In the fall of 1960, president Hugh Borton kicked off the college year and the decade with a topic that reached beyond the walls of the Ivory Tower. Borton spoke on international affairs. Efforts must be made to curb the East-West arms race. The United Nations must be strengthened as a body. Most importantly, the United States must not remain intractable in its own policy views and be unwilling to listen to foreign views. Finally, students must develop their talents to the fullest to deal with the problems of the future.1 This was the message Borton gave at opening Collection that fall. The themes were, perhaps, not dissimilar to those expressed by another president, in his inauguration, some months later: the call for the young (at heart or otherwise) to get involved in politics and play a role in shaping the world. And in fact, a pre-election *News* poll, on Nov. 4, gave Kennedy 60 per cent of student support, the first time during the century the students had chosen a Democrat for president.

Undoubtedly, neither president realized just how much student involvement the upcoming years would bring. But at Haverford at least, it was not readily apparent that the age of student activism had dawned. In fact, the *News*' first editorial of the year attacked student apathy:

> But if we uphold our tradition, our admiration for Mr. Borton's words will relax into apathy or cynicism later on this year when, having tasted the fruits of intellectual success, we shall refuse to let our interests penetrate the physical boundaries of the Haverford campus; and the figure of life in the "Ivory

1 *News*, Sept. 30, 1960: p. 1.

> tower" will assume a litteral signigicance....since each of us however, will one day reside in the world on which we now readily turn our backs, the disintegration of intellectual snobbery and the acceptance of external challenges would increase the meaning of the word "education" for all of us.2

A campus political group did start up: the Caucus Club, a non-partisan orrganization whose goal was to support either a students for Kennedy or students for Nixon groups. As the poll results might have lead one to expect, the Kennedy clan was more active, canvassing the area and distributing literature. The major event the group was working on, though, a speech by the candidate at the college, was cancelled.

But this little spurt of election year activity was far from a sign of flourishing political activity on campus. There were certainly several issues, though, around which if not action there was a good deal of discussion. Not surprisingly for a Quaker community, arms control was a hot topic. The same poll showing support for Kennedy showed that students considered Disarmament, improved relations with Russia, and an end to bomb testing, as the three most important issues. Eighty-five per cent of students said they supported Nuclear disarmament. And that winter, a symposium was held on Arms Control.

Another Kennedy phenomenon, the Peace Corps, though generally supported by the student body, did produce one interesting reaction. In a Sociology class, students were

---

2 *News*, Sept. 30, 1960: p. 2.

asked on an exam their views on the Peace Corps. A number replied that if it served in lieu of military service it could hurt United States prestige and sanction draft dodging.3 In later years, this view of the draft would change somewhat.

But of course, there was no hot war going on at that time. The vast majority of the students were utterly unaware of United States involvement in Vietnam. A few students might vaugley have recalled the events of DIen Bien Phu [check spelling] in 1954, and perhaps some hard core social science majors followed the day to day developments of U.S. involvement in the news, but for most it certainly was not an issue.

In the spring of 1961, Haverford and Bryn Mawr started a local branch of the Student Peace Union. The national Student Peace Union had formed in 1959 and was probably at around its peak at that time, with several thousand members nationwide. The group took a pacifist stand opposing militarism of both the East and the West. The Bi-College group was started by Dan Larkin 64, and David Bates 63, with the goal to be "an informed action group with the constructive aim of making people more aware of the evils of militarism and of alternatives to militarism."4 The group intended to remain unaffiliated and thus independent of the national group's positions, but still held generally similar pacifist views. Initially, 21 students joined up, and the

3 *News*, March 17, 1961: p. 1.
4 *News*, April 4, 1961: P. 4.

group considered plans for joining in local demonstrations. Haverford SPU was destined to last several years. It generally had a few hard core members and sponsored a number of talks and lectures to which perhaps 20-30 people might show up.

The Peace movement at Haverford recceived a big push when Bill Davidon, a physics professor, joined the faculty in the fall of 1961. Davidon arrived with many years of involvment in peace issues. Back when he was in high school, during the war, Norman Thomas, the several-time Socialist Party candidate for president, was prevented from speaking in Jersey City by the local corrupt political machince. Davidon was part of a group which protested this denial, and in doing this he came in contact with a number of Democratic Socialists. He later went to the University of Chicago where he studied physics. Chicago was of course where the Manhatten project had taken place. In response to its development, the Atomic Scientists of Chicago was formed, a group who had worked on the bomb and were concerned about [what exactly, I have to check]. It was in this context that Davidon first became aware of the effects of Nuclear fallout, which led him to oppose bomb testing. Davidon was also involved in the Committee for Non-Violent Action (CNVA) in the 1950s, and their opposition to preparations for nuclear war, and was also involved in the formation of the disarmament group SANE.

With this littany of anti-war involvement, it was not long before Davidon was involved in a campus discussion on fallout shelters, held in Sharpless auditorium. He attacked the views expressed in *Life Magazine* that 73 per cent of the population could survive a nuclear war with a bomb shelter. And, in a foreshadowing of developments the following spring, he suggested emigration rather than hiding as a more realistic approach to avoiding an atomic conflict.5 Several weeks after the fallout discussion, some Haverford students took some direct action and participated in a demonstration organized by the regional SPU, against a department store advertising the shelters. The issue came up once more that semester when president Borton and the Board of managers established a committee to consider the college's position on Civil Defense. Additionally, an effort was made on the part of Biology professor Ariel Loewy to support a letter signed by several hundred Boston area professors protesting the Kennedy administration's discussions of CIvil Defense as an inadequette policy, one which was leading the country to the possibility of accepting nuclear war. Loewy, along with Davidon were the leading Haverford faculty against the Vietnam war. Many times in the up-coming years their actions would make headlines. While certainly other professors joined in the protest, it was these two who spearheaded the movement at Haverford as much as anyone else, including the students. One alumnus recalls:

---

5 "Selove, Davidon Lead Local Discussion Group on Fallout," *News*, Oct. 27, 1961: p. 1.

> In retrospect, it was the examples of committed involvement present in persons like Ariel Loewy, Davidon, and others, *and*, the open, continuous dialogue present on cmapus which afforded me a fertile basis upon which to derive my own stance.6

In the beginning of the second semester, the winter of 1962, the Haverford SPU members met to critique themselves. They felt they had been too isolated from the student body, and talking too much among themselves. The meeting, according to one observer, broke down into several factions. There were those who felt SPU was too closely identified with the national group and had to concentrate on reaching a broader audience and down playing ideology of pacifism. Another part of the group felt SPU needed a stronger committment to pacifist principles. If it became too locally oriented, expressing views on too broad a range of issues, it could be reduced to little more than a debating society. The group worked out a compromise, and vowed to work through both demonstrations and local, personal, contact.7 This conflict between isolating peace issues on the one hand, and seeing them as part a larger picture was a tension that was to be with the movement throughout the period, at Haverford and elsewhere.

Shortly after this discussion, eight students and professor Loewy attended a national SPU demonstration in Washington D.C., Feb. 16-17 to protest nuclear testing. Around seven thousand students gathered by the Washington

---

6 Marshall Schwenk, 1969, in response to survey.
7 "An Analysis of the Student Peace Union," by Dave Hunt, *News*, Feb. 16, 1962: p.2.

Monument, and were addressed by, among others, Norman Thomas.

Nuclear issues continued near the forefront, as a few weeks later, several faculty members publically debated nuclear disarmament. Loewy argued for unilateral disarmament, shaking some folks up with his comments:

> Most of us in this room will probably not be alove five years from now...this is not hysteria, an extreme reaction, if anything, we have all been guilty of a mild reaction to an extreme stimulus...I am for unilateral, complete and irrevocable disarmament. What else is there?

Paul Desjardins, philosophy professor, disagreed, arguing that unilateral disarmament would make nuclear war more likely, but Davidon countered that unilateral disarmament was the only viable alternative of increasing the chances of survival.8 Davidon and Desjardin continued their debate later that month.

Davidon kept the nuclear issue in the limelight, when, the next month, he annouced his plan to emigrate to New Zealand. He remarked that he was not dissatisfied with the school, but felt he could no longer support a country which held the potential for causing world wide destruction. He would still be concerned with the problems of the arms race, but would no longer be devoting so much time trying to alter government policies. "There comes a time when you stop telling dinosaurs not to go extinct," he said.9

---

8 "Faculty Views on the Significance of Disarmament," *News*, March 2, 1962: p. 2.
9 "Davidon Announces Resignation Plans to Leave United States," *News*, April 13, 1962: p. 1.

The year ended with another community discussion on the arms race. The discussion centered around two question, could peace issues be isolated and should the peace movement work within the system to achieve change? Once again, these issues were to remain with the movement for its duration.

It is evident then, that though there was little activity these first two years, there was much discussion centered around peace issues, in great part due to Davidon, Loewy and the SPU. It was only a short while later before Vietnam started to become an issue. And it was these same actors who were to provide much of the impulse for the protests, from the pacifist point of view. Already, SPU was distributing leaflets on United States support for the Diem regime.

But there was another whole aspect to the early sixties at Haverford, as well as in the nation: Civil Rights. A goodly number of Haverford students, perhaps an eighth to a quarter of the student body, took part in civil rights activities of one sort or another. There was great interest on the subject on campus, and students participated in a number of demonstrations, marches and sit-ins in the area. There were several fasts to raise money for civil rights activities in the SOuth and a few students went down South to help out during their vacations. Perhaps the most memorable event were the efforts to integrate the mainline barbershops in March, 1963. At the time, Haverford had very few black students, perhaps one or two afro-Americans and

several African students. One of the latter, a Nigerian student Ola Oleyarkin went to a local barber one day and was refused service. This reesulted in quite an uproar on campus. Afterall, everyone understood that segregation occured in a backwards region like the South, but few expected it was happening in their own backyards. Quickly enough, a scheme was worked out, wherein a group of white students would accompany a black student in to get his hair cut. The barbers responded in some cases by closing early, in other cases by arguing they did not know how to cut a black person's hair. When the barbers refused the students sat down and refused to leave. In several cases, the barbers gave in and gave very poor quality hair cuts, even shaving the black students' heads in some cases. The larger difficulty of this venture was that there were a number of barbershops to integrate on the mainline and only a few heads of black students' hair. Eventually, though, the sit-ins were sucessful, as the Pennsylvania Human Relations Board ordered the barbers to place signs in their windows stipulating they would serve all customers, regardless of race, creed, religion, or color.

The following year, a truly major event took place at Haverford, The Second American Revolution, a national civil rights conference. The conference was organized in large part by Alan Raphael 66, who along with the rest of the organizers worked all fall to produce an event which featured panel discussions with leaders from SNCC, NAACP,

and other civil rights organizations. Fifty nine colleges sent 260 delegates who were joined by 80 other outside visitors. Though many Haverford students participated in the weekend events, others, according to a *News* editorial, did not as they had to attend classes.10

There was also some Haverford involvement in the community movement to improve conditions in mostly black Chester county. The Chester County Committee for Freedom Now organized protests and sit-downs to block the entrances of the broken down and badly-in-need-of-repair Franklin School, and then followed it up with a partly sucessful school boycott. The Swarthmore chapter of SDS played a big role in this action, with local Haverford SDS members contributing. It was the first real sucess at community organizing by SDS.

SDS was the more radical element among the student groups in the early 1960s. The Civil Rights movement was perhaps taking radical action, such as sit-ins, marches, demonstrations, but this was aimed at bringing the South up to date with the rest of the country. It was not a challenge to the liberal political establishment. It was a time of high hopes and great spirits, recalls David Fraser 65, and a sense that society could be changed. But the change was living up the American ideal. More radical change was not prominent; there was the sense that equal opportunity would make society more just, that the goal was

---

10 "Successful Symposium," *News*, Feb. 14, 1964: p. 2.

to change the laws and challenge people to live up to them, Fraser remembers, and their was the feeling of the power of non-violent action. These feelings, though, were tempered a bit by the reports of summers in the South and people getting killed. By the end of Fraser's time these notions of violence were at least becoming a complication.

Violence also made an appearence right in the middle of Fraser's time, November 23, 1963. Haverford, like everyplace else, was stunned. "It was a devastating event in my life, and probably had greatest effect on my lifelong involvement in politics," said Mitchell 64. "Thought there would be a war--my first reaction to the idea of choas at high levels. Shaken."--Keith Brinton 64. "Very affected. I was in the Psychology lab and went back to Barclay Hall, where others hadd gathered to watch TV. We were stunned," Alan Bevitz-Letts 65. "It was a shocking event. Never to be forgotten. I first heard the news in the locker room while preparing for a meet. By the time the race began, he was dead, and I lowered the flag at Belmont Park. The event emphasized how vulernable Americans are to hostile elements, whether foreign or domestic,"--Rob Simmons 65. "Shock. Disbelief. Later a sense of losss--it really did represent the close of a golden age. (I was a Nixon Republican, by the way, and fairly strongly anti-Kennedy):--J. Heinback 66. "Shocked--turned off politics"--Dan Snyder 66. "Devastated. I have not gotten over it; can still recall the moment I heard, the steps I took across campus; the

tears shed, the moments of reflection and grief"--Robert Martin 67. George Stavis 67, who arrived in the fall of 1963, recalls:

> Kennedy articulated the youth movement. We all were young, this was the peace corps generation...and he was our president and that would probably be true for most of the campus. Everyone was stunned and there was a big meeting in the meeting house, jam packed, people were walking in a daze for some time after that, and very worried about Johnson ths southerner...Kennedy was a Harvard guy from Massachussets, he was young and handsome and had a beautiful wife and thats how we thought of ourselves...he was one of us, we liked to think we were terribly bright, the young leaders, and our man had been shot down.

Certainly not all the reactions were this severe. While there was almost univeral grieving, many students were simply sad and suffered no long term effects nor discerned any larger conclusions about violence and instability in American life. But there certainly were a number who's lives and outlooks were permanently affected, who were dissillusioned somewhat with liberal American society. This event, though, would not simply affect Haverford in the fall of 1963, but the whole next "generation" of students as well. These were some of the reactions of those who enter Haverford in the fall, 1964 (just as some of the key years of Haverford anti-war protest were beginning): "Increased feeling that society was unstable,"--Ben Elliot. "Stunned appreciation of the lurking chaos in the world, sense of lost opportunities,"--Greg Wilcox. "I was a high school senior, but had sort of planned to be a comfortable middle-class liberal Democrat. His death (and those which

followed) demonstrated to me that the world was much more chaotic and subject to worse trouble than I had thought,"--John Stuart. "Very Troubled concern; deeply and lastingly affected. After I saw Jack Ruby shoot and kill Oswald LIVE on TV, I did not watch and TV for a half year. "Camelot" attitudes replaced by aniexty, mild angst; daily study, of newspapers became a habit for first time,"--Galen Bollinger.

A good percentage of each incoming class for the next several years, arrived a little more shaken, a little more cynical, a little more used to violence in American political life. Of course faith in the great liberal America was not shaken overnight. At Haverford, especially, alienation from the "system" was minimal, for reasons that shall become apparent below. But even by 1963 there were those who were already rejecting mainstream society.

In the early sixties, at Haverford, there was a small group of students known as the Founders Crew. These students, and there were perhaps 30 or 40 of them, were generally known for their rather bohemian lifestyle. These were, of course, the days before rock music, acid, long hair. The Crew was in a stage somewhere between beatniks and hippies, living in a few rooms on the third floor of Founders. One of their former members recalls them as iconoclastic folks who weren't into the mainstream scene. He remembers them as studious, intellectually stimulating, who did not participate in the poker-television scene in Barclay. The people were rather private. A number, though

not all, were politically active, and they held a variety of political views. They were extremely bright, he recalls, even by the college's standards.

They were weirdos and oddballs, recalls Paul Mattick, 65, another Crew member. Their music was folk, or blues. Pete Seeger or the Weavers. Rock music was still seen as commercial (though this began to change with the coming of the Beatles). Their classmates remember them as: "Beatniks," "Political Radical=Drug User (Pot)+"Rebel,"" "they had a distinctive image, in my memory more related to dress, aesthetics, lifestyle than to politics," "Beatniks of Founders Hall...I do remember the T-shirted sweatpanted crew playing wall-ball all the time. Nice enough guys but "radical" was not a used word then." Rick Hathaway 67, remembers "They were more radical in lifestyle than most, but not in politics...They generally had a feeling of self-confidence and good humor. I usually went around with a frown, worrying about what I should be doing." David Fraser recalls that the Founders crew was a state of mind. Mattresses were on the floor, it was where marijuana was said to be smoked, place of more radical political talks (not necessarily action). There might have 30 to 40 students in this group. They were a fringe group, remembers George Stavis 67, who at first appeared as a bunch of bohemian kooks. But times changed, and within a few years their lifestyle (and the politics of several of their members) was so much a part of the mainstream that they

ceased to be a distinctive group. Around 1967, everyone began growing their hair long, taking drugs, listening to rock music. And certainly, by then, many were aware of and were opposed to the United States involvement in Vietnam.

But, back in 1963, Vietnam was not much of an issue. But there were few of these students living in Founders, students who might have been termed "leftist radicals," who helped make it one. These students were Joe Eyer, Paul Mattick, Jim Garahan, Roger Eaton, and most of all Russ Stetler.

Russell Stetler arrived in the fall of 1962. He grew up in a Republican family in a conservative neighborhood in Philadelphia, the neighborhood to which Frank Rizzo eventually moved. Stetler actually had vaguely liberal beliefs in high school, finding himself exicited by Kennedy's youth and new ideas. He followed and discussed politics, but was not at all an activist. Arriving at Haveford, he entered this enviroment which, led by Davidon and Loewy, was permeated with concern for nuclear war. As with the rest of his generation, he grew up with the nuclear issue and talk of civil defense, and he had thought a good deal about the nuclear issue in high school. A few months into his freshman year, the Cuban missile crisis took place. While certainly a period of great aniexty for everyone at Haverford--the meeting house was full that Thursday--it was an important moment in the life of Stetler, and from that time on, he was extremely devoted to issues around war and

peace. He joined in a local protest of the Cuban blocade, sponsored by SPU, Women Strike for Peace, and SANE. Several hundred people took part in the demonstration, including two dozen Haverford students and faculty. Stetler continued to gravitate towards the Haverford SPU, which that winter was circulating a petitions as part of a National End the Draft movement.

Early on, Stetler began following events in Vietnam. This interest stemmed from correspondences between him and his next door neighbor who held a non-combat position in the southeast Asian country. As Stetler became aware of United States involvement, he started some preliminary research of his own, looking up newspaper articles on microfilm. That summer, he attended a national SPU convention at Princeton University. There, he was turned off somewhat by the sectarian battles among the various leftist groups present, but did find a good deal of information on Vietnam. One particularly striking writing he came across was a pamphlet by Bertrand Russell, making serious allegations against the U.S. in Vietnam. Somewhat taken aback by these charges, Stetler decided to write Russell, asking for more information and what his sources for these charges were. To his amazement, Russell wrote back to him that fall, and a correspondence was begun. Stetler kept in contact with Russell for the rest of his college years and after graduation, went to England to work for Russell's peace

foundation. He made several trips to Hanoi, and helped prepare for Russell's war crimes tribunal in 1968.

For the next two years, Stetler lived in Founders. There he along with Joe Eyer 66, Jim Garahan 66, Roger Eaton 66, and Paul Mattick 65, formed a cadre of students who were to the left of most leftists. Unlike Stetler, the others all came from Old Left backgrounds. Eyer had been in the Communist Party during high school, but rejected it as too liberal. Mattick's father was an old guard Marist theoretican. These were folks who were generally to the left of SDS, though they took part it its activities, as it was the student group of time, with the SPU fading. There were probably some 15-20 Haverford students who were SDS members or took part in SDS activities, although the college did not have an official chapter. Swarthmore, though, had one of the strongest chapters and, as was said above, Chester Country was one of the first sucessful SDS community organizing programs.

During this time, Stelter never joined any political sect, though he was rumored to be a member in the Progressive Labor Party. With no party background he was suddenly exposed to all sorts of socialist ideas and his views changed from week to week. He was generally disillusioned with his government, both for its performance in Vietnam and for not giving enough support for Civil RIghts at home. In the spring, 1964, he attended a conference "Socialism in America" sponsored by the Yale

Socialist Union. A wide vairety of socialist sects attended with competing ideologies. The conference dealt with social and economic issues concerning Socialism. At one point in the conference, one of the panelists suggested the possibilty that they might all agree on the need to take some positive action to protest United States troop presence in Vietnam. This was agreed upon, but what they could not agree was which group would head organizing the protest. Finally, Stetler was thrust forward an an independent neutral representative who mediate between the various factions and plan and coordinate the rally for May 2, 1964. This was the birth of the May Second Movement (M2M), the committee that was to form an alliance of the various student socialist groups in opposing the war. The movement, of which Stetler was the chairman and chiefspokesman, had representatives from a number of schools in the East. Stetler visited many area schools to arouse interest in the protest.