

A REPORT PUBLISHED BY POLITICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES



DELIBERATE DIFFERENCES

Progressive and Conservative Campus Activism in the United States



by Pam Chamberlain



POLITICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

ABOUT POLITICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

Political Research Associates (PRA) is an independent, nonprofit research center that exposes and challenges the Right and larger oppressive movements, institutions, and forces. PRA provides accurate applied research and useful analytic tools to inform and support progressive activism that promotes equality and justice.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Pam Chamberlain is a researcher at PRA.

Political Research Associates
1310 Broadway, Suite 201
Somerville, MA 02144

Tel: (617) 666-5300

Fax: (617) 666-6622

pra@igc.org

www.publiceye.org

August, 2004

© 2004, Political Research Associates

ISBN: 0-915987-18-x

When referencing this document, we recommend the following citation:

Chamberlain, Pam. *Deliberate Differences: Progressive and Conservative Campus Activism in the United States*.
Somerville, Mass.: Political Research Associates, 2004.

Design by Hird Graphic Design

Cover photos by: top, Lonny Shavelson/www.photowords.com.
and bottom, Jim West, Impact Digitals

Acknowledgements

Deliberate Differences: Progressive and Conservative Campus Activism is a publication of Political Research Associates (PRA). In every sense, this report has been a collaborative effort from its inception. Jean Hardisty, President Emerita of PRA, originally conceived the Campus Activism Project as an extension of earlier PRA work on conservative campus groups. The PRA staff team—Nikhil Aziz, Chip Berlet, Shelly Harter, Tom Louie, Namorya Nelson, and Palak Shah—all lent their creativity, talent, and careful attention to the many stages of the project. Chip and Nikhil, in particular, contributed to our understanding of social movement theory and its application to campus activism. Interns Sarah Finn, David Foster, Lyle Pannell, and Elena Williams tirelessly offered their capable minds and hearts to the project in many ways. Our new Executive Director, Roberta Salper, joined us in midsummer in time to help with the proofreading. An active advisory committee reviewed concept papers and drafts and joined other experts in providing contacts and feedback to the staff. Its members are listed on p. 60.

We are grateful to the scores of students, faculty and staff who gave their time so generously to be interviewed. Although honoring their anonymity prevents us from listing their names, without their candor and insight, this report would lack much of its substance.

Nella Van Dyke generously offered us the use of her database on activism at U.S. colleges as a basis for creating our sample of colleges. Sabine Frezier and Myra Marx Ferree shared with us their understanding of the nuances of social movement theory. Our invaluable contacts at our sample schools, including Walda Katz Fishman, Ed Haley, Jyl J. Josephson, Karen Lederer, Charlene Martin, Mamta Motwani, Chris Otis-Skinner, Kyrsten Sinema, Eileen Stewart, and Michael Wiseman, provided inroads into administrative and student organizations, helped identify potential participants, and welcomed us to their campuses.

We thank Debbie Hird for her skillful design assistance and Elly Bulkin for her useful editorial help.

Without the financial assistance of the Ford Foundation, this report would not have happened. The foundation's help has enabled us to provide the first edition of this report free to any interested reader.

We welcome comments about this report. Your feedback is a central part of making PRA's work more useful for everyone. Please contact Pam Chamberlain at p.chamberlain@publiceye.org.

Contents

Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction	5
Definitions	5
Why Focus on Campuses?	6
Historical Background	7
What Is Campus Activism?	10
Using Social Movement Theory	11
Our Approach	12
II. Findings.	13
1. On every campus small numbers of students are energetically engaged in activist work.	13
2. Conservative and progressive students approach activism differently.	15
3. Political mentors are absent from campus.	22
4. Students are responding to issues of race, gender, and sexual orientation as they perceive them on campus.	24
5. Debate is unpopular on campus.	28
6. Using resources, mentors and incentives, national political organizations successfully influence campus groups.	32
7. A 'leadership pipeline' exists on both the Left and the Right.	35
8. Centrist students are not actively recruited by either conservatives or progressives.	39
III. Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Study	42
IV. Appendices	45
A. A Review of Literature on Campus Activism	45
B. Sample Interview Guides and Questionnaires	52
C. Methodology	56
V. End Notes	61
VI. Resource Directories	65
VII. Bibliography	78

Executive Summary

U.S. colleges and universities have a long tradition of political activism. They are centers of intellectual activity in which concentrations of young people live in close proximity and can experience new ideas and constructs about the world. The public expects that our campuses will erupt from time to time in response to national and international crises, but many are surprised when they do.

Today's common wisdom is that conservative students are more effective on campuses than progressives, since conservative organizations provide more financial support and organizational assistance to students than do progressive groups. To what extent is this true? Political Research Associates (PRA) conducted a study of campus activism in the United States in 2003. We wanted to know how politically involved today's college students are. What issues are student activists using to mobilize their peers? Who influences the direction of campus activism? And what happens to activists once they graduate?

Using the tools of social movement theory, PRA examined both conservative and progressive campus activists and their organizations and observed the impact of the social movements from the larger society on student groups at eight representative schools. Such a comparative analysis provided a way for us to observe the relative influence of the two major social movements on the range of political activity on these campuses.

The goals of the PRA Campus Activism Project were:

Goal 1: To produce a rounded picture of: political and social conflicts and tensions on campus; the campus activism directly related to these tensions; and their impact on democratic principles and campus practices, such as tolerance, openness, and dialogue.

Goal 2: To describe and analyze: the nature, goals and ideology of the programmatic work conducted on campus by national conservative and progressive organizations; their effect on campus culture; and the types of organizing being done on campus by conservative and progressive students and faculty.

Goal 3: To assess the comparative effectiveness of conservative and progressive groups in advancing their agendas on campus and recruiting, after graduation, student activists with leadership potential to their competing social movements.

Project staff compiled an advisory committee of experts on the study of campus activism, conducted an in-depth literature review, chose eight representative schools, identified key student leaders, and faculty and staff, interviewed 86 individuals on-campus during 2003, and received completed questionnaires from 20 interns or young staffers. We held a colloquium on a draft of this report for a select group of advisors and incorporated many of their recommendations into this final version.

Our findings are summarized as follows:

Energetic college students all over the country are engaged in campus-based activism, but their numbers are small.

Although both conservative and progressive students organize on campus, the sum total of activist students is small compared to the overall student population. Progressive organizations outnumber conservative groups by a 4:1 ratio, with a range of issue-specific groups being the norm for progressives and a single, general conservative organization the core of conservative campus strength. According to the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, almost equal numbers of first-year students identified as progressive and conservative in 2003: 27% as progressive, and 23% as conservative. Perhaps just as relevant is the fact that 50% of first-year students label themselves independent or unaffiliated.

Campus activists are confronted with the challenge of mobilizing the vast majority of students who have other priorities besides political activity. Despite unpromising odds, small numbers of campus activists create and often sustain a wide range of campaigns, representing various perspectives on issues related to the environment, labor, reproductive rights, free speech, lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender (LGBT) people, multiculturalism, and the war. When major issues emerge, as they did in 2003, like the war in Iraq and affirmative action in university admissions, activists are able to generate a high level of student interest and mass mobilizations.

Conservative and progressive students approach activism differently.

Because there are fewer conservative organizations on campus, usually a core group of activists coordinates campaigns across several issues. Progressives tend to maintain an array of issue-based organizations that do not regularly function with a coordinated strategy unless they create a coalition of progressive groups.

Conservatives' shared view of themselves as being in the minority and enduring a hostile environment on campus shapes their public education and political activity. They tend to use "fortress reasoning," focusing on the need to protect themselves from their numerous opponents. Conservative activists recast some of the terms that have proved successful for progressives in the past, such as valu-

ing freedom of speech and diversity. Progressives, however, share no such common message; instead, they usually generate multiple issue-based messages from their various organizations. They describe a common feeling of fragmentation.

We were interested in the level of tensions between activist groups that traditionally disagreed on hot-button topics. The war in Iraq and the affirmative action court cases created a focus for both conservative and progressive activists.

Political mentors are absent from campus.

Virtually all the student leaders we interviewed described themselves as arriving at college with their politics already developed. For the most part, their political mentors were their parents or teachers. Both conservative and progressive students expressed disappointment that they could not find similar mentors on campus, especially from the faculty. In turn, the majority of the faculty we interviewed preferred to remain distant or exhibited disinterest when asked about their involvement with campus political groups. A few faculty members, mostly progressive, were actively engaged with student activism. All our sample schools had Student Affairs Offices that provided, at a minimum, organizational support and training to student groups. However, student leaders rarely mentioned staff in these offices as their mentors. Without access to ideological or strategic support on campus, students report they seek it elsewhere.

Students are responding to issues of race, gender, and sexual orientation as they perceive them on campus.

Progressive activists observe forms of racism, sexism, and homophobia persisting at their schools, despite the impact that previous activism has had on higher education. They view their work as far from over. Conservative students challenge progressive assessments and compensatory practices, dismissing them as "unnecessary" programs, "substandard" academic offerings, or simply "unfair." National conservative spokespeople stimulate discussion on these topics, providing students with arguments against affirmative action, feminism, multiculturalism, and area academic programs such as Queer Studies.

Activists at the single-sex school and the historically Black university in our sample use a gender or a race lens more readily than student leaders at the

other schools to interpret and analyze their campuses and the issues that interest them. Historically Black fraternities and sororities are examples of organizations with legacies of both service and social action that provide an unusual, and often overlooked, source of activism.

Debate is unpopular on campus.

Contrary to popular opinion, most college students do not enjoy debating political topics. Often the public hears about acrimonious confrontations between student groups or between students and their administrations over hot-button topics in the culture in general, such as the Middle East, terrorism, reproductive rights and racism, as well as over campus-specific concerns like union organizing on campus. Both politically uninvolved students and current student activists reported that they do not value political debate. Either they were intimidated by what they described as a confrontational situation, or they did not expect that engagement in formal or informal debate affects opinions. Most student leaders in this study, with the exception of law students, believed that debate wasted their time.

Many implications emerge for civil society of a generation of young people who do not value debate or do not have the skills to engage successfully in it. We suggest that, without a politically engaged population of young people and leaders who can and will conduct conversations across difference, we cannot expect a similarly engaged population of adults.

National political organizations successfully influence campus groups with resources, mentors, and incentives.

Both progressive and conservative groups from the general political sphere are interested in student activists. These groups regularly become involved with students, often without having a visible presence on campus. Some of their methods include:

- using students as foot soldiers in electoral or other campaigns;
- establishing campus affiliates;
- training students to be leaders;
- supporting student-led organizations such as newspapers or clubs with training, materials, and funding;
- engaging student support through student activities fees;
- providing attractive organizing supplies;
- producing low- or no-cost events with political messages that tour campuses; or

- offering incentives to individual students for participation in their programs.

Conservative organizations use a coordinated strategy of national organizations to provide these services. Progressive organizations, while more numerous, are far less strategic in how they provide support.

A “leadership pipeline” exists for both progressives and conservatives, but their approaches differ.

While there appear to be about equal numbers of opportunities for leadership development for conservative and progressive students, each group has access to different types of such programs. Centralized training opportunities, from summer schools to national conferences, exist for conservatives, but no equivalent, prominent, and multi-issue programs are advertised to progressive students. Although such training does exist for progressive activists, it is harder to identify.

Internships, now considered a necessary part of a college student’s career preparation, are available in scores of national political organizations. Information about these opportunities is available to students through the internet.

Conservative organizations promote their programs more visibly on their websites. Conservative groups tend to focus on developing public figures or stars, while progressive groups primarily develop lower-profile organizers. This distinction is relevant in part because of the general absence of political mentors from campuses. Conservative stars perform mentoring roles for students.

Centrist students are not actively recruited by either conservative or progressive campus activists.

The majority of college students engage in community service, volunteer work of some sort, or service learning. These numbers are growing as a result of directed efforts across the political spectrum to improve civic engagement among young people. Centrist students, those whose politics are neither entirely conservative nor progressive, constitute 50% of college students today. They are the largest body of potentially engaged students on U.S. campuses. Many centrist students engage in service work, but are not motivated to join activist groups on campus.

Surprisingly, neither conservative nor progres-

sive activists report that they target this cohort of students. Centrist students are often the ones who report being “put off” by activists’ recruitment styles. We believe these students constitute an undeveloped source of potential activists.

Researchers, college administrators, national political organizations, and campus activists themselves must look more closely at the status of activism on U.S. campuses today.

This further analysis will contribute to a better understanding of the effectiveness of both conservative and progressive student movements. While this report makes several contributions to the field of studying campus activism in the United States, much more remains to be learned. Several groups—college administrators and national political organizations, as well as students—can enhance their awareness of the status of campus organizing by encouraging further research. Such study will contribute to a better understanding of the effectiveness of student movements in the United States today and may predict their future influence and contributions to social movements in general.

Introduction

“Want to draw a crowd?” asks the website for Students for Bio-Ethical Equality. “Set up the Justice for All exhibit on a university campus. Then be prepared to answer LOTS of questions.” The Kansas-based anti-abortion organization provides an outdoor photo exhibit to campus activists designed to “create debate, change hearts and save lives.” Giant color photos of aborted fetuses and accompanying text displayed on college campuses have succeeded in creating energetic discussion (and sometimes hostile) interchanges at the campuses where they have been displayed.

Students Allied for Freedom and Equality (SAFE) at the University of Michigan staged a mock refugee camp on campus to protest the university’s holdings in Israeli investments. They succeeded in raising awareness around the issue while raising the ire of pro-Israel and Jewish groups on campus.

Illinois State University’s lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) organization, Pride, set up a table this spring on the quad during the National Day of Silence. While they staffed the table in total silence, offering passersby material about discrimination against LGBT people, another student group, the God Squad, surrounded them, reading aloud from scripture, and expressing their religious views about homosexuality.¹

These stories reflect the headlines about today’s campus activism, but how representative are these descriptions? What we found after a year of research is that these anecdotes, while attractive to the media, do not reflect the range, complexity, or reality of the experience of most campus activists. We approached the PRA Campus Activism Project with several questions in mind. PRA has studied the rise of the political Right for over twenty years. For this project, we wanted to look at the range of campus-based social and political tensions to understand the context of student activism across the political spectrum. The study examined student-generated political activity to understand what issues were most compelling for college students in 2003 and how they went about their organizing. We hoped to learn which national political organizations are active on campus, how they affect campus culture, how effectively they advanced their agendas, and how they recruited young talent into their movements.

DEFINITIONS

Words used to mark positions on a political spectrum, such as *right*, *left*, *conservative*, *liberal*, *progressive*, (or even *Republican*, *Democrat* and *Independent*) mean different things to different people, especially to those actively involved in political work. For some young activists, in particular, the conventional either-or dichotomy that distinguishes “sides of the aisle” in electoral politics does not apply to their experience. They often see themselves as unique political beings, collecting and discarding elements of traditional political positions in order to more accurately capture their own place in the range of political views. This presents a challenge in using terms that accurately describe the work of campus activists.

This report uses terms that distinguish among the many nuances of political thought and describe broad categories of difference. In the most general sense, the report defines those on the political right as tending to oppose state actions that redistribute income and to support traditional social and political arrangements, those on the left tend to support

state actions that redistribute income and to oppose traditional social and political arrangements.²

The report does not assume that progressives always oppose the status quo while conservatives always support it. This formulation is too simplistic. Individuals and groups—progressive or conservative—sometimes support a particular aspect of the current political system, and sometimes are oppositional. A position can, for example, be simultaneously conservative and system oppositional. An example is the Right’s successful campaign to dismantle the federal social safety net through a series of laws that diminished the system of support put in place by the New Deal and the Great Society.

Sara Diamond, political analyst, has offered a more complicated formula: “To be right-wing means to support the state in its capacity as *enforcer* of order and to oppose the state as *distributor* of wealth and power downward and more equitably in society.”³ The Left, according to Diamond, would be the mirror image of this formulation. In a similar vein, Norberto Bobbio, political theorist, argues that the distinction between Left and Right is premised upon left support for (and right opposition to), the broad philosophical concept of social egalitarianism: “Doctrines

can be assessed as more or less egalitarian according to the greater or lesser number of persons involved, the greater or lesser quantity or worth of the benefits to be distributed, and the criteria used in distributing these benefits to certain groups of persons.”⁴

These general distinctions are useful as a beginning point for describing ideology. Young activists realize from their own experience that there is considerable fluidity in this definition. We have found, however, that *left* and *right* are not terms that current campus activists tend to use to describe themselves. We, therefore, have adopted terms that are more accurate descriptors and are more familiar to campus activists.

In this report, the word *progressive* stands for a range of political thought across the left spectrum, including traditional political liberalism, civil rights advocacy, labor organizing, social liberation movements, and an array of topical interest groups. *Conservative* stands for a range of political thought

across the right spectrum, including economic conservatives, social traditionalists, classic libertarians, the Christian right, old rightists (self-defined “paleo-conservatives”), neo-conservatives, and an array of topical interest groups. *Centrist* refers to students who identify their political thinking as potentially reflecting elements of both progressive and conservative beliefs, but who see themselves somewhere in the “middle.” The term *independent* describes students who resist any political affiliation. While there are members of left and right revolutionary groups on some campuses, we did not include them in this study. Political party identifiers such as Republican, Democrat, Libertarian, or Green are only used in reference to actual party organizations.

WHY FOCUS ON CAMPUSES?

Whereas political volatility at colleges and universities is common, anecdotal evidence and journalistic reports reveal increased polarization and an increase in stereotyping and demagoguery between conservative and progressive students. When polarization is characterized by a high level of incivility, it can—and in a number of cases does—result in an atmosphere of increased intolerance, with some students feeling intimidated and/or unsafe. In other instances, when students feel powerless to influence decisions on campus, they express their frustration as protest that can escalate in ways that make an open and healthy dialogue nearly impossible. National organizations of the conservative or the progressive movements may fan these tensions, or they may encourage debate and competition.

“Winning,” “shaping,” and “influencing” young minds are goals of all movements for social change. But movements vary in how much attention and how many resources they devote to the youth sector, despite its importance as a source of potential members and future leaders. College campuses are logical places to reach large numbers of young people who are forming—and acting upon—their values and goals. Campus activists often become intellectual leaders, organizational visionaries and political candidates, both inside and outside the college sphere. Campus political leaders have often been at the leading edge of social movement activity in this country. And existing political movements need incubators for new talent and energy to keep their organizations vibrant.

We have found, however, that left and right are not terms that current campus activists tend to use to describe themselves, so we have adopted terms that attempt to be accurate descriptors and are more familiar to activists themselves.

Besides considering the issues of intolerance and the intensity of debate and engagement, we were also interested in what current student movements are like, how students run their organizations, who supports these groups, and how they relate to larger political movements. We sought to learn how successful each student social movement is in accomplishing its goals. These questions have consequences for the practice and sustenance of democracy. Because democracy depends on a free flow of ideas, it is endangered when there is too little respect for competing ideas or too great an imbalance of power. Such instances both diminish opportunities for sharpening critical thinking skills and silence voices. As a result, fewer people openly participate in dialogue and develop and/or maintain trust in democratic institutions.

Since the campus is an important arena for the exchange of ideas, the campus political climate is a central topic of interest to observers of university life. How issues are examined and debated is a barometer of the political health of the campus, and by extension, the country. Further, students and others on campus who organize such movements around these issues can help us understand the nature of both social and political movements in the country as a whole and the relation of campus activism to movement organizations and political organizing in society.

Many student activists' experiences with campus political movements profoundly influence their career choices. Many are eager to continue political work after graduation, this time as professionals. But how do they find out about job opportunities? We were interested in how conservatives and progressives recruit and train new talent from the pool of recent graduates with activist skills and how these young activists are sustained in movement work after graduation.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Higher education plays a special role in the United States, despite what some might describe as an anti-intellectual climate in this country. People generally view universities as communities of scholarship and influential centers of cultural, political and scientific incubation. Students solidify their values and skills at an important time in their lives. And we all look to the cohorts of young people moving through university structures as our future leaders and decision-makers. While a college educa-

tion offers the promise of economic success, a diploma also carries a certain social status. What happens at universities matters to us as a society; we are invested in the success of college students. Many of us believe that what students experience while in school will affect not only their lives, but ours. So scrutiny of what happens on campus is common, and not just at the public campuses that are more clearly supported by tax dollars.

Campuses were important locations for much of the social movement activity in the late twentieth-century United States. Progressive students contributed much to the civil rights, peace, women's, environmental, anti-globalization, and other movements. In addition, they have also focused some of their efforts on changing their own schools, such as implementing or opposing multicultural curricula, fighting or supporting affirmative action in admissions, critically reviewing university investments, and developing student codes of conduct such as harassment policies that reflect a range of sometimes contentious societal issues.

What motivates student political activity has long been the subject of lively debate in the academic and popular presses. Some work has focused on student movements in the 1930s and 1940s.⁵ Examinations of later campus activism were heavily influenced by the impact of several events in the 1960s. These include the Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley, student involvement in the Civil Rights Movement, the development of the Black Power Movement on campus, and student-led antiwar activity during the Vietnam War era. Student activism during this period used petitions and demonstrations, and also sit-ins, strikes, teach-ins, building takeovers, other forms of civil disobedience and scattered violence. In part because of these tactics, many university administrators and much of the general public labeled campus activism as "unrest," "disruption," and "undesirable activity."⁶ Initial theories of student political involvement focused on the motivation of individual behavior, especially "misbehavior." Case studies or participant-observer studies in both the popular press and scholarly journals chronicled the development of

"Winning," "shaping," and "influencing" young minds are goals of all movements for social change. But movements vary in how much attention and how many resources they devote to the youth sector, despite its importance as a source of potential members and future leaders.

campus activism. Later, other approaches that considered the cultural context of activism, or that used theories that described group behavior, came into vogue. This paper examines a sample of these theories.

In the 1960s, many researchers attempted to explain the student Left activism of the time by using social/psychological and structural-functional theories—social science tools popular at the time. They tended to examine individual motivation as an explanation for collective behavior and depended on theories that described students' behavior as "radical," "deviant," and "subversive."⁷ Some authors suggested that student unrest was the manifestation of psychological issues associated with adolescence and the transition from childhood to adulthood, such as finding identity through association with peers.⁸ Others identified the cause as intergenerational conflict: "Every student movement is the outcome of a deauthorization of the elder generation,"⁹ or alienation from the values of their parents.¹⁰ Some even suggested student activism was the result of indoctrination by communist ideologues,¹¹ or the manifestation of social disorganization.¹² These perspectives labeled students as irrational, impulsive and vulnerable to outside influences.

Some researchers tended to generalize about White progressive student activists and characterized them as having high grades, coming from families with liberal politics, placing an emphasis on social responsibility over achievement, tending to be middle class, studying liberal arts, and delaying career choices.¹³ A sweeping characterization of college students as middle class reinforced the notion that members of this age cohort have the free time and inclination to become activists and ignores the role of student of color activists.¹⁴

Public opinion at the time associated student protest with violence and the fear that permissive university administrators were losing control of their institutions.¹⁵ The President's Commission on Campus Unrest published the results of its examination into violence on campus after the 1970 Kent State and Jackson State student shootings by National Guardsmen.¹⁶ The Commission described a nation in crisis, with its colleges reflecting unresolved national conflicts with disruption and

increased violence. It recommended that the government, law enforcement and university administrations acknowledge the value of dissent while working to end campus violence. An alternate review by some members of that Commission called for a more assertive reaction that would successfully prevent further unrest.¹⁷

Doing research on White college students, some researchers noted that these students, who tended to come from the middle class, shared many of the liberal humanitarian values of their families.¹⁸ So, from this perspective, far from experiencing discontinuity with the older generation, they were acting on the values they had been socialized to hold, and the success of their movements was related to the success of the socialization process.¹⁹ The fact that elite, predominately White institutions, where students were more predictably middle class, were more likely to be the site of student activism in the early 1960s seemed to support this theory. But the mass movements of the late 1960s grew to such a large scale that it was no longer possible to find consistent ideological links by class between students and their families.²⁰ Other researchers suggested that individuals join a movement as a result of their own rational choice. But these explanations do not account for how mass mobilizations occur. After all, the 1960s student protests were clearly carefully planned collective actions by groups of activists, not a random collection of individual actions.

Another limitation with most research on student activism in the 1960s is the implication that studying White activism can account for all student political involvement. Students at historically Black colleges were central to the success of civil rights activism in the early 1960s; after all, it was four freshmen from North Carolina A & T who executed the first lunch counter sit-in to protest segregated facilities. Prominent scholars of campus activism in the 1960s and 1970s, however, were White, and their focus on White students at elite schools has prompted others to examine students of color and their political activity.²¹

These studies of campus activism in the 1960s and 1970s focused exclusively on student activism on the Left. But as B.C. Ben Park has pointed out, "Not all members of the same age group react to their historical surroundings in the same way."²² During the 1960s, for example, while student radicals on the Left organized Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), conservative students

Campus political leaders have often been at the leading edge of social movement activity in this country. And existing political movements need incubators for new talent and energy to keep their organizations vibrant.

organized their own movement, Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) with the help of William F. Buckley, Jr.²³ With the exceptions of John Andrew, Howard Becker and Lawrence Schiff, however, there has been little scholarly examination of conservative campus activism.²⁴ Recently the popular press has once again taken an interest in conservative campus activism.²⁵

Without an understanding of conservative campus activism, researchers miss an important piece of the context of Left campus activism, as well as the obvious interplay between the larger social movements of the Right and Left and corresponding interplay on campus. The approaches reviewed above—conventional individualistic research strategies—clearly have limitations: they do not provide a consistent analytical framework for the full range of student activism. For instance, even though there is current interest among progressives concerning the conservative campus press, many of these papers have been in existence since the early 1980s.²⁶ The Institute for Educational Affairs (now the Collegiate Network of the Intercollegiate Studies Institute) is not a new phenomenon; rather, it began in 1978, and, by 1982, was supporting thirty college papers through its network.²⁷

Designed to roll back the impact of progressive student activists, a parallel set of goals has emerged for conservative activists. These include decrying “political correctness,” supporting the war on terrorism, and challenging feminist values. Like the Left, the Right seeks to affect both the campus and the larger culture. While popular social commentators have bemoaned the lack of current student involvement in political issues, especially compared to the profile of student activism from the 1960s, we wanted to know if such a perception was accurate.

Undergraduates who are currently enrolled in American colleges and universities were born after 1981, the year Ronald Reagan was inaugurated. While they may have heard about high levels of progressive dissent in the 1960s, and may have actually studied in class the rise of such political activism on campuses, their experience of campus political activity is very different from that of their parents and teachers. They resist thinking in the traditional terms of Left and Right; when asked about political party affiliation, more are tending to identify as independents.²⁸

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, political ferment in the larger society intersected dynamically with campus life. The civil rights, anti-war,

women’s, and gay and lesbian movements influenced life on college campuses and were, in turn, affected by campus activity. For instance, the successful efforts of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) to mobilize students in lunch-counter sit-ins across the South in 1960 made SNCC a leading organization in the Civil Rights movement. The 1962 Port Huron Statement, marking the beginning of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), recognized the importance of the university as a place where social change could flourish:

*We are people of this generation, bred in at least modest comfort, housed now in universities, looking uncomfortably to the world we inherit.... Social relevance, the accessibility to knowledge, and internal openness, these together make the university a potential base and agency in a movement of social change.*²⁹

As Jo Freeman correctly predicted, the women’s movement was to have a powerful influence on campus, and college campuses would become the staging areas for feminist struggles. And early women’s liberation organizations at New York University and other colleges were active in shaping the second wave of the women’s movement and making links with other issues such as the massive mobilizations against the war in Vietnam.³¹

Students of color and working class students, along with women and LGBT people, bring distinct perspectives to their college experiences. As members of groups that often experience less power or status, these students report struggles with their identities on campus and with their sense of collective efficacy.³² Organizing around these multiple—and often overlapping—identities has been described as “identity politics.” Gay students insisted on their right to create their own campus organizations beginning in the early 1970s.³³ Wayne Glasker describes the history of African American students organizing at the University of Pennsylvania from 1967 to 1990. He identifies how the student struggle between two versions of integration—assimilation and multiculturalism—reflects the social issues of the culture at large.³⁴ The desire to experience support and solidarity with others can create tension when the only available association is not the best fit for an individual. For instance, Chicano students at the University of Arizona expressed ambivalence about joining the only Mexican/Mexican-American group on campus:

although they felt the need to be part of an identity organization, they did not necessarily feel aligned with its politics.³⁵

In the 1960s, students of color began to demand more of their schools, identifying their struggle as the result of both individual student, faculty, and staff attitudes towards communities of color and university policies and practices that came to be known as institutionalized racism. African-American Studies Programs, and later Chicano and Asian-American Studies, owe their existence to students of color and their allies organizing on campus.³⁶ Affirmative action in admissions and a commitment to multiculturalism in curricular and identify-focused extra-curricular arenas were prominent issues on campus by the late 1960s. The value of these practices continues to be hotly debated today as

Campuses were important locations for much of the social movement activity in the late twentieth century United States.

a result of conservative activism on campus that reflects—and draws support from—the major shift to the right in the larger society that we have experienced in the last two decades. Within academia, a conservative backlash has met the growth of progressive-supported African-American, Hispanic, Women’s, and Queer Studies and post-modern theories, cultural studies, and criti-

cal race theory. While Baby Boomers may express puzzlement at how we arrived at this place, current students know no other reality.

The larger society in the United States experiences political activism, such as the 2003 spring protests against the war in Iraq, in a number of ways. For instance, media exposure, direct mail solicitation, opportunities to participate in public actions and personal contacts all contribute to the recruitment of members and the diffusion of a movement’s ideas. Studies of how movements grow and change have often focused on these building factors among the general public. But researchers have shown less emphasis or interest in campus-based movements. The factors influencing campus social movement growth may differ from those affecting movements in the larger society. This study sought to learn more about the challenges and successes of a number of aspects of movement life associated with college campuses.

We see strong evidence that the current images of campuses fraught with conflict and protest are in part created by inaccurate representations of activism from the 1960s. It is true that the student

movement, especially in 1968, was a national, and even international, phenomenon. Although more students identified as liberal in 1971 than at any time since,³⁷ the actual numbers of students consistently involved in campus activism, even in the 1960s, were small.³⁸

An example of the difficulty in thinking about campus activism comes from an examination of the source of anecdotal stories about campus life. Many White, middle-class parents of recent college students are Baby Boomers who graduated from college in the 1960s and 1970s at the height of college protests. So strong has been the heavy pen of social historians’ portrayal of those heady times that these historical moments live on in many Boomers’ memories—not necessarily because of their own involvement, but often despite the lack of actual personal experience. The general public has tended to assume that 1960s activism was all on the Left and that contemporary conservatism on campus is a predictable backswing to some more balanced middle. The media is certainly a key source for the Boomers’ common understanding of contemporary campus activism, as well as the experience of the Boomers’ own children on campus. Current students usually report little visible political activity on their campuses, an observation decidedly discouraging to those who count themselves as a generation known for its activism. Boomers’ expectation that attending college is a time for protest, coupled with reports that current college life does not measure up to these expectations, have produced a widely held belief that students are not engaged in political movements in the ways they once were.

WHAT IS CAMPUS ACTIVISM?

This report defines campus activism as any collective action, whether initiated by students or not, that uses the campus as a target or an arena for organizing towards a political goal.

It may be helpful to think about campus activism as operating in two major spheres. One focuses on the campus as the **target** for organizing, such as campaigns that seek to change financial aid policies, graduation rates for athletes, or the course content of the History Department. Both students and non-students have initiated and led such organizing. This report considers the full range of campus-targeted activity as activism.

Another mode of activism capitalizes on the campus itself as an **arena for organizing**. In this

case, organizers seek to recruit campus members, usually students, around a political goal that could be unrelated to campus life but may affect the interests of potential recruits. Groups that have been able to take such advantage of students include those involved with electoral campaigns, such as Students for Howard Dean or the College Republicans; community service groups, including fraternities and sororities that often have a required service component for all members; and issue-specific groups like student chapters of Amnesty International and Students for Academic Freedom, a conservative group initiated by David Horowitz through www.frontpage.com. Occasionally organizations will both target the campus and use it as an organizing arena. For instance, United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) both targets university policies and seeks to build a student labor movement.

This report defines activism as non-institutionalized collective action designed to bring about change. Certainly social movement activity initiated and organized by students for students conforms to a conventional understanding of this form of political activity. An example of this is Carleton's Conservative Union. Like many student groups, the frequency and focus of its activities depends entirely on the level of conservative student energy in any given year.

Actions conducted or controlled by the administration or faculty who represent the institution do not constitute campus activism by our definition. College-sponsored teach-ins on foreign affairs or public hearings on campus-based racial or gender tensions certainly have a decidedly political slant. But if we define activism as activity generated outside institutional structures, it becomes clear that such activity furthers the needs of the institution itself.

Other non-conventional forms of activism could also be considered campus activism. Outside, adult-run groups that come onto campus with a particular agenda in order to mobilize students around a cause are common on today's campuses. Examples include Planned Parenthood's VOX project, a pro-choice affiliate network that targets students, or its conservative counterpart, Students for Life, which receives support from local pro-life organizations. Students become active and run their own groups with support for their agenda setting provided by an external organization.

We include non-student groups that focus on campus life specifically to change the social, political or curricular climate of campus activism. The

American Council of Trustees and Alumni, a conservative organization, for example, uses a variety of methods to influence the impact of faculty speech and curriculum content.

In addition, there is the range of student-led community service opportunities, like volunteer work done by fraternities and sororities, social action work by campus-based religious organizations, and college-sponsored service learning activities that couple such work with credit-earning reflection and study. Some of this work certainly fits our definition of activism if we can observe students engaged in these activities within a political context.

USING SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY

Unlike some of the earlier researchers, this study sought to explore the structural forces that help facilitate or inhibit the **collective action** of student activists and their followers, which, when they are designed to change existing norms or policy, we call "campus social movements." This approach to studying activism shifts the emphasis from a study of individuals to a study of the ability of groups of activists to organize mass movements for social change. Because our focus remained on the campus as the location or the target of this organizing, the report sheds some light on how different groups within the campus sector engage in movement building.

Sociologists often use the analytical framework of social movement theory. Doug McAdam and David Snow, two sociologists who helped develop this approach, provide us with our working definition of a social movement. They suggest that a social movement is "a collectivity acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional channels for the purpose of promoting or resisting change in the group, society or world order of which it is a part."³⁹ Examples of social movements with histories of being active on U.S. campuses are the women's, Black Power, environmental, pro-life, and LGBT movements. We think of campus activism as a microcosm of social movements in general that involve and influence students on college campuses.

Boomers' expectation that attending college is a time for protest, coupled with reports that current college life does not measure up to these expectations, have produced a widely held belief that students are not engaged in political movements in the ways they once were.

Social movement theory, which has been helpful to PRA in our study of the Right, continues to be useful in this project. It allows us to examine both conservative and progressive campus movements using the same theoretical framework, which makes it easier to draw comparisons. It examines what facilitates, rather than what causes, political activity on campus. And it shifts the focus from individual students' motivation for becoming activists to the structural and cultural factors that affect the success of student movements.

PRA previously used this approach to help explain the rise of the Right in the United States and to describe it as an important, complex movement. Most studies of campus activism have focused on the Left. This study observes and analyzes the political range of student activism. We believe that a comparative look at the main competing social movements in our society, as they appear on campus, gives a more accurate picture of the current state of campus activism and generates many additional areas for further investigation. Thus student organizations that advocate Libertarian or pro-Life positions, or conservative support for Israel, can be examined within the same framework that we have used to analyze progressive social movements. We can also look at the emerging area of centrist activism and examine its relative strength in light of the other campus movements.

Sociologists have persuaded us of the importance of ideologies, frames and narratives in the development of a social movement.⁴⁰ Questions we have about these factors include:

- Do students develop their political ideologies from classroom discussion, extracurricular activity, or other sources?
- Who articulates the frames students use, and where do narratives originate?
- What are the differences between conservative and progressive campus narratives, and what are the implications of these differences?
- How successful are conservative and progressive campus movements?

A more detailed description of our use of social movement theory is found on p. 49.

OUR APPROACH

The project's agenda was purposely ambitious, since our findings are designed to provide an album of snapshots of several aspects of contempo-

rary U.S. campus activism: its scope, its leadership, the influence of national groups on campus activity, and the opportunities students have to continue their activism after graduation. These slices of reality, in association with one another, lead to some preliminary conclusions and implications about the state of current student activism and suggest arenas of further, more thorough research. The approach is qualitative, based on interviews and questionnaires for data collection. This report summarizes how we conceptualized the project, our approach, findings, some of the implications suggested by our findings, and recommendations for further study.

This exploration employed four related data collection and methods of analysis: a review of the current literature (Appendix A); the administration and analysis of taped, on-site interviews at sample schools in the spring and fall of 2003; the use of selective, targeted questionnaires, with students and young staffers (Appendix B); and the solicitation and incorporation of the feedback of outside experts (see p. 60).

A key element of our data collection was the construction of a representative sample of eight schools. We sought student activists to be our primary interviewees. In order to locate activists, we needed to identify schools where at least a minimum of political activism occurred. We used a list of schools generated from a Lexis-Nexis search that identified colleges with at least one incident of protest activity that made news during 2000-2001. The eight selected schools include four large public universities (the type of school the majority of U.S. four-year college students attend), a private university, and three smaller liberal arts colleges. Among these are a women's college and an historically Black college.⁴¹ Five of the schools rank in the top quarter of four-year schools by size of endowment.⁴² The sample schools range from highly to less selective in their admissions criteria and are located in the Northeast, South, Midwest and West. Two schools from each region provided us with ample access to student activists and represented the types of schools a majority of U.S. students attend. The schools are: Arizona State University (Tempe), Carleton College (Northfield, MN), Claremont McKenna College (Claremont, CA), Howard University (Washington, D.C.), Illinois State University (Normal), University of Massachusetts (Amherst), University of Texas (Austin), and Wellesley College (Wellesley, MA). A detailed description of our methodology is found in Appendix C.

Findings

These conclusions are necessarily limited by the type and scope of the data we collected. The highly selective sample involved eight U.S. universities and colleges, and interviews or questionnaires with approximately 100 individuals. Within this small sample, distinct trends clearly emerged.

1. ON EVERY CAMPUS IN THE SAMPLE, SMALL NUMBERS OF STUDENTS ARE ENERGETICALLY ENGAGED IN ACTIVIST WORK.

Pockets of student activism seem to exist everywhere, even if they are not widely publicized. At all eight schools, student-initiated and -led groups are active on campus, both targeting the campus for change and using it as an arena for organizing. A one-year retrospective review of the campus newspapers at our sample schools prior to our visits revealed the kinds of issues student-led groups were bringing to their campus communities' attention. Stories covered actions about local and international labor disputes, human rights, university diversity policies, academic freedom and student freedom of speech, homelessness, university strategies around affirmative action and the war on terrorism, and many other topics. Those campaigns that created interest through a specific action seemed to be guaranteed coverage in the student press. Local, campus-based activity and stories about issues beyond the campus gates coexisted in a healthy mix on the pages of these student papers.⁴³

All eight schools maintain an ongoing presence of activist groups. Often the Office for Student Life categorizes student organizations; activist groups appear under "political," "socio-political," or sometimes "cultural" headings in published information about the school.

Registered student organizations represent vir-

tually all of the organized student groups on campus, because, at all of the sample schools, student groups have an incentive to register with the administration or student government. "Official" groups that register can benefit from such resources as access to organizational support, meeting space, and funding. Of course, not all of these groups are explicitly political organizations. They run the gamut from social, cultural, and service to religious, academic, recreational, and student government.

Chart #1, on the following page, provides an overview of the sample schools, with a focus on registered student organizations.

As indicated on Chart #1, a greater number of student organizations exist at larger and better-resourced schools. However, as the data from the University of Texas and Arizona State indicate, being a large school does not guarantee that high numbers of political groups will flourish. Very large schools such as these do not generate comparatively high percentages of political groups. The expectation by students that a school is political can influence the level of political activity. For instance, UMass has an activist reputation, but Illinois State does not. And schools such as Wellesley and Carleton, with relatively small enrollments, have high percentages of political and advocacy groups. Because similar topics appear at most schools, it appears that the number of political groups may be limited by the range of topical issues as well as the pool of potential members.

At the time of our interviews, all of the sample schools had, at a minimum, environmental, labor, human rights, anti-racist/multicultural, women's, LGBT, anti-war, and generic conservative student groups. Activists used a variety of student-targeted,

Student activists must compete with many other organizations and demands for the chance to organize and mobilize their peers.

Chart #1: Overview of Sample Schools

School	Enrollment	Rank among sample schools by enrollment	Registered Student Organizations (RSOs)	Rank among sample schools by number of RSOs	Registered Political Groups	Advocacy groups	Rank among sample schools by number of activist groups	% political and advocacy of all RSOs	Rank among sample schools by % of activists groups to all RSOs
Arizona State University	44,000	2	500	2	16	38	1	12%	4
Carleton College	1,900	7	132	7	19	11	5	23%	1
Claremont McKenna College	1,000	8	280* all Claremont colleges	3	20	3	6*	8%	6*
Howard University	10,000	5	150	7	8	4	8	8%	6* tied with CMC
Illinois State University	21,000	4	270	6	6	17	6* tied with CMC	9%	5
University of Massachusetts Amherst	25,000	3	200	5*	12	21	4	17%	3
University Texas at Austin	50,000	1	900	1	37	14	2	6%	8
Wellesley College	2300	6	200	5* tied with UMass	19	22	3	21%	2

and very creative, ways to generate “buzz” on campus around their issues. For instance, they staged events like the construction of an on-campus homeless tent city, an anti-affirmative action bake sale, and an anti-war protest. They responded with a rally after an egg-throwing at a statue of Martin Luther King, Jr.; staffed ubiquitous information tables, meetings and educational events; and received media coverage for their activities.

The number of active members in student organizations varies widely within each campus as well as across schools. This is to be expected given the variety of options a student has today in affiliating with student organizations on U.S. campuses. A small core of the most active and dedicated students run their groups, with many connected to national movements related to their particular focus areas. The similarity of types of organizations and, perhaps even more striking, the consistency of political positions of similar organizations from different schools are noteworthy. While we will address the similarity of style and content more extensively in later sections of this report, we note here in passing

that internet technology, access to travel support for conferences, and assistance from national organizations all contribute to shared ideologies and campaigns.

Some overlap exists across organizational types, since religious and fraternal organizations (fraternities and sororities) often engage in activist, or at least service, work. Campus religious groups of many faiths can have a social action focus, with activity reflecting a range of progressive to conservative ideologies.

Student activists must compete with many other organizations and demands for the chance to organize and mobilize their peers. There is, after all, the expectation that they attend class and study. Most students these days, even those enrolled full-time, must hold down a job that can consume many hours per week. One student at a state school had a 20-hour/week residence hall job, spent 20 hours in her premed labs, maintained a full course schedule, and still found time to organize a major cancer research fundraiser. College life also includes opportunities for informal learning, socializing,

community engagement, spiritual development, and academic advancement. All these factors influence how willing a student is to commit to ongoing engagement in activist work.

Our interviews with student leaders of activist organizations reveal a gap between their expectations and the reality of how difficult it is to create influential, self-sustaining campus-based groups. Student leaders reported enthusiasm for being activists, despite competing demands on their time. At the same time, they expressed frustration that their various political goals were so hard to achieve on campus.

Holding political values and attitudes is not the same as acting on them—a reality to which any activist will attest. In addition, when polled, most college students have consistently chosen to identify as unaffiliated, Independent, or “middle of the road” politically. This self-identification may present a heightened challenge for student organizers, whose experience in the practicalities of mobilizing a social movement, and access to support on how to do it, may not match their levels of dedication and enthusiasm.

The task of student activists, then, is not just to build support for their movements among those with similar values and attitudes and to ask them to act on those beliefs and cement their commitment, but to attract potential members from the much larger bloc of uncommitted students. Although these activists worked hard to generate interest in their political issues, most students were uninvolved in campus social movements, especially in a sustained way. Even though many groups boasted email lists of considerable size, most groups considered themselves lucky to attract over fifty regular attendees to their meetings and more to their events. They were able to sustain far fewer core organizers.

How do student activists mobilize the support of their unaffiliated peers? According to social movement theorists, the success of a social movement is determined by the combination of several factors, including an effective motivating frame of their issue for recruits. At all schools, student groups were organized around two major issues in the Spring of 2003: the war on Iraq, which began on March 20, and the Supreme Court’s hearing of the University of Michigan’s affirmative action cases, which took place on April 1. There was wide variation in the levels of involvement at different schools, which appeared to depend on such factors as school

size, the resources available for student organizing, the timing of events relative to the academic calendar, and the reputation of the campus organizers. Progressive and conservative groups framed both issues differently. For instance, progressive activists opposed the war as a misguided extension of the war on terrorism (“War is Not the Answer”), while conservatives supported it as a patriotic obligation (“Support Our Troops”).

Different factors affect the numbers of activists at a given school. All our sample schools provide on-campus student housing, for instance, which contributes to the school’s atmosphere and sense of community. The larger the school, however, the more likely a substantial number of students live off campus, which weakens their ties to daily campus life. A full 85% of students at ASU live off-campus in the areas surrounding the Tempe campus or at home in the Phoenix metropolitan area. This residential pattern may contribute to the trend of student organizers to stage actions in the community as often as they do on campus, especially for anti-war and pro-America rallies.

While opportunities for political activism exist at all our sample schools, and involved students actively attempt to recruit new members to their ranks, organized on-campus student political groups constitute a very small percentage of the combined student activity on college campuses in the United State

2. CONSERVATIVE AND PROGRESSIVE STUDENTS APPROACH ACTIVISM DIFFERENTLY.

Conservative and progressive activists approach the tasks of activism in ways that relate dynamically to such factors as organizational structure and strength, the framing of messages, and the choice of issues. These factors both help determine the challenges these groups of activists face and influence their respective strategies.

Organizational structure and strength

At each school, we found ongoing and ad hoc student groups involving undergraduate and, where they are present, graduate students. Progressive/

Conservative groups—both student-led and those organized by others—describe the climate on most college campuses as unapologetically liberal, with little or no room for conservative or traditional views.

liberal political organizations outnumber conservative ones on our sample campuses by a ratio of 4:1. The ratio of progressive to conservative groups was even higher at Carleton and Howard, both traditionally progressive activist schools, where the Carleton Conservative Union and the Howard College Republicans were the only explicitly conservative political groups. At most of our sample schools, conservative students had organized at least one general conservative organization, often under the banner of the College Republicans, as well, usually, as a few issue-specific conservative groups. At schools where the general conservative group was the only conservative group on campus,

It is undeniable that progressive student groups are more numerous, have larger followings, and have a longer and more successful history of organizing on U.S. campuses.

its agenda was broadly comprehensive. Conservative groups—both student-led and those organized by others—describe the climate on most college campuses as unapologetically liberal, with little or no room for conservative or traditional views.⁴⁴ The students we interviewed agreed that whatever the political makeup of the general student body, at all schools there were more progressive student leaders and organizations on campus than conservative ones. **It is undeniable that progressive student groups are more numerous, have larger followings, and have a longer and more successful history of organizing on U.S. campuses.**

Most conservative students would agree that they are in the minority on campus. But there is less of a united front around social policy issues. This may reflect the divisions among conservative students between libertarians and social conservatives. Libertarianism, an ideology that advocates freedom for individuals and less governmental interference in personal lives, is popular on many campuses, although not at most of our sample schools. Its adherents tend to hold more progressive social values than their counterparts on the Christian Right, which also influences many campus conservatives.

Although there may be student chapters of electoral parties on campus like the College Democrats or Campus Greens, they do not function as clearinghouses for progressive activism in the way that the general conservative groups do. Progressives have a national interactive web-based clearinghouse run by recent graduates: www.campusactivism.org. Because conservative student activists were fewer in

number and often were members of several groups, those on any one campus tended to know each other well and were generally aware of the status of conservative organizing there.

Ideological Frames for Students

Framing, a central concept of social movement theory, is helpful in understanding some of the differences between conservative and progressive student activism. Frames help us understand reality; often they simplify complex issues. A frame guides messages about a movement's issues, while helping to motivate, mobilize, and recruit. They are, then, powerful tools in movement building, often used competitively to attract potential members. What are some of the frames we encountered?

Virtually all conservative students we interviewed described their campuses as places where they felt isolated and in the minority. Some also described themselves as disrespected. They explained that this was because their school was overwhelmingly liberal, from the ideologies of its administration and faculty to the attitudes and analyses of other students. Often students would describe the school's climate as being so unwelcoming of conservative thought that it was unsafe for them. As one Wellesley conservative observed, "There is a sort of hostile environment among faculty and some administrators. In class, if you're trying to make a point, sometimes you feel that the whole class disagrees with you because the professor disagrees with you."⁴⁵ According to a student at a different school, "Every day conservative students on campus have to hide they are conservative so they don't get flack from their friends and have to validate and justify their opinions to whoever is challenging them. Students sit quietly because they are very clearly in the minority." And a White Wellesley student drew the following comparison: "I can make the argument that a conservative student is in more need of a safe place on campus than a Black student." For her, this "frame" helped explain why there were so many fewer campus supporters of conservative student organizations than of progressive ones. A conservative organizer at UTexas: "Due to the spectrum of politics on campus, for us to hold a [pro-America] rally on campus would have meant that only us students would come, and we probably would have gotten shouted down." One conservative leader ran successfully for vice president of her student government specifically to direct student activities fees for conservative

speakers, because she felt that without her voice only liberals would be invited to speak.

Perhaps most notable about how this frame worked was its consistent message and almost complete universality across our campus sites: every conservative student group we studied shared the view that American colleges are overwhelmingly liberal places and that conservatives are victims of this phenomenon. Through this lens, conservatives can see that it is difficult, but necessary, to organize in these settings. Further, this frame encourages conservative students to declare their situation to be inherently unfair and discriminatory, such as expressing the feeling that “Conservative students are overpowered by bully liberals.”

Frequent campus speakers, such as David Horowitz and Harvey Silverglate, who have written extensively on the lack of free speech rights for conservative students, actively encourage conservative students to express this view. Publications aimed at student groups, like the Intercollegiate Studies Institute’s *Campus* or the Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America’s *CAMERA on Campus*, are also influential. The internet makes extensive information and analysis available to these conservative activists. There is no comparable emphasis on the left to support progressive students in developing their own consistent frame.

With one exception, we observed similarity across schools in the message that conservative students suffer from an imbalance of liberal thinking on campus. At Claremont McKenna College (CMC), known to attract conservative thinkers among both students and faculty, conservative students expressed pleasure at being on a campus where they felt there was more balance between liberals and conservatives.

Conservative students as a whole exist in comparable numbers to progressive ones on campus today, and the percentage of conservative students is slowly growing. If the relative numbers of individuals holding political attitudes were an accurate reflection of social movement activity on campuses, though, we would expect to find a higher percentage of organized conservative groups than we did. Perhaps because conservative activists are a minority on campus, they have capitalized on their status to frame their message of isolation and disrespect. We might speculate that their repeated frame is not designed to recruit more conservative activists to their ranks but to hamper the success of their progressive rivals.

Unlike conservative activists, progressive students had no single organizing frame, although they were likely to agree on general political issues. Their descriptions of the political climate at their schools are far more diverse. They often attributed their organizing challenges to the fact that the many non-involved students they met were conservative. They sometimes attributed the difficulties in mobilizing large numbers of students on campus to students’ general support of the status quo and unwillingness to challenge the information they get from the media. Activists expressed frustration at “the level of apathy and propaganda [that] both went up after 9/11,” which contributed to the difficulty of mobilizing students whom they view as “generally progressive.”

Despite these obstacles, some students appreciated the vitality of their campus atmosphere and the possibilities for change. One student at Howard was pleased that the school had been “voted one of the ten most active universities by Mother Jones [Magazine],” while another expressed the optimistic sense that “once you start doing one active thing, you just get tied into the huge network of activists doing similar things.”

Most progressive student leaders saw the proliferation of progressive political organizations on campus as positive, although some were conscious of the possibility for fragmentation. As a seasoned organizer noted, “Lots of groups want to work together. But it’s really difficult.” The spring of 2003 saw large national student mobilizations against the war in Iraq and for affirmative action. This surge of activism dispelled, at least for the time being, the image of a diffused and unorganized campus left. The slogan of a March 5 national student anti-war event, “Books, Not Bombs!,” reflected a frame designed to appeal to many students: that money for war took away support for education.

While progressive activists recognized the importance of framing, they usually focused it on very specific issues like endangered species, transgender rights, living wage campaigns, or university investment strategies. Progressive frames, as expressed by the students in our sample, did not readily lend themselves to simple, pithy statements as often as conservative frames did.

Predominantly White progressive students, wrestling with how to articulate the values inherent in affirmative action, expressed commitment to racial *diversity* in the student body because such diversity enhanced their own college experience.

They described how being with students from a variety of backgrounds made learning more interesting, since this diversity brought differing views into the classrooms and dorms. This message did not always resonate with students of color who tended to describe the value of affirmative action in terms of its ability to correct previous discrimination and increase their own possibilities for success. The complexities of addressing multiple audiences challenged these students to find frames with broad appeal.

Conservatives skillfully used the tool of reframing language to advocate for their position. Often conservatives countered affirmative action arguments by incorporating into their frames language that progressives had originally used to describe their own ideas. Conservatives reworked this language to express a very different series of concepts. For instance, the conservative retooling of the concept of *diversity* has shifted the focus away from multiculturalism and affirmative action and, at several

schools, toward the argument that there was no *diversity of thought* on their campuses. They described a situation in which liberal professors taught a politically correct, or “PC,” curriculum that left little room for their conservative dissenting voices.

Although none of the students we interviewed claimed that their grade had been lowered as a result of a liberal professor’s judgment of their political views, many had heard narratives about such situations. (A national web presence initiated by a parent activist, www.noindoctrination.org, actively solicits and publishes such claims.) Rather than focusing attention on diversifying the student body through the kinds of affirmative action policies that were currently being so hotly debated, these students suggested that there should be more room at the table for minority political views like theirs. These students’ use of the term *diversity* reflects a skillful reframing of diversity as a positive, conservative ideological concept.

Freedom of speech and freedom of expression are examples of terms recast by some conservative students. Consistent with the frame of being excluded and silenced on campus, conservatives described the importance of defending their right to express their political beliefs. On the Arizona State campus, for instance, the College Republicans hung yellow

ribbons on trees that lined a major pedestrian walkway as a symbol of support for the war in Iraq. When these ribbons were mysteriously removed, the group complained to the administration that their rights to free expression had been violated, and the ribbons were reinstalled.

Where did these activists come by these frames? **National conservative organizations working directly with college students play an active role in designing frames for conservative students.** The Intercollegiate Studies Institute, the Leadership Institute, and the Young America’s Foundation are examples of groups that target college students, but are headed by non-students. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, FIRE, has had success bringing suit against colleges that enforce “free speech zones” and speech codes, which it sees as violations of free speech. Morton Blackwell’s conservative Leadership Institute estimates that it has trained 32,000 students in skills and political education. Speakers’ bureaus run by some of these same conservative organizations bring to campus spokespeople who articulate these frames clearly and in ways that students readily understand.

Choice of Issues

Issue-based campaigns are the core of student organizing. Both conservative and progressive groups realized that the selection of a relevant issue is the key to organizing success. Progressive groups appear to initiate the issues for both progressives and conservatives, while conservatives tend to be more reactive to the progressive agenda already in place.

PROGRESSIVE ISSUES ON CAMPUS

Similar categories of progressive organizations are active at all schools. Political groups at our sample schools included: organizations focused on electoral politics such as the College Republicans, Democrats, Greens, or Presidential candidate supporters; activist identity groups such as Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA, the Chicano student movement), Pride (LGBT support and advocacy) or a Black Student Union; issue-based groups such as United Students Against Sweatshops or Amnesty International; internal watchdog groups such as UT Watch at UTexas at Austin, or multi-issue groups like the Radical Student Union at UMass; and ad hoc coalitions, such as the ones that developed to protest the war in Iraq or to support affir-

These students’ use of the term diversity reflects a skillful reframing of diversity as a positive, conservative ideological concept.

mative action on many campuses.

Progressive students do use frames, such as: “We stand for democracy and social justice in a system that has not fully realized either”; or “Big business and corporate domination is bad.” But these frames are usually more consistently theoretical and broader in scope than conservative frames. Because progressive students tend to organize around specific issues, student activists most often described their agenda not in terms of theory but in language related to the issues at hand. For instance, anti-globalization protesters chanted, “This is what democracy looks like,” in reference to forcible police efforts to contain their protests. This is not to say that they ignore theoretical constructs; we observed plenty of discussion at progressive student meetings. But progressive activist goals tended to be pragmatically connected to specific campaigns, such as access to emergency contraception at the student health clinic, or making the campus more environmentally friendly.

Many of the issues progressive students have organized around highlight student grievances, such as wages of student workers and the adults who service their schools, student access to reproductive health care, or affirmative action in admissions. Although students are, for example, active regarding foreign policy even in the absence of a military draft (as during the Vietnam War), many recent progressive student movements are characterized by successful connections between students’ lives and the issues of their movements.

Because the war in Iraq and the U.S. Supreme Court affirmative action cases were so prominent on campuses in the spring of 2003, they eclipsed the work of other ongoing organizing efforts. In previous years, the dominant themes of organizing spanned the spectrum of contemporary campus issues like hate speech codes, wages for college employees, anti-sweatshop work, reparations for African-Americans, or curriculum reforms; concerns about domestic issues like the environment, gay rights or abortion; and foreign policy topics like the Palestinian/Israeli conflict, globalization, and the war on terrorism. These topics have historically been emotionally-laden, not just for student leaders but for college communities in general. Campus debate became heated and, on occasion, hostile.

While these activities did not completely cease on campus during the spring of 2003, many of them took a back seat to the two major issues. Both progressive and conservative students altered their

regular organizing to varying degrees. Yet, because there are so many more progressive issue-specific groups on campus than conservative ones, the war and affirmative action affected them the most. Since there were more progressive than conservative students already involved in various groups, the pool of mobilized progressive participants was larger. But the progressive students needed to be persuaded of the importance of immediate involvement in these pressing issues as opposed to a host of others. Active conservative students, although smaller in number, were more readily aligned with the general positions of supporting the war and opposing affirmative action.

Members of liberal and progressive student groups did not describe an easy sense of solidarity across issues. Perhaps the ideological links are sometimes difficult for progressive student groups to prioritize and put into action. Even when some leaders recognized the value of coalition work, they were sometimes hesitant to encourage such activity for fear of making mistakes. As a student active in religiously based social action explained: “Let’s say you are a member of PETA [People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, an animal rights organization popular on some campuses] and Pride [the LGBT organization] is having a weenie roast. You don’t want to support them because they don’t support you. It’s not about agreeing with the specifics; it’s about your tolerance for their point of view....The majority don’t know how to accept others’ views.”

Progressive campus activists address a range of issues and have varying degrees of understanding of and commitment to those that are not their primary political focus. They are also divided, like the larger society, by ideological, identity and other differences that can both enrich and hamper coalition and other cross-issue efforts. Although progressive campus groups usually affirm their opposition to racism, sexism, homophobia and other concerns, in practice, they sometimes ignore, often insufficiently affirm, and only too rarely fulfill their stated commitment. Such failures affect both the effectiveness of progressive campus organizing and the willingness of some progressive students even to join a specific group or to take a particular political stance in public.

National conservative organizations working directly with college students play an active role in designing frames for conservative students.

CONSERVATIVE ISSUES

The more generic conservative groups found themselves tackling a wide range of issues, often focusing on a single campaign at a time. In the spring of 2003, a multi-issue group, the Young Conservatives of Texas, Austin Branch, for example, worked on local and state electoral campaigns, published a report on the Texas legislature, opposed affirmative action, held a pro-America rally and sponsored a debate on the Iraq war. It regularly recruited new members through information tables, articles in the mainstream and conservative student press, and an active listserv.

“Let’s say you are a member of PETA [People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, an animal rights organization popular on some campuses] and Pride [the LGBT organization] is having a weenie roast. You don’t want to support them because they don’t support you.”

Conservative groups seemed to approach campus activism from a fundamentally different starting point than progressive groups. Conservative student leaders often chose their issues in reaction to progressive campaigns. This “issues-oppositional” approach takes place in three main arenas of issue-based campaigns: university-focused, domestic policy, and foreign affairs. For example, at the university level, conservative activists have challenged the presence of programs in Chicano, Women’s, or Queer Studies; have criticized multiculturalism; and have actively opposed affirmative action. These campaigns began only after such programs were well

established. Conservative campus activists were also outspoken on issues related to society in general and have organized campus-based pro-life groups, opposed same sex marriage, and challenged the regulation of student speech. In these cases as well, the presence of a progressive issue led to a conservative response. And of course, many groups continued to demonstrate active support of Bush administration’s approach to the war on terrorism and the war in Iraq, especially during the spring of 2003.

Because of their smaller numbers, conservative student leaders describe the sense that they “attract the more committed.” One student describes feeling “like the youngest kid, fighting against your big brothers”—a struggle that out in “the real world ... [makes one] a little stronger.”

Conservative campus activists have greater commonality and, for the most part, less internal divisiveness than their progressive counterparts. Social conservative and Christian Right ideas dominate conservative thought on campus. Libertarians, who play a significant, though minority, role on the national scene, did not have a strong presence as independent organizations at our sample schools. And because conservative activists are few in number, they are less likely than progressive students to break away from an organization for ideological reasons. The relative cohesiveness of conservative campus groups is affected by their emphasis on shared ideology rather than on potentially polarizing identity issues. Compared with progressive campus organizations and coalitions, conservative groups attract students who are, on the whole, both more homogeneous in terms of identities such as race/ethnicity and sexual orientation, and less likely to confront racism, homophobia, or sexism within their own political sector. For these various reasons, conservative groups do not face the same kinds of internal challenges that progressive campus organizers do.

Organizing Challenges and Strategies

Both conservatives and progressives face a variety of organizing hurdles. Joining and sustaining engagement in a social movement requires a “hook” to attract sufficient numbers of people. Often this is a resonating ideology translated into a successful frame, coupled with an emotional response to an incident or a learning moment that transforms individuals from observers to participants. For progressives at our sample schools, there were a variety of such hooks—usually issue-focused, and often directly connected with student self-interest. For conservatives, the central grievance was a sense of being embattled, misunderstood, and mistreated.

Progressive campus activists encounter the organizational challenges of “decline,” or a drop in interest in a campaign, a problem that social movements often encounter, as well as fragmentation. “Conservatives are worse off than progressives here,” said one progressive student activist who recognized the phenomenon of decline on his campus. “They’re not very active, pretty disorganized. But we suffer from a problem of sustaining momentum.” The most relevant factors leading to decline on cam-

pushes are: quick turnover of leadership and inadequate transfer of knowledge from one set of leaders to the next; saturation of the campaign so that no new members with similar views are left to join; achievement of a goal and then the inability to expand the goals of the group to sustain and increase interest; and/or failure to achieve or articulate recognizable goals, which can lead to member disinterest or discouragement.⁴⁶

Progressive campus activists also recognized that, as each issue develops its own core of organizers and its own set of goals, it effectively draws potential recruits away from other causes that they may want to support. Progressives in the larger society commonly discuss this fragmentation and its effects, and progressive student activists express frustration about these problems. Student observers revealed their thoughtfulness through comments such as these: “A disadvantage [here] is that you aren’t connected to a national movement,” or “The Republicans are more successful in terms of the efficacy of small numbers....They know the buttons they have to press. They benefit from keeping their issues really narrow, whereas it’s like a candy store here for leftists, since it can dilute the numbers you actually have. That’s why the anti-war coalition was a great thing.”

One response to this problem of fragmentation has been to form progressive student unions. At UMass, a school with a legacy of campus activism, the Radical Student Union (RSU) has been in existence for thirty years. The RSU has not been a substitute for issue-based organizing, but it does provide a space for coordination of planning. (In a similar vein, the UMass Republicans share space with the alternative conservative newspaper, the *Minuteman*, supplying a sense of solidarity and support for two smaller organizations, although this is more of a fledgling “union.”)

Conservative student leaders wrestle with a different problem. They reported to us that their membership numbers were low compared to progressive groups. This continues to be the case despite the slow growth of conservative-identified students on campus, a predictable trend during a Republican administration. Low numbers seem to affect the tactics conservatives use to pursue their goals.

Unlike progressives, who at times focus on mass student demonstrations, conservative students use tactics best suited to their numbers and strengths. A major approach of conservative activists is to send small numbers of students where

their voices can most optimally be heard. Groups have become skilled at generating conservative messages in ways that students can most readily see them. These include op-ed pieces, purchased ads in the mainstream student press, separate conservative, campus newspapers, hosted websites with blogs (web logs written by an individual), or online discussion groups. Small groups can use visibility tactics such as maintaining a steady presence at a campus information table without unduly taxing their membership. Staging a small counterdemonstration at a larger progressive event can reap easy press coverage without the outlay of organizing time and energy. Other approaches used at our sample schools included running for an office in student government in order to influence its funding or programs, or joining progressive organizations and demanding changes in their political agenda.

Conservatives aim for the most “bang for the buck.” For instance, a small number of counter demonstrators upstaged a progressive coalition of multiple student progressive groups at Arizona State University. The counter demonstration drew more media coverage than the actual vigil.⁴⁷ Conservative anti-affirmative action bake sales on several campuses in 2003, for example, garnered national attention in response to a very small outlay of resources.⁴⁸ Recognizing that they are in the minority, campus conservatives gravitate towards activities traditionally used by the disempowered on campus. Conservative activists are trained to use such tactics. Such kinds of provocative activities were common among progressive students in the 1960s. It seems that when an organization becomes frustrated at its lack of success, it tends to try more aggressive methods to attract attention and to build a sense of empowerment.

The marked imbalance in numbers between conservative and progressive groups affected conservative activists. Conservative groups often expressed what has been called “fortress reasoning,” or the belief that, because they are in the minority, they need to protect themselves from people who disagree, or disrespect, their views.⁴⁹ This posture of reluctant defensiveness and occasional outright hostility towards identified liberal or progressive causes influences many aspects of conservative organizing on the campuses we visited. For instance, at UTexas, Michael Moore, the populist social commentator and filmmaker, was scheduled to speak in a large venue to the university community, with his appearance being subsidized by

student activities fees. Conservative students, who had experienced negative responses when they picketed a previous liberal speaker, chose a different tactic. Since one focus of their disagreement was the alleged liberal control of student activities fees, they purchased a block of tickets for conservative students' use. They hoped simultaneously to prevent other students from hearing Moore and to stage a walkout during the event as a public statement of their displeasure.

Across the political spectrum, students organizing a response to the war collaborated with off-campus organizations more often than in response to other issues. Many events at our sample schools took place off-campus and involved members of the larger community. Progressive and conservative

forces each appeared to pull together their own forces with particular success, both to show support for their positions on the war in Iraq and affirmative action, and to attract larger numbers to their events. Young Conservatives of Texas, for instance, held their pro-America rally on the steps of the state Capitol to draw attendance from the larger community. Some of Carleton's student-led anti-war

events were coordinated with community-based groups and held off-campus to make their voices heard in the town of Northfield. Howard students helped coordinate a national student march from their campus to the U.S. Supreme Court building on the eve of arguments on the two Michigan affirmative action cases.

While shifting the locus of public demonstrations to the streets near the college can increase visibility, it also made demonstrators more vulnerable to public criticism. At Illinois State, for example, young people from the community drove back and forth past the weekly anti-war vigil, shouting their disagreement at the demonstrators.

On and off campus, both progressive and conservative student activists encountered multiple challenges, including student apathy, limited resources, and the responses of those who opposed their political perspectives. Nonetheless, they chose—and, at times, used with considerable effectiveness—strategies that reflected their organizational strengths.

3. POLITICAL MENTORS ARE ABSENT FROM CAMPUS.

We expected that many students would attribute key aspects of their political development to faculty and staff mentors. We found, however, that campus mentors played a minor role in this process. This was especially true by comparison to students' pre-college experiences, personal values, religious upbringings, and parents.

Virtually all of the student leaders—56 out of 58 we interviewed—felt that their political opinions had been formed before they entered college. For some, specific events—the 2000 election, coming out as queer, meeting Thurgood Marshall in 1984—inspired them to be committed political activists. Others saw a continuum between high school and college: using the latter as a place to become “more passionate” and informed about previously developed political views; and carrying over to college the perspectives gained by having attended a high school that “fostered awareness and volunteerism.” Several drew on their religious upbringings: with one rooting her political beliefs in her having grown up Catholic, and taking “what I was learning there, respect for human rights and the earth”; and another crediting her religion, Jainism, and the related “values of non-violence and vegetarianism taught at home” as having brought her to her activism.

When asked who their first political mentors had been, almost all of the interviewees said that their parents were highly influential in positive ways. A conservative student leader, for example, recalled, “My Mom would come home and show me her paycheck, and I saw where her money went—into failures of social programs—going to people who hadn't worked nearly as hard as my Mom.” A feminist activist recounted how “I grew up in a liberal household; my mom was in feminist and socialist circles, and she hammered home pro-choice ideas.” Numerous student leaders—conservative and progressive—echoed the ones who said, “At our family dinner, we had [political] conversations every day,” and “We're not divided ideologically from our parents.” This is in marked contrast to the image of activists from the 1960s as rebels against their parents' values.⁵⁰ This perspective of valuing one's parents' influence was shared across ideological and race lines.

When asked who their political mentors were on campus, a clear pattern emerged. **Most student**

Virtually all of the student leaders—56 out of 58 we interviewed—felt that their political opinions had been formed before they entered college.

leaders—53 out of 58—were not able to identify a political mentor on campus. Only one conservative student could name a political mentor from the faculty. The few progressive students with faculty mentors were all grateful for them: appreciating the experience of having “had teachers with radical views ... [that come] out in their teaching; and finding “phenomenal” the “faculty [who] do go out on the street protesting against the war.” But these student leaders, like their faculty mentors, were clearly the exception.

Typical of those we interviewed was one undergraduate at UTexas who spoke about the sense of feeling “really alone” and “finally looking for validation off campus,” while another student there recalled his “hero,” the “high school journalism teacher [who] put her job on the line for me,” only to add sadly, “But there’s no one like that for me here.” A Texas graduate student reported being “mentored” by “a first year feminist studies student” from whom she’s “been learning more ... than from anyone else.” At Carleton, where the legacy of the late Senator Paul Wellstone (perhaps the most outspoken faculty advocate of student activism in the 1990s) still resonates, one student leader lamented the difficulty of students developing on their own—sometimes without success—political skills in a situation in which the absence of “institutions and mentors is quite detrimental to political activism and political awareness.”

The lack of active mentoring on campus may be the result of conflicting feelings among faculty about their political role on campus. The faculty members we interviewed were deeply split over the value of disclosing their own political opinions and perspectives to their students. Reflecting a narrow interpretation of academic freedom for college faculty, some felt it would be unprofessional to express their own views in class and elsewhere on campus. Though one faculty member described, with some ambivalence about the propriety of her actions, using “Bush and his language” to illustrate “the mechanisms he is using,” more typical of the faculty we interviewed was the one who maintained that “I see my job and political work as completely independent. I don’t see the university as having a particularly special role in activism.” As a faculty member at another school said, “I never protest. I never march; I never carry signs. I only teach.”

Conservative faculty in particular seemed inaccessible to conservative student groups. Neither conservative nor progressive student leaders were

able to identify conservative faculty who served as mentors. Some conservative faculty resisted becoming involved in student activist groups or with mentoring individual conservative student leaders. As one political scientist responded, when we asked, “I don’t follow politics much.”

Of course, on some campuses, the political climate is such that expressing one’s personal political views is indeed risky for faculty members.⁵¹ Still, some felt that activism was a political necessity. A Sociology professor who encourages students to become “scholar-activists” explained: I have this tremendous privilege of teaching social theory. I can see activist thinking. My students are attracted to me because I can explain things.”

Another activist faculty member said:

I know a lot of good, hard-working faculty who are engaged in the classroom, and I’m sure their students are nurtured by them, and that’s all good. The question is: is that the end of a faculty member’s responsibility? They say they teach critically. I say, fine. That’s your job. But what are you doing politically? Politics is done in public, not in private.

And some sensed that their relationships with graduate students, with whom they have a much closer bond, made it easier, or perhaps more appropriate, to be open to that group.

How are students, especially those who focus their studies on social or political movements, either through sociology, political science, or some other field, to learn the skills associated with movement work? We expect higher education to provide a certain level of opportunities for practical applications. But, when the issues central to sustaining political systems are controversial and labeled partisan, there is clear hesitancy by most faculty to become involved with student activism.

On all the campuses we studied, the Dean’s office supported student leadership development as an investment in the success of student organizations, including everything from the Chess Club to

The lack of active mentoring on campus may be the result of conflicting feelings among faculty about their political role on campus. The faculty members we interviewed were deeply split over the value of disclosing their own political opinions and perspectives to their students. Reflecting a narrow interpretation of academic freedom for college faculty, some felt it would be unprofessional to express their own views in class and elsewhere on campus.

the Campus Greens. But these training opportunities are usually extracurricular, designed to focus on the operational aspects of organizations, not on their theoretical underpinnings, and they are consistently non-partisan. Notable exceptions to this rule are those run by campus-based Labor Studies or Peace Studies programs or progressive academic programs in Activism and Social Change or Social Justice. These are among the curricular offerings most often criticized by conservative organizations as foci of liberal thought.

Most students reported that they created their frames, messages, and strategies from non-campus sources, such as the Internet, conferences and trainings off-site. Most political science faculty we interviewed insisted on separating their personal politics from the academic work they do on campus. Although they hold strong individual views, faculty and staff on campus for the most part do not facilitate student political growth through mentoring and serving in some way as a political role model.

4. STUDENTS ARE RESPONDING TO ISSUES OF RACE, GENDER, AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION AS THEY PERCEIVE THEM ON CAMPUS.

In the nineteenth century, the privilege of a college education in the United States was primarily enjoyed by young White men who moved onto campus for four years of full-time residential study. This standard remained well into the twentieth century. Coeducation, racial desegregation and sex and gender equity are all examples of progressive activist struggles that changed the look and feel of campuses. Although there is significant variation across the country, today's students of higher education are much more diverse than their predecessors in terms of race, gender, sexuality, age, and social class. The schools they attend have taken on many different structures. We wanted to know the effects of the current campus political climate on those students who have demanded, benefited from, and/or resisted these changes.

Our interview student sample was fairly diverse: 35% of those we interviewed in person were people of color; and about 60% were women. We spoke to at least one member of an LGBT group on every campus.

Progressive student activists, including mem-

bers of the above groups, have formed organizations and campaigns to address issues of race, gender, and sexual orientation. They continue to challenge what they see is the persistent presence of racism, sexism and homophobia at their schools. Conservative students have responded, opposing demands for affirmative action in admissions and area studies that focus on identity topics on the grounds they are unnecessary, substandard academic offerings, or simply unfair.

These students are enrolled at a historic moment when demands on the administration by their earlier counterparts to improve the status and opportunities for them have been, in many cases, at least minimally met. The administrations of all our sampled schools responded to activist demands by putting in place policies and programs designed to overcome some structural biases. These include: special student government offices and operating budgets, multicultural resource and support centers, multicultural peer mentors, book discussions, and school-sponsored brown bag lunches on topics pertaining to a diverse student body. Such institutionalized responses help shape students' politicized awareness and analysis of the issues. For instance, where students have access to a strong Women's Studies department, there tends to be more activism by feminist students and more vocal opposition by conservative groups.

Conservatives have objected to the bias they perceive on the part of the administration in favor of these groups. We have no evidence at the sample schools that conservatives have sought to undermine these structures by seeking to defund them or to take them over with a conservative agenda, although there is anecdotal evidence that this is the case with women's centers at schools outside our sample. Rather, it appears that conservative activists seek to reorder funding priorities by using an equity argument to support more conservative activities.

Most activists dealing with race, gender, or sexual orientation issues expressed that their work was not over even though they had succeeded in gaining a foothold in the structure of their college. Muslim groups at Arizona State felt compelled to mobilize after several of their off-campus apartments were raided after 9/11. LGBT students at Howard reported that they continue to struggle for recognition on campus while receiving more support from the community at large.

The head of the very small, but active Muslim Students Association on one campus described how

her group was addressing hate crimes, affirmative action, and the war. At UTexas, where the student body is only 3% African-American, a student leader described the need for progressive activists “to educate students about campus police profiling, and the value of statues to Martin Luther King, Jr., Barbara Jordan and Cesar Chavez—they counteract all the Confederate soldiers on pedestals.” Recalling his time at a national conference for College Republicans, a Howard student described how, with five Black people and ten Hispanics there, he was “homesick” for his college, where he did not feel so isolated and objectified. And, LGBT activists at an urban school responded after, as one described, “a gay student was attacked by some members of our show band when he mistakenly walked through their formation during an indoor rehearsal. We held a city-wide LGBT Town Hall in our student center, but [the administration] wouldn’t allow any press in. As representative of the LGBT group, I had to give an interview out on the street, away from campus.” One African American student at a predominantly White school reflected on the need for new tactics, including becoming part of the institutionalized structures of the culture. “[Civil rights] marches are not the way to get it done now. But as people from different marginalized groups get into positions of power, then the voice is different.”

Conservative speakers play an important role in stimulating discussion around issues that are important to progressive groups working on race, sex, and sexual orientation issues. When they visit campuses, they bring arguments that conservative students can use to resist progressive claims of racism, sexism and homophobia. Conservative students at most of the sample schools used the resources of groups such as the Young America’s Foundation speakers series or Accuracy in Academia on-site conferences to bring notables such as Dinesh D’Souza and Ann Coulter to campus as invited guest speakers.

Visiting speakers seem to attract more attention than student debates do at our sample schools. Besides their celebrity status, these supportive outside experts can bring rhetorical skills and a sense of legitimacy to the work of sponsoring student groups. Most conservative speakers are highly critical of affirmative action, identity majors such as women’s studies, African American Studies, or Queer Studies programs, multiculturalism, and resource and advocacy centers. Having applied for student activities fees through their college and sub-

sidies from organizations such as Young America’s Foundation to cover their speakers’ fees, conservative student leaders in our sample insisted that they are merely creating opportunities for another perspective to be heard.

Several students of color, women, and members of the LGBT student community from our sample, however, felt attacked by conservatives and saw their movements’ gains threatened. We heard how the conservative student press at one school, for instance, has criticized the existence of women’s centers as college-sponsored organizations that cater only to feminist students, and not to all women, or all students for that matter. University administrators at a large state university have questioned the organization and size of some dedicated academic programs for students of color. And derisive student editorials have responded to transgender students’ demands for their housing needs. These students realize that the climate at their schools is not completely friendly to them.

Experiences at a women’s college and a historically Black university

Compared to student leaders at most of our sample schools, those at the one single-sex school and the sole historically Black college in our sample have quite different experiences of gender and race. Our sample includes Wellesley, a women’s college, and, Howard University, a historically Black college or university (HBCU). These schools were both founded in the nineteenth century to provide opportunities for women and African Americans equal to what was available for White men. Both colleges imprint on their students a respect for the school heritage and special vision.

Several student activists from these campuses preface their comments about challenging the status quo at their college by qualifying their demands, as if a partial apology were in order. Typical of these responses was one from a Howard student who

Progressive student activists have formed organizations and campaigns to address issues of race, gender, and sexual orientation. They continue to challenge what they see is the persistent presence of racism, sexism and homophobia at their schools. Conservative students have responded, opposing demands for affirmative action in admissions and area studies that focus on identity topics on the grounds they are unnecessary, substandard academic offerings, or simply unfair.

said: “Now don’t get me wrong. I love this school. I’m proud to go here. It’s such an opportunity. But it needs to be changed in the following ways....”

While conclusions about the motivation for activism among students who attend schools such

as these are beyond the scope of this report, we can cautiously engage in some conjecture. Perhaps attending such a school could be considered a political statement of some sort. Certainly the student bodies are self-selected: students choose to attend these colleges and bring with them a set of expectations, tested or not, about single-sex schools or HBCUs.

We assumed that students expected that issues of gender and race would be addressed differently at such schools, and we found that to be the case. Some students from these schools describe their awareness of the connections across these issues. Speaking about her experience at Wellesley, one White student spoke about her need to “question its commitment to multiculturalism.” Observing that “the predominant thing people feel here is the race lens,” someone from Howard noted that “there is no active feminist or class lens. Even though the student body is probably a majority women,” she added, “abortion is not at the center of it.”

What can we say about the activism at these schools compared to others in the sample? Wellesley’s activists, both progressive and con-

servative, expressed similar attitudes and ideologies with their counterparts from other schools. They were challenged by similar social movement issues of sustainability, growth, focus, and measurements of success. Much of their discussion about political ideas related to its implications for women. Students appeared clearly aware of the gendered nature of their experience, if not in total agreement with each other about its value and its relationship to feminism or to their own development. They also recognized the elite status of their school, a highly selective, expensive private college. Because the location of the school in an overwhelmingly White and affluent

Boston suburb with limited public transportation sets the campus apart from the metropolitan community, the college makes extra efforts to transport students into Boston and provide them with urban off-campus learning, service and recreational opportunities. Both students and faculty often refer to being in “the Wellesley bubble.”

Within this context, activism at Wellesley exists at about the same level as at other smaller schools in our sample. Organized activity during our interview visits focused on women’s issues such as safety, mental health and reproductive rights; the problems of conservatives at an ostensibly liberal school; and questions about organizing beyond Wellesley’s boundaries around the war in Iraq.

Howard University’s main campus sits in inner-city Washington, D.C. It is an anomaly in that it is a private university subsidized by the U.S. Congress. Compared to other private schools in our sample, Howard’s undergraduate physical plant is under-resourced. However, its status among area schools and in the local and national African-American community, as well as its well-developed connections to federal and corporate Washington, provide many opportunities for community-based learning. Over 200 student organizations are registered with the Office of Student Life. Because of its urban location, off-campus activities frequently complement resources on campus.

Although Howard’s political organizations are fewer in number than at most other schools in the sample, its students are not necessarily less involved in activist activities. Because of its location, many students at Howard may participate in off-campus activities that do not get tracked as student activism. Examples from our interviews include a student-initiated professional organization designed to heighten the visibility of Black women in Sociology, and sorority and fraternity service activities designed to further the advancement of Black youth and adults. While it is possible to describe these activities as conventional service work, the presence of African-American young people in leadership roles in these activities makes an implicit statement about African-American empowerment. The email signature of one Howard student includes the following: “Remember, you must be the change you want to see in the world.” A member of Delta Sigma Theta sorority describes the reasons for her service and political involvement: “It’s important to educate your own community, the mainstream. It’s very empowering.”

In most of our sample schools, usually students of color were leaders of organizations for African Americans, Latinos, Asians, or Asian Americans, and women, primarily White, generally maintained positions of leadership in organizations that pertained to women’s experiences. But people of color at Howard and women at Wellesley joined and led all sorts of groups, focusing on issues such as human rights, the environment, foreign policy, LGBT issues, affirmative action, or the war.

Howard is proud of its long list of influential and well-known graduates. The university retains the legacy of Kwame Ture, the Black Power activist formerly known as Stokely Carmichael, who graduated from Howard in 1964. A life-long activist, Carmichael/Ture's enduring reputation among students is symbolized in the 2003 Howard yearbook by two photos, which need no identification for its audience, almost forty years after he left campus. When we interviewed current activists, they often volunteered his name in their answers to questions about the heritage of Howard.

In most of our sample schools, usually students of color were leaders of organizations for African Americans, Latinos, Asians, or Asian Americans, and women, primarily White, generally maintained positions of leadership in organizations that pertained to women's experiences. But people of color at Howard and women at Wellesley joined and led all sorts of groups, focusing on issues such as human rights, the environment, foreign policy, LGBT issues, affirmative action, or the war. While it was possible, of course, for them to be engaged in environmental work, for instance, at other campuses, it was easier to adopt such roles at these two schools because of the implicit expectation that people of color at Howard and women at Wellesley would be leaders across all topic areas.

We were able to learn about another aspect of campus activism by examining African-American fraternities and sororities. Collegiate fraternities and sororities have a long history in the United States. Primarily founded by students for friendship and support, these societies have developed vocational and academic purposes as well. They do not, however, generally carry a reputation of active political engagement. "Greek Life," so named because most societies adopt Greek letters for their names and chapters, has developed into an elaborate system with strong traditions, national offices and coordinating councils, and extensive graduate connections. Most schools assign administrative staff through the Dean of Student's Office to coordinate the relationships between university administrations and student groups. At times these relationships have been stormy, with Greek organizations sparring with their administration over issues such as recruitment and initiation activities, exclusionary membership practices, or behavior at the organizations' sponsored social functions.

While college fraternities and sororities struggle with a reputation of being primarily social

organizations, several of these organizations, especially historically black fraternities and sororities, were founded primarily as service and advocacy groups, both at predominantly White schools where Blacks were denied membership in fraternities and sororities and at HBCUs as a support system for undergraduate students. Chapters of Alpha Kappa Alpha, the oldest Black sorority, for example, exist at most of the schools in our sample. The rich history and legacy of these organizations contributes to an expectation that members perform public service and engage in political activism on behalf of African Americans and others.

Several fraternities and sororities have set themselves apart from negative associations by highlighting their community service activities. Currently, most societies require some service participation of their members. For instance, historically Black Greek Organizations, organized into a National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC), have emphasized their commitment to the advancement of African Americans, to leadership development, and to public service.

While a sorority system does not officially exist at Wellesley, there is a chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha, a NPHC member. At the rest of our larger sample schools, Greek life is thriving, with many examples not only of conventional fraternities and sororities and NPHCs, but of newer, specialized organizations focusing on the needs of Hispanic or Asian students.

The project examined the role of NPHCs in particular in encouraging community service and engaging in political activism. We interviewed members of Delta Sigma Theta and Sigma Gamma Rho sororities and Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity. Leadership in these NPHC groups strongly overlaps with political activism on all our sample campuses with NPHC groups. Two sorority members described their experiences: one as the President of the Black Student Union; the other as someone trained by the USSA (United States Student Association, the main higher education student advocacy group) to be a leader. By comparison, few if any of the White student activists we interviewed were members of a fraternity or sorority. When asked why this was so, interviewees explained that

While college fraternities and sororities struggle with a reputation of being primarily social organizations, several of these organizations, especially historically black fraternities and sororities, were founded primarily as service and advocacy groups.

NPHC societies maintained a deserved reputation for public service and political involvement as a result of their missions.

Students who are already interested in activism may select Greek organizations with such reputations because they expect to engage in service work and activism through these communities. Several students explained their decisions to join these organizations in terms of such shared ideals. Different students saw membership as providing them with “a base” for such work, a venue for affecting “public policy and social change,” and a way to get “involved in some way with everything political on this campus.”

The vast majority of students are not politically active on the campuses we visited. The most common word student leaders used to describe the political climate on campus was “apathy.”

While most Greek organizations are involved with service projects of some kind, NPHCs interpret service as a central component of their mission. The training that NPHC societies provide their undergraduate members prepares them for active participation in philanthropic and political arenas as African-American leaders. Many prominent politicians and civic leaders are graduate members of NPHC affiliates.

Students in NPHC societies tended to see the connections between community service and political activism. “The tension between the two is a battle for all organizations,” said one sorority member. “Leadership is needed at all levels. There is definitely a place for feeding and clothing people and also for challenging poverty. You can’t have one without the other.” And another maintained, “We are *definitely* a politically based organization.”

5. DEBATE IS UNPOPULAR ON CAMPUS.

One impetus for this project was anecdotal evidence of the rise of acrimony on campus among politically active college students. The public considers colleges and universities as key places where ideas are exchanged and debated in our society. Hot topics such as the Middle East, terrorism, reproductive rights, and racism can generate not only intellectual interest but emotional responses resulting in a range of reactions, from personal attacks to incidents of sabotage. We were interested in how these topics “play” to campus audiences, where debate

occurs on campus, and how emotionally engaged such debates become.

In order to address reported levels of heightened political tensions on campus, it might be helpful to take a step back and examine how students, teachers, administrators, and others introduce, discuss, celebrate, and reject ideas in college settings. Common images of higher education suggest places where the free exchange of ideas occurs naturally, in and out of class, including: spontaneous late-night dorm discussions; access to a student press that provides space for diverse opinions; and student debating skills that are honed in both public and informal forums. While the study uncovered descriptions of all these situations in our examination of the eight sample schools, the composite picture that emerged was at once more complex and less easily categorized than these images might suggest.

Data from students in our sample revealed that both conservative and progressive students often did not experience their campuses as places where the free expression of ideas takes place. This finding was reinforced at a December 2003 national convening of student leaders sponsored by the Ford Foundation. Conservatives and progressives presented different frames to describe their experiences. While they both may accuse the administration of over-regulating student speech, whether it be targeted toward an individual or an organization, conservatives consistently focus on the minority, or second-class, status they experience and claim that a lack of intellectual diversity on campus results in discrimination against them. They measure this in several ways—Democratic party contributions or party affiliation of faculty, collected in-class quotes from faculty, documented reaction to conservative events, and incidents of stolen conservative student papers. Progressives, on the other hand, focus on the difficulty in creating and sustaining vibrant discussion on the issues they see as important, because of what they see as apathetic students or disinterested faculty.

Across the board, student activists recognized that their work was difficult. While all of the students interviewed reported that they enjoyed talking about political ideas (“If there was a major in Discussion, I’d be a Discussion Major!” quipped a junior), they felt that most of the students on their campus weren’t interested in politics or causes. Progressive student leaders, including one who lamented that she had been “told this is a progres-

sive and liberal school,” bemoaned the general lack of “a political consciousness” and “great sense of apathy.” Looking back to an earlier time, one student leader said, “I feel like it must have been so much better in the 1970s or in the Civil Rights movement. It’s kind of sad and lame and boring.”

One student identified a key exception to prevailing student apathy: “when someone feels personally attacked or threatened, or they are being denied some freedom or social right. It’s either really loud and crazy or nothing.”

The vast majority of students are not politically active on the campuses we visited. They do not join groups or participate regularly in movement activities. While many groups at our sample schools had impressive email membership lists, as we have noted, most groups were happy to attract 30-40 members to a meeting or event. The most common word student leaders used to describe the political climate on campus was “apathy,” a term that distinguished them from their target audiences (presumably because most of the students they encountered were less politically involved than they were). Across the board, these student leaders had much higher expectations of student political involvement than they were encountering.

Student leaders’ analyses of the lack of political involvement of their peers were insightful and sophisticated. One activist had this to say about most students’ lack of involvement: “They [students] don’t know much about what is going on, so they don’t want to talk about it. Politics is controversial, so they don’t want to offend anybody. When you came with a fact on the war in Iraq, they didn’t know how to respond to it.”

There were attempts on several of the campuses to conduct student-led “teach-ins” to help students become more informed. Unlike the 1960s, though, administrators at Claremont McKenna and Carleton, not students, sponsored college-wide events. Another student observed at her campus (where she felt there were high academic expectations that were stressful for students) that: “People like to argue when they’re on top. We have a lot of very driven people who do not like to be wrong.”

Still another felt there was little encouragement for debate in a post-modern world: “We’re living in the Great After—post-feminist, post-modernist. We are taught to believe in ourselves but not our peers—very individualistic. There has to be some new way to talk to young people now.”

Campus activists in this sample were aware of

how challenging the tasks before them actually were. Successful strategies for engaging students seemed elusive. A traditional approach—individual discussions with the hope of persuading others to see your point of view, and maybe to agree with it—was not popular among the student leaders, even though about a third of them admitted that their own politics had changed since coming to college. **Both conservative and progressive students reported that they were unwilling themselves to engage in political debate.** Some seemed to think that the process of argumentation with someone they disagreed with was a waste of time, since their own views were already set. An experienced organizer explained: “The only people who come to those panels and discussions are members who agree with the views expressed.” As one progressive student asked, “Why would we want to speak to David Horowitz?” Many expressed a disinterest or even disdain for public debate as a way to engage uninvolved students and build support for their positions. Although many student leaders realize that their audience is uninformed and, in some instances, threatened and insecure about political issues, they do not see debate as a means to reach them. “I don’t get into discussions on the West Mall (where student groups set up information tables) very often,” said one student leader, “since it’s not very productive.”

Law students were the one group that welcomed debate. We interviewed two sets of law students from the three universities in our sample with law schools. Since they needed to develop argumentation skills, law students had more interest in staging and attending debates. At Arizona State, the Federalist Society, a conservative law students’ organization, and a student chapter of the progressive National Lawyers Guild readily arranged panels and debates. Each welcomed participation of the other’s members and the law school community. Howard Law School sustains a similar schedule of regular events.

Perhaps the topics most prevalent at the time of our interviews may well have influenced student opinion about the value of political debate. Two major issues overshadowed most other political activity on the campuses we visited in the spring of 2003: the United States began military operations against Iraq on March 20th, and the U.S. Supreme

Both conservative and progressive students reported that they were unwilling themselves to engage in political debate.

Court heard arguments on two University of Michigan affirmative actions cases on April 1st. These issues dominated the media at all levels during our field work. When asked about the hot issues on campus, all students and faculty indicated the war, and most added affirmative action. These are both polarizing topics, associated with high levels of emotion on each side. They require a high level of coalition building among students to mobilize supporters. As a result, groups may have focused their efforts on mobilizing their own supporters rather than on debating their opponents.

We heard repeatedly from the majority of student leaders that they were not interested in debating with others who might not agree with their own positions on issues they considered important. Many preferred to talk with like-minded students who already shared their opinions. When pressed, some of our interviewees admitted that they did not enjoy watching formal debates on campus, especially among students. Further, they did not express particular appreciation of the value of debates in the campaigns they designed. As one student explained: “Our strong opponents don’t want to hear what you say. Their ignorance prevents them from hearing us.” Why do so many students express frustration, hesitation, or actual refusal to engage? How widespread is this reticence, and what factors contribute to its presence?

Strong individual discussion styles that influence campus-wide social norms could account for part of the widespread reserve around debate and discussion among people who disagree. Carol Trosset, an anthropologist at Grinnell College, has studied student discussion styles related to the difficult and controversial issues of diversity.⁵² While her research is focused on discussions across difference based on a cross-section of students’ attitudes towards race, gender and sexuality, her conclusions may prove useful in an examination of the efficacy of student activists’ conversations across political difference.

Trosset observes that the students she studied believed that talking about difference was a good idea. Almost everyone wanted to talk about issues they felt strongly about. The purpose of such discussion, according to the vast majority of students in her studies, was to advocate for one’s position, to express one’s views, and to persuade or educate others. But most students did not want to discuss topics about which they were undecided or uninformed. Only about 2% of her sample saw discus-

sion as a way to explore their own and others’ ideas. Such a skewed set of attitudes, with most students adopting an advocacy model of discussion over an exploratory one, Trosset suggests, may be “one reason why productive class discussions can become difficult to produce.”⁵³ This may be true for informal discussions as well.

There was wide disagreement on what a good discussion looked like. Some enjoyed a raucous debate; others assiduously sought common ground or refused to engage at all if there were the possibility of disagreement. The student leaders we observed expressed the full range of opinions about when and why to engage in discussion across political difference.

Trosset distinguishes four expectation types for discussions across difference and when these types might feel silenced:

- Protected types want to go unchallenged, and they feel silenced either by a genuine challenge or by the threat of one, often in the form of the presence of an authority on the subject;
- Consensus types want empathy, so they feel silenced when someone disagrees or doesn’t understand them;
- Restrained types want civility. They’re hard to silence because they usually don’t want to talk, but they generally withdraw when others start shouting;
- Competitive types are also hard to silence, but telling them they aren’t allowed to express disagreement can do it. We can...infer their definition of tolerance—the freedom to compete.⁵⁴

In the community she studied, Grinnell students, Trosset found that about one-third of her sample could be classified as Protected, 25% each as Consensus and Restrained, and 15% as Competitive. Our interviews revealed a similar set of attitudes among student activists in terms of their preferences in formal and informal, or non-moderated, discussions, with some interesting cultural differences between conservative and progressive students.

How does such a model help to explain what we observed at our eight sample schools? First, there appear to be distinct preferences in discussion styles among conservative and progressive activists and between activists and uninvolved students. While this area requires further study, we can suggest in quite broad terms that activists, whether con-

servative or progressive, view discussion and debate as opportunities to advocate for their own political perspectives, not usually as a chance to clarify or refine their positions.

Unaffiliated students, on the other hand, did not relish engaging in discussions with activist organizers. A typical strategy of activist groups, especially at larger schools, involves setting up an information table set up at a location with heavy student pedestrian traffic. Groups often used tactics such as waving an American flag, covering their mouths in duct tape to symbolize being silenced, or offering free food as ways to attract attention and to distinguish themselves from other organizations. Despite these lures, we observed that most passers-by chose not to engage in substantive discussion with activist representatives unless the forum was so provocative that it triggered a response. Activists themselves often explained that their goal in “tabling” was more to identify new supporters and to give their point of view some visibility than to persuade people who might disagree with them to change their minds.

Unengaged students hold definite opinions about why they choose not to be involved with high-energy activists. They judge both conservative and progressive activists as intrusive, sometimes excessively so, in expressing their political views and recruiting new members. A faculty member observed, “I’ve heard bystanders taunt activists, saying, ‘Get a life!’ or labeling them hippies.” The style of message delivery can eclipse the ideas themselves.

Conservative campus organizations have developed a consistent style across campuses, one that could be classified as competitive, according to Trosset’s typology. Conservative adherents to this style insist that they are interested in challenging the status quo as they define it, pointing out the limitations of a campus culture in which conservative viewpoints are underrepresented, and encouraging discussion on the lack of range of opinions on campuses. Plentiful examples exist in the conservative student press.⁵⁵ But the competitive style of interaction, which assertively presents its position and aggressively invites response, is only popular with a small minority of students. When conservative campus activists use this discourse style to challenge other students to respond, and most refuse, conservative groups have described this lack of engagement as further evidence of the disrespect granted their views on campus. This style, originally devel-

oped by the *Dartmouth Review*, the conservative campus paper founded in 1980, is still championed by one of its founders, Dinesh D’Souza. It has successfully served as a model for most of the current conservative student press. It is marked by the liberal use of sarcasm, parody, and iconoclasm. Its ability to change students’ minds, to persuade them to develop a conservative ideology, or to join a conservative group, however, remains unclear.

Some centrist students criticized activists’ styles for being “overzealous,” and they reported that they tended to avoid political conversations with campus activists. Describing a typical encounter, one centrist student spoke about how “on any given day, if you walk through the Campus Center, different organizations are hawking something in your face, and I’m just trying to cut across!” For this student, “It’s really hard when people are that forceful about stuff, and I think that’s a real turn-off sometimes.” Other students told us about feeling “really intimidated” and “overwhelmed” by people who are “very adamant” about their beliefs.

Clearly, for these students, the competitive approach that Trosset describes doesn’t work. As one suggested, “I have noticed that if you can figure out another way to convey your message besides throwing flyers at people and screaming at them to come over, and making them feel uncomfortable, you have more people attracted.”

Even informal discussion across political difference can be a challenge. The College Republicans of Illinois State decided to invite their Democratic counterparts to a bowling and pizza party as a way to get to know one another better. The event took place, but socially it was awkward and politically it went nowhere, according to the conservative hosts. “We didn’t understand why they didn’t want to talk with us. It was a bust.”

Progressive student groups, certainly more numerous and organized around many more specific issues than conservatives, displayed a range of stylistic preferences in their activities at our sample schools. No one style dominated across all groups; individual groups appeared to develop their own cultures. Some groups, including some organized

We heard repeatedly from the majority of student leaders that they were not interested in debating with others who might not agree with their own positions on issues they considered important. Many preferred to talk with like-minded students who already shared their opinions.

around women's, people of color, and/or LGBT issues, preferred not to be challenged and claimed that their personal experience deserved recognition on its face value, an example of a "Protected" style of discourse. Others, cross-issue coalitions, for instance, placed a high value on process, consensus-building and non-hierarchical structures. Smaller numbers of groups preferred to engage in discussions only if structured to encourage civility and a balanced presentation—the "Restrained" type—and a few chose a more "Competitive" provocative model, favoring activities that challenge the rules.

6. USING RESOURCES, MENTORS AND INCENTIVES, NATIONAL POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS SUCCESSFULLY INFLUENCE CAMPUS GROUPS.

One of our original project goals was to learn more about the relationships between national organizations and campus-based student groups. What are the ways these relationships develop and what effect do they have on campus organizing? **We saw very little evidence of national organizations physically coming to campus to recruit members.** Perhaps this might be a result of college administrators' efforts to limit such groups' access to students. For instance, at Howard, our interviewees were aware that both supporters of Lyndon LaRouche, right-wing ideologue and political movement leader, and the national College Republicans had approached students on campus, only to be asked to leave by the administration. Most schools have policies that govern the presence of non-student organizations on campus, requiring they be hosted by a registered student group or someone else affiliated with the school. In the fall of 2003, a former student member of the College Republicans at Arizona State allegedly falsified his affiliation with the group in order to reserve a room and host Daniel Pipes, the Director of the conservative Middle East Forum.⁵⁶ Outside political groups have had to develop different ways of finding entry points and attracting student interest.

Although both conservative and progressive national organizations made themselves known on campus at all of our sample schools, they do so in different ways. One method is to create campus affiliates. The state-level Republican and Democratic Parties, for example, affiliate with chap-

ters of the College Republicans and Democrats and often offer substantial responsibility to students in various aspects of state campaigns. The history of these groups is instructive and similar, since they were both created to mobilize foot soldiers for political campaigns and have been on campuses for more than a century.

A second approach for many issue-specific groups is to create a campus affiliate program that represents a wide range of political views. Examples of national organizations that actively create or nurture campus groups focused on women's issues, for example, are progressive groups such as: Choice USA, the Feminist Majority, National Women's Studies Association, and Planned Parenthood; and conservative ones such as the Eagle Forum Collegians, the Independent Women's Forum (IWF), and the National Right to Life Committee.

Another model is used by the Public Interest Research Groups, or PIRGs. The national structure depends on a state affiliate system. Where state affiliates exist, there are active campus groups in our sample schools. PIRGs have a unique history of success in building automatic contributions to their state groups through student activities fees on campus. This has become a focus of counter-organizing by conservatives, who argue that this is, in practice, a tax to support partisan efforts, because the PIRGS advocate liberal and progressive causes. On some campuses, the debate over student fees being used for political purposes reemerges every year through the persistent efforts of conservative challenges.

A fourth approach used by off-campus groups is to tour campuses with a traveling show that is sponsored by local student groups. The ACLU, International Women's Forum, and Accuracy in Academia have all used this method of creating visibility and jumpstarting organizing. These tours are offered as a free resource for campus organizers.

Yet another cost-effective approach for national groups is organizing through the web. Websites such as www.frontpage.org and www.noindoctrination.org promote movement activity primarily through cyberspace. Alternately, progressive websites are usually associated with actual national organizations, such as the www.transafricaforum.org.

There is a trend among conservative adult-led organizations to create a program of student development that relies on a system of individual merit promotions and selective incentives, similar to a business model of competitive performance rewards. For instance, the Young America's

Foundation assigns points to individual students who conduct activities on their campuses, with students being able to redeem these points for opportunities to travel to training sites. Progressive organizations tend instead to rely on a less tangible system of collective incentives related to a sense of accomplishment or empowerment.

Both progressive and conservative organizations have made their presence known on campus through student representatives that affiliate with the national group in some way, such as by having been a summer intern or fellow. Students returning to campus after such experiences can provide a strong connection for the national group, an issue we will discuss in our later discussion of internships.

The model most visibly used by conservative national organizations, however, differs from the above in some noteworthy ways. **Conservatives have built a training infrastructure for new conservative leaders that has no counterpart on the Left.** The Young America's Foundation (YAF), and Morton Blackwell's Leadership Institute, both located in the Washington, D.C. area, and the Wilmington, Delaware-based Intercollegiate Studies Institute (ISI), are premier examples of national conservative groups whose major focus is on conferences and institutes that train students in conservative frames and offer concrete skills-building in organizing on campus. Along with the Collegiate Network, an affiliate of ISI, that supports conservative campus newspapers, these organizations reach thousands of students every year with a generic conservative organizing message: even when you are in the minority, you can be effective.

The national conservative groups that work with college students seek to decrease the influence of progressive activism and ideology on campus. They have a history of providing intellectual leadership, reading lists and published materials, targeted summer training, traveling speakers, and the lure of conferences where conservative students do not feel in the minority—all with the hope of sending students back to campus with frames, ideologies and strategies to counteract progressive influence. **Training opportunities for progressive students are not part of a coordinated strategy. Compared with those of their conservative counterparts, however, they are more numerous, less centralized, more likely to be issue-specific, and less visible in the national media.** But many more events scheduled by progressive groups, both nationally and regionally, offer skills-building for large numbers of campus

activists. Quite often these events are student- and volunteer-run, disbursed throughout the country, and focus on the practicalities of organizing specific campaigns. Groups such as the National Lawyer's Guild Student Chapter, United Students Against Sweatshops, the Student Ecumenical Partnership, the United States Student Association, and the College Democrats of America host annual student-run events to set their agendas.

The goal of conservative groups like YAF, ISI, the Clare Booth Luce Policy Institute, and the Leadership Institute is not primarily to mount campus campaigns, but to identify and train future conservative leaders. This distinguishes them from progressive training networks that are almost always focused on current organizing projects. While conservative student leaders appeared to focus their efforts on campaigns specific to their schools, they worked toward being recognized and rewarded with additional training and leadership opportunities beyond the campus gates. As one African-American student described the College Republican organization: "When you're Black, they move you up fast." National progressive organizations, on the other hand, seemed to offer student leaders learning opportunities because of the need for immediate political tasks to get done and the availability of college students as a pool of available labor. Whereas conservative students were clearly conscious of a structure that rewards campus activism, progressive students did not seem to sense that they were being groomed for leadership.

Although the relationship between national organizations and student groups that share their agendas is complex and worthy of more examination than this project allows, some key patterns are apparent. Several national groups, organized and run by non-students or recent graduates, such as VOX, Choice USA and Students for Life, have recognized the value of lending support to student groups. Targeting students is a priority for some issue-based national or regional organizations because of their recognition that their student base is slipping, as in the case of reproductive rights advocates. Other national organizations recognize the need for consistent cultivation through the college years to retain a loyal base or to grow, such as

Although both conservative and progressive national organizations made themselves known on campus at all of our sample schools, they do so in different ways.

the College Republican National Committee, and Jewish organizations like Texans for Israel, which is supported by two conservative national organizations with student leadership programs, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) and Young Judeans of Hadassah. Students may also be targeted for other reasons, such as: developing conservative student leadership skills (e.g., Leadership Institute, Young Americans for Freedom); promoting a particular ideology (e.g., Intercollegiate Studies Institute); or activist work on and off campus around specific issues related to a profession (the Federalist Society and National Lawyers Guild chapters).

challenges decisions made by higher education administrators around “politically correct” curriculum content and politicized tenure decisions. We found no evidence of anything comparable from progressive alumnae/i. Based on our sample, there was no evidence of progressive student activism being orchestrated directly by alumnae/i or trustee groups.

We asked everyone in our sample about the political impact of alumnae/i groups. Very few students, faculty, or staff could identify an instance of alumnae/i influence at their schools. “They raise money and try to use their influence for football tickets,” was a typical response. One faculty member remembered an isolated alumna who contributed discretionary funds to support a particular point of view, through guest speakers. But schools generally discourage alumnae/i from giving financial support to a particular student group. At Tufts University, a school outside our sample, an alumnae/i group disagreed with a student’s political conduct in 2003 and withdrew its approval of an award.⁵⁷

Certain student-led groups, usually national organizations with local campus-based affiliates, tend to target individual campuses and a coalition of campuses nationally in order to build a student movement. Student-focused groups run by adults fall into two camps based on the mission of the group. One type hopes to add a student component that will support its already established agenda. Many progressive groups with student affiliates, such as Planned Parenthood, fall into this category. Most of the young conservative and progressive alumnae/i-run groups target campuses to affect campus policy and run programs to support local student organizational development, usually with contacts with the national networks of student-led organizations. The existence on campuses of more progressive than conservative groups results in a more extensive network of interconnected national progressive organizations, even though a few national conservative groups are more visible to the public.

Training opportunities for progressive students are not part of a coordinated strategy. Compared with those of their conservative counterparts, however, they are more numerous, less centralized, more likely to be issue-specific, and less visible in the national media.

In addition, some organizations that were specifically designed to support student issues are run by students or recent graduates, such as: United States Student Association, College Republicans and Democrats, Campus Greens, United Students Against Sweatshops, National Campus Antiwar Network, the Student Sierra Club, and the National Lawyer’s Guild Student Chapters. These seek to sustain organizational momentum for student groups, to capitalize on the skills developed by leaders while they were students, and to take advantage of the graduates’ youth when they relate to college students

who are only slightly younger than they are.

There are non-student groups associated with higher education that seek to influence public opinion and higher education policy. These include conservative groups such as the National Association of Scholars, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA); moderate organizations such as the American Association of Colleges and Universities; and more progressive groups such as the American Association of University Women and the American Association of University Professors.

The American Council of Trustees and Alumni, a national organization of conservative scholars and politicians, does not organize directly on campus. Rather, its target audience is composed of individual alumni and donors, trustees, and state leaders. Its goal is to reinforce the notion that universities are not accountable enough to high standards of academic freedom and accountability. It thereby

7. A “LEADERSHIP PIPELINE” EXISTS ON BOTH THE LEFT AND THE RIGHT.

Conservative and progressive movements want to recruit young people into positions of potential leadership, both to sustain their organizational structures and to identify leaders who can appeal to young adults. What are the mechanisms that have produced national conservative figures such as Karl Rove, Dinesh D’Souza, and Ann Coulter? Who are their progressive counterparts? We researched differences in how conservative and progressive campus movements define leadership, where the organizations of today find their young talent, and how campus activists who are eager to work in movement jobs after graduation find employment.

From surveying the main websites of conservative and progressive groups, we might easily conclude that conservatives are more active on campus than progressives. The websites of many of the major conservative groups, including the Independent Women’s Forum, Focus on the Family, and the Eagle Forum, have direct links to their campus-focused divisions. On the websites of major progressive groups, however, it was often so difficult to find information relevant to progressive college students that we were forced to look more carefully at each site. In addition, we quickly found several prominent conservative organizations specifically focused on campus politics, including the Young America’s Foundation, the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, and the Collegiate Network, ISI’s affiliate.

More difficult to find and seemingly less comprehensive from descriptions, there are many programs intended to develop political leadership among progressive students. Examples of national progressive organizations with as strong a commitment to college campuses as some of the conservative groups were the Feminist Majority Foundation, which has extensive resources for its Feminist Campus program online, and the Sierra Club, whose Sierra Student Coalition has its own website. **After extensive Internet research, though, we found that progressive programs were approximately equal in number, if not greater than, conservative programs.** The list we came up with included 15 conservative educational/training programs, including conferences and seminars, and 15 progressive educational/training programs. In addition, we researched 20 conservative and 29 progressive

internship programs among the many regional and national organizations that have internship programs.

Educational/Training Programs

Of the educational and training programs, we were able to speak with participants or organizers for two events, both student conferences. One was sponsored by the conservative Young America’s Foundation (YAF), and the other was organized by the progressive Student Environmental Action Coalition. At the Young America’s Foundation’s 25th Annual National Conservative Student Conference (NCSC) in 2003, we conducted two in-person interviews with YAF staff involved in organizing the conference and two in-person interviews with students who attended the conference. In addition, we spoke informally with approximately five other students at the conference without taking notes; one student who attended the conference emailed responses to our questions.

The Young America’s Foundation describes itself as the “principal outreach organization of the conservative movement.”⁵⁸ Its national summer conference is its largest outreach event. Over the course of their week in DC in 2003, 187 young conservatives heard about 30 hours of speeches by major conservative figures, culminating in an appearance by conservative writer Ann Coulter. The conference’s goals, according to its organizer, were to educate students on conservative issues (something she said the students do not get on college campuses) and to create a “network of like-minded individuals.”

The conference format used a traditional pedagogical approach, with a series of speakers addressing the entire group. Formal interaction in the sessions was limited to questions directed to the speakers. Attendees across the board expressed enthusiasm for the opportunity to be present. The students we talked to saw both of these aspects of the conference as valuable. Both students and speakers at the conference repeatedly referred to a phenomenon that Kathryn Lopez of the *National Review* called the “campus liberal orthodoxy,” and complained that they did not feel comfortable talking about their conservative beliefs on campus. Thus, they were happy to be in an environment in which they felt they could discuss politics without being attacked. They also asserted repeatedly that there was no party line at the conference, which represented conservative views from libertarianism to Christian

conservatism.

The conference's purpose, however, was not solely educational. While the conference organizer made it clear that YAF does not try to create political leaders at the NCSC, the event served as a stepping stone for many young conservatives to become actively involved in conservative political activism. All of the students we spoke with talked about networking at the conference with other students and with representatives of nonprofits and lobbying groups. One, for example, said she got an internship with Oliver North because she had met him at the conference the previous year. At a panel discussion including three "graduates" of the NCSC, each of the panelists said people they had met and information they had received at the conference allowed them to become more involved in the conservative movement. Jim Graham, now executive director of the Texas Right to Life Committee, said of the conference, "I think the most important thing I realized is that...there are people who change the world...and I can be one of them." Kathryn Lopez, an NCSC alumna, who went on to intern at

the Heritage Foundation, said she would not have known about Heritage without the NCSC. Similarly, a current law student at Harvard University said the conference "connected [her] with the conservative movement," and spoke of using attendance at the conference as a credential with conservative organizations. Thus, through a combination of educational events featuring celebrity speakers and networking opportunities, the YAF's National Conservative Student Conference contributes significantly to the development of conservative leaders.

We were unable to find a progressive equivalent to the YAF National Conservative Student Conference, which led us to conclude that no centralized progressive training program exists. Although there are numerous programs offering training for campus organizers from groups such as the AFL-CIO's Union Summer, Feminist Majority Foundation, Sierra Student Coalition, and the Student Environmental Action Coalition, these programs tend to be more narrowly focused on specific issue areas, rather than offering a general training on progressive organizing. These organizer trainings, which last just a few days, are generally

shorter than YAF's conference, do not bring in celebrity speakers, and are focused on organization-building rather than discussing political ideas. And while there is one program, the Century Institute (run by the Century Foundation, a progressive think tank), that offers a more theoretical introduction to general progressive ideas, it serves only around thirty students a year. This lack of commitment to ideological training weakens progressive leadership development in important ways. Leaders become known by their issues alone, and little cross-issue work emerges.

Internships

We conducted interviews with nine internship coordinators from five progressive and four conservative organizations: four by email, four over the phone, and one in person. We interviewed seven interns by email and one by telephone; four of them had interned at two conservative organizations, and the other four had interned at three progressive organizations. The internship programs we studied varied widely in size, from small programs with just two to three interns at a time to large programs like the conservative Family Research Council's Witherspoon Fellows Program, which has fourteen interns at a time and includes an extensive educational component. We were unable to secure cooperation to speak with interns or internship coordinators at the two largest internship programs we found in our search, the conservative Heritage Foundation (fifty summer interns) and the libertarian Cato Institute.⁵⁹

The conservative and progressive internship coordinators generally described the goals of their internship programs in similar terms, saying that they hoped to get assistance with their work from the interns and to provide them with experience in the policy world. Several of the coordinators (both progressive and conservative) felt that both the interns and their organizations benefited from the degree to which interns were allowed to do serious work and were integrated into the day-to-day organizational operations. Several also mentioned that they had problems advertising their internship programs and would like to be able to publicize the internships more widely. At the organizations we studied, internship programs often served as points of entry for jobs after graduation, in spite of the small number of full-time staff at such organizations. This seemed to be true more often for conservative organizations.

We were unable to find a progressive equivalent to the YAF National Conservative Student Conference, which led us to conclude that no centralized progressive training program exists.

We were unable to find a progressive equivalent to the YAF National Conservative Student Conference, which led us to conclude that no centralized progressive training program exists.

All of the interns who responded seemed very happy with their internships. This response was probably related in part to students having applied to specific organizations and to their self-selection, since those who responded may have been more likely to be happy with their internships. The interns we talked with had varying levels of pre-internship political activism on their respective campuses. Some had not been involved in any political groups, whereas others had been leaders in college political organizations and had volunteered for local campaigns. **Nearly all, though, regardless of pre-internship political experience, said that their internships had affected their plans for future involvement in activism.** For some, that meant considering going into grassroots organizing directly after college. For others, participation in an internship program broadened their view of politics and allowed them to integrate political views into their daily lives. In the words of one intern, “It’s not really my career plans that have been changed as much as my idea of politics, my attitude towards activism, and my genuine desire to make a difference.” All of the interns seemed to think that the internships would affect their activism on campus: they planned to be more active in groups, and felt that they had gained skills to make their activism more effective. As one intern said, “I know that I will take back new skills, resources, and a greater passion to help advance the mission of our [Young America’s Foundation] student group.”

Those interns who did plan careers in the political world (whether or not those plans were made before or after their internships), clearly saw the internships as stepping stones to future jobs. One intern was preparing to go directly from her internship into a job at the same organization. While this direct step from internship to job is relatively rare given the small staff size of most progressive nonprofit organizations, political internships give interns unusual opportunities to meet political and nonprofit leaders who might help them get jobs after graduation. In addition, interns often do the same kinds of work as staff members, and thus gain an edge in experience over other job applicants. Many of the interns expressed surprise at the level of responsibility they received in their organizations. **Interns generally cited these two aspects of political internships—networking and job experience—as the most valuable features of the programs.** At the Young America’s Foundation’s National Conservative Student Conference, a panel

of three ‘graduates’ of the conference called internships “essential” for students interested in working in politics.

So, then, who wins the leadership-development race? The conventional wisdom is that conservatives are putting more resources than progressives into campus activism and programs that develop campus leadership. Our study suggests, however, that the picture is somewhat more complicated. **Because conservative and progressive groups approach leadership development in very different ways, it is difficult to directly compare their programs.** From the information we gathered, it is not possible to assess the relative *effectiveness* of conservative and progressive groups’ respective programs to develop campus leaders. However, we can suggest some ways in which these programs and recruitment efforts seem to differ.

The Internet is now the dominant recruitment tool for programs of the kind we studied, and, as noted earlier, it was much easier to find information about campus-oriented programs on conservative sites than on progressive ones. This may be due in part to the importance of college campuses to conservative cultural discourse. Conservative organizations from the Young America’s Foundation to the Eagle Forum describe college campuses as hotbeds of liberal or “politically correct” activism, places where conservative ideas simply are not welcome. YAF president Ron Robinson, for example, spoke of a “pattern of viciousness” aimed at outspoken campus conservatives; he maintained that the “campus establishment is either afraid of or hostile to conservative ideas.” Conservative political organizations, such as Accuracy in Academia, ACTA, or the Center for the Study of Popular Culture devote considerable effort to studying and publicizing their claim of liberal bias in academia. Since conservatives see college campuses as sites of liberal indoctrination, they put a great deal of energy into making Internet and other resources for campus conservatives accessible.

Conservative sites also make various kinds of appeals and use different kinds of language in attempting to attract students (although we cannot

So, then, who wins the leadership-development race? The conventional wisdom is that conservatives are putting more resources than progressives into campus activism and programs that develop campus leadership. Our study suggests, however, that the picture is somewhat more complicated.

tell from our study whether these appeals translate into programmatic differences). Conservative sites make proclamations like “IWF [Independent Women’s Forum] is taking back the campus,” and try to appeal to the individual frustrations of conservative students. The Eagle Forum Collegians website, for example, asks students:

- *Are you tired of student fees being used to promote liberal causes?*
- *Are you concerned about the blatant advocacy of radical leftist ideas in your classroom?*
- *Are you being pressured by the politically correct agenda on campus?*

The Independent Women’s Forum similarly appeals to conservative students’ frustrations, saying its campus project offers “information, guidance, and support for students inundated with rigid political correctness.”

In contrast to these general appeals to frustration about perceived hostility on the part of the campus establishment, progressive groups’ student programs tended to assume that students accessing the site were already solidly in the progressive activist camp, and focused more on networking and organization-building. Almost every campus progressive organization featured “networking” ideas prominently on its site; Feminist Campus (www.feminist-campus.org), for example, had a message board for student activists to network and post event ideas, while JustAct (www.justact.org) talked about “building a national grassroots youth network.” The one progressive organization that used a personal, emotional appeal to students as a recruitment technique was Planned Parenthood’s ‘Vox’ campus outreach group:

- *What would you do if you knew that anti-choice politicians fight to deny women and men access to...information and services?*
- *What would you do if you knew that anti-choice organizations spend millions of dollars on campuses each year to limit access to reproductive health programs and to keep college students in the dark about sexuality? What if they were on your campus and tried to limit your access?*
- *You’d want to protect the services and information that you and your friends rely on, and Vox: Voices for Planned Parenthood is the way to do that.*

The final major difference between conservative and progressive organizations’ campus recruit-

ment efforts is more programmatic. **Conservative organizations focus on stars, while progressive groups focus on organizers.** Groups like the YAF help campus conservative groups pay for conservative luminaries like author Ann Coulter and humorist Ben Stein to come to campus. The Student Environmental Action Coalition, the only progressive speakers bureau program we found, helps students get in touch with student organizers who live close enough to speak at their campuses relatively cheaply.

The conservative focus on ‘stars’ is not limited to speakers: conservative organizations also seem more interested in creating future star leaders than do progressive organizations. Jeff Nelson, Vice President for Publications for the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, identified a unique characteristic of the conservative movement: “I think one of the principal, even signal, features of the conservative movement is its overriding concern for nurturing young people.”⁶⁰

The Young America’s Foundation, for example, has a “Club 100” program, which gives students rewards for bringing speakers to campus and hosting other events. The top Club 100 point earners win a trip to the Reagan Ranch, now used as an education and training center by the YAF. In the words of YAF president Ron Robinson, conservative groups focus on creating strong leaders because they “don’t need a majority of activists.” Conservatives know that college students are more liberal than the population at large, but, with well-funded, well-organized campus groups, conservatives can make as much of a splash as more widely popular progressive groups.

The Path to Movement Work

We also solicited retrospective information from young staff people at movement organizations to learn more about the paths they took to reach their current positions. We contacted 29 organizations and received 16 responses.

Young staffers describe their work primarily in terms of career development, not movement building. There were no distinctions between staffers working at conservative or progressive organizations on this issue. Almost all the young staffers had been active in social or political movement organizations in college, and 100% felt positively about working in a movement position. Although some of the job descriptions were clerical or administrative —not the coveted policy analyst or media jobs—

staffers across the board were pleased with their situations. Even more surprising still was the consistency of response to a question like: How well does this job fit with what you want to do with your life? All of the respondents described their satisfaction with their jobs in terms of personal career development, with only one respondent articulating a desire to contribute to a larger movement.

The process of landing a job in a competitive market during an economic downturn seems to be very similar for both progressives and conservative young graduates. Everyone in our sample acknowledged the crucial role networking plays in landing a job. One student leader was quick to point out that, while networking was “instrumental” in getting a job, “I was not given the job because my contact knew me. I was given the job because my contact knew my work and my writing.” Another took a step further back to speak about how, even before using her network to apply for—and get—a job, networking had been “the foundation of gaining the skills and background necessary to secure [her] current job.” Respondents mentioned interning, meeting key players, getting entry-level positions, attending conferences, and using the Internet as part of the networking process.

When pressed about the role of college career service offices, almost all respondents indicated that they either did not use the service or did not find it as useful as individualized networking and web searching. Progressive students often mentioned a website for progressive jobseekers, www.idealists.org, as a valuable resource; conservative respondents did not mention a single job listing service for conservatives. Not one student from our on-site interviews, in response to a specific question about national organizations, mentioned that they noticed a presence of recruiters from outside organizations on campus. And no one expressed the expectation that they could get either a progressive or a conservative movement job by going through their career services office. This was true even at schools in our sample with extremely pro-active career services staffs.

Although there are probably more progressive job openings available, because of the dispersed nature of the progressive movement, more centralized resources exist for conservative students to use to further their activist careers. At times like these, when a Republican is in the White House, or in any state with a Republican governor, conservative graduates clearly have more opportunities to work near the seats of power; the Republican Party structure

quickly funnels promising young leaders into positions of responsibility. Conservative students mentioned more often than progressive students traditional avenues of networking, like working as an intern on Capitol Hill or volunteering on an election campaign. Progressive students described similar opportunities to network, but they benefited from www.idealists.org, that has no counterpart on the Right. Conservative students often described their devotion to hard work and the willingness to go the extra mile as indicators of their commitment to movement work: “It’s hard to find people like me who will sacrifice for the group—take a day off and maybe impact their grades.” While not expressed explicitly, some conservative students may hold the expectation that these qualities are desirable traits in the competitive job market.

8. CENTRIST STUDENTS ARE NOT ACTIVELY RECRUITED BY EITHER CONSERVATIVES OR PROGRESSIVES.

In addition to learning more about the two major competing social movements, we were very interested in what we call “centrist activism,” group activity that cannot be classified as either progressive or conservative. Low voter turnout among young people has raised questions about their levels of civic engagement. Without an actively engaged electorate, democracies weaken. Various groups have approached the challenge of how to increase civic engagement by broadening the types of activities that help strengthen democracy to include community involvement on a number of levels, and by encouraging young people to become involved in such activities.

Civic engagement among students, or the active participation of students in political and social systems, has generated considerable attention. Examples of these activities are Get Out the Vote campaigns, community service or service learning programs. We wondered how these activities relate to social and political movements on campus. Do student activists see these non-partisan

The Young America’s Foundation, for example, has a “Club 100” program, which gives students rewards for bringing speakers to campus and hosting other events. The top Club 100 point earners win a trip to the Reagan Ranch, now used as an education and training center by the YAF.

activities as political?

While relatively few students are engaged in what we have been calling conservative or progressive activism, many more are actively involved in volunteer activities on campus. These include community service activities, with either individuals or groups of students providing direct service help to those in need or fundraising for charities. Community service is popular, with over 60% of college students reporting that they do some form of volunteer service.⁶¹

Service learning, a type of community service that couples more formal educational programs with service work, is also now a common feature of campus life. Usually service learning is associated with academic courses. Most colleges in our sample

support faculty who wish to incorporate service learning into their classes through on-campus centers for learning and teaching. Campus Compact, a coalition of hundreds of colleges and universities, has been the driving force for increasing civic engagement of students through community service and service learning. Many campus groups organized for social, non-political, reasons, such as sororities and fraternities, identity groups, and religious organizations, engage in collective service work.

Among the student activists we interviewed, several were involved in community service work, some in leadership roles. They organized collective action, such as fundrais-

ers, playground cleanups, housing construction, or food and toy drives. Some had participated in courses that linked community service with course work on the social forces that affected the population they were serving. All the schools sampled had administrative structures that supported student involvement of this sort, some with on-campus offices with paid staff who served as clearinghouses for information about service opportunities. The student leaders were therefore familiar with the concept of community service.

A growing trend is to define community service as political, in part because key students who engage in this activity describe their participation as such. At a 2001 summit of college students on civic engagement, students talked about making differ-

ent ways of participating in a democracy more legitimate. They defined a new mode of participation, “service politics,” one that characterized service to the community as inherently “political” because it could contribute to social change. As one student leader said, “Service politics connects individual acts of service to a broader framework of systemic social change. This may lead to institutional transformation as campuses, government, and public policy become more responsive, public-spirited, and citizen-centered.”⁶² Echoing some of the student leaders interviewed in this study, students who participate in civic engagement activities describe their work as political because they see that activism comes in many forms. To them, non-partisan, non-electoral involvement that tries to respond to community needs can certainly be political. While much of this kind of activity occurs in group settings, students tend to define their participation individually rather than collectively, and not as part of a larger social movement.

When asked if community service was a form of political activism, student leaders of activist groups provided thoughtful answers. **They considered it potentially, but not inherently, political. Most saw both sides to the question.** Students variably saw it as “faith-based and charitable”; as needing “a context of social change to be political”; and as having “a lot to do with politics since it’s organizing on a small scale and helping to gain power for your community.” Focusing on the individuals, not the acts themselves, one student viewed those doing community service as not having “ever made the connection between social justice and volunteerism.”

Another student offered an extended analysis of community service:

I think it has to be taken as political activism. These initiatives [service learning] are designed to empower the community at large, and if you define politics as power relations, any time you empower a segment of society, that must be taken as political. You’re localizing people’s abilities to make decisions, to act in their own interests, and to improve the quality of their life, which is generally the aim of what we call politics—distributing resources, implementing policies. When you think about political activism, you think marches and signs and cheers and stuff. But I think connecting the academic

Although there are probably more progressive job openings available, because of the dispersed nature of the progressive movement, more centralized resources exist for conservative students to use to further their activist careers.

community to the community, to civic issues, could be called political activism.

Community service may provide greater potential for individual political development than for community change. This view is echoed by a main-line Protestant university chaplain who helps organize off-site community service projects, alternative spring breaks in urban and deep South locations. According to him, such programs tend to attract students who want a dose of reality and a way to “break out of the bubble here.” As the chaplain said:

Some students have that deep sense of what it means to be altruistic or to give to others that comes from their own philosophy or their own religious background. Others don't—more and more don't. They don't have a clear sense of political or religious identity especially in the early years of college....I don't think most students realize how privileged they are here....And so a lot of these kinds of programs of outreach, combined with teaching and service learning, give people initial exposure to experiences they wouldn't ordinarily have and to make some tentative commitments they might make later more solidly....[The experience] really challenges people emotionally and morally, I think, in lots of ways....I don't think we take people all the way to “how do I vote” or “what should the issues be.” But it's a first or second step for most folks—they realize “there are issues I wasn't looking at.” We are doing the preparatory groundwork for later political participation.

One student also recognized some of the inherent challenges of service learning:

My friends who have taken this, they are aware of this notion of what your rights are and as far as imposing your new-found knowledge and your role and your vision on someone's life. A lot of these programs study what it is to be doing work with a community, in cooperation with, instead of descending out of a space ship with tie dyes and whatever into rural Virginia and saying, “This is what you need to do.” That's the dilemma of these courses.

Many students who engage in community service see themselves as individual contributors to worthwhile causes, responding to unmet needs, “getting something done,” and benefiting personally from the experience. They do not appear to view their work as part of a social movement or as explicitly political. Some centrist students we interviewed were uncomfortable with thinking of their work as political, and even shied away from students on their campus who organize conservative and progressive political activities.

In our study, most student activists did not necessarily see participants in community service as potential recruits to their organizations or as specific groups to target for education. Perhaps they thought that many practitioners of community service did not see themselves as political. This disconnection between student activist leaders (who are few in number) and students who perform community service (the majority of students on campus) is an area that deserves further examination.

While relatively few students are engaged in what we have been calling conservative or progressive activism, many more are actively involved in volunteer activities on campus.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Study

Preliminary findings suggest several conclusions, and each suggests questions for further research.

While evidence of political activism on campus is widespread, both in terms of geography, type of school, and ideology, most students remain uninvolved, despite heroic efforts by student organizers. Activism is alive and well on campuses across the country, but most students do not participate. Although student activists work hard mobilizing and organizing their communities, active membership in political organizations is small. Progressive student organizations outnumber conservative ones 4:1, and both conservative and progressive students are often members of multiple groups.

If most students do not participate in political activity on campus, what does this say about their predicted levels of involvement after graduation? Uninformed students can develop into unengaged adults. While some studies have been done on the voting habits of young adults, we should learn more about other areas of activism and what factors influence levels of post-college political participation. Are low levels of young people's political involvement indicative of a trend of disengagement, competing priorities, ineffective organizing, or a combination of factors? What are tolerated levels of student activism by college administrators and by the public at large?

Conservative and progressive students differ in their approaches to activism on campus. We have shown that this is in part because of disparate political agendas and different ways of framing messages. Progressive students tend to organize around issues, and conservative students focus more often on ideology. Conservative and progressive activists create different frames for their campaigns as well. Both groups, however, are sensitive to the political

climate on campus, as well as in the culture as a whole. What are the implications of current frames for future activism? As the status and influence of campus organizations necessarily shift over time, how effective will either conservative or progressive student activists be in mobilizing and organizing mass movements in the years ahead?

The lack of substantive political mentoring by faculty leaves student leaders without on-campus direction and support. This may influence the effectiveness of student social and political movements. Both conservative and progressive students consistently reported that they did not have political mentors on campus. They learned their politics from their peers or brought their political ideas with them to campus. What effect does this type of political education have on student-based social movements? Does the university have an obligation to provide political mentoring, and under what auspices could this occur? Although colleges and universities support the organizational development of political groups on campus, often the administrations are hesitant to support the political substance of such groups. If faculty do not support the political education of student activists, who does provide that support? Could others, like graduate students in the humanities and social sciences, appropriately fulfill political mentoring roles?

Faculty report a range of reasons why they do not engage in student-led activism: from lack of time and interest to a firm commitment to non-affiliation. Those few faculty who are active seem to wait until they are tenured before expressing partisan views. What prevents faculty from fulfilling mentoring roles?

Political debate on campus is underdeveloped and even unpopular. The formal debate events that do exist are often poorly attended. Students do not

take advantage of informal opportunities for discussion across political difference. Unaffiliated students report being “turned off” by many activists’ zeal and insistence. Activists, too, often avoid informal and formal debate, even though one-on-one discussions are powerful tools in shifting opinion. What does it mean that even politically active students resist debating their politics with others who may not agree? What are the ways in which students as a whole, and not just student leaders, experience and express differences of political opinion?

Traditional forms of political discussion, such as the formal debate, are less popular than newer, web-based options like “blogs” (web logs) or closed forums. What factors influence the popularity of political debate? Because there is a democratic as well as pedagogical value to deliberate training in political debate/discussion, we recommend that skills of debate, rhetoric or logic be taught much more deliberately to as many students as possible. Without these skills, colleges and universities will not remain marketplaces of the free exchange of ideas.

Issues of race, gender, and sexual orientation remain important concerns for many students. How do these students respond to progressive and conservative frames and movements? What is the future of “identity” groupings in student organizations, social support mechanisms, and curriculum development?

Outside groups, especially national organizations, have resources that can affect student political work and the political climate on campus. Although conservative and progressive organizations influence campus activism in different ways, one way does not clearly work better than the other. Is a concentration on leadership development or direct issue organizing more effective? How do factors like strong message delivery and a high level of national resources affect the success of campus movements?

Both conservative and progressive students who were active politically in college are more likely to secure movement work after graduation. While conservative organizations may be more visible through more concerted public relations, there are many opportunities for progressive students to find movement work after graduation. Political internships for both conservatives and progressives are plentiful. Working as an intern is an effective way to make oneself visible to potential employers.

Many interns and new hires bring substantial

campus experience to their positions. Do social movement groups use the skills and experience of campus activists adequately? What systems are in place to help conservatives and progressive groups in locating and developing leadership, and how can they be improved?

Many more college students are engaged in community service than in explicitly political activism. Politically active student leaders see the potential value in community service and service learning as ways for students to contribute to society. They are also aware of many students active in service work who are not politically active themselves. Yet they do not actively target this group for recruitment to their organizations. Centrist students are similarly aware of campus activists, but they report being “put off” by activists’ recruitment styles and discussion techniques. What are the current and potential roles of “centrist activism” in affecting levels of political engagement on campus?

Many campus religious and fraternal organizations provide opportunities for students to participate in community service projects. And for some, such as members of traditionally Black fraternities and sororities or social action-oriented religious groups, performing community service is political work. Because we have not investigated these groups in any depth as part of this study, we can provide no conclusions about their political agendas here. What are the levels of influence that campus ministries have on students’ political activism?

SOME FINAL WORDS

Students in U.S. colleges and universities are exposed to a wide range of opportunities to learn about political life, civic involvement, and social change. A few become heavily involved in political activism as leaders, more as occasional followers, most not at all. The extent to which this involvement captures the interest of students is one measure of the political health of colleges and universities. It also has an important impact on the levels of political vibrancy in our society at large.

Because there is a democratic as well as pedagogical value to deliberate training in political debate/discussion, we recommend that skills of debate, rhetoric or logic be taught much more deliberately to as many students as possible. Without these skills, colleges and universities will not remain marketplaces of the free exchange of ideas.

PRA's Campus Activism Project reveals that student political life today is a complex phenomenon, interconnected with social and political movements at large and responsive to the issues of the day. While our observation that colleges and univer-

sities, at least ones with documented political activity, are, on balance, more liberal than conservative in terms of the attitudes of their faculty and students, we cannot say with any definitiveness that one social movement sector has completely "won" the campus battle. This report is, after all, a snapshot of a moment in time. Campuses can be dynamic arenas, even beacons, for political change. We have managed to ask far more questions than we have been able to answer. With this awareness, we call on others to observe and analyze further the evolving status of campus activism. Further research will contribute to a better understanding of the effectiveness of student movements in the United States today and may predict their future influence and contributions.

PRA's Campus Activism Project reveals that student political life today is a complex phenomenon, interconnected with social and political movements at large and responsive to the issues of the day. While our observation that colleges and universities, at least ones with documented political activity, are, on balance, more liberal than conservative in terms of the attitudes of their faculty and students, we cannot say with any definitiveness that one social movement sector has completely "won" the campus battle.

Appendix A: A Review of Literature on Campus Activism

INTRODUCTION

As a preliminary step in the Campus Activism Project's research, we reviewed the existing literature on student attitudes and campus activism. This literature review summarizes the existing findings of student surveys, work by popular commentators, and scholarly studies that focus on political activism on campus. We review here a number of approaches that have been used to study campus activism, such as student attitude surveys, participant-observer studies, interviews, and quantitative reviews of existing data. Comparing different theoretical models, we explain the usefulness of a particular model—social movement theory—for the purposes of this study.

STUDYING CAMPUS POLITICAL ACTIVITY

There has been no shortage of analysis and documentation of student attitudes in the United States. College students seem to be one of the most studied age cohorts, perhaps because they are subjects to whom academic researchers have relatively easy access. Students' academic preparation and achievements, their expectations, their level of satisfaction with their experience, and their social attitudes and interests have all been topics for research. The political activity of students, however, has not been studied as extensively, although that is changing.

Looking at colleges and universities allows observers to note other trends besides student activity. Students themselves have historically been interested in what is taught, who gets to learn it, and how their lives are affected by college culture—in college and beyond. But others, including legislators, parents, administrators and social issue framers, are also invested in these issues. Some have argued that the campus is the site of a battle for who is in charge of society at large.⁶³

SURVEYS OF STUDENT OPINION, BEHAVIOR, AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Since the 1960s, surveys have tracked the political ideology of students and their political participation. One way of measuring political ideology is to study political affiliations. According to the Higher Education Research Institute's (HERI) annual survey of first-year undergraduates, more of today's freshmen (27.8%) self-identify as liberal or far left compared to 21.3% who describe themselves as conservative or far right. Most students identify politically as middle of the road (50.8%).⁶⁴ Identifying as liberal has until very recently become more common among college freshmen, and was, in 2001, at its highest point since 1975, although figures are still lower than the all-time high of over 40% in 1971.⁶⁵ Compare this to the population in general: in 2000, 20% identified as liberal, 30% as conservative, and 50% as middle of the road or didn't know/hadn't thought about it.⁶⁶

Since the HERI studies are of incoming freshmen, it is important to examine what happens to students while they are in college. Using recent longitudinal data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) surveys, researchers have concluded that attending college has a liberalizing effect on students' political and social views, including attitudes towards women's roles, civic values, and affirmative action.⁶⁷ Another analysis of CIRP data, however, suggests that interaction with peers and the general socialization process, rather than the education process, may affect student political attitudes.⁶⁸

Another approach commonly used to document political activity among college students is to examine how often they vote.⁶⁹ Although college students vote more often than non-students, 18-24 year olds vote less often than any other age group.⁷⁰ Depending on the political significance of the election year, between 16% and 32% of this age cohort votes at rates that are consistently at least 20% lower than that of the total population.⁷¹ Further, they know less about current political events and party platforms than their elders.⁷²

But, when surveyed about their political engagement, undergraduates report that they are

interested in political issues, though not in the U.S. political process, and that they are informed about political issues.⁷³ Some researchers have suggested the reason for low voter turnout among college students is related to their low sense of political efficacy while in college.⁷⁴ But there is evidence that many adults share this sense of relative powerlessness in the political realm.⁷⁵ One difference between college students and other voting age cohorts may be students' belief that voting is a choice, not a civic obligation.⁷⁶

Some contemporary student leaders appear resistant to being labeled as disengaged from politics. Students at a national Civic Participation Summit in 2001 sponsored by Campus Compact (a national coalition committed to improving student civic engagement in on college campuses), argued that many college students are engaged in civic activities. To capture this level of engagement, they say, we need to broaden the definition of political involvement to include community service as a form of "service politics" that can lead to social change.⁷⁷

Civic participation can be encouraged and developed, claims a recent study by Anne Colby and her team at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.⁷⁸ Colby looks at how higher education prepares students for active civic participation, examines the rationale behind the trend towards deliberate programming for civic engagement, and highlights current best practices.

Observers have often noted that student activism, like political activity in general, occurs in waves. Many popular commentators noted that college students became more conservative during the 1980s. "Generation X" (those born between 1960 and 1980) has been described as less altruistic, more self-absorbed, and less political than previous or subsequent age cohorts.⁷⁹ Some even note that this trend has been exacerbated by the events of 9/11,⁸⁰ although other data indicate that students are more trusting of political institutions and more likely to be involved politically since 9/11.⁸¹ But prior to 9/11, researchers using the CIRP data found that such a trend may reflect an increase in materialism in the culture as a whole, coupled with uncertain economic times, rather than a growing influence of conservative political or social policies.⁸² Contrary to public opinion in the 1980s, the lead researcher of the CIRP study noted that the trend in decreased interest in social problems was beginning to reverse direction by 1991.⁸³

Survey research has identified other factors in addition to political research that influence student political participation. Race, education level, degree of political discussions with parents, level of feelings of efficacy, political party affiliation, and attendance at religious services all positively affect voting, other forms of political participation, and community service.⁸⁴

Conservative groups have conducted student surveys as a way to uncover student attitudes that counter the description of students as liberal. For instance, the now-defunct Foundation for Academic Standards and Tradition (FAST) polled students in 2000 on issues pertinent to academic life, in particular affirmative action in admissions and "political correctness."⁸⁵ In their response to the question, 93% favored "fair enrollment." One of the survey questions read: "Asian-Americans do so well academically that they are considered an over-represented minority on some campuses. Some colleges, therefore, would rather have more Black and Hispanic students than Asian-Americans. Do you think that colleges should give preference to certain minorities, or should colleges strive primarily for fair enrollment?" FAST interpreted the negative answers to mean that 93% of college students oppose giving preferences to Blacks and Hispanics.⁸⁶ The Independent Women's Forum (IWF), a Washington, DC-based rightist women's organization, surveyed college students shortly after 9/11 and found that a majority of students had been at least noticeably affected by that day's events. IWF highlighted that 2/3 of students supported George W. Bush regardless of political affiliation, and that, after the attacks, students reported that they prayed more often and volunteered more. IWF also found that 87% of students supported Title IX until they were told that "350 male athletic programs have been cut to meet the quotas under Title IX."⁸⁷ Then 54% indicated that they believed that enforcement has gone too far.

Unlike the other surveys by conservative organizations, Americans for Victory Over Terrorism (AVOT), a project of William Bennett's Empower America, polled U.S. students in May 2002 and found liberal leanings among students. Those leanings were coupled, however, with a lack of information. The report asserted that college students lack knowledge about terrorism, do not see the United States representing superior values to other nations (with 71% disagreeing with this statement on U.S. values) and do not know the names of prominent

political leaders.⁸⁸

Measures chosen by researchers to indicate political involvement can sometimes limit the usefulness of the conclusions drawn. For instance, one measure of political activity on campus is the degree to which students participate in demonstrations. More students attended demonstrations in 2001 (47.5%) than at any time since 1966 (15.8%).⁸⁹ But, because we have no information on the kind of demonstration, we cannot determine if this change indicates increased liberalism or increased conservatism.

Although surveys of student attitudes and political behavior have generated plentiful data readily available to researchers, virtually all of the data indicates the levels of civic participation in the aggregate, without specifying whether the behavior supports conservative, centrist or progressive ideologies. As a result such analyses give us general information about the civic engagement of college students based on limited variables. Documentation of the political attitudes and behavior of college students has so far lacked specificity about the degrees to which conservative, centrist and progressive students are actively engaged in political work on campus.

STUDIES OF PROGRESSIVE CAMPUS ACTIVISM

Most of the research on campus activism has focused on progressive student movements. Many researchers focused on individual activists, examining student motivations for getting involved, but beginning in the 1980s, theorists began to look at the campus as a place where social movements can flourish. Such studies have contributed greatly to our understanding of how campus activism, at least as generated by students, functions.

Several studies examine campus activism using a variety of lenses. Alexander Astin and others use a topical review to categorize student and faculty protest by their chosen issues during the 1960s and early 1970s.⁹⁰ This has been a common approach for many who observe campus activism. For instance, Tony Vellela seeks to counter the prevailing myth that campuses were quiet during the 1980s by chronicling the rise of opposition to U.S. interventions in Central America and the CIA presence on campus, concerns over the economy, the rise of identity politics, and the influence on campus of the women's movement and the movement for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender rights.⁹¹ Paul Loeb reviews both those students who chose

not to get involved with campus politics and those who did, echoing the earlier work of Kenneth Keniston.⁹² Loeb suggests that students choose not to get involved in political action on campus for a variety of reasons. First, they are the products of an ethic of individualism that leads them to think that "they cannot be the makers of history, but only its recipients."⁹³ Second, they lack access to historical role models of effective activists their own age, though they distrust their peers who currently are activists, and they buy into a prevailing myth that student activists are dissidents. After looking at the non-involved students, Loeb shifts to student activists. Through a seven-year series of interviews, he examines uncommon student activity, such as the rise of farm activism and political organizing of fraternities, and more predictable collective action, such as the environmental movement, as well as those who recognize and respond to the persistence of racism on campus. Interested in centrists and community service, Loeb challenges the hesitancy of the community service movement to adopt strong political stances while advocates of service work appeal across the spectrum of students for participants. He does recognize the value of, in his words, "pre-political" activity, for those individuals whose political education can be affected by their involvement in service work. Addressing the issue of "political correctness" on campus, he looks at opposition to identity politics as the creation of the organized Right on campus and provides a useful summary of the works of rightist authors Dinesh D'Souza and Alan Bloom as the main framers of the political correctness debate.⁹⁴

Robert Rhoads surveys student activism of the 1990s through a series of case studies that represent the predominant issues associated with campus protests in the 1990s.⁹⁵ Multicultural issues accounted for the majority of incidents: campus funding and governance, world affairs, and the environment trailed behind. Based as much on phenomenological principles—that individuals seek meaning in their actions—as on collective behavior theory, Rhoads suggests that the activist spirit of the 1960s endured, despite its failure to achieve radical social change, and this collective consciousness may be able to strengthen a "web" of participatory democracy.

Arthur Levine and Jeanette Cureton, using a collection of student surveys, characterize contemporary college students as "post ideological," meaning that they tend not to adhere to particular parti-

san or other political affiliations or to place much faith in the electoral process and governmental institutions.⁹⁶ They find that today's students maintain their optimism about their own futures and more readily choose to become involved in local versus national projects. This "new localism" often takes the form of community service, which involves up to 75% of the students on campus.

Liza Featherstone examines activism by focusing on a specific campaign, chronicling the development of anti-sweatshop activism on campus since 1997.⁹⁷ This movement took up the issues of globalization and sweatshop manufacture of college insignia clothing to localize an international issue. She notes that the anti-sweatshop movement highlights classic issues for student groups: leadership develops rapidly and changes quickly; funding is a continuous problem; and the challenges of participatory democracy can create lengthy group processes which can heighten group tensions. Featherstone's research illustrates the ways in which researching a particular issue allow one to observe how political education happens within a movement and how goals and strategies evolve over time.

In 1997 Rich Cowan and the now-defunct Center for Campus Organizing produced an activist guide for moderate to progressive students which includes a directory of right-wing organizations active on campus, the campaigns they have waged, and an analysis of their strategies and levels of effectiveness.⁹⁸ Much of the material retains its relevancy today, reflecting a consistent commitment to campus activism among conservative funders and organizations.

A gap remains in researching other groups interested in influencing university life, such as alumni, trustees, and critics of university policy or pedagogy. Current research has not adequately explained the success of campus activism outside expected parameters, such as mass mobilizations at non-elite schools (e.g., the CUNY tuition strikes of the 1990s), effective campaigns with small numbers of participants, (e.g., the anti-reparations movement), and the diffusion of certain strategies across different types of campuses (e.g., the shantytown movement to divest university holdings in South Africa).

CONSERVATIVE STUDIES OF CAMPUS ACTIVISM

Several popular books by self-identified conservatives have contributed to the literature about campus political life. Alan Bloom sets the tone for criticizing the content of modern collegiate liberal arts curricula.⁹⁹ His main thesis is that the demise of general education requirements and the replacement of the great books of Western literature and philosophy with multicultural courses not only have diminished the quality of contemporary education and demoralized our young potential leaders, but have threatened the core of our democratic process.

These ideas are echoed by Dinesh D'Souza, who defines what he sees as "illiberal education," or a close-mindedness and intolerance among campus liberals.¹⁰⁰ Through a collection of case studies, he observes that resentment associated with affirmative action and a new politics of sensitivity to issues of gender and sexual orientation has politicized scholarship and has created a "new racism" on campus. Katie Roiphe summarizes the conservative argument about the harm feminism has inflicted on campus by detailing her own experiences at Harvard and Princeton. She is critical of feminists who project "victimhood" and create absolutist positions where ambiguity should exist, especially concerning rape and sexual harassment.¹⁰¹ And Alan Charles Kors and Harvey Silverglate reassert this perspective with further investigation of the polarization of political debate on campus, documenting incidents of the "tyranny" of progressives: "It is a tyranny that seeks to assert absolute truth over the souls, the consciences and the individuality of our students—in short, a tyranny over the essence of liberty itself."¹⁰² Their series of anecdotes focuses their criticism on what they see as major violations of free speech rights related to student and faculty discipline. David Horowitz and Peter Collier produced an anthology of articles from their journal *Heterodoxy* on "How to Survive the PC [politically correct] Campus."¹⁰³ Using humor and sarcasm, contributors to *Heterodoxy*, from almost the first issue in 1992, have criticized a "politically correct" culture that "restricts the range of allowable opinions on campus."

These books, written for the mass market, are designed to influence public opinion about campus life by providing a conservative lens with which to interpret campus events that most of the public rarely see. They are examples of rhetorical writing

in the best classical sense: they are meant to enlighten and persuade.

While these works provide fascinating reading about student activism from a variety of perspectives, collectively they fail to provide us with a broad enough lens for the purposes of the Campus Activism Project. For that, we turn to research that uses the analytical tools of social movement theory.

SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY

Since the late 1980s, many scholars have adopted a new analytical framework for the study of political, social, and cultural activity. Originally developed by sociologists and now generally called “social movement theory,” this approach has deeply affected how scholars and others look at campus activism.

People construct social movements to help them gain attention for their ideas and increase their cultural and political influence through collective action. According to Doug McAdam and David Snow, a social movement is “a collectivity acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional channels for the purpose of promoting or resisting change in the group, society, or world order of which it is a part.”

While psychological factors are involved, most sociologists now reject the idea that people who join social movements are irrational or psychologically dysfunctional. Instead, they look at movement members as people with a grievance who are strategic and instrumental in the way they mobilize resources, exploit political opportunities, develop their own culture, frame ideas, create slogans, and tell stories.

Social movements do not exist in isolation. Often they overlap with political movements that are focused on elections and legislative campaigns. Social movement theory is an important tool for understanding how civil society is constructed and how groups of people mobilize and organize to extend or limit democracy and human rights in a society.

IDEOLOGY, FRAMES, AND NARRATIVES

In studying campus activism, we are especially interested in understanding three elements of social movement theory: ideology, frames, and narratives.

Ideology

When we speak of conservatism or liberalism or socialism we are talking about a structured way of seeing how the world works. Oliver and Johnston describe ideology as “a system of meaning that couples assertions and theories about the nature of social life with values and norms relevant to promoting or resisting social change.”¹⁰⁸ In developing this concise definition, they drew on a longer definition by Wilson, who, in 1973, described ideology as “a set of beliefs about the social world and how it operates, containing statements about the rightness of certain social arrangements and what action would be undertaken in light of those statements.” As Wilson explains, “An ideology is both a cognitive map of sets of expectations and a scale of values in which standards and imperatives are proclaimed. Ideology thus serves both as a clue to understanding and as a guide to action, developing in the mind of its adherents an image of the process by which desired changes can best be achieved.”¹⁰⁹

Frames

In sociology the idea of studying “frames” has allowed scholars to better understand how social movements gain the attention and loyalty of groups of people in a society.¹¹⁰ Frames help translate ideologies into action by crafting culturally-appropriate perspectives from which to view a struggle over power.¹¹¹ According to Klandermans, the “social construction of collective action frames,” involves:

- “**public discourse**, that is, the interface of media discourse and interpersonal interaction”;
- “**persuasive communication** during mobilization campaigns by movement organizations, their opponents and countermovement organizations”;
- “**consciousness raising** during episodes of collective action.”¹¹²

Frames can be constructed to appeal to different audiences, including leaders, followers, potential recruits, and the public.

Narratives

Narratives are stories circulated within a social movement. The study of “narratives” reveals much about how a social movement identifies heroes and villains.¹¹⁴ According to Davis, when a social movement participant uses a narrative, “past events are

selected and configured into a plot” in a way that “portrays them as a meaningful sequence and schematic whole with a beginning, middle, and end.”¹¹⁵ Narratives also inform movement participants by providing a script that connects them to a past, present, and future, and teaches them about what roles and actions are valued.

“In telling the story of our becoming, as an individual, a nation, a people, we establish who we are,” explains Polletta. “Narratives may be employed strategically to strengthen a collective identity but they may also precede and make possible the development of a coherent community, nation, or collective actor.”¹¹⁶ Narratives involve three points of view, Polletta observes, “those of narrator, protagonist, and audience”; this “contributes to the formation and sustenance of collective identities” necessary for a successful social movement.¹¹⁷ Narratives involve the audience in a dynamic relationship with the narrator and portray the protagonist in a positive or negative light.

The study of narratives reveals much about how heroes and villains are identified by a social movement. The way narratives are constructed can either assist in unraveling systems of oppression or merely replicate existing paradigms of dominance.¹¹⁸ In practical terms, any person in a social movement can tell a story about how they are a victim of unfairness. Sometimes these stories reveal unfair systems and structures of inequality. Sometimes they describe the incident of inequality, while framing the story in a way that obscures what caused the unfairness, and imply that nothing can be done about this inequity. Sometimes they tell the story in a way that enables people or groups who already have unfair power and privilege in a society to portray themselves as the underdog and claim they are victims of unfairness. A striking anecdote might, therefore, be woven into a narrative to imply that a single incident represents a universal truth.

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS ON CAMPUS

Social movement theory has shifted the focus of research on students from the individual student’s personal motivation and psychological makeup as the cause for student activism. Proponents of this approach look at what *facilitates* the development of a movement on campus, rather than what *causes* it.¹¹⁹ In other words, they attempt to identify which structural and cultural factors help or hinder

the growth and effectiveness of student activity, instead of focusing solely on individuals’ ideologies or motivations. Examining multiple elements of collective behavior, they have, over time, refined their analyses by use of concepts such as resource mobilization, political processes and opportunity structures, diffusion (life-cycle theories), collectivity, movement culture, participant identity and emotion, framing of issues, and strategic interaction.¹²⁰

While a detailed examination of social movement theory is beyond the scope of this literature review, a summary of some of the work on campus activism that has used this approach is important for several reasons. First, it can be applied successfully to activism on the Left and the Right, allowing for the comparative study of different forms of political activism on campus. Second, this approach allows us to understand the degree to which groups are effective, because social movement theory looks at other components of collective behavior besides ideology. Many earlier studies, grounded as they were in trying to understand student unrest in order to contain or control it, or to prevent its escalation into violence, did not conceptualize student activism as part of a legitimate movement of dissent. And finally, social movement theory allows for an examination, alongside the study of student movements on campus, of campus activism that is initiated by non-students.

Although most of his work on the political Right uses a conventional, individualistic framework, Seymour Martin Lipset was one of the earliest scholars to look at campus activism through a broader sociological lens. He notes several factors that facilitate rebellion in college, including that college students are a densely populated age cohort, are less tied to ideologies, know less history, and have fewer responsibilities.¹²¹ Sarah Soule uses the social movement concept of “resource mobilization” to study the spread of the campus-based shantytown movement—a student strategy of creating shantytowns on campus to urge the college or university to divest its holdings in companies that did business with South Africa in the 1980s.¹²² The student-built facsimile shantytowns on campus lawns created a visual message about apartheid, and the location became a focus for organizing. Soule uncovered a positive relationship between the level of student activism and the size of the school’s endowment, which suggests that economic resources play a part in student activism.

Nella Van Dyke, working with the ideas of

social movement lifecycles and “movement families,” finds a positive relationship between previous student activism and political activity on campus during the 1960s.¹²³ She also notes the presence of what she terms “activist subcultures” on campus, which explain why activism on one issue predicted student activism on multiple issues on the same campus. Kenneth Andrews and Michael Biggs echo these conclusions in their retrospective study of the 1960s sit-in movement in the South.¹²⁴

Eric Hirsch contradicts earlier collective behavior descriptions of campus activists as confused and troubled by using social movement concepts that focus on the political processes, or factors that describe the development of political power in a group.¹²⁵ His conclusions are that consciousness-raising, the development of solidarity, and the recognition of collective power most accurately explained the 1985 Columbia University divestment protest. And B.C. Ben Park provides a useful critique of various social movement theorists who have studied campus activism through the mid 1990s.¹²⁶ He suggests that the opportunities students have to form student community on campus are prerequisites to the development of political consciousness, which, in turn, influences student activism.

Ellen Messer-Davidow has contributed two analytical pieces to the study of conservative campus movements. The first reviews the debate over “political correctness” that began on campus in the late 1980s.¹²⁷ Looking through a resource mobilization lens, she suggests that the Right has in place an effective framing, recruitment and training apparatus that seeks to relocate aspects of power traditionally held by universities away from campus to sites more controlled by the Right, such as public opinion, the courts, and legislatures. In her second relevant piece Messer-Davidow critically examines the growth of feminist studies as an academic discipline that grew out of the social activism of the women’s movement.¹²⁸ While she questions how a discipline that started out challenging the university status quo became shaped and controlled by the very institution it had sought to change, the value of her book in the context of this study is its careful examination of the structural elements that contributed to a successful antifeminist backlash on campus.

Between 1991-1994, Messer-Davidow studied conservative movements both on campus and in Washington, D.C. as a participant observer. She

noted that on the Right, “the agents for change are not the astute leaders and hardworking followers but the tightly networked national and state organizations.”¹²⁹ These groups provided carefully constructed and controlled student training opportunities for future conservative leaders. Messer-Davidow documents with specificity the nature of the ideological training, the framing and cultural molding that, according to social movement theory, are aspects of social movements. By contrast, she noted that those who used similar training for feminists applied a less prescriptive pedagogy, but were then stymied when their young women participants balked at the idea of being labeled feminist. She also sees fissures in feminist faculty approaches, which she views as having made social problems primarily the topic of discussion and debate, rather than opportunities for constructive social change. In challenging the old guard’s canon by offering a new set of subjects to study in highly analytical modes, she suggests that feminist scholars have perhaps let their eyes stray from the prize.

Conservative student training opportunities like the ones described by Messer-Davidow are not new phenomena. The Intercollegiate Studies Institute, founded as the Institute for Educational Affairs, has supported college students through summer conferences since 1959, and Morton Blackwell’s Leadership Institute in Arlington, VA, has trained over 30,000 conservative students since 1979.

Many areas of interest related to campus activism remain unexplored. To name just two, students of social movements have not yet thoroughly examined how movements deal with counter movements or conflict with groups opposed to their views, such as the polarization on campus and elsewhere around the Middle East, for example. Neither have they examined how campus activists handle complex and competing ideologies, like academic freedom and campus speech codes. Such issues could benefit from the more nuanced theoretical approach available through social movement theory.

Appendix B: Sample Interview Guides and Questionnaires

For Faculty Participants

- 1) How long have you been teaching here?
- 2) What can you tell me about the political climate, for both students and faculty (how vibrant, how open to the free exchange of ideas is the school)? Is it different this year from recent years?
- 3) What have you noticed is the range of political groups present on this campus? How have they been active this year?
- 4) Have you observed any political tensions/conflicts/disagreements among groups on campus? How do political groups deal with differences of opinion?
- 5) [If “yes” to #4] What is your assessment of the impact of political conflict on the overall climate of the school? [Probe for details.]
- 6) How has the administration reacted to political protest and conflict among student groups?
- 7) How do students receive their political education here?
- 8) Who are political mentors for students on campus?
- 9) Do you know if students have access to the resources of any national organizations in doing their political work?
- 10) To what extent do alumnae/i influence policy at your school? [Probe for examples.] How about the faculty?
- 6) What has been the impact of these conflicts on the climate at your school?
- 7) What would you say is the climate for political debate on campus? What factors help or hinder debate?
- 8) How did you form your own political ideas? [Probe for stories.] Has there been anyone on campus who is a mentor to you for political ideas? How about off-campus?
- 9) Are you familiar with civic engagement or service learning ? What do these terms mean to you? Do you consider such activity to be political activism?
- 10) From your perspective, how well do student groups handle political disagreements/tensions that arise? What is the quality of the dialogue? How does the administration handle such conflict? [Examples]
- 11) What do you think are the most effective political movements on campus? Can you give examples of their effectiveness?
- 12) What is the role of faculty in the political life of your school? Are there individuals who stand out in your mind as more influential?
- 13) To what extent do alumnae/i influence policy at your school? Examples?
- 14) Are you aware of any national political organizations that work with students on your campus? Examples?

For Student Leaders

- 1) Do you consider yourself a political activist? If so, how did you become one?
- 2) Could you tell me something about the range of student political groups on campus? Which ones do you work with?
- 3) What are your group’s challenges and accomplishments?
- 4) Looking back on this year, what can you tell me about the dominant political issues at this school? Which groups have been involved? [Probe for concrete stories.]
- 5) Have you noticed any debates, conflicts or tensions among student groups? [Get concrete.]

For Career Services Staff

- 1) What is your role(s) on campus? How long have you held this position?
- 2) What services do you offer? What would you say are the strengths of your office? The challenges?
- 3) How do you collect information on internships and job listings? How proactive are you?
- 4) Various kinds of employers use your service. We are interested in those groups that could be considered political. We define *political* as placements in government, as well as interest groups, think tanks, training centers, and electoral work. What is the range of political groups that use your service?

- 5) How popular are political placements among your school's students? What attracts students to these positions?
- 6) Are you aware of any political organizations that work with students on your campus outside the career services office? Which ones?
- 7) Do you collect student evaluations of their placement experiences? What internships/placements get the highest ratings from student at the your school? [Probe why.]
- 8) To the extent you can generalize fairly, what sorts of students are attracted to working with conservative organizations? Liberal/progressive ones?

For Religious Advisors

- 1) What is your role(s) on campus? How long have you held this position?
- 2) What services do you offer? What would you say are the strengths of your office? The challenges?
- 3) What is the range of religious groups present on this campus? Which ones get involved in political issues? (by *political* we exclude evangelical or service work and mean social change activities rooted in policy change, electoral work, issue or human rights advocacy.) [Probe for stories.]
- 4) Have you observed political tensions/conflicts/disagreements among groups on campus?
- 5) What has been the influence of religious groups on these tensions? Has your office played a role?
- 6) Have you noticed any changes over time in how the students at this school handle political disagreements?
- 7) What is your assessment of the impact of political conflict on the climate of the school and the religious life of students?
- 8) What issues would you expect students to be involved with? Is this congruent with what is actually happening? If not, why not?

For Students Participating in Conferences or Educational Activities

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Demographic info: age, year in school, school attended, hometown.
2. Are you involved with political activism on your campus? In what capacity? (membership in a group, leadership position, etc.)
3. How would you describe the level of activity of the groups you are involved with on campus?
4. How did you find out about this event, and why did you come? What were you expecting to gain from this program at the outset?
5. How are you paying for this program (registration fees, travel, housing, etc)?

B. ASSESSMENT OF EXPERIENCE

1. Has the program lived up to your expectations? In what areas has it met expectations, and in what ways has it fallen short?
2. What organizing skills have you gained as a result of this program?
3. Have you found out about resources — financial support, organizational support, etc.—that will be helpful to your work on campus?
4. Did the program give you an opportunity to network with other students? What about political/nonprofit leaders? How important was this aspect of the program?
5. What do you think is the goal of this program?
6. What do you think was most valuable about this program?

C. IMPACT OF PROGRAM

1. How will your participation in this program impact your involvement with political activism on campus?
2. How has participating in the program affected your future plans? How has it impacted any plans to continue to be involved in political activism beyond college?

For Program Leaders of Conferences or Educational Activities

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Demographic info: position in organization, how long held.
2. What was your role in planning/running this program?
3. How long has the program existed? How many students does it serve per year?
4. Why did you get involved with this organization/program?

B. GOALS FOR THE PROGRAM

1. What are your goals for this program?
2. How did you decide what kinds of events to include in the program? Were students involved in the planning? (workshops vs. speakers, etc.)

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM

1. What do you think was most successful about the program?
2. What do you think needs improvement/needs to be added in the future?

For Student Interns

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Demographic info: age, year in school, school attended, hometown.
2. Are you involved with political activism on your campus? In what capacity? (membership in a group, leadership position, etc.)
3. How would you describe the level of activity of the groups you are involved with on campus?

B. MONEY

1. What kinds of material benefits does this internship provide (stipend, housing, meals, etc.)?
2. If the internship is unpaid/does not pay enough to cover your expenses, how are you paying for expenses?

C. THE INTERNSHIP

1. How did you find out about this internship, and why did you choose to do it?
2. What were you expecting to gain from this program at the outset? What kind of work were you expecting to do?
3. Has the program lived up to your expectations? In what areas has it met expectations, and in what ways has it fallen short?
4. What do you do in a typical day?
5. Were there organized programs for interns outside of work?
6. Did the internship give you an opportunity to network with other students? What about political/nonprofit leaders? How important was this part of the experience?
7. What do you think was the most valuable aspect of this internship for you? For the organization?

D. IMPACT OF PROGRAM

1. How will this internship impact your involvement with political activism on campus?
2. How has this internship affected your future plans? Has it had any impact on the likelihood that you will continue to be involved in political activism beyond college?

For Internship Coordinators

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Demographic info: position in organization.
2. What was your role in the internship program?
3. What do you see as the goals for the internship program?

B. THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

1. How many internships do you offer? Are the interns paid in any way?
2. How long has this program been in place?
3. What kinds of work do your interns do?
4. Do interns work with a supervisor?— Explain how you are supervised.
5. What kinds of programs/speakers do you organize for interns outside of work?

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM

1. What do you think was most successful about the internship program?
2. What do you think was least successful/needs improvement?
3. Do many of your interns go on to become staff members at your organization?

For New Graduates Now in Political Organizations

1) BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- A. Demographic info: age, school attended, hometown.
- B. Job title.
- C. Were you involved with political activism when you were in college? In what capacity? (membership in a group, leadership position, etc.)

2) YOUR JOB

- A. How did you find out about this job, and why did you choose to apply?
- B. What contacts did you make while in college that helped you to land this job?
- C. What was the hiring process like?
- D. What are your job responsibilities?
- E. What were you expecting to gain from this position at the outset? What kind of work were you expecting to do?
- F. Has the job lived up to your expectations? In what areas has it met expectations, and in what ways has it fallen short?
- G. What do you think is the most valuable aspect of this job for you?

3) IMPACT OF PROGRAM

- A. How has this job affected your future career plans?

Appendix C: Methodology

PRA reviewed the existing literature on campus activism, primarily in the United States, to become familiar with key concepts, approaches and findings. A copy of that review can be found in Appendix A. We also reviewed official and alternative campus newspapers at all eight of the sample schools and at four additional schools (Harvard, Berkeley, Tufts and Wisconsin) for the past two years to further identify current political activity and levels of tension on a variety of campuses. We joined several student movement online discussion groups to gain access to the details of how current issues are discussed internally in those groups.

Staff selected eight colleges and universities in the United States based on level of student political activity, geographic location, level of selectivity, type of institution, and the accessibility of on-line campus newspapers. The sample drew from a list of all institutions offering at least a Baccalaureate degree. We used a list of schools generated from a Lexis-Nexis search that identified colleges with at least one incident of protest activity that made news dur-

ing 2000-2001. All schools on this list experienced some form of political protest activity. The list was then divided into two equal sections, separating more politically active colleges in the country from less active institutions. We focused on the more politically active schools, to insure that we could locate a selection of student activists. The more politically active sections were sorted into four geographical regions—East, West, Midwest and South. Four schools were chosen from each of these categories. From the resulting list of sixteen schools, eight were selected, with a balance of more/less politically active, public/private, elite/non-elite, and large/small campuses. This final group of eight institutions became the sample for this study. The eight schools are: Arizona State University, Carleton College, Claremont McKenna College, Howard University, Illinois State University, The University of Massachusetts Amherst, The University of Texas at Austin, and Wellesley College.

The chart of the following page provides an overview of the sample schools.

Descriptors of Sample Schools							
School	Location	Enrollment	Tuition and fees	Public/Private	Coed?	Diversity	Endowment
Arizona State University	Tempe, AZ	44,000	\$10,050 in state; \$18,568 out of state	Public	Yes	23% people of color (poc), 3 % int'l	\$221 million
Carleton College	Northfield, MN	1,900	\$34,400	Private	Yes	19% poc, 5 % int'l	\$452 million
Claremont McKenna College	Claremont, CA	1,000	\$36,900	Private	Yes	29% poc, 3% int'l	\$286 million
Howard University	Washington, D.C.	10,000	\$16,505	Private	Yes	HBCU, 10% int'l	\$312 million
Illinois State University	Normal, IL	21,000	\$11,000 in state \$15,300 out of state	Public	Yes	11% poc, 1% int'l	\$33 million
U Massachusetts Amherst	Amherst, MA	25,000	\$14,200 in state \$22,400 out of state	Public	Yes	15% poc, 1 % int'l	\$66 million
U Texas Austin	Austin, TX	50,000	\$10,600 in state \$17,800 out of state	Public	Yes	35% poc, 3% int'l	\$1.6 billion
Wellesley College	Wellesley, MA	2300	\$36,000	Private	No	36% poc, 8% int'l	\$1 billion

ON-SITE INTERVIEWS

Project staff created a series of interview guides, reviewed them with the advisory committee, and conducted interviews with:

- student leaders; faculty members who have experience with student campus organizing; campus ministers and religious advisors who have experience with tensions created by religious or anti-religious beliefs and practices; and key administrators directly involved with student activism;
- leaders of conservative and progressive groups that organize among students on campus for the purpose of recruiting students to a political agenda and worldview; and
- college placement officers who are familiar with patterns of employment for graduates over time.

The interview guides were informed by: (1) the research questions posed above; (2) insights gained from the literature review and campus publications; and (3) input from the advisory committee. The goal

of the interviews was to collect information that identified types of campus programs, the stated intent and goals of campus programs, the contribution of these activities to campus tensions, and the effectiveness of campus and non-campus political organizing in recruiting committed movement activists and future leaders after graduation.

SAMPLING INTERVIEWEES

We selected individuals to interview based on their roles as informants at their school or organization. We chose from a pool of student leaders representing: mainstream, alternative, and conservative student newspaper editors; heads of active political organizations, such as College Republicans, Democrats or other political parties; and leaders of issue- or identity-oriented campus groups such as environmental, peace, ethnic and cultural, free speech, human rights or civic engagement organizations. Staff or faculty informants included deans, student affairs officials, chaplains, career center staff, or other advisors. We actively solicited candi-

dates for interviews from PRA contacts and the advisory committee.

Project staff conducted the interviews at the sample colleges during the months of March, April and May, 2003. A total of 58 students and 28 faculty/staff were interviewed in person using the interview guides. We received informed written consent from all subjects to perform the interviews, and we assured anonymity by refusing to publish any personally-identifiable data. Interviews were audio taped, but not transcribed. PRA compiled written summaries of the interviews and coded them to maintain confidentiality.

The following chart illustrates the demographics of the interview group.

Subset of interviewees	Students	Faculty/Staff
Female	36	13
Male	22	15
African American	13	4
Hispanic	3	0
Asian or So. Asian	4	1
Caucasian	35	23
Middle Eastern or Arab	3	0
Undergraduate	39	n/a
Graduate student	18	n/a
Progressive	39	24
Conservative	15	2
Centrist	4	2
Total	58	28

We were also interested in how movement activity on campus is connected to off-campus, “real world” social and political movements. What sorts of collaborations exist across campuses? Are there national movements of campus activism? What are they like? What are the issues they face? How do they tackle their organizing challenges? In order to understand some of the structural issues that campus groups face, we joined seven online discussion groups, or listservs, of student organizations and observed the topics discussed over a period of 10 months.

Listserv	Topic	Geographical range
National Campus Antiwar Network	Progressive Anti-war	National
United Students Against Sweatshops	Progressive Labor	National
Young America’s Foundation	Conservative organizing	National
Young Conservatives of Texas	Conservative organizing	Regional
National Lawyers Guild	Progressive Legal	National
Student Peace Action Network	Progressive Anti-war	National
Campus Women Lead	Feminist	National
Student Ecumenical Partnership	Progressive Religious	National

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRES

One of the issues that confront all movements is the development of leadership. Movements on campus are challenged by the nature of student life: students rarely stay more than a few years on campus. How do the skills and expertise of campus movement leaders get nurtured? How do emerging leaders find the resources for their own development? What role do national organizations play in supporting young activist energy and talent? Although we included pertinent questions in the student on-site interview guides, we found that this did not adequately address the relationship between the resources of national organizations and student leaders.

In order to gain a better sense of how the leadership pipeline between campus groups and national organizations is constructed, we designed two methods of data collection. First, we identified 49 national movement organizations that offered internship experiences at their offices. We administered questionnaires to both internship coordinators and student interns working in the offices during the summer of 2003 and analyzed their answers qualitatively.

How do students who want to pursue movement work after graduation find jobs? How do the organizations find new talent? We decided to approach this section of our data collection retrospectively by asking young staffers who currently work at movement jobs to describe how they found out about their positions. Using a similar list of 54 national organizations as the target for the internship questionnaire, we located young staffers, administered a young staffer questionnaire to them, and again analyzed the answers qualitatively.

The initial process of generating a list of the programs offered by conservative and progressive political organizations to recruit future leaders on campus relied on a combination of information from the internet, Derek Wilcox's *Right Guide* and *Left Guide*, and Active Element's Future 500 book of youth organizations committed to social change. To get a sense of the level of commitment to campus activism of major organizations of the Right, we searched for information on the websites of most of the national organizations listed in the top 100 financial or top 300 media citations list in the *Right Guide*. As the *Left Guide* did not have such a list, we relied more on listings, suggestions of PRA staff,

and the Active Element listing of youth development organizations to create a list of programs aimed at developing progressive political leaders. Thus, the lists are by no means exhaustive; there are many organizations involved in campus activism that are not on the list on both sides. However, the list does include the most-referenced (online and in the media), most high-profile political recruitment programs that we were able to find after approximately six weeks of online and print source-based research.

The next step, involving actual program assessment, relied mostly on interviews of participants in and leaders of the programs on our list. Some of these interviews were conducted in person, some over the telephone, and others by email. We asked progressive and conservative program participants and leaders the same questions. None of the interviews were recorded; thus, from the in-person and telephone interviews, we relied on notes taken by the interviewer. For interviews conducted by email, we sent a list of questions to the interviewee (often after an in-person or telephone conversation, but sometimes without any prior contact) and asked them to return the questions with their responses in the text of the email. Less than half of the people who received questions responded. The responses given by email also varied greatly in quality; some were long and thoughtful, while others were very brief. Thus, the quantity of interview material is relatively small and may not be representative even of the programs we set out to study, which in turn represent just a sampling of the programs that are available to politically active college students.

ADVISORY COLLOQUIUM

To advise us, we developed a committee of individuals from higher education, journalism, and student activism. While we maintained communication with the group periodically by teleconferencing and an online discussion group, their main source of feedback to us occurred during a colloquium in which they took part along with a select group of informants identified through our other data collection methods. The following participants attended a two-day conference held at Simmons College in Boston in November, 2003. We incorporated recommendations from the event into the design and content of the report.

Advisory Committee Members

Paul Dana	Sierra Student Coalition CA Coordinator
Brian Edwards-Tiekert	Campus Alternative Journalism Project
Liza Featherstone	Journalist
Myra Marx Ferree	University of Wisconsin
Andrew Hunt	Sierra Student Coalition
Jyl J. Josephson	Rutgers-Newark, the State University of New Jersey
Nick Longo	Campus Compact
Vincent Lloyd	Student Activist
Ellen Messer-Davidow	University of Minnesota
Jeff Milem	University of Maryland
Daniel Hiroyuki Teraguchi	American Association of Colleges and Universities
Nella Van Dyke	Washington State University
Loretta Williams	Gustavus Myers Center, Simmons College

The following joined advisory committee members at a colloquium in November, 2003.

Mike Amato	Student, Northeastern University
Peggy Barrett	Tufts University Women's Center
Christina Brinkley	Simmons College
Michael Chapman	PRA Board Member
David Foster	PRA Intern
P. Edward Haley	Claremont McKenna College
Franz Hartl	Music for America
Ted Howard	The Democracy Collaborative, University of Maryland
Lara Jirmanus	Student Activist
Kitty Krupat	Labor Resource Center, Queens College
Lyle Pannell	PRA Intern
Juli Parker	University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth Women's Center
Cappy Pinderhughes	Black Radical Congress
Brian Sandberg	Campus Greens
Urvashi Vaid	Ford Foundation
Stanislav Vygotsky	Graduate Student, Northeastern University

End Notes

¹ These examples come from the following websites: <http://www.ifaweb.org/mission.html> (9/27/03); http://www.michigandaily.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2002/09/03/3d7435ae7ef4?in_archive=1; <http://www.dailyvidette.org/news/2003/04/16/Viewpoint/Your-View-418609.shtml> (July 12, 2003).

² Norberto Bobbio, *Left & Right: The Significance of Political Distinction*, translated (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996 [original edition, 1994]); Sara Diamond, *Roads to Dominion: Right-Wing Movements and Political Power in the United States* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1995); Chip Berlet, "Following the Threads: A Work in Progress," in *Unraveling the Right: The New Conservatism in American Thought and Politics*, ed. Amy Elizabeth Ansell (New York: Westview, 1998), 17-40.

³ Diamond, *Roads to Dominion*, 9.

⁴ Bobbio, *Left & Right*, 62.

⁵ Philip G. Altbach and Patti Paterson, "Before Berkeley: Historical Perspectives on American Student Activism," in *The New Pilgrims: Youth Protest in Transition*, ed. Philip Altbach and Robert S. Laufer, (New York: David McKay, 1972)13-31; Robert Cohen, *When the Old Left Was Young: Student Radicals and America's First Mass Student Movement, 1929-1941*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

⁶ United States and President's Commission on Campus Unrest, *The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest* (Washington, D.C.: President's Commission on Campus Unrest, 1970).

⁷ Howard S. Becker, *Campus Power Struggle* (Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1970).

⁸ Alice Ross Gold, Richard Christie, and Lucy Friedman, *Fists and Flowers: A Social Psychological Interpretation of Student Dissent* (New York: Academic Press, 1976); Charles D. Bolton and Kenneth C. Kammeyer, *The University Student: A Study of Student Behavior and Values* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1967); Kenneth Keniston, *Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968); James W. Trent and Judith L. Craise, "Commitment and Conformity in the American College," *Journal of Social Issues* 23(1967):38-39.

⁹ Lewis S. Feuer, *The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements* (New York: Basic Books, 1969), 527-28

¹⁰ Feuer, 528.

¹¹ Edward Merrill Root, *Collectivism on the Campus: The Battle for the Mind in American Colleges* (New York: Devin-Adair Co, 1961), 113-138.

¹² Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly, and Richard H. Tilly, *The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975).

¹³ Richard Flacks, "The Liberated Generation: an Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest," *Social Issues* 23 (1967): 52-60.

¹⁴ David L. Westby and Richard G. Braungart, "Class and Politics in the Family Backgrounds of Student Political Activists," *American Sociological Review* 31[5] 1966.

¹⁵ James McEvoy and Abraham H. Miller, *Black Power and Student Rebellion* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1969).

¹⁶ United States and President's Commission on Campus Unrest, 1970.

¹⁷ Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Dissent and Disruption: Proposals for Consideration by the Campus* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).

¹⁸ See Flacks, 1967, and Kenneth Keniston, "Sources of Campus Dissent," *Journal of Social Issues* 23 (1967): 108-137.

¹⁹ Westby and Braungart, 1966.

²⁰ Samuel Lubell, "The 'Generation Gap' " *The Public Interest* 13:52-60 1968; B.C.B. Park, "Politicization of Youth on College Campuses: Thoughts About Theories of Youth Activism," Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 2002.

²¹ For some examples of works by those who focus on African-American students, see: Claybourne Carson, *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995); James McEvoy, Abraham Miller, *Black Power and Student Rebellion* (Belmont, Calif.:Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1969); and Anthony Orum, *Black Students In Protest: Origins of the Black Student Movement* (Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association, 1972).

²² Park, 2002, 8.

²³ John A. Andrew, *The Other Side of the Sixties: Young Americans for Freedom and the Rise of Conservative Politics* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1997).

²⁴ Andrew, 1997; Becker, 1970; Lawrence Schiff, "The Conservative Movement on American College Campuses" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1964).

²⁵ John Colapinto, "Armies of the Right: The Young Hipublicans," *The New York Times Magazine*, May 25, 2003, 30-59; Emma Ruby-Sachs and Timothy Waligore, "A Once Bright Star Dims," *The Nation* 276[6], Feb. 17, 2003, 29; Emma Ruby-Sachs and Timothy Waligore, "Alternative Voices on Campus," *The Nation* 276[6], Feb 17, 2003, 27-29.

²⁶ Carole Bass and Paul Bass, "Thorns Among the Ivy," *The Progressive*, (n.d.on file at PRA), 1984; Casey, John, "At Dartmouth: The Clash of '89," *The New York Times Magazine*, June 12,1989, 28-77.

²⁷ Fran R. Schumer, 1982, "The New Right's Campus Press," *The Nation* 234, no.13 (April 3, 1982): 395-398.

²⁸ "Campus Kids: The New Swing Voter" (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Institute for Politics). Press Release, May 21, 2003, 3.

²⁹ http://lists.village.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Resources/Primary/Manifestos/SDS_Port_Huron.html (July 18, 2003).

³⁰ Jo Freeman, "Women's Liberation and Its Impact on the Campus," *Liberal Education* 57, no. 4 (1971): 468-478.

³¹ <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/wlm/united/> (July 18, 2003).

³² Julia Lesage, *Making a Difference: University Students of Color Speak Out* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002); Jay M. Rochlin, *Race & Class on Campus: Conversations With Ricardo's Daughter*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997).

³³ *Gay Students Organization v. Bonner*, 509 F.2d 652 (1st Cir. 1974).

³⁴ Wayne Glasker, *Black Students in the Ivory Tower: African American Student Activism at the University of Pennsylvania, 1967-1990* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 176.

³⁵ Rochlin, 1997, 132.

³⁶ Immanuel M..Wallerstein, and Paul Starr, *The University Crisis Reader* (New York: Random House, 1971) 295-391; Clayborne Carson, *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981).

- ³⁷ *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 2001*. Higher Education Research Institute. http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/norms_pr_01.html (July 9, 2004).
- ³⁸ For instance, Columbia University's combined membership of women's, African-American and White radical (SDS) organizations in 1968 was about 200. Barnard Electronic Archive and Teaching Laboratory. <http://beatl.barnard.columbia.edu/columbia68/narratives/SDS.htm> (July 9, 2004).
- ³⁹ Doug McAdam and David Snow, eds., *Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamic*, (Los Angeles, Calif.: Roxbury Publishing Co., 1997), xviii.
- ⁴⁰ See pp. 49-50 of this paper.
- ⁴¹ We arbitrarily omitted two-year schools and community colleges from the list of schools from which this study's sample was drawn for logistical reasons, although students who attend these schools comprise the fastest growing group of higher education students in the United States. Such students remain an important topic for future research, especially related to class issues and the economic impact on campus activism.
- ⁴² The Chronicle of Higher Education, *Facts and Figures, 654 College and University Endowments, 2001-2*.
- ⁴³ The papers we examined were: The UMass *Collegian* and the Massachusetts *Minuteman*, the Wellesley *News*, the Howard *Hilltop*, the *Daily Texan*, the Texas *Contumacy*, the *Carletonian*, the *Daily Vidette*, the Illinois *Indy*, the Claremont Colleges' *Collage*, the Claremont *Independent*, and the *Arizona State Press*.
- ⁴⁴ See for instance: Dinesh D'Souza, *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Class on Campus* (New York: Free Press, 1991); and Alan Charles Kors and Harvey Silvergate, *The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses* (New York: Free Press, 1998).
- ⁴⁵ The source for these and subsequent direct quotations, indicated by quotation marks or indented paragraphs, is PRA's collection of taped interviews compiled for this project.
- ⁴⁶ See for instance David A. Snow and Robert D. Benford, "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest," in Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller, eds. *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992), 133-155.
- ⁴⁷ http://www.asuwebdevil.com/global_user_elements/printpage.cfm?storyid=396747 (March 15, 2003).
- ⁴⁸ <http://cbs.news.com/stories/2003/09/25/national/main575005.shtml> (September 25, 2003).
- ⁴⁹ For a description of fortress reasoning, see Paul Bramadat, *The Church on the World's Turf: An Evangelical Christian Group at a Secular University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 59-64.
- ⁵⁰ Kenneth Keniston, 1968, 44-76.
- ⁵¹ For a discussion of academic freedom, see the articles in the May/June 2003 edition of *Academe*, published by the American Association of University Professors.
- ⁵² Carol Trosset, "Obstacles to open discussion and critical thinking: the Grinnell College study", *Change*, Sept-Oct 1998, 1; Trosset, "Discussion in the Classroom," *General Anthropology*, Fall 1999, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1-8.
- ⁵³ Trosset, 1999, 5.
- ⁵⁴ Trosset, 1999, 7.
- ⁵⁵ See *Contumacy* at the University of Texas, the *Minuteman* at UMass Amherst, or the Claremont *Independent*.
- ⁵⁶ <http://www.statepress.com/issues/2003/09/16> (September 16, 2003).
- ⁵⁷ Megan Rooney, "Tufts Alumni Group Withdraws Award to Student Who Protested Speech by George H.W. Bush." <http://chronicle.com/daily/2003/03/2003032502n.htm>, (March 3, 2003).
- ⁵⁸ "About YAFoundation," <http://www.yaf.org/whoweare.asp>, (September 14, 2003).
- ⁵⁹ Cato's internship director stated that he did not understand how participating in the study would benefit the Cato Institute.
- ⁶⁰ David D. Kirkpatrick, "Young Right Tries to Define a Post-Buckley Future," *New York Times*, July 17, 2004, A17.
- ⁶¹ The Institute of Politics, "The Institute of Politics Survey of Student Attitudes: A National Survey of College Undergraduates," press release (Cambridge, Mass.: JFK School of Government, 2002), 7.
- ⁶² Sarah E. Long, *The New Student Politics: The Wingspread Statement on Student Civic Engagement* (Providence, R.I.: Campus Compact, 2002), 15.
- ⁶³ Rich Cowan and Center for Campus Organizing, *Uncovering the Right on Campus* (Houston Tex.: Public Search, Inc., 1997); Alan C. Kors and Harvey A. Silvergate, *The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses*, (New York: Free Press, 1998), 3; Jürgen Habermas, *Toward a Rational Society: Student Protest, Science, and Politics* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970); Daniel Bell, *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955), xii; Seymour Martin Lipset, David Riesman, and Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Education and Politics at Harvard: Two Essays Prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), xi.
- ⁶⁴ Linda J. Sax, J. A. Lindholm, A. W. Astin, W. S. Korn, and K. M. Mahoney, *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 2002*, Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, 2003.
- ⁶⁵ http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/norms_pr_01.html (July 16, 2003).
- ⁶⁶ National Election Studies: Center for Political Studies, *The NES Guide to Public Opinion and Electoral Behavior: Liberal-Conservative Self-Identification*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2000).
- ⁶⁷ Byung-Shik Rhee et al., "Collegiate Influences on the Civic Values of Students," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1996; Maureen T. McHale, "The Impact on Students' Attitudes Toward Women's Roles." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1994; Linda J. Sax and Marisol Arredondo, "Student Attitudes Towards Affirmative Action in Higher Education," *Research in Higher Education* 40, no. 4 (1999): 439-459.
- ⁶⁸ Eric L. Dey, 1988, "College Impact and Student Liberalism Revisited: The Effect of Student Peers." Paper presented at the annual ASHE meeting, 1988.
- ⁶⁹ Katy J. Harriger, and Jill J. McMillan, 2002, "Citizenship Deferred: Political Attitudes, Experiences, and Entering Expectations of First Year Students at a Liberal Arts College," Paper prepared for delivery August 30, 2002 at the annual conference of the American Political Science Association; Paul R. Loeb, *Generation at the Crossroads: Apathy and Action on the American Campus* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 377.
- ⁷⁰ U.S. Census Bureau, 2002, *Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2000*, 1-16: U.S. Government, Table C, 2000.
- ⁷¹ U.S. Census Bureau, 2002.

- ⁷² Michael X. Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter, *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*, (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1996), xiii; Nina Eliasoph, *Avoiding Politics: How Americans Produce Apathy in Everyday Life* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1998), x.
- ⁷³ The Institute of Politics, *A National Survey of Student Attitudes*, John F. Kennedy School of Government (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002).
- ⁷⁴ Katy J. Harriger and Jill J. McMillan, "Citizenship Deferred: Political Attitudes, Experiences, and Entering Expectations of First Year Students at a Liberal Arts College," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 2002.
- ⁷⁵ Eliasoph, 1998, x.
- ⁷⁶ Sarah Long, *The New Student Politics: The Wingspread Statement on Student Civic Engagement* (Providence, R.I.: College Compact, 2002), 1.
- ⁷⁷ Long, 15.
- ⁷⁸ Anne Colby, *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility* (San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey Bass, 2003).
- ⁷⁹ Douglas Coupland, *Generation X: Tales for an Accelerated Culture* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991); Richard Linklater, *Slacker* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992).
- ⁸⁰ Liz Marlantes, "After 9/11, the Body Politic Tilts to Conservatism," *Christian Science Monitor*, January 16, 2002, 1.
- ⁸¹ Lake Snell Perry Associates and the Tarrance Group, *Short-Term Impacts, Long Term Opportunities: The Politics and Civic Engagement of Young Adults in America* (College Park, Md.: Center for Information and Research in Civic Learning and Engagement, 2002).
- ⁸² Kenneth C. Green, "The Mood on Campus: More Conservative or Just More Materialistic?," *Educational Record* 66 [1]:45-48, 1985.
- ⁸³ Alexander W. Astin, "The Changing American College Student: Implications for Policy and Practice," *Higher Education* 22[2]:129-143, 1991.
- ⁸⁴ See for example: David L. Westby and Richard G. Braungart, "Class and Politics in the Family Backgrounds of Student Political Activists," *American Sociological Review* 31, no. 5 (1966); William A. Watts, Steve Lynch, and David Whittaker, "Alienation and Activism in Today's College-Age Youth: Socialization Patterns and Current Family Relationships," *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 31 (1966): 690-692; Seymour Martin Lipset and Philip G. Altbach, "Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States," in *Student Politics*, ed. Seymour Martin Lipset (New York: Basic Books, 1967), 223-224.
- ⁸⁵ Zogby International, *Report on Academic Life Survey for the Foundation for Academic Standards and Tradition (FAST)*, 2000.
- ⁸⁶ FAST-Zogby Academic Life Survey, April 18, 2000, press release: www.gofast.org/pressrelease.htm, (December 23, 2002).
- ⁸⁷ Memo from the Tarrance Group to IWF, 2/5/02, p. 5, www.shethinks.org/pdf/collegepoll_02.pdf, 5. (November 25, 2002).
- ⁸⁸ "College Students Speak Out," *Americans for Victory Over Terrorism*, [www.avot.org/stories/storyReader\\$72](http://www.avot.org/stories/storyReader$72), (November 25, 2002).
- ⁸⁹ Linda J. Sax et al., 2002.
- ⁹⁰ Alexander W. Astin et al., *The Power of Protest: A National Study of Student and Faculty Disruptions with Implications for the Future* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975).
- ⁹¹ Tony Vellela, *New Voices: Student Political Activism in the '80s and '90s* (Boston: South End Press, 1988).
- ⁹² Paul Rogat Loeb, *Generation at the Crossroads: Apathy and Action on the American Campus* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1994); Keniston, 1968; Kenneth Keniston, *The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1965).
- ⁹³ Loeb, 1994, 19.
- ⁹⁴ See Dinesh D'Souza, *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus* (New York: Free Press, 1991); and Allan David Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988).
- ⁹⁵ Robert A. Rhoads, *Freedom's Web: Student Activism in an Age of Cultural Diversity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).
- ⁹⁶ Arthur Levine and Jeanette S. Cureton, *When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Student* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998).
- ⁹⁷ Liza Featherstone and United Students Against Sweatshops, *Students against Sweatshops* (London: Verso, 2002).
- ⁹⁸ Rich Cowan and Center for Campus Organizing, *Uncovering the Right on Campus* (Houston Tex.: Public Search, Inc., 1997).
- ⁹⁹ Bloom, 1988.
- ¹⁰⁰ D'Souza, 1991.
- ¹⁰¹ Katie Roiphe, *The Morning After: Sex, Fear and Feminism on Campus* (Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown and Company, 1993).
- ¹⁰² Kors and Silverglate, 1998, 4.
- ¹⁰³ David Horowitz and Peter Collier, *The Heterodoxy Handbook: How to Survive the PC Campus* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Pub., 1994).
- ¹⁰⁴ For a look at changing trends in social movement theory, see: Roberta Garner and John Tenuto, *Social Movement Theory and Research: An Annotated Guide*, Magill Bibliographies (Lanham, Md. and Pasadena, Calif.: Scarecrow Press and Salem Press, 1997); Steven M. Buechler, *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 3-57; Kelly Moore, *Syllabi & Teaching Resources for Courses on Collective Behavior and Social Movements* (Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association in cooperation with the section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements, 1997). See also these volumes containing a wide range of interpretations and analytical models: Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClung Mueller, eds., *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992); Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, Mayer N. Zald, *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Steven M. Buechler and F. Kurt Cylke, Jr., eds. *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (Mountain View, Calif.: Mayfield, 1997); Anne N. Costain and Andrew S. McFarland, eds., *Social Movements and American Political Institutions: People, Passions, and Power* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998); Doug McAdam, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly *Dynamics of Contention* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Jeff Goodwin, James M. Jasper, and Francesca Polletta, eds., *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); David S. Meyer, Nancy Whittier, and Belinda Robinet, eds., *Social Movements: Identity, Culture, and the State* (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- ¹⁰⁵ Doug McAdam and David Snow, eds., *Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics* (Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company, 1997), xviii.

- ¹⁰⁶ Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, eds., *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- ¹⁰⁷ For discussions of the idea of civil society, see: Adam Seligman, *The Idea of Civil Society* (New York: The Free Press, 1992); Jean L. Cohen and Andrew Arato, *Civil Society and Political Theory* (Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1994); William F. Felice, *Taking Suffering Seriously: The Importance of Collective Human Rights* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1996); John Keane, *Civil Society: Old Images, New Visions* (Cambridge, Mass.: Polity Press, 1998); and Mervyn Frost, *Constituting Human Rights: Global Civil Society and the Society of Democratic States* (London, England: Routledge, 2002).
- ¹⁰⁸ Pamela E. Oliver and Hank Johnston, "What a Good Idea! Frames and Ideologies in Social Movement Research," *Mobilization: An International Journal* 5, no. 1 (2000): 37-54.
- ¹⁰⁹ John Wilson, *Introduction to Social Movements* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 91.
- ¹¹⁰ Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Doubleday, 1959); Erving Goffman, *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience* (London: Harper and Row, 1974); David A. Snow and Robert D. Benford, "Clarifying the Relationship Between Framing and Ideology in the Study of Social Movements: A Comment on Oliver and Johnston," *Mobilization, An International Journal* 5 (2000): 55-60; David Snow and Robert D. Benford, "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest," in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, eds. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992), 133-155; Hank Johnston, "A Methodology for Frame Analysis: From Discourse to Cognitive Schemata," in *Social Movements, Protest, and Contention*, vol. 4, *Social Movements and Culture* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 217-246.
- ¹¹¹ Mayer N. Zald, "Culture, Ideology and Strategic Framing," in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framing*, eds. Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 261-274; William A. Gamson, "Constructing Social Protest," in *Social Movements and Culture*, eds. Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans., vol. 4, *Social Movements, Protest and Contention* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 85-106; Oliver and Johnston, 2000.
- ¹¹² Bert Klandermans, *The Social Psychology of Protest* (Oxford, England: Blackwell, 1997), 45.
- ¹¹³ David Snow et al., "Frame Alignment Process, Micro-mobilization, and Movement Participation," *American Sociological Review* 51 (1986): 464-481; Johnston, 1995; Gamson, 1995.
- ¹¹⁴ Francesca Polletta, "Contending Stories: Narrative in Social Movements," *Qualitative Sociology* 21 (1998): 419-446; *Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements*, ed. Joseph Davis. (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2002).
- ¹¹⁵ Davis, II.
- ¹¹⁶ Polletta, 422.
- ¹¹⁷ Polletta, 423.
- ¹¹⁸ Patricia Ewick and Susan S. Silbey. "Subversive Stories and Hegemonic Tales: Towards a Sociology of Narrative," *Law & Society Review* 29, no. 2 (1995): 197-226.
- ¹¹⁹ Park, 2002, II.
- ¹²⁰ Gold et al, 1976; Elizabeth A. Stiles, "Social Movements, Policy Initiatives and Political Outcomes at the U.S. State Level." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Political Science Association 2002, 9.
- ¹²¹ Seymour Martin Lipset, et al., 1975.
- ¹²² Sarah Soule, "The Student Divestment Movement in the United States and Tactical Diffusion: The Shantytown Protest," *Social Forces* 75, no. 3 (1997): 855-883.
- ¹²³ Nella Van Dyke, "Hotbeds of Student Activism: Locations of Student Protest," *Social Problems* 45, no. 2 (1998): 205-220.
- ¹²⁴ Kenneth Andrews and Michael Biggs, "The Dynamics of Protest Diffusion: the 1960 Sit-in Movement in the American South," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, 2001.
- ¹²⁵ Eric Hirsch, "Sacrifice for the Cause: Group Processes, Recruitment, and Commitment in a Student Social Movement," *American Sociological Review* 55, no. 2 (1990): 243-254.
- ¹²⁶ Park, 2002, 1-10.
- ¹²⁷ Ellen Messer-Davidow, "Manufacturing the Attack on Liberalized Higher Education," *Social Text*, no. 36 (1993): 40-80.
- ¹²⁸ Ellen Messer-Davidow, *Disciplining Feminism: From Social Activism to Academic Discourse* (Durham N.C.: Duke University Press, 2002).
- ¹²⁹ Messer-Davidow, 229.
- ¹³⁰ Information from www.petersons.com, www.uscollegesearch.org, or www.princetonreview.com (July 13, 2004).

Resource Directories

All quotes were taken from the individual group's website unless stated otherwise.

CONSERVATIVE CAMPUS ACTIVISM GROUPS

Accuracy in Academia

4455 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 330, Washington, D.C., 20008, Phone: (202) 364-3085, Fax: (202) 364-4098, URL: www.academia.org

Accuracy in Academia is a watchdog group fighting perceived liberal biases in academia. The organization publishes *Campus Report*, which offers internships in the journalism field. Shares space with Accuracy in Media which publishes *AIM* report. Lectures by writers such as Dinesh D'Souza and David Horowitz are shown on the Accuracy in Academia site.

American Conservative Union, The

1007 Cameron Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314, Phone:(703) 836-8602, Fax: (703) 836-8606, Email: acu@conservative.org, URL: www.conservative.org

The American Conservative Union (ACU) is the central clearinghouse for networking conservatives loyal to the Old Right "Taft Wing" of the Republican Party. The ACU believes in limited government and has a religious aspect as well. It has hosted the annual Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC), a major conservative student conference, since 1974. The ACU and CPAC actively recruit interns (they prefer juniors and seniors in college "who adhere to conservative ideals").

American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA)

1726 M Street, NW, Suite 800, Washington, D.C., 20036, Phone: (202) 467-6787, Fax: (202) 467-6784, Email: info@goacta.org, URL: www.goacta.org

Formerly known as the National Alumni Forum, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni is a tax-exempt, non-profit, educational organization focusing on academic freedom, standards, and curriculum. Established by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute in 1994 and first directed by Lynne Cheney, ACTA has members from over 400 colleges and universities. According to its website, ACTA's quarterly publication, *Inside Academe*, has over 12,000 readers, including over 3,500 college and university trustees.

American Enterprise Institute

1150 Seventeenth Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20036, Phone: (202) 862-5800, Fax: (202) 862-7177, Email: info@aei.org, URL: www.aei.org

Established in 1943, the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) "is an independent, nonprofit organization supported primarily by grants and contributions from foundations, corporations, and individuals." Its beliefs include limited government, private enterprise, and strong national defense. The AEI states that it is a nonpartisan organization that takes no institutional positions on pending legislation or other policy questions. Newt Gingrich, Irving Kristol, Dinesh D'Souza and Christina Hoff Sommers are among AEI's fellows and scholars. AEI is an influential organization whose scholars, fellows, and senior management have close ties with the Bush administration.

American Legislative Exchange Council

1129 20th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C., 20036, Phone: (202) 466-3800, Fax: (202) 466-3801, Email: info@alec.org, URL: www.alec.org

The American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) is a conservative think tank that favors limited government, free markets, and individual liberty. It has numerous task forces dedicated to issues like criminal justice, tax and fiscal policy, and Federalism. ALEC provides legislators and lobbyists with language for filing bills on conservative issues. Its annual meeting has been described as the "largest gathering of conservatives held each year." ALEC offers internships to students in all years and all majors.

Americans for Tax Reform

1920 L Street, NW, Suite 200, Washington, D.C., 20036, Phone: (202) 785-0266, Fax: (202) 785-0261, Email: friends@atr.org, URL: www.atr.org

Americans for Tax Reform (ATR) is an organization that opposes all tax increases. ATR offers internships for undergraduate and graduate students of all majors who share ATR's interest in tax reform and economic policy.

Americans for Victory Over Terrorism

937 West Foothill Boulevard, Suite E, Claremont, CA, 91711, Phone: (909) 621-6825, Fax: (909) 626-8724, Email: info@claremont.org, URL: www.avot.org

Americans for Victory Over Terrorism (AVOT) is a project of The Claremont Institute. AVOT defends democratic principles and looks for ways to become more knowledgeable about terrorist enemies. It sponsors traveling teach-ins for colleges on the war in Iraq.

America's Future Foundation

1512 21st Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20036,
 Phone: (202) 544-7707,
 Email: tom@americasfuture.org,
 URL: www.americasfuture.org

America's Future Foundation is a Conservative/ Libertarian organization geared toward mobilizing conservatives and youth. The Foundation publishes *Doublethink*, a quarterly magazine, and *Brainwash*, a weekly online magazine. It also has a program for interns (from the D.C. area) called "DC7," which arranges for conservative speakers, meetings, and roundtable discussions on how to gain the most from internships.

Campus Leadership Program

1101 North Highland Street, Arlington, VA, 22201,
 Phone: (800) 827-5323,
 Email: clp@leadershipinstitute.org,
 URL: www.campusleadership.org

The Campus Leadership Program is a division of the Leadership Institute. The program's goal is to foster "permanent, effective, conservative student organizations on college campuses across America." The program sends trained field representatives to college campuses in order to identify and recruit future student leaders who will then create and oversee organizations on each campus while promoting conservative views.

Campus Watch

1500 Walnut Street, Suite 1050, Philadelphia, PA, 19102,
 Email: staff@campus-watch.org, URL: campus-watch.org

Campus Watch is a website of the Middle East Forum. Founded by Daniel Pipes, Campus Watch reviews and critiques Middle East studies in North America, with an aim to ensure they do not promote anti-Israeli sentiment. The organization also targets individual faculty members.

Cato Institute

1000 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C., 20001, Phone: (202) 842-0200, Fax: (202) 842-3490, Email: cato@cato.org, URL: www.cato.org

Established in 1977, the Cato Institute is a non-profit, Libertarian, public policy research foundation. The Institute "seeks to broaden the parameters of public policy debate to allow consideration of the traditional American principles of limited government, individual liberty, free markets and peace." Cato offers internships to those who share the Institute's values.

Center for Security Policy, The

1920 L Street, NW, Suite 210, Washington, D.C., 20036,
 Phone: (202) 835-9077, Fax: (202) 835-9066,
 Email: info@centerforsecuritypolicy.org,
 URL: www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org

The Center for Security Policy promotes international peace via American strength. It very prominently supports the war in Iraq. The Center's website lists articles that connect several student activist groups (mainly pro-Palestinian) to terrorist organizations. Dick Cheney and Dan Quayle were former board advisors for the Center and William Bennett is a current member of their National Security Advisory Council. The Center has received grants from organizations like the JM Foundation, the Sarah Scaife Foundation, the John M. Olin Foundation, and the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation.

Center for Strategic and International Studies

1800 K Street, Suit 400, NW, Washington, D.C., 20006,
 Phone: (202) 887-0200, Fax: (202) 775-3199,
 Email: info@csis.org, URL: www.csis.org

The Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) is a private, nonpartisan, and tax-exempt organization. CSIS staff focuses on national and international security, maintaining resident experts on all of the world's major geographical regions, and helping develop new methods of governance "for the global age." CSIS offers full and part-time internships for undergraduate, advanced students and recent graduates.

Center for the Study of Popular Culture

4401 Wilshire Drive, 4th Floor, Los Angeles, CA, 90010,
 Phone: (323) 556-2550, Email: info@cspc.org,
 URL: www.cspc.org

The Center for the Study of Popular Culture is an organization "dedicated to defending the cultural foundations of a free society...." It has gained attention among colleges through campus speaking appearances by the Center's President, David Horowitz. These appearances facilitated the establishment of a nationwide campus network that increased the distribution of the Center's literature and built the audience for its website. According to its website, the Center distributed half a million books and pamphlets on the war on terror, the Middle East crisis and the anti-American left in 2003. The Center has 40,000 contributing supporters and an online journal, FrontPage Magazine. This webzine's staff includes celebrities like David Horowitz (editor-in-chief), Tammy Bruce (contributing editor), and Ann Coulter (columnist). The Center is affiliated with The Individual Rights Foundation, which serves as its legal branch.

Clare Booth Luce Policy Institute

112 Elden Street, Suite P, Herndon VA 20170,
Phone: (703) 318-0730, Fax: (703) 318-8867,
URL: www.cblpolicyinstitute.org

The Luce Policy Institute is named after Clare Booth Luce, a successful conservative public figure. Clare Booth Luce was openly opposed to communism and an outspoken advocate of free enterprise. During her life, she was the editor of "Vanity Fair," a Congresswoman from Connecticut, and the American Ambassador to Italy. The Institute's "Conservative Women Speakers Program" sponsors conservative and anti-feminist women speakers to lecture at college campuses and produces anti-feminist policy papers directed at college students.

Claremont Institute, The

937 West Foothill Boulevard, Suite E, Claremont, CA, 91711, Phone: (909) 621-6825, Fax: (909) 626-8724, Email: info@claremont.org, URL: www.claremont.org

Established in 1979, the Claremont Institute's goal is to establish a "limited and accountable government that respects private property, promotes stable family life, and maintains a strong defense." The Institute, located on the Claremont McKenna College campus, publishes The Claremont Review of Books. William Bennett is the Institute's Washington Fellow. The Institute houses the Publius Fellows program.

College Republican National Committee

600 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Suite 215, Washington, D.C., 20003, Phone: (888) 765-3564, Fax: (202) 608-1429, Email: info@crnc.org, URL: www.crnc.org

The College Republican National Committee (CRNC) is a college campus political organization that "provides training in conservative thought, political technology, and grassroots lobbying." (website) The website states that there are 120,000 College Republicans on 1,148 campuses across the country. (website) In recent years, CRNC says that it has tripled in size due to its outreach programs like the Field Program, Women's Outreach, Minority Outreach and Jewish Outreach. (website)

Collegiate Network

3901 Centerville Road, P.O. Box 4431, Wilmington, DE, 19807, Phone: (800) 225-2862, Fax: (302) 652-1760, Email: cn@isi.org, URL: www.collegiatenetwork.org

Established in 1979, the Collegiate Network believes that American colleges and universities have declined in educational standards because of liberal politicization. The organization provides funding to conservative students and campus publications and provides technical assistance by making use of its journalistic base. Previously, the Collegiate Network was supported and administered

by the Institute for Educational Affairs (IEA). Then, when the Madison Center for Educational Affairs (MCEA) merged with IEA, the Madison Center administered the network until 1995. The Network is now housed at the Intercollegiate Studies Institute (ISI) in Wilmington, Delaware.

Competitive Enterprise Institute

1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1250, Washington, D.C., 20036, Phone: (202) 331-1010, Fax: (202) 331-0640, Email: info@cei.org, URL: www.cei.org

Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) was established in 1984. The Institute is a non-profit public policy organization that believes in free enterprise and limited government. CEI challenges environmental regulations and coordinates the Earth Day Alternative coalition. CEI recruits both full-time and part-time interns throughout the year.

Concerned Women for America

1015 15th Street, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, D.C., 20005, Phone: (202) 488-7000, Fax: (202) 488-0806, URL: www.cwfa.org

Concerned Women for America is the nation's largest conservative Christian women's organization with chapters in 50 states. Founded by Beverly La Haye, the organization considers high levels of defense spending and aggressive anticommunism to be integral to defending traditional family values. The organization has initiated the Reagan Memorial Internship Program.

Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC)

1007 Cameron Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314, Phone: (800) 752-4391, Email: srumenap@conservative.org, URL: www.cpac.org

The Conservative Political Action Conference is geared to students and lasts for three days and is open to the public. Conservative activists and leaders attend the conference "to discuss current issues and policies, and set the agenda for the future." (conservative.org) Participants include such political figures as Presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush, Vice President Dan Quayle, and Senate GOP leader Bob Dole. CPAC's goal is "to bring dedicated and talented Americans into the conservative movement and to train and motivate them for political action." (conservative.org) CPAC looks for student volunteers to help out at the conference.

Eagle Forum Collegians

316 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Suite 203, Washington, D.C., 20003, Phone: (202) 544-0353, Fax: (202) 547-6996, URL: www.efcollegians.org

Eagle Forum Collegians (EFC) is a subgroup of Phyllis Schlafly's Eagle Forum. The organization is designed to attract college students and encourage them to speak out about conservative interests on campus. EFC offers an annual free student summit in Washington.

Family Research Council

801 G Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20001, Phone: (202) 393-2100, Fax: (202) 393-2134, Email: corrdept@frc.org, URL: www.frc.org

Family Research Council (FRC) is an influential think tank and lobbying group. Led by Gary L. Bauer, FRC was a division of James Dobson's Focus on the Family from 1988 until October 1992, when IRS concerns about the group's lobbying led to an amicable administrative separation. FRC believes marriage and family are the foundations of civilization. FRC offers a student resident fellow program, the Witherspoon Fellowship. See Witherspoon Fellowship.

Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy, The

1015 18th Street, NW, Suite 425, Washington, D.C., 20036, Phone: (202) 822-8138, Fax: (202) 296-8061, Email: fedsoc@radix.net, URL: www.fed-soc.org

Founded in 1982, the Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies is a conservative institute concerned with the law. The institute is made up of a group of conservatives and Libertarians dedicated to fighting the perceived "liberal orthodox ideology" in law schools and the law profession. The institute has chapters for students and lawyers.

Focus on the Family

8605 Explorer Drive, Colorado Springs, CO, 80920, Phone: (719) 531-3424, Fax: (719) 531-3400, URL: www.family.org

Focus on the Family is an influential pro-family organization that seeks to defend family, faith and traditional values. Founded in 1977, the organization is led by family counselor James Dobson, Ph.D. The organization has grown so large it has its own zip code. Focus on the Family desires to preserve traditional values and the institution of the family. Its Focus on the Family Institute has a residential program that offers college students semester courses.

Foundation for Individual Rights in Education

210 West Washington Square, Suite 303, Philadelphia, PA, 19106, Phone: (215) 717-3473, Fax: (215) 717-3440, Email: fire@thefire.org, URL: www.thefire.org

In October 1999 Alan Charles Kors and Harvey A. Silverglate founded the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) in response to communications they had received from people who had read their book *The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses*. FIRE desires to protect "freedoms" on campus—"freedom of speech, legal equality, due process, religious liberty, and sanctity of conscience" and to educate the public.

Fund for American Studies, The

1706 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C., 20009, Phone: (202) 986-0384, Fax: (202) 986-0390, Email: info@tfas.org, URL: www.tfas.org

Established in 1967, the Fund for American Studies runs four summer institutes on conservative economics and political theory at Georgetown University and a semester-long program there as well. The Fund has received funds from the Castle Rock Foundation, a Coors family fund, among others.

Heritage Foundation, The

214 Massachusetts Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C., 20002, Phone: (202) 546-4400, Fax: (202) 546-8328, Email: info@heritage.org, URL: www.heritage.org

One of the most influential conservative think tanks in the country, The Heritage Foundation was established in 1973 to formulate and promote conservative public policies based on principles of free enterprise, limited government, individual freedom, traditional American values, and a strong national defense. The Foundation seeks interns year round and has hosted up to 50 in a summer. Its internship program introduces undergraduate students to the policymaking process and encourages them to become active in public affairs. Interns attend weekly seminars on conservative ideas and current policy debates in addition to day-to-day assignments.

Independent Women's Forum

1726 M Street, NW, Tenth Floor, Washington, D.C., 20036, Phone: (202) 419-1820, Email: info@iwf.org, URL: www.iwf.org

The Independent Women's Forum (IWF) is an anti-feminist women's organization funded by the conservative movement. Publications include *The Women's Quarterly* and *Ex-Femina*. IWF desires to "counter the dangerous influence of radical feminism in the courts [and campuses]" and "educate women on the benefits of the free market and the danger of big government." Christina Hoff Sommers is a spokesperson. IWF runs the "SheThinks" program on campuses as a way to counter-

act feminist thinking. It sponsors, among other programs, "Take Back the Date."

Institute on Political Journalism

1706 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C., 20009, Phone: (800) 741-6964, Fax: (202) 318-0441, Email: admissions@tfas.org, URL: www.dccinternships.org/ipj

One of the summer Georgetown programs run by The Fund for American Studies, the Institute on Political Journalism offers a program for approximately 85 students interested in political journalism. The program is eight weeks long, and consists of classes at Georgetown University, an internship, and informational meetings. The cost of the program is fairly expensive, but scholarships are available.

Intercollegiate Studies Institute, Inc.

3901 Centerville Road, P.O. Box 4431, Wilmington, DE, 19807, Phone: (800) 526-7022, Fax: (302) 652-1760, Email: isi@isi.org, URL: www.isi.org

Founded in 1953, the Intercollegiate Studies Institute is a non-profit, non-partisan, tax-exempt educational organization dedicated to promoting conservative thought on campus. A mainstay of the Old Right, the Institute publishes *CAMPUS: America's Student Newspaper*, *Intercollegiate Review*, *ISI Update*, *Political Science Review*, and *Modern Age*. The Institute opposes multiculturalism and all forms of liberalism. It also houses the Collegiate Network of conservative student newspapers and has been funded by such organizations as the Sarah Scaife Foundation, the Olin Foundation, the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation.

Israel on Campus Coalition

Charles and Lynn Schusterman National Center, Arthur and Rochelle Belfer Building, 800 Eighth Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20001, Email: info@israeloncampuscoalition.org, URL: www.israeloncampuscoalition.org

Founded in 2002, the Israel Campus Coalition (ICC) is a network of 25 mostly conservative national organizations that seek support for Israel by offering publications, travel and other learning opportunities for college student leaders (like newspaper editors or student activists). Student activists have used ICC support to help bring to campus a counter presence to divestment campaigns, Palestinian support activities, and other actions they consider anti-Israel.

John M. Olin Foundation, Inc.

330 Madison Avenue, 22nd floor, New York NY 10017, Phone: (212) 661-2670, Fax: (212) 661-5917, Email: inquiry@jmof.org, URL: www.jmof.org

Established in 1953 by John Merrill Olin, the John M. Olin Foundation's goal has been "...to provide support for projects that reflect or are intended to strengthen the economic, political and cultural institutions upon which the American heritage of constitutional government and private enterprise is based." The Foundation is no longer "considering unsolicited proposals" and has initiated a phase out plan. The Foundation is one of the major funders of conservative organizations with grantees like the Heritage Foundation, the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, and the Intercollegiate Studies Institute.

Leadership Institute

1101 North Highland Street, Arlington, VA, 22201, Phone: (703) 247-2000, Fax: (703) 247-2001, Email: lead@townhall.com, URL: www.leadershipinstitute.org

The Leadership Institute is a major conservative training ground for right-wing youth. The Institute includes an employment placement service and intern program that places institute attendees in prominent right-wing organizations. Founded in 1979 by Morton C. Blackwell to "identify, recruit, train, and place conservatives." According to its website, the Institute has had over 30,000 students participate in its programs.

Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation

1241 North Franklin Place, P.O. Box 510860, Milwaukee, WI, 53203, Phone: (414) 291-9915, Fax: (414) 291-9991, URL: www.bradleyfdn.org

The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation is a Milwaukee-based foundation with assets of \$461 million. It is a leading funder of conservative and ultra-conservative causes. Its money goes to organizations like the Heritage Foundation and the American Competitive Enterprise Institute with indirect influence on campus.

National Association of Scholars

221 Witherspoon Street, Second Floor, Princeton, NJ, 08542, Phone: (609) 683-7878, Fax: (609) 683-0316, Email: nas@nas.org, URL: www.nas.org

The National Association of Scholars (NAS) is an organization made up of professors, graduate students, college administrators and trustees, and independent scholars "committed to rational discourse as the foundation of academic life in a free and democratic society." The organization promotes Western civilization values. Irving Kristol and Christina Hoff Sommers are among its Board of Advisors.

National College Students for Life

512 Tenth Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20004,
Phone: (202) 626-8809, Email: students@nrlc.org,
URL: www.nrlc.org/College/nhome.htm

National College Students for Life (NCSL) is a student-run branch of the National Right to Life Committee (www.nrlc.org). NSCL provides information and educational materials to campuses and advises college right-to-life groups.

National Conservative Student Conference

c/o Young America's Foundation
110 Elden Street, Herndon VA 20170,
Phone: (703) 318-9608, Fax: (703) 318-9122,
Email: yaf@yaf.org,
URL: www.yaf.org/conferences/college/conference.asp

The National Conservative Student Conference (NCSC) is a six-day conference offered by the Young America's Foundation. Attendees "hear about the principles and ideas that define contemporary conservatism from the Conservative Movement's biggest stars" through lectures, discussions, and policy briefings. The 26th Annual NCSC hosted speakers such as Morton Blackwell, Bay Buchanan, and Ben Stein. (See Young America's Foundation.)

National Journalism Center, The

110 Elden Street, Herndon VA 20170,
Phone: (703) 318-9608, Fax: (703) 318-9122, Email:
njc@dc.infi.net, URL: www.nationaljournalismcenter.org

Founded by M. Stanton Evans in 1977, the National Journalism Center is a project of Young America's Foundation. The Center functions as a conservative training ground for interns in conservative journalism and maintains a conservative news website. Its intern program places interns at locations like ABC, Newsweek, and CNN while its "Job Bank" helps place alumni in permanent media positions. Interns are also given the opportunity to hear speakers from the world of public policy and the media. For students interested in economic subjects, the Center sponsors economic fellowships.

National Review

215 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY, 10016,
Phone: (212) 679-7330,
Email: letters@nationalreview.com,
URL: www.nationalreview.com

The National Review, founded by William F. Buckley, Jr., is considered one of the oldest and most influential conservative magazines in the United States. It regularly publishes the work of some of the nation's leading conservatives. It also maintains a website for its online journal, NRO, popular with conservative students. It has received grants from the Olin, Scaife, and Bradley Foundations.

NoIndoctrination.org

P.O. Box 2783, La Mesa, CA, 91943,
Email: administrator@noindoctrination.org,
URL: www.noindoctrination.org

No Indoctrination is a web presence that invites students to post their opinions about a course or orientation they believe has blatant socio-political bias. The site also works to inform the professors or schools that they have been accused and invites rebuttals.

Publius Fellows Program

The Claremont Institute, 937 West Foothill Boulevard, Suite E, Claremont, CA, 91711, Phone: (909) 621-6825, Fax: (909) 626-8724, Email: tkarako@claremont.org, URL: www.claremont.org/projects/publius

Run by the conservative think tank the Claremont Institute, the Publius Fellowship is a four week program for about 10 upper-class college and graduate students in political philosophy and public policy. Participants work with the Institute's main publication, receiving the opportunity to write op-ed political articles and have them critiqued by Claremont editors. Fellowship participants are given a \$2,000 stipend and free housing.

Reason Foundation

3415 South Sepulveda Boulevard, Suite 400,
Los Angeles, CA, 90034, Phone: (310) 391-2245,
Fax: (310) 391-4395, Email: gpassantino@reason.org,
URL: www.reason.org

The Reason Foundation consists of the Reason Public Policy Institute, a nonpartisan libertarian think tank, and *Reason* magazine, a popular publication among college students. *Reason* magazine also has an online counterpart.

Ronald Reagan Future Leaders Scholarship Program

7811 Montrose Road, Suite 100, Potomac, MD, 20854,
Phone: (301) 340-7788,
Email: jhollingsworth@phillips.com,
URL: www.thephillipsfoundation.org/futureleaders.htm

Established in 1999 by the Phillips Foundation, the Future Leaders Program (later renamed the Ronald Reagan Future Leaders Scholarship Program) offers renewable scholarships to college undergraduates who demonstrate leadership according to the foundation's belief in freedom, American values and constitutional principles and promote these values on college campuses. In the academic year of 2004-2005, the Foundation awarded \$259,000 in new and renewed scholarships.

Sarah Scaife Foundation

301 Grant Street, One Oxford Centre, Suite 3900,
Pittsburgh, PA, 15219, Phone: (412) 392-2900,
URL: www.scaife.com/sarah.html

The Sarah Scaife Foundation is a leading financier in New Right causes and is considered to be one of the top four conservative foundations. Grantees have included organizations like The Heritage Foundation, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and the Intercollegiate Studies Institute.

Smith Richardson Foundation

60 Jesup Road, Westport CT, 06880,
Phone: (203) 222-6222, Fax: (203) 222-6282,
Email: webresponse@srf.org, URL: www.srf.org

The Smith Richardson Foundation uses money from the Vicks VapoRub fortune to fund conservative and ultraconservative causes. The Foundation has given money to organizations like the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research and the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Students for Academic Freedom

1015 15th Street, NW, 900, Washington, D.C., 20005,
Phone: (202) 969-2467, Fax: (202) 408-0632,
Email: sara@studentsforacademicfreedom.org,
URL: www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org

Founded by David Horowitz, Students for Academic Freedom (SAF) is an information center for promoting intellectual diversity on campus and defending free speech for conservative students. As of August 2004, SAF reports that it has 135 campus affiliates organized primarily on the Web.

Witherspoon Fellowship, The

801 G Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20001,
Phone: (202) 393-2100, Fax: (202) 393-2134,
URL: www.witherspoonfellowship.org

The Witherspoon Fellowship is a program of the Family Research Council. College-age students enter the Fellowship through a semester of study and internship in Washington, D.C., at the Family Research Council. The Fellowship is a cultural leadership development program whose mission "is to form the mind and character of future civic and cultural leaders and to fashion them into a community of Christians for public station."

Young America's Foundation

110 Elden Street, Herndon, VA, 20170,
Phone: (703) 318-9608, Fax: (703) 318-9122,
Email: yaf@yaf.org, URL: www.yaf.org

The Young America's Foundation is an influential right-wing youth organization. The Foundation was established by friends and former leaders of Young Americans for Freedom, but is no longer affiliated with

them. The Foundation introduces American youth to the principles of individual freedom, strong national defense, free enterprise, and traditional values. It provides conferences, seminars, educational materials, internships and speakers to young people. It coordinates the National Conservative Student Conference program. The Foundation also manages the Reagan Ranch in California and runs the National Journalism Center program.

Young Americans for Freedom

8116 Arlington Boulevard, 263, Falls Church, VA,
22042, Phone: (877) YAF-2170, Fax: (703) 249-0779,
Email: info@yaf.com, URL: www.yaf.com

Young Americans for Freedom is a national organization of ultraconservative college students and young adults. Its website lists 26 campus affiliates. It was once a much more visible and influential young people's movement.

Young Republican National Federation

525 G Street, SE, Washington, D.C., 20003,
Phone: (202) 608-1417, Email: yrfn_co-chair@yahoo.com, URL: www.YRNF.com

Young Republican National Federation is the governing body for state Young Republicans affiliates. Its website states that it is "the nation's oldest and largest youth political society." Young Republicans offers Republicans (aged 18-40) special and networking support for their political development. Generally the state or local clubs are community-, not campus-, based and attract a slightly older membership than the College Republicans.

PROGRESSIVE CAMPUS ACTIVISM GROUPS

180/Movement for Democracy and Education

180/Movement for Democracy and Education
Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 251701, Little Rock, AR, 72225,
Phone: (501) 244-2439, Fax: (501) 374-3935, Email:
info@180mde.org, URL: www.campusdemocracy.org

The 180/Movement for Democracy and Education is a student-run organization with a strong web presence. The organization's goal is "to help build a mass movement to reinvigorate a political culture of engaged democracy and social justice in our schools, in our communities, across our country and beyond."

21st Century Democrats

1311 L Street, NW, Suite 300, Washington, D.C., 20005,
Phone: (202) 626-5620, Fax: (202) 347-0956,
Email: info@21stdems.org,
URL: www.21stcenturydems.org

21st Century Democrats recruits and trains future campaign staff in the fundamentals of grassroots organizing in order to support progressive and populist candidates.

The organization desires to transform the Democratic Party by electing candidates who believe in progressive values. It also works with elected officials to build the next generation of Democratic leadership. Its program, "Vote Mob" is aimed "to increase voter participation among 18-34 year-olds in the presidential battleground states of Minnesota, Oregon, and Ohio."

Action Without Borders, Inc.

79 Fifth Avenue, 17th floor, New York, NY, 10003,
Phone: (212) 843-3973, Fax: (212) 564-3377,
URL: www.idealists.org

Action Without Borders runs the Idealists.org web site. Formerly the Contact Center Network, Action Without Borders was founded in 1995 with the goal of building a network of neighborhood Contact Centers that offers volunteer opportunities and nonprofit services, connecting people with volunteer or paying jobs as well as internships.

American Association of University Professors

1012 Fourteenth Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C., 20005, Phone: (202) 737-5900,
Fax: (202) 737-5526, Email: aaup@aaup.org,
URL: www.aaup.org

Founded in 1915, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is a non-profit organization whose services are available to all academic professionals at the college level, regardless of membership status. AAUP is best known for assisting individual faculty members when there is the probability that academic freedom or due process rights have been violated.

American Association of University Women

1111 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D.C., 20036,
Phone: (800) 326-AAUW, Fax: (202) 872-1425,
Email: info@aauw.org, URL: www.aauw.org

The American Association of University Women (AAUW) promotes opportunities for women and girls. AAUW offers a range of opportunities and benefits for student, faculty, and institution members. It offers an internship program as well as fellowships and grants. Its Legal Advocacy Fund supports women who challenge sex discrimination on campus. In addition, the organization has a national conference for college student women leaders, an electronic newsletter (by students, for students) called *Students Speak Out*, and a Student Advisory Council ("a national coalition of student leaders [that] advise[s] AAUW on strategies for the future of young women and girls.")

American Civil Liberties Union

125 Broad Street, 18th Floor, New York, NY, 10004,
Phone: (212) 549-2585, Fax: (212) 869-4314,
Email: info@aclu.org, URL: www.aclu.org

Founded in 1920, the ACLU is a strong advocate of civil liberties. ACLU is involved in legislative lobbying and it works in conjunction with the ACLU Foundation. "The ACLU is supported by annual dues and contributions from its members, plus grants from private foundations and individuals." It offers legal internships and fellowships. In 2003 the ACLU held the first College Freedom Tour, a combination of live concerts and political forums that focused on local civil liberties issues as well as on "ACLU's national programs in support of racial justice, individual privacy, and privacy of information."

Americans for Democratic Action/New Leadership for Democratic Action

1625 K Street, NW, Suite 210, Washington, D.C., 20006,
Phone: (202) 785-5980, Fax: (202) 785-5969,
Email: adaction@ix.netcom.com,
URL: www.adaction.org

Americans for Democratic Action, a liberal independent lobbying organization, started the organization New Leadership for Democratic Action (NLDA) to organize young liberals on college campuses. They share the same office in Washington.

Amnesty International USA

322 8th Avenue, New York, NY, 10001,
Phone: (212) 807-8400, Fax: (212) 627-1451,
URL: www.amnestyusa.org

Amnesty International (AI) studies human rights abuses around the world. AI supports student groups on campuses that, once registered, receive *Urgent Actions* (newsletter), the Activist Toolkit, and invitations to educational events.

Association of American Colleges and Universities

1818 R Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20009,
Phone: (202) 387-3760, Fax: (202) 265-9532,
URL: www.aacu.org

Founded in 1915 by college presidents, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) "forges links among presidents, academic administrators, faculty members and national leaders committed to educational inclusion and the values of liberal education." The organization offers Summer Institutes for campus leadership teams (faculty and academic administrators), the Network for Academic Renewal (an annual series of faculty development and topical conferences), a Presidents' Forum and Annual Meeting, journals, including the *Liberal Education*, and a publications program linked to AAC&U's current priorities.

Campaign for America's Future

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 205, Washington, D.C., 20036, Phone: (202) 955-5665, Fax: (202) 955-5606, Email: info@ourfuture.org, URL: www.ourfuture.org

Campaign for America's Future is a progressive organization that acts as a "center of progressive strategy, organizing and issue campaigns." Campaign for America's Future fights against policies like the privatization of Social Security and for policies like affordable health care.

Campus Compact

Brown University, Box 1975, Providence RI 02912, Phone: (401) 867-3950, Email: campus@compact.org, URL: www.compact.org

Campus Compact, a national coalition of more than 900 colleges, promotes community service and develops students' citizenship skills and values. Students get membership benefits like state and local assistance in organizing and funding activities; grants for graduate students conducting service-learning research; and access to online information about events, resources, grants and fellowships, and discussion forums.

Campus Greens

P.O. Box 1540, Sagamore Beach, MA, 02562, Phone: (508) 833-0334, Email: info@campusgreens.org, URL: www.campusgreens.org

Campus Greens is a "national student-based, non-profit organization dedicated to building a broad-based movement for radical democracy on America's high school and college campuses." The organization is very active in ecology, social justice, democracy, and non-violence issues. Campus Greens also belongs to coalitions such as National Youth and Student Peace Coalition (NYSPC) and United for Peace and Justice (UFPJ).

CampusActivism.org

URL: www.campusactivism.org

Online since 2002, Campus Activism is a web presence that offers tools to progressive student activists. Run by recently graduated students, this site welcomes progressive campus groups to list their events on its page. It has over 600 groups and scores of events available at any one time and offers multiple print resources for student activists.

Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement

School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, 20742, Phone: (301) 405-2790, URL: www.civicyouth.org

Founded in 2001, the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) "promotes research on the civic and political engagement of Americans between the ages of 15 and 25." CIRCLE conducts and funds research on projects with the goal of increasing young people's engagement in politics and civic life. It receives funding from The Pew Charitable Trusts and Carnegie Corporation of New York. It is housed in the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy.

Center for Third World Organizing

1218 E. 21st Street, Oakland, CA, 94606, Phone: (510) 533-7583, Fax: (510) 533-0923, Email: ctwo@ctwo.org, URL: www.ctwo.org

The Center for Third World Organizing (CTWO) is committed to building minority-led social justice movements. Established in 1984, CTWO functions as a training and resource center with programs like the Movement Activist Apprenticeship Program for young activists of color.

Century Foundation, The

41 East 70th Street, New York, NY, 10021, Phone: (212) 535- 4441, Email: info@tcf.org, URL: www.tcf.org

Founded in 1919 as the Twentieth Century Fund, The Century Foundation has provided policymakers with new ideas for addressing the nation's challenges. The Foundation's mission "is to persuade those who care about issues such as economic inequality, population aging, homeland security, discontent with government and politics, and national security that significant improvements are possible even when the conventional wisdom says they are not." The Foundation also sponsors the Century Institute, a project that provides online and on site opportunities for college students. The Century Institute offers weekend seminars and other opportunities to students interested in the progressive approach to political issues. It publishes the e-newsletter Liberal Ink.

Children's Defense Fund

25 E Street N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Phone: (202) 628-8787, Email: cdinfo@childrensdefense.org, URL: www.childrensdefense.org

Established in 1973, the Children's Defense Fund (CDF) advocates for the interests of youth while paying special attention to minority and disabled children. It has a

variety of campaigns including CDF's "Student Health OUTreach" ("SHOUT") and "Student Poverty Reduction OUTreach" ("SPROUT") programs that link college and high school students with local community-based organizations.

Choice USA

1010 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Suite 410, Washington, D.C., 20007, Phone: (202) 965-7700, Fax: (202) 965-7701, Email: info@choiceusa.org, URL: www.choiceusa.org

Founded by Gloria Steinem in 1992, Choice USA is a national pro-choice organization. Its mission is to build leadership and organizing skills in emerging leaders. Its youth-centered pro-choice agenda works to mobilize communities for reproductive freedom through its institutes, fellowships, and internships. The Gloria Steinem Leadership Institute is a five day intensive training program. This program gives 50 participants a year the opportunity increase their organizing skills for reproductive freedom.

Civil Liberties and Public Policy Program

Civil Liberties and Public Policy Program, Hampshire College, 893 West Street, Amherst, MA, 01002, Phone: (413) 559-5416, Fax: (413) 559-5826, Email: clpp@hampshire.edu, URL: clpp.hampshire.edu/population_and_development.htm

A national resource for students at Hampshire College, the Civil Liberties and Public Policy Program sponsors an annual activist conference for students on social justice and reproductive freedom. The Program is affiliated with the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College.

College Democrats of America

430 South Capitol Street, SE, Washington, D.C., 20003, Phone: (202) 863-8151, URL: www.collegedems.com

College Democrats of America (CDA), the student branch of the Democratic Party, "aims to elect Democrats, train and engage new generations of progressive activists, and shape the Democratic Party with voices from America's youth." Each year students attend the annual CDA National Convention where CDA sponsors workshops and events with influential members of the Democratic Party. It supports many campus chapters and involves members in local, state and national electoral campaigns.

Democracy Matters Institute, The

2600 Johnny Cake Hill Road, Hamilton, NY, 13346, Phone: (315) 824-4306, Email: joanm@democracymatters.org, URL: www.democracymatters.org

The Democracy Matters Institute, founded by NBA player Adonal Foyle, is a progressive organization that has campus-based chapters throughout the country "to help students fight for progressive change by standing up to big money interests corrupting our democracy." Its Campus Intern Program offers year-round training for paid undergraduate interns as well as providing support for those students to lead their campus chapter efforts.

Feminist Campus

1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 801, Arlington, VA, 22209, Phone: (703) 522-2214, Fax: (703) 522-2219, Email: campusteam@feminist.org, URL: www.feministcampus.org

Sponsored by the Feminist Majority Foundation, Feminist Campus informs young feminists about the threats to abortion access, women's rights, affirmative action, and LGBT rights. The network consists of 135 organizations in 35 different states. Feminist Campus currently has campaigns to get the vote out to women across America and petitions supporting over-the-counter emergency contraception. It describes itself as the "world's largest pro-choice student network."

Foreign Policy in Focus

733 15th Street, NW, Suite 1020, Washington, D.C., 20005, Phone: (202) 234-9382, Email: infocus@fpif.org, URL: www.fpif.org

Foreign Policy in Focus (FPFIF) describes itself as a "think tank without walls." FPFIF is a collaboration of the Institute for Policy Studies and the Interhemispheric Resource Center. One of its goals is to help the progressive community "deepen its analysis by formulating and strengthening core principles and consistency on foreign policy." It has an entire section of its website devoted to student activism, which offers numerous resources including a list of campus organizations, fact sheets, activism packets, policy briefs, and various organizing materials.

Free the Planet

218 D Street, SE, Washington, D.C., 20003, Phone: (202) 547-3656, Email: info@freetheplanet.org, URL: www.freetheplanet.org

Free the Planet is a dominantly student-led environmental activist organization. FTP hosts a low-cost summer training institute "Project Lead" in Washington that "activates students around key environmental issues and trains future leaders of the environmental movement." (website) Alumni have gone on to full time work in environmental organizations.

Grassroots Organizing Weekends (GROW)

U.S. Student Association, 1413 K Street, NW, 9th Floor, Washington, D.C., 20005, Phone: (202) 347-8772, Fax: (202) 393-5886, Email: grow@usstudents.org, URL: www.usstudents.org/foundation/GROW

GROW is a program run by the United States Student Association. The program has been developed by students and community organizers to give students and activists tools to solve problems like racism and homophobia on campus. Specifically, GROW offers training to organizations centered on student/labor alliances, the LGBT movement, and affirmative action. GROW hosts training sessions (involving presentations, discussions, and other types of exercises) at various schools led by experienced student organizers.

Greenpeace

702 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20001, Phone: (202) 462-1177, URL: www.greenpeaceusa.org

Greenpeace is a world-wide organization with offices in over 30 countries. The organization organizes many campaigns on college campuses throughout the United States. Greenpeace offers a Washington-based training semester for student activists.

Haywood Burns Fellowship for Social and Economic Justice

National Lawyers Guild, 143 Madison Avenue, 4th Floor, New York, NY, 10016, Phone: (212) 679-5100, Fax: (212) 679-2811, URL: www.nlg.org/students/students.htm

Created in 1996 and named after Haywood Burns, one of the first presidents of the National Lawyer's Guild, the Haywood Burns Fellowship for Social and Economic Justice is a part of the National Lawyer's Guild program of training and sponsoring law students in progressive organizations.

Institute for Policy Studies, The

733 15th Street, NW, Suite 1020, Washington, D.C., 20005, Phone: (202) 234-9382, Fax: (202) 387-7915, URL: www.ips-dc.org

The Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) is the nation's oldest progressive multi-issue think tank. Founded in 1963, IPS offers internship and fellowship programs in many of its topic areas.

JustAct

333 Valencia Street, Suite 325, San Francisco, CA, 94103, Phone: (415) 431-4204, Fax: (415) 431-5953, Email: info@justact.org, URL: www.justact.org

JustAct, a national, nonprofit organization promoting youth leadership and action for global justice, was founded by students in 1983 (as the Overseas

Development Network). "JustAct is committed to promoting the emergence of a powerful and unified global youth movement comprised and led predominantly by young people from the grassroots and most oppressed communities around the world." JustAct offers training, workshops, and education. It also has connections with the Asian-Pacific Student Association and the Institute for Popular Education.

Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

1629 K Street, NW, 10th Floor, Washington, D.C., 20006, Phone: (202) 466-3311, Email: afc@civilrights.org, URL: www.civilrights.org

Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR) is a combination of over 180 organizations representing people of color, GLBT, women, and other groups. Its goal is to promote civil rights policy. LCCR along with Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCCREF)/Americans for a Fair Chance (AFC) sponsors a Web clearinghouse, the Student Activism Network campaign, connecting student activists from different college campuses.

Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan, M.E.Ch.A.

URL: <http://www.nationalmecha.org>

This organization is a decentralized federation of university organizations advocating for Chicano/Latino student recognition and influence. It is most active in the Southwest, but it is organized into ten regions across the country.

The National Association of the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)/Youth and College Division

4805 Mt. Hope Drive, Baltimore, MD, 21215, Phone: (410) 580-5656, Fax: (410) 764-6683, Email: webmaster@naacpnet.org,

URL: www.naacp.org/work/youth_college/youth_college.shtml

The Youth and College Division of NAACP, created in 1936, works to create interest and encourage active participation in civic activities among youth through its workshops, seminars, and youth voter registration. The website reports that there are 400 Youth Councils and College Chapters actively involved in voter registration and 67,000 youth involved in NAACP through its Youth Councils and College Division.

NARAL Pro-Choice America

1156 15th Street, NW, Suite 700, Washington, D.C., 20005, Phone: (202) 973-3000, Fax: (202) 973-3096, URL: www.naral.org

NARAL Pro-Choice America offers support for college students through its "Generation Pro-Choice" program. It publishes a pro-choice campus kit for organizers and

activists as well as a monthly newsletter and a magazine called *Know the Facts* about female reproductive issues. It also offers a student organizer e-newsletter.

National Coalition Building Institute

1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 450, Washington, D.C., 20036, Phone: (202) 785-9400, Fax: (202) 785-3385, Email: ncbiinc@aol.com, URL: www.ncbi.org

The National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI) is a nonprofit leadership training organization that teaches student and community leaders “effective bridge-building skills to combat intergroup conflicts.” NCBI maintains over 60 college/university-based teams (known as Campus Affiliates) that receive in-depth training on dealing with controversy and conflict.

National Lawyers Guild/Students

143 Madison Avenue, 4th Floor, New York, NY, 10016, Phone: (212) 679-5100, Fax: (212) 679-2811, Email: nlgn@nlg.org, URL: www.nlg.org/students/students.htm

The National Lawyer’s Guild (NLG) was founded in 1937 as the first racially integrated progressive law association to provide legal support for the progressive community. NLG is made up of students as well as legal workers, lawyers and judges. It has a presence on over 90 law school campuses. NLG offers the Haywood Burns Fellowship for Social and Economic Justice.

National Women’s Studies Association

University of Maryland, 7100 Baltimore Boulevard, Suite 500, College Park, MD, 20740, Phone: (301) 403-0525, Fax: (301) 403-4137, Email: nwsaoffice@nwsa.org, URL: www.nwsa.org

The National Women’s Studies Association (NWSA) is a national organization that advocates for women’s studies programs at the college level and feminist teaching in levels K-12. Its annual conference brings students and teachers together and encourages student leadership. NWSA supports women’s centers.

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals

501 Front Street, Norfolk, VA, 23510, Phone: (757) 622-PETA, Fax: (757) 622-0457, Email: info@peta.org, URL: www.peta.org

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) advocates for the fair treatment of animals through creative protests and lobbying efforts. It encourages chapters on college campuses and offers internships.

Shape Your World

URL: www.shapeyourworld.info

Shape Your World (SYW) is a web presence coalition of national organizations such as Global Exchange, Student Environment Action Coalition, and Student Peace Action Network. SYW’s goal is to encourage students in colleges and universities to sponsor and coordinate “teach-ins” on issues such as civil liberties, international security, and nuclear proliferation.

Sierra Student Coalition

408 C Street, NE, Washington, D.C., 20002, Phone: (888) JOIN-SSC, Email: blahblah@highstream.net, URL: www.ssc.org

The Sierra Student Coalition (SSC) is the student arm of the Sierra Club. The SSC is the largest student led environmental group in the country. It has over 250 affiliated groups and is run by high school and college student volunteers.

Southern Girls Convention

1910 Madison Avenue, PMB 620, Memphis, TN, 38104, Email: organizers@southerngirlsconvention.org, URL: www.southerngirlsconvention.org

The Southern Girls Convention (SGC) is an annual meeting of “pro-woman” activists who wish to network, organize, and empower women of the South. Started in 1999, the SGC offers participants the option of leading their own workshops, which include topics such as the queer and transgender movement in the South, “Cheerleading for the Revolution,” and sexism in the activist community. SGC largely works to reverse the stereotype of the “southern belle.”

Student Environment Action Coalition

P.O. Box 31909, Philadelphia, PA, 19104, Phone: (215) 222-4711, Email: seac@seac.org, URL: www.seac.org

Student Environment Action Coalition (SEAC) is a grassroots organization run and founded by students and youth. SEAC was originally founded in 1988 when students from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill placed a notice in Greenpeace Magazine asking to hear from student environmentalists interested in forming a network. Members include high schools, junior colleges, and universities.

Student Peace Action Network

1100 Wayne Avenue, Suite 1020, Silver Spring, MD, 20910, Phone: (301) 565-4050 ext.322, Email: span@peace-action.org, URL: www.studentpeaceaction.org

Student Peace Action Network (SPAN) is a network of over 70 colleges and high school chapters working for

peace. They organize protests and rallies to stop the war in Iraq, weapons trafficking, and disarmament. SPAN is an affiliate of Peace Action and has an active listserv.

Students Transforming and Resisting Corporations

Email: staffer@starcalliance.org,
URL: www.starcalliance.org

Students Transforming and Resisting Corporations (STARC) is an alliance of youth and students that support the progressive movement through workshops and grassroots organizing. STARC sponsors the STARC Summer Institute to address leadership within the movement specifically concerning the youth. STARC has affiliate programs with many schools across the country.

TIKKUN Campus Network

2342 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 1200, Berkeley, CA, 94704,
Phone: (415) 575-1200, Email: campus@tikkun.org,
URL: www.tikkun.org

Begun in the Fall of 2002, the Tikkun Campus Network (TCN) is a national network of students, faculty, and staff “who share a spiritual and political vision of how to create a world based not only on economic justice, peace, and human rights, but also on a foundation of love, caring, and ecological sensitivity.” TCN currently focuses on the Israel and Palestine conflict, but also feels committed to issues such as “global consciousness and ecological sanity.” It hosts a national student conference.

Union Summer (AFL-CIO)

AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20006, Phone: (202) 637-5000, Fax: (202) 637-5058,
Email: unionsummer@affcio.org,
URL: www.affcio.org/aboutunions/unionsummer

Union Summer, Seminary Summer, and Law Student Union Summer are projects of The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) intended for students who want to do social justice work. Union Summer runs five weeks each summer and the participants are considered AFL-CIO interns. Union Summer focuses on union organizing, workers rights, and social justice. There are 8-10 openings a cycle.

United States Student Association

1413 K Street, NW, 9th Floor, Washington, D.C., 20005,
Phone: (202) 347-8772, Fax: (202) 393-5886,
URL: www.usstudents.org

Founded in 1947, United States Student Association (USSA) is the organization representing college students in Washington. USSA works to increase access to education at the federal, state and campus level. Through testifying in official Congressional hearings, letter-writing campaigns, and face-to-face lobby visits between students and their elected officials, USSA monitors and lobbies federal legislation and policy. USSA represents

students in various coalitions, including the Committee for Education Funding, the Youth Vote Coalition, and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. USSA runs the GROW training events.

United Students Against Sweatshops

1150 17th Street, NW, Suite 300, Washington, D.C., 20036, Phone: (202) NO-SWEAT, Fax: (202) 293-5308,
Email: organize@usasnet.org, URL: www.studentsagainstsweatshops.org

United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) is an international student movement of campuses and individual students who believe in fighting for sweatshop-free labor conditions and workers' rights.

VOX at Planned Parenthood Federation of America

434 West 33rd Street, New York, NY, 10001,
Phone: (212) 541-7800, Fax: (212) 245-1845,
Email: vox@ppfa.org,
URL: www.plannedparenthood.org/vox/index.html

A nationwide program of Planned Parenthood, “Vox aims to educate and inspire a new generation of young adults to advocate reproductive freedom.” The Planned Parenthood League of America is the national wing of the international reproductive rights organization.

Wellstone Action

821 Raymond Avenue, Suite 260, St. Paul, MN, 55114,
Phone: (651) 645-3939, Fax: (651) 645-5858,
Email: info@wellstone.org, URL: www.wellstone.org

Wellstone Action is a training and advocacy organization in memory of Congressman Paul Wellstone and his wife Sheila. In the tradition Wellstone established as a teacher at Carleton College, the organization trains people, including students, to build campaigns around progressive candidates and issues. Its training program, Camp Wellstone, teaches “the skills, strategies and philosophical framework necessary for effective political engagement.” The Sheila Wellstone Institute sponsors conferences, builds coalitions and advocates for sound public policy.

Young Democrats of America

499 S Capitol Street, SW, Suite 100, Washington, D.C., 20003, Phone: (202) 639-8585, Fax: (202) 318-3221,
Email: office@yda.org, URL: www.yda.org

Young Democrats of America (YDA), open to anyone who is under 36, is an arm of the Democratic Party. YDA claims to have over 43,000 members made up of high school students, college students, and young professionals. YDA was founded in 1932 by North Carolina Democrat Tyre Taylor.

Bibliography

- "Activism Linked to Campus Academics Helps Students Learn," *Women in Higher Education* 11, no. 10 (2002): 1-3.
- "Affirmative Action Bake Sale Nixed," CBS News, Available from <http://www.cbsnews.com>, September 25, 2003.
- "Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority Holds Political Debate," *The Hilltop*, January 20, 2004, 1.
- Abbott, Lillian. "STOPIRG Protests Funding Procedure," *The Daily Orange* (Syracuse University), December 3, 1987, 1.
- Altbach, Philip G. and Patti Peterson. "Before Berkeley: Historical Perspectives on American Student Activism," in *The New Pilgrims: Youth Protest in Transition*, ed. Philip G. Altbach and Robert S. Laufer. New York: David McKay, 1972, 13-31.
- Andrew, John A. *The Other Side of the Sixties: Young Americans for Freedom and the Rise of Conservative Politics*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1997.
- Andrews, Kenneth and Michael Biggs. *The Dynamics of Protest Diffusion: the 1960 Sit-in Movement in the American South*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, 2001.
- Astin, Alexander W. "The Changing American College Student: Implications for Policy and Practice," *Higher Education* 22, no. 2 (1991): 129-143.
- Astin, Alexander W. "Diversity and Multiculturalism on Campus: How Are Students Affected?," *Change*, 1993, 44-49.
- Astin, Alexander W., Helen S. Astin, Alan E. Bayer, and Ann S. Bisconti. *The Power of Protest: A National Study of Student and Faculty Disruptions With Implications For The Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.
- Astin, Alexander W., Lori J. Volgelgesang, Elaine Ikeda, and Jennifer Yee. "How Service Learning Affects Students." Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, 2000.
- Balch, Stephen. "The Antidote to Academic Orthodoxy," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 4, 2004: B7-B9.
- Bass, Carole and Paul Bass. "Thorns Among the Ivy," *The Progressive*, (n.d., on file at PRA), 1984.
- Becker, Howard Saul. *Campus Power Struggle*. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co, 1970.
- Bell, Daniel. *The New American Right*. New York: Criterion Books, 1955.
- Bell, Daniel and Irving Kristol. *Confrontation: The Student Rebellion and the Universities*. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Berlet, Chip. "Following the Threads: A Work in Progress," in *Unraveling the Right: The New Conservatism in American Thought and Politics*, ed. Amy Elizabeth Ansell. New York: Westview, 1998, 17-40.
- Bloom, Allan David. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988.
- Bobbio, Norberto. *Left & Right: The Significance of Political Distinction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Bolton, Charles D. and Kenneth C. Kammeyer. *The University Student: A Study of Student Behavior and Values*. New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1967.
- Bramadat, Paul A. *The Church on the World's Turf*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Bruillard, Karin. "Student Group Lists Professors It Considers Too Politicized," *The Washington Post*, November 24, 2003, A3.
- Buechler, Steven M. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Buechler, Steven M. and F. Curt Cylke, Jr., eds. *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues*. Mountain View, Calif: Mayfield, 1997.
- Bunnage, Leslie. *Social Location and the Formation of Political Agendas: Examining Experience, Privilege, and Commitment Among Union Summer Activists*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Labor and Labor Movements Section panel, 2001.
- Butterfield, Fox. "College Press: Network Bred by the Right," *New York Times*, October 24, 1990, A1-B4.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Dissent and Disruption: Proposals for Consideration by the Campus*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Carson, Clayborne. *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Casey, John. "At Dartmouth: The Clash of '89," *The New York Times Magazine*, March 23, 1989, 28-77.
- Cohen, Jean L. and Andrew Arato. *Civil Society and Political Theory*. Boston, Mass.: MIT Press, 1994.

- Cohen, Robert. *When the Old Left Was Young: Student Radicals and America's First Mass Student Movement, 1929-1941*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Colapinto, John. "Armies of the Right: The Young Hipublicans," *The New York Times Magazine*, May 25, 2003, 30-59.
- Colby, Anne. *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Corn, David. "The Greening of Right-wing Journalism," *In These Times*, May 12, 1982, 12-13.
- Costain, Anne D. and Andrew S. McFarland, eds. *Social Movements and American Political Institutions: People, Passions, and Power*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.
- Coupland, Douglas. *Generation X: Tales for an Accelerated Culture*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.
- Cowan, Rich and Center for Campus Organizing. *Uncovering the Right on Campus*. Houston Tex.: Public Search, Inc., 1997.
- Cytrynbaum, Pamela. "Right to Speak," *Midweek, Northwestern University* (on file at PRA), October 23, 1985, 4.
- D'Souza, Dinesh. *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*. New York: Free Press, 1991.
- Davis, Jeff. "Church's Adoption Program Offers College Students a 'Home'," *The Roanoke Times*, October 12, 2002, NR4.
- Davis, Joseph, ed. *Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Delli Carpini, Michael X. and Scott Keeter. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Dey, Eric L. "College Impact and Student Liberalism Revisited: The Effect of Student Peers." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1988.
- Diamond, Sara. "Endowing the Right Wing Academic Agenda," *Covert Action Information Bulletin*, 1991, 46-49.
- Diamond, Sara. *Roads to Dominion: Right-Wing Movements and Political Power*. New York: The Guildford Press, 1995.
- Dionne, E. J. *Why Americans Hate Politics*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991.
- Eliasoph, Nina. *Avoiding Politics: How Americans Produce Apathy in Everyday Life*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Epstein, Barbara. "'Political Correctness' and Corrective Powerlessness," in *Cultural Politics and Social Movements*, ed. Marcy Darnovsky, Barbara Epstein, and Richard Flacks. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995, 3-19.
- Ewick, P. and S. S. Silbey. "Subversive Stories and Hegemonic Tales: Towards a Sociology of Narrative," *Law & Society Review* 29, no. 2 (1995): 197-226.
- Featherstone, Liza. "The New Student Movement," *The Nation*, May 15, 2000, 11-18.
- Featherstone, Liza and United Students Against Sweatshops. *Students against Sweatshops*. London: Verso, 2002.
- Felice, William F. *Taking Suffering Seriously: The Importance of Collective Human Rights*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Feuer, Lewis Samuel. *The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements*. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Flacks, Richard. "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest," *Social Issues* 23 (1967): 52-60.
- Flynn, Daniel J. "Enemies Within." A pamphlet published by Accuracy in Academia, 2001.
- Flynn, Sean. "Dartmouth's Right is Wrong," *The Boston Phoenix*, April 15, 1988, 8-17.
- Freeman, Jo. "Women's Liberation and Its Impact on the Campus," *Liberal Education* 57, no. 4 (1971): 468-478.
- French, David A. *FIRE's Guide to Religious Liberty on Campus*. Philadelphia: Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, 2002.
- Frost, Mervyn. *Constituting Human Rights: Global Civil Society and the Society of Democratic States*. London, England: Routledge, 2002.
- Gamson, William A. "Constructing Social Protest," in *Social Movements and Culture*, ed. Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans., vol. 4, *Social Movements, Protest and Contention*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995, 85-106.
- Garner, Roberta and John Tenuto. *Social Movement Theory and Research: An Annotated Guide*, Magill Bibliographies. Lanham, Md. and Pasadena, Calif.: Scarecrow Press and Salem Press, 1997.
- George, Daniel. "The Right Finds a Niche on Campus," *Insight on the News*, September 9, 2002.
- Glasker, Wayne. *Black Students in the Ivory Tower: African American Student Activism at the University of Pennsylvania, 1967-1990*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.

- Goeas, Ed and William Stewart. "Research Summary: Key Findings from a Nationwide Survey of College Students." A pamphlet published by the Independent Women's Forum, 2002.
- Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Doubleday, 1959.
- Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. London, England: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Gold, Alice Ross, Richard Christie, and Lucy Friedman. *Fists and Flowers: A Social Psychological Interpretation of Student Dissent*. New York: Academic Press, 1976.
- Gold, Allan. "Dartmouth President Faults Right-Wing Student Journal," *The New York Times*, January 15, 1988.
- Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper, and Francesca Polletta, eds. *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Green, Kenneth C. "The Mood on Campus: More Conservative or Just More Materialistic?," *Educational Record* 66, no. 1 (1985): 45-48.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Toward a Rational Society: Student Protest, Science, and Politics*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.
- Habermas, Jürgen and Shierry Weber Nicholsen. *The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism and the Historians' Debate: Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989.
- Hanson, Victor Davis. "Topsy-Turvy," *National Review*, October 13, 2003, 34-41.
- "ISI Sponsors High-Caliber Summer Schools for Seventh Consecutive Year," *Campus Report* 5, no. 1 (1966): 1-3.
- Katy J. Harriger and Jill J. McMillan. "Citizenship Deferred: Political Attitudes, Experiences, and Entering Expectations of First Year Students at a Liberal Arts College." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 2002.
- Harris, Felicia C. "Community Service in Academia: The Role of African-American Sisterhood in the 1990s," *Journal of General Education* 47, no. 4 (2003): 282-301.
- Hill, Kevin A. "Generations and Tolerance: Is Youth Really a Liberalizing Factor?," in *After the Boom: The Politics of Generation X*, ed. Stephen Craig and Stephen Earl Bennett. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997, 107-125.
- Hirsch, Eric. "Sacrifice for the Cause: Group Processes, Recruitment, and Commitment in a Student Social Movement," *American Sociological Review* 55, no. 2 (1990): 243-254.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Student Protest: An Institutional and National Profile," *The Record* 71 (1970): 537-548.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L. and Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Institutions in Transition: A Profile of Change in Higher Education (incorporating the 1970 statistical report)*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Horowitz, David. "Students for Academic Freedom." A pamphlet published by the Center for the Study of Popular Culture, 2003.
- Horowitz, David and Peter Collier. *The Heterodoxy Handbook: How to Survive the PC Campus*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishers, 1994.
- Houppert, Karen. "Wanted: A Few Good Girls," *The Nation*, November 25, 2002. Available at <http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20021125&s=houppert>.
- Institute for Educational Affairs. *Annual Report 1985: Seven Years of Accomplishment*. New York: Institute for Educational Affairs, 1985.
- Institute of Politics, The. "A National Survey of Student Attitudes." A report published by the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass.: JFKSG, 2002.
- Johnston, Hank. "A Methodology for Frame Analysis: From Discourse to Cognitive Schemata," in *Social Movements, Protest, and Contention*, vol. 4, *Social Movements and Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995, 217-246.
- Just, Richard. "Schools of Thought: The Liberal-Conservative Divide on Campus," *The American Prospect* 14, no. 9 (2003): 30-34.
- Kahne, Joseph and Joel Westheimer. "The Limits of Efficacy: Educating Citizens for a Democratic Society". A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 2002.
- Kaplan, Esther. "Malice Doesn't Live Here Anymore: The Rise and Demise of the New Right," *Village Voice*, 33, no. 9 (1988): 3-4.
- Keane, John. *Civil Society: Old Images, New Visions*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 1998.
- Keeter, Scott, Cliff Zukin, Molly Andolina, and Krista Jenkins. "The Civic and Political Health of the Nation: A Generational Portrait." A pamphlet published by The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), College Park, Md.: CIRCLE, 2002.
- Kelly, Christine A. *Tangled Up in Red, White and Blue*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001.

- Keniston, Kenneth. *The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1965.
- Keniston, Kenneth. "Sources of Campus Dissent," *Journal of Social Issues* 23 (1967): 108-137.
- Keniston, Kenneth. *Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968.
- Kimbrough, Walter M. "Self-Assessment, Participation, and Value of Leadership Skills, Activities, and Experiences for Black Students Relative to Their Membership in Historically Black Fraternities and Sororities," *The Journal of Negro Education* 64, no. 1 (1995): 63-74.
- Kimbrough, Walter M. and Philo A. Hutchinson. "The Impact of Membership in Black Greek-Letter Organizations on Black Student Involvement," *Journal of Negro Education* 67, no. 2 (1998): 96-105.
- Kirkpatrick, David D. "Young Right Tries to Define Post-Buckley Future," *New York Times*, July 17, 2004, A1-A17.
- Klandermans, Bert. *The Social Psychology of Protest*. Oxford, England.: Blackwell, 1997.
- Klatch, Rebecca. *A Generation Divided: The New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s*. Berkeley Calif.: University of California Press, 1999.
- Kors, Alan Charles and Harvey A. Silverglate. *The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses*. New York: Free Press, 1998.
- Lake Snell Perry Associates and the Tarrance Group, Inc. "Short-Term Impacts, Long Term Opportunities: The Politics and Civic Engagement of Young Adults in America." A pamphlet published by the Center for Information and Research in Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), College Park, Md.: CIRCLE, 2002.
- Lesage, Julia. *Making a Difference: University Students of Color Speak Out*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002.
- Levine, Arthur and Jeanette S. Cureton. *When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998.
- Lichter, S. Robert and Stanley Rothman. "The Radical Personality: Social Psychological Correlates of the New Left," *Political Behavior* 4, no. 3 (1982): 207-235.
- Linklater, Richard. *Slacker*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin and Philip G. Altbach. "Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States," in *Student Politics*, ed. Seymour Martin Lipset. New York: Basic Books, 1967, 223-224.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, David Riesman, and Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Education and Politics at Harvard: Two Essays Prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Loeb, Paul Rogat. *Generation at the Crossroads: Apathy and Action on the American Campus*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1994.
- Long, Sarah. "The New Student Politics: The Wingspread Statement on Student Civic Engagement." Providence, R.I.: College Compact, 2002.
- Lubell, Samuel. "The 'Generation Gap'," *The Public Interest* 13 (1968): 52-60.
- Lulves, John. "New Name, Same Goals," *Campus Report* 5, no. 1 (1966): 3.
- Marable, Manning ed. *Dispatches from the Ebony Tower: Intellectuals Confront the African American Experience*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Marbella, Jean. "Investment in Israel: New Target of Campus Protest," *Baltimore Sun*, December 21, 2002, 1A.
- Margherita, Tony. "A Voice Cried Out From the Right," *The Grinnell Magazine*, 1983, 11-13.
- Marlantes, Liz. "After 9/11, The Body Politic Tilts to Conservatism," *Christian Science Monitor*, January 16, 2002, 1.
- Martin, Jerry L. and Anne D. Neal. "Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It." Washington, D.C., American Council of Trustees and Alumni, 2nd ed., 2004.
- McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, eds. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- McAdam, Doug and David Snow, eds. *Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company, 1997.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- McEvoy, James and Abraham H. Miller. *Black Power and Student Rebellion*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1969.
- Maureen T. McHale. "The Impact on Students' Attitudes Toward Women's Roles." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1994.

- Messer-Davidow, Ellen. "Manufacturing the Attack on Liberalized Higher Education," *Social Text*, no. 36 (1993): 40-80.
- Messer-Davidow, Ellen. "Who (Ac)Counts and How," *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, 1994, 26-41.
- Messer-Davidow, Ellen. *Disciplining Feminism: From Social Activism to Academic Discourse*. Durham N.C.: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Meyer, David S., Nancy Whittier, and Belinda Robinet, eds. *Social Movements: Identity, Culture, and the State*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Milne, John. "Dartmouth Penalizes Four Review Members," *The Boston Globe*, March 11, 1988, 13-43.
- Minkoff, Debra C. "The Sequencing of Social Movements," *American Sociological Review* 62, no. 5 (1997): 779-799.
- Moore, Kelly. *Syllabi & Teaching Resources for Courses on Collective Behavior and Social Movements*. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association in cooperation with the section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements, 1997.
- Morris, Aldon D. and Carol McClung Mueller, eds. *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Myers, Winfield J. C. "Asking the Right Questions in Choosing a College." A pamphlet published by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, Wilmington, Del.: ISI, 2003.
- National Election Studies: Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan. "The NES Guide to Public Opinion and Electoral Behavior: Liberal-Conservative Self-Identification." A pamphlet published by the Center for Political Studies, Ann Arbor, Mich.: NES, 2000.
- Neal, Anne. "Senate Probes Intellectual Diversity," *Inside Academe* IX, no. 2 (2004): 1-6.
- O'Neil, Robert. "But Litigation Is the Wrong Response," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 1, 2003, B9-B10.
- Oliver, Pamela E. and Hank Johnston. "What a Good Idea! Frames and Ideologies in Social Movement Research," *Mobilization: An International Journal* 5, no. 1 (2000): 37-54.
- Orum, Anthony. *Black Students In Protest: Origins of the Black Student Movement*. An occasional paper published by the American Sociological Association, 1972.
- Ostrander, Susan. "Democracy, Civic Participation, and the University: A Comparative Study of Civic Engagement on Five Campuses," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (2004): 74-93.
- B. C. Ben Park. "Politicization of Youth on College Campuses: Thoughts About Theories of Youth Activism." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, 2002.
- Pattilo-McCoy, Mary. "Church Culture as a Strategy of Action in the Black Community," *American Sociological Review* 63, no. 6 (1998): 767-784.
- Paulson, Amanda. "Religious Upsurge Brings Culture Clash to College Campuses," *The Christian Science Monitor*, December 10, 2003, 1.
- Polletta, Francesca. "Contending Stories: Narrative in Social Movements," *Qualitative Sociology* 21 (1998): 419-446.
- Rhee, Byung-Shik et al. "Collegiate Influences on the Civic Values of Students." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1996.
- Rhoads, Robert A. *Freedom's Web: Student Activism in an Age of Cultural Diversity*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Rochlin, Jay M. *Race & Class on Campus: Conversations with Ricardo's Daughter*. Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona Press, 1997.
- Roiphe, Katie. *The Morning After: Sex, Fear and Feminism on Campus*. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown and Company, 1993.
- Root, Edward Merrill. *Collectivism on the Campus: The Battle for the Mind in American Colleges*. New York: Devin-Adair Co., 1955.
- Rothman, Stanley, Seymour Martin Lipset, and Neil Nevitte. "Racial Diversity Reconsidered," *The Public Interest*, no. 151 (2003): 25-39.
- Rothman, Stanley, Seymour Martin Lipset, and Neil Nevitte. "Does Enrollment Diversity Improve University Education?," *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 15, no. Spring (2003): 8-27.
- Ruby-Sachs, Emma and Timothy Waligore. "Alternative Voices on Campus," *The Nation*, February 17, 2003, 27-29.
- Ruby-Sachs, Emma and Timothy Waligore. "A Once Bright Star Dims," *The Nation*, February 17, 2003, 29.
- Sampson, Edward E. and Harold A. Korn. *Student Activism and Protest*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970.
- Sax, Linda. J. and Marisol Arredondo. "Student Attitudes Towards Affirmative Action in Higher Education," *Research in Higher Education* 40, no. 4 (1999): 439-459.
- Sax, L.J., J.A. Lindholm, A. W. Astin, W. S. Korn, and K.M. Mahoney. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 2001*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, 2002.

- Sax, L. J., et al.. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 2002*. Los Angeles, Higher Education Research Institute, 2003.
- Schiff, Lawrence. "The Conservative Movement on American College Campuses." Unpublished dissertation, Harvard University, 1964.
- Schulman, Bruce J. "Out of the Streets and into the Classroom? The New Left and the Counterculture in United States History," *Journal of American History* 85, no. 4 (1999): 1527-1534.
- Schumer, Fran R. "The New Right's Campus Press," *The Nation*, April 3, 1982, 395-398.
- Schwellenbach, Nick. "Guide to Researching Your Campus." Austin, Tex.: UT Watch, 2003.
- Seligman, Adam. *The Idea of Civil Society*. New York: The Free Press, 1992.
- Silverglate, Harvey A. and Greg Lukianoff. "Speech Codes: Alive and Well at Colleges," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 1, 2003, B7-B8.
- Snow, David and Robert D. Benford. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participation Mobilization," in *International Social Movement Research: From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movements Across Cultures*, ed. Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Sidney Tarrow. Greenwich Conn.: JAI Press, 1988, 197-217.
- Snow, David and Robert D. Benford. "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest," in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, ed. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992, 133-155.
- Snow, David and Robert D. Benford. "Clarifying the Relationship Between Framing and Ideology in the Study of Social Movements: a Comment on Oliver and Johnston," *Mobilization, an International Journal* 5 (2000): 55-60.
- Snow, David, E. Burke Rochford, Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. "Frame Alignment Process, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation," *American Sociological Review* 51 (1986): 464-481.
- Soule, Sarah. "The Student Divestment Movement in the United States and Tactical Diffusion: The Shantytown Protest," *Social Forces* 75, no. 3 (1997): 855-883.
- Stern, Kenneth. "Bigotry on Campus: A Planned Response." A pamphlet published by The American Jewish Committee, 1990.
- Stiles, Elizabeth A. "Social Movements, Policy Initiatives and Political Outcomes at the U.S. State Level." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 2002.
- Swidey, Neil. "God on the Quad," *The Boston Globe Magazine*, November 30, 2003, 15-28.
- Tilly, Charles, Louise Tilly, and Richard H. Tilly. *The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Trent, James W. and Judith L. Craise. "Commitment and Conformity in the American College," *Journal of Social Issues* 23 (1967): 38-39.
- Trosset, Carol. "Obstacles to Open Discussion and Critical Thinking: The Grinnell College Study," *Change* 30, no. 5 (1998): 44-49.
- Trosset, Carol. "Discussion in the Classroom," *General Anthropology* (September, 1999): 1-8.
- TuSmith, Bonnie and Maureen T. Reddy, eds. *Race in the College Classroom: Pedagogy and Politics*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2002.
- U.S. Census Bureau. "Voting and Registration in the Election of November 1998." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000.
- U.S. Census Bureau. "Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2000." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002.
- United States and President's Commission on Campus Unrest. *The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest*. Washington, D.C: President's Commission on Campus Unrest, 1970.
- Van Dyke, Nella. "Hotbeds of Student Activism: Locations of Student Protest," *Social Problems* 45, no. 2 (1998): 205-220.
- Van Dyke, Nella, Marc Dixon, and Helen Van Allen. "Manufacturing Dissent: Labor Revitalization, Union Summer and Student Protest." Unpublished manuscript, 2004.
- Van Dyke, Nella, Verta Taylor, and Sarah Soule. "Cultural Targets and Confrontation: 'New' Versus Old Social Movements, 1968-1975." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, 2002.
- Vance, N. Scott. "Collegiate Press Takes Right Turn," *Detroit News*, March 24, 1985, A1-A11.
- Vellela, Tony. *New Voices: Student Political Activism in the '80s and '90s*. Boston, Mass.: South End Press, 1988.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice and Paul Starr. *The University Crisis Reader*. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Watts, William A., Steve Lynch, and David Whittaker. "Alienation and Activism in Today's College-Age Youth: Socialization Patterns and Current Family Relationships," *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 31 (1966): 690-692.
- Westby, David L. and Richard G. Braungart. "Class and Politics in the Family Backgrounds of Student Political Activists," *American Sociological Review* 31, no. 5 (1966).

Williams, Rhys. " 'Church' in Black and White," electronic citation: <http://www.uic.edu/depts/soci/yrp/comp/modules/mod2.htm>.

Wilson, John. *Introduction to Social Movements*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Young America's Foundation. *The Conservative Guide to Campus Activism*. Herndon, Va.: Young America's Foundation, 2001.

Young, Jeffrey. "Students' Political Awareness Hits Highest Level in a Decade," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 30, 2004, A31.

Zald, Mayer N. "Culture, Ideology and Strategic Framing," in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framing*, ed. Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 261-274.

Zogby International. "Report on Academic Life Survey." The Foundation for Academic Standards and Tradition (FAST), 2002.