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THE EFFECTS OF READING A REPORT OF RACIAL
CONFLICT AND NON RACIAL CONFLICT ON
BASELINE HOSTILITY LEVELS

There is an abundance of research in the area of
conflict, hostility, and aggression at the human level.
The topic has been approached in numerous ways and many
important features pertinent to the dynamics of aggressive
behavior have been derived from these studies. Berkowitz
(1964) in a review of the literature dealing with the
cognitive aspects of aggression concluded that particular
cues, acting as stimuli associated with an anger instigator,
facilitate the occurrence of aggressive or hostile
behavior. In accordance with these findings one might
view such cues as discriminative stimuli for aggressive
behavior. An example cited by Berkowitz best illustrates
this idea. "A man is angered by Person A, but can not
attack him because A is absent from the scene. If the man
should then encounter other people with varying degrees
of association with person A, these people will elicit
hostile reactions from him in proportion to their associa-
tion with A" (Berkowitz, 1964, pg 108).

Berkowitz and Holmes(1959) in an earlier study dealt
with hostility projected toward objects of dislike. Using
an eight condition 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design sixty-eight
subjects were each assigned to one of four experimental
conditions, which were later sub-divided into eight conditions. The subjects were told they would work in non-competitive pairs while attempting to win two five dollar prizes for performing a specific task. Each partner was taken to a separate room and allowed to work on his or her portion of the task. Subjects were assigned to either partner-dislike or partner-like conditions. In the former, half of the subjects were made to dislike their partner via electric shock. They were arbitrarily shocked under the pretext these were administered by the partner for poor performance on the task. At the end of phase one a brief questionnaire was given to determine the degree of partner dislike. In phase two half of the subjects receiving shock and half of the subjects in the partner-like situation, while working alone, were accused of cheating by the experimenter and thus frustrated. The remaining subjects in both conditions received friendly treatment from the experimenter. Following this manipulation another questionnaire was given to determine each subject's unfriendliness toward the experimenter. The final phase consisted of reinstating the original partner situation and having the couples jointly build a structure. After this a final questionnaire was given. The results showed that subjects showing partner dislike in phase one tended to increase dislike in phase three and that the highest increase occurred among subjects with initial partner
dislike who were also frustrated by the experimenter.

Epstein and Baron (1969) arrived at a similar conclusion in their study on hostility projected toward a person or persons who are considered outsiders. Eighty White female college students, half of whom scored high and the others low on a hostility scale, were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions in a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial design with self esteem, level of confrontation and race of the stimulus group as the independent variables. The subjects were told the study concerned interpersonal perception and that in order to evaluate the personality variables related to judgements about others the experimenter would (a) administer personality tests to the stimulus person, and (b) request the subject to judge another person on the basis of her tape recorded stories to a projective test. The contrived stories were recited by a female drama student in either Black or White dialect, and contained periodic reference to hostile behavior. The subjects were first hooked up to a dummy galvanometer which they were told would indicate sub-conscious levels of hostility. The meter registered scores from 100 (low hostility) to 400 (high hostility). While hooked to the galvanometer the subject had to construct sentences from a list of twenty words, ten of which were blatantly hostile. In addition to this they had to record their GSR readings. After this phase the subject listened to the
story and then rated the testee on sixteen semantic differential scales. The results showed that subjects who were led to believe they were high in sub-conscious hostility, as illustrated by GSR readings, tended to deny such feelings. Furthermore the denial of hostility facilitated the attribution of negative qualities toward out groups when the stimulus person or target race was the "Negro".

More recently behavioral scientists have generated scientific investigation into the role played by the mass media in facilitating aggressive behavior. Berkowitz and Green (1967) using filmed segments of violence illustrated that highly salient aggressive cues evoke aggressive responses. The study employed a $3 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial design in which one hundred and eight subjects were placed in one of twelve conditions. The subjects were assigned to one of three arousal conditions wherein they worked with the experimenter's confederate. In this situation the subject was given an insoluble puzzle while the confederate was given a similar one which could be solved. The arousal conditions consisted of being given an insoluble puzzle and being insulted by the confederate, insoluble puzzle and no insult, and a no frustration condition in which the subjects were given soluble puzzles. The confederate was introduced to half the subjects in each condition by a name identical to that of the beaten boxer in the yet unseen film segment, which was shown after the arousal
sequence. The subjects either saw an exciting non-violent racing film or an aggressive prize fight film. Afterwards the subjects were placed in a learning task situation and given an opportunity to punish the confederate for mistakes on the task. Using a modified version of the Buss aggression machine, the subjects delivered shocks to the confederate for his errors. The results showed that subjects having been insulted by the confederate and seeing the fight film, regardless of the name association of the confederate and the boxer, displayed a higher propensity toward aggression then neutral or task frustrated subjects seeing the same film.

A slightly different study by Stern and Pallone (1971) arrived at a similar conclusion. Using a combination of prose reports and photographs of either racially aggressive or harmonious scenes, they found that brief exposure to a mass communication message reporting racial aggression or harmony is capable of yielding small but statistically significant changes in racial attitudes. Youseff (1968) attempted to ascertain the role of four variables, race, sex, hostility, and verbal stimulus, in inflicting punishment. One hundred and twenty White college students scoring extremely high or low on the Siegel Manifest Hostility Scale and the Cook-Medley Hostility Scale were to deliver variable amounts of shock to either a Black or White "victim" for verbal errors on a task. Youseff's results
showed that high hostility subjects inflicted higher shocks, males gave higher shocks than females, males got stronger shocks than females, and Blacks received stronger shocks than Whites.

The present study deals with hostility as a function of situations involving racial conflict. It was undertaken in an attempt to determine if reading a report of a violent incident with racial implications will increase the operant hostility level. For the purpose of the study operant hostility is operationally defined as baseline performance level on two hostility scales given on successive days prior to the treatment condition. Four hypotheses partially derived from Youseff(1968) were advanced:

1) Subjects demonstrating low baseline hostility will show no significant increase in hostility level after reading a report with no racial conflict, irregardless of race,

2) Subjects demonstrating high baseline hostility will show a significant increase in hostility level after reading a report with no racial conflict, irregardless of race,

3) Subjects with racial characteristics similar to the victim will show a significant increase in hostility level after reading a report with racial conflict, irregardless of baseline hostility level,

4) Subjects with racial characteristics similar to the assailant's will show a significant increase in hostility level after reading a report with racial conflict, irregardless of baseline hostility level.
METHOD

Subjects

Forty undergraduate college students enrolled in Western Michigan University served as subjects, twenty of whom were Black students and the remainder Whites. The subjects were placed in racially mixed pairs and matched on the basis of baseline hostility level and sex, resulting in twelve pairs of males and eight pairs of females.

Measurement Instruments

Three hostility scales were used along with a contrived police report and a supplemental campus security division report, both of which described the same incident.

The Buss-Durkee Hostility Index is a seventy-nine item scale, seventy-five of which were drawn from the MMPI items relating to hostility. It is comprised of eight subscales which refer to different types of hostility e.g. verbal, resentment, suspicion etc. The Siegel Manifest Hostility Scale is similar to the Buss-Durkee. It consists of fifty items drawn from MMPI hostility related items. Because scores on these two indexes were used to classify subjects as high or low in baseline hostility, it was hoped that using two indexes with some commonality would lend greater consistency to a subject's performance over the
two day baseline period. The final scale, the Stimulus Response Hostility Inventory, is a split index with high reliability between parts. Each of the two parts contain fourteen stimulus situations and ten responses for each. Thus the scale totals one hundred and forty answers. The responses are scored from one to five points, and refer mainly to affective/autonomic changes e.g. heart beats faster, perspire, become enraged etc (see appendices A, B, and C).

The police report described a single violent incident occurring on the university campus involving an attack upon one student by two other students. The report was presented in four versions. In each case all situational factors such as location, address, number of people involved, remained the same; the names and racial characteristics varied. Since there are certain names which are often associated with particular racial groups, it was hoped that using these names would lend further credence to the report. Briefly, the first version dealt with an attack on a Black student by two other Black students; the second a Black victim and two White assailants; the third version a White victim and two Black assailants; and the fourth a White victim and two White assailants. In all cases the victim and assailants were male students. Each treatment group was assigned one report to read (see appendix D).
Procedure

The investigation consisted of three basic phases, each of which took place on successive days. Phases one and two may be viewed as the baseline phase wherein the operant hostility level was established. The third phase consisted of the actual treatment. A 2 x 4 randomized block design was used.

During phase one the subjects were introduced to the study with the following instructions:

"I am very glad that you decided to take part in this study. I'm trying to gain some insight on the correlation of attitudes and behavior, and to do this I will be giving you a series of tests. They aren't hard and don't require a great deal of time to do."

After this the subjects were allowed to ask questions pertaining to the study. Following the question-answer period the Buss-Durkee Hostility Index was administered. It should be noted that the subject's copy of the index was identified as the Buss-Durkee Attitude Scale. Completion of the index concluded phase one.

Phase two consisted of giving the Siegel Manifest Hostility Scale on the following day. As was the case with the Buss-Durkee scale, the word "hostility" was omitted from the subject's test sheet. Prior to taking the test the subjects were again allowed to ask any questions to further clarify the researcher's purpose and to ease any apprehensions.
Mean scores were computed on each scale for Blacks and Whites as separate groups (see Table I). These scores were in turn used for classificatory purposes. Performance on these two scales served as an indication of the subject's baseline hostility level. Each subject was designated as high or low in terms of baseline hostility level. High baseline hostility was defined as scoring at or above the mean on both the Buss-Durkee and Siegel scales, and low baseline hostility as scoring below the mean on both the above scales. However it should be noted that in one instance the definition of low baseline hostility was altered. Due to the shortage of Black students volunteering to participate in the study, the majority of those complying were used. In one case a Black subject scored at the mean on the first scale and eight points below the mean on the second index. As a result of this, the definition of low hostility was changed to accommodate this subject's score. Mean scores were also computed for high hostility Blacks, low hostility Blacks, high hostility Whites, and low hostility Whites on both scales to further illustrate performance differences on the baseline phase (see Table II).

In relation to the above codification, subjects were assigned to one of four matched pair treatment groups each containing ten subjects or five pairs. Group assignment and pairing were based upon the subject's racial characteristics, baseline hostility level, and sex. Conse-
quently each treatment group had six high hostility subjects and four low hostility subjects. To further clarify this point, there were two Black and two White males of high hostility, a Black and a White high hostility female, a Black male and female low in hostility, and a White male and female of low hostility in each group (see Figure 1).

The third and final phase consisted of administering one part of the Stimulus-Response Hostility Inventory, having the subject read the appropriate police report, and then being given the second part of the index. It should be mentioned that in order to avoid possible sequence effects, the order of presentation of parts A and B of the Stimulus-Response index were counterbalanced. In doing so half of both the Black and White subjects at each hostility level were given part A first while the other half were given part B first. In this way the sequence of administration of the Stimulus-Response index was reversed for half of the subjects. After completion of this phase the study was terminated. Each subject was immediately informed that the report he or she had read was completely fictional, and also told explicitly what the study dealt with.
RESULTS

Table III shows the pre and post treatment mean performance scores on the Stimulus-Response index computed along the lines of racial group and hostility level. The most salient feature again is the marked difference between scores of White and Black subjects. As the figures indicate, low hostility Blacks even scored higher than high hostility Whites. In addition it should be noted that the experimenter was Black, and this may have affected the performance of both Black and White subjects.

In order to determine support of the four hypotheses advanced, t-tests were run on various group combinations based on conflict/no-conflict reports and racial similarity/identity with the aggressor or victim. Figure 2 illustrates the general breakdown of the groups in relation to the report read.

Hypothesis one, predicting no significant increase in scores of low hostility subjects, irrespective of race, reading a non-racial conflict report, was supported. The scores of low hostility subjects in groups A₁, A₂, D₁, and D₂ were analyzed and no significant change resulted. These groups were comprised of subjects reading a report in which the victim and assailants were of the same race.
The second hypothesis was not supported, high hostility subjects reading a non-racial conflict report, irrespective of race, did not show the significant increase which was predicted. In this analysis the scores of high hostility subjects in the above mentioned groups were used, and no significant change resulted (see Figure 2).

Hypothesis three was partially supported, low hostility subjects reading a racial conflict report and having racial characteristics similar to the victim showed a significant increase in hostility level while high hostility subjects under this condition did not. However it should be noted that the change in score of these high hostility subjects did approach significance. In determining support for this hypothesis scores from low and high hostility subjects in groups B₁ and C₂ were analyzed. Group B₁ consisted of Black subjects reading a report with a Black victim and White assailants while C₂ consisted of White subjects reading a report with the roles reversed (see Figure 2).

In testing the final hypothesis groups B₂ and C₁ were analyzed. Hypothesis four stated that subjects reading a racial conflict report with racial characteristics similar to the assailants would show a significant increase in hostility level. No support resulted. Again, in these groups the race of the subject differed from that of the victim, but not the assailants (see Figure 2). Table IV
illustrates $t$-test values obtained as well as the critical values and degrees of freedom for each of the above groupings.

DISCUSSION

The present study seems to support the findings of Epstein-Baron (1969), Berkowitz-Holmes (1959), and Stern-Pallone (1971), in that it demonstrates the out group or disliked object notion of these studies. Hostility levels tended to increase in those situations where the report contained conflict or aggression directed at the subject's racial group by another racial group. It further shows that a racial group will display more hostility toward other racial group members in an aggressive conflict situation involving its' own group and members of another group, then it will direct toward members of its' own group in the same situation. What this implies is that if we have a Black-White aggressive conflict situation, a White person observing it in some way will tend to display more hostility toward the Black aggressor then he or she would if the aggressor were White. The same holds equally true for Blacks in the same position.

To summarize, the present study illustrates the possible effect of racial characteristics on a person's reaction to an aggressive conflict situation, as measured by subsequent increases in previous hostility levels. A
White subject reading a report of an alleged attack upon a member of his racial group perpetrated by members of another racial group will show an increase in hostility level as indicated by performance on a hostility index. The same is true for Blacks. However when an identical incident involves members of the same racial group or if the person being attacked is of a different racial group and his assailants of the same racial group as the reader, no significant increase in hostility level is evidenced. Although the investigation in no way attempts to determine the focus of the subsequent increases in hostility, it seems safe to assume that it would be directed toward the assailants reflecting different racial characteristics. In view of the above discussion and the notion of salient cues suggested by Berkowitz (1964), this hostility may well generalize to members of the assailant's race per se, rather than merely the actual persons committing the attack. Sterotyping is possibly the most popular example of this form of stimulus generalization. Furthermore it seems pertinent to then examine the likelihood of such generalization affecting other areas of our system, particularly in the area of jurisprudence. However this paper is not extensive enough as to offer any form of empirical speculation on such ideas as the above, yet the implications are undeniable.
The behavioral importance of hostility as long as it remains at the covert level cannot be fully determined. The findings of this study along with others seem to suggest that further investigation in the area is needed, which would perhaps focus more on the conditions which change covert hostility toward various racial groups into overt aggression. In addition to this it would supply essential information necessary for designing and perpetuating a multi-racial/cultural social system. Indeed the African, Indian, Asian, European and their descendants will inhabit the earth for some time to come. Consequently it behooves us to make a concerted effort to design a culture, a country, a world to accommodate the many differences which exist among people. Who can better understand the problem, who can better offer a viable solution than scientists of human behavior. As a very great man once said, "this is not a Black problem or a White problem, but a human problem" (Malcolm X, 1966, pg 99).
TABLE I

Mean performance scores on the Buss-Durkee and Siegel hostility scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Buss-Durkee</th>
<th>Siegel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>47.65</td>
<td>36.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>18.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE II**

Mean performance scores on the Buss-Durkee and Siegel hostility scales, computed along racial lines for low and high hostility subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Buss-Durkee</th>
<th>Siegel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-hostility</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-hostility</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>23.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-hostility</td>
<td>38.38</td>
<td>30.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-hostility</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>13.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III

Pre/post treatment mean scores on the Stimulus-Response index computed along racial lines for low and high hostility subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black high-hostility</td>
<td>446.50</td>
<td>453.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White high-hostility</td>
<td>345.00</td>
<td>360.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black low-hostility</td>
<td>403.13</td>
<td>407.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White low-hostility</td>
<td>250.75</td>
<td>254.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV
Values obtained from t-tests in relation to the four hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-obtained</th>
<th>critical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>less than 1</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>less than 1</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-hostility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-hostility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-hostility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>less than 1</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-hostility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>less than 1</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 probability level
FIGURE 1

Summary chart of the subject pairings for each treatment group, matching on the basis of race, sex, and baseline hostility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black S's</th>
<th>White S's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.H.</td>
<td>H.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.H.</td>
<td>L.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.H.</td>
<td>H.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.H.</td>
<td>L.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.H.</td>
<td>H.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.H.</td>
<td>L.H.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- White male -
- Black male -
- White female -
- Black female -
- Low hostility - L.H.
- High hostility - H.H.
FIGURE 2

Summary chart showing the report read by each treatment group and the racial groups involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black S's</th>
<th>White S's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black victim and Black assailants</td>
<td>Black assailants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>$A_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim and White assailants</td>
<td>White assailants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>$B_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim and Black assailants</td>
<td>Black assailants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$</td>
<td>$C_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim and White assailants</td>
<td>White assailants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_1$</td>
<td>$D_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RACE(p)
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Buss-Durkee Hostility Index

1. I seldom strike back, even if someone hits me first.
2. I sometimes spread gossip about people I don't like.
3. Unless somebody asks me in a nice way, I won't do what they want.
4. I lose my temper easily but get over it quickly.
5. I don't seem to get what's coming to me.
6. I know that people tend to talk about me behind my back.
7. When I disapprove of my friends' behavior, I let them know it.
8. The few times I have cheated, I have suffered unbearable feelings of remorse.
9. Once in a while I can't control my urge to harm others.
10. I never get mad enough to throw things.
11. I enjoy hunting birds and small game.
12. Sometimes people bother me just by being around.
13. When someone makes a rule I don't like, I'm tempted to break it.
14. Other people always seem to get the breaks.
15. I often find myself disagreeing with people.
16. I sometimes have bad thoughts that make me feel ashamed of myself.
17. I tend to be on my guard with people who are somewhat more friendly than I expected.
18. I can think of no good reason for ever hitting anyone.
19. When I'm angry, I sometimes sulk.
20. When someone is bossy, I do the opposite of what he asks.
21. I don't know any people that I down right hate.
22. There are a number of people who seem to dislike me very much.

23. I'm irritated a great deal more than people are aware of.

24. People who shirk on the job must feel very guilty.

25. I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.

26. I have little or no experience with guns.

27. If somebody hits me first, I let him have it.

28. When I'm mad, I sometimes slam doors.

29. I am always patient with others.

30. Occasionally when I'm mad at someone, I'll give him the silent treatment.

31. When I look back on what's happened to me, I can't help feeling mildly resentful.

32. There are a number of people who are jealous of me.

33. Whoever insults me or my family is asking for a fight.

34. I demand that people respect my rights.

35. It depresses me that I didn't do more for my parents.

36. I never play practical jokes.

37. It makes my blood boil to have someone make fun of me.

38. When people are bossy, I take my time just to show them.

39. Almost every week I see someone I dislike.

40. When I was younger, I liked target shooting.

41. I sometimes have the feeling that others are laughing at me.

42. Even when my anger is aroused, I don't use "strong" language.

43. I am concerned about being forgiven for my sins.
44. People who continually pester you are asking for a punch in the nose.

45. I sometimes pout when I don't get my own way.

46. If somebody annoys me, I'm apt to tell him what I think of him.

47. I often feel like a powder keg ready to explode.

48. Although I don't show it, I'm sometimes eaten up with jealousy.

49. My motto is "Never trust strangers".

50. When people yell at me, I yell back.

51. I do many things that make me feel remorseful afterward.

52. When I really lose my temper, I'm capable of slapping someone.

53. Since the age of ten, I've never had a temper tantrum.

54. I've been handling and firing weapons since I was a child.

55. When I get mad, I say nasty things.

56. I sometimes carry a chip on my shoulder.

57. If I let people see the way I feel, I'd be considered a hard person to get along with.

58. I commonly wonder what hidden reason another person may have for doing something nice for me.

59. I could not put someone in his place, even if he needed it.

60. Failure gives me a feeling of remorse.

61. I get into fights about as often as the next person.

62. I can remember being so angry that I picked up the nearest thing and broke it.

63. I often make threats I don't really mean to carry out.

64. I can't help being a little rude to people I don't like.

65. At times I feel I get a raw deal out of life.
66. I used to think that most people told the truth, but now I know otherwise.

67. I generally cover up my poor opinions of others.

68. When I do wrong, my conscience punishes me severely.

69. If I have to resort to physical violence to defend my rights, I will.

70. If someone doesn't treat me right, I don't let it annoy me.

71. I have no enemies who really wish to harm me.

72. When arguing, I tend to raise my voice.

73. I often feel that I have not lived the right kind of life.

74. I have known people who pushed me so far that we came to blows.

75. I don't let a lot of unimportant things irritate me.

76. I seldom feel that people are trying to anger or insult me.

77. Lately I have been kind of grouchy.

78. I would rather concede a point than get into an argument about it.

79. I sometimes show my anger by banging on the table.
Siegel Manifest Hostility Scale

1. I've often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they had not thought of them first.

2. I don't blame anyone for trying to grab everything he can get in this world.

3. It is safer to trust nobody.

4. I'm often inclined to go out of my way to win a point with someone who has opposed me.

5. I've very few quarrels with members of my family.

6. I think nearly anyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble.

7. I am easily downed in an argument.

8. I am not easily angered.

9. When someone does me a wrong, I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing.

10. I have at times stood in the way of people who were trying to do something, not because it amounted to much, but because of the principle of the thing.

11. Some of my family have habits that bother and annoy me very much.

12. I've at times had to be rough with people who were rude or annoying.

13. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it.

14. I like to poke fun at people.

15. Someone has it in for me.

16. I easily become impatient with people.

17. I don't blame a person for taking advantage of someone who lays himself open for it.

18. Most people are honest chiefly through fear of being caught.
19. I sometimes tease animals.

20. I've frequently worked under people who seem to have things arranged so that they get credit for good work but are able to pass off mistakes onto those under them.

21. Some people are so bossy that I feel like doing the opposite of what they request, even though I know they are right.

22. I like to play practical jokes on others.

23. I'm often so annoyed when someone tries to get ahead of me in a line of people that I speak to him about it.

24. I know who is responsible for most of my troubles.

25. At times I have a strong urge to do something harmful or shocking.

26. In school I was sent to the principal for cutting up.

27. I'm often sorry because I'm so cross and grouchy.

28. I often feel irritable.

29. I'm sure I get a raw deal from life.

30. At times I feel like smashing things.

31. I get angry sometimes.

32. In school my marks in deportment were quite regularly low.

33. I think most people would lie to get ahead.

34. Sometimes I feel as if I must injure either myself or someone else.

35. If people had not had it in for me I would have been much more successful.

36. I believe I am being followed.

37. I never have "temper tantrums".

38. I believe I am being plotted against.

39. Someone has been trying to rob me.
40. I have no enemies who really wish to harm me.

41. I don't try to cover up my poor opinion or pity of a person so that he won't know how I feel.

42. I am often said to be hot headed.

43. I commonly wonder what hidden reason another person may have for doing something nice for me.

44. I get mad easily and then get over it soon.

45. At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.

46. Sometimes I enjoy hurting persons I love.

47. I can easily make other people afraid of me, and sometimes do for the fun of it.

48. Horses that don't pull should be beaten or kicked.

49. Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them.

50. There are certain people I dislike so much that I'm inwardly pleased that they are catching it for something they have done.
1. You are talking to someone and he/she does not answer you;

2. You accidently bang your shins against a park bench;

3. Your instructor unfairly accuses you of cheating on an examination;

4. Someone has lost an important book of yours;

5. You have just found out that someone has told lies about you;

6. You are driving to a party and suddenly your car has a flat tire;

7. You arrange to meet someone and he/she doesn't show up;

8. You are trying to study and there is incessant noise;

9. You are waiting at the bus stop and the bus fails to stop for you;

10. You are in a restaurant and have been waiting a long time to be served;

11. Someone has opened your personal mail;

12. You wake up early to get to a special 8:00am class and the instructor doesn't show up;

13. You are carrying a cup of coffee to the table and someone bumps you;

14. You are very tired and have just gone to sleep, when you are awakened by the arrival of some friends;
Responses-Form A

A. Heart beats faster:
   1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

B. Want to strike someone or something:
   1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

C. Lose patience:
   1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

D. Feel irritated:
   1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

E. Perspire:
   1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

F. Emotions disrupt actions
   1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

G. Curse:
   1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

H. Become tense:
   1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

I. Want to shout:
   1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

J. Frown:
   1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much
Stimulus-Response Hostility Inventory
Form B

1. You are talking to someone and he/she does not answer you;
2. The grocery store closes just as you are about to enter;
3. Someone has splashed mud over your new clothing;
4. Someone persistently contradicts you when you know you are right;
5. You just found out that someone has told lies about you;
6. Someone makes an error and blames it on you;
7. You are reading and find that the last page of the book is missing;
8. You miss your train because the clerk has given you faulty information;
9. You are typing a term paper and your typewriter breaks;
10. You use your last 10¢ to call a friend and the operator disconnects you;
11. Someone has opened your personal mail;
12. You wake up early to get to a special 8:00am class, and the instructor doesn't show up;
13. You are carrying a cup of coffee to the table and someone bumps into you;
14. Someone pushes ahead of you in a theater ticket line;
Responses-Form B

A. Heart beats faster:
1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

B. Want to hit something or someone:
1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

C. Hands tremble
1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

D. Swear:
1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

E. Perspire:
1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

F. Become enraged:
1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

G. Splutter:
1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

H. Grind teeth:
1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

I. Want to yell:
1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much

J. Grimance:
1-not at all  2-little  3-average  4-much  5-very much
KALAMAZOO POLICE DEPARTMENT
OFFENSE REPORT

OFFENSE SERIAL NO. 0073

LAST NAME OF COMPLAINANT (OR FIRM NAME) — FIRST NAME
Smith, Willie Lee

SEX, RACE, AGE: RESIDENCE OF COMPLAINANT (APT. NO. OR FLR.)(CITY & STATE IF NOT IN KALAMAZOO)
M-BLK-20 408 Stuart Street, City 49001

REPORTED BY

SEX, RACE, AGE TITLE OR RELATIONSHIP

ADDRESS OF PERSON REPORTING
Western Michigan University

OFFENSE AS REPORTED (CRIME)
Felonious-assault

PLACE OF OCCURRENCE — STREET ON — STREET AT OR NO.
valley III complex-Eldridge Hall

DIST. BEAT TRACT
27

RELIEF INVESTIGATOR
Hadley

DISPATCH NO.
39

D A Y  DATE OF OCCURRENCE TIME OF DAY DATE REPORT REC'D TIME REPORTED REPORT RECEIVED BY RANK BADGE NO.
Wed. Jan. 19, 1972 11:40pm 1/19/72 11:40pm R. Hankerson officer #305

COMPLAINANT'S OCCUPATION
W.M.U. Student

TYPE OF PREMISES ATTACKED (BE SPECIFIC)

HOW COMMITTED OR ENTRANCE GAINED

WEAPON USED OR MEANS OF ATTACK
knives-2, iron bar-1

INJURIES RECEIVED
head, face, body, limbs

QUANTITY UNIT DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY STOLEN—USE STANDARD TERMS SERIAL NUMBERS ESTIMATED VALUE DATE - RECOVERED - VALUE

void

none

BY WHOM RECOVERED

TIME AND DATE RECOVERED

OWNER NOTIFIED BY

TOTAL VALUE $ TOTAL VALUE $ TOTAL STOLEN

PERSONS ARRESTED — NAME, ADDRESS
Dan Forbes Eldridge Hall M-WTE-20

CHARGE ARRESTED BY
Fel. assault W.M.U. Security car #11

BADGE NO.

D I S T R I C T

OFFICER WHO OK'D ORIGINAL REPORT
Hadley

PHOTOS TAKEN BY
Brooks

SUPERVISOR IN CHARGE OF INVESTIGATION
Hadley

SUPERVISOR WHO served INVESTIGATION
McKilian

SUSPECTS OR PERSONS WANTED — NAME, ADDRESS, ALIAS

SEX, RACE, AGE

HEIGHT WEIGHT EYES HAIR CLOTHING AND OTHER IDENTIFICATION

none

D E T A I L S  O F  O F F E N S E (STATE FULLY ALL OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CRIME AND ITS INVESTIGATION)

Forbes and Rosen two white male W.M.U. students attacked Smith a Black male

W.M.U. student in the lounge on fifth floor Eldridge Hall—W.M.U. Smith was taken
to Bronson Hospital in serious condition suffering from facial lacerations,
stab wounds and fractured skull. He was unconscious. Four witnesses observed
said attack, F. Green, B. Wright, J. Stearns, B. Mack—all W.M.U. students. All
verified the use of weapons and identified alleged
assailants. Both white male assailants were taken
into custody and transported to county jail.

CONNECT WITH

CASE CLOSED BY

DATE CLOSED

UNFOUNDED

INACTIVE (NOT CLEARED)

RECOVERY:

CLEARED

OTHERWISE

CLEARED

BY ARREST

PARTIAL

NONE

OTHER WISE

PD -100
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WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Safety & Security Dept.

ORIGINAL OFFENSE REPORT

Date January 19, 1972

Complaint No. 0073

Type of Offense: Felonious-assault

Complainant: Willie Lee Smith

Address: 408 Stuart

Telephone No.: 892-8819

Time Rec’d.: 11:40pm

Received By: Base 1 - R. Hankerson

Investigated By: #516

Where Offense Occurred: Valley III complex-Eldridge/Fox Halls

Is Complainant Student? Yes _ X _ No ______

Was case cleared? Yes _ _ X _ No ______

Names and Addresses of Offenders: two

1. Dan Forbes
2. John G. Rosen
3. ________________
4. ________________

Witnesses: four

1. Frank Green
2. William Wright
3. Joseph Stearns
4. Bernard Mack

Nature of Complaint:

Security car #11 of Western Michigan University Division received a call from Base-1 at approximately 11:30pm January 19, 1972 to quell a developing disturbance and to investigate a possible assault involving three W.M.U. students at Eldridge-Fox Halls. Upon arrival at said location at 11:35pm 1/19/72, Willie Lee Smith, a Black male student, was found laying in the fifth floor study lounge of Eldridge Hall, bleeding profusely from the head, face, and lower abdominal region; with multiple abrasions and facial lacerations in a semi-conscious state. Kalamazoo Police Department was immediately contacted and an emergency vehicle dispatched to take the injured Black subject to Bronson Hospital for treatment.

Two alleged assailants, Dan Forbes and John G. Rosen, both white male students, were apprehended while exiting from the far southwest exit of Fox Hall; by security car #6 which had received a support call from Base-1 at approximately 11:32pm. The alleged assailants were turned over to K.P.D. and taken into custody pending further investigation and statements from witnesses.

Preliminary investigation has revealed the incident was of a racial nature, further investigation will be handled jointly by W.M.U. Security and K.P.D.
**Supplemental Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complainant's Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willie Lee Smith</td>
<td>January 24, 1972</td>
<td>0073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complainant's Address</th>
<th>Telephone No.</th>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>408 Stuart</td>
<td>892-8410</td>
<td>Felonious-assault</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow-up Investigation:

On January 19, 1972 at 11:35 pm, the above complainant, Willie Lee Smith, a Black male student, was found injured on the premises of Eldridge Hall suffering from an alleged attack by two white male students, D. Forbes and J. Rosen. The complainant was taken to Bronson Hospital where he remained in serious condition from January 19 to January 22. He was unable to comment on the circumstances of the alleged attack by the white students until today. The complainant suffered the following injuries:

1. Dislodgement of five teeth: 2 upper left bicuspids, 1 upper left canine, 2 upper left incisors
2. Broken left clavicle
3. Shattered left forearm
4. Groin muscle tear
5. Possible kidney damage
6. Partial collapse of left lung
7. Groin muscle tears requiring 46 surgical stitches
8. Severe head concussion

According to statements by witnesses, the altercation started earlier in the day during a classroom debate in which Smith and both alleged white assailants along with several other students participated. Smith, Forbes and Rosen debated on the same side of the issue but lost the debate. As a result of this, they received slightly lower grades than the winning team. The two white assailants were displeased with the Black student's performance. That night, Smith was studying with F. Green in the fifth floor study lounge of Eldridge Hall, when Rosen apparently saw him. Rosen then went to the third floor room of Forbes and the two returned to the study lounge. They immediately began to yell and kicked Smith, and further strike him with an iron bar in the head area as well as inflict numerous knife wounds. After several students intervened, both white assailants fled the scene. The alleged weapons were found January 20, 1972, at 11:13 pm in the Eldridge Hall laundry room, hidden behind the dryers. All witnesses confirm this version of the attack and further identified the assailants and weapons. Further action is to be taken by K.P.D. and the county court.

---
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**KALAMAZOO POLICE DEPARTMENT**

**OFFENSE REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME OF COMPLAINANT (OR FIRM NAME) — FIRST NAME</th>
<th>SEX, RACE, AGE</th>
<th>RESIDENCE OF COMPLAINANT (APT. NO. OR FLR.) (CITY &amp; STATE IF NOT IN KALAMAZOO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mack, Bernard Lorenzo</td>
<td>M-BLK-19</td>
<td>408 Stuart Street, City 49001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPORTED BY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX, RACE, AGE</th>
<th>TITLE OR RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>ADDRESS OF PERSON REPORTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFFENSE AS REPORTED (CRIME)**

Felonious-assault

**PLACE OF OCCURRENCE — STREET ON — STREET AT OR NO.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET ON — STREET AT OR NO.</th>
<th>DIST.</th>
<th>BEAT</th>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>RELIEF</th>
<th>INVESTIGATOR</th>
<th>DISPATCH NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley III complex-Eldridge Hall</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hadley</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPORTED BY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX, RACE, AGE</th>
<th>REPORTED BY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATE REPORT REC'D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE REPORT REC'D</th>
<th>TIME REPORTED</th>
<th>RECEIVED BY</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>BADGE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/19/72</td>
<td>11:40pm</td>
<td>R. Hankerson officer #305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPLAINANT’S OCCUPATION**

W.M.U. Student

**HOW COMMITTED OR ENTRANCE GAINED**

**WEAPON USED OR MEANS OF ATTACK**

Knives-2, iron bar-1

**INJURIES RECEIVED**

head, face, body, limbs

**QUANTITY UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY STOLEN / USE STANDARD TERMS SERIAL NUMBERS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED VALUE</th>
<th>DATE RECOVERED VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONS ARRESTED — NAME, ADDRESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SEX, RACE, AGE</th>
<th>CHARGE</th>
<th>ARRESTED BY</th>
<th>BADGE NO.</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank Green Eldridge Hall</td>
<td>M-BLK-20</td>
<td>Fel. assault</td>
<td>W.M.U. Security car #11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HIGHEST WIGHT EYE S CLOTHING AND OTHER IDENTIFICATION**

none

**DETAILS OF OFFENSE (STATE FULLY ALL OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CRIME AND ITS INVESTIGATION)**

Smith and Green two Black male W.M.U. students attacked Mack also a Black W.M.U. student in the lounge on fifth floor Eldridge Hall-W.M.U. Mack was taken to Bronson Hospital in serious condition suffering from facial lacerations, stab wounds and fractured skull. He was unconscious. Four witnesses observed said attack, J. Stearns, D. Forbes, B. Wright, J. Rosen—all W.M.U. students. All verified the use of weapons and identified alleged assailants. Both Black male assailants were taken into custody and transported to county jail.

---
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Date January 19, 1972

Complainant Bernard Mack
Address 408 Stuart

Received By Base-1 R. Hankerson
Investigated By #516

Where Offense Occurred Valley III complex-Eldridge/Fox Halls

Was case cleared? Yes X No

Names and Addresses of Offenders:

1. Frank Green
2. Willie Lee Smith
3. William Wright
4. John G. Rosen

Names and Addresses of Witnesses: four

Nature of Complaint:

security car #11 of Western Michigan University Division received a call from Base-1 at approximately 11:30pm January 19, 1972 to quell a developing disturbance and to investigate a possible assault involving three W.M.U. students at Eldridge-Fox Halls. Upon arrival at said location at 11:35pm 1/19/72, Bernard Mack a Black male student was found laying in the fifth floor study lounge of Eldridge Hall, bleeding profusely from the head, face, and lower abdominal region; with multiple abrasions and facial lacerations in a semi-conscious state. Kalamazoo Police Department was immediately contacted and an emergency vehicle dispatched to take the injured Black subject to Bronson Hospital for treatment.

Two alleged assailants, Frank Green and Willie Lee Smith both Black male students, were apprehended while exiting from the far southwest exit of Fox Hall; by security car #6 which had received a support call from Base-1 at approximately 11:32pm. The alleged assailants were turned over to K.P.D. and taken into custody pending further investigation and statements from witnesses.

Preliminary investigation has revealed the incident was of no racial nature, further investigation will be handled jointly by W.M.U. Security and K.P.D.
Follow-up Investigation:

on 1/19/72 at 11:35 pm the above complainant, Bernard Rack, a Black male student, was found injured on the premises of Eldridge Hall suffering from an alleged attack by two Black male students, W. Smith and P. Green. The complainant was taken to Bronson Hospital where he remained in serious condition from 1/19/72 to 1/23/72. He was unable to comment on the circumstances of the alleged attack by the Black students, until today. The complainant suffered the following injuries:

1) dislodgement of five teeth; 2 upper left bicuspids, 1 upper left canine, 2 upper left incisors
2) broken left clavicle
3) shattered left forearm
4) groin muscle tear
5) possible kidney damage
6) partial collapse of left lung
7) facial and head lacerations requiring 46 surgical stitches
8) severe head concussion

According to statements by witnesses the altercation started earlier in the day during a classroom debate in which Rack and both alleged Black assailants along with several other students participated. Rack, Smith and Green debated on the same side of the issue but lost the debate. As a result of this they all received slightly lower grades than the winning team. The two Black assailants were displeased with the Black students' performance. That night Rack was studying with W. Wright in fifth floor study lounge of Eldridge Hall, when Smith apparently saw him. Smith then went to third floor room of Green and the two returned to the study lounge. They immediately began to yell and kicked Rack, and further strike him with an iron bar in the head area as well as inflict numerous knife wounds. After several students intervened, both Black assailants fled the scene.

The alleged weapons were found 1/20/72 at 1:13 am in the Eldridge Hall laundry room, hidden behind the dryers. All witnesses confirm this version of the attack and further identified the assailants and weapons. Further action is to be taken by K.P.D. and the county court.
OFFENSE REPORT

KALAMAZOO POLICE DEPARTMENT

LAST NAME OF COMPLAINTANT (OR FIRM NAME) — FIRST NAME | SEX, RACE, AGE | RESIDENCE OF COMPLAINTANT | APT. NO. OR FLR. | CITY & STATE IF NOT IN KALAMAZOO

Rosen, John Glenn | M-WTE-19 | 408 Stuart Street, City 49001

REPORTED BY | SEX, RACE, AGE | TITLE OR RELATIONSHIP | ADDRESS OF PERSON REPORTING

W.M.U. Security Div. | | | Western Michigan University

OFFENSE AS REPORTED (CRIME) | COMPLAINANT'S TELEPHONE | OTHER TELEPHONE—LOCATION

Felonious-assault | 892-8819 | none

PLACE OF OCCURRENCE — STREET ON — STREET AT OR NO. | DIST. | BEAT | TRACT | RELIEF | INVESTIGATOR | DISPATCH NO.

valley III complex-Eldridge Hall | 27 | | | | Hadley | 39

DATE OF OCCURRENCE | TIME OF DAY | DATE REPORT REC'D | TIME REPORTED | REPORT RECEIVED BY | RANK | Badge NO.

Wed. Jan. 19, 1972 | 11:40pm | 1/19/72 | 11:40pm | R. Hankerson officer #305

COMPLAINANT'S OCCUPATION | TYPE OF PREMISES ATTACKED (BE SPECIFIC) | OFFICER FIRST ON SCENE | M.S.P. NO.

W.M.U. Student | | officer #516

HOW COMMITTED OR ENTRANCE GAINED | SUPERVISOR IN CHARGE OF INVESTIGATION | OFFICER ATTEMPTED TO INVEST | PHOTOS TAKEN BY

| | Hadley | Brooks

WEAPON USED OR MEANS OF ATTACK | INJURIES RECEIVED | DAMAGE DONE TO PROPERTY | SUPERVISOR WHO OK'D ORIGINAL REPORT | McMillian

knives-2, iron bar-1 | head, face, body, limbs | none |

QUANTITY — UNIT | DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY STOLEN—USE STANDARD TERMS—SERIAL NUMBERS | ESTIMATED VALUE | DATE — RECEIVED — VALUE

none

BY WHOM RECOVERED | TIME AND DATE RECOVERED | OWNER NOTIFIED BY | TOTAL VALUE STOLEN | TOTAL VALUE RECOVERED | $ | $ | DISTRICT

PERSONS ARRESTED — NAME, ADDRESS | SEX, RACE, AGE | CHARGE | ARRESTED BY | BADGE NO.

Joseph Stearns Eldridge Hall | M-WTE-20 | Fel. assault | W.M.U. Security car #11

Dan Forbes Eldridge Hall | M-WTE-19 | none

SUSPECTS OR PERSONS WANTED — NAME, ADDRESS, ALIAS | SEX, RACE, AGE, WEIGHT, HEIGHT, EYES, HAIR, CLOTHING AND OTHER IDENTIFICATION | none

DETAILS OF OFFENSE (STATE FULLY ALL OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CRIME AND ITS INVESTIGATION)

Stearns and Forbes two white male W.M.U. students attacked Rosen also a white W.M.U. student in the lounge on fifth floor Eldridge Hall—W.M.U. Rosen was taken to Bronson Hospital in serious condition suffering from facial lacerations, stab wounds and fractured skull. He was unconscious. Four witnesses observed said attack, F. Green, B. Wright, B. Mack, W. Smith—all W.M.U. students. All verified the use of weapons and identified alleged assailants. Both white male assailants were taken into custody and transported to county jail.

CASE CLOSED BY | DATE CLOSED

CONNECT WITH

UNFOUNDED | INACTIVE (NOT CLEARED) | RECOVERY: |

CLEARED | CLEARED BY ARREST | ALL | PARTIAL |

OTHERWISE | |

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Date January 19, 1972

Complainant: John G. Rosen

Address: 408 Stuart

Received by: Base-1 R. Hankerson

Investigated by: 

Where Offense Occurred: Valley III complex-Eldridge/Fox Halls

Is Complainant Student WMU? Yes X No

Was case cleared? Yes X No

Names and Addresses of Offenders: two Witnesses: four

1. Joseph Stearns
2. Dan Forbes
3. 
4. 

Nature of Complaint:

security car #11 of Western Michigan University Division received a call from Base-1 at approximately 11:30pm January 19, 1972 to quell a developing disturbance and to investigate a possible assault involving three W.M.U. students at Eldridge-Fox Halls. Upon arrival at said location at 11:35pm 1/19/72, John G. Rosen a white male student was found laying in the fifth floor study lounge of Eldridge Hall, bleeding profusely from the head, face, and lower abdominal region; with multiple abrasions and facial lacerations in a semi-conscious state. Kalamazoo Police Department was immediately contacted and an emergency vehicle dispatched to take the injured white subject to Bronson Hospital for treatment.

Two alleged assailants, Joseph Stearns and Dan Forbes both white male students, were apprehended while exiting from the far southwest exit of Fox Hall; by security car #6 which had received a support call from Base-1 at approximately 11:32pm. The alleged assailants were turned over to K.P.D. and taken into custody pending further investigation and statements from witnesses.

Preliminary investigation has revealed the incident was of no racial nature, further investigation will be handled jointly by W.M.U. Security and K.P.D.
SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

John G. Rosen
Complainant Name

January 24, 1972
Date

408 Stuart
Complainant Address

892-8819
Telephone No.

Felonious-assault
Type of Offense

Follow-up Investigation:
on 1/19/72 at 11:35pm the above complainant, John G. Rosen a white
male student, was found injured on the premises of Eldridge Hall
suffering from an alleged attack by two white male students, J. Stearns
and B. Forbes. The complainant was taken to Bremen Hospital where
he remained in serious condition from 1/19/72 to 1/23/72 and was
unable to comment on the circumstances of the alleged attack by
the white students, until today. The complainant suffered the following
injuries:

1) dislodgement of five teeth; 2 upper left bicuspids,
   1 upper left canine, 2 upper left incisors
2) broken left clavicle
3) shattered left forearm
4) groin muscle tear
5) possible kidney damage
6) partial collapse of left lung
7) facial and head lacerations requiring 46 surgical
   stitches
8) severe head concussion

According to statements by witnesses the altercation started earlier
in the day during a classroom debate in which Rosen and both alleged
white assailants along with several other students participated.
Rosen, Stearns and Forbes debated on the same side of the issue but
lost the debate. As a result of this they all received slightly lower
grades than the winning team. The two white assailants were displeased
with the white students performance. That night Rosen was studying
with W. Wright in fifth floor study lounge of Eldridge Hall, when
Forbes apparently saw him. Forbes then went to third floor room of
Stearns and the two returned to the study lounge. They immediately
began to yell and kicked Rosen, and further strike him with an iron
bar in the head area as well as inflict numerous knife wounds. After
several students intervened, both white assailants fled the scene.
The alleged weapons were found 1/20/72 at 1:13am in the Eldridge
Hall laundry room, hidden behind the dryers. All witnesses confirm
this version of the attack and further identified the assailants
and weapons. Further action is to be taken by K.P.D. and the county
court.
Stearns, Joseph Harold

LAST NAME OF COMPLAINANT (OR FIRM NAME) — FIRST NAME  
M-WTE-20  
408 Stuart Street, City 49001

SEX, RACE, AGE  

TITLE OR RELATIONSHIP  

ADDRESS OF PERSON REPORTING  

Western Michigan University

OFFENSE AS REPORTED (CRIME)  
Felonious-assault

PLACE OF OCCURRENCE – STREET ON – STREET AT OR NO.  
valley III complex—Eldridge Hall

TITL E OR RELATIONSHIP  
W.M.U. student

DATE OF OCCURRENCE  

TYPE OF PREMISES ATTACKED (BE SPECIFIC)  
Complainant's Occupation

W.M.U. student

OFFICER FIRST ON SCENE  
Hadley

DAY DATE REPORT REC'D  
11:40pm 1/19/72

REPORT RECEIVED BY  
R. Hankerson officer #305

TIME REPORTED  
11:40pm

RECEIVED B Y RANK BADGE NO.  
39

OFFICE R EPORTED BY  

SEX , RACE, AGE  

RESIDENCE OF COMPLAINANT (APT. NO. OR FL.R.) (CITY & STATE IF NOT IN KALAMAZOO)  
lft-WTE-20 | 408 Stuart Street, City 49001

RELA TIONSHIP  
none

R EPORTED BY  

ADDRESS OF PERSON REPORTING  

DISPATCH NO.  
892-8819

ROOM

RELIEF INVESTIGATOR  
none

HOW COMMITTED OR ENTRANCE GAINED  
none

WEAPON USED OR MEANS OF ATTACK  
knives-2, iron bar-1

INJURIES RECEIVED  
head, face, body, limbs

DAMAGE DONE TO PROPERTY

none

INJURIES RECEIVED  
head, face, body, limbs

QUANTITY UNIT  
head, face, body, limbs

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY STOLEN—USE STANDARD TERMS—SERIAL NUMBERS

none

QUANTITY UNIT  
head, face, body, limbs

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY STOLEN—USE STANDARD TERMS—SERIAL NUMBERS

none

PERSONS ARRESTED — NAME, ADDRESS  
Willie Lee Smith Eldridge Hall M-BLK-20

Bernard Mack Eldridge Hall M-BLK-20

CHARGE ARRESTED BY

Felonious-assault

W.M.U. Security car #11

BADGE NO.

O THER W IS E U BY ARREST

D E T A IL S O F O F F E N S E (STATE FULLY ALL OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CRIME AND ITS INVESTIGATION)

Smith and Mack two Black male W.M.U. students attacked Stearns a white male

W.M.U. student in the lounge on fifth floor Eldridge Hall—W.M.U. Stearns was taken to Bronson Hospital in serious condition suffering from facial lacerations, stab wounds and fractured skull. He was unconscious. Four witnesses observed said attack, B. Wright, F. Green, J. Rosen, D. Forbes—all W.M.U. students. All verified the use of weapons and identified alleged assailants. Both Black male assailants were taken into custody and transported to county jail.
Date January 19, 1972
Complaint No. 0073
Type of Offense Felonious-assault

Complainant Joseph Stearns
Address 408 Stuart

Received By Base 1-R. Hankerson
Investigated By #516

Where Offense Occurred Valley III complex-Eldridge/Fox Halls

Is Complainant Student WMU? Yes X No

Was case cleared? Yes No X

Names and Addresses of Offenders: two Witnesses: four
1. Willie Lee Smith William Wright
2. Bernard Mack Frank Green
3. John G. Rosen
4. Dan Forbes

Nature of Complaint:

security car #11 of Western Michigan University Division received a call from Base-1 at approximately 11:30pm January 19, 1972 to quell a developing disturbance and to investigate a possible assault involving three W.K.U. students at Eldridge-Fox Halls. Upon arrival at said location at 11:35pm 1/19/72, Joseph Stearns a white male student was found laying in the fifth floor study lounge of Eldridge Hall, bleeding profusely from the head, face, and lower abdominal region; with multiple abrasions and facial lacerations in a semi-conscious state. Kalamazoo Police Department was immediately contacted and an emergency vehicle dispatched to take the injured white subject to Bronson Hospital for treatment.

Two alleged assailants, Willie Lee Smith and Bernard Mack both Black male students, were apprehended while exiting from the far southwest exit of Fox Hall, by security car #6 which had received a support call from Base-1 at approximately 11:32pm. The alleged assailants were turned over to K.P.D. and taken into custody pending further investigation and statements from witnesses.

Preliminary investigation has revealed the incident was of a racial nature, further investigation will be handled jointly by W.K.U. Security and K.P.D.
Follow-up Investigation:

on 1/19/72 at 11:35pm the above complainant, Joseph Stearns a white male student, was found injured on the premises of Eldridge Hall suffering from an alleged attack by two Black male students, B. Mack and W. Smith. The complainant was taken to Franciscan Hospital where he remained in serious condition from 1/19/72 to 1/23/72 and was unable to comment on the circumstances of the alleged attack by the Black students, until today. The complainant suffered the following injuries:

1) dislodgement of five teeth; 2 upper left bicuspids, 1 upper left canine, 2 upper left incisors
2) broken left clavicle
3) shattered left forearm
4) groin muscle tear
5) possible kidney damage
6) partial collapse of left lung
7) facial and head lacerations requiring 46 surgical stitches
8) severe head concussion

According to statements by witnesses the altercation started earlier in the day during a classroom debate in which Stearns and both alleged Black assailants along with several other students participated. Stearns, Smith and Mack debated on the same side of the issue but lost the debate. As a result of this they all received slightly lower grades than the winning team. The two Black assailants were displeased with the white students performance. That night Stearns was studying with D. Forbes in fifth floor study lounge of Eldridge Hall, when Mack apparently saw him. Mack then went to third floor room of Smith and the two returned to the study lounge. They immediately began to yell and kicked Stearns, and further strike him with an iron bar in the head area as well as inflict numerous knife wounds. After several students intervened, both Black assailants fled the scene. The alleged weapons were found 1/20/72 at 1:13am in the Eldridge Hall laundry room, hidden behind the dryers. All witnesses confirm this version of the attack and further identified the assailants and weapons. Further action is to be taken by K.F.D. and the county court.