

William F. Buckley, Jr.
Dr. William Banowsky and
Prof. John P. Roche, Guests

Mr. Buckley: Although there is by yesterday's standards a relative tranquillity on the nation's campuses, it is even reported by one startled professor at Dartmouth recently that his students are reading Byron, there are flare-ups. There is also the suspicion closely felt by a few observers that a great Gotterdammerung is ahead of us. Whether we are headed towards or away from the storm center we pause now to hear from two gentlemen from opposite corners of America. Professor John Roche is well known in his several capacities as professor, adviser to Presidents, nationally-syndicated columnist, dean of students, president of the Americans for Democratic Action, which can, loosely speaking, be thought of as a federation of his ex-friends, (Prof. Roche laughs) scourge of phoniness and a misdirected permissiveness, author of seven books of history and theory. Mr. Roche is currently professor of political science at Brandeis whose Tet Offensive took place two winters ago. William Banowsky is the chancellor of Pepperdine College, probably the youngest chancellor in the United States -- I should have said Pepperdine University. He is a graduate of Lipscomb College in Tennessee and received a doctorate in communications from the University of Southern California. His most recent book grew out of a debate with Bishop Pike, held while Bishop Pike was still alive. (Laughter) I should like to ask Dr. Banowsky whether he believes there has been a sea change in students' attitudes over the situation of a year or two ago.

Dr. Banowsky: Yes, I think there has been a significant change but I think it may not portend an optimistic future in which the students are all going to settle down and go back to class. I think it may simply be a retrenchment in which there will be

The copyright laws of the United States (Title 17, U.S. Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. If a user makes a request for, or later uses a photocopy or reproduction (including handwritten copies) for purposes in excess of fair use, that user may be liable for copyright infringement. Users are advised to obtain permission from the copyright owner before any re-use of this material.

Use of this material is for private, non-commercial, and educational purposes; additional reprints and further distribution is prohibited. Copies are not for resale. All other rights reserved. For further information, contact Director, Hoover Institution Library and Archives, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-6010

a new and more serious, perhaps more philosophical kind of militancy against the academic establishment. And I think the students will now be seeking to form a very serious coalition with as much of the faculty as possible because they have been that their one serious error in the last two years was to so overplay the hand of unrest as to aggravate large numbers of the faculty; and I think the serious ones who feel that a real revolution of some kind is essential can see that this was a tactical blunder and will be making shrewder efforts to involve the faculty; and I think they may meet with some success at this; I think they've lost people like Professor Roche --

Mr. Buckley: Well, they never had him, I don't think.

Dr. Banowsky: Well, at least they were not able to enlist him. He could see very quickly that if this is what the Age of Aquarius meant then, you know, he was for the old thing. We're finding at Pepperdine, for instance, that our freshmen are coming in with much greater sophistication. We're located near the Watts' district with our old campus; we have a new campus at Malibu and our historic campus is very near the Watts' district. We have 22% black students which is the largest enrollment of any private college in American history not counting the all-Negro institutions of the South. We're finding that our freshmen students are coming from local Los Angeles high schools with much greater sophistication, much greater awareness of the issues, and with really an increased militancy, that they are not coming to say, look, we don't want any part of these excesses. I think they are very much committed to the idea that some changes are going to have to be brought about and they will be a part of it. So I think there is a change in attitudes but I do not think it means that we're going back to school as usual.

Mr. Buckley: What do you think, Mr. Roche, from Brandeis as you see the situation there, or for that matter, how you see it anywhere?

Prof. Roche: Well, I think one of the difficulties here has always been the tiny

percentage of people it takes to tear hell out of the school. After all, how many people does it take to try to burn down a building as they did as a compliment to me a couple of years ago (slight laugh) as a sort of welcome home present from Washington. Probably --

Mr. Buckley: Did they burn the building?

Prof. Roche: No, it was an amateur job of arson but fortunately there were effete arsonists at work, but the percentage who are hard core characters in this has always been, I think, fairly small. Now the real difficulty in American higher education, I think, is that the appeal of the extremists has been one that has for entirely understandable reasons reached, spoken to the concerns of, a number of young people; namely the factory environment of an immense school. I'm a Luddite, for example, in my academic conviction; I believe that despite all the psychological tests, and they have been taking -- you know, they have a class with 600 people in it, a class with 16 in it, and they will give them all the same material, they will give them the same tests; and it will turn out it doesn't make any difference whether they're a class of 600 or a class of 16. Well, I'm sorry; deductively I ^{simply} refuse to believe it. It may be true, in which case I could send tape recordings in and stay home in the morning. But the elimination of the old teacher-student relationship that existed in the smaller scale. Now obviously the reason for the increase in scale is another aspect of my convictions, namely, my belief in egalitarianism; that is, I believe that people should have a shot at it. I went to Hofstra College, Long Island, a four-year scholarship, and my father told me I ought to go out and earn an honest living as a longshoreman; and the G.I. Bill of Rights probably turned a good longshoreman into a, you know, run-of-the-mill professor. But the universities, in other words, have come under attack by people who have nursed -- who have picked up and played upon legitimate student grievances. Now I'm an old social democrat; I was an anti-war militant in 1940; I made the same speeches that anti-war militants

make today only I, as a matter of fact with all due immodesty, I made them somewhat better! (Laughter) And --

Mr. Buckley: After all, you were 18 years old. (Laughter)

Prof. Roche: (Laughing) Sure -- 18 years old. I don't believe for a minute that there should be a decrease in concern and in ideological militancy and so on among students. However, what occurred in the last few years was a confusion of what might be called ideological militancy with psychopathic violence! That is, the people that I've known, and I've had contact with in the extreme edges of the youth movement have been psychos! I don't think that -- you/keep blaming it on me -- I say, you liberals. I think there's no monopoly on psychopaths whether it's among liberals or conservatives. And it happens that this particular breed of psychopath are running along our edge of the meadow, whereas the Minute Men, for example, have run along your edge.

Mr. Buckley: But ours is a much smaller meadow. (Laughter)

Prof. Roche: Well (laughs).

Mr. Buckley: Well, tell me this, Dr. Banowsky, when you say that they are coming -- that they are more sophisticated when they arrive on campus, does that mean that they are more sophisticated about the inutility of this kind of demonstration -- of burning down buildings, so on and so forth, or they are more sophisticated in that they know now where the ganglia of power are and are likely to cause even greater trouble?

Dr. Banowsky: Exactly. And they are more sophisticated in the nature of the combat. I would agree with Prof. Roche that it's a small handful of the hard characters who have burned buildings but, as he says, they have played upon and exploited issues which are of a genuine concern to millions of college students. That concern is not going to die down and it is not easy and --

Mr. Buckley: But that's not true in all cases, is it? I mean, for instance,

a black separatism within a college is not a concern of millions, nor is a black studies program which was a thing at Brandeis, and so on.

Dr. Banowsky: No, but the degree to which the students participate in the affairs of the university is one of the real questions at stake.

Mr. Buckley: Yeah, but is it a neurotic comparative or is it because this is the only way that they can distill their dissatisfaction?

Dr. Banowsky: It's because, I think, we have over-believed what the open society and the free society means; it means that a college freshman comes in and takes his tenure on the board of trustees; one of the things at stake in the next ten years is who will manage the universities.

Prof. Roche: Yeah.

Dr. Banowsky: The kids now see that if they're going to manage them, they've got to have a coalition with the faculty. I think there's a good chance that the state legislatures will be in the management of many universities by 1980.

Mr. Buckley: Which you certainly deplore.

Dr. Banowsky: Which I deplore because anarchy always produces a kind of tyranny, as Plato was the first to say. So at Pepperdine, we're a private college, and frankly we have never been more militant on the right of being independent and private. We intend to manage the university come what may because we think that's what's at stake. We think everybody ought to have a part; we think that the students should come and to a curriculum that has some structure, that has some perpetuation to it, that the faculty itself is not in the best position to be running the university.

Mr. Buckley: Well, what about the mechanics of actually getting rid of totally intractable professors? Let me ask you this, we all know that there is that good behavior clause attached to a tenure agreement but, as I understand it, in fact nobody ever gets -- nobody ever loses his place in a college merely for egging students

on to burn the buildings.

Dr. Banowsky: Perhaps it should.

Mr. Buckley: Yes, well, is this something, for instance, is your contract at Pepperdine or the one that you administer to faculty members different from the one that they use at Brandeis?

Dr. Banowsky: Unfortunately it's probably exactly the same because both institutions are subservient to the Academic Guild and the Academic Union which is the American Association of University Professors.

Mr. Buckley: Do they write the form -- do they have the boiler plate?

Dr. Banowsky: Essentially. They influence the form.

Prof. Roche: I believe here, you see, that the greatest problem in the university, in the faculty, is not so much their radicalism but their incompetence. And I cannot recall in all my life hearing of any case of a man who was thrown out for incompetence -- ~~for~~ a tenure appointment -- for incompetence. Because I know of one instance where a chap came into a class and lectured on some secret treaties in history, and some student went out and checked up and found out he couldn't find any reference to them; and the professor involved said well, as a matter of fact, I heard about them in a vision from St. Anthony. And I gather that he was eased out in some polite fashion. But the use of supernal evidence of this sort occasionally occurs. I believe that no one should have tenure in a university faculty, and I have said this for years. No one should have tenure in a university faculty until he's either, let's say, -- has twenty-five years of service and is fifty years old; and I'm less than fifty -- I'm prepared to give my tenure up; it's not a matter of any great concern to me.

Mr. Buckley: How would you -- I mean, how could you say people like George Wald are incompetent?

Prof. Roche: Oh, George Wald is apparently ^{an}/extremely competent biologist.

Mr. Buckley: Yeah.

Prof. Roche: Now --

Mr. Buckley: Yet he was in the category that we are now discussing.

Prof. Roche: Well, I don't know would he or wouldn't he. George Wald has made some speeches but to what extent is George Wald actually letting anybody engage in tearing up something -- that is, he certainly was not involved in bombing the Center for International Studies or anything of that sort. We're getting into here the whole problem of inflammatory speech, of course. Now the old AAUP rule was you were supposed to stay within your -- what is their formula? within your area of --

Dr. Banowsky: Competence.

Prof. Roche: -- competence, something like that.

Dr. Banowsky: Within the area of competence.

Prof. Roche: Yeah. But I think that the Walds of this world are best left alone. At least he's a competent biologist. The people who bother me are the incompetent political scientists.

Dr. Banowsky: Let me say that I, ^{we} have recently renovated our tenure program to be available only for persons who reach the rank of associate professor which in our institution means he has to be there a number of years, perhaps as many as ten with the institution or with some accredited institution, and --

Mr. Buckley: I thought that was standard; has that changed? It used to be that you had to be an associate professor before you qualified for tenure.

Prof. Roche: No, in most state schools what is it, three years, five years appointment -- that's it.

Dr. Banowsky: A lifetime contract is given too early to the academic profession; it is an abuse of the principle of academic freedom which obviously was a good ^{American} principle and ought to be honored. Frankly, we're presently in conversation with the/

Association of University Professors and all of our accrediting agencies to begin our Malibu program in the fall of 1972 without tenure to any of the faculty; we will offer tenure in the university system but not at that particular campus, which means men come there at a greater risk. They have to be judged on the basis of merit both by students and colleagues and administration.

Prof. Roche: Then there's the long haul to be involved. I've always thought it was preposterous. The head of a college gave me tenure when I was 32 years old, which meant that in effect they were taking a 35-year old gamble, assuming God willing, I make it all the way to 67. But they were gambling on the basis of the five years I had been there that I was a good bet --

Dr. Banowsky: Exactly.

Prof. Roche: -- for the next thirty-seven.

Dr. Banowsky: And, you see, what you deserve^{is} the right to speak in your field of competency without coercion or oppression from the administration; what you don't deserve is for the administration to say we're gambling on your health or gambling on your industry, your willingness to show up on time for your classes, and the kind of license which covers all that is simply too great a license.

The Academic Guild -- the universities now are being managed by the faculties in many situations; we're finding that in California. (Station Break)

Mr. Buckley: You were saying, Mr. Roche.

Prof. Roche: Well, the trouble is the faculty is not running things; what the faculty does is it makes it impossible for anybody else to run things but it is incompetent itself to run them.

Dr. Banowsky: And nobody is running things.

Prof. Roche: So what you have is a vacuum; and I'm convinced that a good university or college is in a sense a constitutional monarchy; that is, you have to have a president who has authority, and yet there are overlaps so that the faculty has

the veto; in certain areas the students; And I've never particularly been interested in playing, you know, the care and feeding of children; it doesn't strike me as something the university should waste too much of its time on. I hear great complaints about the morality of your generation -- in the group I see out here before me. All I can say is that I wish you luck in not being any worse than my generation. And (slight laugh) -- so that I'm not concerned about that aspect of it particularly. What has really occurred in American universities has been the retreat of the faculty from responsibility to a point where they block presidents; there's almost a conspiracy against appointing a strong president, for example. Now, I'm prepared to argue that a strong president with a cockeyed view of education like, say, Bob Hutchins, whose views on education I think are cockeyed. Or even a good Marxist! who has a strong set of views is better than a zero because then you have a backboard, that is, you have somebody who gets up there and says, "Here's what I believe in, here's what the school should be built around in, these are the kinds of ideas we want to have," and then you can fight. But when ^{all} you get is a great big hunk of molasses (laughter) -- now, every time somebody comes along and says, "I've got a revolutionary new, dynamic, innovative program," and it turns out he's reinventing the wheel; (laughter) most of these things are; the immediate process is one of accommodation; they say well, yes, of course, we must have women's studies added, or black studies, or Irish studies or whatever. So the universities and the colleges to the great extent share the same problem even though they shouldn't -- they're smaller. They become amorphous ~~blobs~~ ^{blobs}. They just don't have any educational theory whatever. And I'm prepared, as I said, to argue that the bad educational theory which serves as a backboard is better than none at all.

Dr. Banowsky: The point is so good that I think it deserves an illustration.

Berkeley is now without a president -- or a chancellor; Roger ~~Haines~~ ^{Heyns} has resigned -- well, first of all the trustees of the Regents of the university have the obligation

to name the new president, and obviously with Governor Reagan and others on that Regency they have some opinions about whom it ought to be. And they've got the final say. But president Hitch is under the obligation to appoint a faculty committee who don't have the power to appoint the president, but what they have is the veto power.

Mr. Buckley: Yah.

Dr. Banowsky: So they finally can look at the list the Regents bring forth and eliminate the strong man and they'll settle on a compromise who's weak enough not to be able to manage the institution.

Mr. Buckley: Yeah, well, okay -- let's agree that the faculties don't run the colleges; let's also agree that the great disruptions of the last few years which, in the opinion of some very savvy educators, have seriously undermined the purposes of education, could not have succeeded in doing so except with tacit and active faculty cooperation. Now, does that therefore pose a problem for which we are not institutionally or even morally prepared, i.e., the imposition of certain conditions or certain specifications of what good behavior consists in, which would make it possible to actually fire the man who time after time has been the catalyst or whose support has been necessary? Take somebody like Marcuse, now it's true he's not the kind of person who goes out there and personally gives you a match when you want to burn down The Bank of America building, but there is no question that but for the fact that he is the kind of person to whom one repairs in order to get some sort of transcendental justification of what it is that you're up to, it would be much less likely to happen. Are you -- he was a colleague of yours and you found him rather tame as a teacher, right?

Prof. Roche: Well, Herbert -- I think by the same stand^{ards}, you might blame St. Bernard for the pogroms that were launched by the First Crusade.

Mr. Buckley: Well, a lot of people do.

Prof. Roche: Well, I wouldn't; that is, I think that there is a question here about abstract -- and with Marcuse it is abstract in fact; it's abstract almost to the point of utter etherealism. But with Herbert you have a case of somebody whomas I have suggested that really the media invented as a revolutionary. He went to -- there's a marvelous story: He went to Berlin to some great meeting of the radical Berlin students' free university, and he got up really with the traditional Studet^{en}! And they got up in one great voice and roared at him: Comrade! -- and he looked at them; you know, they're not comrade to him, they're students. You know, dammit, they stay in their place. (Mr. Buckley laughs) Well, but I think Marcuse is a very bad case to use as a litmus paper here. I think when you've had the instances we have had in certain universities and colleges members of the faculty have actually been instigators and involved directly in acts of violence. There is no question as far as I'm concerned: Off to the bucket with them!

Mr. Buckley: Well, has there been any such?

Prof. Roche: Oh, I believe there have been some in New York City. I've seen in the papers -- it seems to me that they got somebody here in New York -- at NYU, I'm not sure.

Mr. Buckley: Angela Davis might turn out to be a case in point, I suppose.

Prof. Roche: Yes, I suppose she might. But I don't believe that the university is a ~~sanctuary~~, that people can commit criminal acts and rush to the university and say --

Mr. Buckley: I'm asking for something less than a criminal act; I'm asking whether it's possible in the tenure situation to have a campus that guarantees freedom to the students to learn and to those teachers who desire to teach, to teach, if in fact the students, backed by certain professors, make life absolutely impossible. Now

you don't have to catch, as I say, you don't have to catch a *faculty member in flagrante* but if you know your campus you know perfectly well that there might in fact be two or three people who are the actual agents of disruption, the intellectual force-feeders of this disruption; what are you going to do about it?

Dr. Banowsky: Well the most recent case in point is at Fresno State in California. A half or dozen or so faculty have been -- most of whom were tenured -- have been released by the administration --

Mr. Buckley: Oh, I didn't know that.

Dr. Banowsky: -- it's very recent, and it will be a hot question.

Mr. Buckley: And very unique.

Dr. Banowsky: Yeah. It will be debated probably a year or so. But again, the Academic Union becomes involved, the influence of the American Association of University Professors, because --

Mr. Buckley: Come to think of it, at Dartmouth a couple were suspended last summer, weren't they?

Dr. Banowsky: I suppose they censor Fresno State with all rights and privileges pertaining thereto. I think that we will see more of this what you have at Dartmouth and I think, frankly, Prof. Roche may be a little kind to Marcuse because while he is abstract some of his writings on the proper use of violence are all so clear-cut and seems to me to provide a case of conspiracy: Opposition, yes; Conspiracy, no.

Prof. Roche: Well, I disagree. I think that as I can provide you with *a number of* considerably more blood-curdling calls to violence than Herbert's even written in his life --

Dr. Banowsky: Sure that's true.

Prof. Roche: -- and I don't think that the author is necessarily -- I simply do not accept the notion of the Moscow trials of objective guilt --

Mr. Buckley: Because something happened you infer --

Prof. Roche: Right.

Mr. Buckley: -- the other guy was responsible for it.

Prof. Roche: Precisely. The Darkness at Noon logic --

Mr. Buckley: Eisenhower-is-a-communist logic.

Prof. Roche: Right, precisely.

Dr. Banowsky: You're talking, I suppose, about philosophical guilt; is there such a thing?

Mr. Buckley: Well, no, the kind of guilt that *requires (unclear)* is what Mr. Roche is talking about, I assume.

Prof. Roche: There are two separable questions here; one is a political question, one is a legal question. Now on the legal question I would resist any attempts to stage a Los Angeles version of Darkness at Noon with Marcuse as the centerpiece.

On the political and moral level I have attacked Herbert Marcuse for twenty years and I plan to continue to do so; that is, vigorously on what I consider to be the fundamental -- well, malevolence indeed of a great deal of his theory. But the two should not be confused, it seems to me, and a lot of people tend to do it. I've got colleagues who are, I suppose, almost Maoites in their -- not at Brandeis but I think colleagues generally speaking -- who are almost Maoites in their intellectual convictions, and yet they also believe that the university is a place where you should have differences of opinion, and conflict, and ideas and so on. As far as I'm concerned that's fine. If they come around and start launching guerrilla warfare in my neighborhood, I'm going to call the police! It's as simple as that. (Laughs) (Station Break)

Mr. Buckley: Mr. Roche, you heard Mr. Banowsky here mention that there are 22% black students at the Pepperdine University; and the black students at your university were very much in the news a while ago, may I ask you this: from your observation of what subsequently happened at Brandeis, is the black studies

program a legitimate way to satisfy the black minority, that in fact their intellectual and historical interests are being sufficiently cared for, and that we think enough of the ethnic background to make it a source of -- or rather an object of study? Has it been successful intellectually and socially? (Pause) Or is it too early to tell?

Prof. Roche: Well, it's very hard -- it's very hard to make a generalization this early. It has been, and it was set up, and the faculty insisted on it being set up as a legitimate academic exercise; that is to say, there are no courses in black astrology, black statistics, you know, like the old textbooks in the parochial schools: if three nuns are walking down a street and one nun goes to the drug store, how many nuns are left, you know. (Laughter) There's none of this kind of pedagogy involved which I take it is the parallel to black statistics and black the rest of it. Now there are some quite good courses but I've noticed, myself, that the most intelligent Negro students of my acquaintance, not just at Brandeis but elsewhere, take the general view that they don't particularly want to major in black studies because they know enough about that already; in fact they know more about it than they want to know; they're much more interested in taking physics and chemistry and so on. So I think it was a symbolic affair and has certainly -- probably -- made some people feel better. I feel, knowing my own -- the ethnic chauvinism of my ancestors -- that I feel the Negroes have a right to be as equally chauvinistic; in fact I doubt if they could ever match the Irish. But let them have a swing at it as long as it is not an impingement upon the legitimate academic objectives of the school.

Mr. Buckley: And what if it's an intellectual travesty?

Prof. Roche: Well, I'd throw it off the campus.

Mr. Buckley: Uh-huh. What is your experience, Dr. Banowsky, with that?

Dr. Banowsky: In a very practical way we're finding that our ethnic studies program

-- we've called it that to include the Mexican-American groups; and we have several hundred Oriental students at Pepperdine; it's failing. The black students are not taking it, and we have a black dean of ethnic studies, and he gets a large budget, and we structure the curriculum and we want to favor it to demonstrate our willingness to work with the program. But the dean's request now is for more and more funds because he can't get sufficient students which he thinks more money will solve. And we feel it's because the students know black history and they want to learn to diagram an English sentence or learn some physics. And so, just from one practical illustration we have a problem and we are having to take a new look now at our ethnic studies programs because --

Mr. Buckley: Because they're undersubscribed.

Dr. Banowsky: That's right; undersubscribed -- seriously undersubscribed.

Mr. Buckley: Would there be any reasons that aren't obvious to me why there should be more of an appetite for it on the east coast -- than on the west coast?

Dr. Banowsky: There may be more of an appetite in the public universities. Our young people pay a high tuition. Their parents are working to get them there --

Mr. Buckley: They do at Brandeis, too.

Dr. Banowsky: -- and by the time they come to pay the bill I think they're not quite willing to pay --

Mr. Buckley: (unclear)

Dr. Banowsky: That's right.

Mr. Buckley: Well, is it that?

Prof. Roche: Well, I've noticed, you see, as distinct from the so-called white radicals, that the Negro militants that I've had contact with, and I've had contact with a number of them, have been very serious people; that is, that whereas

the whites are off dancing around/freeing Reggie Debray, or something like this, the blacks are interested in getting another hand on the ladder in the system. In other words, they are functionally oriented toward achievement in the system; and as a consequence I have a great deal more sympathy for them, and have had a great deal more sympathy for them, then I have had for the white protesters who have been sort of dancing around the margin with their various and sundry -- what's the latest one? free the Oshkosh Ten or something? I don't know, you know, there's -- it's a new one every week. In other words, the black demands have been specifically oriented towards --

Mr. Buckley: Like the Indianapolis 500 who were all innocent? (Laughter)

Prof. Roche: (Laughing) Right. The black militants that I've had contact with have been very consciously, teleologically postured toward achievement; that is, they want to get up in the system, they don't want to kill the system; whereas the kookies, dancing around the edges -- the credit card revolutionaries and the rest of them -- basically are attempting to work out their own psychological angst at the expense of the university.

Mr. Buckley: Well, is that true also at Pepperdine?

Dr. Banowsky: I think we have some black militants who feel the system has to come down, --

Mr. Buckley: I would have thought so, yeah. I wondered how you were spared them.

Dr. Banowsky: -- that it is sufficiently sick; it's got to come down.

Prof. Roche: Well, I take this to be a bargaining position; that is, a fellow says the system must come down, and you say, alright, what do you want.

Dr. Banowsky: Yeah -- I see that.

Prof. Roche: And he says then, we want 10 more scholarships. Whereas if you get one of these white kookies, and he says, the system must come down; you say, what do you want; he says I want the system to come down.

Dr. Banowsky: Yeah.

Prof. Roche: There's a difference.

Dr. Banowsky: Yeah, I think that's a legitimate difference, too. But I still think that some of the black students are sufficiently alienated, and they're increasingly so. The black high school -- the ghetto high schools -- are very active centers now for real militancy. And young people coming from black high schools and black neighborhoods in these great cities are coming prepared for combat of any kind. We're finding them, and I think we've got a practical situation. We're finding them increasingly willing to sacrifice whatever is necessary to make a point.

Mr. Buckley: You mean to make an abstract point.

Dr. Banowsky: No, to make -- well, we're a small college; we've had no difficulty until last month. We fired a black public relations director, and we were asleep at the switch -- we just imagined that --

Mr. Buckley: That one could do that.

Dr. Banowsky: Yeah, or one could not do that. Immediately the Los Angeles Times and all the media were called because it was a showdown; a complete demand by the BSU that he be reinstated immediately, pending a two-month investigation of the case because he was fired for racism. Well the administration ends in the untenable position of having to abdicate management if it says okay, we'll reinstate. then any time you call in the press and make demands on any issue. So we said no. During the night our major academic building was confiscated and very shrewdly now, I'm talking about the shrewdness of it, being done at a small college, it was chained from the inside -- all of the doors; so that when we reported for school the next day the building was locked from the inside, which was a messy situation --

Mr. Buckley: You can't sort of gracefully open the door and walk in.

Dr. Banowsky: No. You can't shove your way through -- you've got the chains;

you've got to call the police, you see; here are your own black students. And 75%

of the hundred or so involved in that were freshmen students who had been with us no more than three or four months.

Mr. Buckley: Uh-hm. Are they still with you?

Dr. Banowsky: We're engaged now in the process of --

Mr. Buckley: Sub judice.

Dr. Banowsky: Yes, but academic justice --

Prof. Roche: Have you found that the TV wagons are so crucial?

Dr. Banowsky: Oh, the TV wagons -- the media is growing more,,more --

Mr. Buckley: Blase.

Dr. Banowsky: No. It may be blase, but I think also there's a sense of responsibility .

Mr. Buckley: Inconceivable. (Laughter)

Dr. Banowsky: I genuinely feel that the media -- well, I was at Reagan's inauguration two days ago ; about 3,000 people with a hundred hecklers who heckled during the invocations by clergymen of all faiths. I mean --

Prof. Roche: Completely ecumenical heckling. (Laughter)

Dr. Banowsky: Oh -- savage heckling; loud, savage heckling . And Reagan and all were all were restrained; of course the game is that if Reagan acknowledges -- if there's any effort to restrain them then it's in the national media.

Mr. Buckley: Yeah.

Dr. Banowsky: So the whole inauguration was conducted under chants of various obscene kinds. The next morning the press was very light in its treatment. It talked about the inauguration; it said there were some --

Mr. Buckley: Well, what did the television cameras do?

Dr. Banowsky: The television cameras were there but though I didn't see all of the channels we got some reports that they also were --

Mr. Buckley: But how can you tune out obscenities if the --

Dr. Banowsky: Well, it depends upon what who's going to decide where you clip and cut in that TV -- they may take back, you know, two hours --

Mr. Buckley: So if it happened that if somebody was chanting during the climax of Reagan's speech, you would have had the obscenities.

Dr. Banowsky: Yes, they would have had that, but they're not focused with special play on the fact that here's a confrontation.

Mr. Buckley: Well, this may not be too good an example; you're talking about the use of television to attract, to magnify a riot, right? But after all you can't very well magnify an inauguration; there it is.

Dr. Banowsky: Yes --

Prof. Roche: I was thinking what happens at school ; they sent out advance notice, you see, to tip off the TV people that there's going to be a little scene at four o'clock --

Dr. Banowsky: Oh, yes.

Prof. Roche: -- and you might find it interesting to show up. So, you know, one day they showed up, and a fellow came rushing over to them and said, I'm sorry, it's been postponed. Please don't leave. (Laughs) The spontaneous demonstration had been held off, (Laughter) for 45 minutes or something like that . So that with all the cameras going full tilt then you get, of course, this theatre of the absurd. And I think that the media played a major role in the academic troubles, particularly last spring.

Dr. Banowsky: No doubt about it.

Prof. Roche: The whole great orgiastic --

Mr. Buckley: Post-Cambodian thing.

Prof. Roche: Post-Cambodian thing, sure. (Station Break)

Mr. Buckley: Mr. Greenfield.

Mr. Greenfield: I went back to my alma mater a couple of months ago to do a magazine piece and I'd like to test out --

Prof. Roche: Which is what?

Mr. Greenfield: Wisconsin.

Prof. Roche: Wisconsin.

Mr. Greenfield: It's catatonic or calm, depending on where you sit. It's what Brewster of Yale called "an eerie tranquillity" almost. Part of it I had thought after spending a week there and talking to people from administrators, to students, to faculty, part of it seems to be the particularly violent act that occurred there -- the bombing of an Army Research center which killed a graduate student. Part of it seemed to be something that neither of you have talked about which I think, to my disappointment, is the underlying sense of despair that I think students feel; part of it I believe resulting from something that comes almost out of one of Ericson's insights: that with all that's gone on in this country in the last five years, and I would specify the war in Vietnam, there seems to have been a ripping apart of the connection between the university community as a purposive community leading to something worthwhile participating in and the society at large. People who came to the university who were radicals or liberals or left or activists eight years ago, six years ago, when I left, whatever our convictions may have been felt somehow that the purpose of the exercise was essentially legitimate; and that there were things out there -- worth doing that one can be proud to be a part of. The university itself as a bastion of academic freedom was very much alive even on the part of dissenting students. It seems to me that that school and a couple of others that I have at least asked my friends ^{in the academic world} about, that seems to have been shredded apart; that the overlay of the war and everything else that in turn brought up: the complicity of the university in what a number of students saw as illegitimate purposes,

secret defense research, what have you. All of that has led to a sense of we're here because we don't want to be in the Army -- because we want to get some kind of job, because it's the next logical step but we're not here for much of a reason. And in fact, the only people I found as a body who gave me a different point of view were the black students who had struck a year and a half ago in a very disruptive element: National Guard, the whole works, who were now engaged in going out to junior high schools, teaching black poetry and talking about black purpose. So I wonder maybe particularly, Mr. Roche, as a supporter of the Vietnam effort, whether you think that sense of mine is inaccurate; whether on the part of students I'm wrong in thinking that the war and what it taught them about their country was the source of this despair.

Prof. Roche: Well, every generation thinks that sex was invented the day it hit puberty; and every generation thinks it is vested somehow by the cosmos with sovereignty. And every generation has to learn that somehow or other out there in the world, in the United States, there are like 200 million people -- you know.

Mr. Greenfield: No, I don't know because it is exactly what was not around eight years ago.

Prof. Roche: Oh, yeah. Well, what happened was there was a generation to whom Vietnam came as a catalyst. They were the ones that were there when the war blew up, that is, from '65 to '68. You've got a new generation now of people coming for whom it's old stuff. It's been going on since they were in what? eighth grade! And you can't gin up the same kind of -- you know, you can't run this kind of emotional thing time in and time out. It's already part of their whole body of experience --

Mr. Buckley: You get second act trouble.

Prof. Roche: That's right, you get second act trouble.

Mr. Greenfield: It's remarkable, you see; I was getting to that but my sense was that there was so much -- one of the deans there who goes out to Wisconsin high schools, not the center of activism, says the kids are infinitely -- white kids -- are more radical in a different way. They're not energized to protest; they're in despair!

Dr. Banowsky: Yes.

Prof. Roche: I don't buy this.

Mr. Greenfield: Okay, let's --

Prof. Roche: I don't buy it at all, that is, I think as I say that the impact of the war was a tragic impact, I don't question it. The fact that it was tough on a generation of young Americans is something for which I am genuinely sorry. However, I happen to believe that it was a just war; I support it and still do. And the notion that somehow or other it should be stopped because the young people don't like it seems to me to be absurd as saying in 1963 that we should stop desegregating the schools in the South because the young Southern whites don't like it.

Mr. Greenfield: Of course, that was no part of my argument.

Prof. Roche: No.

Mr. Greenfield: I would not say the war should be stopped because young people don't like it; I would say it should be stopped because it's --

Mr. Buckley: But that was part of the argument -- Vietnam --

Mr. Greenfield: But clearly then one doesn't -- (unclear in crosstalk)

Mr. Buckley: Well, Dr. Banowsky seems to recognize in Pepperdine that there is something unnatural -- this quality of despair.

Dr. Banowsky: Yes, I would say in California we have 20 million people now -- first in population in the nation, and you could cut the despair with a knife on any of our major campuses. Despair is the word. I think it's the product of a number of things. I think the fact that the young people were in the eighth grade

when the war started and that there is still a war, and that they're still the ones being drafted; the practical matter of just being, you know, who wants to go shoot at someone, shoot bullets into somebody's body. They may not have the philosophical basis to raise the broader questions but they can raise that question. And I think the sense of despair also grows from the value vacuum in American education; that our universities have bred the despair. What's it all about, Alfie? just for the moment that we live? And we're going to have to return in this country to a commitment to values in our education, or we're going to be torn apart.

Prof. Roche: I'm an historian and I must inject a note here. I just did a little research because at Christmastime my wife's great-aunt gave us -- knowing my interest in American history -- gave us the whole set of mementoes of the American Civil War pictures. She had three uncles who served in the Union Army in the Civil War; one was killed and two survived. And I went back and I did a little research, statistical research, and I discovered that between 1861 and 1865 one American in five between the age group of 20 and 40 was killed in the war. Now, in terms of despair --

Mr. Buckley: What would be the comparable figure today?

Prof. Roche: (Whistle) God! I suppose it would be in the order of 11-12 million people probably, something like that. I don't know off-hand.

Mr. Buckley: No, I say what would be the comparable figure: 1 out of how many have been killed in America during the '60s in war?

Prof. Roche: Oh, let's see, we've lost 50,000 --

Mr. Greenfield: 1 in 4,000 more or less; something like that.

Prof. Roche: Something like 1 in 4,000. Now I admit I'm an optimist but every time I think that somehow or other our time is uniquely cursed by history, I think of (1) the American Civil War and (2) I take consolation in the Book of Ecclesiastes.

Dr. Banowsky: What do you think of ^{Toffler's} ~~Talfer's~~ book, Future Shock, and the whole thesis that these young people are facing a uniquely different situation?

Prof. Roche: I haven't seen it.

Dr. Banowsky: Well, his point is that these young people -- you take a 15-year old boy, he is born at the median point of all human history ; that is, half of everything that happened happened before he was born and half has happened since he was born. We've traveled more rapidly. We have, you know, the statistics about 90% of the natural scientists. Well, the knowledge explosion --

Mr. Buckley: The psychological problem of absorbing that.

Dr. Banowsky: In absorbing the rapidity of change. In 1900, 4 American cities had a million; now -- 4 cities in the world had a million in 1900 -- now 141 cities have a million or more. The rapidity of change is difficult to absorb.

Prof. Roche: It is, it is, but on the other hand it has its advantages. As far as I can figure out with the exception of clergy, I'm the first member of my family that ever graduated from high school. And at this point in time, if you look at the comparison, what potentialities there are for young people, I think there's good reason to be somewhat less pessimistic.

Dr. Banowsky: I think the point they see is that your generation came through that period of feeling that education wasn't the solution. We wanted to solve these problems in this country by education and, frankly, the dream has turned into a nightmare; education has not been the solution; in fact the university centers seem to be the area from which the problems are fomenting. It is the difference between where we now are and where we were supposed to have been by now which causes these young people to feel a sense of despair.

Prof. Roche: Yes, I think you're right there; that is, you do get the expectation-level problem.

Mr. Buckley: Miss Williams.

Miss Williams: Mr. Banowsky, I would like to go back to this question with the very slumbering mood of campuses and the despair and ask you something that may be somewhat more subtle than just the exhaustion that young people in colleges are feeling as a result of the war, and so forth. I've known a number of young people recently who either dropped out -- did not go directly from high school into college, were out for a year or two, or who went into school, dropped out and have now gone back. They really are very uncertain as to why they're back in school at all. They've been through some incredible experiences in the year that they were out, living with addicts, doing anything, you know, just sort of any number of things.

Dr. Banowsky: We've got to find something for young people to do besides go to college --

Miss Williams: Well, I was just going to ask you if there are --

Dr. Banowsky: -- (crosstalk) we've got to have some vocational training schools; we've got to get them through college much more quickly; we've got to train doctors and lawyers, especially doctors much more quickly than we train them.

Mr. Buckley: Yeah, they do in Russia in about two months, don't they? (Laughter)

Dr. Banowsky: Well, let's take four months. We are keeping these young people who are -- I've got 4 sons, the oldest is twelve. He's learned more on television than I got by the time I got my doctor's degree at USC, I mean. He watches the tube. And he has an overshot of information but an undershot of involvement in anything. He can't get a job like we could, you know. And he would like to act on some of his information before he's twenty-seven years old.

Mr. Buckley: Dan?

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Roche, both you and Dr. Banowsky seem to be against more or less

the principle of tenure.

Prof. Roche: No, I qualified that; I said after a certain point.

Mr. Oliver: All right, after a certain point, but it does seem --

Prof. Roche: Premature tenure, I'm opposed to.

Mr. Oliver: But premature tenure then seems to be supported by the AAUP. If both of you presumably from dissimilar ends of the political spectrum are against it, how long will the AAUP be able to hold out supporting it?

Prof. Roche: Given the inertial operation of the AAUP, I would say 120 years.

(Laughter)

Dr. Banowsky: The most conservative people in America are a college faculty. They're liberal --

Mr. Buckley: Concerning themselves.

Dr. Banowsky: Yeah. They're liberal about everybody else's business. To change a curriculum -- heh! -- the people who will not change -- I mean the most innovative people in the country are the business people, the big, sick, corrupt business people --

Mr. Buckley: The military industrial complex.

Dr. Banowsky: They will innovate.

Mr. Buckley: Try the F 11-11.

Dr. Banowsky: And the faculty people, to change a curriculum and to move a cemetery are tasks of utter magnitude. (Laughter)

Mr. Greenfield: Is it true in your experience that it's the younger faculty members who are the worst? One professor told me that.

Prof. Roche: Worst what?

Mr. Buckley: Stick-in-the-muds, you mean?

Mr. Greenfield: Yes, the worst non-innovative; the people who once they get their

tenure hang on for dear life.

Prof. Roche: What you get is, you see, there's a real hustle going on. What it involves is -- for example, ^{once} if you thought that you were not going to get tenure a couple of years ago, the first thing you did was rush up in front of a TV camera and burn a draft card because then if they denied you tenure it was obviously because you were a political dissenter.

Mr. Buckley: The Mary McCarthy plan.

Prof. Roche: The hustle, yeah. So you've got this kind of gambit going. And it was done, by the way, in the '50s by chaps who were on the right end of the thing and made a sort of career out of being professional defenders of Joe McCarthy in order to get tenure from liberal schools.

Mr. Buckley: Well, all two of them were absorbed by the *system*. (Laughter)

Prof. Roche: Well, there were four.

Mr. Buckley: Thank you very much, Mr. Roche, Dr. Banowsky, ladies and gentlemen, members of the panel.

* * * * *