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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the Berkeley student crisis in 1964, university campuses throughout the country have been confronted each year with an ever increasing number of student protests. Some of these demonstrations have evoked violence, most of them have taken place amid calm and reason. Many persons across the country, college and non-college graduate alike, have been puzzled, awed, angered, and occasionally inspired, by this spate of student protests and student activism. As a result of these uprisings, perplexing and even penetrating questions have inevitably arisen. Who are these student radicals? Why are they protesting? What is it they want? Are most college students rebelling? Are student activism and protests but passing phenomena, or are these a portent of what is to be expected in the future? What kind of students are these student radicals? Is the student protest movement widespread? Is this just the age-old manifes-
tation of rebellion against their elders? Is there more to these protests than is apparent on the surface? What are their goals? Do they have any suggestions for constructive change in our societal institutions? These and other questions, too numerous to recite, are plaguing Americans of all types and at every level.

With the growing tendency of a significant number of young people today to search for a new life style, a mode of living that is neither conventional nor traditional, there is a widespread rejection of middle-class styles. Radical and widespread disaffection is the tempo of today's students, and as a result, an ever-increasing number are becoming part of the Movement. Fortune magazine indicates that two-fifths of the college-going population today—or a universe of some 2,300,000—are identified by their "lack of concern about making money," are disdainful of "careerist" values, and are interested chiefly in finding work that is intellectually challenging and somehow relevant to their social concerns. ¹

The grandparents of the young activist were heirs of a Victorian tradition, a tradition that emphasized respect, control of impulse, obeisance to authority, and the traditional inner-directed values of hard work, thrift, self-control and self-

restraint. The parents of today's activist student generation were brought up and reared in families that largely reflected this Victorian outlook. The activist students, products of this family background, have grown up and been exposed to psychological ideas that has contrasted sharply with the values of their own families; thus, they have manifested behavior that is distinct from that of their parents and grandparents. These young activists perceive a real discrepancy between what their parents avow as their values and the actual assumption from which parental behavior springs. They see the people in today's society working so hard for material goods that there is no time nor energy left to enjoy them. They are not satisfied with more affluence. They see that Dad does not enjoy the wealth he has now, so why accumulate more wealth? As a member of the New Left, they want satisfaction—enjoyment out of life—personally. Thus, they view the present structure as artificial, and their own rationality becomes unconventional, non-linear, contrary to tradition.

Many of the young people between the ages of 19 and 24 are more concerned with what people should do with their lives, in work and in play, in style and in form, what is reasonable morally and what is not, rather than with established and long held values. The fundamental question that they are raising is:
What is of real worth in living? They are questioning why a person does what he does, and how can men become truly human and humane in this technocratic age in which they live.

There is some clear indication that this trend could have a significant impact if some basic changes are not brought about in our economic, social, political, education, and cultural institutions. The question remains, is this a sub-cultural phenomena of limited duration, or is there evidence that the Movement is an emerging force in our society with the potential of becoming a significant part of the dominant culture?

The purpose of this study is to focus more specifically on the national officers of two national student organizations: the National Student Association (NSA) and the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). NSA was founded in 1947, and it is now over twenty years old. SDS is a more recently organized student association, having been founded in 1962. This study will concern itself with the national officers of the National Student Association over the past twenty years and the Students for a Democratic Society over the past six years, in an attempt to determine the present role and status of these national officers in our present society. The study will endeavor to ascertain the occupations that the former officers are currently engaged in, their political persuasions and interests, and their political and social attitudes. Allowances will be made for the age
differential between the two groups in the interpretation of the data, recognizing that career patterns and possibly social and political attitudes are affected by age. These variables will be analyzed as they have affected the style of life that they have adopted. Differences between the officers of NSA (an organization that has been historically left of center, and liberal to radical in its political orientation) and the officers of SDS (an organization that is identified as radical in its political orientation) will be analyzed. (Both groups--NSA and SDS--identified themselves as activists.) Given the differences between the two student organizations in both political orientation and length of time in existence, and the small sample utilized in this study, the analysis of the individual officers representing each association in the sample population will be taken into account in the drawing of conclusions from this study.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It is assumed that many of the past officers of NSA and SDS share a value system that is different from that found in conventional society. This being the case, one of the purposes of this study is to find out what happened to them when they entered what is generally referred to as the "system" or the "establishment." As they have advanced in years and become
immersed in the "system," have they altered their attitudes and ideals from those they held while in college? Are they interested in changing the "system" from within via more traditional means, or do they feel that the "system" can only be changed by working outside it? Have they chosen a career and a life style that is not identified with the "establishment?"

It is often charged that yesterday's radicals become conservatives as soon as they assume family responsibilities and gather material possessions. An attempt will be made to determine whether in fact this is true of these particular persons.

DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

At this point, several concepts such as system, establishment, life style, New Left and the Movement, which will be considered in this thesis, are defined relative to this study.

The following definitions are arbitrarily derived, and have been adapted for this study because of their close relationship to the topic.

System: Since all society can be understood as a complex system of organization, system can be defined as "the concept that refers both to a complex of interdependencies between parts, components, and processes that involves discernible regularities of relationship, and to a similar type of interdependency between
such a complex and its surrounding environment.” Further, Webster's definition of system applies here as "a complex of ideas, principles, doctrines, laws, etc., forming a coherent whole and recognized as the intellectual content of a particular philosophy, religion, form of government, or the like." The system referred to in this paper is intended to include all or part of the above meanings in the normal usage of the word.

Establishment: The establishment can be used as another word for the system. The two are probably synonymous. It is what makes a person feel powerless in his efforts to achieve his personal ideals for society and individually frustrated when he attempts to deal with political procedures and organization politics. The establishment is not any one group of persons or any one thing. The establishment is that part of the system composed of such varied institutions as church, family, education, government, political, economic, and communications which hold the chief measure of power and influence in society.

Life Style: In the context of this dissertation, life style does not refer to style of dress, hair, language, etc., but rather it is used to reflect both vocational pattern and

---


value schema. Life style is defined broadly as his value orientation to self, others, and society, that each individual develops and follows.

The Movement and the New Left: These terms are often used interchangeably, and the distinctions are negligible. The New Left is a loose, non-bureaucratic, unconventional, decentralized structure of individuals and groups united by a moralism, romanticism, and sense of community that has its own distinctive style and tone. It is characterized by humanist, existential, informal, and communitarian qualities; its anarchistic, transcendental, populist, socialist, and bohemian strands of thought provide for unity. The New Left is built on a feeling of powerlessness, moral disaffection, purposelessness of middle-class life. It finds its identity in an experimental culture, politics shaped by domestic experience, and a oneness in its revolt against war, racism, militarism, poverty, materialism, impersonalization, and centralization.

The Movement is in general a protest against the political inequities in American life, the moral revulsion against corruption in American society, and the existential reaction against the remoteness of technological society and its lack of responsiveness to human needs. The Movement is an invisible layer of college students, recent college graduates,
and young intellectuals who are not full-time radicals but whose career-oriented sympathies lie with the values and basic assumptions of the New Left.

Review of the Pertinent Literature

In an attempt to provide a better understanding of today's radical students, a review of the current literature is presented here, then subjected to a reasoned analysis of the multiple factors impinging upon these students in creating the climate of unrest prevalent in the United States in the late 1960's.

In many ways, "The Port Huron Statement," framed at the 1962 SDS convention at Port Huron, Michigan, serves as the basic guideline for students in the New Left. It states: "We seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and the direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation."4 As Andrew Kopkind has put it, "More than anything, the new generation of students cares about democracy. They have talked about, written about it, demonstrated about it. Now they have begun

to organize people to change their communities into more democratic forms." Perhaps uniquely in this generation, they have understood the enormity of the contradictions in American life; thus they have committed themselves to work for basic social change.

The scope of student concerns is extensive, and covers such issues as nuclear testing, the arms race, attacks on civil liberties, the problems of the poor in urban slum ghettos, democracy and educational quality in universities, the war in Vietnam, and conscription. Are, then, all students who object to one or more of these issues members of the New Left? Hardly. The New Left itself is amorphous, pluralistic, multi-layered, a loose amalgamation of many organizations concerned with civil rights, peace, anti-poverty, often caught in the tide of shifting sentiments about their real purposes and goals. Many students of moderate or even conservative leaning will coalesce with members of the New Left when the proper issue galvanizes them into action. Thus, while the New Left represents a minority of students, and although the importance of the new student left has been overestimated, their forces can often be strikingly

---


6 Ibid., p. 16.
enlarged, for their grievances often strike a key nerve in the consciousness of the student generation. There is little question but that the new student activists have had an impact greater than the modesty of their number would suggest.

The New Left is characterized by a set of assumptions, beliefs, and goals to which several interrelated but decentralized groups subscribe. It is distinguished by idealism and youthfulness. "These radicals," observes Glazer, "identify themselves with the poor of the world: the underdeveloped, the colored, the struggling."\(^7\) Or, as Lowman puts it, they are interested in people as people and strike out against injustice, and they are imbued by this "burning moral thing."\(^8\) To be "left" in the eyes of youthful rebels is to assent to an ethic and method of social relations rather than to adhere to a political program. The student agitator elects to take on unpopular causes by working with the indigent Negro and the white slum dweller; he chooses to confront society with its hypocrisies and injustice.\(^9\) Peterson defines the student left as a "movement that has emerged


in the past seven or eight years on the basis of a shared rejection of many prevailing American institutions, a vaguely democratic-socialist political ideology, a faith in participatory democracy, and a commitment to direct social action."\(^{10}\) The ultimate goal of the New Left is to reform American society on a radical scale, as well as the characteristic nature of human roles and relationships on which it rests.

Historical Growth of the Movement and Some Definitions

The radical student movement was born and given impetus by a number of social and historical forces, not the least in importance being the "discovery" of the subjection of the Negro in democratic, enlightened America. It was stirred anew by the assassination of a young, idealistic President who was perceived as a ray of hope in an otherwise dim world, and it was intensified "by the discovery of grinding poverty in the world's wealthiest nation and by the thought of the world's greatest power being engaged in a war of attrition in a tiny, undeveloped country. It is sustained by the view that students themselves are being degraded in the university, and, indeed, that citizens everywhere are leading 'lives of quiet desperation.'"\(^{11}\) And,


\(^{11}\) Ibid., p. 312.
finally, the movement is given further support by the belief that the social system that permits these hypocrisies cannot be tolerated and must be altered.

The number of students who share this strong sense of outrage is probably only about 2 per cent. But as Jacobs and Landau explain, counting the number who are members of the organizations within the Movement would be to misunderstand one of the basic facts of its nature: "The Movement is organizations plus unaffiliated supporters, who outnumber by the thousands, and perhaps even hundreds of thousands, those committed to specific groups," and the Movement's basic strength lies with these unaffiliated reserves.\(^\text{12}\)

Joseph Katz has defined activists as those who share four broad psychological characteristics: "An orientation toward mastery of frustrating conditions rather than submission and conformity, a will to change the social environment, a tendency to explore the inner life, and a willingness to risk future social or economic opportunities in the pursuit of some abstract but immediate ideal of justice."\(^\text{13}\)

Characteristics of the Activist Student

The radical student activist's personal and background characteristics show a remarkable consistency, as reflected in


the data of eight studies. The social class of the student radicals is upper-middle class, and their parents tend to be politically liberal or radical. Many parents have been actively involved with radical politics in the past. The parents are permissive and democratic in their child-rearing practices, and they and their children demonstrate a high degree of intelligence. They are intellectually rather than career-oriented, and academically they are concentrated chiefly in the social sciences and humanities while being underrepresented in preprofessional programs. The students engaging in activism identify themselves as being either non-religious, or open and non-formal in their religious persuasion. This is consistent with their parents' self-description of their relationship to religious traditions (orthodoxy). However, while student activists are less religious than the campus population as a whole, certain religious backgrounds, mainly Jewish and liberal Protestant, tend to produce a large proportion of them. They are interested in and sensitive to various forms of artistic expression, and they see themselves as independent from most sources of social influences and authority. At the same time that they stress empathy, openness, and honesty in their interpersonal relationships, they also feel a genuine sense of responsibility and altruism in their relations with all people.14

14 These eight studies deal with activists involved in the Berkeley affair in 1964 and students from several "movement" organizations:
Joseph Katz, in his definitive study of the activist student, has provided us with some additional insights into his personality and background. The activist comes from a happy family background. His parents have generally been somewhat permissive and affectionate toward their children. At home, these students have been allowed to express disagreement openly. Parents of activists have higher incomes and more education as well as greater occupational status than parents of non-activists.

Generally, activists seem to act more in conformity with the values of their parents than against them, although they express those values with more energy and less compromise than do their elders.

Paul Heist, "Intellect and Commitment: The Faces of Discontent," Order and Freedom on Campus: The Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty and Students, eds. O. W. Knorr and W. J. Minter (Boulder, Colorado, 1965);

Block, Haan, and Smith, "Activism and Apathy in Contemporary Adolescents," in J. F. Adams (ed.) Contributions to the Understanding of Adolescence (New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1968);


Is it true that the activist student is generally the flunk-out or the drop-out? On the contrary, an assessment of activists' academic aptitude and performance shows that they are generally top-notch students. On verbal aptitude tests, they score significantly higher than non-activists, and they do especially well on theoretical orientation, ability to think reflectively, estheticism, and diversity of interests. They also put their abilities to good use: their grade-point averages are significantly higher than those of non-activists, and they are more frequently influenced by teachers and ideas from courses. They go on to graduate school in greater numbers than non-activists and are less likely to drop out of school. 15

"Student protesters are generally outstanding students; the higher the student's grade average, the more outstanding his academic achievements, the more likely it is that he will become involved in any given political demonstration." 16 Katz concludes that "they now want to extend and deepen their experiences and relate the ideas and theories to their own lives and to the improvement of the society around them. The activists tend to be concerned with self-expression, to be intellectually oriented, and to feel a sense of community with and responsibility for

15Katz, The Student Activists, pp. 13-16.
for their fellow men. The non-activists, on the other hand, are more success-oriented, self-denying-conventional, competitive, self-controlled, and orderly. Psychologically, activists are among the soundest of any group. They are flexible, socially mature people with a rich and complex inner life. They have a more pronounced sensitivity and responsiveness to, and a greater need of, other people, and their idealistic and humanitarian tendencies are stronger than average."17 Furthermore, because of the personal antecedents of activism—economic security, committed parents, humanitarian, liberal, permissive home environments, and good education—unusual high levels of psychological functioning are promoted.18

The student movement, then, has had a decided impact on society, or certainly, at least, special segments of it. Asserted Lipset and Altbach in 1966: "Even in the United States, where the student population is large, heterogeneous, and is not generally considered a politically crucial factor, a vocal student minority has been able to attract a good deal of attention and has stimulated much thought on political and educational issues. The effects of the new student left on the larger polity are still

17 Katz, The Student Activists, p. 17.
18 Keniston, The Sources of Student Dissent, p. 317.
being felt, and it is clear that while the movement has been unable to change the nation's Vietnam policy, it has been a source of pressure for educational reform and has given a voice to the student community.\textsuperscript{19} Additionally, one of the Movement's most startling characteristics is the fact that so many of these young people reject the affluent society which produced them. According to Jacobs and Landau, their "repudiation of the American value system is so serious that they have forced thoughtful elements in society to re-examine their own acceptance of America, to discover what it is in American life that is so unattractive, so distasteful as to make these young people turn their backs on it and call for a revolution to replace it."\textsuperscript{20}

The Development of SDS and Its Impact

Two principal organizations have been in the vanguard of social change. These theories of change are being put into practice by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). These organizations are characterized not so much by specific political programs as by a desire to work actively for social progress. SNCC was one of the original groups to move into the South in pursuit of


\textsuperscript{20}Jacobs and Landau, \textit{The New Radicals}, p. 83.
racial justice. Thus, the New Left received from the black movement a sense of social outrage over the denial of civil rights, and in turn transmitted this feeling to the collegiate young of the middle class. The SDS is a fairly good representative of the new student movement. It is pluralistic, and decentralized, and its leadership is mainly advisory, with local chapters highly autonomous. The unifying bond for its members is the perceived hypocrisy in American society—the gap between the liberal democratic dreams and the grim human reality of American life—and a commitment to work for social change. 21

Altbach describes SDS as having "succeeded in obtaining a high degree of commitment from its membership, engaged in a broad range of programs aimed at most of the ills of modern society, and has appealed to students on a essentially emotional and non-ideological base. It has tried to create a movement without a coherent organization or program. In this way it has achieved a good deal of spontaneity and creativity but has failed to maintain a sustained effort in all but a few areas." 22 While SDS has some significant gains, particularly as they have affected the personalities of its members. They have willingly given up the creature comforts of middle class life in order to immerse

---


themselves in movement work. Andrew Kopkind vividly portrays this dedication as follows:

Hardly anyone on the "outside" can imagine the completeness of their transformation, or the depth of their commitment. They are not down there for a visit in the slums. They are part of the slums, a kind of lay-brotherhood, or worker-priest, except that they have no dogma to sell. They get no salary; they live on a subsistence allowance that the project as a whole uses for rent and food. Most of the time they are broke. The kids are the very antithesis of paid organizers the unions or political parties have to hire. Most of them have committed their lives to "the movement"; no matter if in a few years they change their minds. It is important that they now have the expectation of remaining. In some instances they are more proletarian than the proletariat: they eat a spartan diet of one-and-a-half meals a day, consisting mainly of powdered milk and large quantities of peanut butter and jelly, which seems to be the SDS staple.23

For many of these young people, material wealth is a meaningless goal, and it is their feeling that such strivings results in a loss of human values. Thus, they respond to the sense and sound of friendship and community, and they are willing to sacrifice most middle-class comforts.

After a very inauspicious beginning, SDS gathered impetus, especially following its Port Huron manifesto in 1962. In 1964, it was successful, and surprised everyone including itself, when it was able to mobilize over 20,000 persons in Washington, D. C. for a "March to End the War in Vietnam." At that time, speaking

---

23Andrew Kopkind, Of, By and For the Poor, p. 18.
at the SDS-sponsored affair, Paul Potter, then president of the organization, raised these concerns:

What kind of system is it that disenfranchises people in the South, leaves millions ... impoverished and excluded from the mainstream and promise of American society, that creates faceless and terrible bureaucracies ... that consistently puts material values before human values--and still persists in calling itself free and in finding itself fit to police the world? What place is there for ordinary men in that system and how are they to control it, make it bend itself to their wills rather than bending them to its? We must name that system. We must name it, describe it, analyze it, understand it, and change it.24

Thus it is clear that they are unhappy with the "system" as it presently is constituted, and they wish to radically alter its structure. The hallmark of SDS is community organization of the poor as well as their attempt to end the war in Vietnam. Community action at the local level has become an SDS trademark, combining, as Kelman puts it, "the traditional concerns of the one-plank radical groups (civil rights, poverty, and peace) into a unified approach."25 Since 1962, ten community action projects have been set up in such diverse communities as Baltimore, San Francisco, Chicago, Cleveland, Cambridge (Maryland), Roxbury (Massachusetts), Chester (Pennsylvania), Cairo (Illinois), Newark, and Appalachia. SDS even rejects the Old Left—or as

24As reported by Kopolind, Ibid., p. 19.

Newfield calls it, the Hereditary Left. "Many SDSers go so far as to consider the New Deal a positive evil, in that it expanded the decision-making power of a centralized bureaucracy."²⁶

The SDS counter organizations, as they call their grass roots efforts, would allow the poor to participate in the control of their own lives. The SDS activists are convinced that the important needs are personal, thus their immediate goal in organizing among the poor is to help each person feel his own sense of dignity and worth. SDS contends that before the poor can achieve political independence and "act as an insurgent force," they must have a sense of identity, a sense of being able to make decisions, as well as a sense of independence, "in a nation of bureaucracies that has usurped all decision-making."²⁷

SDS has not had notable success with its "community union" projects, despite the fact that it has brought college students in direct contact with the urban poor, thereby creating among the students a genuine social consciousness. Its Newark project under the guidance of Tom Hayden had limited success, insists Kelman, and while this was achieved in small items, the larger purpose has not succeeded, that of "the creation of an independent national organization of the poor."²⁸ Altbach feels that the

²⁶Ibid., p. 10.
sporadic efforts to build a sustained interest in problems of university reform have also failed. It goes one step further and suggests that the present anti-Vietnam war efforts by SDS and other student groups have proved successful mainly because of the rather widespread opposition to the government's policy in the first place rather than any effective planning by the initiating organizations. 29 Despite its shortcomings and failures, opines Altbach, "the new student generation has made a more substantial impact on its environment and on American higher education than any group of American students since the volatile 1930's." 30 And SDS remains the most effective "new left" student organization in the United States. 31

The New Left: Its Ethical Values and Search For Identity

The New Left is alive with social concerns, with attempting to create a better and more just society. Newfield calls it an "ethical revolt," this strong feeling on the part of the new radicals against racism, poverty, war, hypocrisy, dehumanization of societal institutions, impersonal bureaucracies, and the gap between American ideals and beliefs and actual practice. Perhaps the true measure of a person is what he becomes, what he accomplishes, as reflected in his personal ethics and values.

29 Altbach, The Student Movement, p. 425.
30 Ibid., p. 427.
31 Lipset and Altbach, Student Politics in United States, p. 337.
These students of the new left were willing to put their "ethics" to the test. Students today, says Nathan Pusey in an article that is somewhat critical of the activist student, "do have a livelier understanding than we did that ethics are not merely personal, but also inescapably corporate and social. And beyond this . . . the students have come to see that to be personally satisfying and life-giving, any ethics which are to command their assent have to be their ethics; they cannot be ethics devised and held by someone else or ethics acquired through words without personal involvement."\(^{32}\) Erikson, in discussing the powerful influence of technology in our lives and its relationship to ideology, indicates that today there is a tendency to subordinate ideology to technology. Given this ominous trend, he insists that "it is just possible that a new mankind, seeing that it can now build and destroy anything it wishes, will focus its intelligence on the ethical questions concerning the workings of human generations—beyond products, powers, and ideas."\(^{33}\) He elaborates on this issue of ethics as follows:

Ideologies in the past have contained an ethical corrective, but ethics must eventually transcend ideology as well as technology. Moralists sooner or later outlive themselves, ethics never: this is

---


Many have contended that the young activist is rebelling against his parents, and this would explain his radical behavior. There is ample evidence to indicate that the reverse is true, and that the parents of activist students actually favor their children's involvement with social concerns. The study of civil rights activists in the Summer Community Organization and Political Education Program (SCOPE) indicates that they were not rebelling against parental wishes in becoming civil rights participants. In fact, almost two-thirds reported that their participation would actually enhance their relationship with their parents. Only 5 per cent of the volunteers reported that they didn't get along with or were hostile toward their parents. The majority of the young activists have inculcated their ethical value system from their parents, who, asserts Keniston, are highly principled, almost without exception. He states: "Somehow these parents communicated, often without saying outright, that human behavior was to be judged primarily in terms of general ethical

---

34 Ibid., p. 23.

principles; that right conduct was to be deduced from general maxims concerning human kindness, honesty, decency, and responsibility; that what mattered most was the ability to act in conformity with such principles. Whether the principles were religious or secular, the atmosphere within these radicals' families during their early years was one in which ethical principles occupied the highest position. 36

Thus, the Movement, according to Jacobs and Landau, is also a revolt against the postwar "overdeveloped society" with its large bureaucracies in government, corporations, trade unions, and universities. Technology's emphasis on routine efficiency has created a set of values, rationalized by its supporters as representing 'the facts of modern life.' But the Movement sees these values as false, imposed on the whole society without, 'the consent of the governed.' 37 Of course, as Keniston so rightly points out, a revolt against the effects of technology is possible only in a technological society. "In the end," says Keniston, "it is not so much the material as the spiritual consequences of modern technology that are deplored—not so much technology as technologism." 38 With greater or less articulateness, the New

38 Kenneth Keniston, Young Radicals, p. 283.
Left "seek ways of retaining the benefits of technology without dehumanizing, desiccating, and depersonalizing the citizens of technological society." 39

So we return to the importance of identity in today's technological age. How, if at all, does work within the Movement help the young radical to find his identity? Being in the Movement enables him to search for a "psychic community," which, it is claimed, "one's own identity can be defined, social and personal relationships based on love can be established and can grow, unfettered by the cramping pressures of the careers and life styles so characteristic of America today." 40 Erikson would characterize our youth culture as a psychosocial moratorium on adulthood, a period providing youth with an opportunity to develop their identity as adults. "One of the main psychological functions of a sense of identity," argues Keniston, "is to provide a sense of inner self-sameness and continuity, to bind together the past, the present, and the future into a coherent whole; and the first task of adolescence and early adulthood is the achievement of identity." 41 This is especially true in an era of exceedingly rapid change. What rapid change signifies is that little can be

---

39 Ibid.


counted on to endure from generation to generation, and that all technologies, institutions, and values are open to revision and obsolescence. Because we are living during this period of social transformation, a new emphasis on the present is engendered, devoid of significant interest in the past or the future.

Kensington astutely points out:

The differences between the America of 1950 and that of 1960 are greater than those between 1900 and 1910; because of the accelerating rate of innovation, more things change, and more rapidly, in each successive decade. Social changes that once would have taken a century now occur in less than a generation. As a result, the past grows progressively more different from the present in fact, and seems more remote and uncertain. Because the future directions of social change are virtually unpredictable, today’s young men and women are growing into a world that is more unknowable than that confronted by any previous generation. The kind of society today’s students will confront as mature adults is almost impossible for them or anyone else to anticipate. Also, the present assumes a new significance as the one time in which the environment is relevant, immediate, and knowable. The past’s solution to life’s problems are not necessarily relevant to the here-and-now, and no one can know whether what is decided today will remain valid in tomorrow’s world; hence, the present assumes an autonomy unknown in more static societies.42

The young radicals might be viewed as being immersed in an "unresolved identity crisis." These young men and women have not "settled down" like most of their peers, and in fact, they perceive themselves as ripe for personal change. Thus, their

---

42 Ibid., pp. 168-69.
identity formation is far less complete than is true of most of their contemporaries. It is conceivable that the radical feels compelled to "stretch" his development over a longer period of time before becoming adjusted. Perhaps his identity can be achieved only with the "socio-political transformation he seeks."*3

Traditionalism and Conservatism Among Students in American Higher Education

Another aspect of the psychology of rapid change is the widespread feeling of powerlessness—social, political, and personal—of many young people today. They feel sharply the impersonalization of life in this technological, urban decade, and that they are but mere instruments to be manipulated by impersonal machines and institutions which are unresponsive to human needs.*4

The most common response to this feeling of helplessness is what David Riesman has called privatism. Younger people are therefore less interested and involved in the wider society, and place greater value in the areas of their lives that seem most manageable and controllable.*5

The majority of students in the United States do not manifest the strong interest in social and political issues as do the activist students. They are more inclined to stress academic

---

*3 Keniston, Young Radicals, p. 224.


preparation in a vocational or professional field, and this is particularly true of those students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds who are striving for upward mobility.

According to Lipset and Altbach, "American students have never been particularly active politically, and they are not generally expected to actively participate in their society. The new student left is essentially going against the major trends in American academic life. Despite recent widespread publicity, student political activity still is regarded in negative terms by a majority of the students, as well as by many educators and the general public."^46

Of all the recent research on the attitudes and behavior of American students, a comprehensive and continuous long-term study of samples of the Berkeley and Stanford student bodies by Joseph Katz not surprisingly indicates that a considerable majority at each school is passive and conformist. He states:

When we asked these students what they expected to be doing ten years from now, they often replied with a description of a suburban existence that they considered rather routine... Our questionnaire and interview data confirm for more than the majority of students a strongly "privatist" orientation. They rank highest their own individual careers and future family life. Involvement in international, national, or civic affairs, helping other people are ranked astonishingly low and

there is little change from the freshman to the senior years.\textsuperscript{47}

It should not be assumed, however, that because the vast majority of American students are privatistic, careerist, and moderate in their politics, that the university is a conservative environment. There are some schools that do fall into this category, but the majority of universities do seem to have a liberalizing effect on a large number of their students with regard to their attitudes to civil rights, religion, and domestic politics.\textsuperscript{48} Those who attend the universities in the United States liberalizing influence, generally institutions of higher learning are characterized by the values and attitudes of the educated majority of restless students have forced us to analyze and even


\textsuperscript{48} The following sources demonstrate through their research findings that institutions of higher education do have an impact on the personality and attitudes of college students by developing greater tolerance, liberalism, and social sophistication:

- Philip E. Jacob, Changing Values in College (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957);
middle classes. Students attending these schools do reflect attitudes that are more liberal than those of their parents and the mainstream of the middle class, and this liberality has been evident particularly since 1960. Nevertheless, there is a tendency to agree with Katz's conclusions concerning the vast majority that "the primary need still is to wake up students, not to constrain them." This conclusion is indeed significant, for when American students are measured on the scale of conventional radicalism, "those who attend the universities in the United States must be considered a fairly conservative and passive lot."\footnote{Katz, "The Learning Environment," p. 342.}

It matters not that a great majority of students remain largely content, conservative, and apathetic, for a determined minority of restless students have forced us to analyze and even change existing institutions, rules, and values formerly considered fixed and permanent. While it is true that a vocal minority of students are protesting on U. S. campuses, the surprising fact is that very few of the issues center around purely educational or academic matters. A greater concern for educational problems, though necessary, takes a backseat to social and political issues in the larger society. Reports Peterson: "When the responses from all the colleges were combined to form a
national picture, it was observed that (1) issues pertaining to instruction, faculty, and freedom of expression rarely evoked organized student activism, (2) issues bearing on personal freedoms and student participation in the administration of the college somewhat more often generated protest, and (3) civil rights matters locally was the single issue most frequently cited by the deans (38 per cent of them) as leading to student activism.50

The "revolt" at Berkeley in 1964 did, however, open some much needed debate concerning the direction of higher education in this technological age. It is interesting to note that more moderate segments of the student movement, such as the Northern Student Movement, student tutorial projects, and student government committees, have actually taken a more active interest in educational affairs on many campuses than has the New Left. What the New Left has done is to bring an awareness of the problems of the problems of the multiversity to the attention of faculty and students, and it has stimulated debate in the first place.51

Despite the fact that the student revolution has been exaggerated by the press, plagued with organizational difficulties, and unable to sustain an ongoing movement,


51Lipset and Altbach, Student Politics in United States, p. 336.
it is clearly one of the most significant factors on the campus. The militant students will not cause the walls of academia to fall, but they have already succeeded in shaking some long-held notions about higher education. The agitation is not going to cease, because students are often faced with frustrating experiences which arouse indignation and protest. The wine of an effective student movement, once tasted, is not easily forgotten.  

The lesson that we might take from the student protests is one of learning and growth. It is encouraging that students are exercised over the vital issues of our time, and if the gap generationally and politically among students, faculty, and administration can be bridged, a vital source of energy as well as insight into important education and social issues may be used constructively.

Source of Student Discontent

To understand the sources of student dissent, and why protests occur, we must consider various factors, including attitudes, values, and motivations, certain kinds of educational and social settings, and the prevailing cultural climate. When any of these elements, either singly or in combination presents itself, the likelihood of protest is considerably increased. The very backgrounds of activist students is a conditioning factor. "Activists are not drawn from disadvantaged, status-anxious, underprivileged, or uneducated groups;" Keniston tells us, "on

52 Altbach, The Student Movement, p. 427.
the contrary, they are selectively recruited from among those young Americans who have had the most socially fortunate upbringing," coming as they disproportionately do from professional and intellectual families of upper-middle class status.53

There appears to be some qualities or values that can be attributed to activists as indigenous. Many activists are concerned with living out expressed but unimplemented parental values. As Solomon and Fishman indicate in their study of civil rights advocates and peace marchers, many of them are perhaps "acting out" in their demonstrations the values that their parents believed in explicitly, but never had the opportunity or the courage to fight for or practice.54 As a group, activists also seem to possess an unusual capacity for "nurturant identification," that is, they identify with the underdog, the oppressed, and the needy through their empathy and sympathy. Throughout the activist's life he has been encouraged towards self-development, independence, and autonomy, and the dominant ethos of his family is unusually equalitarian, permissive, "democratic," and highly individuated.55

The "broad climate of social criticism in American society" is an important cultural factor in prompting protests, argues Keniston. He alludes to the theme of "universalism" which this society is pressing toward, that is, "an increasing extension of principles like equality, equal opportunity, and fair protection of the law to all groups within the society." Students as well as other segments of the population have become increasingly impatient at the slow "progress" of the non-affluent minority groups, even more so as affluence has increased in American society. "The current student concern for the 'forgotten fifth' was not so much initiated by student activists as it was taken up by them. In this regard, student activists are both caught up in and in the vanguard of a new wave of extension of universalism in American society."56

In fact, by virtue of their economic security, comfort, education, and privileged status, they take their affluence for granted. But these very assets allow them a growing sense of personal involvement, and also to become more complex, to arrive at, in Keniston's words, a more separate selfhood. In an affluent society man has the time and freedom to contemplate the meaning of his life. As Halleck has said, "many restless students do come from affluent homes and many have decided that their existence

is devoid of meaning. Sometimes it seems that their provocative behavior is designed primarily to invent new struggles and even imaginary hardships which will free them from their lethargy and help them atone for their guilt over 'having it so good.'

"One way of looking at student unrest," insists Halleck, "is as a massive reaction to the destruction of that kind of world and way of life which their forebearers [sic] enjoyed but which will be denied to them." Thus, our incredible neglect in the planning and development of the land area our cities are consuming, and the concomitant pollution of air and water, forces adolescents, who grow up in a world in which he must sit back and watch beauty fade and pollution gain, to despair of the future.

Therefore, it is clear that there is a diversity of explanations of student unrest. It is enough to say, however, as Halleck has done so well, that "students have demonstrated to anyone who is willing to read their message that a complacent drifting into the future, an unchecked growth of technology, science, and media cannot take place without profoundly altering the nature of human existence and the character of man. Some of


58 Ibid., p. 7.
the behaviors of youth including many forms of student activism are efforts to warn us of the existence of overwhelming danger."[^59]

**Criticisms of the New Left**

In reviewing this idealism and strong sense of commitment, we should not overlook some of the flaws within the Movement. The New Left has been criticized for its lack of patience, irresponsibility, anti-intellectualism, vagueness, disorganization, fuzzy-mindedness, and attitudes toward authority and morality. There are some who have been critical of the New Left for trying to operate outside the bounds of the Establishment, for its work in attempting to organize the poor, for its emphasis on action, for its notion of leadership, for its ineffectiveness in reaching a larger segment of students, and for its avoidance of long-range programs.

Jencks feels that when the New Left realized that America could not undo racism in a few years, or could not restrain its military, and that radical change would be neither quick nor easy, it soured on America, seeing this country as hopelessly complacent, corrupt, and self-centered.^[60]

Some have insisted that those within the Movement denigrate authority and lack respect or refuse to take advice from their elders. This dilemma over authority results in the New Left

[^59]: Ibid., p. 12.

not having any clear idea as to who would organize a revolution to restructure society, how this "revolution" would be organized, and if this would materialize, who would bring it to power.\textsuperscript{61}

Lowman has charged that "a morality that flaunts the ethical standards of the outside world, while at the same time failing in its moral obligation to think through the effects of one's own actions is questionable."\textsuperscript{62} Lowman, Glazer, and Kelman also are critical of the young radicals' lack of responsibility, and though they are aware that the Movement claims that it is a vehicle for furthering individual freedom, they are curious as to whose freedom is obtained. The New Left is criticized for being content to destroy without offering constructive replacements, its failure to enunciate alternatives, and its choice of direct action ahead of any other channels of change.\textsuperscript{63}

Several writers have accused the New Left of anti-intellectualism. As Glazer has said, "the speeches, articles, and slogans of many new left groups have a strong anti-intellectual tone." She interprets this strain in this way:

This anti-intellectualism of the young students is an important manifestation of their alienation from the traditional intellectual institution, the university,

\textsuperscript{61}Ibid., p. 21.


which the young radicals think of as being largely staffed by the liberal intelligentsia, who receive enormous support from the federal government, including the military agencies and the C.I.A., and by those who produce white papers on government policy in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and so on. It is furthermore, a manifestation of the new leftist's deep commitment to activism, to being part of the "real world" in which hunger and fear predominate, to the exclusion of books or philosophical arguments.64

A more stern indictment is rendered by Altbach. "The student movement finds itself without ideology, and virtually without intellectual roots at a time when serious thinking must be done on educational issues and on problems of international politics."65

Keniston, Kelman, Glazer, Altbach, and others have admitted that the Movement is uncoordinated, fragmented, and disorganized, especially at the national level.

Draper contends that the New Left's attempt to find a course "outside the Establishment but not in collision with the Establishment has not been successful." He goes on to criticize the new radicalism for cutting itself off "from the past, from the lessons of experience, from its own history. It suffers from a morbid fear of repeating the old. This is a gangrenous weakness—not because the old holds the answers, but because it is


only in a study and critique of the old that fruitful new ways can eventually be found. 66

This theme is picked up by Harrington, who feels that the New Left's independence is destined to fail, for in today's complicated societal economy, only by working through a coalition among groups will they be strong enough to change the structure of society. 67 Kelman, Draper, and Newfield are critical of participatory democracy and community organizing or working with the poor. While Kelman recognizes that SDS, in order to make the difficult transition from current American "frustrated democracy" to the "participatory democracy" of the future, counts on the unspoiled poor, it is not clear how this will happen, especially, as he points out, so many of the poor seem interested mainly in partaking of the benefits, however dubious, of 'frustrated democracy.' 68 In the SDS attempt to organize the poor, Draper has stated, "as Negroes, as peasants, or sharecroppers, as workers, even as unemployed workers, particular groups of poor people have a positive social relationship in common. As the 'poor,' they have only a lack in common--lack of money--and no social movement can be held together by a no-thing." 69

---

69 Draper, "In Defense of the 'New Radicals,'" p. 17.
Lowman is particularly critical of the New Left for the emphasis on "active experience" without considering the consequences of its actions. "The movement," says Lowman, "has been unwilling to make a distinction between action as a profession of personal faith and action as a mean to desirable ends. Often there has been action without regard to political consequences." 70

A major criticism of radical students is that their tactics and methods are designed principally to foment violence—that this is a way to achieve their ultimate ends. Howard tells us that "in some instances the protesters have depended on violence from their opponents as a condition of success. Some think that dependence on violence has grown so great that non-violence frequently becomes a strategem to provoke violence." 71

Lipset and Altbach make it clear that the student movement in the United States has played a significant role in the past few years in the civil rights struggle in the South, in focusing attention on problems of higher education through the Berkeley revolt, and in beginning the national foreign policy debate on Vietnam. But they are equally insistent that the student movement "has not succeeded in mobilizing a really

significant segment of the student population, or in substantially influencing either its educational environment or the broader society." This last assertion is based on this country's relatively stable social system, along with its fairly long tradition of political calm. This being the case, it is their contention that radical social movements of any kind have had difficulty in establishing themselves in the United States.72

Positive Values of the New Left

Many of these criticisms are well-taken, and there is little question that the New Left is indeed vulnerable to some of the charges listed. But to put some of these issues in proper perspective, let us take a look at Keniston's treatment of these factors. In his extremely lucid expository, Young Radicals, he gives us a brilliant and deep-seated analysis of the many forces and variables at work both in the Movement and in the lives of the young activists. In order to understand why the young radical works outside the bounds of the establishment, perhaps it helps to perceive his estrangement. "The radical reinterpretation of American society," says Keniston, "requires that the radical redefine his relationship to society and disconnect himself from the liberal vision of social change." This is necessitated because of the radical's intensified awareness of oppression in

72 Lipset and Altbach, Student Politics in United States, p. 346.
American society through his work and daily contact with those who do not participate in the American dream. Thus, "these radicals no longer believed they could count upon existing institutions to effect the changes they sought." As Keniston makes clear, these radicals rebelled "against the options that society offered them as adults. Finding none of these options morally satisfying, they chose an option outside the System--the identity of a radical."  

Keniston does not feel that young radicals revolt against authority, and, in fact, among those he interviewed, he does not see this as an especially important problem. He examines the issue of authority in this way:

When these young men and women criticize the President of the United States, it is not so much because they cannot tolerate constituted authority, as because they consider the President's policies contrary to their own fundamental principles--which they take to be the principles of this country. When they distrust the pronouncements and promises of government officials, it is not so much that they are irrationally distrustful of those in positions of power, but that their own experiences has given them reason to mistrust these pronouncements and promises. And the wariness of these young radicals toward some of their elders seemed less a rebellious projection of hatred of their fathers than a reflection of the very real differences in outlook and style that separate the generations. The early attempts of these young radicals to "work within the System" suggest that their first impulse

73 Keniston, Young Radicals, p. 131.
74 Ibid., p. 219.
was to trust authorities and authoritative agencies; it was through experience that they turned away.\(^7\)

Even Christopher Jancks, who has been critical of the New Left, inserts this qualifier in defining its attitude toward authority:

While the weakness of the New Left does indeed derive from anti-authoritarianism, so does its strength. If the New Left were less concerned with equality, with participation, and with personal freedom, it would find it much easier to build organizations which could influence American politics and perhaps ultimately win power. But it would lose its essential identity and its value to the United States.\(^6\)

Katz, Keniston, and others have indicated that far from being irresponsible, those students involved in the movement have demonstrated by their very commitment to unpopular causes and issues, that they reflect qualities of responsibility most valued by a concerned citizenry. According to Keniston, "at the level of even more basic personal values, these young men and women had been brought up to cherish honesty, responsibility, seriousness, and thoughtfulness. Their work in the New Left, far from requiring them to repudiate these values, offered an arena in which they could act on them."\(^7\)

To the charge of being fuzzy-minded, vague, and disorganized, Keniston responds by saying that "the characteristic

\(^{75}\)Tbid., p. 220.


\(^{77}\)Keniston, Young Radicals, p. 117.
vagueness of these New Leftists as to the specifics of their vision of a just, free, peaceful, participatory society may be related not only to their distrust of simple blueprints, but to the fact that contemplation of the distant future arouses feelings of frustration, discouragement, and despair that would undermine their effectiveness in short range. "78 This, then, he feels, is one of the origins of their non-programmatic outlook. An even more significant rationale is indicated by Keniston when he states: "Whatever its psychological meanings, the avoidance of long-range programs and 'utopian' visions of the ideal future is not an unconscious symptom, but largely a deliberate position. The New Left is different from the Old Left in part because it emphasizes process rather than program, and because it seeks to avoid the doctrinaire interpretation of society, the rigid structuring of goals, and the inflexible definitions of the ideal of earlier radicalism."79 As to being disorganized, his response is that "to criticize the New Left for not being an efficient political organization or a complete philosophical system is to criticize it for not being what it tries hard not to be. Its political goals are not to win the next election, or the one after, but to increase the social and political consciousness of the

78 Ibid., p. 143.
79 Ibid., p. 181.
American people."\(^{80}\) Despite this spirited defense, it remains to be seen, Keniston forthrightly concedes, whether a movement that emphasizes tactics rather than goals and which seeks a mass base as well as political effectiveness, can achieve the "necessary impetus, persuasiveness, and direction without clearer statements of goals, priorities, and positive programs."\(^{81}\) And though Keniston deeply understands the fear of ruthless authority, abuse of power, and the legitimate anxieties engendered within the New Left, he, too, questions the use of participatory democracy in mounting an effective program on a national scale. This insistence on mutual group participation relating to the power of decision-making is perhaps best explained by the fact that the young radicals are "psychologically and ideologically hostile to formally defined, inflexible roles and traditional bureaucratic patterns of power. In their personal manner and values, these young men and women favor open, equal, and direct relationships with other people."\(^{82}\)

Basically, the tactics of the New Left are those of direct action and non-violence. States Upton Sinclair, in reacting to a previous article critical of the New Left: "The work goes on, and the need for it grows greater. Social justice without

\(^{80}\)Ibid., p. 286.
\(^{81}\)Ibid., pp. 170-71.
\(^{82}\)Ibid., p. 164.
violence is our dream, and our appeal to all who share it--and are willing to work for it."\(^{83}\) Keniston reports: "Despite the psychological and historical forces that are moving today's young radicals toward resistance, those interviewed are in no way a personally violent or psychologically aggressive group. Although the issues of struggle and conflict are central to their psychological development and historical position, their early experience disposed them to argue, persuade, and discuss, rather than coerce or attack."\(^{84}\) Indeed, the paradox of the psychologically non-violent revolutionary is that "on the one hand, he seeks to minimize violence, but, on the other, his efforts often elicit violence from others. He works toward a vague vision of a peaceful world, but he must confront more directly than most of his peers the warfare of the world."\(^{85}\)

Contrary to the writings of some observers, studies by Heist, Katz, Keniston, and others cite intellectualism as the most pronounced characteristic of the new breed of student activists. Heist describes the criteria of intellectualism manifested by rebel leaders as a high "degree of interest in the learning-reasoning process as well as in the world of ideas," a greater

---


\(^{84}\) Keniston, \textit{Young Radicals}, p. 203.

\(^{85}\) \textit{Tbid.}, p. 255.
perception of the world, and a deep "concern for the lives and welfare of others." 86 Joseph Katz, in speaking of the positive factors that motivate students to become activists, reports that activists are more highly motivated intellectually, are better academic performers, and have higher academic aptitudes. As he puts it, "the frustrations of a curriculum felt to be inadequate are thus particularly great for students who care about intellectual matters in the first place. Moreover, these students have been stimulated by the university they find fault with—by the greater expression of dissensual views and more heterodox opinions that distinguish colleges and universities from the lower levels of education." 87

Keniston, in his analysis of "post modern youth," explains their conception of knowledge as it relates to action, to being part of the world.

Knowledge, to be worthy of the name, must be relevant, personally meaningful, and a guide to action. Most of what is taught in schools, colleges, and universities, according to this view, is an indirect apology for the existing System, technical training that "adjusts" people to become good workers in the System, or aridly disconnected from the "really important" questions of man's nature, destiny, and relationship to society. It would be wrong simply to label this criticism "anti-intellectual," for most new radicals and not


87 Joseph Katz, The Student Activists, p. 5.
a few hippies are themselves intellectual people, actively engaged in a pursuit of "relevant" knowledge. What is demanded is that intelligence be engaged with the world, just as action should be informed by knowledge.88

The Role of the Activist and His Influence on the Future

The young men and women of the New Left seek new kinds of learning—learning, says Keniston, "that maximizes the involvement of the intellect in the individual's experience, instead of divorcing the two. The 'merely academic' is eschewed because it gives so little weight to either inner life or personal experience. What is sought is a means of connecting the knowledge of the past to the experience of the present so that together they inform life and action."89

Since the young activist is geared to the present, to action, to experience, he often seeks a career that is unconventional. If this is true, where will he find career opportunities for his talents, and what kind of future does this suggest for him? Does this mean he will be forced to live and work outside the traditional establishment structure? What really is his view of the prevailing societal institutions, and how will this affect his pursuing his life goals? To answer these questions, we will take a look at the activist's view of career goals, his perception of our present "system," and how this

88 Keniston, Young Radicals, pp. 283-84.
89 Ibid., p. 288.
relates to his future. Furthermore, we will attempt to describe the implications of these trends for the future of our society, and to examine the role of the activist student who is giving direction to these trends.

The basic value commitments of the activists tend to be academic and non-vocational. In rejecting careerist and familist goals, as Keniston, Harrington, Trent, Flacks, and others have reported, they espouse humanitarian, expressive, and self-actualizing values. As we have noted earlier, their fields of academic specialization are chiefly in the humanities and the social sciences. As Newfield has indicated, these young people have indeed displayed a prophetic function. In recent years, there has been a decided trend away from careers in business, and to the shock of the business world, the elite students seem to be more interested in the Peace Corps than in the corporations. In 1966, the Harris poll interviewed a cross section of college seniors to learn of their future plans. Only 12 per cent wanted a career in business, while 24 per cent looked to teaching and 55 per cent aimed at being professionals. Many of our young people have simply turned their backs on what they consider to be the crass materialism of the new affluence. Students, says Keniston, "tend not only to have a highly negative view of the

---

90As reported by Michael Harrington, Introduction to A Prophetic Minority, p. 10.
work of the average American adult, seeing it as sterile, empty, and unrewarding, but to feel themselves caught up in a system which they can neither change nor escape."\(^{91}\) The adult world that beckons them seems "cold, mechanical, abstract, specialized, an emotionally meaningless place in which one simply goes through the motions, but without conviction that the motions are worthy, humane, dignified, relevant, or exciting."\(^{92}\)

Young men and women today display a strong distrust of involvement with conventional institutional roles. This is, perhaps, most dramatically expressed in "the almost universal desire among the highly involved to avoid institutionalized careers."\(^{93}\) Data from an ongoing study undertaken by Flacks suggest that not only do few student activists look toward careers in the professions, the sciences, industry, or traditional politics, but that many of them expect to continue to work full-time in the "movement" or to become free-lance writers, artists, intellectuals. In fact, a high proportion are oriented toward a career in the academic world, for activists still feel that this type of career permits "freedom," and is legitimate.\(^{94}\)

\(^{91}\)Keniston, Social Change and Youth in America, p. 173.
\(^{92}\)Ibid., p. 170.
Students today take for granted their life of relative affluence, and this is especially true of children of the upper-middle class, a category typical of the activist student. Because of these factors, the young are today searching and questioning the base of this prosperity. Thus, life must be meaningfully sought elsewhere, in art, love, philosophy, service to others, and in intensified experience. Increased education and leisure have permitted a minority of students to manifest a special sensitivity to the oppressed and the dissenting everywhere. This, then, is possibly the first generation in which a substantial number of the young have had the impulse to both free themselves from concerns of a conventional nature and can afford to do so. Thus, Flacks terms them a "liberated generation," for affluence has freed them, for a while at least, from some of "the anxieties and preoccupations which have been the defining features of American middle class social character."96

Commitment to the New Left seems to have occurred for many activists as entry into the Establishment became more imminent. This was not because they had not "proved" themselves in terms of success as defined by American society, for most of the young men and women of the New Left had excelled; but they had

95 Keniston, The Sources of Student Dissent, p. 316.
drawn very little satisfaction from their achievements. Indeed, they turned their backs on success they could easily achieve. They are running away from the 9 to 5 life, the mortgage, the ranch house in the suburbs. Thus, the increasing sense of inadequacy of their own lives, and the fact that the Establishment options held little attraction for them, inspired in them a feeling that the direction in which they were headed was meaningless, irrelevant, and above all, ethically inadequate. This is not to say that most young radicals did not attempt to work within the System, for indeed this was their first impulse. "It was often only after the apparent failure of such efforts, and only with the developing conviction that the System could not be trusted to remedy its injustices, that they turned toward a Movement that stressed the need for new institutions." These young people value personal, I-thou encounters between individuals, especially as they recognize the uniqueness of the individual. Therefore, it is their feeling that the ultimate judge of a man's life is the quality of his personal relationships, and in all too many cases, youth today feels that this form of relatedness and trust are absent in institutionalized roles and jobs. The young radical is devoted to personalism, that is, his attempt is to help people be people. Hypocrisy and artificiality are vociferously

97Keniston, Young Radicals, p. 129.
condemned, as are all conventions, prejudices, institutions, and stereotypes; and in their place they promote self-expression, which will permit people to be people.

In all of this there is a certain existential commitment manifesting itself, and the dignity of man is vehemently upheld. This form of existentialism is concerned with the unfolding of the individual as a whole in the situation in which he finds himself. Thus, man is a being in this world, according to Heidegger, not just a political animal as conceived by Aristotle. Individualism, then, becomes a significant force in the life style of the young activist. In this context, individualism is not conceived as a "return" of the Protestant Ethic, but rather the individual, rather than society, must be the paramount end. Or put another way, rather than fitting the individual to the group, fit the group to the person, for truly the individual is more creative than the group.98 Soren Kierkegaard, the father of existentialism, protested any sort of action that would exalt society at the price of submerging the individual. The young activist also feels keenly about this, that the individual is irreplaceable, and that he should be treated as if he personally mattered. It would seem, then, that this is what the activist has dedicated himself to achieving.

---

98See William H. Whyte, Jr., The Organization Man (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1957), particularly chapter VII.
But what of the future prospects, both for the activist and the larger society? What impact will he have on our future society, and will his activity be an increasing or diminishing phenomenon?

The future of the student protest movement in the United States will continue to depend on multiple factors. The active expressions of dissent have increased because of an interaction of individual, institutional, cultural, and historical factors. Keniston has indicated that if the cultural climate in this country remains the same, student activism and protest will continue to be visible features on the American social landscape. He bases his reasoning on the fact that there will be more and more students who come from the upper-middle class, highly educated, politically liberal, professional backgrounds from which protesters are selectively recruited. In addition, there appears to be an emerging trend of middle class America families who advocate an expressive, permissive, democratic, and autonomy-producing atmosphere in the home. Criticisms of American society will also probably continue and intensify, and Keniston posits this on two grounds: "first, that it has excluded a significant minority from its prosperity, and second, that affluence alone is empty without humanitarian, aesthetic, or expressive fulfillment."

Thus, he foresees in the next decade, not only the continuation of activism in American society, but a "slowly growing minority of
the most talented, empathic, and intellectually independent of our students who will take arms against injustice both here and abroad."

Daniel Moynihan's historical perspective is not so optimistic, or gloomy, as is Keniston's, for he is less critical of our present era, despite his own alliance with the activists over an impatience with America to attain its basic creedal values for all of its citizens. While recognizing that the revolutionary aspect of history can never be over-simplified, he pays credence to J. H. Plumb's "The History of Human Society," who states "that the condition of man now is superior to what it was." Moynihan goes on to say that things are better, and this is especially true in the liberal industrial democracies of the North Atlantic world. "I hold," he says, "these regimes to be the best accommodation to the human condition yet devised, and will demand to know of those who reject it, just what they have in mind as a replacement." 100

Regardless of this viewpoint, organized expressions of youth disaffection are likely to be an increasingly visible and established feature of our society. Flacks has suggested that in

99 Keniston, The Sources of Student Dissent, pp. 320-23.
many important ways, the new radicalism is really not new, but rather a more widespread version of certain subcultural phenomena with a considerable history. He outlines what he considers the early roots of today's radicalism, including the movement to Greenwich Village of a considerable number of university educated persons during the 19th and 20th century, the creation there of the first visible bohemian subculture in the United States, the influence of Freud and Dewey upon them, and their shared values and style of life as having become strongly rooted in American life. Thus, these abstract values have become embodied as personality traits in the new generation. It is this thesis that "the rootedness of the bohemian and quasi-bohemian subcultures, and the spread of their ideas with the rapid increase in the number of college graduates, suggests that there will be a steadily increasing number of families raising their children with considerable ambivalence about dominant values, incentives, and expectations in the society." Flacks feels, therefore, that students who engage in protest are often not "converts" to a "deviant" adaptation, but people who have been socialized into a developing cultural tradition.¹⁰¹

Today, the ideal of social action is defining a generation. Although both Moynihan and Newfield and others point out that the

New Left has only a fraction of the whole truth, it is the fragment glimpsed by this generation.

Newfield comments with vivid imagery:

In the immediate future, the impulse to rebel will continue to grow among marginal groups like students, Negroes, migrant farm workers, intellectuals, and white-collar workers. This will happen because the generators of dissent—war, bureaucracy, guilt-producing affluence, racism, hypocrisy, moral rot—are enduring in the fabric of American society. If the Vietnam war is settled, there will be another one in Thailand, or Angola, or Peru. If Bobby Baker is jailed, there will be another fast buck politician exposed. If the killers of Goodman, Chaney, and Schwerner are convicted, there will be other atrocities in the South. All this means that the New Left—and the other sections of the society in motion—will grow and become even more uncomfortably radical. 102

These are the young men and women who will insist that society heed the poor—the voteless, the powerless, the victimized, and those who are just plain angry for decades of injustice. And they have become the advocates, as someone has said, "because no one else is doing the marching." To demand any more of this generation is to deny the responsibility of the last one—and the possibility of the next.

During the 1950's, students were criticized for their conformity, their interest in the big corporation, in job security. They were called the Silent Generation. Many of the

102 Newfield, A Prophetic Minority, pp. 154-55.
same people who registered their complaint about student apathy and non-involvement are today complaining because of student activism, militancy, the New Left. Students have historically expressed their frustrations at "changing the system," or even objected to their being unable to work within the confines of legitimate politics (which were sewed up by the "professionals" and the machine). In the year 1968, thousands of young people responded anew and rallied under the banner of Senator Eugene McCarthy. His has been an inspirational message, and has taken a stance free of the traditional slogans and cliches of the past. As it has been said, the students of today want democracy, not power; and Senator McCarthy's candidacy reflected all of the core values with which they so strongly identified. What this demonstrated is that students are willing to work constructively within legitimate channels and under traditional structure if these be untarnished by manipulation, corruption, and self-aggrandizement. Should the McCarthy "children's crusade" be given short shrift—that is, if those in authority and those who hold the traditional power in society indicate that the efforts of the students is a commendable exercise in citizenship, but that the ultimate decisions are far too serious for them to heed the voices and demands of youth—then the consequences of such a rebuff could be long and lasting.
The University itself is often times the focal point of all of this activity and, concomitantly, this restlessness on the part of students. Students are part of the university at a point in time in their psychological maturity when they are attempting to find themselves, when they are endeavoring to examine with open curiosity many of the variables that affect their lives. Thus, the university, as an institution perceived by them as representing society in microcosm, finds itself being poked at by the activist student until he finds weak spots. It is precisely because of the university's antiquated structure, its gross resistance to change—perhaps as much if not more than most societal institutions—and its particular mode of governmental operation that it is vulnerable to annoying probings by students. Sociologist Allan Silver put it quite interestingly in referring to the radical student leaders at Columbia University by saying that

a lot of them come here seeking a permanent home. They find a filthy house. They perceive the arbitrary authority of the professors, the pressures of grades, of graduate schools, the draft, early specialization. These are real problems. They really want to get at society, but they're not in American society here. They're young. They have no access to power. The only thing they can force to respond to them is the university—tolerant of their ways, vulnerable, a soft touch.103

Silver also comments, though, that the university also serves as the base and object of their political style. If more students were able to channel their energies into constructive pursuits like political action for Senator McCarthy or social causes like civil rights, they would be less likely to attack the university. They do attack it, though, because it is readily available to them, and it happens to coincide with their social and political awareness at this particular time in their personality development.

It would seem today that the idealism of part of the middle class of the early 1960's is ebbing. By 1968, many American students lost confidence in themselves and in the middle class; thus they reject the middle class value system.

Recognizing this mood, Senator McCarthy has been quoted to this effect:

America stands today at a critical point of decision. It can go in the direction of continued war and violence and further bureaucratization and automatization of man, or it can go in the direction of personalism and reason and a spiritual renewal. There is no country in which such a renewal is so important as in the United States . . . This aim demands the creation of a new mood in our nation: A mood of hope and love of life rather than that of hopelessness and attraction to the mechanical and lifeless. ¹⁰⁴

The young activist is saying that we need to show that we can bring institutions close to people, that we must break down

impersonality and bigness. He contends that middle class coat-and-tie conventionalism need not obscure our unique qualities. While it is true that many of the essential principles of parents, elders, and traditional institutions can persist, even those who seek to maintain the continuity of a tradition must assume a creative and innovating role. In addition to rediscovering the vital ideals of the past, we need to create new ideals, values, and utopias in order to help us to adapt creatively to a world rent by sweeping transformations.105 Young students are concerned with and protesting a future society that may not meet humanistic needs.

There is little question that qualitatively, a small number of our youth have changed the character of our society. What is even more significant is that the majority of society's members are on youth's side of the gap. This raises the possibility that society will have to accommodate itself to youth, instead of youth to society.

In summary, perhaps the key concept in understanding this entire phenomenon is change—blinding, swift, relentless change. It is the name of our age and our culture, and its pervasiveness generates widespread social consequences, psychocultural climates, and the transformation of institutions. In this society of chronic

change, one of its products is the engaged personality, the activist student, moving in response to the problems caused by change. Thus, we find that students take on a new dimension as agents of change, particularly in the social arena. The question remains, is our society generating new forms and institutional structures to accommodate itself to this unprecedented rate of change? Our questions, then, are only partially answered. Considerably more planning needs to be done so that our society not only will not raise a future generation of despairing individuals, but will be humane and compassionate as well.

Summary

In this chapter, we have reviewed some of the relevant data in the literature concerning the New Left and the young student activist. We began by studying the historical growth of the Movement and some of its characteristics as delineated by such writers as Peterson, Katz, Heist, Lipset and Altbach, Flacks and Keniston. These writers view the activist as being psychologically ready to act vis-a-vis passivity. They see that his general orientation is toward mastery of frustrating conditions as opposed to submission or acquiescence to such conditions, and that he is ready to risk economic security and personal well-being both at present and in the future for the ideals of true equality and social justice for mankind. Fundamentally, they have
identified his rejection of the social and political status quo, but actively seeking to reshape institutional structures. Furthermore, they have pointed out the alienation and rejection of the traditional societal values by the student activist. Keniston and Flacks emphasize the adoption by the activist student of a new life style that is contradictory to the general tenets held historically by Western Civilization—an emphasis on hard work, self-discipline, personal responsibility, and success.

Erikson and Keniston particularly have focussed on the rapidity of social change, the rise of technologism, and its affect on individual identity. In addition to the sources of student discontent, the shortcomings and strengths of the New Left were presented.

Finally, the future role and societal contribution of the student activist and their existential commitment was analyzed as it relates to the present life style of the former officers of NSA and SDS.

In this study, we shall present quantitative, empircial data bearing upon the questions raised by these various viewpoints. An effort is made to determine which of these phenomena have relevance for the actual lives of former NSA and SDS leaders. Further, we attempt an analysis and evaluation of the merits of the theory that this period of history involving accelerated social and technological change is instrumental in encouraging a
new or different style of life for those activist students who have experienced this matrix of converging societal forces.

Chapter II will present a brief historical perspective for both NSA and SDS. It will also include a statement of the eight hypotheses and the methodology used in this study.
CHAPTER II

METHOD OF RESEARCH

Background and History of N.S.A.¹

The origin of the National Student Association dates back to the period immediately following World War II. In August, 1946, twenty-five American students representing six organizations and ten colleges attended a World Student Congress in Prague called to form an International Union of Students (IUS). Upon their return, the Prague 25 realized that a national organization of students in the United States was lacking, so they constituted themselves as the Committee for a Chicago Student Conference. Some 500 delegates met at the Conference in

¹The two major sources used in obtaining historical information about NSA are as follows:
Chicago where a National Continuations Committee was elected and plans were laid for a Constitutional Convention of a National Student Organization to be held in the summer of 1947. The Constitutional Convention met in Madison, Wisconsin and discussed several issues which were to become dominant themes of the new national union of students: academic freedom, elimination of discriminatory practices in education, improvement of the intellectual atmosphere of American campuses. The National Student Association was officially formed with a national staff, and it was determined that membership would be restricted to democratic student governments.

As early as 1948, the Association concerned itself with a Faculty Rating System, human relations programming, and curricular revision, and in 1949 the Second National Student Congress discussed a Student Bill of Rights and federal aid to education. While interested in domestic and campus issues, the Association also identified with international programs and students. In 1950, a meeting of twenty-one national unions of students met in Stockholm to create a less formal conference than that of the IUS, and to provide for the autonomy of individual national organizations. This organization became known as the International Student Conference (ISC), and was to eschew partisan politics and operate as an open forum in which national student organizations could cooperate on common problems.
Some of the campus and national issues that NSA gave its attention were fraternity discrimination, leadership training, opposition to commercialization and abuses of intercollegiate athletics, freedom of the college press, the presence of discrimination in higher education, civil liberties, limitations on freedom of expression and campus due process, lowering of the voting age to 18, opposition to compulsory R.O.T.C., and student mental health. During the period from 1954 to 1960, the Association was the recipient of a number of foundation grants. In 1954, the Ford Foundation granted NSA $30,000 for a project to encourage students to become involved in campus administrative projects, and a $29,400 Student Activities Study project in 1955 outlined the nature and scope of student government, and student government participation in campus policy formation. The findings of the latter study supported the prevailing viewpoint on the limitation of student government powers. Another Ford Foundation grant in 1958 was designed to encourage students to contribute to the solution of some of the problems increasing enrollments were beginning to cause American colleges and universities. The project emphasized: recruitment of teachers; independent study programs and curriculum evaluation; and counseling services. Under a grant from the Field Foundation in 1959, the Southern Student Human Relations Seminar was established. Interracial in nature, the purpose of the seminar was to promote better under-
standing of racial relations by bringing together Southern student leaders. Civil rights provided a major focus for the Association, and strong support was given in 1954 to the Supreme Court decision of desegregation in education. In 1961, NSA raised $10,000 to support SNCC's work in the South. The Association also supported the omnibus civil rights bill in 1963 through Congressional testimony.

A basic policy declaration defining the role and obligation of students in society and the relationship of the declaration to their essential job on campus was adopted by the 13th National Student Congress at the University of Minnesota in August, 1960.

USNSA recognizes the great value of student involvement in programs of political and social action and the integral connection of these programs with the educational process. While recognizing that a student must devote primary attention to his academic program, the USNSA urges student participation in legitimate social and political activities. The student should be an active, informed, responsible participant in the democratic life of the campus, local, state, national and international communities. The student should seek with interest those problems which will lead to responsible involvement in social and political action. And in this connection, the student should be concerned not simply with problems of direct relevance to the academic community, but as well with those great problems and issues of national and international life.

At the Fourteenth National Congress at the University of Wisconsin, the major issue was a controversial resolution favoring the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The resolution passed by a close vote.
The Association indicated its concern for international affairs in a variety of ways. Working with other organizations, such as World University Service, it developed material relief and scholarships for students in Africa, Asia, Latin America and many other parts of the world. An International Student Relations Seminar was held at Harvard in 1954, and in the same year at the ISC conference in Istanbul, NSA voted along with the other 42 national union of students to investigate alleged denials of student rights all over the world. Among its other international projects, the Association worked closely with foreign student organizations in the United States, gave moral support to the South Africans' struggle against apartheid legislation, developed a student exchange program with the Soviet Union in which six American and Russian student editors toured each others' countries for two months in the summer of 1958, advanced a cultural affairs program that sent delegations of student performing artists on tour in university centers abroad, and developed a National Student Film Festival for showing to students in foreign countries. A Foreign Student Leadership Project was undertaken in 1956 with a grant of $128,000 to bring foreign students primarily from underdeveloped areas to the United States for one year of study in student organization and leadership. At two separate ISC conferences, NSA supported the Algerian students in their struggle for an independent Algeria, and supported an ISC resolution against nuclear testing.
Throughout this period, the Association was periodically subjected to attack for its national and international posture. In 1952, the right wing Students for America attacked the USNSA, and in 1959 a blistering attack was leveled by a former research assistant for Senator Joseph McCarthy. Again in 1961, the Young Americans for Freedom attacked the organization.

In the sixties, as the attention of the student community grew from the national problem of segregation to include the international problem of war in Vietnam, and as the means of student involvement broadened from the sit-ins to include a variety of techniques of social action, the Association continued to act as a forum and catalyst for the universe of students nationally.

From the time of the Constitutional Convention until now, the concerns of USNSA have remained remarkably unchanged. Racial equality, academic freedom, student participation in academic policy formation, improvement of student government, international student cooperation and stimulation of student concern—these have remained constant, and in the last analysis, define the Association. The preamble to the USNSA Constitution is perhaps the best summary of the goals of the Association:

We, the members of the National Union of Students of the United States, desiring: to maintain academic freedom, academic responsibility and student rights; to develop better educational standards, facilities and teaching methods; to improve student cultural,
social and physical welfare; to promote international understanding and fellowship; to guarantee to all people, because of their inherent dignity as individuals, equal rights and possibilities for primary, secondary and higher education regardless of sex, race, religion, political belief or economic circumstance; to foster the recognition of the rights and responsibilities of students to the school, the community, humanity and God; and to preserve the interests and integrity of the government and Constitution of the United States of America do hereby establish this Constitution of the United States National Student Association.

One additional bit of information needs to be discussed to make this history complete.² Beginning in 1952, NSA received considerable financial backing from the Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A.). This relationship developed during the McCarthy era domestically and the Cold War internationally. Because of the need to offset Communist influence with students at the various international conferences, the C.I.A. was only too willing to assist NSA in a covert way. This relationship began innocently enough when members of NSA approached the U. S. government to outline their difficulty in raising funds for international activities abroad. The government suggested a foundation that would be sympathetic to these needs, and it was later learned

²Two special sources provided material concern the NSA-C.I.A. relationship:
Sol Stern, "A Short Account of International Student Politics & the Cold War, with Particular Reference to the NSA, CIA, etc." Ramparts, January 25, 1969, pp. 87-97.
that the foundation was acting on behalf of the C.I.A. Three foundations have been identified as having been the chief channel of C.I.A. funds to NSA: the J. Frederick Brown Foundation, the Independence Foundation, and the Sidney and Esther Rabb Charitable Foundation. Between 1962 and 1965, NSA received $256,483 in grants for its international programs from the Independence Foundation. In 1964, 80 per cent of NSA's budget came ultimately from C.I.A. sources, most of it earmarked for international programs.

The officers whom the C.I.A. took into their confidence were the president and the international affairs vice-president of the association. Few, if any, of the officers or staff that worked on NSA's national programs knew of the C.I.A. involvement. Of the money spent on international projects, many went toward worthwhile goals. In 1958, for example, NSA gave 60 scholarships to nationalistic Algerian students who were expelled from French universities during the Algerian War.

In 1965, NSA extricated itself from its relationship with the C.I.A.

Background and History of S.D.S.³

SDS has a long and complicated prehistory going back to 1905, when Clarence Darrow, Jack London, and Upton Sinclair

³The two major sources utilized in gathering historical background about SDS are as follows:
founded the League for Industrial Democracy. During the 1920's the LID launched a youth division called the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID), whose politics were Fabian socialist.

In the formal sense SDS is a direct descendant of SLID. After the end of World War II, SLID was revived, under the leadership of James Farmer, who later became national chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). After a decline of membership in the fifties, LID decided to revitalize its student department in 1960, rechristening it the Students for a Democratic Society.

The revival was led by a trio from the University of Michigan, Al Haber, Tom Hayden, and Bob Ross, who took it over in 1960 and gave it an active orientation. In May, 1960, Haber organized a conference on Human Rights at Ann Arbor attended by over 150 students. Slowly, the concept of a new direct action, non-ideological national student organization began to grow. A group of about 35 met at Ann Arbor in December, 1961 to set up an SDS executive structure and agree upon a founding convention to be held the following June. The official founding convention was held June 11-15 at the FDR Labor Center at Port Huron, Michigan. (The organization dates its birth from Port Huron, Michigan.)

---

not from the LID action in 1960.) It was attended by fifty-nine individuals, representing eleven functioning SDS chapters, or groups. The delegates debated over the definition of the Port Huron Statement drafted by Tom Hayden. The manifesto showed the strong influence of C. Wright Mills and Erich Fromm, supported political realignment, and suggested that the university was the catalytic agent of social change. It attacked capitalism and the welfare state, the military-industrial complex, the university concept of in loco parentis, the Soviet Union because of its "suppression of organized opposition," and America's support of totalitarian governments.

What SDS founders were groping for in their early statements was a theory or narrow ideology that could simultaneously encompass their ideals of democracy and serve as a guide for social change. By June, 1963, SDS had 900 dues-paying members. Many were student government leaders, campus editors, or graduate students.

SDS concentrated much of its early energy by attempting to meld education and action programs around economic issues. In 1963, Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers gave SDS $5,000 to aid in this effort. This grant turned out to be the beginning of ERAP (Economic Research and Action Project) and enabled SDS to jump from the campus into the ghetto. ERAP basically involved community organizing, mainly of the poor. The most active
community project in 1964-65 was in Newark under the coordination of Tom Hayden. Another community project was organized in the "Uptown" area of Chicago and was called JOIN (Jobs or Income Now). ERAP provided a mechanism to begin implementing the values and "participatory democracy" of the Port Huron Statement. It gave college students a chance to leave the ivory-tower of the campus and provided them with a way to act, to experience, and to confront segregation and poverty directly. Those who took part in the community projects closely resembled SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) civil rights workers in their outlook and life style. They brought to the North what SNCC workers had brought to the South: their sense of alienation, love of the poor, and impatience about social change.

In April, 1965, SDS organized a march of 25,000 on Washington to protest the war in Vietnam. The teach-in movement was born in Ann Arbor, with the help of the biggest chapter of SDS. During that period, strong chapters developed at Swarthmore, the University of Texas, Johns Hopkins, and in the Boston colleges.

The politics of SDS are rooted in ethical values which are at the same time a-historical and action-accented. This value reflects what has been called the "post-Nuremberg ethic", which means every individual is morally responsible in toto for everything he does. Carl Oglesby, one of the early presidents of SDS, saw in the organization a romantic, transcendentalist
quality. The concern of SDS in his view "is to make love more possible."

The essence of SDS, participatory democracy (the importance of the individual and his ability to make meaningful decisions that affect his life), led SDS to be critical of existing bureaucratic structures, and to go into the ghetto and organize the poor into their own organization. It was SDS that injected economics into the early civil rights movement, and underlined the role of private American capitalism in supporting foreign as well as American racism. The real task visualized by the ERAP group, a vision which most of SDS shares, is to gain freedom from the "one dimensional society" which controls by "terror, welfare, and vested interests". Almost all SDS members are convinced that in order to survive the might of the Establishment, the emphasis of new politics must be on letting the people choose, on decentralizing decision-making.

In 1969, SDS had some 6,000 dues-paying members in 300 to 400 chapters across the country, but commands a following at least ten times that number. Since the days of the Port Huron statement, SDS has evolved from a somewhat reformist organization into a revolutionary one. It is convinced that "the system" will resist all meaningful reform, and is dedicated to forcing the processes of change. This shift has been accompanied by growing pressures from some of its members for more discipline and central
control, the necessary elements of a strong classical revolutionary body. Up to this point, SDS has resisted such pressures. The leadership remains mainly advisory, and local chapters are highly autonomous. The national council tries to develop theoretical positions as guides for the membership, but the chapters retain the right to implement issues as they see fit.

Recently, individual chapters have displayed increasing militance and resistance as they become frustrated with the pace of change. By virtue of the guerilla tactics of some members of SDS, it is suggested that only a fraction of its history is already written.

Statement of the Research Problem

The question that presents itself here is this: have the social forces and institutions of our present culture—family, social class, education, politics—influenced the former officers of two national student organizations, NSA and SDS, in the adoption of a life style that is unique and deviates from the conventional pattern of our modern society? Is there a distinction between the life style formed since college of SDS officers as compared to NSA officers? What are some of the other pressures impinging upon these persons that aided the development or formulation of their particular life style?

An attempt is made in this thesis to shed some further light on these queries. Tests of the following hypotheses will be made to determine significance of difference:
Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their political orientation.

2. There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their social orientation.

3. There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their aesthetic interests.

4. There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their literary interests.

5. There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their academic achievement in college.

6. There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in the choice of their major field of concentration in college and/or graduate work.

7. There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their religious preference.

8. There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their choice of career or occupation.
Methods and Procedures

In order to gather the information necessary to complete this study, the decision was made to draft a questionnaire containing questions of both a quantitative and qualitative nature. The determination to use a questionnaire as a measuring instrument was based on the fact that the respondents were distributed over a wide geographical area; thus, a questionnaire would afford the best means to obtain the data. The primary purpose of the instrument used in the study, a questionnaire, was to obtain a description of the present life patterns of the former national officers of NSA and SDS. By utilizing this form of measuring device, it was felt that we would be able to confine the responses to meaningful knowledge and in accordance with the information desired.

A questionnaire to be utilized in a pilot study was presented to two members of the Dissertations Committee for their comments and suggested changes. The pilot study was then undertaken in the Fall of 1968. Ten students from Roosevelt University, seniors and graduate students, were contacted by Dr. Helena Lopata, Professor of Sociology, and were asked to complete a questionnaire. Students were chosen from Roosevelt University and from a class in sociology because of the lack of traditional behavior and non-conformism characteristic of students from that institution and
that discipline.* Also, these students were easily accessible to our residence in Chicago. It also insured that these student respondents would not appear in the final sample. Contact with Dr. Lopata enabled us to announce in one of her classes our need for respondents willing to aid us in our study. Ten students spoke with me following class and agreed to participate in the pilot study. We distributed one questionnaire to each student, and they were permitted to take them home and complete them at their convenience; thus, the questionnaire was self-administered. Arrangements were made for the student-respondents to return the completed questionnaires to our office. Each questionnaire was subsequently returned personally, and all the questionnaires were returned within two weeks.

The questionnaire consisted of twelve pages, four pages of which contained 17 open-ended questions; the other eight pages contained 83 items, objective statements relating to personal and educational background, parental attitudes, economic,

*Roosevelt University was founded in 1945 to provide opportunity for learning and teaching in conditions of freedom and equality. The University from the beginning sought both teachers and students not only dedicated to the essential themes of a democratic society, but also the admission of students based on individual merit and without regard to race, color, or creed. It was the first university to admit a sizable number of black students, and its short history has been marked by its highly liberal viewpoint and its willingness to give the educational maverick a vehicle for free expression.
educational and social class of family, literary and aesthetic interests, and political attitudes. A copy of the pilot questionnaire can be found in Appendix I.

During the Fall of 1968 and Winter of 1969, the questionnaire was refined based on the results of the pre-test. This was necessitated due to some awkward and inappropriate questions encountered in the administration of the pilot study. To facilitate ease in responding to the questionnaire, a number of the questions were rearranged, and a rewording of some of the questions was done as well. Several of the questions were simplified in wording and response choices. To provide for greater continuity of response, some of the original questions were dropped and new ones were added.

In Part II of the questionnaire containing structured open-ended questions, two questions were combined and reworded into one question for clarity and to offset any ambiguity. One other question was eliminated because of its redundancy and a new question was added to achieve a more complete exposition of one of the first questions.

The self-administered pilot questionnaire was submitted to a panel of three university professors, members of the faculty in psychology, sociology, and marketing at DePaul University, for examination and criticism. Following five revisions of the questionnaire based on criticisms or suggestions for the
improvement of its form and content, the final questionnaire, as found in Appendix II, was sent to the sample population.

The Design and Sample Universe

The questionnaire contained seven major item areas of eighty-two total items analyzed as follows: ten relating to background; five relating to college education experience; twelve to parental background and attitudinal information; twenty-four relating to personal economic and political and social attitudinal information; four relating to service and community information; five relating to occupational information and career interests and satisfactions; and twenty-two relating to literary and aesthetic interests. In addition, Part II of the questionnaire contained seventeen structured open-ended questions concerning career, social, and political attitudes.

This instrument was sent to ninety-three former officers of the National Student Association (NSA) and thirty former officers of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in March, 1969. Follow-up mailings were made in May, 1969 and again in August, 1969.

In undertaking any study of this nature, the writer was confronted with the need to identify the people to be studied and make contact with them, and enlist their cooperation. This was accomplished in the following way.
The names and addresses of many former officers of NSA were obtained through the cooperation of the national office of NSA in Washington, D.C. Since the national office did not have a complete list of all of the officers of the association spanning the period from 1948 to 1968, the writer journeyed to Washington in February, 1969 and spent three days in the national office developing a roster of the national officers having served NSA during this period. Through the assistance of the national office, this researcher was able to use its facilities and office information to locate 15 former officers and interview them personally. This enabled us to obtain the names and addresses of fellow officers whom they knew personally as to their present location and address. The compilation of this information coupled with the data already available at NSA headquarters provided us with an initial mailing list of 90 persons.

The structure of the NSA organization is as follows: NSA is governed by five major officers: President, International Affairs Vice President, National Affairs Vice President, Student Government Vice President, and Secretary. Thus, through our efforts in Washington, D.C., we were able to compile a listing of the names and addresses of ninety-three former officers of NSA, more than 88 per cent of the total officer membership.
After originally agreeing to cooperate with this researcher on this study, the national office of SDS in the Spring of 1969 refused to assist us in any way. Therefore, the residential information of the former officers of SDS was gathered from several sources. Two of the former national officers were able to supply us with the majority of the names and addresses of those persons eventually contacted, and Mr. Arthur Waskow of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D. C. also provided us with a supplemental list of former SDS officers.

Structurally, SDS is governed by three National Secretaries plus five members of the national office staff. In all, a mailing list of thirty names, 57 per cent of the complete national office leadership, was compiled. Considerable difficulty was encountered in locating the former officers of SDS, due in large part, no doubt, to the political climate existing in the country at this time.

The questionnaire was mailed to each person listed as a former officer of the two organizations, NSA and SDS. The sample included all of the men and women of both organizations whose names we were able to obtain; thus it is considered the total universe. The questionnaire was self-administered, and the persons completing the instrument were the respondents being tested.
The mailing included one questionnaire with a self-addressed, stamped, return envelope. All questionnaires sent to the NSA leadership had a formal printed covering letter attached (Appendix III), while each questionnaire sent to the SDS officers contained a personal typewritten cover letter. A copy of the general form followed in communicating with SDS can be found in Appendix IV.

The collection of data persisted from March, 1969 until November, 1969. Nine NSA and two SDS questionnaires were returned because the parties had moved and left no forwarding address. Fifty-four completed questionnaires were returned: 39 were from NSA officers and 15 were from officers of SDS. Thus, of the respondents actually contacted, there was a 48 per cent return from NSA people and a 54 per cent return from the SDS officers.

Of the 112 in the total sample population with whom contact was made, the 54 questionnaires utilized in the study constitute a 48 per cent return.

Assumptions

Assumptions of this study are presented as follows:

1. The career-orientation in the lives of these individuals measured against the background of their political and social attitudes and commitments will provide a delineation of their life pattern or style of life.
2. We assume that these connections are ascertainable from information that can be secured through the use of a self-administered questionnaire.

3. We assume that we have no bias in the data as a result of the respondents actually sampled.

4. Another assumption is that the respondents will not falsify the information, that is, the responses are not only true, but adequately perceptive.

5. Lastly, we assume that we will be able to adequately deduce from these answers the data necessary for completion of this study.

Summary

The eight hypotheses in the research problem have been presented in this chapter. The methods and procedures utilized in obtaining the data, as well as the research instrument are discussed as is the definitions of the sample universe.

The major characteristics and background of the former officers of both NSA and SDS are analyzed in Chapter III. Data relative to the eight hypotheses are also discussed.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE QUANTITATIVE DATA

Data are presented and analyzed in this chapter as they relate to the eight hypotheses classified as political orientation, social orientation, aesthetic interests, literary interests, academic achievement, curricular choice, religious preference, and occupation choice.

Demographic and social and economic background information of the respondents will also be offered in this chapter, along with the presentation of data concerning the type and size of the respondent's community, the type of dwelling unit in which they live, the ownership or rental of their living unit, the arrest record of the former NSA and SDS officers, the relationship of the respondents economic position to that of their parents, and the activities most satisfying to them.
Demographic and Social and Economic Background Information about the Respondents

Sample Population:  N = 54

Table 1

Sex of Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Age of Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 to 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 to 31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 to 34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 to 40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 to 46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NSA (N = 39)  SDS (N = 15)
### Table 3

Religious Affiliation of Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

Race of Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>97.32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

Marital Status of Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married without children</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married with children</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Annual Family Income (1968) of Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA(^a) (N = 36)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS(^b) (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to 3,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 to 6,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 12,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,000 to 15,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000 to 18,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,000 to 21,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,000 to 24,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 to 27,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,000 to 30,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31,000 to 33,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,000 to 36,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37,000 to 39,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 to 42,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Two reported income figures of $50,000 and $55,000 were excluded from this table.

\(^b\)A respondent report of no earned income was excluded from this table.
Only nine per cent of the total sample population is female, but all five women (33 per cent of SDS respondents) are former officers of SDS. Thus, the NSA population is composed of all males. The mean age of NSA is 32 while the mean age for SDS is 28, a difference of 4 years. The distribution of the NSA sample by age is skewed toward the younger side, with 67 per cent ranging in age from 23 to 34, and forty per cent of the total are between the ages of 26 and 31. The bulk of SDS respondents range in age between 26 and 31, with 79 per cent falling in that category.

Proportionately more SDS (27 per cent) than NSA (10 per cent) respondents are single, due, no doubt, to the fact that the SDS population is younger. There is no significant difference between the two groups in terms of being married, with or without children.

The mean annual family income (1968) of the NSA group ($15,207.64) is almost double that of the SDS group ($7,917.14). The median income for the NSA group is $11,500 and for the SDS group it is $5,500. It would be expected that the income level for the NSA members as a group would be higher since twelve of its members are older than 34 years of age, with the oldest NSA respondent being 45. No SDS respondent is older than 33.

In reaching the mean and median levels of income for both groups, two of the income figures reported by NSA respondents,
one at $50,000 and one at $55,000, were omitted because of the possibility of skewing the data. One SDS respondent reported no earned income, and he also was excluded from the data as indicated.

To make allowance for the age differential, an adjustment was made utilizing only the income data for both groups in the 23 to 34 age brackets. The difference in income between the 23-34 year old groups, though not as significant as when the entire NSA population is examined, still favors NSA with a mean income figure of $11,922.12 for the NSA group as against the $7,917.14 for the SDS group.

Social Attitudes

The following items were measured to analyze the social attitudes of both the NSA and SDS officers.

The identification of the categories in Table 1 as reflecting social attitudes of the respondents is based on the interpretation that the views of the NSA and SDS officers toward both the nationally prominent men and the social issues itemized in Table 7 is a true indication of their social values. The t-tests were performed to determine the significance of difference between means. Weighted scores were given on a continuum from 1 to 5, with strongly approve at 1 and strongly disapprove at 5.

While there is a significant difference in attitude toward student protest demonstrations between the two groups, both groups basically approve of this form of social protest. All
Table 7

Differences Between Former NSA and SDS Officers on Attitudes Toward Student Protest, Civil Disobedience, Nationally Prominent Personalities, Socialization of Industry and Professions, and Concept of Black Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA  (N = 39)</th>
<th>SDS  (N = 15)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Involvement in Protest Demonstrations</td>
<td>1.59 .63</td>
<td>1.00 .00</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights Protests Using Civil Disobedience</td>
<td>2.00 1.30</td>
<td>1.13 .34</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>NS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndon Johnson</td>
<td>3.44 1.28</td>
<td>4.93 .25</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nixon</td>
<td>3.69 1.14</td>
<td>5.00 .00</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene McCarthy</td>
<td>2.51 1.15</td>
<td>3.33 .79</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>NS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldridge Cleaver</td>
<td>2.77 1.12</td>
<td>1.13 .34</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Socialization of All Industries</td>
<td>3.82 1.15</td>
<td>1.40 1.02</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization of Medical Profession</td>
<td>2.80 1.36</td>
<td>1.33 1.01</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Power</td>
<td>2.13 1.04</td>
<td>1.20 .40</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring: 1 = Strongly Approve
2 = Approve
3 = Neutral
4 = Disapprove
5 = Strongly Disapprove

*Not Significant
fifteen of the SDS respondents (100 per cent) strongly approve, and nineteen of the NSA respondents (49 per cent) strongly approve of student protests, with seventeen NSA members (43 per cent) indicating simply approval; thus, thirty-six NSA respondents (92 per cent) either approve or strongly approve student protests. Three NSA members identified themselves as neutral to this issue.

Twenty-nine NSA'ers (74 per cent) indicated either strongly approve or approve of using civil disobedience in civil rights protests, and all fifteen SDS'ers (100 per cent) strongly approve or approve this form of social action. However, seven NSA officers (18 per cent) either disapprove or strongly disapprove of this method of protest. The results can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8
Attitudes of Former NSA and SDS Officers Toward Civil Disobedience During Civil Rights Protests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA Per Cent</th>
<th>SDS Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Approve</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disapprove</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 39) (N = 15)
Attitudes Toward Selected Persons. Attitudes by the respondents toward Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, and Eldrige Cleaver show a significant difference between the two groups, whereas the response toward Eugene McCarthy, while approaching significance, is not statistically different.

All of the SDS respondents disapprove of Lyndon Johnson, with fourteen (93 per cent) expressing strong disapproval. Among NSA respondents, twenty-two (51 per cent) strongly disapprove or disapprove of Lyndon Johnson, but seven (18 per cent) approve of him and eight (20.5 per cent) remained neutral.

The SDS officers were unanimous in their strong disapproval of Richard Nixon, whereas only ten NSA officers (26 per cent) indicated their strong disapproval, with an additional fourteen (36 per cent) expressing simply disapproval. Three NSA respondents expressed a degree of approval for Richard Nixon.

The attitudes toward Eldridge Cleaver varied significantly between NSA and SDS. Thirteen of the SDS respondents (87 per cent) strongly approve of Eldridge Cleaver vis a vis three (8 per cent) NSA officers. Twelve other NSA respondents (31 per cent) indicate their approval of Cleaver, but nine (23 per cent) also express their disapproval.

An ambivalence in feelings towards Eugene McCarthy is reflected in the data. Twenty-two NSA respondents combined to strongly approve or approve McCarthy, seventeen (44 per cent) of
whom approve. Among SDS, two (13 per cent) approve of Eugene
McCarthy, while six (40 per cent) disapprove. Nine NSA respondents
(23 per cent) similarly disapprove of McCarthy, while seven in each
group remain neutral (NSA--18 per cent; SDS--47 per cent). The
data are presented in Table 9.

Attitudes Toward Socialism. There is a significant
difference in attitudes between NSA and SDS officers regarding
socialization of industry. Fifteen NSA respondents (38.5 per cent)
disapprove and thirteen (33 per cent) strongly disapprove of this
idea; thus, a total of twenty-eight NSA respondents (72 per cent)
disapprove of full socialization of industry. On the contrary,
twelve SDS respondents (80 per cent) strongly approve of this
concept, and two others (13 per cent) approve, bringing the total
approval among SDS respondents to fourteen (93 per cent).
Definitive data can be found in Table 10.

Table 10
Attitudes of Former NSA and SDS Officers Toward
Full Socialization of Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Approve</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disapprove</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 39) (N = 15)
Table 9
Attitudes of Former NSA and SDS Officers Toward
Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Eugene McCarthy, Eldridge Cleaver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lyndon Johnson</td>
<td>Richard Nixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Approve</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disapprove</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | NSA (N = 39)                                                                 | SDS (N = 15)                                                                 |
|                | Lyndon Johnson | Richard Nixon | Eugene McCarthy | Eldridge Cleaver | Lyndon Johnson | Richard Nixon | Eugene McCarthy | Eldridge Cleaver |
|                | Per Cent | Per Cent | Per Cent | Per Cent | Per Cent | Per Cent | Per Cent | Per Cent |
| Strongly Approve | 87     |
| Approve         | 13     |
| Neutral         | 47     |
| Disapprove      | 7      |
| Strongly Disapprove | 93   | 33     |
| No Opinion      | 7      |
Attitudes on the part of the NSA and SDS respondents towards socialization of medicine are not as sharply divided as are their views on socialization of industry, but the difference remains significant. All but one SDS respondent approves of the idea of socialization of the medical profession (93 per cent), whereas twenty-one NSA respondents (54 per cent) approve and fourteen (36 per cent) disapprove of this form of socialization. Table 11 presents the data.

Table 11
Attitudes of Former NSA and SDS Officers Toward Socialization of Medical Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Approve</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disapprove</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 39)          (N = 15)

The majority of respondents from both groups—NSA and SDS—support the concept of Black Power, but there is a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence.
Table 12
Attitudes of Former NSA and SDS Officers Toward Black Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA Per Cent</th>
<th>SDS Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Approve</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disapprove</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 39) (N = 15)

Political Attitudes. In measuring political attitudes nine of the items analyzed to determine social attitudes--student protest demonstrations, civil disobedience, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Eugene McCarthy, Eldridge Cleaver, socialization of industry, socialization of medicine, and Black Power--were also utilized to assess the attitudes of the respondents politically. Data for these items can be found on pages Data for the additional items used to measure the political attitudes of the respondents is presented below in Table 13.

There is a significant difference between the officers of NSA and SDS in their political party identification. The great
### Table 13
Political Party Preference of Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th></th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The bulk of NSA respondents (28) profess their political party affiliation as Democrat, 72 per cent so indicating. Eight of the NSA sample (20.5 per cent) have identified some other political category. Among their selections, four are Independents, with one being an Independent Democrat and another indicating that he is a Left Independent. Two others who identify themselves as formerly traditional Democrats now see themselves as a Dissident Democrat and a Peace and Freedom Party member, respectively. One respondent stated that he was a Socialist.

- Only two SDS respondents were identified as being members of a traditional political party, both indicated their choice as Democratic. The remaining thirteen (87 per cent) responded that they did not identify with any formal political party. Two SDS persons stated that none of the parties currently existing expressed their views, and one respondent said that the "political party with which I will affiliate has not yet been organized."
Two other SDS respondents leaned toward Socialism, expressing their views in this way: "None existing political party --would vote for a real Socialist party" and "No formal party identified --revolutionary socialist." One person identified politically with the Yippies and the Black Panthers, and one other SDS person said that he was not affiliated with any American Party.

Table 14 indicates a further breakdown of the NSA and SDS respondents political views.

Table 14
Classification of Former NSA and SDS Officers Identifying the Political Party Categories of Other or None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Democrat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Independent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Freedom Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissident Democrat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The great majority of both NSA and SDS respondents attitudes toward the United States bombing of North Vietnam and troops in the Dominican Republic is one of disapproval. In both instances, SDS respondents unanimously strongly disapprove of these governmental actions. Thirty-three of the NSA respondents (84 per
percent) disapprove of the bombing of North Vietnam, twenty-five (64 per cent) of whom express their disapproval strongly. Similarly, thirty-five of the NSA respondents (90 per cent) disapprove, with twenty-three (59 per cent) registering their strong disapproval of U. S. troops in the Dominican Republic. Complete data are presented in Tables 15 and 16.

Table 15
Attitudes of Former NSA and SDS Officers Toward U. S. Bombing of North Vietnam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA Per Cent</th>
<th>SDS Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Approve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disapprove</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 39) (N = 15)
Table 16

Attitudes of Former NSA and SDS Officers Toward U. S. Troops in Dominican Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Approve</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disapprove</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(N = 39) \quad (N = 15)\]

All fifteen of the SDS respondents and twenty-four of the NSA respondents strongly disapprove of congressional investigation of "un-American activities." Twelve other NSA respondents (31 per cent) disapprove of this governmental activity. See Table 17.

Table 17

Attitudes of Former NSA and SDS Officers Toward Congressional Investigation of "Un-American Activities"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Approve</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disapprove</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(N = 39) \quad (N = 15)\]
Table 18 summarizes the data concerning political attitudes and the differences between the two groups—NSA and SDS—for the persons and issues identifying their political views.

**Aesthetic Interests.** Except for the enjoyment of classical music, the visiting of art galleries, and the attending of political rallies, there are no significant differences in aesthetic interest between the NSA and SDS respondents. The data in Table 19 indicate the differences between the two groups.

The NSA officers enjoy classical music more than do the SDS officers (64 per cent to 27 per cent said they liked this type of music "very much"), according to the data in Table 20. Folk music was more popular with SDS respondents, with 80 per cent indicating they liked it "very much" vis-a-vis 51 per cent for the NSA respondents, although placed a high rank on folk music. Jazz is enjoyed "very much" by 33 per cent of the NSA members, while popular music (53 per cent), classical music and poetry (both ranked at 27 per cent) were valued in this category by SDS members.

Visiting art galleries was ranked high on the "moderate" enjoyment scale, 59 per cent of NSA officers and 53 per cent of SDS officers so responding. Poetry is also highly valued by both groups in the category of "moderate" enjoyment, with 53 per cent of SDS and 49 per cent of NSA respondents giving it one and three ranking respectively. Conversely, 28 per cent of the NSA
Table 18
Differences Between Former NSA and SDS Officers on Selected Political Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Party</strong></td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. Bombing of North Vietnam</strong></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. Troops in Dominican Republic</strong></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Involvement in Protest Demonstrations</strong></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Rights Protest Using Civil Disobedience</strong></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congressional Investigation of &quot;Un-American Activities&quot;</strong></td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lyndon Johnson</strong></td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richard Nixon</strong></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eugene McCarthy</strong></td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eldridge Cleaver</strong></td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Socialization of All Industries</strong></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization of Medical Profession</strong></td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Power</strong></td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring: 1 = Strongly Approve
2 = Approve
3 = Neutral
4 = Disapprove
5 = Strongly Disapprove

*Not Significant
Table 19

Differences Between Former NSA and SDS Officers on Aesthetic and Cultural Interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyed or Attended Activity</th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS* (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Music</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Music</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpting</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Art Galleries</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays and Other Dramatic Performances</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts or Ballet</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lectures</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rallies</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Galleries or Exhibits</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Study Group</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign or Experimental Film</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring: 1 = Strongly Approve
          2 = Approve
          3 = Neutral
          4 = Disapprove
          5 = Strongly Disapprove

*Not Significant
respondents indicate they don't enjoy poetry very much. Neither does sculpting have much appeal among the two groups, with 47 per cent of SDS and 28 per cent of NSA respondents indicating they don't derive much enjoyment from it. This is similar to their responses that they do "not at all" like sculpting, 31 per cent of NSA and 27 per cent of SDS officers so responding.

Less than half of the NSA respondents (41 per cent) and slightly more than half of the SDS respondents (53 per cent) indicate they do not like painting very much or at all.

Classical music, folk music, jazz, visiting art galleries, and popular music rank as the favorite aesthetic and cultural activities among NSA officers. The cultural interests of the SDS officers are remarkably similar to those of NSA, substituting poetry for jazz as one of the top five cultural activities most enjoyed. Folk music, popular music, poetry, classical music, and visiting art galleries rank high among SDS respondents.

The aesthetic and cultural interests are of a generally high level for both groups among all activities with the singular exception of sculpting.

In response to the question, "How often during the past year have you gone to each of the follow?" as listed in Table 21 and 22, forty per cent of SDS respondents had not attended a concert or ballet, and 36 per cent of NSA respondents had not been to a serious study group session. However, the respondents
Table 20
Types of Cultural and Aesthetic Activity
and Rank Order Choice of Enjoyment
for Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Music</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Music</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Art Galleries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Music</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Music</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Art Galleries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Art Galleries</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Music</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Music</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Art Galleries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 20 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(N = 39)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(N = 15)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Much</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not Much</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>11  (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpting</td>
<td>11  (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>10  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>8   (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Music</td>
<td>7   (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Art Galleries</td>
<td>7   (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Music</td>
<td>3   (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music</td>
<td>2  (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(N = 39)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(N = 15)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not At All</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not At All</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpting</td>
<td>12  (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>8   (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Music</td>
<td>5  (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>4   (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Art Galleries</td>
<td>2   (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>2   (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Music</td>
<td>2   (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music</td>
<td>0  (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for both groups reflect a uniformly high level of attendance at the various cultural and aesthetic activities.

The activities ranked high in terms of attendance three or more times during the year for NSA officers are foreign or experimental films (74 per cent), plays and other dramatic performances (72 per cent), public lectures and political rallies more than half of the respondents falling into this category. When attendance at three or more activities is combined with attendance at one or two activities, going to art galleries or exhibits and concerts or ballet can be added to the activities of greatest interest for NSA officers.

The SDS respondents highly valued attendance at foreign or experimental films, all fifteen having indicated that they went three or more times during the year. Also rated important was attendance at political rallies (94 per cent three or more times), serious study group sessions, public lectures, and plays and other dramatic performances. The latter three activities found more than 60 per cent of the SDS officers attending each of these activities three or more times. When combining attendance at the various activities three or more times with the category of attendance once or twice, 80 per cent or better of the SDS officers responded that they attended all of the listed activities except concert or ballet.
The SDS officers, it is conjectured, place greater emphasis on going to films, rallies, study groups, and lectures because of their highly political orientation. Then, too, these activities do not cost very much as compared to going to a concert, ballet, or play; since their income is significantly lower than that of the NSA respondents, this could account for the slightly different weight placed on the above activities.

Literary Interests. There is no significant difference between the NSA and the SDS groups in the number of hours spent in serious reading each week, and the number of books owned by the family. The largest number of respondents in both groups indicated that the average amount of time devoted to serious reading during a week is six to ten hours, 26 per cent of the NSA officers and 40 per cent of the SDS officers responding in this fashion. The great bulk of respondents from both groups fell into the reading category of 3 to 20 hours per week, with 72 per cent of those in the NSA group and 73 per cent of the SDS group being so classified.

The NSA group has accumulated more books in their family household, with thirty NSA respondents (77 per cent) holding between 250 and 1,000 or more. The SDS population average holding of books is slightly lower, varying between 100 and 999 for fourteen of the respondents (93 per cent). Only one SDS officer own 1,000 books or more, whereas eleven NSA respondents (28 per
Table 21
Types of Cultural Pursuits and Rank Order Number in Attendance for Former NSA Officers
(N = 38)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Study Group</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>Art Galleries or Exhibits</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rallies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>Concerts or Ballet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lectures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>Public Lectures</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign or Experimental Films</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>Plays and Other Dramatic Performance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(20.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts or Ballet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>Serious Study Group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays and Other Dramatic Performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Foreign or Experimental Films</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Galleries or Exhibits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three or More</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>1 or 2 - 3 or more (combined)</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign or Experimental Films</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>Plays and Other Dramatic Performance</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays and Other Dramatic Performance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>Art Galleries or Exhibits</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lectures</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>Concerts or Ballet</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rallies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>Foreign or Experimental Films</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts or Ballet</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>Public Lectures</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Galleries or Exhibits</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>Political Rallies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Study Group</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>Serious Study Group</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(61.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One Respondent Failed to Answer This Series of Questions
Table 22
Types of Cultural Pursuits and
Rank Order Number in Attendance
for Former SDS Officers
\( (N = 15) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerts or Ballet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Study Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays and Other Dramatic Performances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lectures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Galleries or Exhibits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rallies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign or Experimental Films</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Galleries or Exhibits</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts or Ballet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays and Other Dramatic Performances</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lectures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rallies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Study Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign or Experimental Films</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three or More</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign or Experimental Films</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rallies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Study Group</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lectures</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays and Other Dramatic Performances</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts or Ballet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Galleries or Exhibits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 or 2 - 3 or more (combined)</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign or Experimental Films</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rallies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lectures</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Galleries or Exhibits</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays and Other Dramatic Performances</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Study Group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts or Ballet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cent) state that they own this size collection of books. This could no doubt be due to the fact that the NSA group is somewhat older in age, allowing them more time to develop their collection. Tables 23 and 24 present the data concerning this reflection of the respondent's literary interests.

Table 23
Number of Hours Spent Per Week for Serious Reading for Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 14)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 Hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 Hours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 Hours</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20 Hours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Hours or More</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some striking differences between the NSA and SDS groups in the kinds of magazines and periodicals they read regularly. The Guardian is the most popular periodical read by the SDS respondents, followed closely by Hard Times and Ramparts. Also read quite avidly is the I. F. Stone Weekly. The NSA respondents identified some of the more traditional publications.
Table 24
Number of Books Owned By Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 249</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 - 499</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 and Over</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in listing their reading enjoyment. *Newsweek* heads the list, with *Harper's* magazine in second place. *Time* and *New Republic* are also popular with the NSA officers. The only periodicals common to both groups among their top ten choices is the *New York Review of Books*, *Ramparts*, and *New Republic*. Eight of the thirty-nine NSA officers (20.5 per cent) and five of the fifteen SDS officers (33 per cent) list the *New York Review of Books* among its readership. Five of the thirty-nine NSA (13 per cent) and eight of the fifteen SDS officers (53 per cent) count themselves as regular readers of *Ramparts*. Eighteen of thirty-nine NSA'ers (46 per cent) and three of fifteen SDS'ers (20 per cent) identify themselves as regular readers of *New Republic*. Of the top fifteen
magazines listed by percentage of response, nine are SDS-selected, including the top three. See Tables 25, 26, 27, and 28 for a presentation of the data.

Table 25
Rank Order Number of Magazines and Periodicals Read Regularly by Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper's</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Republic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Times</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Review of Books</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Review</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramparts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Times</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramparts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. F. Stone Weekly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Review of Books</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Republic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Left Notes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Number of Magazines and Periodicals Listed More Than Once and Read Regularly by Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chicago Daily News</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Scholar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York Times</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washingtonian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leviathan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Movement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Political Science Review</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playboy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development and Cultural Change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. News and World Report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27

Combined Top Ten Choices and Rank Order Number of Magazines and Periodicals Read Regularly for Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpers</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Republic</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Review of Books</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramparts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Times</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. F. Stone Weekly</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Times</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28
Rank Order of Magazines and Periodicals Selected by Former NSA and SDS Officers by Percentage of Response

(N = 54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Times</td>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramparts</td>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. F. Stone Weekly</td>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper's</td>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Review of Books</td>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Republic</td>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Times</td>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Review of Books</td>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Republic</td>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation</td>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Review</td>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Left Notes</td>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The differences between the two groups concerning their enjoyment of poetry was reported on page...

The views of the NSA and SDS populations differ, but not greatly, toward the reading of fiction with SDS more than NSA favoring this style of literature, but their views concerning the enjoyment of non-fiction are strikingly similar. Data can be found in Tables 29 and 30.

Table 29
Former NSA and SDS Officers Choice of Degree of Enjoyment in Reading Fiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Much</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30
Former NSA and SDS Officers Choice of Degree of Enjoyment in Reading Non-Fiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents from both the NSA and SDS groups like to browse in bookstores. Thirty-five (90 per cent) of the NSA respondents have visited a bookstore for browsing three or more times during the year, and fourteen (93 per cent) of the SDS respondents have done likewise.

Both the NSA and SDS groups place a relatively high premium on the literary enterprise, as would perhaps be expected of such an educated group. They read widely, if not different types, in the area of literary pursuits, and both groups hold a substantial number of volumes in their personal libraries.

Data on the differences in literary interests between the NSA and SDS groups can be found in Table 31.

**Academic Performance.** Two items were utilized to determine the academic performance of the two groups: NSA and SDS; level of formal educational attainment and self-estimate of overall grade point average in college as undergraduate. The data for educational level are presented in Table 32.

There is a significant difference statistically between the two groups, as seen in Table 33.

The educational level of the NSA respondents is singularly high, and the largest number of respondents (13) indicated that they have attained professional degrees (34 per cent). Of this number, eleven have received law degrees. The
Table 31
Differences Between Former NSA and SDS Officers in Literary Interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent in Serious Reading</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>NS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Books Owned</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of Poetry</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of Fiction</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of Non-Fiction</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browsing in Bookstore</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring: 1 = Strongly Approve  
2 = Approve  
3 = Neutral  
4 = Disapprove  
5 = Strongly Disapprove  

*Not Significant
### Table 32
Level of Educational Attainment for Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>SDS</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College, incomplete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate work, no degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond master's, no degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., Ed.D.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate study toward professional study, no degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 33
Differences Between Former NSA and SDS Officers in Academic Performance (Level of Education Attainment and Grade Average)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Degree</th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Grade Point Average (Undergraduate)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring:
1 = Strongly Approve
2 = Approve
3 = Neutral
4 = Disapprove
5 = Strongly Disapprove

*Not Significant
next highest percentage of NSA respondents (20.5 per cent) indicated they had acquired the doctorate degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D.). Two of those with a law degree also have earned master's degrees, and one of the NSA respondents with a Ph.D. also received a masters in Business Administration. Of those beyond the master’s degree, one is working toward a degree in law, and another needs only to complete his dissertation to receive his Ph.D. degree.

Among the SDS respondents, none has a degree in a professional area, and only one respondent holds a Ph.D. degree, although another person indicated that the doctorate is expected. The highest single number of respondents (4) indicated that they have work beyond the Master’s level (27 per cent); thus, 40 per cent of the SDS respondents have the Master’s degree. It would seem that the educational level of the SDS group, though high, is slightly lower than that of the NSA group.

There is no significant difference in grade point average between the two groups, both demonstrate exceedingly high performance levels academically. The large majority of both NSA and SDS respondents (69 per cent and 63.5 per cent, respectively) have a B+ average or better, and over 92 per cent of each group has a B- average or better. Thirty-five per cent of the SDS respondents held an A average while an undergraduate, and this is true for twenty-five per cent of the NSA respondents, as seen in Table 34.
Table 34
Grade Average in College (Undergraduate)
For Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Choice. More NSA respondents (18) chose Political Science than any other undergraduate major (46 per cent), and the next major most often selected was History (7). Political Science also ranks first in curriculum choice among SDS respondents (40 per cent), with six identifying this area of study for their undergraduate major.

Almost an equal percentage of both groups, NSA and SDS, apt for History as an undergraduate major (18 and 13 per cent, respectively). Eighteen per cent of the NSA respondents chose Economics or Business Administration as their major field of study, while none of the SDS respondents studied these fields. Conversely, forty per cent of the SDS respondents selected Sociology or Psychology as an undergraduate major, but no NSA respondent identified these disciplines. At the graduate level, strikingly, fifteen NSA officers chose the field of Law, and
eleven others chose Political Science, combining to result in almost two-thirds choosing these two major areas of study. Except for Sociology, which was identified by four SDS respondents as their graduate major, there are no other subject in the graduate curriculum that was selected more than twice.

In comparing the two groups as to the selection of their graduate majors, 28 per cent of the NSA officers and 13 per cent of the SDS officers majored in Political Science. While none of the SDS officers pursued an advance degree in Law, 38.5 per cent of the NSA officers chose Law for their graduate study. However, although only 8 per cent of the NSA respondents majored in Sociology or Psychology, 33 per cent of the SDS'ers selected these fields of study. Thus, there would appear to be some minor differences in the selection of undergraduate majors between the NSA and SDS respondents, and some significant differences in choice of major among individuals within the two groups at the graduate level of study. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the differences in selected majors for both undergraduate and graduate NSA and SDS officers.

Religious Preference. More than one-third of the NSA group (36 per cent) identified their religious affiliation as Protestant. No single denomination prevailed, with most of the major denominations being represented. Nine NSA respondents (23 per cent) indicated that they followed no particular religion,
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CURRICULUM CHOICE
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NSA AND SDS
Number of Graduate Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and four respondents who identified with the category of "other" are listed as Unitarians (2), Humanists, and Deist. Roman Catholic was the second highest choice (18 per cent) of the NSA respondents among formal religions.

Of the SDS respondents, nine of the fifteen respondents (10 per cent) indicated that they had no religion preference, and two others (13 per cent) identified their preference in the "other" category as Secular Jew (not affiliated) and Atheist-Quaker. Overall, only four SDS respondents (27 per cent) hold membership in a formal religious persuasion, none of whom were Protestants. (See Table 35)

Table 35
Religious Affiliation of Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference between the NSA and SDS groups in their religious preference as seen from the data in Table 36.

In analyzing the respondents from NSA and SDS as either non-religious or religious, we find that 23 per cent of the NSA
Table 36
Differences Between Former NSA and SDS Officers in Religious Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Preference</td>
<td>2.66, 1.59</td>
<td>4.26, .99</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring: 1 = Strongly Approve
2 = Approve
3 = Neutral
4 = Disapprove
5 = Strongly Disapprove

respondents and 60 per cent of the SDS respondents identify themselves as being non-religious. Looking at it another way, 77 per cent of NSA and 40 per cent of SDS respondents say they are religious. This difference is significant at the one per cent level of confidence. \( x^2 = 6.646, df = 1, .01 \) level

**Occupations.** More NSA officers, eighteen, have entered a professional occupation, as compared with other fields of endeavors. Of this number, eight identify themselves as lawyers. Those in the category of professional occupation make up 46 per cent of the total NSA population. Other types of professional positions identified range from economic advisor and urban affairs director to an architect, public affairs consultant and college administrators. Eight NSA respondents (20.5 per cent) indicate they teach in a college or university.
Among the SDS respondents, six (40 per cent) state that they are radical organizers within the Movement. No other occupation was mentioned more than twice. A complete breakdown of the types of occupations chosen by the two groups can be found in Table 37, and illustrated in Figure 3.

Table 37
Occupational Choice for Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional (physician, lawyer, architect, etc.)</th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Per Cent</td>
<td>No. Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 46</td>
<td>1 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, proprietor, or official of firm or agency</td>
<td>5 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Officer</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8 20.5</td>
<td>2 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical Organizer</td>
<td>1 7</td>
<td>6 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>1 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Data. Responses were elicited from the NSA and SDS officers regarding their present community, the type of dwelling in which they live, and whether it is rented or owned. Data are presented in Tables 38, 39, and 40.
Figure 3
OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NSA AND SDS

Number of Occupations

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

Professional*

Professor

Manager, Proprietor, Official**

Student

Army Officer

Political Consultant

Radical Organizer

Teacher

Writer

Other***

* Physician, Dentist, Lawyer, Architect
** Official includes Government
*** Includes Photographer, Researcher, Clerk, Social Worker

NSA

SDS
Table 38
Type and Size of Community of Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large city, over 1,000,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, 100,000 to 999,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs of city over 1,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs of city 100,000 to 999,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 11.578 \lt .01 \]

Table 39
Type of Dwelling Unit Resided in by Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 12.617 \lt .001 \]
Table 40
Number of Former NSA and SDS Officers Who Own or Rent Their Dwelling Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 8.041 < .01 \]

There is a significant difference between the NSA and SDS respondents in the size of community in which they live,* with more SDS than NSA officers living in cities with a population larger than a million, while more NSA than SDS officers live in cities with a population between 100,000 and one million.

A significant difference exists between NSA and SDS respondents in the type of dwelling they live in, with all 15 (100 per cent) of the SDS officers living in an apartment, while the type of living accommodation of the NSA officers is almost evenly split between an apartment (44 per cent) and a house (49 per cent).

Fourteen of the fifteen SDS respondents (93 per cent) rent their living quarters. Among NSA respondents, 56 per cent

---

*Of the former SDS officers, ten reside in the Midwest, three in the East, and two in the West.

Among the former NSA officers, 16 live in the East, 13 in the Midwest, and two each in the West, Southwest, and South. Four live abroad.
rent and 38.5 per cent own their housing unit, a significant difference statistically.

**Arrest Record.** Table 41 shows that a significantly greater percentage of SDS respondents than NSA respondents have been arrested in connection with civil rights or anti-war activities. Only two NSA respondents (5 per cent) have been arrested for such activities as compared to eleven SDS respondents (73 per cent).

A listing of the kinds of charges preferred against the officers of NSA and SDS who have been arrested for their civil rights and anti-war activity is included in Table 41.

**Social Mobility.** In comparing the economic position of the respondents from both groups today with that of their parents at the same age, we see that 59 per cent of the NSA respondents perceive their income to be considerably higher now as against 20 per cent of the SDS respondents. Forty per cent of the SDS respondents indicate that their income level is somewhat higher now as compared to 23 per cent of the NSA respondents. Only 10 per cent of the NSA officers feel that their economic situation today is somewhat or considerably lower than that of their parents at the same age, while 27 per cent of the SDS officers see themselves as falling into one of these two latter categories. Complete data can be seen in Table 42.
Table 41

Number of Former NSA and SDS Officers Arrested for Civil Rights or Anti-War Activities and Types of Arrest Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Arrested</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 27.571, \text{ df } = 1, < .001 \text{ level} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrest Charge*</th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disturbing the peace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inciting to riot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal to disperse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tresspass</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littering</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisting arrest</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of marijuana</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parading without a permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling obscene literature</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes multiple charges
Table 42
Economic Positions Today in Comparison to Parents at Same Age and Number of Responses by Former NSA and SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 39)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably higher</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat higher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat lower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably lower</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no idea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfying Activities. Performing a Spearman rank difference correlation to test the difference between the NSA and SDS group in their choices of activities through which they receive the most satisfaction, the results of Table 43 indicate that there is a significant difference statistically.

Closer inspection of the data, however, reveals that the preferences for both groups—marriage and family, career or occupation, international affairs, association with friends, local community affairs, and literature, art or music—are quite similar. Major differences reside in the greater emphasis of SDS officers finding satisfaction from involvement in national affairs (ranked second), and the fact that none of the SDS respondents found satisfaction in engaging in religion, leisure time pursuits, and association with parents or relatives.
Table 43
Cumulative (First, Second, and Third Choice) and Rank Order of Activities Providing Most Satisfaction to Former Officers of NSA and SDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career or occupation</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and family</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, art, music</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with friends</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with parents and/or relatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure time activities (sports, hobbies, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious beliefs and activities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community affairs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National affairs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International affairs</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aFirst, second, and third choice (N=39) (N=15)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th>SDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career or occupation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with friends</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community affairs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, art, music</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National affairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious beliefs and activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure time activities (sports, hobbies, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with parents and/or relatives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p = .780 < .01 \]
Summary

Data for analysis were presented in this chapter in the form of quantitative results. The data included attitudes toward social and political orientation, aesthetic and literary interests, academic achievement, curricular and occupation choice, information concerning residence, violations of law, economic status in relationship to parents, ranking of personal values, and demographic and socio-economic information.

The meaning of the findings as they bear on the eight hypotheses, and remarks concerning the life style patterns of the respondents together with the theoretical implications of the data as they relate to the literature will be discussed in Chapter V.

Chapter IV will contain an analysis of the qualitative data of the research. A complete summary of all of the data will be treated in Chapter V.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS
OF THE QUALITATIVE DATA

In this chapter, qualitative data resulting from the responses to the open-ended questions in Part II of the questionnaire are analyzed.

**Open End Responses of Former NSA and SDS Officers.** The following questions concerning the sample population's views toward the choice of a career, their attitudes toward the "system" or the establishment and their success at working within this framework, their feelings regarding social issues, and their attitudes concerning the present and future prospect for this country elicited the responses indicated below.

Ques. 1

Looking back, do you feel differently now than when you were college age about the things that are important in the choice of a career?
Table 44
Rank Order Listing and Number of Reasons Cited by Former NSA Officers in Choice of Career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service to humanity, moral and community responsibility and social concerns. Allowance of time for service to others (useful-social service). Career that involves work with people to facilitate self-development for all.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career that is inherently interesting and enjoyable. One that would be enjoyable for free, intrinsically rewarding, interesting and rewarding (lucrative).</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income and community acclaim (success) not important. Development of career-oriented technical skills not important. Interest of job, not monetary rewards. Social problems it can solve, not prestige it imparts. Not interested in merely earning large sums.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of that enjoyed doing and make greatest contribution. Choice depends on interest of job and social problems it can solve. Career must allow chance to live out personal values and convictions.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career that allows full use and outlet of individual talents.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To obtain rich and varied intellectual experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NSA (N = 33)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SDS (N = 15)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: N will differ throughout; all respondents did not answer every question.
Table 45
Rank Order Listing and Number of Reasons Cited by Former SDS Officers in Choice of Career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue same pursuits, but more radical approach, application of skills to radical movement, movement considerations now, pursue identity as radical or revolutionary, consider movement work later.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress on social value and personal satisfaction, emphasis on changing conditions of people and society that creates conditions, choose job in light of social and political significance, choose career in which act on principle.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject &quot;careerism&quot;, eschew traditional careers.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most careers designed to develop leaders of oppressive and exploitative society, careers lead to inequity, repression.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology of career more important than career itself.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with personal freedom in choosing and keeping job.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the responses of the NSA and SDS group reflect a strong sense of social awareness and place value on other-service rather than self-serving career goals. The NSA respondents are strong on social consciousness, altruism, and general social service, indicated not only by what they look for in choice of a career, but what they definitely do not seek in terms of job
satisfaction. Only four NSA respondents sought monetary rewards as a major career objective.

The SDS officers are distinguished by their radical ethos, their negative views of traditional society and careers, as well as their highly political orientation. This is seen in their strong identity with the Movement.

Ques. 2

What are the things about this country that you are most proud of as an American?

Table 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for rights of individual, Tradition of civil liberties, Rights and freedom enjoyed (free speech and expression)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights and opportunity to dissent, Express unorthodox views, Relatively high level of tolerance for difference</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosity, Essential decency, General openness of American people</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic opportunity and development</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality, Industry, Inventiveness, Individual initiative</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative equal opportunity, Human equality, lack of emphasis on status</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental spirit, Reform tradition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons | Number
--- | ---
Democratic political process and environment | 4
Pluralism, Heterogeneity of population, Populist tradition | 4
Technological achievements, Productivity | 3
Resiliency of people and system, Capacity to adapt to change | 3
Ease of social mobility | 3
America--more wide-ranging opportunities than any other country | 3
Tradition of voluntarism | 2
Stated beliefs and ideals of country (Founding Fathers) | 2
Idealistic young people | 2
Leadership in world community | 2

Table 47
Rank Order Listing of Things Most Proud of As American and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers

Reasons | Number
--- | ---
Bill of Rights, Tradition of civil liberties, Somewhat greater freedom available | 3
Black revolt, Black movement; Blacks, Browns, Reds | 3
Left wing working class movement, Radical tradition | 3
Not an American, Not proud of being an American, Not proud of anything (decry nationalism and patriotism) | 3
Among the NSA responses, a note of positivism is discerned, with such areas as our basic freedoms and the Bill of Rights cited as things in America of which they are most proud. Other things such as the essential goodness of American people, their vitality, resiliency, experimental ability, and technological achievements, economic opportunity, and democratic process are rated highly by the NSA officers.

The SDS officers to a lesser degree value the traditional liberties associated with the United States, but demonstrate their strong identification with the social thrust in our society—the Black revolution, the leftist movement, and the New Left. Their more radical responses are exemplified by the three SDS'ers who are not proud of America, and by their adherence to the model of a humane world, which though sought ideally, they do not witness in reality at the present time in this country. Several of the SDS comments explicity point to this: "I am proud of the
frequent desire of many Americans to do the right thing—to be fair and humane, but I think most people are too brainwashed to act consistently with their best beliefs," and "The sooner we drop our destructive nationalism the better." "More atrocities are committed in the name and guise of patriotism than I care to think about."

Ques. 3

List the three things in this country that you think are most in need of change.

Table 48

Listing of Things Most in Need of Change in America and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racism, Attitudes toward racial injustice, prejudice</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties and institutions (decentralization), and Electoral system</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of income</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic system, Economic opportunities for minorities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational system</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward and causes of poverty</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional reform needed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deference and control exercised by the military</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation (Tax reform)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical care</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National priorities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban re-development and planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49
Rank Order Listing of Things Most in Need of Change in America and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic system (Capitalism)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and militaristic imperialism</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political system</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of income (liberation of poor)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in priorities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy (radically extend, re-institute)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values of great proportion of people, Social consciousness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class system</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male chauvinism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NSA respondents place racism at the top of the order for change, followed closely by political institutions, and the economic system, with a broader distribution of income. The problem of poverty, the educational system—particularly as it relates to special education for ghetto and minority group children—is considered seriously in need of change. As one NSA respondent put it, "Twenty per cent below the poverty line is intolerable." While the general tenor of the remarks by the NSA officers is progressive or liberal in ideology, several statements indicate some conservative leanings. Said one person, "The idea that anyone owes anyone else a living needs to be changed. The idea that if people have a right to something they should go and grab it," and another stated that change is needed in "the idea that numbers of people (intellectuals and puritans) are divinely appointed to run other people's lives."

The American economic system, capitalism in particular, was given high priority for change among SDS officers. Racism also rates high as an area in need of correction. Other areas that SDS'ers think important regarding change is the political system and imperialism. There appears to be a greater consistency of response between NSA and SDS members in the areas basically in need of change, with several minor exceptions unique to each group. NSA persons mentioned the educational system and SDS persons mentioned imperialism.
Ques. 4

What do you anticipate will be the future social and political trends in American society twenty years from now?

Table 50

Rank Order Listing of Expected Future Social and Political Trends in America and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension of welfare state, Socialization of medicine, and Guaranteed income</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More open, just, egalitarian society, Resolution of race problem</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level of internal conflict and external tension</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of planning, use of expert analysis for ecology and other social problems</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More enlightened foreign policy, Accommodation to restraints of American power</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in violence and repression unless equality granted minorities: young and poor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More responsive government</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing polarization of the races</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial strife</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of metropolitan centralization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of taxation philosophy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swing to the right--backlash</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in structure of political institutions (more than two parties)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 51

Rank Order Listing of Expected Future Social and Political Trends in America and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More upheaval, more polarization, more discontent, Sharp conflict, Growing disorder, possible violence</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either repression and fascism or strong revolutionary movement (growing left and right wing movements)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscillation between garrison state and repression and social reform</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brave new world (&quot;fascism without tears&quot;)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System will resist attempts for change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of liberation movement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major re-evaluations of institutions and societies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolution (replacement of capitalism by higher cooperative order)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More meaningful work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed annual income</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in political structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct election of the president</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have nots of society to become increasingly vocal and action-oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response of the NSA members, in general, is one of cautious optimism toward the future of American society. There is a definite trend seen toward an expansion of the welfare state, a more egalitarian society with a diminution of the race problem.
There is a significant number of NSA respondents who foresee constant tension in our society, but temper their remarks with the hope that majority-minority group relations will improve. More responsive government domestically, and more enlightened foreign policy augur well for the country. Perhaps the feeling of many NSA'ers is summed up by this respondent's statement: "If given a high enough income floor to the poor, we may muddle through to a fairly free system. . . . I frankly believe that barring a major catastrophe, the economy's ability to produce will outrun the government's ability to tax. So I am fairly optimistic." Perhaps this optimism is based on the value placed on the role of education, with several NSA'ers seeing the level of education and the number of benefitting from education increasing. Two respondents indicated that the problem will continue to outgrow efforts to solve them, thus a concern is raised over second-order consequences of all activity.

The view of the SDS offices towards the future seems marked by ambivalence. In some ways, it appears that some members of SDS have a dimmer outlook than does the NSA group, but several are quick to admit that while they don't envision the system changing, they will educate their group as to how to undermine the system and they indicate that predictions are difficult since they plan to forge their own history. Though violence, disorder and repression are anticipated, there is an element of hope that
these will not result. Again, it is evident from the response of the SDS members that they are not opting for a liberal reform (welfare state, etc.), but rather for a radical or revolutionary restructuring of American society.

Ques. 5

Do you feel that you can work within what is generally referred to as the "system" or the establishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 33)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers of Ability to Work within "System" or Establishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work through system (is sensitive), No alternative but to work within, Shifts do occur within system, It's only way to accomplish improvements</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform, not revolution, for social change</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must work outside system and confront it, System is unresponsive, Establishment is oppressive, Create counter-institutions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work within, but system must be more responsive, Needs reforming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For some things within system and against others</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on the fringe of the system</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 53
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers of Ability to Work Within "System" or Establishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitalism incapable of fulfilling human needs, System dedicated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to exploitation of Blacks, poor, underdeveloped countries, System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too integrated and centralized to be reformed, Establishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basically racist and inegalitarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get &quot;straight&quot; job and use it to organize, Use system for own ends</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(counter to conventions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not without destroying it, Can't get change working within, but</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;guerrilla&quot; action can bring change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes can work within, but it will use you more than you use it</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(but questions survival)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work anywhere to seek change desired, to work within only strengthens</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There would appear to be a fairly clear dichotomy between the responses of the NSA and SDS groups to the question of working within the system. While the bulk of NSA respondents state their willingness and ability to work within the system (with the notable exception of five who see the system as unresponsive and oppressive), even those three SDS'ers who responded in the affirmative to the question, qualified their response. These respondents, in effect, suggest that they use the system for their own ends as long as they don't become a part of the system mentally, or they state that a "guerrilla" can work anywhere. As
one SDS officer put it in decrying the system, the "man" made up the rules of the game precisely to insure that he would remain the "man". One SDS person, warned, however, that you can't survive for long functioning within the system "or it will use you more than you use it."

In opting for reform over revolution, while respecting the role of the "outsider" or "quasi-revolutionary", an NSA respondent emphasized the need for social change through an orderly process lest it lead to "a new form of authoritarianism (otherwise known as the corruption of the revolutionary ethic)." Another NSA officer explained that he preferred working within the system because he "enjoys the fighting of battles." Several NSA respondents, while working within the system, recognize the need for reform and greater responsiveness. These persons see the system as bad, but vulnerable to change, and they cite the McCarthy campaign and progressive leaders in Congress. Furthermore, as one of them stated, "the system encompasses 95 per cent of all job prospects and almost all power relationships. However, the bureaucratic and non-democratic traits of the system need policing and reforming." Finally, an NSA'er who feels the defects in the system are amenable to human change by working through the system with effective group action, provides this analysis: "I can conceive of no other system that will enable us as effectively to move in the direction where realistic
liberals wish us to go. Much of the present frustration of the left is due (1) to a faulty and inadequate analysis of the nature of existing problems and the methods for remedying them, and (2) an inability and unwillingness to undertake remedial action by means which the system permits."

Ques. 6
When you were a student leader, did you hold the same view?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 33)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 14)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 54
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers Toward Their View as Students in Working Within the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now more radical, then more optimistic about gradualist reforms, more inclined to work within system</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked within thru student government, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essentially the same, though much less developed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked within through Civil Rights, MOBE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought system formidable, now finds it vulnerable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While aware of shortcomings, no alternative but to work within system, defend basic values</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 55
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers
Toward Their View as Students in Working within the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basically the same, More harassment of the left now perceived, Real experience to fortify position</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less aware of how irremediable it is, Less developed then, now more angry over injustice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was reformist liberal, not now</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View was not held so firmly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt system should be changed completely, now feels this isn't feasible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of one SDS respondent, the SDS members as a group felt strongly about the system and their inability to work within it, but while some of their views when they were students were not as pronounced, now, through experience, they have for the most part rejected the system. The one person in the SDS group who feels that complete change is no longer feasible still desires it, but realizes that it can't happen since "too many people are unaware of what's really wrong."

The responses by both groups is consistent with their views as expressed in question number five, with the large majority of NSA willing to work within the system, even as students. The interesting difference, however, is the fact that
four NSA respondents have become more radicalized through their first hard observation and experience in the system. As one NSA'er said, "I now have a better comprehension of how system works, and it now requires dramatic change." Another now sees the establishment as "bankrupt". The great majority of NSA officers worked within the system as students, one stating that he was very much a liberal, an activist, from 1949 to 1955. Another NSA respondent said that his duties as National Affairs Vice President, heightened by a year abroad, sharpened his perspective toward this country. The primary goal during the fifties, as one NSA officer saw it, was "to defend the basic values from attacks of the right and to a lesser degree from the left."

Ques. 7

Do you feel that it is necessary to reconcile or accept the "system" as it is presently constructed when you have such responsibilities as children, automobiles, a mortgaged house, etc.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSA (N = 29)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 56
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers Concerning Reconciliation of "System" When Assuming Marital Responsibilities and Material Possessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System to survive must always change (don't accept as presently constructed), If believe in overthrow, can make living without penalty, acceptance not an economic necessity, A number of revolutionaries are good family men, It's not necessary to be intimidated by the system, there are some economic rewards for those who oppose</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The greater the value dependence, the more difficult to reject family responsibility, Limits mobility and time, Responsibility makes it less likely to abandon system</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education system and organized religion provide large number of opportunities (riches isolated but supported by power structure), CORE, Peace fellowship, etc., can provide healthy living, Job market pretty open</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must take risks, Take consequences in defending basic values rather than compromise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities necessitate living within system, Reality of life</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts system on own grounds, System should not inhibit full, autonomous life</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept system, but work to improve it if contribution is to be made for change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can reconcile system and still keep integrity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 57
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers Concerning Reconciliation of "System" When Assuming Marital Responsibilities and Material Possessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creates problems (causes some compromise), Does not accept system, but difficult to be consistent when hustling the system for work, Temptations are great (sleep in bed you make)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to survive, feed kids (reconcile with system), but don't undermine the revolution, Got to have job to live (don't sell out completely), Work for change</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on courage and commitment and willingness to lose possessions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't hold your kids responsible for your cop-out</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some do reconcile themselves, hopes he doesn't</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need to support system</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an observable difference in the response to this question by the two groups, with SDS members overwhelmingly (eleven out of twelve) responding in the negative. The NSA respondents are mixed in their reaction to the need to reconcile the system when married and accumulating material possessions, with the majority agreeing to this supposition, but nearly 38 per cent disagreeing. In fact, ten of the itemized responses by NSA officers listed in Table 56 counteract the proposition that a person must reconcile themselves to the system, and several pointed to various opportunities for existing without
being fully absorbed by the system. This is put into perspective by this account from an NSA respondent: "I accept the system on its own grounds, not because of other responsibilities. Moreover, the existence of other responsibilities should not inhibit one from leading a fulfilling, autonomous life. The question is whether one can conceive of an effectively functioning social and political order which lacks those characteristics of the system which the radical left now decry." Eight other NSA respondents identify the difficulty of rejecting the system as responsibilities accumulate.

Perhaps the responses from the SDS group can best be marked by honesty, or candor. Despite the avowal of various members of this group to restructure the system in their own image, they recognize the need to survive, both for themselves and their families; thus, their dependence on the very system they seek to overturn. The theme of some of the SDS officer's responses would be to avoid co-optation ("selling out") while drawing succor from the system for minimum wants and needs.

Ques. 8

Do you feel that you compromise your ideals and violate your principles by working within the "system"?
### Table 58
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers Concerning the Question of Compromise of Ideals by Working within the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No system can operate without compromise,</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must compromise because of need for money,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise involves mediation of personal loyalties, Hard reality,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>since system controls money, thus forces compromise (moral relativism and situational ethics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can accomplish more by working within system,</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System capable of executing change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honestly feels he has not compromised</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodate to system, but understand personal ideals and values</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 59
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers Concerning the Question of Compromise of Ideals by Working within the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes, when compromise divorces you from total change</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on where you work--not if work is as a radical teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not if you work against it at the same time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If idea of changing from within is maintained, no compromise, Compromise of ideals violates his principles, but without accomplishing practical ends, person would become stagnant 2

Any job in system is compromise, greater in certain jobs 1

If he would work within system, would have to change principles (cognitive dissonance) 1

Doesn't really work in it (Movement research) 1

The "yes" and "no" responses by members of the two groups would seem to be consistent with their responses to the preceding question (No. 7). Those eight NSA respondents categorized under the first itemization in Table 58 are in general agreement that compromise is necessary in our everyday world, or as one person put it, that's "hard reality". As several NSA officers stated, a person has to have a good idea of his own values if he is to maintain them within the larger social organization. "Hang on to your ideals and speak the truth," said one NSA respondent. One NSA'er, in responding "not at all" to the question, indicated that his "professional and economic success has resulted from my individual and professional activities which in large measure consists of attacks on entrenched and abusive economic and political power."

Many of the SDS respondents qualified these answers, as reflected in the data in Table 59. These qualifications take
the form that total compromise can be escaped as long as you continue to work for ultimate change of the system—work against it. An SDS respondent replied to the question in this fashion: "There may be great compromise as one trades beliefs for economic gain. To resist this in common small ways in which it arises demands continual self-scrutiny and sensitivity."

Ques. 9

Do you feel that our society as it is presently constituted can be responsive to the needs of the poor and other disenfranchised groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 31)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 14)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 60
Rank Order and Number of Responses of Former NSA Officers Regarding Responsiveness of Society to the Disenfranchised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant redistribution of economic power needed, Political system needs to become more responsive, Must be radical change in political and economic institutions, Alternate institutions needed</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society has and will continue significant change, It already is changing, and increasingly so</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item                                                                 Number
Drastic change of attitudes and values and cultural assumptions is needed 6
No violence, but change and responsiveness needed 2
Society can change and respond only with much pressure 2
Can be responsive with better elected representatives 2
Responsiveness is possible; if not, there will be hell to pay 1
There is a limit to the possibility of societal change by human beings 1

Table 61
Rank Order and Number of Responses of Former SDS Officers Regarding Responsiveness of Society to the Disenfranchised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society socializes just enough to prevent revolt, Can now only elevate a few at the expense of many, Can satisfy segments of society for short-run period only</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction of capitalist system: profits over people, Power follows money, money is concentrated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less stratified social arrangement necessary to meet the needs of the poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super welfare state is possible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society could be responsive if it wanted to</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the surface, it is clear from the data that almost two-thirds of the NSA officers agree that society can be responsive to the needs of the poor, while a sizable majority (86 per cent) of the SDS officers do not feel that the society can be responsive. Underneath the hard data, as outlined in Table 60, a substantial number (twenty) of the NSA respondents state that society can be responsive, but they recognize that considerable change is needed for this responsiveness to be fully effective. As one NSA'er said, "Institutions, with some exceptions, are not inherently unresponsive; however, the people who control them must significantly change their attitudes, or there will be no response." One NSA officer who feels that society is responding, says that this is true "materially". He further qualifies this response by analyzing the reaction of the middle class to this phenomenon. "The middle class increasingly views some sacrifice of the present standard of living as a small price to pay for social stability." One NSA respondent, who has faith in the system, states that "society has and will continue to undergo significant and far reaching change, since it is not 'constituted' to remain static. It can respond to the poor and must do so. Change can and will be made." Another NSA respondent, who sees society's response as being but minimal, views the response "all too frequently, as dictated in part by structures and in part by the values of the holders of power." He sees
their attempt as providing preconceived programs—"housing, jobs, welfare, packaged education" rather than the need to respond "by creating institutions and other means by which the poor or disenfranchised can make their own decisions--create their own lives and life styles." A final NSA respondent puts the problem in the perspective of the long view, suggesting that a dispassionate scrutiny of hard facts rather than a recourse to utopian ideology be examined. He says, "One accepts that change is a lengthy process and that definite limits exist on the scope of human activity in society."

The SDS respondents are not so optimistic. Their analysis differs significantly, with minor exceptions, from that of the NSA respondents. An SDS officer felt that "American capitalism has rolled with the punches before and socialized just enough to prevent revolt (e.g. the New Deal)." Perceiving this society as one which produces vast wealth, an SDS respondent urged that "the need of the poor is for elements of sustenance and dignity." While both groups see this problem in economic and political terms, the rhetoric of the New Left is more pronounced in the responses by some of the SDS members. "Our priorities are with capitalists," said an SDS'er in identifying the values of this society, "and by definition they—the capitalists must oppress and exploit people of our own and other countries."
Ques. 10

Do you consider yourself alienated or divorced from the "system" or establishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA  (N = 34)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS  (N = 15)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 62
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers to Question of Alienation from the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disenchanted, not alienated, Must exercise discriminating judgment, Disappointed in establishment's attitudes and values</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has access to establishment and understands it, Feels part of system through work with government and foundations, Solid acquaintance with state politics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-adjusted member of system</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienated psychologically, with methods rather than with philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical of system, but not as much as when younger</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies with young, New Leftists, Searching for means for change outside system</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can use system to one's ends (e.g. McCarthy campaign)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 63
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers
to Question of Alienation from the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System conflicts with ideals of love and humaneness, respect for others, and their welfare, not ethical, is unfeeling</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to capitalism, militarism, repression; Struggles against system</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System institutionalizes and legitimizes exploitation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is part of Movement, not system</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly alienated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alienation, for many SDS'ers, stems from the frustration at not being able to get at those who hold the power in society. The responses listed in Table 63 indicate the desire on the part of several SDS respondents to create a society predicated on love and human values, and several others indicate their opposition to a system that is exploitative and repressive, as they perceive it.

Two-thirds of the NSA respondents, contrary to the SDS respondents, do not feel alienated from the system, but many of this majority are disenchanted with the strategies adopted by the system in confronting moral issues. A hostile NSA respondent says, "I consider the system abrasive, offensive, callow and venal, but I hold little faith in the New Left." Four of the NSA
respondents have established themselves with various governmental
and foundation agencies and officials; thus being "inside" and
having access to the system, they feel comfortable in it.

Ques. 11

Does this differ from your opinion when you were a
college student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 33)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 13)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 64

Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers
Toward View as Students to Alienation from "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more radical now</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views have not changed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had more faith in system then</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More critical and disenchanted now--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellectually antagonistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tended to reject system out of hand; Today, more</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident in ability to affect decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to capture system, gain power--then and now</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not alienated then, but now</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 65
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers Toward View as Students to Alienation from the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not see issues clearly, Did not fully understand</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-interest as a student (a political null)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw America as good, Naively proud of professed ideals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differed only in degree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College years were period of coming to radical consciousness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienated in different context, Was frustrated in developing maturity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is only a slight difference between the views held when there were students and today in terms of NSA respondents' alienation from the system with the majority denoting that they were not alienated while in college. However, eight of the NSA respondents specify that they have lost faith in the system since their student days, and have tended to become more radical. As one who is now more critical put it, "I now understand better the realities of power and privilege." Upon broader exposure to the society and experience with the systems malfunctioning, an NSA respondent felt that "we need to experiment with new ideas to fabricate a new culture and polity, a new economics and lifestyle."
There appears to be a distinctive difference in the SDS officers' feeling in alienation now (100 per cent) than when in college (38 per cent state that their view as a student was different). Perhaps the feelings of the SDS respondents is summed up in this statement by one SDS'er: "As a student I saw America as good, progressing toward the solution of its few problems (like civil rights). I was proud of what I thought was an American tradition of brotherhood, equality, helpfulness toward other people in the world. Now I know better."

Ques. 12

Is it possible to follow a career independent of the "system" or establishment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 34)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 66
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers As to the Possibility of Following a Career Independent of the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent professions are possible--university teaching, doctors, writers, etc.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career must allow for effecting change, can be outside but not independent of system</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No, unless you have enough money not to worry about future  3
Can work for anti-system protest organizations—write, teach, speak, professional organizer  3
Can't be escaped, System affects all manner of life  3
Yes, if dependency on system is avoided  2
Yes, system is not formidable  2
To effect change, must live on margin or fringe  2
Need to organize outside to build power base  1
New communities and new life styles needed  1

Table 67
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers
As to the Possibility of Following a Career Independent of the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a Movement organizer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's difficult, but possible if different life style is adopted, If you hustle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a teacher, writer, actor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By building counter-institutions it's possible</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the extent not independent of system but trying to revolutionize it</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental attitude allows for independence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More SDS (92 per cent) than NSA (71 per cent) respondents think that it is possible that an career can be fashioned independent of the system, but the difference is not significant. Both groups envision a variety of ways in which independent careers can be forged, as portrayed in the data listed in Tables 66 and 67. As one SDS respondent makes clear, this is to a large extent predicated on the willingness to accept a low standard of living. This, of course, would not necessarily hold for those in teaching, or even for writers. Another SDS officer, while recognizing that it is not easy to work independently of the system, suggests that "most of us are at work on a 'revolution'. After it's here," he says, "we'll find work in it." An SDS respondent put it this way. "Obviously in capitalist America one works for capitalist firms and buys capitalist products. But one still fights to destroy capitalism."

Ten of the NSA respondents identify such areas as teaching, writing, and becoming a radical organizer—which, in fact, six SDS officers currently are—as ways of working independent of the system. An analysis of the situation by an NSA respondent goes like this: "It is imperative that we organize and build an independent power periodically on the 'outside'. This will lead to a threat to the system and responsiveness by it—the system only responds to power." An NSA officer who felt it was impossible to work outside the system
stated: "It can't be escaped, whether in Haight-Ashbury or in jail." Another qualified his response by saying, "Can work outside but not independent of system." Finally, one NSA respondent saw those who go into radical organizing as choosing to live on the margin of the established order," whereas another responded, "you can't live outside, unless you are a monk; otherwise, there must be some relationship with or involvement in system, even if you intend to destroy it."

Ques. 13

If you reject the "system", is your rejection total or partial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 15)*</th>
<th>SDS (N = 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Reject</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response to this question by NSA officers was limited.

SDS officers significantly more than NSA officers reject the system totally (79 per cent to 7 per cent, respectively). Those who answered with a partial rejection qualify their responses in this way. One NSA person says this is because "it
is a series of little systems, not one system." One NSA officer states that his rejection philosophically to the system is total, but realistically he does not reject the system entirely, though he wants to fight for radical change. Another NSA respondent who responded "partial", says that "institutions are created for human convenience. Some relevant, some are harmless, and some are dangerous."

One SDS'er opines that "total rejection leads either to hippie commune or prison. That would end the opportunity to organize." A few of those SDS respondents who responded with a total rejection, hedge slightly by saying "as far as is practical" and "pretty total". A rejection of the system takes on a political tone by one SDS officer: "I believe in socialism and democracy, but the present system is capitalistic and authoritarian. I believe in individual freedom and the present system tends toward totalitarianism."

Ques. 14

Do you feel that you have changed your thinking on social issues in any way from the way you felt as a college student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 34)</td>
<td>Number Per Cent</td>
<td>(N = 12)</td>
<td>Number Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 68</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 32</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 68
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers on Change in Views Toward Social Issues Today from College Student Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More aware of abuses, more realistic; thus, more radical, less righteous</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now, more sophisticated appreciation of complexities, More knowledgeable, better understanding</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepticism now, more disillusioned</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More socially conscious now, More committed to participatory ethic, More concerned</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More aggressive, more extensive liberal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better informed of realities, Greater realization of limits of human power in society</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic position not changed, more tolerant of non-conformity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 69
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers on Change in Views Toward Social Issues Today from College Student Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More radical, revolutionary, More bitter and depressed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much deeper knowledge and understanding of issue today</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reformist then</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have become anti-capitalist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now see interrelationship in American life of racism, imperialism, war, and poverty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of members of both groups indicate that they have changed in their attitudes towards social issues from the time when they were college students, with the SDS respondents (83 per cent) registering a slightly higher percentage than the respondents of NSA (68 per cent).

The NSA respondents have become more sophisticated, more radical, aware of complexities, through additional knowledge and experience, and more committed to change. Thus, there has been a deepening impression of the inadequacies of the system for a substantial number of the NSA officers. Among those NSA respondents who signified no change, the response of this 27-year-old person may be reflective of their views. "Some of the issues have changed, of course, and I am disappointed at the violence of some tactics; but my basic positions have not changed much. If anything, my tendency to give students the benefit of the doubt has probably increased as I observe more the more the reluctance or inability of the establishment generation to deal effectively with social problems."

Some of the SDS respondents demonstrate why their views have changed. As one said, "I see things now as being more rotten than I did before." The political and economic rhetoric persists in some of the analyses by SDS officers. "I am now a revolutionary socialist rather than a fuzzy radical anti-capitalist," replied an SDS respondent, indicating to his move
from the ideological left to the far extreme left. "On the race question," responded an SDS'er, "I am less an integrationist." As to international relations, he says, "I am more angry with the war/imperialism question, and I am less impressed with the danger of nuclear war. I am more favorable to the People's Republic of China and the communist movement in the Third World."

Ques. 15

Do you think it is possible for you personally to bring about change in the "system"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 29)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 70
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers
As to the Ability of Each Person to Bring about Change in the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the system, particularly through political party and process, government, and other institutions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In combination with other like-thinking individuals, in cooperation and support of others</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yes, through individual influence & 5 
Through confrontation & 3 
Through public office, leadership & 2 

Table 71
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers
As to the Ability of Each Person to Bring about
Change in the "System"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As part of larger movement, With others of like dedication</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No individual can, they are powerless</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested in change, want to shut it down</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have already done so by helping found SDS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow going in lower working class communities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In part</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through each changing his own little niche</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officers of NSA (90 per cent) are considerably more optimistic than SDS (58 per cent) officers regarding their ability to personally contribute to change in the system. The key response on the part of some of the members of both groups is working for change in tandem with others. Although one NSA respondent said, "Attitudinal changes within institutions can come only through hard jolts from activist insurgents," this
was the exception, rather than the rule. Several NSA respondents felt that personal change has resulted from their input through formal organizations and processes. One respondent, a lawyer, said, "Helped win gubernatorial campaign, managed congressional campaign, changed system for choosing advisory committee of welfare recipients by welfare recipients themselves." Another gave this concrete example, "In work with major corporations, I have been able to bring about some changes. Also, limited change has come about through my participation in political and community organizations." Another NSA respondent agreed that personal change is possible within narrow limits. He cited "experiments in teaching, course substance, evaluation of teachers, and involvement of students in course development," as having an impact in promoting change in a very rigid law school faculty where he resides as a faculty member. He adds this dictum: "If you change one person's perception and his ability to act within the system he perceives, you have changed the (or a) system."

An SDS officer who is not sure radical change is possible because of being co-opted by liberal reform, asserts, "but I feel personally committed to spend my life trying for real change." The emphasis among SDS respondents is on masses of people, who would be powerless as individuals, to organize collectively to bring about change.
Ques. 16

Did your activism as a student bring about any changes which gave you a sense of satisfaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 34)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDS (N = 13)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 72

Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers Regarding Satisfactions Derived from Changes Brought about by Student Activism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of radical student activities--peace activities, anti-war, civil rights, student reforms</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activism brought about educational reforms</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Power, Student participation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed interests internationally in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Europe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived satisfaction through NSA activities and accomplishments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made progress in origin and development of role and value of student government</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided a sense of personal confidence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped change social awareness in '50's--laid groundwork for '60's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 73
Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers Regarding Satisfactions Derived from Changes Brought about by Student Activism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of massive student movement—SDS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of satisfaction and community with others in common struggle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-war movement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small victories, concessions, in every endeavor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferment in college, elimination of rules</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through JOIN project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal worth, lessened competitiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frustration, not satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the NSA officers almost uniformly found something satisfying from their activist days as a college student, the reaction to this question by the SDS officers is decidedly mixed. Heading the list of activities among NSA respondents are such "activist" pursuits as peace and anti-war protests and civil rights. Educational reform, student power through greater student participation in university decision-making, and progress with student government also rate high among responses offered by NSA respondents. Significantly in both groups, a number of the respondents valued their experience and accomplishments with
their respective organizations, NSA and SDS, as seen in Tables 72 and 73. One NSA respondent reflected on his organizational affiliation in this way: "Perhaps it provided a mechanism (the student associations we founded and nourished) for education, mobilizations, and action, which had some impact on the universities and trained a large number of students in political action. We created a mechanism, also, for political action in developing areas of the world which served a high purpose, at least until it was subverted by the C.I.A."

For SDS, a respondent insists that the formation of SDS set off a massive student movement in this country, as well as a new tradition of radicalism for an entire generation of students. The SDS officers placed less emphasis on external accomplishments, but rather on internal satisfactions such as community feeling engendered by working with others and the stimulation of a sense of personal worth.

Ques. 17

Do you feel more strongly about current social and political issues today than you did as a college student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSA (N = 35)</th>
<th>SDS (N = 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 74

Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former NSA Officers to Present Feelings about Social Issues Compared to Time as a Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less hope, Stronger and deeper feelings, Hardening of views due to lack of inaction, More determined to seek change, Greater sense of urgency</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same, but more aware, Virtually identical, felt strongly then and now</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More radical, More actively involved</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has clearer understanding of mechanisms of power now</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less active now, but intellectual critique stronger</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeptical, more jaundiced view of human leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More realistic, more compromising, See more facets of social issues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little change, perhaps more conservative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 75

Rank Order and Number of Responses by Former SDS Officers to Present Feelings about Social Issues Compared to Time as a Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakes are higher, feels more deeply</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally as strong</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed: Total transformation, revolution of system</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasn't interested in social problems in college</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opposed to U. S. imperialism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In college, involvement more crisis oriented, now it is central to life</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NSA leadership indicates by its responses that a variety of degrees of feeling toward social issues currently prevails, with the predominant feeling being one of strengthened need for reform, a sense of urgency concerning needed corrections and abuses, and a hardening of resolve toward getting things done. These feelings are coupled with the number of NSA respondents who specified no marked change in their thinking since college, with views held as firmly then as now.

The realities of entrenched power, and the inactivity and lack of responsiveness by officials and institutions toward social concerns has raised the "ante" among SDS respondents of the need for total transformation and revolution in the society and as a result they feel proportionately more deeply. As one respondent perceived it, "I hold to my views with less idealism and naivete, and more conviction."

Summary

Qualitative data were presented and analyzed in this chapter relating to the respondents' views regarding societal change, attitudes toward the "system" and the establishment,
and a comparison of the respondents' views and attitudes today with the period when they were college students.

The findings as particularly relevant to the formation and adoption of a style of life by the respondents, and a summary of the data together with the conclusions reached, are discussed fully in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This thesis is concerned with the social, political, aesthetic, literary, education, occupational, and religious attitudes and characteristics of a sample of the former officers of the National Student Association and Students for a Democratic Society. An examination of the data presented in Chapters III and IV will be made in this chapter to determine whether there are any differences between the two groups, and whether or not these basic institutions in our national life have, in fact, influenced the former officers of these two groups in the adoption of a distinctive life style. It will also be determined whether the hypotheses, as stated in Chapter II, are supported.

The basis for the determination of any differences in life style pattern is made from a review of the data from the following measures: political party preference, social and political attitudes, religion, occupation, graduate major, kinds
of magazines read, cultural interests, type of community, type of housing and occupancy, arrest record, and kinds of activities providing personal satisfaction. It is felt that these data provide some measure of the life style patterns of the members of the two groups: NSA and SDS. A further review of such unstructured responses as attitudes toward American society, and the "system" and the establishment, will be made to reveal any qualitative evidence of the formation of different life styles.

Quantitative Data. It can be seen that there is a significant difference between NSA and SDS members in their political party affiliation, with NSA officers opting generally for the Democratic party and SDS officers distinguished by their aversion to any formal political party. There is also a significant difference in eight of thirteen measured items delineating political attitudes of NSA and SDS respondents.

In analyzing the social attitudes of the respondents by objective criteria, it is observed that significant differences do occur in seven of nine measured items, with the only approximation of agreement between NSA and SDS members being their attitudes toward the use of civil disobedience as a means of civil rights protest, and their opinion of Senator Eugene McCarthy.

There is a significant difference between the officers of NSA and SDS in their religious preference, both from the standpoint of adoption of a traditional religious denomination, and an analysis of their adherence to a formal religion.
Occupationally, there is a significant difference between the officers of the two groups in their choice of their life's work up to this point. Whereas two-fifths of the SDS officers were engaged full time as professional radical organizers, two-thirds of the NSA officer were employed in conventional professional occupations.

A significant difference is observed in the choice of a graduate major for members of the two groups. While one out of three SDS officers chose a major in the area of social science (sociology, social work, political science), two out of three NSA officers chose to do graduate study in political science or law.

While that there are no significant differences in the general literary interests for members of both groups, the type of magazines and periodicals regularly read are a manifestation of the political outlook of each group. There is a significant difference in the specific magazines read by the NSA and SDS respondents, the NSA officers reflecting a more traditional, albeit liberal, approach to their reading sources; the SDS officers, however, habitually read magazines that are distinctive to the ethos of the Movement.

There is a significant difference in only three of fifteen items measuring the cultural interests of the NSA and SDS respondents; thus, there is no significant difference for this category viewed as a whole. The slightly greater emphasis placed on experimental or foreign films, political rallies, study
groups, and public lectures by the SDS officers attests their highly political orientation.

The community place of residence, the type of housing accommodation, and the type of occupancy of the dwelling unit of the respondents is reflective of the style of life, to some extent, of the sample population. The findings, based on respondents' information, indicate that there is a significant difference in each case between the living patterns for members of both groups. The SDS members are more likely to live in or near a large city (over one million population), and live in a rented apartment than are members of the NSA group.

The significant difference between the officers of NSA and SDS in their record of arrests attests the value placed on direct action by SDS as a method of their commitment. Almost three of every four SDS respondents were arrested at one time or another for civil rights or anti-war protests. Arrests among former NSA officers, on the contrary, were rare.

Finally, there is a significant difference in the rank order selection of the activities that are personally most satisfying to the respondents of both groups. Caution is exercised, however, in interpreting these data. It is evident that the priority placed on the various activities selected by the NSA and SDS officers is different only in degree, and that with few exceptions, the interests of the respondents of both groups are very similar. Therefore, marriage and family, career or
occupation, and interest in international affairs are valued highly by the members of NSA and SDS.

Based on these quantitative observations, there is a clear-cut difference between NSA and SDS officers in nine of the twelve major categories: political party affiliation, political and social attitudes, religion, occupation, magazine preference, place of residence, ownership and type of dwelling unit. The emergence of a life style that is distinct, and deviates from the conventional in whole or in part, is apparent among the SDS respondents.

Qualitative Data. The responses to the open-ended questions provide qualitative data that bear on both the issue of life style orientation and the hypotheses.

The perceptions of the respondents as to what things in America they are most proud of indicate both similarities and differences. The officers of NSA and SDS both value civil liberties and our basic rights and freedoms (SDS to a lesser extent), but there are more differences between them than similarities, especially differences of degree. The thrust of the SDS officers' pride lies with the revolutionary social protest movement of the 1960's, the youth, the Blacks, the disfranchised in general.

To the question of what things are most in need of change in the United States, there is considerable consistency of view
concerning the ordering of priorities. The triad of racism, capitalism, and imperialism are cited most often by the SDS respondents as necessary for repeal, and the NSA respondents also feel strongly that change be enacted in attitudes toward racism, our economic and political system. Perhaps a difference here would be that the majority of NSA officers would like to maintain our present economic and political systems, but make them more responsive and provide more opportunities to constituents; the SDS respondents desire an overturn of these systems for something completely new.

The perceptions by the NSA and SDS respondents of the social and political trends for the future demonstrates that the NSA officers are more optimistic than those of SDS. The differences are not marked, however, the NSA view being more traditionally liberal (emphasis on the growth of the capitalistic welfare state), and SDS reflecting a more radical or revolutionary perception. Members of both groups, to some extent, envision internal disorder and disruption of our social structures, but many NSA respondents see a more open and just society developing, with many material and social benefits accruing to those less fortunate, whereas a number of SDS respondents perceive definite tendencies toward fascism on the horizon. Some of the SDS officers are ambivalent, however, about the possibility of a fascistic state, and they seem equally divided between hope and despair.
To the question, "Can you work within the 'system'?", there is a clear difference between the respondents of the two groups. Over four-fifths of the NSA officers see working in and through the system as the only realistic method of achieving anything. SDS respondents feel just the opposite, with four-fifths of their group unalterably opposed to working within the system, with the exception that some do use the system to achieve their own goals. As one SDS pamphlet asks, "Do we work inside the system? Of course we do. The question is not one of working 'inside' or 'outside' the system. Rather, the question is do we play by the established rules? Here the answer is an emphatic no."¹

The response to the question of reconciling the system when assuming responsibilities was greeted with a mixed reaction by NSA respondents. Two-thirds of NSA'ers indicate their acceptance, thus their reconciliation, of the system, but the SDS respondents are almost completely irreconciled to the system. Many of the SDS officers, though, do recognize their temporary dependence on the system.

In response to the question of compromising ideals or principles, over two-thirds of the SDS respondents felt that

they do indeed compromise by working within the system. Almost four-fifths of the NSA respondents felt the opposite, and they do not see this as a compromise of their principles; many of them do, however, highly qualify these feelings.

The question was raised, "Can this society be responsive to the poor?", and a guarded difference is noted between the NSA and SDS responses. Half of the NSA'ers say society can be responsive, but change is needed. The responses by the SDS officers indicate they feel change within the system to make it responsive is futile. Again, it is a matter of confidence that the members of one group (NSA) have in the system which the other (SDS) lacks.

All of the SDS officers stated that they were completely alienated by the system, and two-thirds of the NSA officers felt so alienated. The alienation of many of the NSA respondents takes the position of disenchantment rather than full rejection of the system.

To the issue of whether it is possible to follow a career independent of the system, the large majority of both groups agree that such a direction is possible. Both groups felt, at the same time, that there had to be some relationship to the system.

In response to the question of total or partial rejection of the system, there is a difference between the members of the two groups. There was a thirty-eight per cent NSA response to
this question, and of this number, two-thirds reject the system partially, and one-fourth of the NSA officers disclose that they do not reject the system at all. Among the SDS officers, almost four-fifths of them reject the system totally, but a few of the SDS members qualified their "total" response.

Asked what the possibility is of personally bringing about change in the system, the NSA respondents more than the SDS respondents think that it is possible. The majority of both groups answered affirmatively to this proposition, with ninety per cent of the NSA officers but less than sixty per cent of the SDS officers displaying their agreement. A substantial number of members of both groups see the potential for change coming about in cooperation with others of similar feelings and persuasions.

Qualitative Data--Views when They were Students. The views of the NSA and SDS respondents politically and socially as student leaders and their views today are generally consistent for both groups. The NSA leaders were willing to work within the system then, as now, but not the SDS leaders.

In comparing the feeling of alienation today with their years as a college student, the majority of NSA officers were not alienated in college; however, slightly better than twenty per cent of NSA'ers have lost faith in the system and now are more radicalized (i.e., they recognize the need for the adoption of a new life style). While all fifteen of the SDS'ers are now
alienated, this was true of slightly less than two-thirds of them as students. In other words, more than one-third of the SDS respondents say that they were not alienated while in college.

A substantial majority of members of both groups indicate a change in their thinking on social issues now as compared to when they were students in college, with a growing number of NSA officers becoming increasingly disillusioned with societal trends. More than four-fifths of the SDS leaders see themselves as changed, identifying themselves now as more radical and revolutionary. The system and its response to social issues is seen as oppressive and exploitative.

Asked whether their activism as a student brought about any changes which were satisfying to them, almost all of the NSA leaders said "yes" but barely half of the SDS leaders responded affirmatively. The NSA officers were more involved in college, in addition to civil rights and anti-war activities, in educational changes, student government, and student power.

Comparing the intensity of their feeling today with when they were college students regarding social and political issues, a majority of both groups said they felt more strongly now. One-half of the NSA respondents and two-thirds of the SDS respondents indicated this increase in their feelings. The difference is not significant, however, as many of the NSA officers who said they had not changed pointed out that their position was strong
both then and now. Many of the NSA members feel an increased urgency toward the social and political situation, and the general position among the SDS officers is a hardening of their feelings toward societal issues. There is, then, a continuity in the value patterns of these leaders between the views they held as students in college and those they hold today. As students, they were in a process of becoming what they are today, as is reflected in their continued preoccupation with political and social issues. Thus, a life style of thought and action persists for the leaders of both groups.

In analyzing those questions which produced qualitative data relating to the formation of life style patterns, those dealing with the capacity for work within the system, reconciliation with the system, compromise of ideals, alienation from the system, career possibilities independent of the system, and degree of rejection of the system, it is evident that there is a decided difference between the members of the two groups in five of the six questions. Despite these ostensible differences, caution is suggested in interpreting these findings. In three of the questions, members of both NSA and SDS qualify their categorical responses, and in two other questions, the difference is more one of degree than of kind. Nonetheless, the degree of difference is the difference, and tends to reinforce what has already determined from the quantitative data, namely, that the
SDS officers opt for a style of life that is non-traditional, unconventional and special in its focus and orientation. The style of radical or revolutionary is contrary to that associated with the general concept of law and order, or with the existing standards and norms of the society. These data fortify what was already learned from the quantitative data, that the SDS officers have adopted a different life style from that of the NSA officers. Jack Newfield gets at this life style difference in a letter to a friend:

Perhaps at the bottom of what we call the generation gap are cultural and sociological differences. You did not smoke marijuana, or dress freaky, or wear your hair long, or live with a girl while you were still in high school. Affluence, television, the proliferation of birth control devices and drugs, have liberated this generation. This liberation has led to perhaps the most critical difference between our generations—the choice of career and life style. We don't want to live out lives of quiet desperation in split-level suburbia. We don't want to make it on Wall Street, or contribute anything to the corporate-military-security nexus. We don't even want to join the Peace Corps anymore, because Vietnam taught us that is only a mask for the ugly wants of interventionism and imperialism. In short, we reject the root values of the culture—religion, materialism, patriotism, and status. And this is probably much more revolutionary than rejecting the Cold War or the New Deal.2

This life style differential is manifested in this way. The SDS respondents in the sample population do not identify with

---

the formal political party structure, have views on political and social issues that are more extreme than their NSA counterparts, are unorthodox in their religious affiliations, place significantly less emphasis on a goal-oriented career, choose a less pragmatic field of graduate study, read magazines that are outside the reading patterns of normative America, are considerably less concerned with permanence in their living arrangements, eschewing as they do ownership of a house, are more inclined to live in highly concentrated areas of population, or "where the action is," and manifest their value orientation by their willingness to be arrested for what they believe in.

In addition, the former SDS officer respondents are less willing to work within the system, have greater difficulty in reconciling the system and the responsibilities it demands, feel more deeply that they have compromised themselves in their relationship to the system, are alienated more completely by the system, and reject the system more fully than do the NSA officers.

The Hypotheses. The hypothesis concerning political attitudes was stated as Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their political orientation. Conclusion: The findings indicate that the hypothesis is, in general, not supported.

Empirical evidence from eight of thirteen measures specifies that there is a significant difference between the
officers of the two groups; however, non-support of the hypothesis is not total since five of the political measures are not significantly different.

On social attitudes Hypothesis 2 was stated in this manner: There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their social orientation. This hypothesis is not supported, as a significant difference is apparent between former officers of SDS and NSA in seven of nine measured items.

Concerning cultural and aesthetic interests Hypothesis 3 was stated as follows: There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their aesthetic interests. This hypothesis is generally supported. It was found that there were no differences in twelve of fifteen items measured to test this hypothesis.

To determine any difference in literary interests, the following Hypothesis 4 was set forth: There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their literary interests. This hypothesis is only supported in part. There was no difference between the respondents of both groups in six items measured, but five items measuring the type of magazines read showed that there was a significant difference in reading.

Academic performance was considered in Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA
and SDS in their academic achievement. The hypothesis is neither supported nor disproved. Of the two items utilized to measure academic achievement, the item for grade average in college showed no difference between the respondents for both groups, but the item measuring level of academic or degree attainment demonstrated that there was a significant difference between the NSA and SDS officers. Since NSA is older, the age differential between the two groups could account for this difference.

Hypothesis 6 regarding curricular choice was stated as follows: There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in the choice of their major field of concentration in college and/or graduate work. This hypothesis is neither supported nor disproved. There was no difference between the respondents of the two groups in their choice of an undergraduate major, but there was a difference between them in their choice of a graduate major.

Hypothesis 7 concerning religious identity was presented in this form: There is no significant difference between the former officers of NSA and SDS in their religious preference. The hypothesis is not supported. Differences between the respondents of the two groups do occur in their attitudes toward organized religion and religious experience.

Hypothesis 8 concerned occupational or career choice: There is no significant difference between the former officers of
NSA and SDS in their choice of career or occupation. This hypothesis is not supported, since there is a significant difference in the selection of the various occupation roles by the NSA and SDS officers. Because of the age differential between the former officers of NSA and SDS, this could account for the difference.

In summary, of the eight hypotheses, three are clearly not supported, four are supported in part, and only one is fully supported. Of the four hypotheses which are neither supported nor disproved, in each instance half of the items measured support the hypothesis, and the other half reject the hypothesis.

Relationship of Data to the Literature. The findings, in general, support what has already been reported in the literature concerning activists. Specifically, the data relevant to the SDS respondents indicate that they are socially and politically aware, very well-educated, intelligent as measured by graduate school attendance and undergraduate grade average, and high in cultural and aesthetic interests. This is consistent with the findings of Altbach, Katz, Heist, Watts and Whittaker, Lyons, Somers, Lyset, and Wolin, Flacks, Westby and Braungart, Soloman and Fishman, and Keniston. These characteristics would also be true of the NSA respondents.

There is some support in this study of the research suggested by Block, Haan, and Smith; namely, that moral issues
are at the heart of the matter. Certainly, the SDS respondents, and a large proportion of the NSA respondents, feel a sense of community with and responsibility for their fellow man. This moral imperative is their *Weltanschauung*. The SDS indicate that they vehemently act out their radical beliefs, as their arrest record would indicate.

The SDS respondents are non-careerist in their occupational outlook, a value that has been reported by both Keniston and the widely quoted study in the January, 1969 issue of *Fortune*. Both NSA, and to a greater extent, SDS, express satisfaction in their jobs based on the intrinsic aspects of the job. Consistent also with the literature is the choice of both undergraduate and graduate majors in primarily the humanities and social sciences for both NSA and SDS respondents, but less so for NSA persons at the graduate level.

Consistent with previous research findings are the data on religious affiliation. Most young people engaging in protest describe themselves as non-religious, which is precisely what we find among the SDS respondents. In fact, Flacks, Solomon and Fishman, and Watts and Whittaker note that a higher number of Jewish students are involved in protest than might be expected, and although the SDS respondents do not identify themselves as Jewish, just about half, or seven of fifteen, come from Jewish parentage.
One significant deviation from the findings in the literature is the rank order of personal priorities for both the NSA and SDS respondents, with marriage and family and occupation or career ranking one and two by the NSA officers and one and three for the SDS officers. The SDS respondents ranked national affairs second. Flacks found that dedication to work for national and international betterment and interest in the world of ideas, art, and music were ranked as most important personal values for his activist students. Those scoring low on activism tended to place marriage and family and career in the highest ranked positions of importance. Since we are dealing with an older, non-student population, this could possibly account for the difference.

What we can perceive from the data in this study is what Warren Bennis described in his book, The Temporary Society: a shift in values, "a shift from achievement on the basis of the Protestant ethic in society, to self-actualization; a shift from self-control to self-expression; a shift from independence to interdependence; a shift from the endurance of stress to the capacity for drive; and a shift from full employment to full lives." The respondents in this study, particularly those...

---

formerly in SDS, reject many of the values implicit in an
achievement-oriented, competitive, individualistic society. As
Keniston says: "Traditional roles, institutions, values and
symbols are critically scrutinized and often rejected, while new
roles, institutions, value and symbols more adequate to the modern
world are desperately sought."4

It would seem from the data that the NSA and SDS officers
are an elite group. They are a literate, artistic group of
individuals and the SDS officers especially reflect a non-pragmatic,
non-vocational life style.

The question, "Is the student revolutionary of today the
insurance salesman of tomorrow?", is pretty well rejected by the
present data. It is evident that most of the SDS respondents
continue to view themselves as radicals or revolutionaries, and
for the most part they feel more militant today than when they
were students. This reinforces the findings of Solomon and
Fishman, and Heist in their persistence studies. As Block, Haan
and Smith have expressed it, "Activism appears to represent a
relatively enduring personality disposition rather than an
isolated, impetuous, ephemeral behavioral act. The students
engaged in protest apparently make a relatively long-term

4Kenneth Keniston, "Notes on Young Radicals," Change,
November-December, 1969, p. 33.
commitment and direct their activities toward a number of issues."\(^5\) A survey by the *Wall Street Journal* of the leaders of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement in 1964 (Mario Savio and company) also rejects the question as postulated concerning their future orientation, finding them still very much in the radical camp.\(^6\)

It is true that moral and social issues have been the focus for a radical commitment by many activists, but radicalism has developed not only within a social and a cultural matrix, but above all, through a political context. The very act of becoming politicized has had a major impact on the behavior of many of the SDS officers. It is the contention of W. I. Thomas that the individual's definition of the situation is the basis upon which behavior emerges, and the SDS officers insist that their behavior is politically defined.

Daniel Bell argued that we had come upon "the end of ideology."\(^7\) By this he meant that present day society had achieved welfare-state capitalism, and along with such controls as


Keynesian economics, the objections raised during the nineteenth century and again throughout the thirties had been met; therefore, since there were apparently no new objections, the matter was closed. However, as the malaise of the fifties developed into the unrest of the sixties, it has become obvious that there has been no end of ideology at all. What was becoming evident was the emergence of a "post-scarcity" of "post-industrial" state, or as the physicist Max Borns called it, a "post-ethical" society. As Carl Oglesby has written, "ideological thought--critical thought with historical structure--had merely gone out of its conventional metier to prepare its negation of contemporary Western life."8 Thus, it was precisely politics that was being put into question. In the advanced industrial societies, the organized left has moved toward integration into the established political system and abandoned its radical vision. The impact of the Cold War on intellectualism tended to suffocate left political thought. A normalization between the university and government was established, and centrist became a national ideology. More recently, students began to debunk the ideology of centristism and we have a re-emergence of a left political analysis on the American scene. Thus, as one of the reports prepared for the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence put it:

it has devolved upon students in the West to reconstitute radical political action and ideology. In so doing, they adopt the populist, egalitarian, romantic, and generational rhetoric and style which characterized the classical student movements in the early stages of their development. But they also reject the ideological orientations and modes of action that were characteristic of the revolutionary left in earlier phases of industrialization and modernization.\(^9\)

"The New Left," says Oglesby, "is properly so called because in order to exist it had to overcome the memories, the certitudes, and the promises of the Old Left."\(^{10}\) This development coincided with the formation of SDS, and with the concept that ideas had consequences. As Oglesby makes it clear, the instinct of SDS from the beginning was to "discover the streets," and he suggests that there was nothing anti-intellectual about this. "It embodied rather a refusal to tolerate the further separation of thought from its consequences; only direct experience was incontrovertible."\(^{11}\) From the beginning, the movement gave the system the benefit of every doubt. An SDS slogan in 1964 was: "Part of the way with LBJ." A more radical consciousness gradually cam to be more widely shared as the movement broke from this quasi-relationship with the system. The English New Leftist

---


\(^{10}\)Carl Oglesby, "The Idea of the New Left," p. 84.

\(^{11}\)Ibid., p. 85.
Tom Fawthrop reflects to a considerable extent the thinking of the SDS officers in this study. He commented: "We chose the real politics of revolutionary democracy as opposed to the sham politics of revolutionary semantics. Every real struggle, every engagement with the power structure is worth a hundred revolutionary slogans."  

In a very real sense this points up the difference politically between the NSA and SDS respondents in this population. The NSA officers define themselves as liberals. Some would call them "Cold War" liberals, particularly those who were active in NSA during the period of C.I.A. influence. While actively involved in many of the insurgent campus and political movements of the day, many of the NSA officers were also able to move freely through the highest echelons of established power. "This form of Liberalism cannot properly be examined as a flabby compromise between general good will and compliance with the powers that be," according to Rosenthal.  

It is a highly structured belief in the socially curative power of the professional middle class. Armed with wisdom and know-how, the professional administers to the ills of society, constructing right order and

---

12Ibid.,

13See Sol Stern, "A Short Account of International Student Politics and the Cold War, with Particular Reference to the NSA, CIA, etc."

dispensing aid and justice to the oppressed. Liberalism represents the highest expression of managerial vision; the healthy society, in its view, is the society properly managed.

Another view of the liberal as it contrasts with the radical or revolutionary is presented by Harry S. Ashmore. Mr. Ashmore identifies the liberal as one committed to "the maintenance of an open society which accords all members justice." The liberal understands that his "primary task may be to see that the necessary compromises are not fatal," and although Ashmore is skeptical of the short-range results of democracy, he sees the liberal as perceiving no substitute for self-government. The liberal "acknowledges the existence of power and distrusts it; he accepts the use of force only when it is allied with constitutional authority and the rule of law."\textsuperscript{15}

The radical would counter that to be realistic cannot mean to limit oneself to what now seems politically possible, but to undertake the impossible in an attitude of trust. In other words, it is only by tackling the impossible that we can discover what is possible. As Robert Kennedy said, "Some men see things as they are and say why. I dream things that never were and say why not."\textsuperscript{16} Thus, the new revolutionary movement provided the

\textsuperscript{15}Harry S. Ashmore, "Vanishing Liberals?", The Center Magazine, September, 1969, p. 81.

\textsuperscript{16}From Text of Senator Edward M. Kennedy's tribute to his brother, Chicago Sun-Times, Sunday, June 9, 1968, p. 4.
context for the development of a new style of life. For the revolutionary, feeling he has been excluded from the exercise of political power within the present technological order, the occasion for the gradual shaping of a new vision of a new social order is provided. As Hannah Arendt describes it, "this tradition represents the coincidence of the idea of freedom and the experience of a new beginning. It is an attempt to liberate man and to build a new order by means of daring human initiative."17

Robert Brustein, Dean of the Yale University School of Drama, claims that the militant radical movement is characterized by its genuine lack of interest and concern for individual freedom, and he says the question is, "how to maintain individual freedom without sacrificing social progress and how to achieve social progress without sacrificing individual freedom?"18 This, he contends, is the issue to which liberals and radicals ought to be addressing themselves.

Cary James, in a refutation to Mr. Ashmore's definition of the liberal, takes issue with his view of constitutional authority. He insists that the young know that "constituted authority is a grand cloak behind which always lies power, and

---

that the 'rule of law' is the exercise of a legal system, but not necessarily of justice,"¹⁹ and he cites such constituted authority as Hitler, George III, and the Czars to fortify his position.

Mr. James calls for the "redirection of the family of man" due to the changing impact of population and technology.²⁰ Mr. Ashmore, in this ongoing dialogue, states that it is precisely these "great, dislocating changes that raise for the first time the prospect of freeing man from the material demands of mere survival, and opening up for humankind at wholesale the possibilities of leisure, learning, and informed speculation previously reserved for a small elite,"²¹ as long as man maintains a rational, detached view of life. While Ashmore would accommodate change to "ordered liberty," James notes that "revolution occurs only when a system has become so unbalanced that it can no longer correct itself, when the dynamic of change has been replaced by the stasis of privilege."²² This, of course, is the position taken by the SDS respondents. The question comes back to whether it is better to work for social renewal from within or outside the structures of the system?

¹⁹ Cary James, "The Liberal: Friend or Foe?", The Center Magazine, November, 1969, p. 68.
²⁰ Ibid., p. 70.
²² James, "The Liberal: Friend or Foe," p. 76.
Shaull's thesis is that the very "size of institutions and the concentration of power which each represents create a situation in which it is very difficult to conceive of doing anything effective except from within."\textsuperscript{23} The prospects of accomplishing anything outside the structures are not very encouraging, and Shaull even postulates that those who do work outside the system "can end up at the margin of the struggle for change. In fact, they may eventually wake up to discover that the battle for the very issues which most concerned them has been going on elsewhere."\textsuperscript{24} He warns that they are often threatened with the same inertia and inflexibility that they originally rebelled against. Shaull suggests that a strategy for guerrilla action offers the possibility for "a redefinition of the problem." By this he means not whether a group is working for radical change inside or outside of the system, but whether or not it has its "own self-identity and base of operation, a clear definition of its goals, and a relevant plan of action--whatever its relation to and position in a particular institution."\textsuperscript{25} For those who would do this, he feels that there would be no special merit in being outside the structures. "The important thing," he says, "is to use


\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., p. 240.

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid.
them for the purposes of social transformation, wherever this is possible."\(^{26}\) This is the tactic that has been adopted by a considerable number of SDS respondents.

Many of the NSA officers voiced a concern for the corruption of the revolutionary ethic itself. Shaull contends that "it is very easy to be intensely concerned about the well-being of man and blind to what is happening to men and women. Moreover, there is something about the revolutionary struggle itself that is dehumanizing, and that releases forces which work against the goals previously established."\(^{27}\) "Only the revolutionary," says Shaull, "whose political commitments are related to a broader vision of human life and history can cope with this situation, and thus contribute significantly to the humanization of contemporary society."\(^{28}\) His conclusion is to work toward permanent revolution rather than total revolution in the sense of a head-on assault on the total structure of the established order. He would opt for a large number of small victories that create more open and flexible institutions capable of responding to new problems in more creative ways. These types of changes, he believes, will push the revolutionary process forward to new stages.\(^{29}\)


What these officers of SDS, and those NSA officers who identify with the root values of the Movement, have done is to transform the vision of a significant segment of the society, particularly the young, from a conventional mode to that of a revolutionary one--one in which an entire new style of life has emerged. In fact, many of the young today define the Movement, not in terms of a social or political revolution, but as a cultural revolution. Many of the young today--students and others--avoid the mandate of the dominant culture, and have embarked on a revolution in music, art and morality, that is distinctly different from the traditional values of rationalism, puritanism, and materialism. This cultural revolution is a style different even from the post-industrial life style, and certainly a quantum leap from the values implied in the Protestant Ethic. "What is most impressive about the radical young," according to Martin Duberman, "is not their politics or their social theories, but the cultural revolution they have inaugurated."\(^{30}\)

The sources and manifestations of the revolution lie in "a bewildering grabbag that includes hallucinatory drugs, bisexuality, communal pads, dashikis and bluejeans, rock and
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soul, Eastern mystics, scientology, encounter groups, microbiotic foods, astrology, street theaters and free stores.\textsuperscript{31}

This alternate or counter culture\textsuperscript{32} has been called by some a "rock culture," a culture that is not only producing its own films and film stars but a culture that takes technology for granted and is developing new art forms. The epitome of its creation was the Woodstock Festival, and such stars as Arlo Guthrie, Mick Jagger, Bob Dylan, and Ringo Starr. Eisen has this to say about the rock rebellion:

What holds rock together is not uniformity of sound or agreed on definitions or even a stable constituency. Rather, it is a consciousness, an aesthetic and a framework of reference—a new reality principle if you will—that has set apart the rock people from the rest of the culture in certain important and discernible ways. Rock is not a protest movement. There is an occasional rock song with a political point to make, but even in such cases the words are not the important part, or even the part that conveys the protest. Rock is its own rebellion, its own medium and its own message. Into its own thing, rock tends toward the position that the revolution has already occurred.\textsuperscript{33}

"There is a feeling among those who have converted," says Eisen, "that there is nothing to be gained through the old forms of political protest any longer." They recognize that the system

\textsuperscript{31}Ibid.


is oppressive, but that "there are ways to get around it, to get around its predominant values and to circumvent the ways that it has set up for seeking change."34

The answer, then, to arriving at a system that is viable, open, just, and humane would seem to be multilateral in its approach. While many of the young today continue to identify with a political model for change, others have pursued an alternate culture. In this latter sense, it is clear that a portion of the Movement is becoming a dominant fact of life—a dominant stream within American society. What is being formulated is a "New History," as Robert Jay Lifton calls it, a period of radical re-creation of the forms of human culture—biological, institutional, technological, experiential, aesthetic, and interpretive. This represents a quest by the young for a new kind of revolution, shifting as it does from fixed, all-encompassing forms of ideology to more fluid ideological fragments. It finds expression in a contemporary psychological style that is defined by Lifton as "protean", or one characterized by interminable exploration and flux. In other words, the protean man seeks to remain open, in the midst of his revolution, in order to draw on the extraordinarily rich, confusing, threatening as well as liberating contemporary historical possibilities.35

34Ibid.
This New Left style of revolutionary behavior "is an attempt on the part of the young to mobilize the fluidity of the twentieth century as a weapon against what they perceive to be two kinds of stagnation: the old, unresponsive institutions and newly emerging but fixed technological visions (people 'programmed' by computers in a 'technetronic society')."36

The rebel is extending his field of possibilities through mockery—hair, dress, general social and sexual style—for as Lifton says, "when historical dislocation is sufficiently profound, mockery can become the only inwardly authentic tone for expressing what people feel about their relationships to the institutions of their world."37

There are many within our society who are genuinely concerned with social justice, and the radical, by definition, is not the only person interested in a transformation of our basic institutional structures. The real question, as Joseph Duffey, National Chairman of Americans for Democratic Action sees it, "concerns the transition from what our society is now to what it has got to become. I don't think that transition will come about only through evolution or reform. There will have to be some dismantling. Some of it will be revolutionary. What we

36 Ibid., p. 50.
37 Ibid.
ought to pay attention to is what an adult political movement is and how it can address itself to social transition in a humane way."

In the radicals' constant search for new forms, it would be well to bear in mind that man as an organism cries out for stability. Since there has always been for radicals a perception and feeling of distance between aspirations and achievement, one way of bridging this gap might be to combine the dement of flux with that of connectedness and consistency. Any history worthy of the name not only confronts the old, but draws actively from it. Thus, continuity is needed in order to form a society that is truly human. The classical dialectic of thesis to antithesis to synthesis may well serve as an appropriate model, as well as being relevant to the needs of this day. We have reached the stage where a synthesis of ideas is not only incumbent, but necessary. Existential man must realize that to live is to suffer, but to survive is to find meaning in the suffering. If there is a purpose in life at all, there must be a purpose in suffering and in dying. But no man can tell another what this purpose is. Each person must find out for himself, and he must accept the responsibility that his answer prescribes. The New Left activist responds existentially to his present situation, and for this

---

he is acting responsibly. But he must be aware of the human consequences of his action. If a person succeeds in discovering the purpose of his existence, he will continue to grow in spite of all indignities. As Viktor Frankl is fond of saying: "He who has a why to live can bear with almost any how." 39 A sanguine look at our present difficulty is provided by the Swedish scholar, Gunnar Myrdal:

America is now in real crisis, and God knows how she will get out of it. Nevertheless, I keep my faith. I have always felt that America would solve its crises. I have become convinced through intensive study that what I call the American Conscience is not only an explicit system of values but an historical trend to fulfillment. 40

Things do change in America, but slowly. Meanwhile thousands of precious, beautiful children in poor communities are crippled and possibly destroyed by the environmental conditions they are exposed to while growing up. While it is true that the rule of law is important in civilized society, the law itself is not sacred. People are sacred.

It is for this reason that so many of the young oppose the systematic destruction of all that they feel is good and wholesome in our society. In reply to a speech by George F. Kennan


prepared for the dedication of a new library at Swathmore College, and printed in the *New York Times* Sunday Magazine for January 21, 1968, in which he was critical of the irrationality of activist students, several students provided a brilliant exposition of their views. A student from Notre Dame wrote:

> For us, to choose a democratic system is not to accept all its workings, administrative and legislative, without question. The essence of democracy is not, for us, the willingness to accept the dictates of the majority, but the readiness to respect and defend the dignity and rights of the many minorities. Most of us believe strongly in the democratic ideal thus stated, and in fact hold it to be the most free and viable system yet conceived and implemented by man. Yet even we must admit that in recent years the gap between this ideal and the practice in our land has assumed yarning proportions.\(^\text{41}\)

A Harvard student responded:

> Order is not necessarily good: the army is orderly, Madison Avenue is orderly, capital punishment is orderly. Cleanliness is certainly not either good or bad—unless one has a strictly Puritan middle-class view of it. What we need is sanity, not order; morally clean actions, not cleanliness; self-approval and self-understanding, not self-abnegation; commitment to make society healthy, not health.\(^\text{42}\)

It is this rational call for action and commitment that we must all heed. It is important to analyze that change must be forthcoming via societal institutions. Institutions as well as


\(^{42}\text{Nicholas Macdonald in Ibid., p. 78.}\)
human beings are weak and imperfect; thus, it is reasonable to hold that institutions, if not perfectible, are at least improvable to a point where war and poverty, exploitation and racism can disappear. It is necessary to work diligently for institutional transformation, and this change must be enacted immediately and without delay. It is only through this means that men—students, radicals, the everyday person—can have faith in the responsiveness of our present structures, and can open up a future that will be bright and prosperous for everyone.

Given the will for change, the courage, enlightenment and sensitivity of its people, this country will forge in the latter third of the Twentieth Century a society based on love, understanding, mutual trust and respect for all its citizens. There is no alternative.

**Summary**

In this chapter we have directed attention to the various institutional and societal forces that have influenced the emergence of new life styles and a new culture.

The eight hypotheses positing no difference between former officers of NSA and SDS were analyzed relevant to the data, with some conclusions drawn from the fact that all but one of the hypotheses were not supported in whole or in part.
Finally, it was observed that there is a consistency between the findings in the literature and those found in this study concerning characteristics of young radicals.

Recommendations for future study will be presented in Chapter VI.
In order to provide a certain perspective, a review of this study is made to determine any limitations. These limitations are discussed in this chapter and an attempt is made to suggest directions for future studies.

**Limitations of Study.** Certain weaknesses are evident in an evaluation of this study, one major one being that the size of the pretest sample was inadequate. Had the pretest sample been larger and more inclusive, it would have uncovered some of the deficiencies in the questionnaire finally utilized. It would also have allowed for a more sensitive refinement of the questionnaire.

The final questionnaire itself posed some weaknesses. As previously mentioned, the commission of certain questions impeded the efforts to gain some necessary data. Several questions provided data that were not fully utilized due to the nature of the data and the way in which the sample population responded.
It was apparent as the data were analyzed that all of the questions were not fully appropriate, and greater emphasis could have been placed on other areas of interest. A series of more discerning questions perhaps could have delineated the life styles of the respondents even more definitively than was actually the case. The attempt to determine sources of influence over those in the sample population was relatively unsuccessful.

The sample, as used for this thesis, is somewhat limited in size. It would have been helpful to have a larger sample, particularly among the SDS respondents. This was exceedingly difficult, due to the nature of the group studied, the recency of SDS' organization, and the problem in reaching them. While the SDS sample is clearly inadequate in size, it is important to emphasize that the universe is a very limited one by definition.

Recommendations for Further Study. Future research into this area should utilize personal interviews rather than mailed questionnaires, whenever possible. While the open end questions used in this study provided substantial qualitative information and complemented the more structured data, an interview situation would allow for greater probing in depth. Furthermore, the use of an interview schedule would permit a more subtle, intensive, exploratory study.

It is felt that a broader study of the NSA and SDS membership is warranted. This would go beyond merely a study of
the national officers of these associations; it would include the local campus officers for both groups. Such a study would reflect a broader demographic base, as well as the possibility of more divergent regional, university, and class groups. Further, it would be well to study the "male chauvinism" of NSA, and male-female differences in SDS.

The hypotheses might be modified to explore parental social class as they influence NSA and SDS officers, as well as to determine the value orientations of parents and officers and concomitant study of parents and siblings. It would be well to study more fully the relationship of the officers to the political arena so as to discern the many nuances in political style and orientation. An effort should also be made to determine more directly the trends of the Movement, and its impact on the future of society. This could be reviewed in two ways: through an historical overview and, because of the acceleration of change affecting today's youth, through a careful analysis of high school students' attitudes and values. This would be a study of those high school students who are living a life style basically identified with the Movement. There is also a need to study control groups at the other end of the political spectrum; e.g., Ripon Society, Y.A.F., etc.

Several other suggestions for further study are presented as follows:
There is a need for further analyze the data from this study. It would be of significance to future research to compare the SDS officers with the NSA officers for the same period in which leadership was held. Another variation would be to compare the NSA and SDS officers in the same age bracket.

It would also be helpful to compare the younger members of NSA with the older members of NSA. It might even prove beneficial to divide up the NSA officers into four groups representing each five year period of the association's existence, and compare the groups. Such extensions of the present study were deemed beyond the scope of this thesis.

Other variables that might be considered for further research could be the respondents' attitudes toward violent revolution vis-à-vis reform, and the development of some suggestions for positive and constructive alternatives to the present system.

Perhaps the greatest merit of this study has been to generate questions like the following, to be directed to the general college or university population:

Does society need reforming? Can the reforming be done peacefully? Is reform from within the system possible or might it come from outside? And by political organizing or confrontation tactics or by violent revolution?

An apparent weakness of this study, viewing this study as objectively as possible, could be inadequate analysis of the data, and a tendency to interpret the data too subjectively.
It is this researcher's sincere hope that not only will there be a further examination of the premises upon which this study is based, but that further study in this area will be explored. In so doing, it is hoped that other studies will make allowances for some of the factors neglected in this thesis, and will shed some additional light which this study failed to disclose on some of the variables.
This is a pilot questionnaire being used in a doctoral dissertation study of the past national officers of the National Student Association (NSA) and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Please answer all of the questions to the best of your ability.

We are attempting to learn why you have made your present career choice (at this particular point in your life), how your college experience has affected that choice, something about your background, and your views on a range of social and philosophical issues.

If any of the questions are ambiguous or unclear, kindly make a note to that effect on the questionnaire. Your responses to the questions, particularly those to the open-ended questions in the last part of the questionnaire, will be utilized in the dissertation study. The results of this study will remain completely confidential, and you will not be personally identified. Therefore, I encourage you to respond honestly and openly.

My very personal thanks to you for taking time to complete this questionnaire, and for helping me to make this study a reality.

Kenneth P. Saurman

KPS:il
Enclosure
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In answering the questions below, please circle the appropriate number for each question. Circle only one choice unless otherwise indicated.

1. Sex:
   1. Male
   2. Female

2. Please indicate your age as of your last birthdate: ____________

3. Marital Status:
   1. Single
   2. Engaged
   3. Not married, living with someone with children
   4. Not married, living with someone without children
   5. Married without children
   6. Married with children
   7. Divorced
   8. Separated
   9. Widowed

4. Religious Affiliation:
   1. Protestant – Indicate specific denomination _______________
   2. Roman Catholic
   3. Jewish
   4. Other (please specify) __________________________
   5. None

5. Education:
   1. College, incomplete
   2. College, graduate
   3. Some graduate work, no degree
   4. Master's degree
   5. Beyond master's no degree
   6. Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.
   7. Graduate study toward professional study but no degree
   8. Professional degree (please specify) __________________________

6. Race:
   1. White
   2. Black
   3. Yellow
   4. Other

7. Income: Please indicate the combined income of you, your husband or wife, last year (1968): __________________________

8. What is your political preference?
   1. Democrat
   2. Republican
   3. Other __________________________

Comment:
9. Does your political orientation differ significantly from that of your parents?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   Explain: ____________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

10. Are both your parents currently living and together?
   1. Yes, both living and together
   2. No, parents separated or divorced
   3. Mother dead
   4. Father dead
   5. Both parents dead

11. What is (or was) your father's principal occupation?
   1. Professional (e.g., physician, lawyer, architect)
   2. Manager, proprietor or official of a firm or agency
   3. Sales worker
   4. Clerical worker
   5. Skilled workman (e.g., craftsman, technical worker or foreman)
   6. Semi-skilled worker
   7. Unskilled worker
   8. Farmer
   9. Other

12. List specifically the occupation your father is (or was) associated with (Please avoid such general terms as manager, salesman, office worker, engineer):
   ________________________________________________________________

13. What is (or was) your mother's occupation if other than housewife? (again, please be specific):
   ________________________________________________________________

14. Indicate the highest educational attainment of both your mother and your father:

   1. Some grade school or less
   2. Grade school graduate
   3. Some high school
   4. High school graduate
   5. Some college
   6. College graduate
   7. Some graduate or professional education
   8. Graduate school or professional school degree recipient

   14. Mother       15. Father
   1
   2
   3
   4
   5
   6
   7
   8
16. Which of the following best describes your parents' ethnic background or nationality?

1. Anglo-Saxon (Australian, Canadian, Scottish)  
2. Belgian, French, French Canadian  
3. Far Eastern (Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, etc.)  
4. German, Austrian, Swiss  
5. Irish  
6. Italian  
7. Middle Eastern  
8. Greek  
9. Black  
10. Slav (Polish, Czech, Russian, etc.)  
11. Spanish, Portuguese, Latin American  
12. Swedish, Finnish, Danish, Norwegian  
13. Other

17. Father

16. Mother  
17. Father

18. Are you a U. S. citizen?

1. Yes  
2. No

19. Where do you live at the present time?

1. Large city, over 1,000,000  
2. City, 100,000 to 999,999  
3. Suburbs of city over 1,000,000  
4. Suburbs of city 100,000 to 999,999  
5. Rural  
6. Other, please specify ________________________________

20. In what type of dwelling do you currently reside?

1. House  
2. Duplex  
3. Apartment  
4. Room  
5. Other

21. Do you own or rent the dwelling in which you currently reside?

1. Own  
2. Rent

22. Where did you spend most of your childhood years?

1. Large city, over 1,000,000  
2. City, 100,000 to 999,999  
3. Suburbs of city over 1,000,000  
4. Suburbs of city 100,000 to 999,999  
5. Rural  
6. Other, please specify ________________________________
23. Have you ever served in the military service?
   1. Yes
   2. No

24. If yes, in what branch of the military have you served?
   1. Army
   2. Navy
   3. Air Force
   4. Marines
   5. Coast Guard
   6. Other, specify ________________

25. Have you ever served in the Peace Corps and/or Vista?
   25. Peace Corps
       1. Yes
       2. No
   26. Vista
       1. Yes
       2. No

27. Have you ever been arrested in connection with any civil rights or anti-war activities?
   1. Yes
   2. No

28. If yes, what was the charge?

29. Have you ever been jailed in connection with any civil rights or anti-war activities?
   1. Yes
   2. No

30. If yes, explain:

31. Which of the following best describes your current relations with your mother and father?

31. Mother
   1. Mother is dead
   2. Very close
   3. Somewhat close
   4. In touch, but not close ties
   5. Not in touch
   6. Open hostility

32. Father
   1. Father is dead
   2. Very close
   3. Somewhat close
   4. In touch, but not close ties
   5. Not in touch
   6. Open hostility
33. What was your mother and father's attitude toward your student action organization?

33. Mother
   1. Supportive
   2. Opposed
   3. Neutral

34. Father
   1. Supportive
   2. Opposed
   3. Neutral

35. Indicate type of colleges you attended:

1. State university
2. State college
3. Teachers college
4. Private university
5. Private urban university
6. Private college
7. Ivy league college

36. What year did you receive your Bachelor's degree?

37. Major field as undergraduate (please specify):

38. Major field in graduate study if applicable (please specify):

39. What was your overall grade average in college as an undergraduate?

1. A  2. B+  3. B-
4. C+  5. C  6. C-
7. D  8. Failing

9. If governed by another grading system, please indicate:

0. Indicate exact grade point average, if known

40. Indicate the degree of influence of the following kinds of people on your organizational activity in college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Slightly Influential</th>
<th>No Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Father</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College faculty members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Individual faculty member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Friends in college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Others (please specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. __________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. __________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. __________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. How do you think your family's (or parents) economic position now compares with what it was when you were about ten years old?

1. Considerably higher now
2. Somewhat higher now
3. About the same now
4. Somewhat lower now
5. Considerably lower now
6. I have no idea whatsoever

42. How would you compare your own economic position today with your parents at the same age?

1. Considerably higher
2. Somewhat higher
3. About the same
4. Somewhat lower
5. Considerably lower
6. I have no idea whatsoever

43. Considering the opinion of people in general toward you when you were in college and at the present time, would you say that such opinion of people now is:

1. More important to you
2. Less important to you
3. About the same in importance to you

44. What is your occupation? Please specify as closely as possible in the space allotted.

45. Does your current occupation include an extension of your student action interests, or are they in any way related? Explain fully.

46. Aside from your work, about how much serious reading do you have time for each week, on the average?

1. None
2. 1-2 hours
3. 3-5 hours
4. 6-10 hours
5. 11-20 hours
6. 21 hours or more

47. Indicate the three writers who have been most influential on your behavior.
48. How many books do you yourself own—as in your family home?
   1. Under 50
   2. 50-99
   3. 100-249
   4. 250-499
   5. 500-999
   6. 1,000 and over

49. What five magazines or periodicals do you regularly read?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. Please rank in order of your first preference the three activities at present that are most satisfying to you?

1. Career or occupation
2. Marriage and family
3. Literature, art, music
4. Associations with friends
5. Associations with parents and/or relatives
6. Leisure time activities (sports, reading, T.V., hobbies, etc.)
7. Religious beliefs and activities
8. Local community affairs
9. National affairs
10. International relations

51. 60. How much do you enjoy each of the following?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Poetry
52. Classical Music
53. Jazz
54. Folk Music
55. "Popular" Music
56. Painting
57. Sculpting
58. Fiction
59. Non-Fiction
60. Visiting art galleries

61. 68. How often during the past year have you gone to each of the following?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. A bookstore, for browsing
62. Plays and other dramatic performances
63. Concerts or ballet
64. Public lectures
65. Political rallies
66. Art galleries or exhibits
67. Serious study group
68. Foreign or experimental films
69. In my opinion most people are:

1. Good by nature and in actual behavior
2. Good by nature but led astray
3. Not good by nature but trained and improved in society
4. Not good by nature nor in actual behavior
5. Other opinion

70. Read each of the statements below and indicate your reaction to each one in terms of whether you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly approve</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>Strongly disapprove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draw a circle around the SA if you strongly approve of the statement; around the A if you approve; around the N if you are neutral; or around the D if you disapprove; or around the SD if you strongly disapprove.

70. U. S. Bombing of North Vietnam
71. U. S. Troops in Dominican Republic
72. Student involvement in protest demonstrations
73. Civil rights protests using civil disobedience
74. Congressional investigations of "un-American activities"
75. Lyndon Johnson
76. Richard Nixon
77. Eugene McCarthy
78. Eldridge Cleaver
79. Full socialization of all industries
80. Socialization of medical profession
81. Black Power

82. All things considered, do you feel that your present work provides the satisfactions and rewards you had anticipated by this time?
1. Yes
2. No

83. Do you feel that your career aspirations at the time you completed your undergraduate education were realistic?
1. Yes
2. No
In this final section, I would be grateful to your responding to several open-ended questions (attach extra sheets if you need additional space).

The following are the kind of questions an uninitiated person might ask of someone who has been through an active student political experience. Imagine that you are trying to explain to someone like this your position on these issues, and try to answer these questions in that context.

1. Looking back, do you feel differently now than when you were college age about the things that are important in the choice of a career? Explain.

2. Speaking generally, what are the things about this country that you are most proud of as an American?

3. List the three things in this country that you think are most in need of a change.


5. What do you think of the social future of American society, say, twenty years from now? Explain.
6. Do you feel that you can work within what is generally referred to as the "system" or the establishment? Explain.

7. When you were a student leader, did you hold the same view? Explain.

8. Do you feel that it is necessary to reconcile or accept the "system" as it is presently constructed when you have such responsibilities as children, automobiles, a mortgaged house, etc.? Explain.

9. Do you feel that you compromise your ideals and violate your principles by working within the "system"? Explain.

10. Do you feel that our society as it is presently constituted can be responsive to the needs of the poor and other disenfranchised groups? Explain.

11. Do you consider yourself alienated or divorced from the "system" or establishment? Explain.
12. Does this differ from your opinion when you were a college student? Explain.

13. In your opinion, is it possible to follow a career independent of the "system" or establishment? Explain.

14. If you reject the "system," is your rejection total or partial? Explain.

15. Do you feel that you have changed your thinking on social issues in any way from the way you felt as a college student? Explain.

16. Do you think it is possible for you personally to bring about change in the "system"? Explain.
17. Did your activism as a student bring about any changes which gave you a sense of satisfaction? Explain.

18. Do you feel more strongly about current social and political issues today than you did as a college student? Explain.
In answering the questions below, please write the appropriate number in the box provided for each question. Make only one choice unless otherwise indicated. Please complete each question fully where you are asked to Explain your answer.

1. Sex:
   1. Male
   2. Female

2. Please indicate your age as of your last birthdate:

3. Marital Status:
   1. Single
   2. Engaged
   3. Not married, living with someone with children
   4. Not married, living with someone without children
   5. Married without children
   6. Married with children
   7. Divorced
   8. Separated
   9. Widowed

4. Religious Affiliation:
   1. Protestant - Indicate specific denomination
   2. Roman Catholic
   3. Jewish
   4. Other (please specify)
   5. None

5. Education:
   1. College, incomplete
   2. College, graduate
   3. Some graduate work, no degree
   4. Master's degree
   5. Beyond master's no degree
   6. Ph. D., Ed. D., etc.
   7. Graduate study toward professional study but no degree
   8. Professional degree (please specify)

6. Race:
   1. White
   2. Black
   3. Yellow
   4. Other

7. Income: Please indicate the combined income of you, your husband or wife, last year (1968).
8. What is your political party preference?
1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Other
Comment:

9.
10. Indicate the political party preference of both your mother and father.
1. Socialist
2. Liberal Democrat
3. Conservative Democrat
4. Independent leaning toward Democrat
5. Independent leaning toward Republican
6. Liberal Republican
7. Conservative Republican
8. Other, PLEASE specify

11. Are both your parents currently living and together?
1. Yes, both living and together
2. No, parents separated or divorced
3. Mother dead
4. Father dead
5. Both parents dead

12. What is (or was) your father's principal occupation?
1. Professional (e.g., physician, lawyer, architect)
2. Manager, proprietor or official of a firm or agency
3. Sales worker
4. Clerical worker
5. Skilled worker (e.g., craftsman, technical worker or foreman)
6. Semi-skilled worker
7. Unskilled worker
8. Farmer
9. Other

13. List specifically the occupation your father is (or was) associated with (Please avoid such general terms as manager, salesman, office worker, engineer—please write in space provided):

14. What is (or was) your mother's occupation if other than housewife? (Again, please be specific and write in space provided):

15. Indicate the highest educational attainment of both your mother and your father:
1. Some grade school or less
2. Grade school graduate
3. Some high school
4. High school graduate
5. Some college
6. College graduate
7. Some graduate or professional education
8. Graduate school or professional school degree recipient

16. Which of the following best describes your parents' ethnic background or nationality?
1. Anglo-Saxon (Australian, Canadian, Scottish)
2. Belgian, French, French Canadian
3. Far Eastern (Japanese, Chinese, Filippino, etc.)
4. German, Austrian, Swiss
5. Irish
6. Italian
7. Middle Eastern
8. Greek
9. Black
10. Slav (Polish, Czech, Russian, etc.)
11. Spanish, Portuguese, Latin American
12. Swedish, Finnish, Danish, Norwegian
13. Other

17. Are you a U.S. citizen?
1. Yes
2. No

18. Where do you live at the present time?
1. Large city over 1,000,000
2. City, 100,000 to 999,999
3. Suburbs of city over 1,000,000
4. Suburbs of city 100,000 to 999,999
5. Rural
6. Other, please specify

19. What is (or was) your mother's occupation if other than housewife? (Again, please be specific and write in space provided):

20. In what type of dwelling do you currently reside?
1. House
2. Duplex
3. Apartment
4. Room
5. Other
22. Do you own or rent the dwelling in which you currently reside?
   1. Own
   2. Rent

23. Where did you spend most of your childhood years?
   1. Large city, over 1,000,000
   2. City, 100,000 to 999,999
   3. Suburbs of city over 1,000,000
   4. Suburbs of city 100,000 to 999,999
   5. Rural
   6. Other, please specify

24. Have you ever served in the military service?
   1. Yes
   2. No

25. If yes, in what branch of the military have you served?
   1. Army
   2. Navy
   3. Air Force
   4. Marines
   5. Coast Guard
   6. Other, specify

26. Have you ever served in the Peace Corps and/or Vista?
   26. Peace Corps
      1. Yes
      2. No
   27. Vista
      1. Yes
      2. No

28. Have you ever been arrested in connection with any civil rights or anti-war activities?
   1. Yes
   2. No

29. If yes, what was the charge? (Please indicate in the space provided).

30. Have you ever been jailed in connection with any civil rights or anti-war activities?
   1. Yes
   2. No

31. If yes, explain: (Please indicate in the space provided).

32. Which of the following best describes your current relations with your mother and father?
   32. Mother
      1. Mother is dead
      2. Very close
      3. Somewhat close
      4. In touch, but not close ties
      5. Not in touch
      6. Open hostility
   33. Father
      1. Father is dead
      2. Very close
      3. Somewhat close
      4. In touch, but not close ties
      5. Not in touch
      6. Open hostility

34. What was your mother and father's attitude toward your involvement in student politics?
   34. Mother
      1. Supportive
      2. Opposed
      3. Neutral
   35. Father
      1. Supportive
      2. Opposed
      3. Neutral

36. Indicate type of colleges you attended. (Make your first choice in Box number 47. If you have attended more than one school, indicate in Box numbers 48 and 49):
   1. State university
   2. State college
   3. Teachers college
   4. Private university
   5. Private urban university
   6. Private college
   7. Ivy league college

37. What year did you receive your Bachelor's degree?

38. Major field as undergraduate (please specify in space provided):

39. Major field in graduate study if applicable (please specify in space provided):
40. What was your overall grade average in college as an undergraduate?

1. A 5. C-
2. B+ 6. C-
3. B- 7. D
4. C+ 8. Failing
5. C 9. If governed by another grading system, please indicate

0. Indicate exact grade point average, if known

41. Indicate the degree of influence of the following kinds of people on your organizational activity in college according to the following rating scale:

1 - Very Influential 2 - Slightly Influential 3 - No Influence

1. Father 5. Individual faculty member
2. Mother 6. Friends in college
3. Other relatives 7. Others (please specify)
4. College faculty members as a group

42. How do you think your family's (or parents') economic position now compares with what it was when you were about ten years old?

1. Considerably higher now 4. 6-10 hours
2. Somewhat higher now 5. 11-20 hours
3. About the same now 6. 21 hours or more
4. Somewhat lower now
5. Considerably lower now
6. I have no idea whatsoever

43. How would you compare your own economic position today with your parents at the same age?

1. Considerably higher 4. 6-10 hours
2. Somewhat higher 5. 11-20 hours
3. About the same 6. 21 hours or more
4. Somewhat lower
5. Considerably lower
6. I have no idea whatsoever

44. What is your occupation? Please specify as closely as possible in the space allotted.

45. Does your current occupation include an extension of your student action interests, or are they in any way related? Explain fully.

46. Aside from your work, about how much serious reading do you have time for each week, on the average?

1. None 4. 6-10 hours
2. 1-2 hours 5. 11-20 hours
3. 3-5 hours 6. 21 hours or more

47. Indicate the three writers who have had the most influence on you.

48. How many books do you yourself own—as in your family home?

1. Under 50 4. 250-499
2. 50-99 5. 500-999
3. 100-249 6. 1,000 and over

49. What five magazines or periodicals do you regularly read?

50. Please rank in order of your first preference the three activities at present that are most satisfying to you?

1. Career or occupation 5. Associations with parents and/or relatives
2. Marriage and family 6. Leisure time activities (sports, reading, TV, hobbies, etc.)
3. Literature, art, music 7. Religious beliefs and activities
4. Associations with friends 8. Local community affairs

9. National affairs
10. International relations
51. How much do you enjoy each of the following? Please respond in the appropriate box according to this rating scale:

1 = Very much  2 = Moderately  3 = Not Much  4 = Not at all

51. Poetry
52. Classical Music
53. Jazz
54. Folk Music
55. Popular Music
56. Painting
57. Sculpting
58. Fiction
59. Non-Fiction
60. Visiting art galleries

61. How often during the past year have you gone to each of the following? Please respond in the appropriate box according to this rating scale:

1 = Never  2 = Once or twice  3 = Three or more

61. A bookstore, for browsing
62. Plays and other dramatic performances
63. Concerts or ballet
64. Public lectures
65. Political rallies
66. Art galleries or exhibits
67. Serious study group
68. Foreign or experimental films

69. Read each of the statements below and indicate your reaction to each one in terms of whether you

1 Strongly approve  2 Approve  3 Neutral  4 Disapprove  5 Strongly disapprove

Place a 1 in the box if you strongly approve of the statement; place a 2 if you approve; place a 3 if you are neutral; place a 4 if you disapprove; or place a 5 if you strongly disapprove.

69. U. S. Bombing of North Vietnam
70. U. S. Troops in Dominican Republic
71. Student involvement in protest demonstrations
72. Civil rights protests using civil disobedience
73. Congressional investigations of "un-American activities"
74. Lyndon Johnson
75. Richard Nixon
76. Eugene McCarthy
77. Eldridge Cleaver
78. Full socialization of all industries
79. Socialization of medical profession
80. Black Power

81. All things considered, do you feel that your present work provides the satisfactions and rewards you had anticipated by this time?

1. Yes
2. No

82. Do you feel that your career aspirations at the time you completed your undergraduate education were realistic?

1. Yes
2. No
In this final section, I would be grateful to your responding to several open-ended questions (attach extra sheets if you need additional space).

The following are the kind of questions an uninitiated person might ask of someone who has been through an active student political experience. Imagine that you are trying to explain to someone like this your position on these issues, and try to answer these questions in that context.

1. Looking back, do you feel differently now than when you were college age about the things that are important in the choice of a career? Explain.

2. Speaking generally, what are the things about this country that you are most proud of as an American?

3. List the three things in this country that you think are most in need of change.

4. What do you anticipate will be the future social and political trends in American society, say, twenty years from now? Explain.

5. Do you feel that you can work within what is generally referred to as the "system" or the establishment? Explain.

6. When you were a student leader, did you hold the same view? Explain.

7. Do you feel that it is necessary to reconcile or accept the "system" as it is presently constructed when you have such responsibilities as children, automobiles, a mortgaged house, etc.? Explain.

8. Do you feel that you compromise your ideals and violate your principles by working within the "system"? Explain.

9. Do you feel that our society as it is presently constituted can be responsive to the needs of the poor and other disenfranchised groups? Explain.
10. Do you consider yourself alienated or divorced from the "system" or establishment? Explain.

11. Does this differ from your opinion when you were a college student? Explain.

12. In your opinion, is it possible to follow a career independent of the "system" or establishment? Explain.

13. If you reject the "system," is your rejection total or partial? Explain.

14. Do you feel that you have changed your thinking on social issues in any way from the way you felt as a college student? Explain.

15. Do you think it is possible for you personally to bring about change in the "system"? Explain.

16. Did your activism as a student bring about any changes which gave you a sense of satisfaction? Explain.

17. Do you feel more strongly about current social and political issues today than you did as a college student? Explain.
APPENDIX III
April 1, 1969

Permit me to introduce myself. I am Ken Saurman and am Dean of Men at De Paul University. Currently, I am engaged in doctoral studies at Loyola University. My dissertation will center on a study of the national officers of the National Student Association.

As you know, the academic climate in the country today is clouded by fear, myths, stereotypes, and lack of understanding. This atmosphere hinders attainment of the goals and ideals in which you believed as a former officer of NSA. In that capacity you were in the vanguard of campus and national political leadership. In many ways, your experiences are being shared today by other young men and women. They also are being alternately praised and damned.

One of the objectives of my study is to determine the direction your life has taken since you have graduated from college. This knowledge may be of assistance in predicting the possible directions which present and future NSA officers may find open to them.

You can understand then why I am particularly interested in your views and background characteristics which may be similar to other officers of NSA -- why you have chosen your present life style, how this choice has been affected by your college experiences, and, in general, your perspective on a range of social and philosophical issues.

In order to obtain this information, I have drawn up a questionnaire which I am asking you to complete. Because of your previous association with NSA, I know that you share with me this special concern. To the best of my knowledge, this projected study is the first of its kind.

As you are aware, there are sundry problems encountered in all questionnaires. Some questions seem vague and without meaning; you may feel misrepresented and constrained by the response categories. Yet I ask you to be understanding and to persevere in answering every question fully and accurately. Of course, your individual responses will be completely confidential and anonymous.

As a token of my appreciation for your time and effort in completing this questionnaire, I will send you a summary of my findings and conclusions.

In anticipation of your cooperation, I would like to express my personal thanks.

Cordially yours,

Kenneth P. Saurman
Dear

Presently I am a graduate student at Loyola University in Chicago, and I am working on a dissertation study of the life styles of former members of S.D.S. after their graduation from college.

Many people both in and outside of the Movement have expressed an interest in what happens to activists as they move on in life beyond their educational years (college days). The question that has perplexed many persons is: Is radicalism just a phase in life, or can a person in his mature years continue to follow a life style of action and radicalism?

Others within the Movement have already cooperated with me by completing a questionnaire for the study. I would appreciate it if you would be willing to help me in this project by completing the enclosed questionnaire.

Your help will be gratefully received. If you have any questions at all about this project, please feel free to write to me. Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Kenneth P. Saurman
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