



The Almost Forgotten Story of How Clandestine Subterfuge Nearly Subverted Brown's Open Curriculum

By Robert Porter Lynch, Brown '69

The Integrated Open Curriculum at Brown has proven to be one of the best decisions the University has made.

It catapulted Brown into the spotlight, raised the standing of Brown in the eyes of academics, and has attracted an extraordinary group of students and professors from around the world.

Back in 1968 and into the Spring of 1969, there was a concerted effort to have dialogues all over campus unifying support for the Open Curriculum proposal, which was quite controversial at the time. Elliott Maxwell '68 and Ira Magaziner '69 were the thought leaders that coalesced a large amount of backing for the plan. Their 400 page report was heading for crucial votes by the faculty and administration in the spring of 1969, when it was almost derailed.

Though Brown's administration was at first reluctant to entertain the report, eventually faculty backing emerged after Maxwell and Magaziner had personally visited every Brown professor. After a months of meetings and discussions, Brown's faculty agreed to implement the New Curriculum following a marathon meeting in May 1969. Several years later the New York Times reported ¹

The system, which stresses learning rather than grades, and self-direction in place of requirements, has given Brown a distinctive character, a reputation for being tension-free and growing in prominence. This has made it one of the most coveted campuses in the nation among high school seniors.

Climate of Protest and Activism

The Spring of 1969 was not a placid place for Ivy League campuses. The prior Spring, Martin Luther King was assassinated, followed by the Kent State massacre, which resulted in the National Guard shooting thirteen unarmed college students, killing four. That mass protest against the U.S. military was orchestrated by SDS (Students for a Democratic Society). The subsequent assassination of Bobby Kennedy in June, 1968 triggered an entire summer of roiling violence in urban cities. Riots exposed the divisiveness and distrust in the black community. No one knew what to expect, many feared the worst would happen with all America being subjected to violence and burning in every black urban center. No Ivy campus (except perhaps Dartmouth and Cornell, located in rural areas) seemed exempt.

African-American protests became the norm. The Afro-American Society at Brown had become quite radicalized, fighting against what was perceived as imperialism, oppression, and subjugation. Activism was the norm on campus. Protests, sit-ins, and demonstrations were an expected event. It seemed like hardly a week went by when some group was holding a tension-filled protest.

¹ New York Times, *Talk of New Curriculum Sets off Furor at Brown University*, December 24, 1983, Section 1, Page 8

The national election in November 1968 was especially divisive, resulting in the election of Richard Nixon. Young Republicans on campus were accused of dirty tricks by the Democrats for a New Society. Political polarization created high anxiety. In those days of open discourse, fierce debates broke out everywhere, often pitting friends against one another in a manner that was unheard of only a year earlier.

Impact of Vietnam on ROTC

Vietnam protests spilled onto the Brown Campus as the Tet Offensive of 1968 had its backlash with frequent student protests.

On campus, the Navy and Air Force ROTC came under fire. I was the Battalion Commander of the Navy ROTC Unit at Brown in the spring of '69. It was a red-hot issue as ROTC was the face of the military. We reported once a week to our headquarters at Lyman Hall dressed in full uniform.

Needless to say we attracted quite a number of remonstrations from our fellow students, often carrying signs. Close friends became adversaries – my best friend held a placard on the steps of Lyman Hall as I marched in. The sign said “**ROTC Trains Killers.**” Yes, it hurt. Many of us in ROTC believed that an officer corps trained in the liberal arts was fundamental to preserving a civilian controlled military. But for most students on campus, the threat of being drafted and opposition to the war overrode any more philosophic issues such as the future of the military's officer corps.

A Faculty-Student Review Committee to reform ROTC had been established, and we were in the process of concluding our report in April, 1969. David Kertzer and I were the two student representatives on that committee, along with Political Science Professor Lyman Kirkpatrick and Economics Professor Marc Shupak. We were in the middle of proposing an academic curriculum reform for ROTC, calling for all Navy Instructors to be enrolled in a Masters or PhD program at Brown and co-instruct with a qualified academic. The Navy was willing to do such a thing, but was Brown? Little did I know serving on this committee would prove fortuitous in the rapid unfolding of explosive events soon upon the horizon.

An Age of Turmoil and Change

Ivy League institutions were a magnet for turmoil. Mark Rudd, an instigator at Columbia, representing an organization named SDS (Students for a Democratic Society), staged a protest in March 1969 that shut down the Columbia campus. He led a cadre of students who occupied a half a dozen buildings at Columbia, which required massive police intervention, provoking blood-stained riots.

It made front page national headlines. College campuses were targeted to be sucked into this epidemic of turmoil.

We returned from Spring Break the second week in April that year. During the next three weeks there were two key issues on campus – *Whether Brown should retain ROTC*, and *Whether Brown would adopt a New Open Curriculum*.

A review of the headlines in the *Brown Daily Herald* for April of '69 shows the ROTC issue actually commanded more attention than curriculum reform, was far more divisive, and potentially threatening to the future of Brown's adaption of a new curriculum. The fate of both the ROTC and the New Curriculum would be facing critical votes.

Each was controversial, but in very different ways. While each sounded very independent from the other, the realities were far more complex.

How Things Stood in the Spring of '69

Upon returning to classes after Spring Break, Monday, April 8th the *Brown Daily Herald* reported:

Curriculum Changes To Face Final Tests as the faculty, administration, and students were meeting in protracted sessions to work out the details of the controversial new curriculum.

Nothing was cut in stone – no one was assured of the outcomes. Regarding curriculum reform:

"I think it's pretty good," declared Ira Magaziner '69, former Cammarian Club president. "Basically, I'm pleased with the recommendations of the report. It's been two years that we've been working on this. We're hoping to get it approved this Thursday."

A lot was at stake, and it required a delicate balance and equilibrium to ensure three critical stakeholders – the Administration, Faculty, and Students -- would jointly support the effort.

That day's *BDH* edition carried an ironic editorial proclaiming:

"If there is one thing students know about Brown, it is that most people back home have never heard of it. For years, Brown has done a pretty abysmal job of publicizing the really significant things that are going on here; and it is beginning to show.

"The fact is [Brown is] rapidly becoming one of the well-kept secrets in college circles. Harvard, Yale, and Princeton manage to let the world know when ROTC is being abolished, when students are making moves toward participation in policy-making, and when innovations in the social system and curriculum are in progress. And somehow or other schools that spread the word about what they are doing attract good administrators, faculty and students. But Brown [is] still 'unknown.'"

Administration and Students at Odds

On Wednesday, April 9th, the front page of the *BDH* proclaimed the Brown President had betrayed the trust of the student body with this headline:

"Makes ROTC Deal with DOD" to keep the military programs on campus for another year. In spite of an earlier vote by the faculty to keep ROTC on campus for another year, there was widespread dissention among faculty and students who wanted either the ROTC off campus or subject to more stringent standards for faculty [something our committee was seriously considering recommending.]

The Cammarian Club [Brown's Student Governance organization] ***"Registered Shock"*** according to the front page headlines and was preparing to protest the Administration's decision and seek a reversal. The Cammarian Club had channeled much of its energy on the new curriculum proposals, but also had become entangled in the divisiveness of the ROTC issue, coming out clearly against ROTC, much to the chagrin of many in the student body.

The *Brown Daily Herald* staff and editorial board was also anti-ROTC, becoming more and more enamored with the SDS factions on campus led by fellow classmate David Kertzer '69. The larger issue of liberal arts trained officers as the core of our national defense (versus professionally military academy trained officers with more of an offensive posture) was totally lost in the discourse. Getting this issue front and center in the press was difficult; that's why we needed the special ROTC committee of faculty

and students to issue a report. We soon learned that if you weren't loud, audacious, organized, and revolutionary, you wouldn't be heard.

Moreover, we were reluctant, given the climate, to have the ROTC unit speak out without support from other groups on campus. Less than a handful of people had voiced any support, and certainly not loudly.

The following day, Thursday, April 10th, the ROTC turmoil at Brown again commanded the front page.

Vol. CIII, No. 43

PROVIDENCE, R. I., THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1969

Price Ten Cents

Heffner Makes 2nd ROTC Agreement, Fails To Consult Faculty, Students

The Cammarian Club called for a reversal of the decision. Many faculty members voiced strong disapproval. The Administration, Faculty, and Student body were seething, and becoming increasingly polarized and antagonistic, just at a time when they needed to be united around the New Curriculum.

Equally disturbing that day was another headline front page story:

Harvard Students Occupy Building, Demand No ROTC, Attack Pusey

by JON WINER

Two hundred Harvard students occupied University Hall in Cambridge last night in response to President Nathan Pusey's indication that both he and the Harvard Corporation wish to keep ROTC on campus.

Announcement has not been made at Harvard of the agreement between the Defense Department and Ivy presidents to maintain ROTC, where the faculty met Tuesday.

Also, no announcement has been made at Yale and Dartmouth, other Ivy schools that have taken action similar to Brown's on ROTC.

At 4 p.m. yesterday, Franklin L. Ford, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences notified that those who refuse to leave the occupied building will be subject to criminal trespassing charges.

The students at Harvard entered University Hall at 12:15 p.m. yesterday.

The students marched to the president's house after an SDS meeting and tacked a list of six demands on the front door. The demands call for the immediate abolition of ROTC at Harvard by breaking all existing contracts and not entering into any new ones.

The students also demand the replacement of all ROTC scholarships with university funds and the restoration of scholarships to students who lost them as a result of demonstrating at a faculty meeting on ROTC.

Other demands include the reduction of rents in university-owned apartment buildings, and the preservation of black homes around new construction sights.

The action came after 450 students present at an SDS meeting Tuesday night by a close vote, decided not to occupy university buildings.

According to a source at the *Harvard Crimson*, tension has been building up among students for the past few weeks and SDS had feared that the corporation would not follow the faculty's recommendations to remove academic credit from ROTC courses and to revoke the free use of university buildings to the ROTC program.

President Pusey, at a meeting of the Student-Faculty Advisory Committee last week, stated that he was in favor of maintaining ROTC in some form at Harvard. Other Ivy presidents, including John Dickey of Dartmouth, Robert Goheen of Princeton, and James Perkins of Cornell, have also indicated that they wish to retain ROTC programs on their campuses.

Would SDS target Brown -- the least known of the Ivys? Would we be next in line on their hit list? At that time we didn't know, but many were anxious we'd be targeted for a takedown.

Personally, as the Navy ROTC Battalion Commander, I was on "high alert."

The following week we'd learn the answer.

On the second page of that edition was another editorial calling for student protests about ROTC at the Faculty meeting that day, along with a highly visible box ad beneath the editorial:

Speak Out on ROTC Today

SPEAK-OUT to discuss President Heffner's action on ROTC and student faculty participation in university decisions. Noon today on the College Green. Open Mike. Sponsored by SDS and the New University Conference. David Kertzer '69 called on the faculty "to rebel and confront" President Heffner at yesterday's faculty meeting, rather than "roll over and submit to the ultimatum given by the military."

The Friday, April 11th front page of the *BDH* reported more faculty turmoil about ROTC. What's more, David Kertzer and SDS planned a Sit-In at the Corporation's Advisory and Executive Committee scheduled later that day. A non-student instigator was brought in from SDS to train the Brown contingent on how to ramrod their agenda. It was expected 175 students would be crashing the Corporation's meeting – something that was unheard of, as it violated the sacred decorum of the staid Corporate Officers.

More Violence at Harvard

But just as serious, the *BDH* front page also carried this headline article:

Cops Beat 75-Harvard on Strike describing how...

"More than 2000 Harvard students yesterday voted a three day strike of classes, in protest of early morning arrests of 300 students occupying University Hall.

"The strike, effective immediately, may continue beyond three days, if student demands are not met. Demands include amnesty for students arrested, restructuring of the Harvard Corporation, and the resignation of Harvard president Nathan Pusey.

"Harvard students originally took over the administration building in protest of President Pusey's decision to maintain a ROTC program on campus.

"At 4:30 a.m. yesterday, 400 policemen stormed University Hall, injuring 75 students while arresting 300. Policemen, wearing gas masks and carrying metal shields, formed a double line behind buses filled with State Police and marched into Harvard Yard. Students standing on the steps of University Hall were thrown to the pavement below."

Photos of police brutality appeared on television and newspapers across the nation.

If this happened at Brown, our culture would become impossibly and irreparably divided. Resolution of the ROTC issue and adoption of the Open Curriculum would become hopelessly entangled and polarized – turmoil would replace common sense, vision would be thrown out replaced by passionate manipulation as blood stained our campus.

Police at Harvard



Brown Students Become More Confrontational

Later that day (April 11th) the Corporation met. 250 unwelcome students, led by Ira Magaziner and David Kertzer, interloped with a sit-in of the Advisory and Executive Committee. The *BDH* reported:

“President Heffner explained to the students that no A&E business could be transacted in an open meeting and asked Ira Magaziner '69 to explain the presence of uninvited observers. Mr. Magaziner called on John Salinger '70, Cam Club president, David Kertzer '69, an SDS member, to present student views.”

It was a nearly fatal mistake. Magaziner was leading a sit-in orchestrated by SDS, alienating the very Corporation leaders that would be pivotal to the adoption of the critical Open Curriculum in another couple of weeks. Nerves frayed. The Corporation's Committee did not want a Town Meeting environment for their agenda that day. The *BDH* reported:

“Dr. Heffner twice asked students to leave so that committee business could be transacted. Mr. Magaziner said students had consistently left matters to legitimate channels and recommended that students stay and allow the Corporation to continue its meeting. Mr. Salinger told Dr. Heffner that the students had no intention of leaving. The President then announced that a meeting was impossible.

“Richard Salomon '32, another Corporation member, said "if military officers are not trained at Brown they will be trained elsewhere — at duplicates of West Point." For this reason, he said, ROTC "should be encouraged at Brown as long as it meets university academic standards, but it should not count toward a degree." Dr. Heffner answered a question about his telegram to the Navy Department by saying there had been "a perfectly legitimate difference of opinion," and that "I now stand corrected." In one of few heckling comments at the meeting, a student cried, "We don't trust you." He was quieted by those around him.

“Several A&E members talked with students on the first floor of University Hall. Mr. Tillinghast reportedly met with Dr. Heffner elsewhere. Students remained in the Corporation Room and discussed tactics. Dr. Heffner sent back a signed statement "so that there be no misunderstanding about my replies to questions in the assembly in the conference room of University Hall," emphasizing that the faculty decision "takes precedence over all previous discussion and agreements between all parties concerned."

“After much discussion and a straw vote showing that two-thirds of those present favored total abolition of ROTC, students decided to meet in separate groups over the weekend and reach a consensus stand at a Sunday night meeting.”

SDS Escalates the Game

Emboldened from their “Pyrrhic Victory,” the *BDH* also reported that SDS had formed a coalition with the Brown Afro-America Society, which declared that:

ROTC at Brown is "an instrument for the recruitment of black and white men into a military structure which is now an organ to promote (an) intolerable national policy."

Stating that the first objective of the United States should be "to abolish racism and exploitation here in America," the Afro-American Society advocates "the total and immediate abolition of any and all connections between Brown University and the Reserve Officer Training Corps of the American military."

Reports on the Open Curriculum being advanced from faculty subcommittee to the whole faculty for approval were relegated to page 2 that day.

But more important, it was evident that the worst was likely yet to come. The climate on campus was quickly coming to an ignition point.

Some of us became increasingly more suspicious of the motives of SDS, which was clearly not being run by students; apparently outside organizers were really behind the riots at Harvard, Kent State, and Columbia, and they were guiding all the SDS schemes.

Would Brown Suffer the Fate of Harvard?

I was beginning to realize Brown was destined to follow on the heels of Harvard, or maybe worse: like Kent State. I could imagine police in military formations, helmets with dark eye shields hiding the faces of Gestapo-like storm-troopers, and the blood of my fellow students. It was deeply disturbing. Those scenes belonged in war, not on the hallowed ground of the Brown's campus.

The aftermath of the Harvard brutality triggered a long student strike, months of angry accusations masquerading as debate, and a chain reaction of foaming resentment between students, faculty and administration. Brown could be in the middle of a divisive and chaotic student strike within days – just as the New Curriculum was scheduled to face critical faculty votes.

No one would be a winner, and the good intentions of many responsible people would be replaced with animosity and vindictiveness resembling a Civil War. The glory of academic learning would crash headlong with forces of a dark age, setting the University back decades.

This foreshadowing compelled a deeper probe of the more fundamental question: “Who, really, was SDS?” I wanted to find out the truth. The answer would soon be forthcoming.

SDS, after a weekend of caucusing, by Sunday night, April 13, set in motion the charged forces of collision to engulf the University in a conflagration. The *BDH* reported on a banner headline:

Vol. CIII, No. 45

PROVIDENCE, R. I., MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1969

Price Ten Cents

Anti-ROTC Coalition Drafts Demands

A coalition of 125 students drew up four demands last night advocating major changes in the ROTC program at Brown.

I urged our ROTC team of about 80 future officers not to blow their fuses, not to wear the uniforms anywhere except to ROTC classes, and certainly not to let SDS provoke them into doing something that would be embarrassing or detrimental to our mission.

“Ask good questions, make people think of alternatives, but don’t poke them in the eye, literally or figuratively. ‘Discretion was the better part of valor;’” (to quote Shakespeare)

SDS Reveals Its Evil Intentions

The next day, Tuesday, April 15th, while attending class, I overheard that SDS was having an open meeting that night in one of the classrooms in Alumni Hall. As an International Relations major who was studying Revolution and Propaganda for my final papers at Brown, I thought this would be a good time to understand SDS from a closer vantage point.

There were nearly 100 students in the room when I entered and quietly took an unobtrusive seat in the back of the room. To my surprise, no one seemed alarmed or threatened by my presence. I was determined not to cause a stink -- just listen, learn, and react later.

Soon the subversive truth was unveiled. Outside organizers led the meeting; the Brown SDS contingent played little role except introducing the instigators, who were clearly professionally trained rabble-rousers.

They stated it was they who had orchestrated the Harvard takeover and would choreograph the University Hall takedown this coming weekend, April 18th, only three days later, (coincidentally, the date of Paul Revere's Ride preceding the Battle of Lexington & Concord).

Their plan was to occupy University Hall late afternoon Friday. This was the only weekend when it was possible to stage the takedown, since Spring Weekend was the following weekend. Just as the administration staff was leaving, the SDS students would crash the building. They were to be peaceful at the outset, not breaking into any staff offices. Food would be supplied by SDS. All were supposed to remain relatively quiet through the weekend, because many students would not be around.

Then, according their sinister master plan, on Monday morning, April 21st, just when the administrative staff was returning to work, the students would block the entrances to the building. The police would then have to be called in to extricate the students.

That's when all hell would break loose. SDS would train the students how to provoke the police, insult them, spit on them, call them "pigs," and virtually force the police to become violent. At that point the students would resist, becoming martyrs as they were being bloodied by the police using brutal force.

They described their dark intention: drive a wedge between students and the administration, forcing the faculty to take sides, thus dividing and polarizing the university to accept their demands.

Breaking Point

By the end of the meeting, it was all I could do to hold in my anger and outrage -- mass manipulation by SDS. And to top it off, students attending the meeting failed to state any objections, demonstrating their submissiveness to go along with the plan. These crooked connivers seemed just like Hitler's SS agents I was studying while writing my paper on Germany's Propaganda Machine. How could this be happening right before my eyes! Good students becoming pawns of some obviously devilish scheme?

The meeting broke up just after nine. I raced back to my dorm to get to a phone. I needed to call Lyman Kirkpatrick, my Political Science Professor, mentor on the ROTC committee, and former Inspector General of the CIA. He'd hoped he'd know just what to do to repel a professional machine like SDS with just three days advanced warning.

I got hold of him at his home in Narragansett about 9:30 pm and told him what was happening. He responded by saying we must meet at his office in the basement of Prospect House on the Brown campus at 8:00 am. I was to bring coffee and donuts. There we'd put together a game plan.

I didn't sleep much that night as the options of what would be the right response rattled in my head. Fortunately I had learned a lot about revolutions since my childhood -- George Washington was a true hero to me. But revolutions can also be terrible and end poorly, like the French Revolution or the American Civil War.

At our breakfast meeting, Lyman confided in me that SDS was a "front organization" for the Communist Party. It had trained Columbia's Marc Rudd to start these University "take downs." Rudd had been brought to Cuba and indoctrinated in subversive tactics. The Reds had convinced Rudd that leaders like of Mao Tse Tung, Ho Chi Minh, and Fidel Castro were all wonderful people helping their country's social justice. Rudd took the bait, and was their front-man.

Now things were starting to make sense. But what should we do? We only had three days to organize.

Mapping a Strategy

Together we began designing a three-day plan and counter-stratagems. There was no room for a mistake. It required mobilizing hundreds of people to oppose SDS -- we must infuse a sense of urgency.

But we had no idea if we'd be able to garner support -- exactly how strong was the opposition to SDS?

The ROTC students could become engaged, but not visibly lead the effort for fear of backlash.

We must have some compelling rallying cries. And we needed a strategy that would coalesce students and faculty, not alienate them, while keeping the *BDH* at least neutral in their coverage.

We must confront SDS, but not head-on, using some oriental martial arts stratagems that wouldn't trigger a response we couldn't address. We needed to think through the opposition's counter-reactions and know we could out-fox them at every turn. And it had to be simple enough to attract and hold the moderates on campus to a commitment to take action if necessary. This was no small order.

Lyman was a great coach. First he observed that often you can mobilize people more adroitly when they think there is a crisis worth responding to, which we had. Second, he focused on getting out the word. This meant using every reasonable network on campus and briefing the *Brown Daily Herald*. We had to choose a name. We settled on *Students for Responsible Action*, which embodied our philosophy. I liked it.

Critically, we needed an end-game stratagem that would subdue the barbarians at the gate. Fortunately Martin Luther King and Gandhi provided models we could use: *peaceful resistance*. Here's how it would work: Prior to SDS taking over University Hall we'd string 1,000 students hand-in hand, two rows deep around the building. We'd sing Joan Baez peace songs, and hold a candlelight vigil. We'd protect our beloved university against the thugs that would jeopardize our future. Too much was at stake.

We focused on two themes:

- we solve our problems peacefully with honorable discourse devoid of threat, brutality, and manipulation, and
- if students are going to be involved and engaged in decision-making, they'd better be truly represented by the Cam Club -- the student governance body. SDS did not represent the majority of the student body and we needed to discredit SDS's claim of authority.

We'd kept ROTC as a third theme, but it was not critical to stopping the impending barbarian take-down of University Hall. Wednesday, April 16th's *BDH* Banner Headlines shows the central issues at that time:



The right hand column headline story only hinted at the harsh realities, stating:

"Students for a Democratic Society decided at a meeting last night to take some form of militant action within a week to emphasize their demands for the abolition of ROTC at Brown. Although no definite plans were made as to what type of action would be taken, the students agreed that "escalation" of pressure tactics was necessary in light of the recent actions taken by the Administration in its dealings with the Defense Department."

This was clearly a devious message sugar-coating malevolence. I attended that meeting; their plan was clearly delineated; and it was onerous. "Militancy" meant occupation, provocation, and bloodshed.

Organizing for Action

That day I skipped all classes, instead spending the day meeting with potential coalition partners. First I spoke with my fellow ROTC midshipmen, laid out the game plan, and asked them to recruit moderate students who could join the effort. "Not on our watch," was the byword – we had pledged to protect our nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic; this was the time to act on that oath, but subtly.

I spoke with liberal and conservative friends from both the *Democrats for a New Society* and the *Young Republicans*. Both were outraged at the possibility the Harvard debacle might happen here.

In an editorial that day in the *BDH*, the editors reported:

"The Deans of the College and Pembroke College yesterday sent a letter to the Cammarian Club charging that "the actions of the Cammarian Club went well beyond any mandate it had from the student body" at the sit-in during the Advisory and Executive Committee meeting [on the previous Friday]."²

The editors went on to say:

"The student government is a representative body which is responsible for representing both short-range positions and long-range ideologies. Even if a majority of students took the short range position of silence on the ROTC issue, they certainly take a long range position against violent encounter."

Finally people were beginning to question whether the Cammarian Club, supposedly elected to represent student opinion, had overstepped its bounds. The issue of non-violence emerged as a central theme. The time was right, if we acted judiciously. We needed to neutralize the radical element on campus by showing they were not representative of the student body – most of whom were making extraordinary efforts just to pass courses, do their homework, and get papers written. Most of us didn't come to Brown to change it radically, and certainly not to destroy its culture and cherished traditions.

Wednesday noon (April 16), there was an Open Mike gathering on the Green. SDS and the Afro-American Society railed against ROTC. But we too started to demand time at the microphone. The *BDH* reported:

Steve Newton '69 was among those who spoke out against the abolition of ROTC. He emphasized that it was necessary for military officers to be exposed to the attitudes and education found at a liberal arts college. He warned that if the military was forced to train all of its officers in its own military academies, it would become isolated from civilian control and thus become more powerful as an "offensive military" rather than as a "defensive military." Mr. Newton added, "The military would wind up with hard core officers if there was an abolition of ROTC."

We were now starting to get our message across. In a *Letter to the Editor* that day, William McNeely '72 eloquently stated:

² Although I met with Lyman Kirkpatrick daily, I never knew what influence he was exercising with the faculty and administration through "back channels." He never said and I never asked. He just smiled sagaciously, letting me know he was active behind the scenes

"The views espoused by both SDS and the Cam Club are certainly not my views, and I am a student; nor, however, are they the views of the vast majority of students on campus

".... a really responsive Cam Club would not have allowed itself to be dominated by a few left-wing activists...

"Instead, somehow, we are faced with a situation in which the new left fecundity of SDS has come to be considered the "student view" of this matter. This is most disturbing when one considers that of this university's student body of about four thousand, less than twenty are members of SDS. The concept of one-half of one per cent of us speaking for all of us is, indeed, frightening. Again, they do not speak for me. It is possible that the Cam Club has given up all hope of representing the whole student body."

That Wednesday night we had the first meeting of *Students for Responsible Action*, which was reported in the *BDH* the following morning with the banner headline:

Vol. CIII, No. 48

PROVIDENCE, R. I., THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1969

Price Ten Cents



Robert Lynch, '69, Ed DiPippo '69 and Scott Bush '71 (l-r) discuss the objectives of Students for a Rational Society.

Anti-SDS Faction Organizes; Calls Cam Club Illegitimate

The moderate voice on campus is being squelched and the Cammarian Club is not truly representative of the student body, according to Robert Lynch '69, speaking for the newly-formed Students for Responsible Action at a Young Republican meeting last night.

Mr. Lynch, who is not a member of YR, indicated that in order for the Cam Club to operate effectively, pressure must be applied by the moderate faction as well as the left-wing. He claimed that student government is being pressured only from one side — by the SDS.

Presently, there is a possibility that "SDS could pull another Harvard here at Brown," said Mr. Lynch.

Concerning the ROTC issue, Mr. Lynch said that SDS is not aiming at ROTC but a complete change in government. "We must stop SDS from radicalizing the university; we must stop SDS from polarizing the university," he said.

Mr. Lynch did, however, cite the ROTC situation as a "chance we have to do something beneficial for all and prevent the breakdown of the university."

SDS is just waiting to put people's feet in their mouths, Mr. Lynch said, and they can make "people in the center or right of center look like fascists."

The guidelines of the SRA, as given by Mr.

Lynch, include equal student power for everyone, student referendum on all major decisions, and a total "abhorrence of violence."

We had 48 hours left to confront SDS. We still didn't know how much support there was for a moderate voice to express itself, so at this point we made sure we didn't look big, powerful, and threatening. We encouraged people to start writing more *Letters to the Editor* to voice the moderate point of view.

We must stand strong while being the voice of reason, pushing back at the SDS aggressors, and forcing the Cammarian Club to be a truer voice of the student body.

Marcus Bernabo '72 wrote in a *Letter to the Editor* that day:

"If the Cam Club is to be a legitimate representation of the student body's opinion, it must take the initiative in assessing student opinion, not allow itself to be subject to haphazard representation of student views or the organizing ability of the SDS.

"The immediate need is for a referendum on the ROTC issue to determine what "student opinion" really is. The Cam Club is the logical organization to undertake a poll of the student body on this issue.

"The Club should also take the initiative to determine student opinion on any controversial issue before proclaiming its own version of "student opinion."

Assessing Our Real Strength

We held a meeting in Rogers Hall Thursday night (April 17th) to see how many people would support our effort. The room held 150 people. Maybe we could fill it to ½ half capacity. To our surprise and delight, 200 people came – we packed the house (fortunately the fire marshal wasn't around the corner). The *BDH* Reported the following day, Friday April 18th:

Vol. CIII, No. 49

PROVIDENCE, R. I., FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1969

Price Ten Cents



Robert Lynch '69 leads the meeting of the SRA.

200 Moderates Charge Club Not Representative

by JIM MORGAN

Students who feel misrepresented by the Cam Club and SDS overflowed the 150 seats of Rogers 14 last night in an effort to make their voices heard through the newly formed Students for Responsible Action.

Robert Lynch '70, who led the meeting, said that the SRA is neither anti-SDS nor pro-ROTC. The first mention of SDS at the meeting last night brought hisses and then applause from the whole room.

The SRA's position drafted last night favors "restructuring the University so that students can control what happens to them" and opposes "any use of violence or force," according to Mr. Lynch. "We want constructive change," he explained. "We want to show that the students of Brown are not apathetic."

Mr. Lynch explained the imbalance of student representation. "The Cammarian Club is a pressure-type organization," he said. The general feeling was that a large moderate group of students had failed to apply the necessary pressure on the Cam Club.

Doug Hurley '71, secretary of the Cam Club, said, "groups like this have abdicated their responsibility."

Mr. Lynch tried to get a consensus on a course of action about ROTC. He said that he wanted to get something done before the faculty meeting at 4:00 this afternoon.

A proposal to have a vote supporting ROTC brought protests that the organization had claimed not to be pro-ROTC and would violate its own principles by supporting the proposal. The majority of those present were strongly in favor of ROTC and the objections were shouted down.

The crowd finally voted to support a resolution urging the Cam Club to favor a "three-year phase-out of ROTC in order to maintain discussion on the ROTC issue." The general feeling that this was the only way to possibly keep ROTC at Brown was clear.

The merits of the ROTC program and the consequences of the faculty guidelines and Defense Department policy were not considered at the meeting.

Club Asks ROTC Phase-out; Dissidents Demand Abolition

by DANIEL CUMMINGS

In a special three and one half hour session last night, the Cammarian Club voted to support a three-year phase-out program of ROTC on the campus.

The resolution passed by a vote of 20 to 9, reads as follows:

"The Cammarian Club supports the report of the Advisory Committee on ROTC, which states that any student presently committed to a ROTC program at Brown should be allowed to complete his ROTC requirements.

"All efforts should be made to make this phase-out program as short as possible, and as compatible with the faculty guidelines as possible.

"Those sophomores and grad students who have completed final application procedures should be allowed to enter their respective programs."

Four members voting against the resolution, Andy Eisenberg '71, Josh Posner '71, Michael Tobey '71 and Daniel Reisenberg '71, said in a signed statement after the meeting, "We are determined to stand up at the faculty meeting and vociferously declare the voice of that portion of the community that finds the action of the Cammarian Club patently immoral."

Speaking in defense of the resolution, Lon Shinn '70 stated, "We should be concerned with the students already in the program." Mr. Shinn, a Naval ROTC member, acted as a spokesman during the meeting for a group of ROTC members who had caucused before the Cam Club met.

Mr. Shinn also asserted that the cost of eliminating the ROTC program immediately would be harmful to the university. "If the university has to pick up the tab for the remaining ROTC guys it would take money away from other programs such as the Transitional Year Program."

Mr. Salinger added that according to a member of the Admissions Office this total could be around \$100,000.

Michael Tobey '71, voting Cam Club

Page 2, Col. 1



The Cammarian Club meeting was expanded by the attendance of SRA members last night.

Delays on Affirmative Action

by LAURA E. HERSH

Brown University has gone on record in support of affirmative action to increase the employment rate of Rhode Island blacks.

However, Brown's moves to train black employees often have been stunted effectively by pressures from outside the university and sidetracked by "crisis-politics" administration.

While contract terms are settled between Brown and a construction company, apprenticeship specifications are set by unions. The contract for Brown's new art building with Dimeo Construction Company is no exception. Ultimate jurisdiction on apprenticeship qualifications rests with the unions.

Unions can continue de facto

exclusion of blacks through requirements for formal education and personal interviews. David Edmunds, a black who began working in the University Personnel Office this year, said yesterday that "nothing significant" has been accomplished in exerting pressure on the unions since the Dimeo contract was signed at the end of March.

Calling the electricians, the

We encouraged the students who came to the meeting to enlist five others, bringing the total number of those who would stand for non-violence and obstruct an SDS takeover of University Hall at over 1,000. Would this numerical advantage dissuade SDS? We surely hoped so.

Friday morning we'd publicly unroll the strategy, not giving SDS a lot of time to react. We tracked down the SDS leaders first thing that morning. We told their leaders, David Kertzer and Doug Fokitt, we'd have 1,000 students surrounding University Hall that afternoon in a peaceful resistance and candlelight vigil, unless they called off the takedown. The SDS leaders were visibly angry, but did they recognize we had the Kryptonite to neutralize them? SDS had invested a lot of energy and effort into their dastardly plan. Would they back down? Or would we have a show-down? (our version of the classic fight at the OK Corral using pacifistic resistance). Deep inside my head and heart I was prepared for either outcome – *nothing* or a big display of *morality versus evil*. What would SDS do? We didn't trust a word they said.

SDS Backs Down

A couple of hours later SDS made it clear they were not prepared to confront their own students, knowing that without undivided student support, their plan to polarize the university could not succeed.

Professor Kirkpatrick had cautioned me never to disgrace a defeated opponent; otherwise they might strike back ferociously. I thanked SDS for their wise decision.

We did not stand-down for several hours until we were assured SDS would not renege on their pledge and our precious University was safe and secure, at least for the moment. Instead of occupying University Hall over the weekend, SDS met on Sunday night. The *BDH* reported on Monday Morning (April 21st):

SDS To Extend Fight

“Although many SDS members consider the faculty decision to phase-out ROTC a “big failure,” the majority of members attending last night’s SDS meeting termed their anti-ROTC campaign a “success.” Chairman Doug Foskitt ’70 claimed “We can eliminate ROTC next year.” Several members feared that freshmen in the future will be able to join ROTC programs.

“SDS considered taking militant action to emphasize demands for the abolition of ROTC.

“Future SDS meetings may be closed to non-SDS members. In a policy statement, David Kertzer ’69, stated that “all meetings may be closed, unless otherwise posted.” It was explained that members of groups with opposite views on issues sometimes used information from open meetings to plan their own counter-offensives. It was felt that the organization could be more effective informing policies and devising tactics if it met in private.”

In other words, SDS confirmed it was a clandestine organization. Essentially we revealed their ill intent.

Making Student Government Responsive to Student Opinion

The next task was to make the Cammarian Club less of a left wing, elite group. Members of the Navy ROTC, led by Lon Shinn ’70, became vocal about the value of ROTC. He urged the Cammarian Club to be responsible to the students by holding a referendum to poll the opinions of their constituency.

In a *Letter to the Editor* on Monday, April 21st, William Smith ’71 said:

In the Herald of Friday, April 18, it is stated that I introduced a resolution calling for a referendum on the issue of ROTC in response to the demands of the Students for Responsible Action. This is not quite correct; I stated that the idea was suggested by a person associated with the SRA. I acted as an independent agent in introducing the resolution. Very simply, I introduced the resolution to establish a precedent.

Much has been said about apathy on the Brown campus; the ROTC issue shows that if there is enough dissemination of information on issues, this apathy vanishes.

If the [Cammarian] Club were to hold referenda on issues of vital student concern, such as the issue of ROTC, I believe that it would serve a dual purpose; it would draw the Club closer to its constituency, and it would serve to a large extent to help overcome this much-discussed apathy. If the Cammarian Club holds a referendum on the issue of ROTC, it would be setting a precedent which would, in the long run, be extraordinarily valuable.

We decided to hold the Cammarian Club accountable to the student body by circulating a petition requesting a referendum on the ROTC issue. Hopefully this would make the Club representative, restraining it from going off on tangents with no real support.

The Banner headlines for Monday, April 21 were dominated by the ROTC issue:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1969

SRA Plans Future Concerns

The Students for Responsible Action (SRA), satisfied with Cammarian Club and faculty decisions on ROTC, plan to become involved in broader issues on the campus.

Robert P. Lynch '69, an organizer of the group, said that SRA will press for a faculty resolution condemning violence as a legitimate means of obtaining anything at a liberal university and a restructuring of the university to give students a voice in matters which concern them.

Though no specific plans have yet been formulated, Mr. Lynch said that he expects that SRA "will be doing something this week."

Mr. Lynch termed the faculty's decision on ROTC "most reasonable," adding that it was a victory for SRA in the sense that SDS demands for abolition were not met.

Any limiting of the phase-out to less than three years, would have constituted a final decision on the more general question of Brown's relationship to ROTC as opposed to the question of curricular status, according to Mr. Lynch. He said that "many people have not really considered the overall issue" and that SRA hopes to allow students to participate in further debate and discussion on ROTC.

Mr. Lynch said the Cam Club, by its actions on ROTC, "showed that it is responsive to pressure from both sides."

Mr. Lynch said the fact that SDS didn't take any action this weekend and their plans for closed meetings may be indicative of a lack of support.

SDS To Extend Fight

Although many SDS members consider the faculty decision to phase-out ROTC a "big failure," the majority of members attending last night's SDS meeting termed their anti-ROTC campaign a "success."

"We've accomplished something," claimed chairman Doug Foskitt '70. "It's only logical that we lost this year," he added. "We can eliminate ROTC next year."

Several members were "disappointed that the 'phase-out' isn't even a phase-out." They feared that freshmen in the future will be able to join ROTC programs.

SDS members attending last Friday's faculty meeting walked out to protest future ROTC enrollment. "Absolutely nothing happened last Friday," according to Mr. Foskitt.

At the beginning of last week, SDS members participated in the coalition of anti-ROTC students that drafted four demands, including one stating that no students who have not signed ROTC contracts as of April 13, 1969, may do so. This demand was not met as completing final application procedures does not constitute signing a contract.

Later, SDS considered taking militant action to emphasize demands for the abolition of ROTC. It broke with the coalition and accused the Cammarian Club of not standing firm on its original stand on ROTC.

Future SDS meetings may be closed to non-SDS members. In a policy statement, David Kertzer '69, stated that "all meetings may be closed, unless otherwise posted."

It was explained that members of groups with opposite views on issues sometimes used information from open meetings to plan their own counter-offensives. It was felt that the organization could be more effective in forming policies and devising tactics if it met in private.

When the subject of closed sessions was brought up last week, Mr. Foskitt mentioned that several members of the Young Republican Club attended SDS meetings fairly regularly before the sit-in which kept the Brown Corporation from meeting last Friday. He said that much as the organization disliked the idea of closed meetings, it considered the ability to act effectively to be of greatest importance.

SDS has in the past occasionally ejected members of the press from its meetings in order to protect the surprise value of its demonstrations.

Cam Club Docket: Merger, Maeder

The Cammarian Club will discuss two major issues at its Tuesday meeting: the complete merger and function of the class councils and social organizations, and the Maeder Committee Report.

John Salinger '70, president of the Cam Club, said that the student government will also consider the question of referendums. William Smith '71 plans to introduce a resolution on procedures by which students can petition Cam Club to have a referendum on an issue.

We brought the referendum petition to the Cam Club. The petition was hastily circulated, yet still we attracted the signatures of 15% of the student body, over 600 signatures in total.

In a blunder, the Cam Club declined to take such a poll. The *BDH* reported:

Club Nixes Referendum, Backs Maeder Report

The Cammarian Club last night unanimously endorsed the Interim Report and Recommendations of the Special Committee on Educational Principles, and narrowly defeated a motion to hold a referendum on ROTC before the faculty meeting May 6.

Robert P. Lynch '69, a member of Students for Responsible Action, had presented Cam Club President John J. Salinger '69 with a petition signed by 15% of the student body, requesting a referendum.

Mr. Lynch stressed the importance of the Cammarian Club "having some idea where student opinion lies" on the ROTC issue.

David Bearman '71 questioned the utility of the referendum, since the faculty had already set the guidelines for negotiations with the Defense Department.

Joyce K. Nakada '71 replied that, even if the referendum seemed "after the fact," the Cammarian Club might undermine its student support by disregarding a valid petition.

Lon Shinn '70, after voting against the referendum because its details were unspecific, proposed that a specific referendum be drawn up and presented to the Cam Club for consideration next Tuesday. The Executive Board of the Club agreed to meet today with representatives of various opinions on ROTC to begin drawing up the referendum.

This was another win for moderation, engagement, and sensibility. It seemed that a semblance of order was reemerging and the Open Curriculum could command the attention it deserved, unfettered by the riots and the decent into darkness SDS's confrontations would have triggered.

That day, in another *Letter to the Editor* titled: **SDS— OPEN MEETING** by Pembrokers Louise Hainline '69 and Kathleen Kennedy '69, the issue of hidden intentions by SDS was irking the student body:

We were disappointed to read of the contemplated action by the Students for a Democratic Society to close future meetings to non SDS members.

With all the recent discussion of the rights of "free and open inquiry" directed toward the faculty and the corporation, it seems that the SDS cannot practice what they "screech."

If the *BDH* report (4/21/69) can be considered accurate, it appears that the SDS has a double standard: the ideal of open discussion is required of others, but when this ideal interferes with the objectives of the SDS, it can be discarded.

Besides, we're curious— just what is SDS trying to hide?

The day after the Cam Club decided to postpone any referendum, and fearing the Cam Club would drag its heels, and knowing that Spring Weekend was only a few days away, we decided to conduct the poll right away. We set up a polling station in Faunce House near the Post Office Lobby. The *BDH* reported:

Joseph DiLorenzo '72, (a high school friend of mine), Vice President of the Young Americans for Freedom and one of the organizers of the poll said yesterday, "The Cam Club has some responsibility to go out and find what student opinion is. We feel the Cam Club has abdicated their responsibility" so we will do the poll ourselves.

A Sense of Normalcy

At that point, ROTC began to fade from the headlines, and the Open Curriculum reports gained prominence. A semblance of normalcy seemed to be returning to campus as we bypassed catastrophe. Spring Weekend came and went with the normal raucousness. At the Faculty Committee meeting on Tuesday, April 29th, the Open Curriculum Report gained approval for the Faculty vote the following week.

Before the week ended, we had received a significant response to our student poll. On Friday, May 2nd, the results were announced, and they shocked both SDS and the Cammarian Club.

BROWN DAILY HERALD

FOUNDED IN 1866

Vol. CIII, No. 59

PROVIDENCE, R. I., FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1969

Price Ten Cents

Poll Shows 60% Think Club not Representative

Over 60% of Brown students feel that the Cammarian Club does not represent their views, particularly on the ROTC issue, according to a poll conducted by a group of students, some of whom were members of the Young Republicans and Students for Responsible Action. Thirteen hundred undergraduate and graduate students, a little less than one fourth of the student body, replied to the poll.

68% of the students polled desire ROTC on campus in some form. 17.1% of the students desired a gradual phase-out of ROTC and 13.7% called for immediate abolition.

The poll also asked students their reaction to the occupation of a building by demonstrators. 68% of those replying voiced disapproval, while 15% said that they

approved of the tactic. 10% wrote in that their feelings depended on the issue.

However, 65% of the students said that they disapproved of bringing Providence police on campus to "restore order." 22% said that they would approve police action on campus.

The poll also asked whether the view of the Students for a Democratic Society represented student views demanding that the military be barred from the campus. 14% said that it did, while 83% said that it did not.

Four-fifths of those polled were in favor of a campus-wide referendum which would bind the Cam Club. A motion for a binding referendum was defeated by one vote by the Cam Club on Tuesday, April 22.

The poll was highly supportive of the ideas we advocated. It gave deep assurance to the students, faculty, and administration – the three key constituent groups in approving the Open Curriculum – that it would be very foolish for Brown to be radicalized and jeopardize its academic future.

Certainly SDS, at least for this point in time, had the wind sucked from its sails. Their attempts to wreak havoc on the Brown Campus and divide the University against itself were thwarted. The Cammarian Club could get out of the fire of SDS agitators and become a responsible organization again.

Our idea of evolution was not radical; it was indeed responsible. Sanity and reason would reign. Sensibility and wisdom would counter the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune."

Students, when fully engaged in rational discourse, are logical and ethical in their views on the world, provided they can trust their comrades, their leaders, and their institutions.

A Pleasant Surprise

The following week I received a phone call from the secretary of John Nicholas Brown, the patriarch of the University. I had seen him from a distance – a tall, gaunt, elderly, aristocratic man. He was a legend the day he was born, being worth over a million dollars the moment he exited the womb.

JNB's secretary declared that Mr. Brown would like to see me. Would I come over and join him for tea some afternoon soon? This was highly unusual for an ordinary student to be invited into the inner sanctum of old Yankee aristocracy.

Needless to say, I was stunned. JNB asking a student for tea? Of course I said yes. The next day I dressed in coat and tie, walked to his home on Benefit Street, and rang the bell at his beautiful Georgian mansion. His butler answered, I announced myself, and was cordially invited in. JNB was right behind; he welcomed me with a hearty handshake. He was a very genial man. We discussed historic preservation as he quickly ascertained my interest in colonial antiques. I received a tour around his beautiful home. He soon recognized my parents, who had been champions of historic preservation throughout the state.

He then thanked me from the bottom of his heart for "saving 'his' university," in obvious appreciation for this ancestor's commitment to the heritage of Brown University. We chatted about what had been done in such a short time; and I credited much of the work to Professor Kirkpatrick's patriotism and the other once-silent students who joined in the effort.

When we parted, he offered his help to me anytime I might need it. It was an offer I was never able to satisfy as JNB died several years later while I was on active duty in the Navy.

And the Open Curriculum – What happened?

These stories tell it all.



Vol. CIII, No. 61 PROVIDENCE, R. I., WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 1969 Price Ten Cents

No Classes, Faculty To Meet All Day; Maeder Report Marathon Continues

Classes will be cancelled today to allow the faculty to hold an all-day meeting on the Interim Report of the Special Committee on Curricular Philosophy.

Yesterday's faculty meeting was adjourned after an hour-long discussion whether to substitute a motion calling for Undergraduate Seminars for the Maeder Committee's proposal for Modes of Thought courses. No vote on the motion to substitute was taken.

An estimated 300 of Brown's 500 faculty members attended the meeting, which was moved from Carmichael Auditorium to Sayles Hall because of the large turnout.

After Dean F. Donald Eckelmann reported the Curriculum

Committee's recommendation that the faculty adopt the report with minor editorial changes, Juan Lopez-Morillas, professor of comparative literature, spoke to second the motion.

"No curriculum at Brown has been fashioned as openly as this one, under so many scrutinizing eyes and with so clear a sense of

a joint undertaking. If anyone says that he was not heard, it is only because he chose not to speak," he said.

"This is not meant to be a sacred document, a kind of pedagogical Holy Writ not to be tampered with and subject only to reverent interpretation. This, as I see it, is a working paper . . . what is

the faculty voted to defer discussion of the statement of philosophy proposed by the Special Committee until more specific proposals were debated.

Karl Weimar, professor of German, introduced a substitute motion from the set of alternate proposals drafted over the weekend by thirteen professors. His motion

WBRU will broadcast today's meeting of the faculty starting at 3:00 at 57.0 on the AM dial.



Vol. CIII, No. 62 PROVIDENCE, R. I., THURSDAY, MAY 8, 1969 Price Ten Cents

The Brown University Faculty and Graduate Student Club has won its year-old court battle to get a Class-B (beer and wine) club liquor license. Court order compels the Providence Bureau of Licenses to grant the license.

'Satisfactory-No Credit' System Passes; Faculty To Debate Principles Today

A rally and question and answer session will be conducted by student members of the Special Committee on Educational Principles at 12:30 on the Green.

BROWN DAILY HERALD

EXTRA

FOUNDED IN 1866

Vol. CIII, No. 63

PROVIDENCE, R. I., FRIDAY, MAY 9, 1969

FACULTY ADOPTS AIMS OF EDUCATION TO BACK UP CURRICULUM CHANGES

by BEVERLY J. HODGSON
The faculty yesterday backed up the measures for a new curriculum with a statement of principles declaring that undergraduate education "has for its purposes the fostering of the intellectual and personal growth of the individual student."

The faculty approved the statement of philosophy (printed at right) after defeating a motion proposed by Reginald Archambault, professor of education, to refer the question of educational principles to a new committee. Members of the Special Committee on Educational Principles strenuously objected to this motion, all citing the three years of committee work and research which went into the final report.

"It would be criminal," said F. Donald Eckelmann, Dean of the College, "to refer this matter to yet another committee." Ira Magaziner '69, leader of the student movement for curricular reform,

for the first time in the three-day session spoke out vehemently against a delaying measure: "This has gone on for three years, and the faculty didn't seem to care about educational principles at all."

He said the one-paragraph statement of philosophy, written by a group of faculty and students in a late-night session Wednesday, had been formulated in "a spirit

of conciliation" after the faculty had found the principles written into the Maeder Report unsatisfactory.

"This is not a meaningless statement. Referring it to another committee will do the same thing the faculty has done to the principles in the Interim Report. A new committee will come back to the faculty and be told 'we can't talk about this stuff,'" he said.

"At Brown University, education for the undergraduate has as purposes the fostering of the intellectual and personal growth of the individual student. The student, ultimately responsible for his own development in both these areas, must be an active participant in framing his own education. A central aspect of this development is the relationship of the student with his professors and fellow students and with the material they approach together.

Structures, rules, and regulations of the University should facilitate these relationships and should provide the student with the maximum opportunity to formulate and achieve his educational objectives. Accordingly the following curricular structure reflects these purposes."

— Statement of principles passed by the Faculty of Brown University, May 8, 1969



Jerome Grieder, associate professor of political science, said the faculty's action indicated "a matter of neglect, not concern."

"It is not true that the faculty can act only without principles. We must illustrate that we are making a serious commitment to serious ideas," he said.

After several speakers commented that the short statement was "uncontroversial," Michael Rosen, associate professor of mathematics, pointed out that Brown Uni-

versity "has not always accepted the idea that it is the function of the university to foster personal growth" and emphasized the novelty of other concepts in the statement.

"We have heard something that differs from a traditional, conventional form of education. This embodies a good rationale for a curriculum we have already passed a good portion of," he said.

mittee of the Whole.

The faculty will meet next Tuesday to appoint the committees for implementing the new concentration system and Modes of Thought course program.

In a press conference after the meeting, Mr. Magaziner estimated that a million student work-hours had gone into curricular reform. Paul F. Maeder, associate provost, termed the meeting "spectacular."

In the first part of the session, A. David Kossoff, associate professor of Spanish and Italian, said he did not think the faculty had realized that its votes yesterday eliminated all distribution requirements. His motion to restore distribution was defeated after another speaker pointed out "it would be impossible to take 28 courses without hitting at least one in each of the four areas" (Humanities, Natural Science, Social Science, and Formal Thought).

Joseph P. LaSalle, professor of applied mathematics, and George Monteiro, associate professor of English, co-authored a motion asking the Special Committee to "examine the nature, purpose, and place in the total undergraduate curriculum" of the Sc.B. programs. Until the committee reports back on this matter in December, the Sc.B. programs will operate as they do presently, except that distribution requirements will be eliminated.

Mr. Monteiro said, "The Sc.B. Faculty Page 2, Col. 1



— Curricular Reform Chronology —

From Project to Passage

The following is a chronology of the development of curricular reform at Brown. It traces three years and a million student work hours of discussion and planning culminating in the Maeder Report proposals passed by the faculty yesterday.

October 6, 1966 — The Group Independent Study Program (GISP) met for the first time.

December 6, 1966 — GISP decided to focus its work on education at Brown.

April 11, 1967 — The faculty voted to decrease the number of courses required to receive a degree from 32 to 30.

September 28, 1967 — Ira Magaziner and Elliott Maxwell announced their plans to write a report on education at Brown.

March 12, 1968 — Ira Magaziner ran unopposed for Cam Club president pledging curricular reform.

March 18, 1968 — The Mazza-Maxwell Report on curriculum was released. It called for sweeping changes in educational philosophy.

October 6, 1968 — Magaziner mapped his plans for curricular reform before the Cam Club.

October 8, 1968 — President Heffner opened hearings on curriculum reform.

October 15, 1968 — The Stultz Subcommittee reported its recommendations for further study of curriculum to the Curriculum Committee.

November 4, 1968 — The first reform rally was held to demonstrate student support for curriculum change. Seven hundred students attended.

November 7, 1968 — The Curriculum Committee discussed adopting a pass-fail grading system for the University.

November 19, 1968 — The Curriculum Committee decided to step beyond the specific proposals of

the Stultz group to consider a new educational philosophy. It was decided a committee would be appointed to outline such a philosophy.

December 4, 1968 — The Special Committee on Curricular Philosophy was appointed. The chairman named was Paul F. Maeder, associate provost of the university.

December 17, 1968 — The Maeder Committee held its first meeting.

February 6, 1969 — The Maeder group began to evaluate the freshman year.

February 20, 1969 — The Maeder Committee opened discussion on the Modes of Thought courses.

April 7, 1969 — The Maeder Committee announced the drafting of its interim report on curricular reform. The report was made public four days later.

April 16, 1969 — The report was sent to the Curriculum Committee.

April 23, 1969 — The University Committee on Student Affairs held an open meeting to discuss the Report.

April 25, 1969 — The Curriculum Committee approved the liberalized concentration requirements recommended by the Maeder Committee.

April 29, 1969 — The Maeder Report was passed with minor revision by the Curriculum Committee.

May 6, 1969 — The first faculty meeting to consider the Report was held.

May 7, 1969 — A marathon faculty meeting was held on the Report. The faculty passed extensive rules changes for the curriculum.

May 8, 1969 — The faculty approved a new educational philosophy for the University.

And now you "know the rest of the story" from one student's "worm's eye" perspective.