University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers

Graduate School

1968

Systems and contra-systems: The case of student radicalism

Robert Kelly Hancock
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

SYSTEMS AND CONTRA-SYSTEMS: THE CASE OF STUDENT

RADICALISM, 1968

By

Robert Kelly Hancock

B.A. The University of Texas

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Arts

The University of Montana

1968

Approved by:

_____
Chairman, Board of Examiners

_____
Dean, Graduate School

_____August 7, 1968_____
Date

UMI Number: EP38702

UMI

Dissertation Publishing

UMI EP38702

ProQuest

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In the days since 1964, The University of California at Berkeley, Northwestern University, Columbia University, and many other lesser known institutions of higher learning in The United States have been for short periods of time shut down by student radicals. The names of Mario Savio, Clark Kerr, Summerskill, and Mark Rudd have become familiar to all persons in academic life and to many persons in the society less directly involved in the consequences of these effervescent events. It is my belief that as student radicalism and radicals moved out of the coffee houses and into the streets, they not only became important subjects of sociological inquiry, but, indeed, in terms of the immediacy of the crises created, demanded study. Therefore, this is a thesis about student radicals. More specifically, it is a case study of two radical student groups, one left-wing and one right-wing, on the campus of a large university on the American West coast.

In Chapter 1, I attempt to place student radicals into a relative political spectrum by operationally defining the "mainstream" of American politics. Though this process is static, it does permit a view of political space for the spring of 1967. This chapter further contains an indication of the amount of

1

underlying support student radicals have on the campus of the West coast university.

Chapter 2 is a discussion of right-wing and left-wing student radicals in transition over the last four years. The groups on the West coast are the primary center of attention, but they are also compared with two very similar groups in the Southwest which I studied in 1964. Though the comparability of the data is complicated by the shift in locale, the findings present a rather informative picture of the changing face of student radicalism. Here, are presented the concepts trans-culturation and contra-system as a step beyond marginal status and alienation.

The final chapter is an attempt to bring together some of the germane findings presented in the first two chapters in order to develop a theory of contra-systems. This discussion is, to be sure, tentative and speculative and at points reachs far beyond the data gathered. However, I have tried to work with a number of concepts and ideas which, though I am rather hesitant to present them at this point, need to be explored.

Finally, the methodology is varied and is explained in each phase of data presentation rather than in one large and complicated chapter. Basically, Chapter 1 depends upon a random sample of all students at the university on the West coast. Chapter 2 rests upon semi-structured interviews with radicals in the Southwest and on the West coast. Chapter 3 is primarily

a theoretical discussion, somewhat of the armchair variety. All formal research instruments appear in the appendix along with an explanation.

In terms of acknowledgements, of course, the greatest debt is owed to the radicals, left and right, who took time to participate in rather long interview sessions. Beyond these, I owe a tremendous debt to Professor Gideon Sjoberg who started me on this project in 1964 and to Professor Gordon Browder who helped expand it and also who provided the liberal atmosphere wherein I could come this far toward completion.

CHAPTER 1

In the spring of 1967, Westcoast University[1] regis-
tered slightly more than 24,000 undergraduate and graduate students.
Being a resident university in one of our nation's largest urban
areas, Westcoast offers its students almost any conceivable area of
study and extra-curricular activity. As stated by its information
service, Westcoast is:

> a complex of teaching and research facilities engaged
> in inquiry into nearly every area of man's endeavor.
> The site of the inquiry ranges widely: from the polar
> ice cap to a Pacific atoll; from the cyclotron on
> lower campus to a medieval literature seminar....

whose location in a metropolitan center:

> offers a large reservoir of professional talent for
> demonstrations of day-to-day principles in such fields
> as law, engineering, and medicine. It also provides
> the multiple advantages of an urban environment--the
> same environment in which, in an age of increasing
> urbanization, the majority of today's students will
> spend their lives after graduation.

In short, Westcoast University is probably not very different from any
other large resident university in any other large urban center. It
was for this reason, primarily, that it was chosen for study.

---

[1] A pseudonym. (This is not the University of California
at Berkeley.)

4

The question that I wanted to answer regarding Westcoast's total student population was: how does the student body perceive the national political structure and where do the students place themselves in this perceived structure. To determine this, five groups were selected from the mass of organizations on campus:

(1) Students for a Democratic Society (SDS)--a New Left organization
(2) Young Republicans (YR)--student affiliate of the Republican Party
(3) Young Democrats (YD)--student affiliate of the Democratic Party
(4) New Conservatives Club (NCC)--a New Right organization wHich had been affiliated with Young Americans for Freedom
(5) University District Movement (UDM)--the political arm of the hippies at and around the University.

These groups were selected over others because they: (1) were reasonably well known on campus, (2) represented a national political orientation, and (3) seemed to fall into a traditional political spectrum viewed from left-wing to right-wing (UDM, SDS, YD, YR, NCC).

A questionnaire was designed which requested respondents to do two things: (1) rank these five groups on the basis of distance from the "mainstream" of American politics and (2) rank the same five groups on the basis of distance from the respondent's own personal ideology. This questionnaire was sent to a systematic random sample of 257 students obtained by drawing every 94th name from the Student Directory Listing, Spring Quarter, 1967, which is the registrar's official alphabetical listing of all students

at Westcoast.[2] The questionnaire was mailed with a cover letter and a stamped return envelope in May, 1967. Of the 257 sent, 149 (57.98%) were returned of which 18 were incomplete in some regard and were not used in analysis. This left 131 (50.97%) with which to work.

Two limitations to this procedure must be discussed at this point and kept in mind throughout the subsequent presentation of the data. First, the questionnaire is highly structured; that is, it presents a forced choice situation. In the inception of the study I contemplated using an "other" or residual category, but decided not to do so because: (1) I felt that the groups on the questionnaire represented a fairly broad political spectrum which would allow most respondents a choice between meaningful alternatives and (2) the groups selected possessed influence and some power and my purpose was to rank such groups relative to each other. To have included a residual category would have most likely defeated my attempt to operationalize the concepts "in" and "out" in any way that had meaning in relation to the national political structure. Second, nothing may be said about those in the sample that did not respond.[3] Speculation

---

[2]Since this list was not numbered and was available for only a few hours, a true random sample was not practical. Given the nature of the sample and, particularly, of the project, this methodological short-cut is probably not a major problem. See Hubert M. Blalock, Social Statistics (New York, McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), pp. 397-399.

[3]Inasmuch as some people feel intimidated by questionnaires, particularly questionnaires dealing with politics, I felt it necessary to guarantee respondent anonymity. This, of course, precluded follow-up questionnaires and interviews for non-respondents.

regarding them is a somewhat idle exercise, but it does seem likely

that they are more apathetic regarding politics than the people who

answered the questionnaire. I will analyze the data as if they

reflect the opinions of the student body, but it should be kept in

mind that it might be more accurate to say that the data reflect the

opinions of those who have a definite interest in the political

arena. What is interesting to consider is that those spectators

to this research may well be spectators to the political process,

some of whom probably mobilize around issues depending upon the

particular circumstances involved. At any rate, the data probably

contains a "political interest" bias.[4]

Table I contains the frequency and percentage information

for the 131 respondents ranking the groups in relation to the

"mainstream" of American politics. For the entirety of the "main-

stream" rankings, the coefficient of nominal-ordinal association

(θ) is .5812.[5] This represents a fairly high degree of association

between the distributions, but because the sampling distribution of

θ is unknown it is impossible to test for significance. However,

---

[4]It might be argued that respondents who identified
with "out" groups on the personal level are disproportionately
represented in the data due to what might seem to be their greater
interest in politics. If this were true, it might also be argued that
they would respond more quickly. The proportion of persons placing
SDS, UDM, or NCC first in relation to personal ideology in each 25%
of the questionnaires divided on the basis of date of receipt (early
to late): .39, .33, .30, .31. Z= .676 (.39 to .31 difference)
which is not significant at .01 or .05.

[5]Linton C. Freeman, Elementary Applied Statistics For
Students in Behavioral Science (New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,
1965), Chapter 10.

Table I

Perception of the "Mainstream"

G R O U P S	Distance from the "Mainstream" near				far	T O T A L S
	I	II	III	IV	V	
SDS	10 7.63%	7 5.34%	29 22.14%	39 29.77%	46 35.11%	131
YR	37 28.24%	79 60.31%	7 5.34%	3 2.29%	5 3.82%	131
YD	79 60.31%	34 25.95%	11 8.40%	6 4.58%	1 .76%	131
NCC	1 .76%	6 4.58%	55 41.98%	50 38.17%	19 14.50%	131
UDM	4 3.05%	5 3.82%	29 22.14%	33 25.19%	60 45.80%	131
Tot.	99.99%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.99%	

θ= .5812

8

the calculations for θ and Z derived from the Mann-Whitney test for significance between all possible combinations of groups are instructive:[6]

Calculations for Table I

Pair	θ	Z	Significant at .01
SDS-UDM	.1237	1.823	
SDS-NCC	.1672	2.450	
YR-YD	.2713	4.160	*
NCC-UDM	.3033	4.455	*
YR-SDS	.7424	10.689	*
YD-SDS	.8017	11.554	*
YR-NCC	.8316	11.998	*
YR-UDM	.8344	12.024	*
YD-NCC	.8603	12.404	*
YD-UDM	.8758	12.603	*

An examination of Table I and its calculations permits a ranking of the five groups into four levels that are significantly different in terms of frequency of choice. From "in" to "out" they rank: (1) YD, (2) YR, (3) NCC, and (4) SDS-UDM. This ranking is perfect with the exception that the difference between NCC and SDS is not significant. What may be said at this point is that what would seem to be intuitively true is, in fact, true: the Young Democrats and Young Republicans hold a more or less "in" position and the Students for a Democratic Society, New Conservatives Club, and University District Movement hold a more or less "out" position. These findings only become important when compared with the "personal ideology" rankings.

---

[6]Ibid., pp. 187-198.

Table II contains the frequency and percentage information for the respondents regarding personal ideological orientation. The coefficient of nominal-ordinal association for Table II is .3311 which reflects a greater randomness in the "personal ideology" rankings than in the "mainstream" rankings, although for the reason already stated it is impossible to know whether or not this observed difference is significant. However, it is again instructive to compare each possible combination as done for Table I:

Calculations for Table II

Pair	θ	Z	Significant at .01
YR-YD	.0199	.291	
SDS-UDM	.0388	.559	
NCC-UDM	.0480	.693	
SDS-NCC	.0837	1.207	
YR-SDS	.4610	6.597	*
YD-SDS	.4707	6.734	*
YR-UDM	.5250	7.245	*
YD-UDM	.5285	7.510	*
YR-NCC	.5539	7.921	*
YD-NCC	.5814	8.308	*

Table II and its calculations demonstrate that regarding "personal ideology" there are only two significantly different levels. YD and YR occupy the first position and NCC, SDS, and UDM occupy the second. This is a reflection of the fact that these latter three groups possess over a third of the first place choices and close to 40% of the second place choices.

Given these rather surprizingly large percentages of people who identify with an "out" group, it is crucial at this point to ask whether or not those people who view one of the "out" groups

Table II

"Personal Ideology" Orientations

G R O U P S	Distance from "Personal Ideology" near				far	T O T A L S
	I	II	III	IV	V	
SDS	17	22	23	29	40	131
	12.98%	16.79%	17.56%	22.14%	30.53%	
YR	48	37	17	26	3	131
	36.64%	28.24%	12.98%	19.85%	2.29%	
YD	39	44	32	12	4	131
	29.77%	33.59%	24.43%	9.16%	3.05%	
NCC	13	11	29	36	42	131
	9.92%	8.40%	22.14%	27.48%	32.06%	
UDM	14	17	30	28	42	131
	10.69%	12.98%	22.90%	21.37%	32.06%	
Tot.	100.00%	100.00%	100.01%	100.00%	99.99%	

$\theta = .3311$

11

as closest to their personal political philosophy perceive that group's position in the "mainstream" as everyone else in the sample does. Table III (1-5) contains this information. The differences in ranking are not significant for any group save NCC whose identifiers see it as being somewhat closer to the "mainstream" than it, in truth, is. With this one exception, it may be argued that a first place choice on the "personal ideology" ranking does not influence the "mainstream" ranking of the group involved. Or put in other terms, those people who identify with an "out" or "in" group know what the "mainstream" position of that group is. (It is interesting that even NCC's modal frequency is 6 which is at the third level--that group's position in the total "mainstream" rankings.)

It seems to me that to the extent that these results are valid they are important for interpreting the current scene of student politics as they relate to national politics. Certainly they shed some doubt upon theories concerning the "end of ideology" and the increasing homogeneity (other-directedness?) of today's youth. It would be very difficult, indeed, to argue that these findings reflect any seminal of the so-called mass-society society. The students at Westcoast are divided and a large portion of them are personally identified with organizations that they recognize as outside the "mainstream" of American politics, i.e., NCC, SDS, and UDM. This may mean that student movements of an "extreme" nature are not the products of outside agitation or the noise of a very few discontents among the student body, but are simply the products of the structural

Table III

Effect of a First Place Rank on Personal
Ideology Upon the Perception of that
Group on the Mainstream Compared
with the Combined Ranking of
All Others.

GROUPS	Distance from Mainstream					TOTALS
	near I	II	III	IV	far V	
YR YD NCC UDM	8	6	25	31	44	114
	7.02%	5.26%	21.93%	27.19%	38.60%	
SDS	2	1	4	8	2	17
	11.76%	5.88%	23.53%	47.06%	11.76%	

(1) Perceptions of SDS: Z= 1.600 which is not sign. at .01

GROUPS	Distance from Mainstream					TOTALS
	near I	II	III	IV	far V	
SDS YR NCC UDM	50	26	10	5	1	92
	54.35%	28.26%	10.87%	5.43%	1.09%	
YD	29	8	1	1	0	39
	74.36%	20.51%	2.56%	2.56%	0.00%	

(3) Perceptions of YD: Z= 2.280 which is not sign. at .01

GROUPS	Distance from Mainstream					TOTALS
	near I	II	III	IV	far V	
SDS YD NCC UDM	21	50	6	2	4	83
	25.30%	60.24%	7.23%	2.41%	4.82%	
YR	16	29	1	1	1	48
	33.33%	60.42%	2.08%	2.08%	2.08%	

(2) Perceptions of YR: Z= 1.410 which is not sign. at .01

GROUPS	Distance from Mainstream					TOTALS
	near I	II	III	IV	far V	
SDS YR YD UDM	0	3	49	47	19	118
	0.00%	2.54%	41.53%	39.83%	16.10%	
NCC	1	3	6	3	0	13
	7.69%	23.08%	46.15%	23.08%	0.00%	

(4) Perceptions of NCC: Z= 3.067 which is sign. at .01

GROUPS	Distance from Mainstream					TOTALS
	near I	II	III	IV	far V	
SDS YR YO NCC	3	4	23	31	56	117
	2.56%	3.42%	19.66%	26.50%	47.86%	
UDM	1	1	6	2	4	14
	7.14%	7.14%	42.86%	14.29%	28.57%	

(5) Perceptions of UDM: Z= 2.025 which is not sign. at .01

13

context within which activists work. In other words, members of "extreme" groups, at least at Westcoast, are playing to an audience that is not necessarily hostile and one which certainly is not unified in attitude. Many of those students standing in the wings are not being convinced and from their point of view, the actors are not breaking the normative order, but are reflecting a large portion of it. The next question is: how will they act and under what circumstances will they act? Unfortunately, this research was not geared to this question, but I suggest that recent events at many of our large universities hint at the answer.

CHAPTER 2

Having placed certain outgroups into a political spectrum, it is now interesting to examine in detail some of the characteristics of these groups. Basically, since those fall days of 1964 when the Berkeley student revolt rocked the nation,[1] I have been engaged in just this task of trying to understand right- and left-wing students from a sociological perspective. In 1964, I began a case study which ended in 1966 of two campus groups at a large Southwestern university (20,000+ students): Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) which have been labeled "new right" and "new left", respectively.[2] More recently, in the spring of 1967, I returned to the field to study two very similar groups at the large resident Westcoast University. These groups were: New Conservatives Club (NCC), which had been a chapter of YAF, and Students for a Democratic Society.

Basically, the discussion which follows is a report of this second study, although some background material is drawn from the earlier one. The methodology of the two studies was very similar.

_____

[1]James Cass, "What Happened at Berkeley," Saturday Review (Jan. 16, 1965), pp. 47-48, 66-69.

[2]R. Kelly Hancock, The Dynamics of "Extremist" Groups, a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association, April, 1967, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

15

16

In both cases I interviewed persons in the groups who were considered highly active by the leaders of the respective organizations. This amounted to a mere 8 SDS members and 12 YAF members in the first study and 7 SDS and 13 NCC members in the second. The total membership of each group ranged from 60 to 125 as estimated by the respondents. None of the groups kept anything approaching a formal roster of members--beyond these activists, "member" meant anyone who happened to participate in a particular event. This unstructured atmosphere precluded any sort of sampling for two reasons, one obvious, the other interesting: (1) to sample one must have some vague idea of the parameter of the universe involved and (2) questioning members regarding names and addresses of other persons involved in the movements raises the spectre of law enforcement investigation and, hence, damages rapport and could undermine an entire project. This is particularly true of left-wing students. In short, one takes what one can get under the circumstances in an atmosphere of suspicion of strangers, sociological or otherwise.[3]

However, interviews from these persons are important for at least two reasons: (1) these members often shape the local nature of the movement to which they belong and add disproportionately to the national movement of which they are at least somewhat representative and (2) these persons are probably more sensitive to shifts in the national and international arena than are many of the others who are

---

[3] In the beginning of the first study I tried to contact members individually. After one interview, there was a rumor that "someone" was investigating the "extremist" groups.

not so active. This should not be taken as a denial of the importance
of "followers" to any movement, but simply to mean that for my
research purposes the activists were the ones who could supply the
kinds of information needed.

For both studies this information may be more or less
divided into two theoretical dimensions with three areas of interest.
I was concerned with the personal and the ideological dimensions of
these members and more specifically regarding their group involve-
ment in terms of initial involvement and commitment, ideological
orientation and commitment, and future orientation. In the second
study I was also interested in a few socio-personality character-
istics of the members and, hence, included some scales in that study
which were to aid me in interpreting some of the intuitive con-
clusions drawn from the Southwestern study.

From the Southwest

Out of this early study, I was able to draw a number of
tentative general statements which more or less took the form of
broad hypotheses in the Westcoast study. These hypotheses are not
stated well enough to be testable, but are simply designed to give
direction to inquiry and, hopefully, lead to further refinement.

On the personal level of analysis, the most striking
finding concerned the large amount of camaraderie between members of
SDS and YAF which I interpreted as stemming from a number of con-
ditions: (1) all members were students and as such tended to inter-

act with each other and have a vested interest in their student role and (2) all were students whose ideology could be described as outside the "mainstream" of American politics and of the general academic community which led them to have a feedback interest in each other in terms of philosophy and action. This led them to group together for both protection and development and gave rise not only to a feeling of "know thine enemy" but also to a feeling of "like thine enemy". Finally, all respondents came from similar middle class families. The second important fact was that there did not <u>seem</u> to be any presence of alienation among the members--that is, as alienation has been defined by Seeman and operationalized by Dean, Bonjean and Hayes, and others.[4]

The camaraderie found on the personal level was strengthened by certain ideological similarities. Both groups tended to agree that the primary political problem facing American society today was "encroaching bureaucracy" and the subsequent loss of individual freedom. This common concern tended to foster action-cooperation, especially in such things as pressure to change policies and procedures of the university administration. Added to this was the fact that both had rather strong commitments to radical action in the

---

[4]Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 24, (Dec., 1959), pp. 783-791; Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, 26, (Oct., 1961), pp. 753-777; Charles M. Bonjean and Gary G. Vance, Port Lavaca Community Survey: A Description and Comparison of Some Characteristics of Businessmen, Managers, and Workers, prepared for The Industrial Life Research and Development Center, Port Lavaca, Texas.

future. However, it was quite clear that the members of these two groups were very definitely split over two issues. Historically, YAF has a commitment to define freedom not only in individual terms, but also in terms of private property. Historically, SDS has a commitment to define freedom in individual terms, but without including any concept of private property. Though this difference is serious, since it rests upon differences in philosophic assumptions regarding the nature of society, the conflict created by it has become chronic (non-escalating) rather than progressive (escalating). Much more serious to action-cooperation in the short run is the split between the two groups over the foreign policy issue of Vietnam. Since this is a single issue about which there is new information almost daily, it is highly debatable and this leads to progressive conflict. This difference was crucial enough even in 1964 to show signs of breaking all association between the members, both personally and ideologically, if it continued.

From the Westcoast

All of the students interviewed first became actively involved in radical activities early in their college career, though most indicated that they had held a great deal of concern for political matters for some time previously.[5] This interest and

---

[5]In both studies women tended to become interested in political concerns much earlier than men--a consistency that is difficult to explain. See Hancock, op.cit., pp. 7-8.

development is probably at least partially a reflection of the fact that all of the students could be termed middle class from a monetary point of view and, indeed, most would be considered upper-middle class with their estimated family income ranging from $6,000 to $65,000 with a median of $12,000. In this particular case, more of the conservatives came from quite wealthy backgrounds than did SDS members. This fact of the respondents having middle class backgrounds coincides with data from the Southwest and also with Newfield's analysis of student radicals in 1966.[6] However, regarding background there was one noticeable change between the first and second studies. Most parents in the Southwest took a non possumus attitude toward their son or daughter's membership in either SDS or YAF, though attitudes ranged from active encouragement to overt hostility. Interestingly, on the West coast, members showed a distinct difference along group lines on this point of parental acceptance. Overwhelmingly, the parents of SDS members were either somewhat or quite hostile; whereas, the parents of NCC members were, with two exceptions, actively encouraging participation. Typical of parental responses to SDS membership:

> I let them know very little so they won't worry. They believe the New Left is asking for trouble or, perhaps, communist inspired.[7]

---

[6]Jack Newfield, A Prophetic Minority, (New York, The New American Library, Inc., 1967). Also see D.L. Westby and R.G. Braungart, "Class and Politics in the Family Backgrounds of Student Political Activists," American Sociological Review, 31, (Oct., 1966), pp. 690-692.

[7]Interview Schedule No. 4.

> My father thinks I'm a neurotic communist. Mother
> worries because I'm radical and that isn't proper
> in America.[8]

Common responses of NCC members were "they really don't know what I am doing, but would agree" and "they like and encourage it".[9]

Though this difference may be only the result of changed situational and geographic factors, it is interesting to speculate on this finding in relation to the changing nature of the "new left" in the period between 1964 and 1967. This discussion should be taken as extremely tentative as it is based solely upon my own observations made during this period as little formal study has been made of the recent developments in student radicalism.

The year, 1964, witnessed the passing of the first major civil rights legislation since the Civil War era. Within the "new left" which was primarily oriented toward civil rights until that time, there developed what may be termed a critical cause vacuum. On the surface, the movement had won a major victory and the workers were without an issue and a cause and, perhaps, more importantly, they were without open opposition (partially a reflection of the despair that swept many right-wing students following the outcome of the 1964 elections). During this same period, for the nation in general and the "new left" in particular, a new issue was developing--the war in Vietnam was turning from a limited American involvement to a massive

---

[8]Interview Schedule No. 7.

[9]Interview Schedules Nos. 19 and 13, respectively.

one and, thus into a major political and social issue. However,
there was a crucial difference between this developing issue and the
old one which seemed to be at least temporarily dead. In the old
issue, the Federal Government had more or less officially supported
the students which permitted civil rights workers to be apparent
defenders of the Federal system and the ideal order (though among
some workers there was a great deal of personal hostility toward the
Federal Government). (This is not meant to underplay the amount of
conflict with local power structures and local branches of the
Federal Government.) However, regarding this new issue, the govern-
ment was both practically and ideally, firmly and grimly opposed to
the "new left". This meant that the "new left" not only faced
opposition on the local level, but on the national level as well. Not
only did this effect the pragmatic aspects of developing an opposition
to such a large force, but it also effected the mass media's treatment
of the "new left".[10] Generally, during the civil rights issue the
press, following national policy, had been more or less approving or
tolerant of the ideals of youthful rights workers in the South and
urban North, though often highly critical of their methods. Now the
media masters in general began to sense that the movement was becoming
more "extreme" as it mobilized to halt a war effort. Indeed, this

---

[10]Related to this see Nathan B. Blumberg, "A Study of the
'Orthodox' Press: The Reporting of Dissent," Montana Journalism
Review, 11, (Spring, 1968), pp. 2-9. On this and other issues below,
it is profitable to consult SDS literature which may be obtained from
their national office at 1608 West Madison, Chicago, Illinois.

feeling was not fantasy, as SDS literature clearly calls during this period for a shift from reform to resistance. This was the change in the "new left" from being a subculture to emerging as a true contra-system. It seems unlikely that this new reaction of the government and the media would have gone unnoticed by the parents of these students. This not only illustrates a major shift in the left, but also, then, helps to explain why or how parents could be passive in 1964 and opposing in 1967. Considering another dimension of this change, it may be that when radicals on the left are becoming more radical than before, it becomes more respectable to be in the "new right" (the range of tolerance for right-wing behavior is expanded). Certainly it seems reasonable that if one had a son or daughter with an "extreme" interest in politics, one would prefer radicalism on the right to radicalism on the left--though the former may not be sanctioned by the government, at least it is not being attacked and condemned.

Some other background information about the respondents: (1) all of both groups, except one NCC member, were single and none of the members had any children, (2) among NCC members there were two atheists and the other eleven identified with either a Protestant or the Roman Catholic religion. On the other hand, among SDS members the closest thing to what could be called a standard category was one agnostic. Other responses were: my own, self-trancendentalism, and love. (3) Regarding employment, five of the seven SDS members were employed as were seven of the thirteen NCC members. With the

exception of one free-lance writer in SDS, all of the workers were employed in typical student jobs such as waitress, shoesalesman, and golf course worker. Finally, one person in each group classified himself as coming from a rural rather than an urban area.

In the Southwest study about half of each group had undergone a major shift from left to right or right to left in terms of a political continuum. This also held true on the West coast though in this case a quarter of the NCC respondents had undergone such a shift contrasted with half of the SDS members. This again lends superficial support to Hoffer's contention that True Believers are converted, not convinced.[11] The difficulty with Hoffer's thesis is that he reduces all of radical politics to psycho-pathology. Thus, though there are behavioral referents to demonstrate his contention, this does not demonstrate that these transitions have the psychological content that he imputes to them. My own data, limited as they are, suggest that there are sound ideological reasons for these transitions and, perhaps more importantly, these transitions do not cover the ideological space that might be imagined.

Whereas in 1964 for both groups the major political problem facing American society was viewed as centering around bureaucracy and the loss of individual freedom, in 1967 the issue was Vietnam for SDS and NCC remained concerned with bureaucratic centralization. Illustrative of general SDS opinion:

---

[11]Eric Hoffer, The True Believer, (New York, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1958), p. 25.

Involvement in Vietnam.[12]

Vietnamese War, the non-concern of the public regarding killing, misery. The lack of love.[13]

Of NCC opinion:

> The encroachment of government bureaucracy at all levels on what should rightfully be private concerns of individuals; and related to this, the increasing remoteness of governing officials from the voters.[14]

> Government encroachment into private affairs and [winning in] Vietnam.[15]

This difference, as I predicted in the Southwest study, has led to extremely strained relations between the members of the groups though they are not entirely destroyed. There is still some attempt to cooperate on university reform.[16]

No doubt, differences regarding the methods for changing society also strain relations between the groups. All SDS members approved of civil disobedience as an effective and appropriate tool for social change:

> Damn right. When a law is immoral it is the duty of

---

[12]Interview Schedule No. 1.

[13]Interview Schedule No. 4.

[14]Interview Schedule No. 16.

[15]Interview Schedule No. 17.

[16]There is also some cooperation on other issues, for example, in both groups there is sentiment pushing for the abolition of the draft--though it is greater in SDS than NCC.

man to visibly refuse to follow it.[17]

> Yes. Each person is morally responsible for his
> acts. If obeying the law conflicts with an
> individual's sense of morality, then he should
> break the law.[18]

However, SDS members were divided over whether or not civil dis-

obedience should include violence:

> Again, a person is morally responsible both for his
> actions and inactions. Germans during WW II were
> obligated to act violently against the law. Similar
> contemporary situations are not impossible [to
> imagine].[19]

> Passive resistance only, but at times I sympathize
> with violent advocates of black power. Also, if the
> U.S. drifts into war with China, I may reconsider
> my position.[20]

> I prefer passive resistance. Violence is in-
> compatible with goals of Love and Peace.[21]

On the other hand, not any of the NCC members felt that civil dis-

obedience was ever justified:

> Absolutely not. Order is a prerequisite of any form
> of government. As Edmund Burke pointed out, liberty
> can only exist alongside order.[22]

---

[17] Interview Schedule No. 3.

[18] Interview Schedule No. 5.

[19] Interview Schedule No. 5.

[20] Interview Schedule No. 7.

[21] Interview Schedule No. 2.

[22] Interview Schedule No. 16.

No. To have a society at all--i.e., a relationship among individuals--one must follow the rules of that society.[23]

No. Because it is usually done by a group of people who just want attention, nothing else.[24]

Thus, though in the Southwest I found a great deal of close personal contact between the members of YAF and SDS as well as a desire for such contact, in 1967, the contact and the desire had waned. This difference was quite evident in one question where the respondent was to pick a roommate hypothetically on the basis of only knowing a person's group affiliation. In the Southwest, both sets of members rated each other in places one and two (with only a few exceptions), but on the West coast they never rated a member of the other group above third in a field of five groups.[25]

However, there were still a few factors which worked to push the groups together. For example, they were similarly viewed by the general student body and more importantly they were aware of their similar negative image on campus.[26] To describe how they thought

---

[23]Interview Schedule No. 8.

[24]Interview Schedule No. 19. By opting for social order, they must defend its most characteristic form--bureaucracy. This is a dramatic and recognized paradox.

[25]The five groups were SDS, NCC, Young Republicans, Young Democrats, and the University District Movement (the political arm of the hippies at and around the University).

[26]R. Kelly Hancock, From the Campus: Perceptions of the American Political Structure, a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, March, 1968, San Francisco, California. See Chapter 1.

other students viewed them, the respondents listed terms like: a

joke, crack-pots and trouble makers, kooks, and Birch nuts. Still

another factor is that both groups of respondents have strong future

orientations regarding radicalism. One SDS member looking into the

future: "Yes, I hope to be more active"; and a NCC member: "the

plan is to become more active than I presently am!"[27]

Socio-Personality Characteristics

It has been argued by Lipset and others that student

radicals are alienated individuals.[28] In the Southwest, I felt that

they were not.[29] In an attempt to resolve this question I included a

number of "objective" scales in the Westcoast study. These scales

were designed to measure the various dimensions of alienation: power-

lessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement as well as

the so-called anomia scale.[30] Table IV contains the mean scores for

the two groups on the West coast contrasted with the means of college

---

[27]Interview Schedules Nos. 6 and 14, respectively.

[28]S.M. Lipset, "University Student Politics," The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations, S.M. Lipset and S.S. Wolin (Eds.), (Garden City, New York, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), pp. 1-9.

[29]Hancock, op. cit., p. 3.

[30]For powerlessness, normlessness, and isolation, see Dean, op. cit.; for self-estrangement, see Bonjean and Vance, op. cit.; for anomia, see Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries," American Sociological Review, 21, (Dec., 1956), pp. 709-716.

Table I V

A Comparison of Mean Alienation Scores for Two Samples
of College Students with Mean Alienation
Scores of SDS and NCC Members
at a Large Westcoast
University

Scales	RANGES	College Students		Radicals	
		Northeast N=186	Southwest N=251	SDS N=7	NCC N=13
Powerlessness	0-36	16.9	15.7	18.0	12.3
Normlessness	0-24	10.6	9.9	10.9	5.4
Isolation	0-36	17.5	16.1	17.3	17.2
Self-estrangement	0-28	14.3	13.5	11.9	9.7
Anomia	0-20	7.4	6.4	8.3	7.5

29

students in general in the Southwest and Northeast.[31] (The ranges represent the possible scores. The higher the score, the greater the possession of the thing being measured.) Note that in no case does the mean of the radical groups exceed the highest college student mean by over two points. If these students are outside the "mainstream" of American politics and most of them feel that they are negatively evaluated by their fellow students, why are they not alienated to a much greater extent than the average college student? First, since these radicals were not drawn at random, it may be that the scores are atypical of radicals in general and highly active radicals in particular. Second, it may be that the scales do not measure what they claim to measure--alienation. Finally, it may be that these students are not alienated any more than any other students.

With these data I cannot answer the questions concerning extremely biased responses. However, the fact remains that these are radicals from some universe and they are not greatly alienated according to these "objective" tests. Therefore, at this point it may be fruitful to speculate about the nature of alienation and the nature of the scales. It has recently been assumed by researchers that alienation is by necessity a subjective attitude of the individual. Archetypical of this type of approach was Seeman with his dimensions of alienation which were operationalized through scaling by Dwight Dean

---

[31]A special note of thanks to Professor Jo C. Lewis of Queens College of the City University of New York for making these unpublished data on college students gathered in 1966 available to me.

and Bonjean and Hayes.[32] The Dean scales were designed to measure

powerlessness, normlessness, and isolation as these were defined by

Seeman:

> powerlessness--the expectancy or probability held
> by the individual that his own behavior cannot
> determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or re-
> inforcements, he seeks.[33]

> normlessness--high expectancy that socially un-
> approved behaviors are required to achieve given
> goals.[34]

> isolation--assignment of low reward value to goals
> or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the
> given society.[35]

The Bonjean and Hayes scale was designed to measure self-estrangement:

> self-estrangement--the degree of dependence of the
> given behavior upon anticipated future rewards.[36]

though they suggest that this dimension may cut across all of these

other types.[37] Unfortunately, given these subject oriented defini-

tions it is very difficult to move from them to concrete hypotheses

---

[32]Dean, op. cit.; Bonjean and Vance, op. cit.

[33]Seeman, op. cit., p. 784 (paraphrased).

[34]Ibid., p. 788 (paraphrased).

[35]Ibid., p. 789 (paraphrased).

[36]Ibid., p. 790 (paraphrased).

[37]Charles M. Bonjean, Mass, Class, and the Industrial
Community: A Comparative Analysis of Managers, Businessmen, and
Workers, a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for
the Study of Social Problems, August, 1965, Chicago, Illinois.

regarding correlates of alienation with conditions in the social system without making some kinds of assumptions about the rationality, if not of man, then, of men. In other words, one must assume that men perceive similar conditions in the social system similarly and then act similarly in terms of these conditions. If one makes such an assumption, it seems reasonable to hypothesize an increase in alienation with distance from the power and influence structure of the society. Certainly this is the assumption (among others) that Lipset is making. Since the data do not seem to support this hypothesis, it becomes necessary and important to explore the issue further.

It seems to me that one crucial consideration is that these radicals of NCC and SDS were members of an out-group that is marginal to the social system--that is, part of another system of political negation that could be termed a contra-system.[38] Perhaps, during the period of transition of these individuals from system to contra-system, they were marginal men in the sense of being caught between two orders. Certainly this was true of a large number of civil rights workers before the shift from reform to resistance. As such, one might expect them to demonstrate a high degree of alienation on most of the dimensions at that time. However, once this process of negative acculturation (what I prefer to term transcul-

---

[38]The distinction between a contra-system and a sub-culture depends upon emphasis. A contra-system persists through the will of the people within it. A sub-culture persists through the will of the people without it. It is possible to distinguish in the same manner between achieved and ascribed out-groups. The former implies a great deal more negation than the latter.

turation--the coming together of alienated individuals into contra-systems) is complete then their feelings of alienation should be alleviated.[39] This would be due to the fact that the group would now provide most or all of the psychological rewards that had been previously obtained from other groups within the system. Another factor affecting the amount of alienation would be the fact that these contra-systems are achieved organizations rather than ascribed ones.

However, with this decline of alienation in contra-systems, one should not assume that the society at-large becomes more stable. Indeed, the possibility of the opposite is greater, to the extent that an organized group has more power and authority than a restless aggregate in most cases. In other words, the presence of contra-systems is not only a reflection of an anomic society, but is also a condition for forming more anomie. Thus, it would be possible to have decreasing alienation while anomie was increasing. It is quite probable that this is what occurs just prior to revolution; the only truly alienated individuals at that point would be those between the warring parties who "sat it out".

In conclusion, it appears to me that if alienation is considered as a subjective phenomenon, then it is probably a misnomer

---

[39]At this point it is crucial to keep folk and analytic definitions separate. Radicals often speak of themselves as being "alienated", but the referent is different in most cases. It is also interesting that the groups in the study have very similar self-esteem scores. The means are 29.00 and 29.23, SDS and NCC. The possible scale values range from 0-40, low to high. Morris Rosenberg, "Parental Interest and Children's Self-Conceptions," Sociometry, 26, (March, 1963), pp. 35-49.

to refer to student radicals as alienated (unless one is referring to the hangers-on in the community). The only way that they could be rightly considered alienated would be to change the definition of the term. If sociologists want to refer to persons who give rise to conflict from outside the system as alienated (sometimes implying abnormality), then the concept loses its analytic meaning through overextension. Similarly, sociologists could use the term as the radicals often do--to mean "turned-off" or repulsed by the system. Again such a definition is of questionable use analytically. Finally, the term could be used to describe the objective position of a person from the point of view of social action within the system. One wonders, however, whether or not the concepts of the fields of stratification and power should be able to cover this dimension.

CHAPTER 3

The explicit purpose of this chapter is to integrate the

data presented in the preceding two into a general theoretical frame-

work. To do this it will be necessary to begin the discussion from a

highly abstract plain and then progressively lower the level of

analysis. Following Durkheim, I begin with the social system and move

to the individual.

For Durkheim a "social fact" was:

> ...to be recognized by the power of external coercion
> which it exercises or is capable of exercising over
> individuals, and the presence of this power may be
> recognized in its turn either by the existence of some
> specific sanction or by the resistance offered against
> every individual effort that tends to violate it.[1]

Viewed in this manner, a social system is nothing more or less than a

power unit with a collective life which by virtue of the fact that

power is not unitary may be broken into analytic levels for analysis.

This is generally what is done when the social scientist tries to

isolate the parameters of a group for study. This is particularly

true for community studies, though power is rarely specified as a

defining characteristic of the community.

---

[1]Emile Durkheim, Rules of Sociological Method, (New York,
The Free Press, 1966), p. 10.

35

Since any social system can be broken down into component power systems until reaching the diadic situation of the power of individual A over individual B,[2] then it is possible to identify various power systems which are sometimes referred to as sub-systems or sub-cultures. The extent to which these sub-systems are integrated around generally accepted goals and means of the larger system of which they are a part defines the amount of anomie present in the composite.[3] In times of relative balance or equilibrium, systems are said to possess or be characterized by competition and cooperation which are forms of chronic conflict, that is, conflict that does not threaten the collective existence of the whole.

In these times power within a system is more or less organized in pyramidal fashion regardless of whether the society in question is fascist, totalitarian, democratic, or socialist.[4] There are relatively stable norms regulating the passage of groups and individuals through the various levels in the structure. And these norms are of crucial significance analytically. These norms have a collective existence of their own--that is, they exist in the collective representations of the social system not by the design of

---

[2]For an interesting discussion of this topic, but which begins with the individual, see R.H. Emerson, "Power-Dependence Relations," American Sociological Review, 27, (Feb., 1962), pp. 31-41.

[3]Though he takes his discussion much farther into psychology than this discussion, see R.K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, (New York, The Free Press, 1965), pp. 131-160.

[4]R.M. MacIver, The Web of Government, (New York, The Free Press, 1965), pp. 62-85.

any group or individual, but as a consequence of the very historical existence of the order. As a complex, these norms are called the normative order or system. Though resistant to change, the normative order does change.

The process by which a normative order changes is to be found in the interaction of the order and the nature of power. At any level power exists both within the system and outside of it. That is, power may be viewed internally and externally. This permits two views of change--power breakdowns which are either internal or external to the system under consideration. In most historical cases, however, these usually coincide. More specifically, member individuals no longer are or feel dependent upon the system, or sub-systems are not or are no longer perceived to be dependent upon the larger system.[5] In any event, the minimum result is some form of change involving collective behavior. Historically, in its turbulent form such change is seen after a disastrous war, during a depression,[6] but it can also occur in the wake of rapid technological change.[7] By definition one part or more is now out of the game--the regularized pyramidal structure is broken, the social system becomes increasingly

---

[5]For the importance of dependence in power relations, see Emerson, op. cit.

[6]P.A. Sorokin, The Sociology of Revolution, (Philadelphia, J.B. Lippincott Company, 1925), Chapters 1, 2, and 17.

[7]R.L. Lee, Dissatisfied Young People: The Impact of Affluence and Poverty, a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association, May, 1968, Denver, Colorado.

out of balance, that is, characterized by anomie. From an individual point of view, there are now unattached persons within the geographical boundaries of the former orderly system. From the point of view of the system, the institutionalized power structure (authority structure) has been broken and so, likewise, the normative order can no longer be maintained in unity.[8]

Generally speaking, social scientists refer to unattached individuals within a social system as being alienated; that is, characterized by self-estrangement, isolation, powerlessness, norm-lessness, and meaninglessness.[9] This is what Sorokin has referred to as "biologization" of the individual.[10] But assuming that man is a social animal, he will seek other social arrangements to relieve his sense of alienation which is a general form of anxiety.[11] Often he comes together with others who are also wandering through the system. It is possible that this is a result of what Giddings termed Consciousness of Kind:

> The awareness of resemblance may be little more than a feeling of sympathy, or it may become a clean-cut perception. It may include feelings of affection and a desire for recognition. In all its degrees, from sympathy to a clear perception of resemblances and differences, including every perception by the

---

[8] I am aware that these are so linked that they tend toward tautology.

[9] See Chapter 2.

[10] Sorokin, op. cit., p. 35.

[11] Anxiety is the recognition of a good and bad alternative.

responding individuals themselves that they do respond
in like ways to like stimuli, this awareness of
resemblances and differences plays a large part in
social groupings and activities.[12]

From the point of view of a social system, this seeking of new social
arrangements can move in either of two directions, toward or away from
unity of the composite system. When individuals move toward unity,
the situation is said to be one of acculturation. New patterns emerge
which reassert power in terms of a pyramid which becomes regularized
and normative. On the other hand, it is possible for individuals to
move away from unity and the power structure becomes a network which
is unregularized and non-normative. This process is referred to as
transculturation and the systems formed are called contra-systems as
opposed to the sub-systems which develop from acculturation.[13]

In either case, alienation is diminished as social organi-
zation develops. Social organization also brings power to the systems
coming into being. Indeed, other things such as technology and
resources being equal, the power of a group is always greater than
that of an aggregate of individuals.[14] In the case of acculturation,
power tends to be as before the breakdown, that is, the chronic con-

---

[12]F.H. Giddings, Inductive Sociology, (New York, MacMillan
Company, 1901), p. 64.

[13]Yinger has suggested the use of the term "contraculture",
see J. Milton Yinger, "Contraculture and Subculture," American Socio-
logical Review, 25, (Oct., 1960), pp. 625-635. Since I link power and
the normative order, I prefer the more dynamic "contra-system."

[14]Robert Bierstedt, "An Analysis of Social Power,"
American Sociological Review, 15, (Dec., 1950), pp. 730-738.

flict of cooperation and competition. In the case of transcultur-
ation, however, power tends to become manifested in progressive or
escalating conflict. When this happens the composite system becomes
increasingly anomic. It is in this manner that it is possible to have
the curious phenomenon whereby alienation within the larger social
system is declining while anomie is increasing. It seems quite
probable that the extreme of this condition occurs just prior to
revolutions within social systems politically organized. This is the
point at which, as William F. Buckley, the conservative columnist, has
indicated, the fringe becomes larger than the bedspread.

I have written of these processes as if they were unitary
and mutually exclusive. This, however, is not the case. To the
extent that no social system is ever in complete equilibrium, this is
true by definition. As Murdock has pointed out in his modified
acceptance of equilibrium theory, "there is merely a tendency to
approach an equilibrium."[15] This is just one way of looking at the
fact that anomie is a constant characteristic of all social systems.
It is interesting in this regard that Durkheim, as Alpert has written,
never used the logical opposite of anomie, that is <u>nomia</u>.[16] It may
be that Durkheim was not interested in <u>nomia</u>, but it may be also that
he never envisioned a social system wherein such a condition could

---

[15]G.P. Murdock, <u>Social Structure</u>, (New York, MacMillian
Company, 1949), p. 197.

[16]Harry Alpert, <u>Emile Durkheim and His Sociology</u>, (New
York, Columbia University Press, 1939), p. 192.

exist. To assume that it could exist raises serious problems in dealing with social change. It would be extremely difficult to discover the roots of change in a perfectly balanced system. In her novel, The Age of Innocence, Wharton has one of her characters ask: "Does anything ever happen in heaven?"[17] Heaven is, perhaps, the folk model of the perfectly balanced social system.

If at any given time any social system is characterized by a relative degree of anomie, then, likewise, it is characterized by both acculturation and transculturation, although in any given historical period the emphasis tends to be upon one or the other. In this manner it is possible to view social systems as becoming or disintegrating, or perhaps more accurately, in the process of fusion or fission. One of the crucial operational measures of these processes is the normative system itself—particularly that part of the normative system which is sometimes referred to as the folk system. That is, it is crucial to examine the folk rationale for how the system works and how it is supposed to work from the point of view of the sub-system and contra-system participants. It is this that turns power into authority pyramidally organized and that condemns the use of force which disrupts the pyramid. Here I follow Bierstedt's discussion of power as residual and which may be expressed

---

[17]Edith Wharton, The Age of Innocence, (New York, The New American Library, 1962), p. 112. This is only one of many sociological insights contained in this novel.

legitimately as authority or illegitimately as force.[18]

But inasmuch as social systems are always characterized by anomie, then there are always cracks in the normative order and this fact opens room for another process of social change, namely manipulation which is the playing off of power centers of sub-systems to arrive at a position of power. Oftentimes this is done by individuals and groups through the appeal to the normative order by insisting that the larger system "live up to" the statement of how things ought to be. Such appeals as "it's not fair" and "he didn't have to do that" are everyday examples of this process. As true contra-systems evolve, they develop their own collective mythologies which may be seen as reinterpretations of the normative order of the system. At this point relations between the system and the contra-system become power rather than manipulative relations. The outcome, of course, depends upon such factors as the amount of change implied in the contra-systems as well as the internal organization of the system.

It is now possible to look critically at the pyramid of power in terms of the normative order to see how contra-systems are able to manipulate the latter to become part of the former. To the extent that all power relations are also dependency relations, then

---

[18]Bierstedt, op. cit. This distinction, of course, finds its intellectual origins in the writings of Max Weber. See H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, (New York, Oxford University Press, Galaxy, 1958), pp. 77-128.

authority increases with the height of the pyramid, but so also does the amount of limitation placed upon the use of power as it becomes increasingly well defined and complex. That is, groups at the top sit above a very complex system of dependency relations which must be kept in balance to maintain their position. To do this they must, at least in the majority of cases, defend the normative system. Further, the amount of the system that they must justify is larger than at each level beneath them. This places a greater number of controls upon them which persons lower down the scale do not have. It is very difficult for persons and groups in the higher reaches of the power system to step outside of the authority structure. To do so they must work through persons or groups lower in the scale whose power is not intrinsically as great, but whose power is not as limited by the authority system. Authority limits power. This process is seen in the passing down of so-called "dirty work" such as a police chief's framing of a bit too vigorous patrolman who has begun to push against some large interest in a community. There are very good sociological reasons for why the mayor was "not involved." If he had been and had been exposed, then the amount of the power structure discredited would have been much greater than if the police chief had been ex-posed. The greater the amount of the system discredited, the greater the likelihood of rupture in the normative order and, hence, the possibility of redefinition.

It is at this point that the upper portion of the power system is most vulnerable and is at this point that contra-systems

often press with the hope of forcing a breakdown in the authority
system, i.e., forcing the upper groups to step out of the authority
system (and, hence, out of the normative order) with a subsequent
emergence of more followers or contra-systems in the wake of the
increasing disorder and expanding issues. This is frequently done
through the use of force on the part of the contra-system in the name
of the ideal order which, if it cannot be handled "through channels",
will lead to a display of force by the upper groups of the authority
system. From the point of view of the contra-system, if it survives,
it has won the first encounter.

In such situations as the above, the usual tactic of the
upper groups is to appeal to the ideals of the normative system to
encourage those in the middle of the power system to remain stable
while they eliminate the "temporary" disturbance. The appeal of the
contra-systems is usually to the lower groups of the power system to
join them for future reward and to restore the "true" values which
are often many of the same values being used by the upper groups with
a somewhat different interpretation. This process has been illus-
trated recently in almost classic form in the French crisis. Of
course, the outcome of these appeals determines whether or not civil
war or revolution will occur.

Summary and Conclusions

With the foregoing theoretical formulation in mind it is
possible to understand the empirical data presented in the first two

chapters. It is profitable to look back at this point at some of these findings and also to look at some of the more recent developments in student radicalism nationally in terms of this theory.

In Chapter 1, I attempted to place five groups in relation to the mainstream of American politics in the context of a large university. I hoped to isolate the ideology of the power groups at the various levels by operationalizing them as the influence structure. Through this procedure I located three groups which could be considered outgroups, though it appeared that they had a residue of underlying support. Under the theory presented in this chapter, this support should increase whenever the contra-systems are able to create situations wherein upper power groups must use force rather than authority to maintain order. Certainly this appears to have been what happened in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley and in the student revolt at Columbia. There are two main reasons for this: (1) whenever upper groups step out of their authority roles and use force, then they are able to muster greater paraphenalia for the administration of violence than are the contra-systems and this often creates an "underdog" identification pattern and (2) the use of force usually broadens the issues involved in the event from specific protests to more abstract ones primarily concerning the legitimacy of the upper group's actions in terms of the ideal normative system.

Of the two groups discussed in Chapter 2, Students for a Democratic Society much more closely approximates a true contra-system than does the New Conservatives Club. This is primarily due to

the differences in tactics between the groups in relation to changing
the power structure. Though at the time of my study Westcoast
University still had not had a major confrontation, it was possible
to see SDS shifting to the use of force while NCC still found its use
philosophically untenable. This may be seen in the various positions
concerning civil disobedience and the use of force. However, it
should also be pointed out that NCC members are suspicious of
centralized authority. If through confrontation SDS members are able
to convince NCC members of the illegitimacy of the authority system,
then it may be that NCC will become a true contra-system.

If the various developing contra-systems in the university
setting are to coalesce into one contra-system, then it appears that
the underground press will play an important role in both the forma-
tion and the maintenance of the coalition. At Westcoast there were
two such papers which bridged the gaps in ideology and life style of
SDS members and members of the University District Movement. Issues
of these papers were a combination of psychedelic art and literature
directed at the political issues of concern to SDS activists. A side
effect of importance of this linking of SDS and UDM has been the
development of the psychedelic experience as an important rite of
passage into the contra-systems as well as a status denomenator.
The culture surrounding the use of marijuana and psychedelic drugs
has given rise to a collective mythology and strong feelings of group

solidarity.[19] In a word, it has produced a sense of community.[20] The underground press is a community weekly which is gradually evolving a normative order at the same time that it confronts the power structure. In terms of reinterpretation and confrontation some of the slogans which appear in the underground press and which have become lexicons of the contra-systems are important. Such slogans as "make love, not war" and "hey, hey, L.B.J., how many kids have you killed today?" are classics in light of the theory presented here. They not only reinterpret the normative system by juxtaposing war and love as logical opposites, but they also challenge at least the symbol of the top of the power structure.

It is said that the good theory permits prediction and, indeed, it would be well if I could now predict the events of the next few years. Unfortunately, I am unable to do so. This thesis then ends with some speculation and an important question. Looking at the events of recent weeks it is possible to see the upper power groups beginning to appeal to the middle power groups for calm. Without having too sinister an eye, the new anti-riot bill and the fair housing act, which is, of course, of primary benefit to middle and

---

[19]For an interesting, if somewhat romanticized version or presentation of this contra-system combination, see J.L. Simmons and Barry Winograd, It's Happening: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today, (Santa Barbara, Marc-Laird Publications, 1966).

[20]For the importance of the concept community in the development of student radicalism, see Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau, The New Radicals: A Report with Documents, (New York, Random House, Vintage Books, 1966).

upper class Negroes with the income necessary to buy into better neighborhoods, in this light. Similarly SDS's Newark community project can be seen as an appeal to groups low in the power system. It may be that the next major event will be an attempt by groups high in the power structure to use force against student and certain black contra-systems. Should this occur, the major question will become: will the black and student contra-systems coalesce? It was possible to see the beginnings of such a coalition in the Columbia revolt, but to conclude with a cliché, time will tell-- but at this point it would seem that it will be clock rather than calendar time.

APPENDIX

NOTE TO THE APPENDIX

This section contains all of the formal instruments and documents used in the present research. The first document is the form letter sent along with the questionnaire which follows it to the random sample of all students at Westcoast University. This supplied the data for Chapter 1. The next instrument consists of all of the questions on the interview schedule administered to members of Students for a Democratic Society and New Conservatives Club. This schedule is divided into two parts. Part one is primarily open-ended and part two is closed and consists of the scales used in Chapter 2.

Dear Sir:

As you know there is a great deal of controversy today over the nature of the new student protest movements. In order that the campus political structure be accurately presented, at the present time there is a large study under way concerned with this very problem. As a part of this study you have been selected in a random sample of over two hundred to answer a number of questions.

It is extremely important to have your responses to these questions so that the findings of the research will be accurate and truthful. Further, please do not place your name upon the schedule so that complete anonymity of all respondents can be assured.

Because of the size of this study and the relative lack of funds it has been impossible to send each of you in the sample a personal letter. I offer you my apologies for having to send a form letter and hope that you understand this problem.

If you have any questions about this research I will be most happy to hear from you. Enclosed you will find a stamped self addressed envelope for your use in responding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

R. Kelly Hancock

Department of Sociology

QUESTIONNAIRE

The following information about yourself is important for understanding how different people variously placed in age and university classification feel about the rest of the information needed:

What is your age? _____   What is your sex? _____

Are you a: a. freshman
            b. sophomore
            c. junior
            d. senior
            e. graduate
            f. other _____

What is your specific major? _____

We are particularly interested to know what group or groups you feel represent(s) the general political orientation of the people of the United States? Please rank the following five groups from one to five (highest to lowest) on the basis of how close you feel their attitudes come to the "mainstream" of American political thought:

Students for a Democratic Society (S.D.S.)
The Young Republicans (Y.R.'s)
The Young Democrats (Y.D.'s)
The New Conservatives Club (N.C.C.)
The University District Movement (U.D.M.)

Ranks: (From closest to the mainstream to farthest from the mainstream)

1. _____   2. _____   3. _____   4. _____   5. _____

Would you now rank these same five groups from one to five (highest to lowest) on the basis of how close their general orientation comes to your personal political orientation:

Ranks: (From closest to your position to farthest from your position)

1. _____   2. _____   3. _____   4. _____   5. _____

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Questions on the Cover Sheet

   A. What is your age? _____
   B. What is your sex? _____
   C. What is your major? _____
   D. What is your classification? _____
      freshman
      sophomore
      junior
      senior
      graduate
      other _____
   E. If applicable:
      What is your religious preference?
      How many times in the last month have you attended church?
   F. What is your marital status? _____
   G. Do you have any children? _____
      If yes, how many? _____
   H. What place do you consider your hometown? _____
   I. Are you currently employed? _____   city   state
      If yes, what do you do?

2. Questions on part one of the Interview Schedule

   A. When did you first become interested in political concerns?
      When did you first become active?
   B. What political organizations do you currently belong to?
   C. Have you ever changed your political point of view? That is,
      have you ever been in sympathy with a point of view which is
      quite different from the one you now hold? If yes, what was
      that point of view and why did you change from it?
   D. How much time do you spend in an average week on club
      activities?
      In regard to organizational work, would you say that you are:
      very active
      somewhat active
      about average in activity
      somewhat inactive
      inactive
      Do you hold any office within the organization, either locally
      or nationally? If yes, what office?
   E. What is the primary political problem facing American Society
      today? How would you like to see this problem solved? (Re-
      cognizing that this is an extremely difficult question...
      please try to be as specific as you can.)
   F. What do you consider to be the major goal(s) of the organi-
      zation? If more than one, could you put them in rank order?

G. Do you consider these group goals the most important goals to you personally?

H. A great deal has been written recently regarding civil disobedience as a mechanism for social change. Do you feel that this is a legitimate way to bring about change in our society? Why or why not? If yes to the above, do you view civil disobedience as involving only passive resistance or can you foresee circumstances under which violence might be appropriate or necessary? If so, can you give either a real or hypothetical example of such a situation?

I. How do you define the term freedom?

J. Do you have any close friends who are members of any of the following groups?

Students for a Democratic Society	yes	no
Young Republicans	yes	no
Young Democrats	yes	no
New Conservatives Club	yes	no
the Hippies	yes	no

K. Recognizing the wide range in personality types, if you had never met person X and all that you knew about this person was his or her group affiliation and you were going to have to have person X as a roommate, how would you rank your choices on the basis of known membership in one of the following groups?
Young Republicans: Rank _____
Students for a Democratic Society: Rank _____
New Conservatives Club: Rank _____
Young Democrats: Rank _____
the Hippies: Rank _____
Why did you rank each of these as you did?

L. Do you plan to continue to be active in political organizations through-out your life? (Will you continue to be as active as you now are?)

M. What are your parents' occupations?
Your father:
Your mother:

N. Could you give an estimate of your parents' combined annual income?

O. Are your parents of basically the same political orientation as you are? If not, what is each of their orientations?

P. What do your parents think of your political orientation and activities?

Q. What do you think that those students on campus who are politically inactive think about members of your group generally?

3. Questions on part two of the Interview Schedule

SA-strongly agree; A-agree; U-undecided; D-disagree;
SD-strongly disagree

A. Most public officials (people in public   SA A U D SD
    office) are not really interested in the
    problems of the average man.
B. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.   SA A U D SD
C. Sometimes I feel all alone in the world.   SA A U D SD
D. Sometimes I get restless because I can't   SA A U D SD
    express my real feelings when talking
    and doing things with others.
E. One should always try to live in a highly   SA A U D SD
    respectable residential area even though
    it entails sacrifices.
F. At times I think I am no good at all.   SA A U D SD
G. The end justifies the means.   SA A U D SD
H. Most people today seldom feel lonely.   SA A U D SD
I. Before joining any civic or political   SA A U D SD
    association, it is usually important to
    find out whether it has the backing of
    people who have achieved a respected
    social position.
J. I have found that more often than not,   SA A U D SD
    the rules in our world go against human
    nature.
K. Nowadays, a person has to live pretty   SA A U D SD
    much for today and let tomorrow take
    care of itself.
L. I worry about the future facing today's   SA A U D SD
    children.
M. I don't get invited out by friends as   SA A U D SD
    often as I'd really like.
N. These days a person doesn't really know   SA A U D SD
    whom he can count on.
O. I have found that just being your natural   SA A U D SD
    self won't get you very far in this world.
P. I feel that I have a number of good   SA A U D SD
    qualities.
Q. Possession of proper social etiquette is   SA A U D SD
    usually the mark of a desirable person.
R. Sometimes I have the feeling that other   SA A U D SD
    people are using me.
S. People's ideas change so much that I   SA A U D SD
    wonder if we'll ever have anything to
    depend on.
T. When I am around other people, I try to   SA A U D SD
    keep in mind that saying what you really
    feel often gets you into trouble.
U. It is frightening to be responsible for   SA A U D SD
    the development of a little child.

V.	I frequently have to do things to please others that I would rather not do.	SA	A	U	D	SD
W.	It is hardly fair to bring a child into the world with the way things look for the future.	SA	A	U	D	SD
X.	I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	SA	A	U	D	SD
Y.	Everything is relative, and there just aren't any definite rules to live by.	SA	A	U	D	SD
Z.	One can always find friends if he shows himself friendly.	SA	A	U	D	SD
AA.	In spite of what some people say, the situation of the average man is getting worse, not better.	SA	A	U	D	SD
BB.	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	SA	A	U	D	SD
CC.	The raising of one's social position is one of the more important goals in life.	SA	A	U	D	SD
DD.	Real friends are as easy as ever to find.	SA	A	U	D	SD
EE.	What others think I should do is usually not what I would really like to do.	SA	A	U	D	SD
FF.	I certainly feel useless at times.	SA	A	U	D	SD
GG.	I often wonder what the meaning of life really is.	SA	A	U	D	SD
HH.	There is little or nothing I can do towards preventing a major "shooting war."	SA	A	U	D	SD
II.	The world in which we live is basically a friendly place.	SA	A	U	D	SD
JJ.	There are few dependable ties between people any more.	SA	A	U	D	SD
KK.	I wish I could have more respect for myself.	SA	A	U	D	SD
LL.	There is little chance for promotion on the job unless a man gets a break.	SA	A	U	D	SD
MM.	With so many religions abroad, one doesn't really know which to believe.	SA	A	U	D	SD
NN.	We're so regimented today there's not much room for choice even in personal matters.	SA	A	U	D	SD
OO.	All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	SA	A	U	D	SD
PP.	I have found that in order to get along in this world usually you have to put on an act instead of being able to be your real self.	SA	A	U	D	SD
QQ.	I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	SA	A	U	D	SD
RR.	There are so many decisions that have to be made today that sometimes I could just "blow up."	SA	A	U	D	SD

SS.	The only thing one can be sure of today is that he can be sure of nothing.	SA	A	U	D	SD
TT.	We are just so many cogs in the machinery of life.	SA	A	U	D	SD
UU.	People are just naturally friendly and helpful.	SA	A	U	D	SD
VV.	The future looks very dismal.	SA	A	U	D	SD
WW.	I take a positive attitude toward myself.	SA	A	U	D	SD
XX.	I don't get to visit friends as often as I'd really like.	SA	A	U	D	SD

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alpert, Harry. Emile Durkheim and His Sociology. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.

Bierstedt, Robert. "An Analysis of Social Power," American Sociological Review, 15 (Dec., 1950), 730-738.

Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

Blumberg, Nathan B. "A Study of the 'Orthodox' Press: The Reporting of Dissent," Montana Journalism Review, 11, (Spring, 1968), 2-9.

Bonjean, C.M. "Mass, Class, and the Industrial Community: A Comparative Analysis of Managers, Businessmen, and Workers." Paper read before the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Chicago, Illinois, August, 1965.

Bonjean, C.M. and Gary Vance. "Port Lavaca Community Survey: A Description and Comparison of Some Characteristics of Businessmen, Managers, and Workers." A report prepared for The Industrial Life Research and Development Center, Port Lavaca, Texas, n.d.

Cass, James. "What Happened at Berkeley," Saturday Review, January 16, 1965.

Dean, Dwight G. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, 26 (Oct., 1961), 753-777.

Durkheim, Emile. Rules of Sociological Method. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Emerson, R.H. "Power-Dependence Relations," American Sociological Review, 27 (Feb., 1962), 31-41.

Freeman, Linton C. Elementary Applied Statistics For Students in Behavioral Science. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Gerth, H.H. and C.W. Mills. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Giddings, F.H. Inductive Sociology. New York: MacMillan Company, 1901.

Hancock, R.K. "From the Campus: Perceptions of the American Political Structure." Paper read before the Annual Meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, San Francisco, California, March, 1968.

Hancock, R.K. "The Dynamics of 'Extremist' Groups." Paper read before the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association, Colorado Springs, Colorado, April, 1967.

Hoffer, Eric. The True Believer. New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1958.

Jacobs, Paul and Saul Landau. The New Radicals: A Report with Documents. New York: Random House, 1966.

Lee, Ronnel L. "Dissatisfied Young People: The Impact of Affluence and Poverty." Paper read before the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association, Denver, Colorado, May, 1968.

Lewis, Jo C. Unpublished statistical data on alienation and the college student.

Lipset, S.M. and S.S. Wolin. (eds.) The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965.

MacIver, R.M. The Web of Government. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Merton, R.K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Murdock, G.P. Social Structure. New York: MacMillan Company, 1949.

Newfield, Jack. A Prophetic Minority. New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1967.

Rosenberg, Morris. "Parental Interest and Children's Self-Conceptions," Sociometry, 26 (March, 1963), 35-49.

Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 24 (Dec., 1959), 783-791.

Simmons, J.L. and Barry Winograd. It's Happening: A Portrait of the
        Youth Scene Today. Santa Barbara: Marc-Laird
        Publications, 1966.

Sorokin, P.A. The Sociology of Revolution. Philadelphia: J.B.
        Lippincott Company, 1925.

Srole, Leo. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries," American
        Sociological Review, 21 (Dec., 1956), 709-716.

Westby, D.L. and R.G. Braungart. "Class and Politics in the Family
        Backgrounds of Student Political Activists," American
        Sociological Review, 31 (Oct., 1966), 690-692.

Wharton, Edith. The Age of Innocence. New York: The New American
        Library, 1962.

Yinger, J. Milton. "Contraculture and Subculture," American
        Sociological Review, 25 (Oct., 1960), 625-635