	Keniston	Lubell	Gerzon	Massialas	Harris	Yankelovich	Westby Braungart	Kahn Bowers
All to do families			*	*	*	*	*	
Liberal parent(s)	*	*			*		*	
All Educated parents			*					
Fathers-Professional or Business Occupations			*		*	*		
Upperclassmen or graduate Students				*				
Academically oriented	*			*				**
Intellectually inclined				*				*
Social Studies or humanities Major			*	*	*			**
No Religious affiliations		*	*			*		

ONE ASTERISK IS A DEFINITE YES; TWO ASTERISKS IS A QUALIFIED YES.

table? It would appear that the evidence presented by several scholars is inconclusive. This is not to say that the evidence they have presented is worthless. From the various studies made, certain characteristics of radicals appeared in many studies. Certainly, at least from a purely descriptive standpoint, a composite picture of a radical can be made. It seems safe to assume that most radicals do come from upper-middle class homes, are academically oriented and intelligent, and major in social studies and/or humanities.

However, the questions still remain. Is it possible to identify the types of students who become involved in student movements? Is it possible to determine whether or not a student will become a radical by examining his background, attitudes, and commitments? From the evidence presented in this Chapter, I would have to say no. The most well researched, tested, and scientifically valid studies (Flacks and Mankoff, Kahn and Bowers, and Kerpelmann) support this answer.

Flacks and Mankoff demonstrated that psychological factors such as the way radical students were reared by their families, i. e., permissive atmosphere, religious training, and certain life styles, are unconvincing in predicting student activism. Kerpelmann demonstrated that personality characteristics and intelligence have little significance in predicting student

activism. Kahn and Bowers demonstrated that the variables of family income, academic achievement, and field of study were not sufficient in predicting student activism. Their study was the only one that recognized the variety of variables that must be taken into account when predicting student activism.

The study by Westby and Braungart is indicative of the problems encountered when comparing two different groups of students. Their study did seem to suggest that radical students do come from liberal, well-to-do parents and conservative students do come from conservative, less well-to-do parents. It appears that the study would have been more valid if they had compared students within similar cultural, religious, and political environments. As it is, the study by Westby and Braungart can be questioned as to whether or not they were actually comparing what they intended to.

Inconclusive is the term I have to employ to describe most of evidence presented in this Chapter. The evidence is impressive but not convincing.

### CHAPTER III

#### CAUSES OF STUDENT UNREST IN THE UNITED STATES

The New Left exploded powerfully on the American scene in the 1960's and ushered in a decade of protest which proved to be unique in many ways: it came during a period of prolonged affluence, and not depression; it did not have a fundamental doctrine or point of view; it was activist-oriented; and it was led by young people who had definitely given it a revolutionary tone.<sup>1</sup>

One thing is certain - the New Left was real. It can no longer be comfortably dismissed as a mere Freudian revolt against fathers or as a conspiracy of Maoist groups.<sup>2</sup> It was an amorphous, multilayered, and pluralistic movement. There were three levels in this contemporary New Radicalism. At

---

<sup>1</sup>William O. Douglas, Points of Rebellion (New York: Random House, 1969), p. 9.

<sup>2</sup>Jack Newfield, "In Defense of Student Radicals," The University and Revolution, ed. by Gary R. Weaver and James H. Weaver (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), pp. 43-54.

its first, or political level, New Radicalism was definitely an anti-Establishment approach to the inequities of American life. Three political strands mingled in various proportions in the New Left--pacifism, anarchism, and socialism. At its second level, New Radicalism was a moral revulsion against a "sick" society that was supposedly becoming more corrupt everyday. At its third and lowest level, it was a revolt against the impersonal machines and technology which were not responsive to human wants or needs.<sup>3</sup>

Accepting the obvious fact that the Vietnam War has been a major cause of student unrest, what are the other major causes of student unrest?

#### Psychological Factors

S. L. Halleck is the only scholar to present hypotheses of student unrest. Five of these hypotheses stress changes in child rearing practices as the major causes of student unrest:

(1) Critical hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis seek the causes of student unrest through factors which have created moral decay in the youth. They believe that the youth of today are restless due to the lack of purpose, values, and

---

<sup>3</sup>Jack Newfield, A Prophetic Minority (New York: The New American Library, 1966), pp. 22-23.

discipline. These deficiencies are believed to have originated in a disturbed, family pattern of living, particularly when the family is permissive, liberal, and affluent.

(2) Permissiveness hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis believe that student unrest is caused by too much parental permissiveness. They say that parents have nurtured a generation of youth that is greedy, spoiled, and unable to cope with or to tolerate frustration.

(3) Responsibility hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis believe that this particular culture has been "psychologized" to such an extent that youths have become unwilling to accept the responsibility for their actions. Behavior which was once considered bad is now considered "sick" and the implication follows that students are not responsible for their actions because of their "sickness".

(4) Affluence hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis argue that affluence which is not earned and not accompanied by a tradition of commitment and service creates a sense of boredom, restlessness, and meaninglessness in the youth. Students are involved in a continuous search for new meanings and freedoms in their lives, since they have not learned to use work and/or creativity as a means of mastering certain aspects of the self-identity.

(5) Family Pathology Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis suggest that students are restless and alienated because they are responding to some unresolved conflict within their family units. This hypothesis emphasizes the breakdown in the authority of father and the confusion of sexual roles in our contemporary society.<sup>4</sup>

For the most part, these five hypotheses place the student in an unfavorable light. They all imply that there is something wrong with students who protest.

The permissiveness hypothesis is probably the most difficult hypothesis to dismiss. There is much evidence that activist students do come from liberal, permissive parents. However, other studies (Flacks and Mankoff, and Kahn and Bowers, Chapter II) do indicate that this is not always the case. These exceptions would seem to refute this hypothesis.

The responsibility hypothesis is unconvincing because many activists are willing to hold themselves accountable for their actions. In many cases, they have been arrested and gone to jail for participating in sit-ins, barricading buildings, and resisting the draft. The culturally alienated students

---

<sup>4</sup>S. L. Halleck, "Hypotheses of Student Unrest," in Conflict and Change: The Response to Student Hyperactivism, ed. by William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer (New York: School and Society Books, 1970), pp. 126-143.

may seek the easy way out, but not the activists.

There is little evidence to support the affluence hypothesis. Affluence in itself does not always produce indolence or protest. Many conservative students come from affluent families. Some of our greatest leaders have come from affluent families. These exceptions indicate the insignificance of this hypothesis.

The family pathology hypothesis is a difficult hypothesis to prove or disprove. Determining family disorganization is a complex situation and its influence on youth is difficult to prove. Certainly, we can say that some student restlessness can be related to family disorganization but the degree of influence it exerts is not measurable.

#### Societal Factors

S. L. Halleck has also presented other hypotheses which deal with societal factors. These hypotheses view the student as a "victim" of man-made circumstances and thus maintains that student unrest is a rational and legitimate effort to change the circumstances.

(1) Sympathetic Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis see students as victims of their environments. They see student unrest as a rational effort to change the circumstances that created this environment.



(2) Two Armed Camps Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis believe that our tremendous emphasis upon education had led to excessive competition among students. Students find they cannot stand the pressure and finally withdraw or protest against a system which has produced this competitiveness.

(3) War In Vietnam Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis believe much of student restlessness is a result of the frustration and the lack of power students feel in unseccessfully attempting to stop a war they feel is immoral and misdirected.

(4) Deterioration in Quality of Life Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis justify student unrest as the appropriate reaction to the deterioration in the quality of life they see in America. Students' unrest is a massive response to the destruction of the kind of life their forefathers had but is being denied to them. Presently, life seems to lack meaning and a basis for optimistic anticipation.

(5) Political Hopelessness Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis see student unrest as a response to a society that is hesitant to accept change. Students believe that society is so intricate, complex, and self-equalizing that change is just not possible. They are convinced that

education, government, and industry are tied together to ward off any attempt to alter the status quo.

(6) Civil Rights Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis see student unrest as a reaction to oppression. Students have learned the psychological meaning of oppression from minority groups and now want to seek out and attack the sources of oppression in their lives.

(7) Neutral Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis believe student unrest is caused by their attempts to adapt to a highly complex society by creating new modes of psychological adaptation.

(8) Technology Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis interpret student unrest as a protest against the reality that values of the past will no longer be appropriate for the technological world in which they must live. Students realize that in this fast changing world, long term planning is impossible for them and they are apprehensive about the future.

(9) Media Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis state that the new electronic mass media has brought everyone closer together in a more communal sense. Young people who have grown up with the influence of the media are ready for this communal society. Their elders, who are committed to the

institutions of the past are not. Student unrest can be surmised as an effort by the young people to convince their elders that the values and the traditions of the past are now irrelevant.

(10) Reliance on Scientism Hypothesis - Proponents of this hypothesis say that young people today are raised to rely on scientific rationality as an answer to everything. In this conviction, young people feel that there must be rational solutions to any problem. When confronted with the irrationality of man which resists change and often leads man to his own destruction, students become intolerant and angry. They project their anger upon those who are frustrating them.<sup>5</sup>

New Radicalism is opposed to the present American society as it exists today. It sees many evils in society - racism, poverty, centralized decision making, hypocrisy, manipulative bureaucracies - that divide America's professed ideals. The students blame these evils on middle class values - money, patriotism, material wealth, status, religion, and Puritanism.<sup>6</sup> They reject these values, because in their eyes, these values have sustained a culture that can kill millions of people in Vietnam. Yet this same society tried to put Benjamin Spock in jail for opposing this slaughter.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Newfield, "In Defense of Student Radicals," pp. 49-50.

The radicals find the American system to be illegitimate, undemocratic, and perverted. It tolerates injustices, inhumanity, insensitivity, lack of candor, and it has no higher goal than the preservation of the existing status quo. It could be no further removed from the American promise.<sup>8</sup>

In society today, they see apathy, hoarding of power, resistance to change, and a remoteness from people.<sup>9</sup> The entire system deprives people of their self respect, rights, and dignity. It does not recognize the autonomy and individuality of each person.<sup>10</sup>

The radicals' protest is against a society whose standards and behavior are determined by the exigencies of industrial planning, the domination of the rule of things.<sup>11</sup> They criticize the consumer and feel that they live in a world which moves according to laws of the development of technological invention and massive impersonal interests.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup>Gregory H. Wierzynski, "An American Student Manifesto," Youth In Turmoil, ed. by Editors of Fortune Magazine (New York: Time, Inc., 1969), pp. 47-57.

<sup>10</sup>The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest (New York: Arno Press, 1970), pp. 57-59.

<sup>11</sup>Stephen Spender, The Situation of Young Rebels (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 155.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., pp. 157-58.

## Universities

In the United States, there are 2300 institutions of higher learning, 150 of which are classified as universities. It is these schools, and particularly the universities, that have come under the most severe attack by the radicals. One critical feature of these schools is their exceedingly rapid growth. The United States embarked on a program of mass higher education in the late 1950's.<sup>13</sup> In 1930, only a little more than 10% of the high school graduates went on to college. In the 1950's, approximately 20% went to college. In the 1970's, well over 50% of all high school graduates will go on to college. From 1961 to 1971, the actual number of students attending college jumped from less than three million to eight million. In 1971, over 50% of all college freshmen indicated that they expected to continue their education beyond a four year degree. Between 1960 and 1970, more masters and doctorate degrees were awarded than in the preceding fifty years.<sup>14</sup> These proportions are larger in the United States than in any other country.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup>Talcott Parsons, "The Academic System: A Sociologist's View," Confrontation: The Student Rebellion and the Universities, ed. by Daniel Bell and Irving Kristol (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968), p. 161.

<sup>14</sup>Fredrick G. Dutton, Changing Sources of Power: American Politics in the 1970's (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971) p. 31.

<sup>15</sup>Parsons, "The Academic System," p. 161.

What are the consequences of this new kind of college environment? There are four processes involved in this twenty year transition.

- (1) changes in the character of the student population recruited and its size
- (2) changes in the functions and size of universities
- (3) changes from locally attached college teachers to the cosmopolitan professional who is oriented to a world of specialized disciplines and research, and not a world of students
- (4) changes from the aristocratic cultivation of people to the meritocratic training of people.<sup>16</sup>

To the students, schools have become large, impersonal structures dominated by unsympathetic and authoritarian administrations. They feel that the faculty and the administration is out of touch with the basic wants and needs of the students.

To them, the schools are anti-social in their thoughts in that they measure human achievement individually and not

---

<sup>16</sup>Joseph Gusfield, "Beyond Berkeley," Campus Power Struggle, ed. by Howard S. Becker (No place named: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970), p. 17.

collectively. Conversely, the students see human achievement and productivity as a collective social process and not an individual one.<sup>17</sup>

They desire more academic freedom and more freedom in shaping their own educations. They want to be released from excessive course loads, graded systems, and irrelevant courses. No longer do they want a system geared to producing good grades but rather a system geared to create "a meaningful experience".<sup>18</sup>

They want a voice in the affairs that affect them.<sup>19</sup> They charge that the present student courts and councils are allowed to deal only with the trivial cases and that the important cases are handled by the administration, usually under vague and arbitrary rules. They want to set their own guidelines and enforce them.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup>Paul Rockwell, "How We Became Revolutionary," The New Revolutionaries, ed. by Tarig Ali (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1969), p. 288.

<sup>18</sup>Jeremy Main, "The 'Square' Universities Are Rolling Too," Youth In Turmoil, ed. by Editors of Fortune Magazine (New York: Time, Inc. 1969), pp. 120-128.

<sup>19</sup>James J. Lynch, "Disorder, Power, and the Student," Virginia Quarterly Review, XLIII (Winter, 1967), p. 49.

<sup>20</sup>Main, "The Square' Universities"; pp. 120-128.

They dislike the schools' restrictions on their personal lives. They see outdated dormitory restrictions and other restrictions such as drinking, smoking and sex as an attempt of the schools to set standards of conduct and decency. Their morals are their own and none of the universities' concern.<sup>21</sup>

They are discontented with their instructors and feel that there are too few instructors per student. Overcrowding in classrooms, mass lectures, lack of contact with professors outside of class, and being known only as a number are frequent complaints. Also, the student-faculty ratio is increasing disproportionately. In 1960, there were 12.5 students per faculty member. In 1970, this number had increased to 13.5 and the predicted ratio is 14.5 by 1980.<sup>22</sup>

Most of all, they lack confidence in the trustees and the president. The students feel that the trustees and their boards have lost interest in the true objectives of the school.<sup>23</sup> As far as the students are concerned, those who serve as trustees or regents are not university-oriented. The people are usually heads of large corporations or industries and; therefore, lack contact with the academic world.<sup>24</sup> No longer are the trustees

---

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Michael W. Miles, The Radical Probe (New York: Atheneum, 1971), p. 95.

<sup>23</sup>Main, "The 'Square' Universities," pp. 120-128.

<sup>24</sup>D. W. Brogan, "Student Revolt", Encounter, XXXI (July, 1968), p. 22.



and administrations interested in academics. They are closely associated with the military-industrial-society complex. The university is no longer a disinterested community of scholars. It offers courses for credit in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and conducts chemical, germ, and biological warfare research. The university cooperates with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and draft board, and has affiliations with the Central Intelligence Agency.<sup>25</sup>

To support their claims, students can direct attention to the following facts. In 1969, the Pentagon had contracts with forty-eight universities for research on subjects such as steering of missiles, aerial photography, detection of mines, gunnery, and search-and-destroy operations. The University of California has received grants from the Atomic Energy Commission to research nuclear explosives. Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Hopkins University are among the top 100 major military aerospace corporations. Stanford, Michigan, and Columbia Universities have also had defense contracts.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Newfield, "In Defense of Student Radicals," pp. 43-54.

<sup>26</sup>Douglas, Points of Rebellion, p. 13.

Where grievances accumulate and discontent is prevalent, protests and demonstrations seem to be the only effective counterattack. Grievances and discontent grow more rapidly at complex institutions than at simple institutions.<sup>27</sup>

Alexander Astin and Alan Bayer conducted a survey and found that the highest rate of demonstrations and protests were at the medium and large universities.<sup>28</sup> In a survey in 1968, the Urban Research Corporation found that the incidents of protest were likely to greatly increase with the size of the university.<sup>29</sup>

TABLE 2  
PERCENTAGE OF PROTESTS BY SIZE OF  
INSTITUTIONS\*

Percentage of Protest	Size of Institution
1% . . . . .	less than 500 students
3% . . . . .	500 to 999 students
8% . . . . .	1,000 to 4,999 students
27% . . . . .	5,000 to 9,999 students
54% . . . . .	more than 10,000

\*Figures from: Michael W. Miles, *The Radical Probe* (New York: Atheneum, 1971), p. 93.

<sup>27</sup>Carl Davidson presents an interesting account of the tactics employed by students in a university confrontation; e. g., his chapter on "Toward Institutional Resistance" *University Crisis Reader: Confrontation and Counterattack*, ed. by Immanuel Wallerstein and Paul Starr (New York: Random House, 1971), pp. 134-136.

<sup>28</sup>Miles, *The Radical Probe*, p. 95

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 93.

In 1969, Harold Hadgkinson did a study of student protests for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. He found that compared with a national sample, high-protest schools had a more heterogenous student body in terms of socio-economic background, age, and ethnic composition, with a higher proportion of out-of-state students. His conclusion was that the best single indicator of demonstrations and protests was institutional size. His study demonstrated that there was a continuous rise in the probability of protest and the size of the schools.<sup>30</sup>

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF PROTESTS BY SIZE  
OF INSTITUTIONS\*

Percentage of Protest	Size of Institution
14% . . . . .	under 1,000
32% . . . . .	1,000 to 5,000
58% . . . . .	5,000 to 15,000
75% . . . . .	15,000 to 25,000
88% . . . . .	more than 25,000

\*Figures from: Michael W. Miles, *The Radical Probe* (New York: Atheneum, 1971), p. 98.

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 98.

Given the below stated premises, Joseph W. Scott and Mohammed El-Assal hypothesized

The more complex the formal structure is, the more likely is the administration to be bureaucratic as opposed to parental and patrimonial. The more bureaucratic the educational institution, the more structurally separated are the students from the administrators, faculty, and students; and the more the students are personally separated from the administration, faculty members and other students by structural and social heterogeneity, the more likely the students will feel separated, neglected, manipulated, and dehumanized to the extent that they will engage in protest activities. Given these premises, we hypothesize that the more nearly a university constitutes a "multiversity" the higher the rate of protest demonstration.<sup>31</sup>

Scott and El-Assal correlated the degrees of social heterogeneity and formal complexity with the number of student protests. They also introduced intermittently other intervening variables such as quality, size of institution, and size of community in which the institution is situated. After completing these studies, they found that their hypothesis was supported. (See Appendix B).<sup>32</sup>

Michael Miles states that there is another hypothesis which has gained popularity, and this the outside agitator

<sup>31</sup>Joseph W. Scott and Mohammed El-Assal, "Multiversity, University Size, University Quality, and Student Protest: An Empirical Study," *American Sociological Review*, XXXIV (Winter, 1970), pp. 38-55.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

hypothesis. Proponents of this hypothesis believe that student unrest is being caused by outside agitators. They also believe hard core professional agitators are responsible for inciting students. These outside forces make it their occupation to convert passive student dissatisfaction into confrontation and violence. Others think that the conspiracy is more complex and accuse the Chinese Communists of initiating the student unrest and rebellions in the United States.<sup>33</sup>

The general consensus is implied by the delegation of hypothetical accusations to traditional institutions. Established institutions such as the family, education, and religion which until this point have gone unchallenged are now the recipients of nebulous expressions of dischord.

---

<sup>33</sup>Miles, The Radical Probe. pp. 5-6.

## CHAPTER IV

### CAUSES OF STUDENT UNREST IN JAPAN

There are common elements between the student movements in Japan and the United States. The number of students involved in protests and demonstrations is nearly equal in size. Both societies are affluent and are entering a mass technological age. Some students in both countries suffer from a profound crisis of belief and have little sense of or respect for nationalism. The objectives of the students in both countries are somewhat indefinite but are directed to the whole fabric of society.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, there are five major distinctions that must be kept in mind when examining the relevance of student unrest in Japan and the United States. In Japan, there are no black-white racial tensions because there are no significant radical

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph A. Califano, Jr., The Student Revolution (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1970), p. 64.

minorities in Japan. There are no drug problems in Japan. The Vietnam problem is ubiquitous and is therefore a source of distress in both countries. However, in Japan the Vietnam War was not aggravated by a draft problem which was an issue that alienated many American students. There is no marked tendency among Japanese leaders or adults to look upon student protest as part of some larger conspiracy.<sup>2</sup> In terms of successful disruption of universities and national activity, Japanese students are by far the more successful.<sup>3</sup> Other than these minor differences, the causes of student unrest in Japan and the United States are much the same.

#### Society

Japanese students are pessimistic about the society in which they live. The students suffer from a sense of historical dislocation accompanied by a tremendous and rapid social change.<sup>4</sup> They want to challenge what they call the "capitalist deception"

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 57-64.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>4</sup>Charlotte Nassim, "Notes on the Revolutionary Students in Japan," in The New Revolutionaries, ed. by Tariq Ali (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1969), p. 256.

of the present government which is attempting to develop Japan into a mass consumer society. They feel that traditional ideologies, group and family life, and interpersonal communications are no longer relevant and not adequate for life in today's world.<sup>5</sup>

The students are dissatisfied with the existing political and social structures and feel that the older generation has failed them. They see injustice and crime all around them. They see themselves as being exploited by their elders. They see society as corrupt and needing change.<sup>6</sup> Students protest the present structure of society and government and resent the highly centralized and powerful decision-making bureaucrats who run the country.<sup>7</sup>

Students feel that there are two modes that will bring about a change in society. These modes refer to the actions taken by the students. The mode of transformation calls for the remaking of the entire social order by revolution. The mode of accommodation calls for the remaking of the social order by drawing upon the relevant traditions to help them face the

---

<sup>5</sup>Robert Jay Lifton, "Individual Patterns in Historical Change: Imagery of Japanese Youth," Journal of Social Issues, XX (October, 1964), p. 97.

<sup>6</sup>New York Times, March 30, 1970, p. 16.

<sup>7</sup>New York Times, August 24, 1969, IV, p. 9.



realities of today. Reform will come through placing much stress upon self-realization and personal autonomy.<sup>8</sup> Whatever mode the students adopt, they are attempting to make "a breakthrough [that may] often appear confusing, misdirected, and threatening, but . . . express the effort to arrive at hope in the future."<sup>9</sup>

#### Universities

In Japan, there are 845 institutions of higher learning and of these, 377 are classified as universities. The rest are essentially two-year colleges. Around 1.27 million students attend the four-year colleges, and around 230 thousand go to junior colleges.<sup>10</sup>

In 1969 over one half of the universities endured some form of student interruption. On a single day, April 9, 1969, eight-two universities were suffering either building barricades or class boycotts. Many of these disruptions lasted over 100 days. For example, Nihon University lost control of its campus for 253 days. Sophia University was closed for over 100 days.

<sup>8</sup>Lifton, "Individual Patterns in Historical Change," pp. 97-107.

<sup>9</sup>Califano, *The Student Revolution*, p. 365.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., pp. 34-35.

The College of General Education of the University of Tokyo was closed from the summer of 1968 to March, 1969, because of a student strike. The Tokyo University of Education was closed for eight months.<sup>11</sup> In 1969, Todai University gave up its entrance examination due to student strikes and some first year classes were delayed a year.<sup>12</sup>

Students openly intimidated their professors and university presidents. It is not unusual for professors and administrators to be held as prisoners by students who attempt to get them to sign confessions of guilt for "crimes against society".<sup>13</sup>

In order to understand the reason for these severe attacks on the university system, it is necessary to understand the education system in Japan. Japanese universities were patterned on the German model during Japan's period of modernization during the nineteenth century.<sup>14</sup> The universities embodied

---

<sup>11</sup>Victor Kobayashi, "Confusion and Hope: Student Unrest in Japan," in Conflict and Change: The Response to Student Hyperactivism, ed. by William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer (New York: School and Society Books, 1970), pp. 359-66.

<sup>12</sup>Michiya Shimbori, "Student Radicals in Japan," Annals of American Academy, CCCXCV (May, 1971), p. 153.

<sup>13</sup>Califano, The Student Revolution, p. 35.

<sup>14</sup>New York Times, January 9, 1969, p. 64.

the doctrines and influences of Karl Wilhelm von Humboldt. The Humboldt doctrine is an idealistic one and elaborates theories of education and transcendental ethics. After World War II, Japan initiated the four year university system along guidelines favored by American mass democracy. However, the Humboldt doctrine of education was retained and dominated post-war universities and professors. This doctrine essentially holds that a university is an ivory tower existing for the purpose of educating a small number of social elites. After the war, the increased enrollment of students at the universities founded on this doctrine led to many contradictions within the universities.<sup>15</sup> While the universities are now serving the "mass" students, they are still some of the most autocratic institutions in Japan and the sole remaining feudal institutions in the country. The universities are still powerful and professors still continue to adopt elitist approaches to education.<sup>16</sup> The universities tend to be faction-ridden, exclusive, and not capable of keeping

---

<sup>15</sup>Fukashiro Junro, "Student Thought and Feeling," Japan Quarterly, LXII (April - July, 1969), pp. 149-150.

<sup>16</sup>New York Times, January 9, 1969, p. 64.

their affairs in order. No policy changes can be made in the universities without complete agreement among the faculty, and the faculty is often split into various factions. The faculty has extensive power and is characterized as arrogant, distant, and despotic.<sup>17</sup>

In Japan, one's career is determined to a great extent by the prestige of the university he attended. This is a common practice in Japan and is called gakureki - shugi (educational backgroundism).<sup>18</sup> At the prestige universities, it is a disgrace for the professors or the universities to produce a student who has received poor grades, dropped out, or been dismissed. The universities feel that this failing or incompetence of their students is a reflection on the schooling they received at the universities. Thus, a sense of sympathy, fear, and/or pity exists at these universities and professors try to give good marks to most of the students.<sup>19</sup> Consequently, when students arrive at these universities, they

---

<sup>17</sup>Edward Siedensticker, "Pulverisers", Encounter, XXXIV (June, 1970), p. 82.

<sup>18</sup>Shimbori, "Student Radicals in Japan," p. 152.

<sup>19</sup>Michiya Shimbori, "Zengakuren: A Japanese Case Study of a Student Political Movement," Sociology of Education, XXXVII (Spring, 1964), p. 235.

discover that the mirage of knowledge is in fact a farce. The result is a psychological revulsion toward the universities.

In order to get into any college, students must first take a severe, difficult, and grueling examination. It is no exaggeration to say that the emphasis of all education at the secondary level is placed on preparation for this notorious entrance examination.<sup>20</sup> The competition is high. In 1967, around 750,000 young people were competing for 420,000 places available at all colleges in the fall.<sup>21</sup> The frustration and dissatisfaction among the high school students is so great that many of them have joined in the demonstrations at several universities. Around 17,000 high school students were recruited by radical student organizations for demonstrations in 1969.<sup>22</sup>

Another large group of young people involved in the demonstrations at the universities are the ronin or students who have failed the entrance examination.<sup>23</sup> They attend special schools

---

<sup>20</sup>Califano, The Student Revolution, pp. 30-31.

<sup>21</sup>New York Times, January 11, 1967, p. 45.

<sup>22</sup>Shimbori, "Student Radicals in Japan," p. 152.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

where they prepare to take the examination the following year. In 1969, 330,000 students were classified as ronin.<sup>24</sup> Their frustration is also very great and, as a result, they also join radical student organizations.<sup>25</sup>

Another objection the students have is the universities participation in activities that go beyond academics. Many students believe that the universities are receiving aid for research in bacteriological warfare.<sup>26</sup> Students demonstrated at Keio University in 1968 in order to force the administration to turn down research funds from the United States.<sup>27</sup> They also want the Self Defense Force Personnel dismissed from the universities.<sup>28</sup>

Other situations which can bring on student demonstrations are raises in tuition, disciplinary action against students by

---

<sup>24</sup>New York Times, January 11, 1967, p. 45.

<sup>25</sup>Shimbori, "Student Radicals in Japan," p. 152.

<sup>26</sup>"First You Destroy the Universities," Economist, January 25, 1969, p. 30.

<sup>27</sup>"Zengakuren," New York Times, January 9, 1969, p. 64.

<sup>28</sup>Kobayashi, "Confusion and Hope," p. 361.

the administration, and administrative interference with the student governments.<sup>29</sup> Other complaints are the lack of student control of dormitories, teacher-student ratios, overcrowding, lack of contact with professors, meaningless courses, and lack of control over decisions which concern the students.<sup>30</sup>

In Japan, as in America, students are dissatisfied with their education, families, religion, and societal values. They seek to change the entire fabric of their society in order to meet the needs of tomorrow.

---

<sup>29</sup>"Zengakuren", New York Times, January 9, 1969, p. 64.

<sup>30</sup>Califano, The Student Revolution, pp. 30-35.

## CHAPTER V

### STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS AND TACTICS IN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN

It should be clear, then, that any individual or group of individuals involved in such a movement, or potentially involved in such a movement faces a very great problem in trying to organize sufficient power to achieve any end that he wished to achieve at a given time. He does not have an organization which he can throw into the struggle, but must . . . create an organization an uncertain coalition for that purpose . . . anyone seeking to lead a radical movement and any individual member wishing to see such a movement succeed must rely very heavily upon the individual commitments to the radical purposes. This lack of stable organization . . . leads to the necessity of relying to an extraordinary degree on the individual emotions and beliefs of the individuals involved . . . it should be apparent that such movements as this have a tremendous tendency to be anarchic.<sup>1</sup>

#### Student Organizations in the United States

The student movement in the United States was extremely diverse. It was as varied and multi-layered as the society itself.

---

<sup>1</sup>Jack D. Douglas, Youth In Turmoil (Chevy Chase, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, Center of Studies of Crimes and Delinquency, 1970), p. 168-69.



Attempts to bring all the activist students together in a cohesive fashion has been defied. However, there were definable groups in terms of ideologies.

#### Young Socialist Alliance

This was a group which leaned more toward the old left and had a narrowly constituted base. Its members claimed that they had a program for the future and knew what to do when the revolution came. They were known as the Trotskyite group and claimed to have over 1,000 members on over 100 campuses.<sup>2</sup>

#### Progressive Labor Group

This group was said to be the most left in ideology of the leftist groups. The Progressive Labor group began in 1962 as a militant, pro-Peking group that broke away from the Communist Party. It was a small group, well organized, tightly knit, and very rigid in party lines. The youth segment of this group was known as the May 2nd Movement until it was disbanded in 1966. This disbanded group usually left the Progressive Labor group and attached itself to some other

---

<sup>2</sup>Charles Burch, "The Movement: Freeform Revolutionaries," in Youth in Turmoil, ed. by Editors of Fortune Magazine (New York: Time, Inc., 1969), p. 137.

group, usually to a local chapter of the Students for a Democratic Society.<sup>3</sup>

W. E. B. Dubois Club

This group represented an attempt of the Communist Party to get in on the New Left Movement. It was formed in 1964 as the youth segment of the Communist Party.<sup>4</sup> Although it has never been formally disbanded, the W. E. B. Dubois Club has never fulfilled the hopes of the Communist Party and is not a major force today, although it claimed a membership of over 1,000 students.<sup>5</sup>

Peace and Freedom Party

This group was formed in 1967 and was probably the only existing group that had a chance at unifying the New Left radicals. Its major program of action was to work for change through the regular electoral process, mainly to get its views and programs publicly aired. There are no estimates of the number of members that belonged to this group.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 138.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Fred Powledge, "The Student Left: Spurring Reform," New York Times, March 15, 1965, p. 1.

<sup>6</sup>Burch, "The Movement: Freeform Revolutionaries," p. 138.

New University Conference

This was a national organization composed mainly of teachers and graduate students. It was formed at a national conference of over 300 faculty members and graduate students. It had a national office in Chicago and a national director. The central office was chiefly a coordinating and communications center, and most of its activities originated at local levels rather than the national level. It claimed a membership of over 1,000 members throughout the country. Its principle aims were to unite people who thought of themselves as part of the New Left and who were working and living within the universities.<sup>7</sup>

National Mobilization Committee To End the War In Vietnam

Although the main purpose of this organization was to end the Vietnam War, it was more than just an "anti-war" group. This group also recognized what it called "racism" and "imperialism". Mobe, as it was called, had a loosely knit national organization and served to coordinate disparate elements in the movement. Thus, it had no active membership. Mobe served as the coordinator for the various student groups at the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago and had planned a demonstration

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 137.

at the 1972 Presidential Inauguration in Washington, D.C.<sup>8</sup>

Rennie Davis was the first national coordinator of Mobe.<sup>9</sup>

### Resist

Resist was formed in 1967 by a group of social critics and professors. It had a national office and national officers, but basically, it was non-structured on the national level. Its local groups were the most active and they organized around a variety of political and community issues as well as peace and anti-draft positions. Two of its most famous members were Professor Noam Chomsky of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Paul Goodman, social critic and author.<sup>10</sup>

### The Resistance

This was the New Left Movement's second major grouping. It was organized by a small group of anti-draft students on the east and west coasts in 1967. It had no national office, national officers, or members, per se. It was active on a local level where local offices served as coordinating centers in a communications network, printed literature, and helped arrange

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 136.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 135.

the efforts and travels of Resistance people. Its original purpose was to organize the scattered number of students who were draft resisters. However, it broadened its scope and its opposition to include the draft and was frequently used as a starting point for an attack on other issues and institutions.<sup>11</sup>

### Students For a Democratic Society

In a formal sense, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was a descendant of the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID) which was a Fabian group organized in 1930 by the League for Industrial Democracy. SDS maintained a link with SLID until 1966 but only for tax exemption purposes.<sup>12</sup>

SDS, the movement's largest and most prominent organization, was founded in 1962. On December 28-31, 1961, a group of thirty-five students met in Ann Arbor, Michigan, to set up the executive structure of the SDS and to agree on a founding convention to be held in June, 1962. Its manifesto, the Port Huron Statement, was written by Tom Hayden between December, 1961, and June, 1962.<sup>13</sup> This manifesto, fifty-two single-spaced pages,

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau, The New Radicals: A Report With Documents (New York: Random House, 1966), p. 28.

<sup>13</sup>Jack Newfield, A Prophetic Minority (New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1966), p. 96.

spelled out the aims and goals of the organization.<sup>14</sup>

The official founding convention was held June 11-15, 1962, at the FDR Labor Center at Port Huron, Michigan. It was attended by fifty-nine individuals with forty-three who could actually vote. These individuals represented eleven functioning SDS chapters, the largest being the chapters at Oberlin, John Hopkins, Swarthmore, and Earlham colleges.<sup>15</sup>

SDS had a national headquarters in Chicago, Illinois. It was located between two empty storefronts under East 63rd Street in the Negro Woodlawn section of Chicago. This national office consisted of ten rooms filled with telephones and typewriters.<sup>16</sup> The national office was mainly a clearing-house for information. There was no one leader or even a cadre to make basic policies or decisions. Power on the national level was shared by the National Council and about fifteen others who worked at the national headquarters and were known as the "Chicago Kernel".<sup>17</sup>

The national office made no attempt to create doctrines or ideologies but served as a provider of guidelines. The

---

<sup>14</sup>Burch, "The Movement: Freeform Revolutionaries," p. 134.

<sup>15</sup>Newfield, A Prophetic Minority, p. 96.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 85.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 88.

main work of the SDS was done by the local chapters and consisted of mobilizing forces for protests and demonstrations, guerilla attacks (more prominent in New York Chapters), making speeches, personal contacts, and the education of other students.<sup>18</sup>

In 1968, SDS claimed some 6,000 dues-paying members (\$5 per year) in some 300 to 400 chapters across the country. They claimed that they could command a following of ten to fifteen times their actual numbers.<sup>19</sup> This was quite different from the SDS of 1962 which claimed only 200 committed members in eleven functioning chapters.<sup>20</sup>

Who belonged to the SDS? Jack Newfield states that the membership can be reduced to five main categories:

(1) Members on small, rural campuses (Far and Mid-West) who were politically unsophisticated, vaguely liberal, and most idealistic

(2) Members of the Old Guard or those who founded and helped build the organization, and were usually politically sophisticated

---

<sup>18</sup>Burch, "The Movement: Freeform Revolutionaries", pp. 134-35.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Newfield, A Prophetic Minority, pp. 86-88.

(3) Members who were apolitical hipsters, who were skeptical of all programs, formal voting, centralized authority, and national offices, and who aided in keeping the organization at the grass roots level (most anarchist segment)

(4) Members who were interested in working on social problems such as ghetto projects and who existed independently of the rest of the organization (members of the Economic Research and Action Program or ERAP)

(5) Members who were typical liberal intellectuals on major campuses throughout the country.<sup>21</sup>

Mona G. Jacquency has isolated three distinct groups of the SDS: (see Appendix C)

(1) Patriotic idealists - these were the members whose ideals were only slightly left politically. The strategies employed by this group were demonstrations concerned with justice for all Americans, regardless of their social positions, civil rights, and poverty programs. Their protests were nonviolent, and they wanted to teach people to use their rights as provided for them in the political framework. These individuals were

---

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., pp. 86-88.



the most idealist, and through their genuine idealistic visions, provided inspiration for others. They were most often the community organizers who planned ghetto projects and trained new workers.

(2) Intellectual "politicos" - this group can be divided into two categories: the original SDS founders or the "over 30's" group, and the younger group which strived for radical change. Harassment, violence, and disruption were the acceptable means for bringing about change. The leaders of this group were most often SDS chapter chairmen or SDS national leaders. They created the emotional climate, the issue, and the strategy for any protest. They were the students who kept issues in the forefront of public awareness.

(3) Alienated youth - this group encompassed the largest segment of the SDS organization. They were the students to whom the mass media referred to as dirty, long-haired, advocates of free love, acid heads, pot smokers, disrespectful, and disruptive. Many names such as hippies, yippies, and pot-heads have been employed to designate this most indescribable group. They often wanted to withdraw from society and rejected it, and their aims ranged from extreme individualism to complete anarchy.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Mona G. Jacqueney, Radicalism On Campus: 1969-1971 (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1972), pp. 35-36.

By the end of 1968, SDS had around 50,000 to 75,000 students affiliated with them in one way or another. At its June 1969 convention, SDS split.<sup>23</sup> Two major groups emerged from this split: The Revolutionary Youth Movement (RYM) and the Worker Student Alliance (WSA). The WSA faction was supported by the Progressive Labor Party.<sup>24</sup> Its national office was in Boston and its primary goal was to fight for improved working conditions for its campus workers and employees. This was not the theme of the year's student protests and the WSA was unable to play a major role in the student protest movement except in the Boston area.<sup>25</sup>

Within a short time, the RYM group had split into two factions: RYM I, better known as the Weathermen, and RYM II (a third faction called RYM I-B or the Mad Dogs was formed in New York, but it was short lived). RYM II rejected RYM I because they felt it had neglected the Vietnam War issue and had rejected certain struggles for democratic rights. The program of RYM II was to create an alliance with the working class along Marxist-Leninist Lines.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>James P. O'Brien, "The Development of the New Left," Annals of American Academy, CCCXCV (May, 1971), p. 23.

<sup>24</sup>Immanuel Wallerstein and Paul Starr, "The Splintering of SDS", The University Crisis Reader, Vol. II: Confrontation and Counterattack, ed. by Immanuel Wallerstein and Paul Starr (2 Vols.; New York: Random House, 1971), pp. 257-59.

<sup>25</sup>O'Brien, "The Development of the New Left," p. 23.

<sup>26</sup>Wallerstein and Starr, "The Splintering of the SDS," pp. 257-59.

The RYM I faction, or the Weathermen, was composed of the most extreme students within the SDS. They were essentially a youth-oriented, guerilla band who glorified violence and used such tactics as bombing public buildings and police stations. As a result of their violent activities, they moved underground before 1969 came to a close.<sup>27</sup>

Their members first lived in groups of ten to twelve called "affinity groups". Later, they lived in "cells" of three, and usually, the only other Weathermen they knew were those who shared their "cells". All of their orders came through the mail or over the telephone.<sup>28</sup>

Consequently the SDS, the largest group in the student protest movement in the United States has ceased to exist.

#### Student Organizations in Japan

##### Zengakuren

The Zengakuren (an abbreviation for Zen Nihon Gekusèi Jachikai So Rego or All Japan Federation of College Students Governments) was organized in Japan on September 18, 1948.

---

<sup>27</sup>O'Brien, "The Development of the New Left," p. 23.

<sup>28</sup>Jacqueney, Radicalism On Campus: 1969-1971, pp. 35-36.

At that time it had chapters in 168 national Universities, 31 municipal universities, and 61 private universities. It had an estimated 300,000 members out of a total university enrollment of 440,000. Zengakuren successfully articulated students' interest until 1960 when it split into factions due to differences within the organization. In 1960, it still had a membership of 300,000 students out of an approximate university enrollment of 708,878.<sup>29</sup>

The national Zengakuren organization still exists, but it is made up of two main categories: Minsei (Democratic Youth League) and Anti-Yoyogi. The Minsei faction is often referred to as the moderate faction and is affiliated with the Japanese Communist Party. Its aims are to change Japanese society without violence. It wants to work within the existing framework.<sup>30</sup>

The Anti-Yoyogi group is made up of several factions, but they all are against the Minsei group. The Anti-Yoyogi group considers the established Communist Party in Japan as

---

<sup>29</sup>Michiya Shimbori, "The Sociology of a Student Movement-A Japanese Case Study," in Students In Revolt, ed. by Seymour Martin Lipset and Philip G. Altbach (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969), pp. 297-300.

<sup>30</sup>Victor Kobayashi, "Confusion and Hope: Student Unrest in Japan," in Conflict and Change: The Response to Student Hyperactivism, ed. by William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer (New York: School and Society Books, 1970), p. 363.

corrupt. This group is committed to violence and destruction.<sup>31</sup>

In 1970, the Zengakuren had organizations on 845 campuses. The Minsei and Anti-Yoyogi groups controlled 519 (more than 60%) of the campus organizations and the national Zengakuren. Upon entering college as freshmen, all Japanese students pay compulsory dues for membership in local campus organizations. They pay four years dues at one time. Each campus organization, in turn, sends a portion of these dues to the national student organization, the Zengakuren, which is free to spend the funds as it wishes. Since the radical group controls the student organizations on both the local and national levels, the dues collected from the students are often spent for propaganda, weapons, and recruitment of new members.<sup>32</sup>

#### United Red Army

The United Red Army, or Rengo Sekigun, is the most radical of the leftist student groups. They seek to overthrow

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.

<sup>32</sup>Joseph A. Califano, Jr., The Student Revolution: A Global Confrontation (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1970), p. 34.

the government and establish a "provisional revolutionary government".<sup>33</sup> Their leaders control the members very strictly, and there is little room for individualism. The students' actions are collective, disciplined, and well controlled. The leaders often agitate the members with slogans that call for death in support of the cause. Their symbol is the sword which represents harakiri, or suicide of the sumurai. For the students, death is worthwhile, both aesthetically and morally. They resort to violent tactics such as guerilla attacks, bank raids, and bombings. For them, the end justifies the means, and one who ponders over the means is a coward.<sup>34</sup> Twelve members of the United Red Army were killed by their fellow members for wavering from the fierce revolutionary line established by the leader of the group, Tsuneo Mori.<sup>35</sup>

#### Tactics of Student Revolts

John R. Searle had observed a certain recurring tactic in successful student revolts in advanced industrial societies.

---

<sup>33</sup>New York Times, March 13, 1972, p. 13.

<sup>34</sup>Michiya Shimbori, "Student Radicals in Japan," Annals of American Academy, CCCXCV (May, 1971), p. 151.

<sup>35</sup>New York Times, March 13, 1972, p. 13.

Initially, all revolts had two features: (1) there were only a small minority of radicals and, (2) there appeared to be no legitimate grievances. This small minority can build protest by progressing through three phases:

(1) Stage One - A small minority of troublemakers select an issue that students will sympathize with and that the authorities can not give in to. The demand must initiate a confrontation and cause the authorities to take some sort of disciplinary action against some of the students.

(2) Stage Two - The original issue which was selected is changed so that the authorities become the target. This is done by pointing out that it was the authorities who rejected the original demand and disciplined some students making the demand. This is offered as conclusive proof that it is the authorities and their structures who are the real enemies. At this point the number of people involved becomes larger. Students who refuse to demonstrate illegally for the original demand will now demonstrate illegally for those who were disciplined. It is hoped that the news media will come in and provide the leaders a chance to speak out and justify their actions.

(3) Stage Three - The students who become involved in Stage Two actually initiate Stage Three. Students who joined

the protest in Stage Two will form sit-ins, and building takeovers. Naturally, the authorities will eventually rely on the police to remove and/or arrest the students who are sitting-in and holding the buildings. Stage Three occurs. First, there is an enormous amount of revulsion against the tactics of the police. This produces what Searle calls a "shame on you for calling in police instead of speaking to the students" feeling among the uninvolved populace, thus making almost everyone sympathetic to the students.<sup>36</sup>

Searle goes on to emphasize that this is not a generalization, but simply a common tactic that has occurred in many countries over different issues. The term tactic as employed by Searle is a broad one. It is not meant to include the strategies employed by radical students—demonstrations, building barricades, class boycotts, and sit-ins. Searle uses the word tactic as an overall plan employed by radical students.<sup>37</sup>

S. M. Lipset refers to this plan as the "tactic of confrontation". Radicals resort to the deliberate use of the "tactic

---

<sup>36</sup>John R. Searle, "A Foolproof Scenario for Student Revolts," in The Radical Left, ed. by William P. Gerberding and Duane E. Smith (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970), pp. 4-12.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.



of confrontation" to provoke authorities to be resprssive. According to Lipset, the radicals can rely on more mass support if their actions result in some sort of clash, usually between the demonstrators and the police. The radicals regard any incident in which the police are called in as necessary to their success and to further the processes of radicalization. The character of this tactic has been attested to by many leaders of the movement (Mario Salvo, Steve Weissman, and Mark Rudd).<sup>38</sup>

It seems reasonable to assume that the Japanese radicals also employ this "tactic of confrontation". Certainly, the Japanese radicals have made demands which could not be met by the authorities, the police have been called in, and the students have been arrested. Notoriety was gained and there was public sympathy for the students.<sup>39</sup>

Thus, this "tactic of confrontation" does appear to be common to at least two advanced industrial societies.

---

<sup>38</sup>Seymour Martin Lipset, Rebellion in the University (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), pp. xx-xxi.

<sup>39</sup>Radical students in Japan frankly and openly admit to using the universities to pursue political goals, New York Times, January 9, 1969. An example of Japanese radicals specifically employing this "tactic of confrontation" can be found in an article published in the New York Times, January 19, 1970.

## CHAPTER VI

### FUTURE OF STUDENT MOVEMENTS

There are two opposing views concerning the future of student movements. One view is that student movements will continue and be as active in the future as they were in the 60's. The opposite view is that student movements will decline and lose their effectiveness.

#### Propagation of Student Movements

Many people feel that student movements will continue, perhaps not in the same vein as in the 1960's, but in other directions. According to a survey by the Urban Research Corporation, over one-half of the protests in 1969 occurred at schools which had not previously had any major disturbances. It was reported that in 1969-1970, the student movement tended to expand into virgin territories particularly in the Midwest, South, and Southwest.<sup>1</sup> A study of 849 colleges in 1964-1965

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael W. Miles, The Radical Probe: The Logic of Student Rebellion (New York: Atheneum, 1971), p. 259.

estimated that there were approximately 370 campus demonstrations per 100 colleges. A somewhat comparable study in 1969-1970 showed an increase of 386 demonstrations per 100 colleges.<sup>2</sup>

It is felt that the movements will continue because students will always find new sources of anguish whenever the old ones disappear. There is always a reason to dislike the Establishment. Also, many old angers, such as racism, simply will not die but will remain and grow stronger.

The subcultures and the protest movements are rooted deeply enough in our society to go on for a long time and possibly will grow far stronger. The movements can only be affected by basic changes in society and most people will probably be unwilling to make these changes.<sup>3</sup>

#### Diminution of Student Movements

Others believe that student movements will dwindle, if not die altogether. Much evidence is pointing in this direction.

---

<sup>2</sup>Kenneth Keniston and Michael Lerner, "Campus Characteristics and Campus Disorder," Annals of American Academy, CCCXCV (May, 1971), p. 41.

<sup>3</sup>Jack D. Douglas, Youth In Turmoil (Chevy Chase: Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, 1970), pp. 182-83.

Douglas Kneeland surveyed thirty colleges to find out why there was such tranquility on college campuses in 1969-1970. He found that students were not as prone to protest or demonstrate because:

- (1) draft reform was initiated
- (2) students believed that the Vietnam War would soon be over
- (3) colleges were tightening security and dealing with radicals in a firm manner
- (4) many radical leaders have dropped out of college or graduated
- (5) colleges have become more progressive
- (6) students are tired of fighting losing battles and participating in endless demonstrations
- (7) remaining radicals have become divided<sup>4</sup>

C. L. Sulzberger says that he has observed that students were more relaxed and more tolerant in 1971 than they were in the past two or three years. Today, students are less hysterical, less tense, and less given to violent protests.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Douglas Kneeland, New York Times, December 20, 1970, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup>C. L. Sulzberger, New York Times, March 31, 1972, p. 29.

A Gallup Poll in December, 1970, found that extremist groups, both far right and far left, have little appeal among college students. If the radicals are viewed favorably, it is by a small percentage of college seniors and graduate students who attend private colleges in the East.<sup>6</sup>

A New York Times Survey in 1971 indicated that today students are concentrating on their studies and staying aloof. Students are concentrating on individual and personal priorities. While some students are still demonstrating and protesting, most students have disavowed confrontation and mass protest. Students attribute this to apathy or a regrouping to aim their energies in new directions. Others say that the hysterical period had ended and that students are returning to a traditional non-political status. A new mood seems to have appeared among the students and the key words to this new mood are privatism and individual protest, not relevant mass action and participatory democracy.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Gallup Poll, New York Times, February 7, 1971, p. 54.

<sup>7</sup>Survey, New York Times, May 9, 1971, p. 29.

A survey of students at twelve large universities yielded the findings that demonstrations are less serious and less frequent now that students have won roles in the college governing process. As governing roles are won, the students' interests wane.<sup>8</sup> Earl J. McGrath, director of Higher Education Center at Temple University, surveyed 700 colleges and universities and disclosed that not one college reported any increase of student protests on campus once students were allowed to participate on academic committees.<sup>9</sup> Staughton Lynd says that demonstrations have now become a drag since they lacked imagination and were frequently subjected to failure. He believes that students are tired of taking risks and do not have personal commitments strong enough to keep them involved.<sup>10</sup>

Walter Leagueur states that "The American Youth Movement of the '60's, infected by the decadence of the age, missed the opportunity to become a powerful agent of regeneration and genuine social and political change".<sup>11</sup> He attributes this

---

<sup>8</sup>Survey, New York Times, June 21, 1971, p. 31.

<sup>9</sup>Earl J. McGrath, New York Times, June 21, 1971, p. 31.

<sup>10</sup>Staughton Lynd, "Radical Politics and Nonviolent Revolution," in Radical Perspectives On Social Problems, ed. by Frank Lindenfeld (New York: Macmillan Company, 1968), p. 316.

<sup>11</sup>Walter Leagueur, "Reflections on Youth Movements," Commentary, XLVII (June, 1969), p. 40.

to the fact that the student movements failed to produce and new ideas or develop national alternatives to the problems of the times. Instead, the movement preferred a total rejection of everything and thus became politically irrelevant.<sup>12</sup>

Zbigniew Brzezinski states that the main problem with the movement was its escapist ingredient. Although it proclaimed a desire to change societal structures, it only offered a refuge from society. Its prophets were also unable to move from a dated European radicalism. The problems of our complex society simply could not be resolved by reverting to nineteenth century criticisms of capitalism. Therefore, the movement made itself a negative force.<sup>13</sup>

Peter Berger and Richard Neuhaus state that the movement was doomed from the start because it was characterized by negation rather than a positive view of the future. These anti-stability, anti-capitalist, and anti-liberal views by the movement were evils in themselves and doomed the movement from its beginning.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Zbigniew Brzezinski, Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era (New York: Viking Press, 1970), pp. 230-31).

<sup>14</sup>Peter L. Berger and Richard John Neuhaus, Movement and Revolution (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1970), p. 46.

Robert Nisbet states that the majority of the radicals came from the middle class and the middle class of today is not capable of producing revolutionaries. He says that our family structure with its "possessions oriented, children dominated, guilt tinged, and boredom producing values . . . [and] undiluted, unconditional, unbreakable love by parents of a child"<sup>15</sup> might produce juvenile delinquents but definitely not revolutionaries. According to Nisbet, there is nothing in the American way of living likely to produce the dedicated, demanding, and disciplined life necessary to be a revolutionary.<sup>16</sup>

What appears to be the future of student movements?

From the evidence presented above and other current information, it would be fairly accurate to assume that student movements as they existed in the United States in the '60's will cease to be in the 70's. This is not to say that students are still not dissatisfied with our society and its mores. Students are still protesting but it is now on the small, the individual, and the personal level. Students appear to be directing their

---

<sup>15</sup>Robert Nisbet, "Who Killed the Student Revolution," Encounter, XXXIV (February, 1970), p. 11.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.



energies into new and pragmatic tactics. The demonstrations that took place in the early 1970's were less serious and frequent. Also, the new interest in religion in the early 1970's appears to be absorbing many more students. This is reflected by greater enrollment in religion classes and seems to represent a personal search for spiritual values. The most visible manifestation of this is the rapid growth of nondenominational, evangelical, Fundamentalist, Christian movements. As the student movement in the '60's, the Christian movement is being nourished by a sense of restlessness, by a search for truth, and by a conviction that old ways have failed.<sup>17</sup>

What about the future of student movements in Japan?

Again, from current information it would appear that Japan will have larger, more frequent, and more violent demonstrations in the 1970's. The reasons for this prediction are many, Probably the most important reason lies with cultural values. Demonstrations in the United States began to lose their appeal after the death of students at the Kent State Jackson State demonstrations. The accidental deaths of students was viewed

---

<sup>17</sup>New York Times, December 26, 1971, p. 1.

as senseless by our entire society and seemed to serve as a "damper" for further demonstrations. Death in the United States is not held in esteem as it is in Japan. In Japan, the dead students would have become martyrs for the radicals. Demonstrations, protests, sit-ins, and building barricades are the accepted tactics employed by the students in the United States-death is not. Many Japanese students are willing to sacrifice their lives for their cause-American students are not.

A second reason for predicting a greater rise in student movements in Japan is the success the Japanese students have had as opposed to their American counterparts. In no instance were the American students capable of completely closing down a university for any period of time. As previously stated, the Japanese students have successfully halted all university functions for a year. There seems to be little doubt that success such as this would encourage the students.

The difference in the way the Americans and Japanese view student movements is a third reason for predicting the growth of student movements in Japan. The student movement in the '60's was unlike any previous student movement in the United States. Many attempts were made to quiet and pacify our students particularly at the university level. In Japan, just the opposite is true. Student movements have become an

almost accepted part of their society. More often than not, the universities' position is that of "patience". When students are finally removed from barricaded buildings, the university returns to "business as usual" with little or no attempt to meet the students' demands.

From 1967-1971 Japanese students were becoming more radical.<sup>18</sup> Just the reverse was true in the United States during the same time span. For Japan, it appears that a turbulent student movement will continue in the '70's. For the United States, it appears that the silent '70's will prevail.

---

<sup>18</sup>New York Times, October 17, 1971, p. 7.

## CONCLUSION

The thesis of this paper, as stated in the Introduction is that student unrest and the causes of student unrest in highly advanced countries are similar. In an attempt to provide evidence for this thesis, student movements in two modern countries-the United States and Japan-were compared to see if any generalizations could be made.

In the 1960's, both countries had a substantial percentage of students who were ready to attack the existing structures in their respective societies. They both employed similar tactics to make their complaints heard and to show their contempt for and rejection of the world created by their parents. In both countries students were questioning the accepted political and social values of their elders because they saw the inadequacy of the existing social, political, and economic institutions. In both countries, students believed that while the adult world publicly espoused the values of honesty, justice, equality, and the rights of individuals to make their own decisions, it did not practice them. Students therefore saw a tremendous gap between the professed ideal and the actual reality. To express their cultural renunciation of adult values and behavior,

students in both countries developed their own dress, work orientation, morality, and life styles.

In both countries, students were rebelling against the universities and seeking to reform them. They condemned the universities for seeking to maintain traditional authority and prerogatives and for abdicating their responsibility for the quality of the personal and intellectual lives of their students. Students were demanding more influence in the decision making processes in the universities--they wanted to be a part of the decisions that directly affected them.

Both countries had students who were alienated to various degrees. There were culturally alienated students in the United States and Japan (see Chapter II for a summary of culturally alienated youth in America). In Japan the culturally alienated students were called the Mogura or moles. The greatest percentage of these students were found in Okaka. They were between the ages of 15-20 and hung out in underground shopping and entertainment centers beneath the large cities. They generally did not attend school and stayed underground most of the time. They had few convictions and were not interested in politics or the radical student organizations. Their main purpose in life was to kill time and enjoy themselves. These students, like their American counterparts, were side

effects of affluence and increasingly materialistic values of modern societies.<sup>1</sup>

Both countries had large percentages of students who sought to change society within the existing framework by non-violent and peaceful protests and demonstrations. These were the center activists or the moderates and they constituted the largest percentage of those students who participated in mass demonstrations.

In the United States and Japan, there were students who wished to change their respective societies by violent and radical means. These were the radical students and they represented approximately 2%-3% of the total student population in both countries. The radical organizations in both countries (the SDS in the United States and the Zengakuren in Japan) were loosely knit organizations beset by factionalization. Both organizations lacked a strong coordinating national organization and national leaders. The organizations in both countries were diffuse and had a multiplicity of targets. Radical students in both countries had not found an issue with enough galvanizing appeal to hold their organizations together.

---

<sup>1</sup>New York Times, February 20, 1970, p. 10.

In both countries, the radical students were not certain of what type of government or society would replace the existing system once it was overthrown. Japanese radicals expected to establish some sort of a provisional revolutionary government after the overthrow of the existing government, but Makoto MATSUO leader of the radical Chugaku-Nei said he had no "clear ideas of what sort of a new Japan he wanted."<sup>2</sup> The same was true in the United States. Some radicals wanted a socialist government, some wanted a "participatory democracy", and some admitted they did not know the mechanisms of the established system well enough to prescribe specific remedies. They had no grand design for a new society and as Tom Hayden, once prominent leader of the SDS, said, "First we will make the revolution, and then we will find out what for."<sup>3</sup>

Both countries had an even smaller percentage of ultra-radicals (the Red Army in Japan and the Weathermen in the United States). Both of these groups were committed to violence and guerilla tactics for attaining the revolution. The main difference between these two organizations appeared to be the degree of commitment to the cause. In the United States, even

---

<sup>2</sup>New York Times, October 17, 1971, p. 7.

<sup>3</sup>Sidney Hook, "The Prospects of the Academy," in The Radical Left, ed. by William P. Gerberding and Duane E. Smith (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970), p. 207.

ultra-radical students were not prepared to die for the cause. This was not true in Japan. Some Japanese ultra-radical students would have apparently died for the cause and killed for the cause; however, this difference in attitudes toward death can be traced to different cultural values of death.

Admittedly, these are low level generalization but, I think they suggest that student movements and the causes of student movements are similar in modern countries.



APPENDIX

Appendix A

Studies of Roger M. Kahn and William J. Bowers\*

In testing their first hypothesis that activist students come from high status families, Kahn and Bowers first used three variables to test this hypothesis-maternal and paternal education, paternal occupation, and family income. Their findings were as follows:

TABLE I  
PERCENTAGE ACTIVISTS BY INDICATORS OF SOCIAL CLASS

Variables	Less than High School Graduate	High School Graduate Or Some College	College Graduate Or more
<u>Education</u>			
Mother	12 (152)	20 (494)	22 (263)
Father	16 (223)	19 (365)	22 (323)
Variables	Blue Collar	White Collar	Professional
<u>Fathers Occupation</u>			
	17 (251)	19 (444)	24 (201)
	\$7,499-\$15,000	\$7,500-\$9,999	\$10,000+
Family Income	15 (298)	22 (146)	27 (268)

Using the three variables of maternal and paternal education, paternal occupation, and family income, Kahn and Bowers

constructed a Socioeconomic Index. Each student was scored 0, 1, and 2 on his answer. They were given 0 if their mother and father had less than high school diplomas, 0 if the father was a blue collar worker, and 0 if the family income was less than \$7,499. They were given 1 point if mother and father had graduated from high school and/or had some college, 1 point if father's occupation was white collar, and 1 point if family income was between \$7,500 - \$9,999. They were given 2 points if their mother and father were college graduates and/or more, 2 points if father was a professional, and 2 points if family income was \$10,000 or more. Students who scored 0 - 3 were classified as low, 4 - 6 as medium, and 7 or 8 as high. The findings were as follows:

TABLE 2  
PERCENTAGE ACTIVISTS BY SES INDEX

	Low	Medium	High
SES Index	17 (285)	22 (257)	30 (120)

The results of the SES Index were tested against school quality variable. Schools were rated as Top Ranking, Highly

Selective, Moderately Selective, and Not Very Selective.

The results of this finding were as follows:

TABLE 3  
PERCENTAGE ACTIVIST BY SES INDEX AND  
SCHOOL QUALITY

SES INDEX	Quality of School			
	Top Ranking	Highly Selective	Moderately Selective	Not Very Selective
High	41 (39)	27 (49)	15 (26)	13 (15)
Meduim	38 (34)	19 (75)	18 (90)	20 (51)
Low	50 (18)	13 (60)	14 (97)	14 (105)
Total	42 (91)	19 (194)	15 (213)	16 (171)

In order to test their second hypothesis that activists come from those students with strong academic commitments, Kahn and Bowers first grouped the activists according to two variables: hours studying and doing assignments per week, and total grade average. Their findings were as follows:

(See next page).

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE ACTIVISTS BY INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC  
COMMITMENT

Variable	30 hours +	20-29 hours	0-19 hours
Hours Studying And Doing Assignments Per Week	22 (449)	18 (305)	14 (99)
Variable	B+ or above	B+ to C+	C or below
Total Grade Average	22 (140)	18 (471)	15 (175)

To see if their findings held true when a third variable was introduced, Kahn and Bowers studied the activists academic commitment in relation to the quality of school they were attending. Schools were divided into four categories: top ranking, highly selective, moderately selective, and not very selective. Their findings were as follows:

(See next page).

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE ACTIVIST BY INDICATORS OF  
ACADEMIC COMMITMENT AND SCHOOL QUALITY

Variables	Top Ranking	Highly Selective	Moderately Selective	Not Very Selective
<u>Hours Studying Per Week</u>				
30+	47 (74)	21 (136)	14 (162)	14 (102)
20 - 29	22 (27)	16 (70)	14 (103)	18 (82)
0 - 19	17 (6)	9 (22)	11 (36)	12 (26)
<u>Grades</u>				
B+ or above	47 (17)	32 (37)	14 (49)	11 (37)
B or C	47 (60)	16 (136)	11 (153)	16 (122)
C to below	27 (26)	13 (40)	13 (70)	16 (39)

To test their third hypothesis that activists come from the students majoring in humanities and social studies, Kahn and Bowers classified students according to their fields of studies:

(See next page).

TABLE 6

## PERCENTAGE ACTIVIST BY FIELD OF STUDY

Variable	Social Sciences	Humanities	Physical Sciences	Pre Professional Programs
Number of Students	23 (164)	21 (274)	13 (131)	12 (301)

Again to see if the conclusion that activist students do come from the social science and humanities fields, they introduced the school quality variable to see if this altered their previous conclusion:

TABLE 7

## PERCENTAGE ACTIVIST BY FIELD OF STUDY AND SCHOOL QUALITY

Variable	Top Ranking	Highly Selective	Moderately Selective	Not Very Selective
Field of Study				
Social Sciences & Humanities	43 (80)	22 (116)	16 (149)	16 (93)
Physical Sciences & Pre-Professional	30 (30)	13 (112)	10 (156)	13 (121)

In order to test their final hypothesis that activists come from students who have strong intellectual orientations,

Kahn and Bowers asked students to rate three questions in degree of importance:

TABLE 8  
PERCENTAGE ACTIVISTS BY INDICATORS OF  
INTELLECTUAL ORIENTATION

Variables	Degree of Importance		
	Great Deal	Fair Amount	Not Much at All
How Important are the Following to you?			
Ideas and Intellectual Problems	25 (336)	17 (437)	12 (132)
Appreciation of Arts	26 (269)	18 (364)	15 (271)
Intellectual Skills and Knowledgeability	21 (332)	19 (465)	13 (69)

In order to see if these respondents would answer the same according to school quality, Kahn and Bowers established an Intellectual Orientation Index. Those who responded "not very important" were scored 0 for each item; those who responded "fairly important" were scored 1 for each item; and those who responded "very important" were scored 3 for each item.



Respondents classified as low had scores of 0-1, those classified as medium had scores of 2, 3, or 4, and those classified as high had scores of 5 or 6.

TABLE 9

## INTELLECTUAL ORIENTATION INDEX

I O Index	Low	Medium	High
Respondents	27 (273)	15 (529)	9 (99)

This results of establishing the Intellectual Orientation Index were tested against school quality to see if the results would vary. The following shows the relationship:

TABLE 10

## PERCENTAGE ACTIVIST BY INTELLECTUAL ORIENTATION INDEX AND SCHOOL QUALITY\*

Variable	Quality of Schools			
	Top Ranking	Highly Selective	Moderately Selective	Not Very Selective
Intellectual Orientation Index				
High	45 (41)	29 (66)	18 (85)	21 (58)
Medium	37 (59)	16 (129)	13 (173)	13 (145)
Low	26 (9)	6 (32)	3 (36)	8 (13)

\*This study comes from: Roger M. Kahn and William J. Bowers, "The Social Context of the Rank and File Student Activists: A Test of Four Hypotheses," Sociology of Education, XLIII (Winter, 1970), 38-55.

## APPENDIX B

Studies of Joseph W. Scott and Mohammed El-Assal.

In their study Joseph W. Scott and Mohammed El-Assal postulated the following:

The more complex the formal structure is the more likely is the administration to be bureaucratic as opposed to primary and patrimonial. The more bureaucratic the educational institution, the more structurally separated are the students from the administrators, faculty, and students; and the more the students are personally separated from the administration, faculty members, and other students by structural and social heterogeneity, the more likely the students will feel separated, neglected, manipulated, and dehumanized to the extent that they will engage in protest activities. Given these premises, we hypothesize that the more nearly a university constitutes a "multiversity" the higher the rate of protest demonstrations.<sup>1</sup>

To test this hypothesis, Scott and El-Assal correlated the degrees of formal complexity and social heterogeneity with the number of student protests. A complex school was classified as being above the median in number of departments, granting doctoral, masters, bachelors, and professional degrees, and in numbers of non-dormitory, foreign, out-of-state, and graduate students as well as the ratio of professors to students. Their findings were:

(See next page).

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph W. Scott and Mohammed El-Assal, "Multiversity, University Size, University Quality, and Student Protest: An Empirical Study," in American Sociological Review, XXXIV (October, 1969), pp. 702-04.

TABLE I

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS BY  
INDICATORS OF FORMAL COMPLEXITY AND  
SOCIAL HETEROGENITY\*

Variables	Schools Reporting Demonstrations	Schools Reporting No Demonstrations	Number
<u>School Characteristics</u>			32
Complex Institution	87%	13%	G. = .80
Simple Institution	43%	57%	37
<u>School Size</u>			
Large 10,000+	96%	4%	26
Small 10,000-	44%	56%	G. = .94 43
<u>Community Size</u>			
Large 50,000+	74%	26%	27 G. = .36
Small 50,000-	57%	43%	42
<u>Quality</u>			
High Quality Institution	85%	15%	33 G. = .69
Low Quality Institution	44%	56%	36

\*From: Joseph W. Scott and Mohammed El-Assal, "Multiversity, University Size, University Quality, and Student Protest: An Empirical Study," in American Sociological Review, XXXIV (Oct., 1969), pp. 702-04.

Scott and El-Assal then introduced intervening variables of institutional size, quality and size of community institution is located in to see if the correlation varied. Their findings were:

TABLE 2  
PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS BY INDICATORS OF FORMAL COMPLEXITY AND SOCIAL HETEROGENITY, INSTITUTIONAL SIZE, COMMUNITY SIZE, AND QUALITY\*

School Characteristic	Intervening Variables	Schools Reporting Demonstrations	Schools Reporting no Demonstrations	Number
<u>School Size</u>				
Mostly Complex	10,000+	96%	4%	23
	10,000-	67%	33%	9
G = .82				
Mostly Simple	10,000+	100%	0%	3
	10,000-	38%	62%	34
<u>Community Size</u>				
Mostly Complex	50,000+	94%	6%	16
	50,000-	81%	19%	16
G = .66				
Mostly Simple	50,000+	42%	58%	26
	50,000-	45%	55%	11
<u>School Quality</u>				
Mostly Complex	High Quality	89%	11%	27
	Low Quality	80%	20%	5
G = .75				
Mostly Simple	High Quality	67%	33%	16
	Low Quality	39%	31%	31

\*From: Joseph W. Scott and Mohammed El-Assal, "Multiversity, University Size, University Quality, and Student Protest: An Empirical Study," in American Sociological Review, XXXIV (October, 1969), pp. 702-04.

SOCIAL POSITION

PERFORMANCE

FUNCTIONS

Patriotic Idealist	Strategist	Facilitator	Implementer	Worker
<p>Concerned with civil rights. Voter registration. Social and economic self help projects.</p>	<p>Provides strategy for non-violent or social work projects.</p>	<p>Glib proponent of Utopian America. Salesman of the idea.</p>	<p>On the scene organizer. Often lives in area of social welfare projects.</p>	<p>College student with altruistic motives and summer vacation to spare.</p>
<p>Intellectual Politico</p> <p>Concerned with American foreign policy. Selective service. University reform. Military industrial complex.</p>	<p>Strategist</p> <p>Provides strategy for protests (violent and non-violent confrontation)</p>	<p>Facilitator</p> <p>Choose the issue and strategy appropriate to his local constituency. Creates climate for demonstrations.</p>	<p>Implementer</p> <p>Organizes demonstrations. Is where the action is. Responsible for continuation of protest activities.</p>	<p>Worker</p> <p>Student whose commitment varies with cause. Defender of cause, not organization.</p>
<p>Alienated Youth</p> <p>Leans toward anarchy. Extreme individualism.</p>	<p>Strategist</p> <p>Although apolitical often involved in strategy for confrontation on issues of freedom.</p>	<p>Facilitator</p> <p>Voices cynical criticism at every opportunity.</p>	<p>Implementer</p> <p>Peer-group member who feels strongly about issues to be discussed or protested.</p>	<p>Worker</p> <p>Individual whose participation is dependent upon situation &amp; whim.</p>

\*From: Mona G. Jacqueneay, Radicalism On Campus: 1969-1971  
 (New York: Philosophical Library, 1972), p. 32. LIBRARY  
 UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND  
 VIRGINIA

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. BOOKS

- Almond, Gabriel A., and Powell, G. Bingham, Jr. Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach. Little, Brown Series. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.
- Berger, Peter L., and Neuhaus, Richard John. Movement and Revolution. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1970.
- Califano, Joseph A. The Student Revolution: A Global Confrontation. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1970.
- Douglas, Jack D. Youth In Turmoil. Chevy Chase, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crimes and Delinquency, 1970.
- Douglas, William O. Points of Rebellion. New York: Random House, 1969.
- Dutton, Frederick G. Changing Sources of Power: American Politics in the 1970's. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Feuer, Lewis S. The Conflict of Generations. New York: Basic Books, Incorporated, 1969.
- Gerzon, Mark. The Whole World Is Watching: A Young Man Looks at Youth's Dissent. New York: Viking Press, 1969.
- Hinckley, Barbara. Stability and Change in Congress. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971.
- Jacobs, Paul, and Landau, Saul. The New Radicals: A Report With Documents. New York: Random House, 1966.

- Jacquene, Mona G. Radicalism On Campus: 1969-1971. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1972.
- Kerpelmann, Larry C. Activists and Nonactivists: A Psychological Study of American College Students. New York: Behavioral Publications, Inc., 1972.
- Langdon, Frank. Politics in Japan. Little, Brown Series. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. Rebellion in the University. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.
- Massialas, Byron G. Education and the Political System. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.
- Miles, Michael W. Radical Probe. New York: Atheneum, 1971.
- Newfield, Jack. A Prophetic Minority. New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1966.
- Spender, Stephen. The Situations of Young Rebels. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era. New York: Viking Press, 1970.

## B. ARTICLES IN BOOKS

- Burch, Charles. "The Movement: Freeform Revolutionaries." Youth In Turmoil. Edited by Editors of Fortune Magazine. New York: Time, Inc., 1969.
- Ford Franklin L. "To Live With Complexity." The Radical Left. Edited by William P. Gerberding and Duane E. Smith. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- Gusfield, Joseph. "Beyond Berkeley." Campus Power Struggle. Edited by Howard S. Becker. No place given: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.
- Halleck, S. L. "Hypotheses of Student Unrest." Conflict and Change: The Response to Student Hyperactivism. Edited by William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer. New York: School and Society Books, 1970.
- Hook, Sidney. "The Prospects of the Academy." The Radical Left. Edited by William P. Gerberding and Duane E. Smith. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.

- Kobayashi, Victor. "Confusion and Hope: Student Unrest in Japan." Conflict and Change: The Response to Student Hyperactivism. Edited by William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer. New York: School and Society Books, 1970.
- Lubell, Samuel. "That Generation Gap." Confrontation: The Student Rebellion and the Universities. Edited by Daniel Bell and Irving Kristol. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.
- Lynd, Staughton. "Radical Politics and Nonviolent Revolution." Radical Perspectives on Social Problems. Edited by Frank Lindenfeld. New York: Macmillan Company, 1968.
- Main, Jeremy. "The 'Square' Universities Are Rolling Too." Youth In Turmoil. Edited by Editors of Fortune Magazine. New York: Time, Inc., 1969.
- Nassim, Charlotte. "Notes On the Revolutionary Students in Japan." The New Revolutionaries. Edited by Tarig Ali. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1969.
- Newfield, Jack. "In Defense of Student Radicals." The University and Revolution. Edited by Gary Weaver and James H. Weaver. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Parsons, Talcott. "The Academic System: A Sociologist's View." The Student Rebellion and the Universities. Edited by Daniel and Irving Kristol. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.
- Rockwell, Paul. "How We Became Revolutionaries." The New Revolutionaries. Edited by Tarig Ali. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1969.
- Searle, John R. "A Foolproof Scenario for Student Revolts." The Radical Left. Edited by William P. Gerberding and Duane E. Smith. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- Shimbori, Michiya. "The Sociology of a Student Movement - A Japanese Case Study." Students in Revolt. Edited by Seymour Martin Lipset and Philip G. Altbach. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.