Are you listening or are you just hearing? If all you hear are sounds and fury, you are not listening. Don’t let the noise deceive you. Pause a moment and listen; someone is trying to tell us something. The message is buried in noise but can be filtered out and deciphered. The text of the information is this in essence.

Since World War II there have been major cultural and technological changes. The attitudes, social mores and values of the 1920's, '30's and '40's are no longer pertinent. This country is no longer an insular "entity" with only internal "consumer" demands to shape our course. We no longer have an expanding economy based on illimitable natural resources and millions of acres of free land that the economically deprived social groups can be promised as "pie in the sky" to make their lot better.

For twenty years we have been educating the present generation. Not in our schools, there they have been "trained", not educated. It has been the mass media of communications and the ease and speed of travel that have truly educated the present generation of college age. They are aware. They have accepted the facts and recognize the necessity for action. They have looked to see who in the "establishment" is doing something about these problems. This is the "involved generation". They know that decisions and acts consummated now will determine the kind of lives they and their children will face. Having seen that the establishment is spinning its wheels; that the intellectual community has involved itself in endless discussions without consequent action; that the educational system still limits its activities to the transfer of facts and the institutions of higher learning are involved in the charade of seeking "prestige" through "research", they know there must be change.

We should not be misled by the seeming inconsequence or irrelevance of the subject of the early confrontations between the activists and the power structure. These are only skirmishes in which they will try their strength and learn the skills necessary for command in the field. For the activists to lose a confrontation over a petty matter would be a minor setback for there are many more trenchant causes awaiting their attention. Conversely, if the establishment can be brought to its knees and made to look weak and stupid for having chosen to oppose the redress of some apparently inconsequential matter, the gain will be significant. A bit of hair is not what it may seem.

Can the activists be criticized for seeking what they know must come? How can we question their goals? For two decades the power structure of all kinds of social, educational and political institutions has avoided positive actions on the most pressing questions of our times. At least these young people are attempting to accomplish something.

Let us examine just a few of the goals of the activists of this college generation:

1. To bring some consideration to the ethical and moral implications of political acts locally, nationally and internationally. Can you deny that our state and national political establishments continue to perform their duties by the expedients of horsetrading, backscratching and pork barreling?
2. To establish between nations the same concepts of juridical procedures that are almost universally accepted as normal between individuals.

Can you deny that major international policy decisions are commonly determined on opportunistic, jingoistic or economically selfish bases?

3. To provide universal equal social, economic and educational opportunities to all of our citizens without consideration of race, color or economic status.

Can you deny that two decades of legalistic and legislative maneuverings have resulted in practically no measurable advance in obtaining equal opportunity for the masses of socially and economically deprived of the United States?

4. To provide a system of education that will make available to each generation the knowledge and understanding to cope with the new problems and opportunities that they will face.

Can you deny that "educational" institutions are primarily limiting their efforts to the production of highly trained technicians? Or deny the fact that fear of displeasing the establishment causes most if not all instructors at this institution, and most others, to limit the discussions of controversial matters or the pronouncement of viewpoints known to be contrary to the accepted opinions of society? Can you deny that society has failed and is failing to solve its most serious problems of overpopulation, severely deprived populations, destruction of the environment and the rape of natural resources?

Can you deny that practically every major institution of higher education today tries to convince society of its contributions in terms of the millions of dollars committed to research; in terms of the percentage of the staff supported by outside funds; in terms of the magnitude of capital construction; in terms of the number of faculty members "honored" by election to national or international groups and that there is literally no effective emphasis on the quality of the instructional program or the qualifications of a staff member as a teacher or educator?

5. To destroy all systems that measure all change by various economic standards and not the single standard of the welfare of society.

Can you deny that the legislative programs in this country and others are decided on purely economic criteria; that monetary return or its equivalent and not social, sociological or cultural criteria determine the acceptability of programs?

6. To put in power men of intellect, understanding and action who can inform, instruct and lead society in its struggle for existence.

Can you truly deny that the men in power in the social, industrial and political life have toadied to cliques and pressure groups, or that they have been fearful to upset the outmoded social and economic organizations inherited from a time so remote that they have no relevance today?
If you honestly feel that you *can* deny these truths then "wake up and smell the coffee". A new day has dawned. A day of change. It is here, now, today. You have no more time for procrastination; no time to argue and defend. Change you will or, as with all else that is unchanging, become simply a point in history.

If you doubt, then listen. The message is there. The phraseology is strange and it is couched in a jargon unusual to our ears. It offers a threat and a promise that many cannot accept, but accept it we must or we will find our fine institution closed. Closed by the edict that we lack relevance.

Harry K. Phinney
Professor of Botany
March 13, 1969
REMARKS ON THE GOVERNMENT OF OSU

With the arrival of the Revolution on campus, our system of university government has been subjected to review and criticism from various quarters. I wish to contribute to the debate.

My point is that central authority within this university is being weakened and that is unfortunate.

The drift has been apparent for several years. Recently, the process seems to be accelerating. Pressures are developing from several sources: the Athletic Department wants extensive autonomy; John Fraser wants student power; some of the faculty want faculty power; the OSUFT favors both student and faculty power; black power, oddly enough, has not as yet been an issue. President Jensen, who might be expected to offer opposition to the disseminators, has shown himself no friend of concentrated executive power. While so far carefully retaining his prerogatives, he has continued his policy of encouraging faculty and student participation in governing.

Some results have already begun to emerge. First, in the Milton matter, the burden of solution to what well might have been defined as an administrative problem has been shifted, however confusingly, to a variety of committees. Second, creeping bi-cameralism, with all its 18th century trappings, is hard upon us. During its last meeting in March, the Faculty Senate passed a not very radical measure in a fairly radical fashion. The bill, which concerns "Student Rights, Freedoms, and Responsibilities," is to be "adopted" when accepted by a simple majority vote of both the Senate and ASOSU and "effective" when signed by the president. It worried some of the senators that a regrettable precedent was being established, and it worries me, too.

OSU, I believe, is now ready for neither student nor faculty government and certainly not for a combination of the two. Our not being ready has nothing to do with the quality of the faculty and student body. It derives, rather, from the stage of development at which the institution finds itself. As a university, we are still very young and in need of radical innovations. The best way to achieve these innovations is through strong, progressive executive leadership. Faculty and students are certainly appropriate sources of advice but incapable of consistent constructive action. If their authority is increased, the result will be to contribute to the maintenance of the status quo. Operating almost necessarily without the basic innovative tool of legislatures, i.e., disciplined political parties, the senates and their committees will usually serve as forces for negation.

The local AAUP Committee on Faculty Government has just recommended that the university adopt the national's 1966 "Statement on Government
of Colleges and Universities." It is a moderate document, calling, in the words of its editorial preface, for "appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution." The same preface reasons that American institutions of higher learning have now reached the point in their evolution at which such sharing becomes advisable. No doubt, but for those of us who continue to linger in our springtime, the lion's share will hopefully remain with a resourceful president.

Nothing in the above should be taken as an argument against consultation. Faculty and students must speak frankly, and the executive must listen. But then, of course, he must act.

Should our next president decide that student and faculty government are to be encouraged, then all is not lost. There is a slight chance that after the creation of honest factions one or the other might gain control and give the direction necessary to continue our conversion. If this is to be the case, we shall need some new rules. The first, in my opinion, should see the president and dean of faculty removed from the Faculty Senate. Then, at some point, the legislature will have to be given the power to legislate. But even with appropriate reforms, it is unlikely that we can achieve anything through faculty leadership but the preservation of what we already have, and that is insufficient. It is not that we produce too few leaders, but rather too many. Therefore, I hope that before the advocates of increased power for the university's components seek new results they will join in encouraging President Jensen, the acting president, and the new president to maintain central authority. At OSU it is not an outmoded form of government. It will remain for several years our best weapon in the struggle to eradicate the twin images of mediocrity and anti-intellectual conservatism that continue to plague us.

David B. King
Associate Professor
History Department
March 31, 1969