



# Background Guide

Dissent in the Heartland:

IU Board of Directors

Under Secretary-General Will Fleming

Crisis Director Kaity Radde

Chair Maan Murad, Vice Chair

# IndianaMUNC VII

February 19-21 | Bloomington, IN | School of Public and Environmental Affairs



## Copyright Notice

This document is the copyrighted intellectual property of Indiana Model United Nations Inc and is solely intended for use by students attending IndianaMUNC VII. Any distribution, modification, or duplication of this document without express written authorization from the Corporation is strictly unlawful.



## A Letter from the Crisis Director

Hello Delegates,

Welcome to Indiana MUNC VII! My name is Kaitlyn Radde, and I'll be your crisis director this year. I am a junior majoring in Political Science and minoring in International Studies and Spanish. I have been a member of Indiana Model UN since the second semester of my freshman year, and this is my second year being a crisis director. If you have any questions about committee or about IU, please feel free to reach out.





## Introduction to Committee

This committee will simulate the unrest on IU's campus during the late 1960s. It will begin in 1967 and end in 1970. As the events unfold, you will represent the key members of IU's administration, board of trustees, and faculty senate, three bodies with very different views of and relationships to the student movements that erupted on campus and around the United States during this period.

Much of the activism of the 1960s has been mythologized and slandered, remembered fondly and bitterly, and accounted by sympathetic and hostile historians and journalists alike. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was born at the University of Michigan and the DNC riots in 1968 occurred in Chicago, but student activism from this period is often remembered in the zeitgeist as something that happened on the coasts and in the deep south. But the upheaval of the 1960s took place across the country, including the Midwest.

The culture of our campus was radically changed during this period. Students transformed the mostly conservative, sometimes uptight campus you will read about in this background guide to the more progressive, easygoing campus you may notice when you visit. Although we still have progress to make, students forced it to transform into an institution that treats marginalized people more fairly than it did before.

This committee asks you to take the perspective of the real adults on campus, deciding how to respond to student unrest and endless and conflicting demands, knowing the

budget, the reputation, and the well-being of the university hangs in the balance. In so doing, remember that history did not decide in real time what was right and wrong. When we're done and you no longer have the fate of the university in your hands, though, I ask you to think of the student activists at IU and around the country and nationwide in the late 1960s and ask yourself what we, as students in an equally precarious political present, can learn from them.

## Historical Context

### History, Politics, and Culture of IU and Bloomington<sup>1</sup>

Indiana University was founded in Bloomington, Indiana in 1820. At the beginning, it was Indiana Seminary, but it grew steadily, officially becoming Indiana University in 1838. IU was one of the first universities in the United States to admit women (1867) and Black people (1890s).

Herman B Wells was a central figure in shaping the way the university would exist during the upheavals of the 1960s. As president beginning in the late 1930s, he travelled around the country, convincing leading scholars to come to teach and research at the university. He opened the university to foreign exchange on an unprecedented scale, cementing the robust overseas study and world-class language programs that exist to this day.

Wells was dedicated to academic and intellectual freedom on campus, attempting with a high degree of success to shield students and faculty from Red Scare attacks

---

<sup>1</sup>Mary Ann Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland: The Sixties at Indiana University* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 1-7.



during the 1950s. Most commonly, faculty and students faced accusations of being Communists or socialists and demands for firing or expulsion on those grounds. He often refused to take a side on key issues, infuriating student activists and their opponents alike, but he tried to create and maintain a culture of free speech and intellectual exchange without witch hunting.

Perhaps the most famous example is Alfred Kinsey's work at IU. Kinsey's research on human sexuality offended many members of the community and parents of students, but Wells defended Kinsey's right to do his work, though he eventually was forced to choose between teaching and continuing his research. The research Kinsey did at IU was foundational in the understanding of human sexuality, especially bisexuality, and earned him a place among the "pioneers, trailblazers, and heroes" on the National LGBTQ Wall of Honor in New York City,<sup>2</sup> and is surely one of the reasons that IU remains one of the most LGBT-friendly campuses in the United States.

The university's relationship to the town around it has changed over time, but for most of IU's history, the university and the town have coexisted in harmony. Residents of Bloomington during the 1960s were relatively conservative, reflecting Bloomington's geographic and political blend of southern and Midwestern cultures and values. But many IU students during this period also were, coming from conservative families and valuing manners and order over the attitude of activists

who valued justice and equity, which were eccentric and radical beliefs then and, in some circles, still are today.

## Beginnings of Activism at IU (mid-1950s—1962)

As activism began to grow more prevalent on campus, the university's relationship with the comparatively conservative town and the state became strained for a sustained period of time. However, it's important to keep in mind that most of the time, activists who showed up at demonstrations were a minority of IU's tens of thousands of students.

Agitation against the House Un-American Activities Committee, and against McCarthyism in general, began in the mid-1950s at IU. In response to the McCarthy hearings and, more specifically, to a proposed ban on stories about Robin Hood by some public librarians and textbook publishers, a group of students blanketed the campus in chicken feathers they had dyed green to look like the green feathers worn by Robin Hood and his merry men.<sup>3</sup> In spite of the lighthearted, peaceful nature of the protest, the students were investigated by the FBI, and local newspapers made it clear that the residents of Bloomington were outraged by the action.<sup>4</sup> Wells, revealing that his commitment to free speech would not always overcome his desire to reduce tension and appease all sides, denied the movement's request for recognition as a student organization.

---

<sup>2</sup>"National LGBTQ Wall of Honor Unveiled at Historic Stonewall Inn," National LGBTQ Task Force, accessed August 6, 2020, <https://www.thetaskforce.org/nationallgbtqwallofhonortobeunveiled/>

<sup>3</sup> Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 6.

<sup>4</sup>Alison Kysia, "The Green Feather Movement," Zinn Education Project, last modified 2013, <https://www.zinnedproject.org/materials/the-green-feather-movement/>.



Other than the Green Feather Movement, there was not much notable early Cold War activism at IU until 1960, but the administration still had a big problem to address. In February 1960, Wells announced his decision to retire, and the university began the process of finding his replacement.

The man they found was Elvis J. Stahr, former secretary of the army under the Kennedy administration. He was eager to leave the Kennedy administration due to conflicts with Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and IU was eager to have him. He had traveled all over the world, positioning him well to continue to develop Wells's vision of IU as an international institution, and his experience and personality made him well-equipped to deal with corporate and political leaders. His academic achievements - including time as a Rhodes scholar, a Yale diploma in Chinese languages, and time teaching law at the University of Kentucky, his alma mater - impressed those charged with choosing Wells's replacement. Pairing all of this with his experience as assistant secretary of the army during the Korean War and secretary to the army for the early years of the Vietnam conflict, he seemed the perfect fit for IU.<sup>5</sup>

However, Stahr was hired just as groups like the Southern Christian Leadership Council (SCLC) and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) began civil disobedience and protest campaigns against segregation and voter suppression in the south, and as students at the University of Michigan who had founded the SDS issued the Port Huron Statement (1962), which outlined their goals and values.<sup>6</sup>

A “skeletal” statement of their values, in relation to the university context, appeared as follows:

1. *Any new left in America must be, in large measure, a left with real intellectual skills, committed to deliberativeness, honesty, reflection as working tools. The university permits the political life to be an adjunct to the academic one, and action to be informed by reason.*
2. *A new left must be distributed in significant social roles throughout the country. The universities are distributed in such a manner.*
3. *A new left must consist of younger people who matured in the postwar world, and partially be directed to the recruitment of younger people. The university is an obvious beginning point.*
4. *A new left must include liberals and socialists, the former for their relevance, the latter for their sense of thoroughgoing reforms in the system. The university is a more sensible place than a political party for these two traditions to*

<sup>5</sup> Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 9-10.

<sup>6</sup> Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 10-11.





*begin to discuss their differences and look for political synthesis.*

5. *A new left must start controversy across the land, if national policies and national apathy are to be reversed. The ideal university is a community of controversy, within itself and in its effects on communities beyond.*
6. *A new left must transform modern complexity into issues that can be understood and felt close up by every human being. It must give form to the feelings of helplessness and indifference, so that people may see the political, social, and economic sources of their private troubles, and organize to change society. In a time of supposed prosperity, moral complacency, and political manipulation, a new left cannot rely on only aching stomachs to be the engine force of social reform. The case for change, for alternatives that will involve uncomfortable personal efforts, must be argued as*

*never before. The university is a relevant place for all of these activities.<sup>7</sup>*

Some administrators worried that the SDS would one day come to IU, and that these values would cause trouble on campus and possibly in Bloomington as a whole. Furthermore, the SDS was not as far left as some New Left factions, but its pragmatic bent was more worrisome than the more radical but less concrete plans and goals of other leftist organizations.

However, at the advent of the 1960s, most parents, faculty, and administrators believed that IU would not see the kind of militant activism that made Berkeley, Columbia, Ann Arbor, and other universities infamous. This attitude made subsequent protest action all the more shocking. To be fair, compared to campuses more famous for their activism, IU got off to a late start. Many, if not most, IU students came from socially and politically conservative Indiana and had little interest in foreign and national affairs. They were not energized by the national student movement, at least not at first.

In October 1962, during the Cuban Missile Crisis, it became clear that Stahr was not in for the smooth ride he had been promised. The Ad Hoc Committee to Oppose U.S. Aggression in Cuba organized a demonstration outside the IU Auditorium, at which about 30 demonstrators carried signs against Kennedy's naval blockade. They marched from the auditorium to the courthouse as about 2000 students, 40 police officers, and three police dogs followed

---

<sup>7</sup> "Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) Port Huron Statement (June 15, 1962)," Hanover College, accessed August 6, 2020,

<https://history.hanover.edu/courses/excerpts/111huron.html>.



behind.<sup>8</sup> The demonstrators were further outnumbered by the counter-rallying members of the conservative group Young Americans for Freedom (YAF), composed mostly of fraternity members.<sup>9</sup>

While they were marching, a local business owner grabbed one of the marchers' signs and hit a student who was standing next to the woman whose sign he had taken, which sparked a series of fistfights and drove protesters to seek shelter in the library nearby. The student who was hit was arrested, and President Stahr defended the freedom of expression of the students with whom he disagreed.

Tom Hoadley, a Monroe County prosecutor and IU graduate, was not willing to let the event end there. He indicted several of the demonstrators under the Indiana Anti-Subversive Act of 1951, which made the assembly of two or more people for the purpose of advocating the overthrow of the state government a felony and which banned teaching communism.<sup>10</sup> These charges were based on the fact that some of the demonstrators were members of the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA), which he alleged had brought a speaker that advocated overthrowing the state government to campus at an earlier date. He also alleged was inherently a revolutionary group and that the university

should withdraw recognition from the YSA as a student group.<sup>11</sup>

Hoadley's attempt to interfere with campus activity enraged many current students and faculty of all political persuasions. Some even wrote a song that played on IU's radio station, which included the line: "There's just one office he thinks he's worth / Attorney-General of the Earth!"<sup>12</sup> In spite of how unpopular he quickly became Hoadley's actions kept the "Bloomington 3," as his three main targets came to be known, embroiled in legal battles for four years.

### The Times, are they A-Changin'? (1963—1966)

As the Bloomington 3 soldiered on, some leaders began to attempt to organize their fellow students into a movement rather than one sporadic demonstration at a time. There had been no sustained student activism after the Cuban Missile Crisis demonstration, perhaps because many IU students were not interested in the national and international issues that were mobilizing other campuses. To combat the apathy they faced, early IU activists hyper-localized issues, either by mobilizing students against campus-specific policies, especially those that governed student life, or against IU policies that were tied to

---

<sup>8</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 13-14.

<sup>9</sup>The leading member, Tom Huston, went onto become national YAF chairman and serve in the Nixon administration, where he advised Nixon to use an array of government agencies to spy on his political enemies, a plan opposed by FBI director J. Edgar Hoover.

<sup>10</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 15.

<sup>11</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 15. The offending speech in question, delivered by Leroy McRae, national

secretary of the YSA: "Those who have the power are those who have denied us our rights. We will achieve that necessary power [ie, legal and political rights]... one way or another." His grounds for calling the YSA inherently revolutionary was a passage in an entry of the YSA's journal that declared solidarity with revolutionary youth in all countries. The state of Indiana did not list the YSA as a subversive group.

<sup>12</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 16.





national and international affairs, especially the military.

One example of this tactic was student activists' fight against compulsory enrollment in Reserved Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) for male students in 1964, which sowed the seeds for later antiwar activism as the Vietnam War intensified. ROTC is a military program at colleges and universities that trains students in military and leadership skills. During the 1960s, ROTC was compulsory at land-grant institutions due to the Morrill Act of 1862, which sought to protect the U.S. by pursuing the military ideal of a "citizen-soldier" who would have basic training and be able to serve more quickly when the nation needed them. The idea was that by having all young men complete ROTC in college, there would be a militarily competent citizenry to call upon in the event of a war, especially in the event of a draft.

The ROTC requirement was unpopular, but the administration insisted it was required of them under state law because they were a land-grant institution. Student activists, led by graduate student Guy Loftman, figured out that because IU was founded under Indiana's original constitution, before the 1862 legislation mandating ROTC at land-grant institutions, this was untrue. They harnessed this knowledge as they went from dorm to dorm, convincing their fellow students to challenge the requirement.

The administration eventually admitted they could not legally make ROTC required, and students stopped enrolling in droves, which angered pro-war factions, from the ROTC program itself to the war hawks in the state legislature. However, the administration had no

legal leg to stand on and no longer found it practical or even possible to stand against the students' evidence in the long run. This victory taught participating and spectating students two things: those in positions of authority do not always tell the truth, and challenging those authorities can pay off in big ways.<sup>13</sup>

The IU chapter of the SDS was formed by the leading group of students that had made the ROTC victory possible. The participatory, democratic ideals outlined by the SDS's foundational text, the Port Huron Statement, resonated with IU activists, and it was an accessible and flexible national organization. Furthermore, the SDS encouraged localized, pragmatic challenges to occurrences of arbitrary authority, racism, and national and international issues rather than the loftier, more symbolic and abstract actions favored by other groups.<sup>14</sup>

By the beginning of the fall 1965 semester, IU's aspiring SDS chapter had a written constitution. John Grove, a founding member, wrote to the Chicago SDS staffer who was supposed to sign their membership cards. Grove "received the following advice, typical of SDS's free-flowing style: '[Carl] Oglesby is supposed to sign the cards but he never will since we will either forge his name or use a stamp. You might as well forge them as us, so go ahead.'" Thus, IU's chapter of Students for a Democratic Society was born.<sup>15</sup>

In that same semester, the IU SDS also created the Organization for University Reform, led by Guy Loftman. The main policy of contention was the university's imposition of women's hours, but OUR also campaigned

<sup>13</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 18.

<sup>14</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 18-19.

<sup>15</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 20.



against dress regulations, against housing and car restrictions, and for student and faculty representation in administrative decisions.

Broadly, OUR's platform sought to end the university's role as *in loco parentis*. *In loco parentis* means "in the place of a parent" and refers to adults, usually schools or teachers, taking a parental role when parents are not around. At IU, this manifested in the aforementioned policies and other policies that sought to control student behavior and appearance. The platform of ending *in loco parentis* rules was popular even among conservative groups such as Greek life and the YAF but unpopular among many parents, who saw it as the university's responsibility to enforce parental values and rules in their stead.<sup>16</sup>

From the administration's point of view, operating *in loco parentis* reduced liability, kept the conservative state legislature and parents - two main sources of university money - happy, and made campus life more orderly and manageable. From the students' point of view, especially for women students, *in loco parentis* rules were annoying at best and dehumanizing at worst.

OUR organized a massive rally, inviting students to come and speak about their frustrations with these and other university policies that governed their lives. As one song at the rally argued, summarizing the feelings of many students: "IU's administration is liberal to a degree / wants freedom for the Russians but not for you and me / we try to protest about it, and ask for more than we got / But they say jeans at dinner / is part of a communist plot."<sup>17</sup>

In response to the massive rally and petition with thousands of signatures, IU's administration began to change dress regulations by allowing each residence hall to democratically chose their own dress codes and allowed students over 21 years old to move off campus. The victories were partial: women's hours, the main point of contention, remained in place.

Shortly before the IU SDS formed, a group of students led by graduate student Skip King formed a chapter of the W.E.B. Du Bois Club, which was under investigation by the U.S. Attorney General for its advocacy for socialism, social justice, and civil rights. Indiana state Republicans began attempting to get the federal government to withdraw the prestigious federal National Science Foundation grant that allowed King to attend IU. In spite of ideological and practical differences, the SDS staunchly supported the Du Bois Club's right to activity on campus.<sup>18</sup> The two groups often appeared at demonstrations organized by the other and helped one another post bail, both out of solidarity and as a way to express their unconditional commitment to free speech.

King ultimately lost his grant for political reasons and had to drop out, outraging the student movement - even those who, like the SDS, were not fully in accord with the Du Bois Club's ideology. Soon after, the board of trustees decided to defer recognition of student groups that were under investigation by the Subversive Activities Control Board, meaning that the Du Bois Club's ability to use university facilities was unclear. However, the board's

<sup>16</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 25.

<sup>17</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 26.

<sup>18</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 32.



legal authority to defer registration was dubious at best.<sup>19</sup>

Due to the unclear nature of the trustees' decision and the fact that the annual student activity fair was open to all registered groups, which the Du Bois Club still was, two members named Bruce Klein and Allen Gurevitz decided to set up a booth. Some union board members and the Dean of Students, Robert Shaffer, told the two students to leave and took their table. The Young People's Socialist League gave them an extra card table they had with them, and the Du Bois Club set up shop again, standing by their table for the remainder of the fair. At the end of the afternoon, Klein and Gurevitz were told that they would be suspended and fired, respectively, and that they would be arrested if they returned to the Union again.<sup>20</sup>

Many student groups, including the majority party in the IU Student Government (IUSG) and the SDS, decided to fight for free speech on campus by fighting for the Du Bois Club. Robin Hunter, an IUSG senator for the majority party,<sup>21</sup> read a statement in support of Klein and Gurevitz's right to enter the Union as individuals and as representatives of the Du Bois Club. The two then walked into the Union and were immediately arrested. They refused to post bond and instead went on a hunger strike at the county jail, and four days later, a judge dismissed the bond requirement and released them.<sup>22</sup>

Students, regardless of their political orientation, were dismayed at the way the Du Bois Club had been treated, and the faculty council and student senate each passed resolutions asking trustees to reconsider its ban on club members using university facilities and reaffirming that IU should be a place of freely exchanged ideas. Even the IDS, which at that time could usually be counted on to support the administration, published an editorial criticizing the trustees.

Even the most conservative students and groups were alarmed by how easy it had been for students to be sent to jail for violating university rules and desired stronger protections for students' rights. For just one example, Bob Turner of the IU Conservative League expressed that "even though he thought the club might be a communist front, students should be allowed to listen and decide for themselves" rather than having the Du Bois Club representatives hauled off and jailed.<sup>23</sup> But townspeople supported the administration's strict rule enforcement, especially because of concerns about the Du Bois Club's ties to the Communist Party.<sup>24</sup>

In short, this period saw an awakening of student activism, spurred largely by a desire for more robust freedoms of speech and assembly. Solidarity among students with differing political views began to emerge, and some faculty started to try to defend students whose speech and activities were being unduly punished.

---

<sup>19</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 32-33.

<sup>20</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 33-34.

<sup>21</sup>The minority party was, at this time, the Progressive Reform Party. The PRP was largely composed of SDS members and other student activists.

<sup>22</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 34.

<sup>23</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 35.

<sup>24</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 34-36





## IU Student Government (1960s)

In the spring semester of 1966, leading members of SDS decided to form a party to run for student government. They called it the Progressive Reform Party. The presidential candidate was Guy Loftman, and the campaign was managed and propelled to victory by Connie Loftman. Party spokeswoman Lynn Everroad was a leading voice in presenting the party's platform which sought to eliminate women's hours, give the student senate full power over non-academic aspects of student life, keep the library open 24 hours a day, establish a free bus service for students, and give the student newspaper independent operation, among other goals.<sup>25</sup>

The theme of the PRP's platform was to achieve the SDS's goals of participatory, localized democracy and to make students interested in taking control over their own lives and rights. Student power was the phrase of the election, if not the decade. The PRP promised to fight for these goals via "open confrontation" with the administration, taking a much different angle than previous student governments which sought friendly administrative relations above meaningful change.<sup>26</sup>

In the middle of the IUSG campaign, university employees went on strike to demand recognition for their union. Strike leaders took their demands to members of the PRP, who voted to support the strike by preventing supplies from getting into buildings and setting

up a soup kitchen for strikers, their families, and any student who didn't want to break the strike by eating in university dining halls.<sup>27</sup> The Port Huron Statement envisioned a world where university students would stand in solidarity with the working people of the town around them; IU SDS brought that vision to Bloomington.

This action not only helped the Bloomington working class but also showed that there was potential for integration between the campus and town communities and that there was potential for continuing solidarity between students and workers. Furthermore, the successful outcome of the strike showed that the PRP leaders were not only committed to their ideals but also that they had the potential to force concessions from the administration.

Other campaigns issued statements in support of the strikers but took no actions to support them. Around the same time, the Association of Women Students, which was elected to legislate rules for women, issued an abolition of women's hours against the authority of the board of trustees. This, along with the fact that the AWS was the only other student group besides the PRP to assist with the strikers' soup kitchen, served as an implicit endorsement of the PRP. Then, against the wishes of the journalism faculty, the Indiana Daily Student endorsed Loftman and the PRP as the best representatives of IU students, "with more experience, more intelligent ideas, and more potential for progress" than all other campaigns.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 27. The latter three goals are still features of IU student life today.

<sup>26</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 27.

<sup>27</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 29.

<sup>28</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 29-30.



This election had one of the highest turnouts in IUSG history with over 10,000 votes cast and was a major victory for low-budget, grassroots organizing against the high-dollar, glossy campaigning of the Greek and conservative campaigns.<sup>29</sup> The PRP forced IUSG to transform from a tired, pre-professional sandbox for fraternity members into a student power organization dedicated to improving student life and enhancing students' rights.<sup>30</sup> The administration gets some credit for forcing IUSG to engage in substantive issues, too: its suppression of free speech and arbitrary controls over student life created student coalitions and spurred student risk-taking that would have been unprecedented under normal, bearable circumstances.<sup>31</sup>

President Elvis Stahr was, at this point, quite alarmed by the growing power of the student movement at IU, not only because of events in Bloomington but also because of events in Berkeley and Ann Arbor. Furthermore, the PRP was arguably the first IUSG administration to approach the IU administration without deference and with the intention to create real change, which ruffled feathers and caused panic in the administration even beyond Stahr personally.

Perhaps this anxiety is what made his December 1966 State of the University address so vitriolic. He "disparaged the New Left as a threat to academic freedom and drew an analogy to the challenges German universities before World War II faced from the Hitler Youth," warning that New Leftists wanted to "control us" and blaming looming budget

cuts from the state legislature on the New Left.<sup>32</sup>

Stahr was right about the state legislature choosing to cut the university budget, if not about the reason for those cuts. Students were outraged by Stahr's address, and Robin Hunter, president of the student senate and member of the PRP, responded with his own state of the students. He accused Stahr of unethical behavior in his comments about the student movement and drafted a resolution asking that Stahr either provide evidence for his claims or retract them. The resolution failed, leading to Hunter's resignation. The IDS called Hunter "one of the brightest members of an otherwise lackluster student senate" and blamed the administration for its handling of campus issues.<sup>33</sup>

The PRP-led IUSG had a broad platform, but it was primarily concerned about securing and expanding student rights and student power. Due to the arrest of the Du Bois Club members and the alarming ease with which they went to jail and lost university positions, student rights were of immediate concern. One way they sought to do this was by creating a student bill of rights, drafted by student senate attorney general David Cahill in November 1966 and passed by the senate and dean of students in February 1967. It formalized freedom of speech, publication, and distribution rights and introduced new rights regarding judicial

---

<sup>29</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 30. Nearly twice as many students voted in the 1966 IUSG election than in the 2020 IUSG election.

<sup>30</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 30.

<sup>31</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 31-32

<sup>32</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 45.

<sup>33</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 45-46.



proceedings including the right to an advisor and the right to confront witnesses.<sup>34</sup>

IUSG was not consistently a part of the broader student movement, and status quo IUSG administrations which valued friendly relationships with the administration over meaningful changes were elected during some years. But the efforts of the PRP shaped campus life for decades, and it set the stage for future meaningful work from an institution that can often be fairly described as “sandbox politics.”

### Fighting for Peace: Anti-Vietnam War Protest at IU

Even as on-campus activism became increasingly common, it was still easier to mobilize students regarding campus-specific issues than national and international issues. Student activists were critical of the Vietnam War, but in the mid-1960s, many students were either indifferent or supportive. Apathy was a much bigger obstacle to IU student anti-war action than opposition was.<sup>35</sup>

For example, when Richard Nixon came to IU to speak in October 1965, only about 200 students protested at Showalter Fountain outside the auditorium, and they were almost exclusively members of activist organizations like the SDS and YPSL. One faculty member, history professor Leonard Lundin, had once been a member of the YPSL and decided to join the demonstrators, but he was the only

faculty member known to have taken part in the protest.<sup>36</sup>

The following month, about 25 IU students joined the 30,000 war protesters in the nation’s capitol. One member of that small group wrote in the Bloomington SDS newsletter of his experience: “We are convinced that the only way to stop this and future wars is to organize a domestic social movement which challenges the very legitimacy of our foreign policy; this movement must also fight to end racism, to end the paternalism of our welfare system, to guarantee decent incomes for all, and to supplant the authoritarian control of our universities with a community of scholars.” In other words, anti-war coalitions were against more than just the war but also the system that allowed such a war to persist.<sup>37</sup>

In May 1965, Indiana native and director of the Selective Service Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey came to IU to discuss the necessity of the draft after he decided that students at the bottom of their classes could lose their student draft exemptions. About 350 antiwar activists decided to protest against his presence on campus at Showalter Fountain, and they were met with about 2,000 pro-war counterprotesters, many of whom were members of Greek life. The counterprotesters quickly turned to egg throwing, and one of the protesters they hit was Jeffrey Sharlet, a Vietnam War veteran who had served a tour before returning to IU to finish his degree.<sup>38</sup>

Antiwar activists continued demonstrations in Bloomington and Indianapolis throughout the

<sup>34</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 36.

<sup>35</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 38.

<sup>36</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 38. Other participating groups included the YSA and ADA.

<sup>37</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 39.

<sup>38</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 43.





summer, but they remained a relatively small group.<sup>39</sup> IU's SDS chapter looked to the SDS national headquarters for guidance about how to raise students' political consciousness.

Therefore, they visited dorms to start discussion groups, mimicking the SDS strategy of raising the political consciousness of the working poor by living with them and helping them to execute with their own ideas and actions to improve their communities. This, slowly but surely, got more students involved, but campus-specific grievances remained the most enticing as time went on.<sup>40</sup>

## Committee Issues

### The Student Movement

The student movement and all its diverse demands are beginning to grow larger and more ambitious, and diverse interests have largely coalesced into the New Left. At the present moment, the various student movements regarding the war in Vietnam, racial justice, women's rights, and other issues that can be generalized as movements for fully participatory democracy are small but growing. The fact that these movements are allied but not logistically unified means that meeting one demand or set of demands will not necessarily quench campus activism but instead allow a student coalition to organize around a new grievance.

Activists, specifically the SDS, are increasingly focused on hyper-localizing these issues to campus-specific demands, directing demands at the administration rather than, or in addition to, the United States government. They are including students who have not been politically active before and are beginning to reach out to non-student community members.

Therefore, it is reasonable to expect these movements to grow in numbers and scope, especially if provocative events like the Du Bois Club incident or Hoadley's irritating meddling in student life continue to occur and provoke conservative or neutral students to change sides.

Parents, a major source of the university's revenue, are opposed to many student demands. So is the state legislature. Many faculty members often find themselves on the side of the students, but not always, and not always all the way. The students vastly outnumber the administration. Finding a balance between appeasing their demands and appeasing their parents and the state will be one of the main problems in dealing with the student movement.

Below is a brief survey of each of the various movements that comprise the broader student movement:

#### *The Participatory Democracy Movement*

This movement is perhaps the most general, and most members of the other movements listed would consider themselves a part of the movement for participatory, everyday democracy, making it the largest. This movement is embodied by the SDS and the values of the Port Huron Statement. Members of the SDS are generally the driving force behind creating student coalitions of New Left groups whose goals are different but partially overlapping, and they are usually the ones to organize mass demonstrations and post bail for arrested student activists, even if those activists are not affiliated with the SDS.

<sup>39</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 44.

<sup>40</sup>Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland*, 40-41.



### *The Antiwar Movement*

The antiwar movement is largely organized by and overlapping with the SDS. Some veterans who finished their tour or tours of duty and came to IU to earn a degree have gotten involved with the antiwar movement, and their presence lends the movement additional legitimacy and rhetorical force. Its tactics largely reflect those of the nationwide antiwar movement - teaching students how to avoid the draft and organizing mass demonstrations against the war. In keeping with the SDS tactic of hyper-localization, they have also begun to research the ways in which IU is connected to the military and are likely to make their grievances IU-specific in order to turn out more students.

### *The Antiracist/Civil Rights Movement*

The civil rights and racial justice movement is allied with the SDS but is not as overlapping with it as the antiwar movement is. It is comprised mostly of Black students but also includes Hispanic students and some white allies. Students of color generally, but Black students especially, face discrimination in the classroom, at local businesses, and in student organizations - especially Greek life. It is connected to the demands of the nationwide movement but also has university-specific demands, and has thus far been successful in creating Black spaces in Bloomington, in spite of the fact that Bloomington is a Ku Klux Klan hotspot.

### *The Women's/Feminist Movement*

The women's movement at IU overlaps with all of the other movements on campus, but it has carved out its own space and demands due to the fact that many student organizations are male-dominated and do not sufficiently consider women's issues. The women's movement at IU would like to see more all-female spaces, more women professors and administrators, and more resources for students and faculty who are mothers. University leadership, from the administration to leadership of student organizations, is overwhelmingly white and male. The women's movement is striving to change that but is often bogged down by internally conflicting commitments to other movements.

### *The Environmental Movement*

The environmental movement is, at this point, very small and very new. However, inaction regarding the new and looming threat of global warming has alarmed some students and faculty. Some students are trying to reconnect with the land and encourage the university to implement more environmentally friendly policies including global warming-related education on campus.

## **Other Student Populations**

### *Conservatives*

Conservative student groups including but not limited to Greek life, Young Americans for Freedom, and the IU Conservative League have not built a coalition in the way that the New Left has. However, as a whole, they do outnumber the New Left. They generally support the IU status quo and are rarely up in



arms about administrative decisions, with the notable exception that most conservative students support the abolition of *in loco parentis* policies.

The Du Bois Club incident did rattle many of these students' indifference, however, and in some contexts, acts of intense repression by the university or the state could be reasonably expected to create some cross-ideological student coalitions.

### *The Indiana Daily Student*

The IDS, IU's official newspaper, is usually a neutral observer. In recent years, however, it has increasingly editorialized in favor of the student movement's IU-specific demands in spite of pressure from faculty to avoid doing so. While it is not the only student publication, it is the main source of campus and town-related news for most students. The administration can see it both as a bellwether of student opinion and, to a lesser extent, as an influence on student opinions.

## **The State Legislature**

The state legislature has little direct control over university policies. However, because IU is a public institution, it controls how much state funding IU will receive. State legislators, and the constituencies they represent, are more conservative than the majority of the students in Bloomington. This is becoming increasingly apparent as even politically conservative students find themselves in favor of students rights reforms generally associated with the New Left.

Indiana residents fear that their tax dollars are paying for leftist reforms pushed by a minority

of students and for the salaries of leftist professors. That fear is largely unfounded, but it is nevertheless powerful thanks to Red Scare-fueled coverage and perception of the student movement and New Left activity in Bloomington. Granting too many student demands may result in less state funding for IU, but fully ignoring them may lead to equally problematic chaos on campus that would necessitate larger concessions to the students in later battles.

## **Campus Surveillance and Policing**

Thanks especially to Herman B Wells, IU has prided itself on academic and intellectual freedom. However, the FBI and the police have been increasingly obvious in their surveillance and obstruction of legal political activity by the New Left, particularly unofficial leftist student publications. *The Spectator*, the most successful of these publications, has been the target of intense federal repression but has only grown more popular. It is also worth noting that the racism that the student movement is attempting to end is nowhere more obvious than in Bloomington's policing.

Some students are beginning to pressure the administration to protect them, especially since the treatment of the arrested members of the Du Bois Club. They are tired of bailing their fellow student activists out of jail for what they see as legitimate exercises of their first amendment rights. Some faculty are echoing their concerns.

The administration does not have a direct say in local policing, but it has some control over what can be done on campus. However, police activity on campus has made student political activity easier to manage, so far. This may cease to be true as the student movement





grows - as the students have taken to pointing out, the police cannot arrest all of them, and those left behind when their friends are arrested are not likely to become less angry.

## Committee Positions

### *Administration*

#### **Joseph Sutton: Vice President and Dean of Faculties**

Before joining IU's administration, Sutton was a beloved professor of political science. He had also been well-respected by administrators, creating the first institute for public administration at IU. In his role as dean of faculties, he is well-respected by faculty members and oversees them in their jobs. However, he does not have working relationships with state leaders like previous administrators, leaving him in what he feels is a precarious position. He holds himself relatively aloof from students and avoids taking public stances as often as possible, seeing his role as a supporter of the president and faculty members.

#### **Robert Shaffer: Dean of Students**

Robert Shaffer is seen by student radicals as an enemy due to his role in enforcing the trustees' dubiously legal decision to ban the Du Bois Club. A former IU faculty member, he left his position at the business school to serve in World War II. Therefore, he has little patience for antiwar activists and rabble-rousers and has a reputation as a strict disciplinarian. However, he is seen favorably by many students in Greek life and at the business school, and he earned the respect of many by making student affairs co-ed. He works closely with Thomas Schreck.

#### **Thomas Schreck: Dean of Students**

Thomas Schreck, like Shaffer, has participated in disciplining student radicals in what some would call a draconian fashion by calling for the strictest possible intervention of both law enforcement and the university disciplinary system wherever appropriate, championing what some have called double jeopardy. As a scholar, he is particularly interested in how the power dynamics between groups within the student population affects the work of student affairs administrators. In this regard, the New Left weighs heavily on his mind. He believes that the New Left is shifting student power toward hippies and away from fraternities, where student power at IU had formerly been concentrated, particularly with regard to student government. He is not opposed to these long-standing power dynamics shifting away from the traditional power vested in fraternities, but he hopes a group less radical than the New Left can step up to fill the void.

#### **John Snyder: Chancellor**

Snyder was promoted to this role by the board of trustees, in a bitter disappointment to the student activists and their faculty allies, who had nominated two antiwar and civil rights activists to the position in hopes of disarming the campus police and ending ROTC. Snyder was a former administrator and history professor who came into the position around the time budget cuts made university administrators even more hostile to student demands. He will be primarily responsible for making decisions about fee hikes, reductions in university programs, and other financial concerns moving forward.



## **Bill Orwig: Athletic Director**

Bill Orwig is a former football star from the University of Michigan who has served in his current role as the IU Athletic Director since 1961, presiding over a long period of Hoosier athletic excellence due to his good judgement in hiring coaches. He is charismatic, and coaches and athletes enjoy working with him. He sees sports as an arena for reconciliation and was profoundly affected by the unifying effect of sports after World War II, particularly with regard to the Japanese-American community in the 1940s. He believes that sports could similarly facilitate reconciliation efforts at universities in the 1960s, from racial reconciliation between white and non-white students and between the New Left and the rest of the student body.

## ***Board of Trustees***

### **Robert Mencke: Trustee**

Robert Mencke is a former IU basketball star. Throughout his tenure as a trustee, he was a conciliatory figure who was also deeply committed to academic freedom. Like all the trustees, he frustrated student radicals who saw them as too preoccupied with keeping the state legislature happy. However, he was one of the only trustees to extend an olive branch to students during the Du Bois Club incident. He met with students who protested outside trustee meetings and offered explanations of trustee decisions; even if they did not like him, they appreciated that he was honest and direct. While still primarily concerned with the university's stockholders, students believed he had their well-being in mind to a greater degree than the other trustees.

### **Frank McKinney: Trustee**

Frank McKinney is an IU graduate and former chair of the Democratic National Committee. He was a supporter of intellectual freedom and an opponent of banning speakers on the grounds of their political beliefs. Although he was opposed to censorship, he was not supportive of student demonstrators and advocated harsh punishments for those who orchestrated or participated in disruptive protests.

### **Jesse E. Eschbach: Trustee**

Jesse Eschbach, a navy veteran, attended IU for his undergraduate and law degrees. He had little patience for rule-breaking and was particularly opposed to strikes. However, he was open to listening to and working with students who went through the proper channels. He preferred student government leaders who presented carefully thought out plans over student organizers who held picket lines.

### **Harriett Simmons Inskeep: Trustee**

Harriet S. Inskeep is the first woman to be appointed by the Governor to the IU Board of Trustees. She played a key role in helping to desegregate Fort Wayne's schools before coming to IU as a trustee, and she and her husband were both advocates of local journalism. Upbeat and energetic, she is known to have a good sense of humor and a deep commitment to student well-being.

### **Donald C. Danielson: Trustee**

Donald Danielson is a former IU baseball star and navy veteran. During his undergraduate years at IU, he was an active member of his fraternity Sigma Chi. He is a staunch Republican and does not care for the New Left,



which he sees as undermining societal stability and values. As a philanthropist, he has been a key fundraiser for the university.

### ***Faculty***

#### **Richard L. Turner: Secretary of the Faculty Council**

Richard L. Turner is a professor of education whose primary research interest is in how to cultivate high-quality teachers, particularly for elementary and middle school teachers. As the secretary of the faculty council, he seeks to accurately relay the views of the faculty to the administration and to further faculty interests. At faculty meetings, he is often relied upon to mediate disputes between other faculty members and to help the group come to agreements or, at least, friendlier disagreements.

#### **Leonard Lundin: Professor of History**

Leonard Lundin, an American and European historian, is one of the few professors who openly and wholeheartedly sides with student demonstrators and expresses admiration for the SDS. In his youth, he was a member of the Young People's Socialist League, and he has participated in antiwar activism throughout his life. He has defended student activism in the past, even when other faculty members wrote student activists off as impolite, imprudent, or extreme.

#### **Roger Buck: Professor of History and Philosophy of Science**

Roger Buck is a member of the American Civil Liberties Union. While staunchly supportive of academic and intellectual freedom, he has also opposed New Left activity that he saw as coercive or threatening to the free speech of others. He is concerned about the fact that

New Left demonstrations are becoming increasingly less civil and is interested in helping the university balance between the need for robust protections for dissent and the need for that dissent not to drown out other speech.

#### **Marjorie Blewett: Lecturer in Journalism**

Marjorie Blewett is a former Indiana Daily Student editor in chief and current and beloved journalism instructor. She is a fierce advocate of free speech who, like Buck, has opposed both McCarthyism and the New Left when their activities threatened robust free speech protections on campus. She considers educating and advocating for students to be the most important part of her job.

#### **George Levine: Professor of English**

George Levine is a professor of English. He is concerned about the relationship between the university and the state, especially when it comes to free speech. In particular, he is concerned about the potential for student demonstrators to be subjected to "double jeopardy," or punishments by both the legal system and the university itself. He advocates for opening up healthier channels of communication between the administration, faculty, and students. In his view, this would help ensure not only that students' right to dissent would be protected but also that students would have more useful channels to use, lessening the need for disruptive protest in the first place.

#### **C.E. Kaslow: Professor of Chemistry**

C.E. Kaslow is a professor of chemistry. He is opposed to student demonstrators and their goals. The IU chemistry department has grants from the U.S. government in connection with





# IndianaMUNC VII

Dissent in the Heartland: IU Board of Directors

the Vietnam War effort, and Kaslow, like many others in the chemistry department, fears that the New Left will target their research and opportunities. He is in favor of using every power available, whether state or university, to punish student activists when appropriate.