CHAPTER VIII
THE ERA OF THE STUDENT

The Dynamic Decade

More than any other decade in the history of American higher education, the 1960s deserves to be designated "the era of the student." There was no time in these ten years when the influence of the student was not felt, although in different ways at different times. In the early years, administrative forces were marshalled to accommodate the new numbers of students. Demands for books, teachers, courses, and dormitory rooms rose as the enrollment boom came to life. Toward the end of the decade, higher education was hit with a malaise of discontent, sometimes expressed in violent political acts: bombing, arson, shooting, death. As the universities were propelled into the seventies, a pattern of participation emerged: university governance was seen as a partnership of administrators, faculty, and students, and student representatives began to contribute to the routine operations of universities.

The changes that came in the dynamic decade went beyond local campus situations and the way in which local situations were handled. The culture of protest and alienation was produced, packaged, and marketed to an eager youth-conscious public. Music became a medium of communication; the protest songs of Bob Dylan and Joan Baez, recorded for Muzak, accompanied business transactions in corporation offices. Grooming and dress became casual; the "Beatle" haircut that repulsed many in 1964 could almost be called conservative by 1970. Taboos covering sex and violence were eroded, if not erased. Even small towns were affected by crime and drug abuse, and nearly everywhere it soon became fashionable to support minorities, chastise elected officials, and protest against the "establishment" at home, in the office, and in the community.

As the nation moved through the sixties to a rock beat, events blossomed into movements, and movements begat new events. The center of attention became youth and those sanctuaries of youth, the colleges and universities. Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire, though far from being the cauldron of change that was Berkeley or Harvard, did not remain unaffected by pressure and change in society.

Activism, Civil Rights, and Free Speech: "Where It All Began"

To the surprise of many experienced educators, the radical generation of the 1960s surfaced early. Clark Kerr, speaking as the new president of the University of California in 1960, said that the students of the upcoming decade "are going to be easy to handle. There aren't going to be riots. There aren't going to be revolutions." But soon after his statement, students from California's Berkeley campus were involved in physical confrontation with uniformed authority at the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in San Francisco. In November 1960, activism shattered Kerr's vision of placidity when student editors of The Daily Californian resigned over censorship by administrators. The happening was brought to the attention of readers of Eau Claire's student newspaper, the Spectator, whose editors expressed their support of the California student journalists. The omnipresent mass media found in student activism a message that attracted the attention of readers and viewers in all parts of the country.

Assessing the trends that shaped activism, Michael Harrington stressed the importance of the civil rights movement of the early sixties. "Black America," he noted in Fragments of the Century, gave the nation "a renewed sense of its own conscience." Harrington himself could be considered a force in the movement; his 1962 book, The Other America, focused attention on the irony of hunger co-existing with affluence. The issue of poverty joined the two concerns of rights and racism in the formulation of the social legislation of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

There were opportunities for students of Wisconsin State College at Eau Claire to keep abreast of events in the civil rights crusade. In March of 1962, Martin Luther King, Jr., spoke on the college's Forum series, bringing the message of total integration but emphasizing peaceful protest: "Destructive means cannot be used to bring about constructive ends. We can hate injustice, but we must love the perpetrators of it."

The following year, Dr. King repeated his cry for justice in the memorable "I Have a Dream" speech at the Lincoln Memorial which concluded the "March to Washington." In the crowd that August evening were four students from Wisconsin State College at Eau Claire, Dr. John Higgins of its history faculty, and John Kruse of the Cooperative Campus Ministry. "There was a sense of dedicated joy, congenial participation, and purpose among the marchers," Mr. Kruse recalled in his interview with the Eau Claire Daily Telegram.

The "sense of conscience" among young people found outlets in positive participation in new pro-
grams that crossed the New Frontier into the Great Society. The Peace Corps, established early in the Kennedy administration, became “the liberal hero of the hour.” James W. Gould, Peace Corps representative, spoke on the Eau Claire campus and told interested students that the Peace Corps is “a positive plan which is trying to contribute something good and helpful instead of trying to stamp out the things it considers bad.” More than a dozen students and graduates of Eau Claire committed their energies to two years or more of work in the “third world” nations during the 1960s as Peace Corps Volunteers.4

Young people were also attracted to service in the Office of Economic Opportunity’s “War on Poverty” in Appalachia, in Volunteers in Service to America programs, in Project Headstart and Educational Opportunity efforts. As Calvin Lee, chronicler of campus life, wrote: “In the early sixties the movement from the left was still a movement for something: for desegregation, for equality for the blacks, for individualism. It was not, at least not perceivably, a movement against impersonalization, against the IBM card, or a rebellion against war. This change in tone was to come soon enough. . . .”75

A significant meeting took place in June 1962 when 45 young people gathered at the old UAW-CIO camp at Port Huron, Michigan, and founded the Students for a Democratic Society. The 62-page manifesto, “The Port Huron Statement,” drafted by Tom Hayden, a University of Michigan student, proclaimed: “We are people of this generation, bred in at least modest comfort, housed now in universities, looking forward uncomfortably to the world we inherit.” As it urged that students “as individuals take the responsibility for encounter and resolution” the newly formed SDS was “then but a shadow of its future self.”76

A change in tone began with the November 1963 assassination of John F. Kennedy. The death of the young and vigorous president brought a feeling of helplessness and despair to the youth of America. John Anderson, editor of the Spectator, described the reaction of Eau Claire students: “When news of his death reached the campus, hundreds of students crowded around television and radio sets to await the news that never came — that the President would recover. Long, sober faces met in halls as the afternoon passed.” It was evident, Anderson concluded, that “students have a great love for their country which today is just a little bit weaker.”

The Johnson administration lacked the luster of “the best and the brightest” of the Kennedy years, and it gradually became apparent to the country, and especially to those of draft age, that the commitment of military forces in Indochina was deep.

The Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley, often cited as the beginning of the student revolt, arose over the issue of the “right” of campus political groups to promote their causes and solicit contributions on university property. When in the fall of 1964 administrators began to restrict these activities, their rulings were met with sustained protest. The polarization was completely unanticipated: students burned the IBM cards which were their identification as members of the university community as a demonstration against the university, perceived as an “education factory.” The Free Speech Movement became a model for later protests: “The Free Speech Movement was anti-status quo, valued ethics above law and order, had its own hip-anarchic style and included everyone from Maoists to Goldwaterites.”78

The events at Berkeley were reported to readers of the Spectator by on-the-spot syndicated correspondents. In many parts of the country, reports in student newspapers and the public press helped produce a student solidarity — an ideological alliance and awareness of movements on other campuses. At the same time, Berkeley caused a backlash on the right. In Wisconsin, it was easy to draw the inference that the University’s Madison campus was similar in size to Berkeley and might also harbor students and faculty with radical leanings. In April 1965, State Senator Gordon Roselep of Darlington introduced Bill 235, “Communist Lecturers,” and Bill 301, “Truth in Education.” Between them, the two bills stated that no member of the Communist Party could seek, accept, or hold a position — nor could he or she speak — in schools supported wholly or partially by state funds. The bills, ultimately defeated, were opposed by Eau Claire’s Spectator.9

Through empathy or backlash, the movement at Berkeley became a powerful influence as student protest spread through the larger state universities in California, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York; into the venerated private institutions of the East such as Harvard, Columbia, Yale, and Princeton; and ultimately to smaller schools and former teachers colleges.

The Dow Chemical Protests at Madison: 1967 and Beyond

In October 1967, the state of Wisconsin was shocked by a violent demonstration against Dow Chemical Company representatives on the University of Wisconsin’s Madison campus. Dow, a major manufacturer of napalm which was being
used in the Vietnam War, had an extensive personnel recruitment program on campuses across the country. In the two-day Madison incident, said to involve some 3,000 students, 80 persons were injured and 13 students were suspended.\textsuperscript{10} Though their appearance was heralded by a large employment advertisement in the Spectator, Dow representatives had no trouble on the Eau Claire campus; indeed, interviews by all recruiters went “almost unnoticed” in the 1967-68 year. An editorial in the Spectator took a stand against recruitment for athletic teams — not against corporations supplying the Vietnam War.\textsuperscript{11}

The Dow disturbance of 1967 began an era of protest on the Madison campus marked by a strike by graduate teaching assistants, demonstrations for black studies and a black cultural center, anti-draft demonstrations, “trashings” of area businesses: a drama of broken bones and broken glass that reached a climax when a homemade bomb gutted the Army Mathematics Research Center, killing a young scientist working late at night — an eventuality so shocking that it brought an end to violence at the University of Wisconsin.

Wisconsin citizens and their elected representatives in state government were shocked and alarmed by the sequence of events on the Madison campus. The state’s newspapers contained letters from readers demanding that the University of Wisconsin “crack down” on protestors. Governor Warren Knowles replied that his daily mail was full of letters from constituents who said that the demonstrations were “all Communist inspired” and their leaders were “devoted to Russia and Red China.” The Republican controlled legislature responded with budgetary threats, increased campus police forces, and comments to the press on the inability of UW President Fred Harvey Harrington to govern the University.\textsuperscript{12}

The Wisconsin State Universities Campuses: Two Major Outbreaks

The two major disturbances in the Wisconsin State Universities were at Oshkosh and Whitewater, and both grew out of strained relations between the campus and the community when blacks first began to attend the regional institutions.

At Oshkosh, located in the east central part of the state, black students filed into President Roger Guiles’ office in November 1968 with a list of demands — for a black center, for black studies, for more blacks on the faculty. When the president declined to sign the document, disillusioned students proceeded to tear his office apart. Sit-ins, marches, and faculty protest followed, as did the suspension of 90 black students. The New Yorker magazine reported that most Oshkosh citizens were “so angry that they could explain the destruction only in terms of outside influence, perhaps Communists. It was Oshkosh’s first experience with modern student unrest.”\textsuperscript{13}

At Whitewater, a small southern Wisconsin city near the Illinois border, town/gown relations became strained when the university there began recruiting black students. In December 1969, a racial disturbance erupted over a basketball game between white and black fraternities. Three months later, the campus’s central structure, Old Main, was hit by fire during a week of protest. The Milwaukee Journal noted: “Whitewater citizens were tired of outsiders dictating to them. They feel that the university is ‘so damn big and it’s an outsider, our students come from out of town, and we look to Madison and the legislature for money.’”\textsuperscript{14}

Later, Eugene McPhee, director of the Wisconsin State Universities, recalled that the board office in Madison was “like a war room, with maps . . . to keep track of where trouble would break out.” Yet he himself remained calm, casually phoning the presidents to ask, “How are things today?”\textsuperscript{15} By the end of the decade, his tally of disturbances within the WSU System included both radical and minor activism:

— the racial incidents at Whitewater and Oshkosh, major disturbances that showed that violent protest could indeed hit the WSUs.
— protest marches for a uniform 18-year-old drinking age on the La Crosse and Stevens Point campuses.
— student action against tenure policy and nonretention of favorite faculty members at Whitewater and Eau Claire.
— anger over administrative decisions to deny SDS charters at La Crosse and Eau Claire.
— an omnibus protest at Platteville against faculty domination of the library, residence hall rules, violation of Constitutional rights, and the “second-rate image” of the Wisconsin State Universities “established by the board of regents.”\textsuperscript{16}

Though each of the state universities considered itself an autonomous institution, the presidents could not divorce themselves from what was happening on other campuses. By administrators and students alike, the board of regents came to be regarded as an appeals board, and board meetings themselves became the scene of protest on several occasions. President Haas remembered the regents’ meeting the month following the Oshkosh disturbance as “a very tense situation”: 
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Hundred of people converged on Madison and the board meeting, which was held in one of the chambers of the capitol building at that time. I was sitting at the back of the room; there were some students nearby and some other students decided to storm the place. Glass flew all over the room and around my head. There were a couple of Eau Claire students there, and they immediately tried to protect me... because I was sitting in that particular spot. I think that’s indicative... there was some concern because people could have been hurt that day.

Dr. Haas also recalled a meeting of the state universities presidents following the Whitewater fire. Their luncheon gathering at a Madison restaurant was watched over by bodyguards hired to protect Whitewater President William Carter.

The regents responded to the problem of protest by formulating a unified conduct code which stipulated that demonstrations must be conducted within the law and that they must not interfere with the “accepted functions or activities of the university and its educational program.” Later, the regents called for increased campus police forces through the creation of a special security office at each school, a system which, the board said, “should be one of protection and security, not the enforcement of criminal statutes.”

The University as Parent, a Concept Whose Time Had Passed

By January 1966 the message of the “new student” was beginning to filter into the Upper Midwest, and in a perceptive address entitled “Ferment and Freedom on the Campus,” the Most Reverend James P. Shannon, president of the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, gave the midwinter commencement charge at Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire:

We must admit we are confronted with a new breed of students. Ten years ago we were lamenting the fact that our students were addicted to a buttondown style which went far beyond their shirtwear. We called them indifferent, callous, apathetic, and insipid... We shook our heads in the 1950s and then turned our attention to the coming generation of students. We had some advice for them. We told them their predecessors had sold their birthright in return for security. We admonished them to slough off conformity and said they should be unafraid to hear a different drummer. We urged them to strive for excellence and not settle for mediocrity. We warned them of an indifference so brittle it would shatter on the great moral and social issues of our time. Some students took us to heart. On the road to Damascus they were struck from their horses, and they became committed young men and women.

In a sense, universities and colleges were responsible for the very emancipation of their students which was demanded in the 1960s. One of the immediate casualties was the whole idea of “in loco parentis,” or the university as foster parent of the student who is away from home. Young people wanted none of the security of a buttoned down way of life supervised by their elders.

The concept of “in loco parentis” had an honorable history. All the Wisconsin state normal schools, except the youngest, Eau Claire, had at one time accepted students as young as 14 and 15 years of age. Eau Claire, when it opened its doors in 1916, expected all entering students to have a high school diploma or the equivalent in experience in teaching. Other early institutions were governed by religious organizations and were charged with the responsibility “to improve, to the utmost of our power, discipline and moral character.” But “in loco parentis” is a concept which dies hard, especially with parents who have protected their children as they grow up, or who themselves have been unable to cope and wish someone else would, and with a segment of the citizenry. A liberalized campus policy, a controversial speaker, a questionable film brings angry letters to the desks of presidents and deans beseeching them to protect “our gullible students.”

The 1960s at Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire represented for the vice president of student affairs at Eau Claire years filled with a strenuous effort to keep up, not only with the “new breed,” but with actual numbers. From 2,909 students in the fall of 1963, when he came to Eau Claire as dean of students, enrollment went to 3,573 the following fall, when Dr. Ormsby Harry’s title had become vice president for student affairs. From then on, it climbed each year until the figure in the fall of 1970 was 8,282, and among these students were young men who had already fought in Vietnam.

A number of functions fell under the purview of the vice president for student affairs. He became early acquainted with freshmen through the admissions function of his office and the two-day freshman orientation and advisement sessions held for freshmen and their parents the summer before entrance, during which President Haas, Dr. Harry, associate deans of students, and leaders of the student body,
as well as academic advisers, smoothed the path to matriculation.

Housing of all non-commuting students on campus was the desideratum, but even though residence halls were constantly under construction through 1968, only for a very brief period were there more rooms than students who wished to occupy them, and at the same time it was deemed necessary for the staff to inspect off-campus student housing, and work with community landlords. The vice president for student affairs watched over the health of the campus population and brought the first full-time physician on to his staff.

University programs and liaison with student government demanded the talents of a full-time person, and in 1966 Johannes Dahle, from the University of Minnesota and Macalester College, St. Paul, was brought to Eau Claire to work with Forum and Artists Series committees and plan many special events, such as “Arena of Ideas” and “Meet the Professor,” and to work closely with cultural and social, standards, and organizations commissions of the student government. The disposition of several hundred thousand dollars of the student activity fee each year was a matter for both student and administration input.

Clayton Anderson became full-time director of recreation when the Hilltop Center opened. Bowling alleys, game rooms, and snack bar were located there closer to the several thousand students living in upper campus dormitories. Year-round intramural competition in all the major sports became a safety valve for the energies of young men and women; equipment was loaned for tennis, skiing, golf on city courses, and bicycling. Molded by television, the record industry, specialized magazines, and mature motion pictures, the “new breed” of students was served on campus by TV viewing rooms, major popular groups such as “The Fifth Dimension” and “Jefferson Airplane” in concert, a large university bookstore, and contemporary films and film festivals. The social and cultural patterns of the 1960s took over, and Anthony Lewis of the New York Times noted that “the changes in attitude occurring in bigger, less controversial places are beginning to touch even central Wisconsin.”

The first of the older customs to go was the freshman “beanie”:

When called upon to “beanie” by a sophomore, the freshman is required to come to attention and recite the freshman poem... Maximum penalty for the failure of freshmen to identify with the freshman class would be a recommendation of social probation during Eau Claire’s homecoming... Other penalties include crawling in Minnie Creek chanting “quack, quack,” cutting grass in front of Schofield Hall with nail clippers, or counting the number of steps from Schofield basement to the 11th floor of Towers.

Richard Kirkwood, poet and assistant professor of English, failing to see the value of the compulsory poetry recitations, wrote a letter to the Spectator in which he opined that the tradition “can be and often is harmful to the proper and immediate adjustment of some freshmen.”

Even seniors, just about to graduate, were subject to a parental-type rule. If they did not wish to attend the commencement ceremony, they had to seek permission of the appropriate dean to absent themselves, and each such application received personal attention from the dean, who would make a recommendation to the vice president for academic affairs. Dr. John Morris, dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, approved a request from a student who asked to be excused from the ceremony because the date interfered with his marriage and his entrance into the armed forces with the quip that “one should never fight city hall or cupid.”

Another custom abandoned in 1967 was the requirement of convocation credits, when Johannes Dahle, director of university programs, persuaded reluctant administrators that students could be trusted to take advantage of cultural programs without compulsion. The former lines of students waiting to have their convocation cards punched as they entered a lecture or concert were a thing of the past, and attendance was as good as ever.

The once-a-week freshman convocation was carried on for a while, even though it became necessary to hold it in sections to accommodate the entering classes reaching a thousand and more in numbers. “Guerilla theater,” a term most administrators had never heard of when it happened, spelled the end of compulsory freshman convocation. Three performances of approximately a minute and a half each interrupted freshman forum during the fall of 1968, when ten or a dozen students staged little dramas of a reluctant freshman being forcibly dragged into the assembly by a uniformed representative of the law. The “Winston Baker case” was turned over to a disciplinary tribunal of faculty and student members, chaired by assistant professor of sociology Shirley Wright. The charges were presented by dean of men Willis Zorn, and the defendant was represented by political science professor Morton Sipress as counsel. The Chippewa Valley Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union reviewed the case.
While some 10 to 12 students participated, only the black student was disciplined even though others were recognized. It is difficult to judge whether those bringing the charges did so because the student was black or because they viewed him as more of a troublemaker than the others. . . . The student was charged under a Board of Regents rule prohibiting "interference with accepted functions," through such things as "noise," "tumult," "breach of peace," and other such activities. It was never specified what particular category his interference fell into. . . . The student was found guilty, suspended for four semesters and the suspension then suspended providing the student behaves in the future. The disciplinary hearing generally met the requirements of due process. . . .

Two other matters which impinged on student life at WSU-Eau Claire were presented in the same December 1968 issue of the Civil Liberties Bulletin: whether the proprietor of a downtown movie theater would be willing to risk censorship for showing the film of "The Fox," based on the story by D. H. Lawrence; and the excessive bail set for George Hanley, a "non-student," head of the Eau Claire chapter of the Wisconsin Draft Resistance Union, arrested for selling copies of an underground newspaper called "The Roach," on the grounds that the material was pornographic and lewd.

**Housing: Battlefield in the War Against "In Loco Parentis"**

One of the requirements for head residents which Dr. Harry was most proud of was that those hired in that position have master's degrees in counseling and guidance. "Resident assistants" were chosen from among student applicants who were judged to be the finest type of responsible young persons. Rules establishing women's hours were made, according to associate dean of students Valena Burke, "with careful consideration to the campus and student needs." Social probation might be imposed for violation of the rules. Generally, during the decade, visitation hours were introduced through the student government procedures in cooperation with the vice president for student affairs and his housing staff, and privileges of free movement in and out of the dormitories were equalized for women and men. The concept of residence hall living as an educational experience remained an essential part of the philosophy of student personnel services.

Rules for off-campus housing had two functions: to ensure clean and livable quarters, certain furnishings, reasonable rents, and adequate fire exits; and to provide that a householder, or other responsible adult, be "on duty" when a student tenant was in the house, and to see that the tenants, if women, conformed to sign-out and sign-in rules.

The board of regents, meeting in Eau Claire on April 10, 1964, reaffirmed "the principle that it is the duty and responsibility of each college to establish policies and procedures relating to off-campus housing for all students." The following month, Dr. Harry's office attempted to sample the varieties of student housing in a survey which was roundly condemned by the Spectator. A dummy suspended from a tree opposite Katharine Thomas Hall carried the legend "Dean Harry Unfair to Students," and to the Daily Telegram Dr. Harry explained that the sign was probably protesting the current survey of housing, that "while the college has had a rule that all students must live in approved housing, the rule hasn't been enforced in recent years, and the survey now being made is aimed at enforcing the rule again."

When, in the first semester of 1964-65, the university sent letters to some 150 students informing them that they were living in "non-approved" housing and must make arrangements to move, the student dissidents were joined by the landlords. "Property owners in university cities should be protected!" an angry Eau Claire citizen wrote to the state attorney general. After the local newspaper disclosed that several Water Street residences were considered substandard, the Water Street Businessmen's Association appointed a committee to negotiate with "the authorities over there" at the university, who they said were "trying to enforce a rule that was unenforceable." The five-man committee was mollified when the rules of the regents were reviewed for them and they were assured that the university had no wish to "wipe out Water Street off-campus housing."

While university officials, juggling the housing needs created by constantly rising enrollments, lobbied for more residence halls, the opening of new dormitories was regarded by some students as a conspiracy to force students to live on-campus, reinforced by the rule that "all single men and women students not residing with their parents are required to live in a university residence hall in so far as accommodations are available." Though housing director H. Don Pope insisted that housing regulations were not set up as a means to obtain strict control over students, he predicted that with the opening of the Towers high-rise hall, "housing will be provided on the campus for all students under the age of 21 for the 1967-68 academic year."
In April 1967, 200 students marched from the Council Oak on south campus to Schofield Hall to protest the housing rules. In a spring rain, President Haas told the demonstrators that the previous year the rules had been "liberalized" because of a shortage of dormitory space: "We were criticized then for not having enough housing." At the rally, student senators, students not affiliated with the university, fraternity members, and even a visiting member of the Students for a Democratic Society, were allowed to speak, protected at the podium from the rain by G. Willard King, director of university relations, holding an umbrella.30

The following year, as a leveling-off of enrollments was foreseen and dormitories on other state campuses already stood empty, the assembly state affairs committee of the legislature recommended that no new residence halls be built except in cases of "dire need." At Eau Claire, however, residence halls reached capacity occupancy in 1969, and with the moratorium on dormitory building in effect, Eau Claire students were allowed, and even encouraged, to seek housing in the community.31

The 1969 legislature enacted a statute which established advisory housing committees in each Wisconsin State University city. Composed of three representatives each of the administration, the student body, and the faculty, three representing the governing body of the municipality, and three representing the owners of private housing, the committee was "to consider and advise on all phases of student housing, including leases, contracts, building plans, grievances, and standards of operation." Adam Bors, dean of students, served as chairman of the committee, with John Curtis, local realtor, vice chairman. At the same time, the city of Eau Claire began to consider a housing code that would set municipal standards of housing.32

In a major step taken in the summer of 1970, Douglas Hallatt, who joined the student personnel staff the year before, was named director of housing. Occupying a suite of offices on the first floor of the Towers residence hall, Dr. Hallatt presided over a staff of 12 head residents, 150 resident assistants, 18 custodians, and 500 work-study student helpers, an associate director, and two assistant directors. The occupancy rate rose to 105 percent, with overflow happily ensconced in lounge areas, as various amenities were added to dormitory living: refrigerators for rent, telephones in each room, beer at the nearby Pub in the Hilltop Center, recreational facilities in the Center and the McPhee Physical Education building. Dr. Hallatt, whose qualifications included a doctor of education degree, proved to have talents combining management skills with educational goals. "The old idea of 'in loco parentis' is out," he said, "and the emphasis now is shifting toward a richness of life in the residence halls with cultural and special events taking place within the context of dormitory living.33

"Sandbox or Soapbox": Student Government in the 1960s

In the early 1960s a new form of student government was established by a push from above, when President Haas made a proposal, saying: "I have no desire to keep the reins of authority in one administrative office on the campus. I hope that I will be here long enough to witness dispersal of authority over the entire faculty and the entire student body."34 The college senate, created in 1961, contained a handful of faculty, making it a kind of unicameral governing body for the college. Student representatives were elected from classes and residence halls. The college senate concerned itself with issues ranging from allowing card-playing in the Blugold Room to marshalling student input into the disposition of the segregated fee, and the effectiveness of the body, President Haas recalled, "depended upon the ability of the president and the vice president of the student body." The organization did relate itself to statewide issues through its membership in the United Council of Student Governments, which had been founded as a legislative and lobbying agency for students of the Wisconsin State Universities.35

When the faculty senate was established in January 1965, a separate student senate continued the commissions first formulated under the college senate set-up: social activities, cultural activities, campus organizations, student welfare, and standards. "Helping students achieve a working organization" was still the preoccupation of administrators, and this was one of the topics, along with housing, the under-21 drinking law, free speech, free assembly and picketing, communication techniques, and student council, on the agenda of the deans of students
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of the nine state universities when they met at Eau Claire in September of 1965.  

In 1962 it was possible for Dean Zorn and the Eau Claire police to raid a party in a student apartment on Water Street. A half-dozen students were either suspended or placed on probation as a consequence. But students were becoming aware of their rights to privacy, even in university housing, to specificity of charges, and to a fair hearing before suspension or other punishment. When a residence hall head searched a student’s room, the Chippewa Herald-Telegram took the university authorities to task for violation of a student’s constitutional rights.

Offenses ranged from appearing barefoot in the Davies Center, to making a bomb threat from a telephone there, which turned out to be the work of a prankster rather than of a political saboteur, to hanging a red flag from the Towers residence hall. Tribunals convened by the student personnel committee of the faculty senate were succeeded by a judicial board, advised by Drury Bagwell, associate dean of students, who had a degree in law. The judicial board, composed of students elected as representatives, heard cases and recommended solutions to Dr. Harry, vice president for student affairs. A women’s standards board had much the same function. Forms of student government also were authorized for the residence halls, and the Inter-Residence Hall Council was chartered in 1969 to improve communications and coordinate policies on visitation among the ten residence halls.

Critics of the student senate pressured for more political involvement: the senate, the Spectator said, “will be effective only when it mobilizes student power. . . . Now is the time for an organized student senate which is not afraid to reflect student opinion and lobby for what it feels are the students’ best interests.” Later in the decade, an “all power to the people amendment” was proposed for the student senate constitution which would eliminate the words “and upon its acceptance by the president of the university” from the Article VII provision that all amendments to the constitution were subject to the approval of the president of the university.

The World Intrudes

At mid-decade students at Wisconsin State University—Eau Claire seemed more concerned with the inflated price of a hamburger, 25 cents, in the Blugold snack bar, than with the cost of United States involvement in Vietnam, but ultimately the Vietnam War became a topic for discussion and action. In 1966, Richard Russell, a student writer for the Spectator, in two pages of eloquence, expressed his fear of confrontation with China if communism was not vigorously opposed in Vietnam, but an opposing view was beginning to attract followers as an effort was made to organize a chapter of Students for a Democratic Society as a chartered group at the university, as marches were launched in sympathy with national protest movements, and as television brought the war into student apartments and dormitory TV lounges.

One factor was the draft. President Haas, among others, identified conscription as one of the major factors in the enormous growth of student enrollment in the 1960s. A young “new breed” of faculty, hired to instruct the swollen numbers of students in the classroom, imported news of what was going on on other campuses. Administrators were caught up in the juggling of new regulations and procedures for reporting the draft status of students and younger faculty members. Cooperation with the Selective Service System presented a problem in determining the philosophic bounds of the university’s neutrality, particularly when a student’s deferment status could change on the basis of a teacher’s grade or a registrar’s action. As draft calls increased and student deferments were phased out, the Wisconsin Draft Resistance Union local chapter offered explanations of selective service laws and alternatives to induction, and the American Friends Service Agency counseled draftees on the right to conscientious objection.

The Forum series brought to the campus speakers from the outside world, and one of the most interesting was Dr. Henry Kissinger, professor of government at Harvard University, who spoke on January 4, 1967, on “A New Approach to International Relations.” Though he took as his main theme the distinction between the approach towards foreign policy taken by “outsiders, academicians, newspaper commentators, and in general those who have no responsibility,” and the approach of “those who are charged with making the final decisions,” Dr. Kissinger did comment on the Vietnam involvement:

When the United States has committed 400,000 troops to a country, that country has become important. Our commitment has made Vietnam important. All over the world today, whether we like it or not, the ability of the United States to carry out its promises depends importantly on our ability to carry out our pledges in Southeast Asia. . . . I have visited Vietnam three times in the last year for the government, and one of the perplexities of the situation is that there doesn’t exist a necessary relationship between the war of the large units
which is fought in the jungle and the political stability in the countryside, in the rice paddies, and in the Delta area in the south of Vietnam. We are fighting a curious war in which one side's losses are not necessarily the other side's gains, or in which both sides are sometimes winning simultaneously in different categories. One student viewed Dr. Kissinger's defense of U.S. policy in Vietnam as "an exercise in Johnsonian apologetics" and provoked an attempt by several students to drown out Kissinger's answer with stamping of feet, an act which embarrassed administrators and some townspeople.\(^4\)

As part of a Political Emphasis series initiated by the Young Republicans Club and the Young Democrats Club, chartered student organizations of the Eau Claire campus, an invitation was given to George Lincoln Rockwell, leader of the American Nazi Party, to speak in the university fieldhouse on February 16, 1967. His appearance caused problems in public relations with the community for the president, and a picket line protesting the philosophy Rockwell represented was organized by members of the faculty. President Haas took the position that student activity funds should not be used in presenting Rockwell. The faculty advisors to the two sponsoring groups were on the platform with the speaker; they were Dr. Donald Ellickson for the Young Republicans and Dr. Karl Andresen for the Young Democrats.

In a memorable statement, which was subsequently reprinted by every major newspaper in Wisconsin, Dr. Karl Andresen introduced the speaker:

\[
... I am sure Mr. Rockwell appreciates that I am standing here with somewhat mixed feelings. The last time I was this close to a Nazi was in my hometown in Nazi-occupied Norway in 1944 when I was being marched down the street with a machine pistol in my back and surrounded by three Nazis. ... Mr. Rockwell, tonight you will be speaking to a group of young American men and women who are growing up in a confused and confusing world ... to some who have prejudices against Negroes, Jews, and other minorities. I am grateful that your presence here tonight will be a timely reminder that such prejudice is a part of the Fascist ideology and not of the democratic concern for the dignity of all individuals regardless of race, creed, and color. ...\]

Finally, let me comment in answer to those who opposed the right of students to hear the speaker for tonight ... the true test of freedom is to be willing not to silence the idea we abhor.

This view is based on the faith that error, when absurd, when vicious, will refute itself. ... May the day never come when pressures from groups outside our college communities will dictate which speakers American college students may or may not hear.\(^4\)

Some years later, Dr. Haas recalled what had been a tense and difficult situation as a "great time in the life of the university":

Never have I been so proud of the student body as I was that night — quiet, calm, with 3500 people in the auditorium. It was due to people like Karl Andresen, who willingly took on a very delicate role, and did it with dignity, not with derision — in fact, with such high dignity that there couldn't be anything worse for the Nazi, because he was being treated as a human being. Anything less than that would have given him a platform to stand on, and he might have gathered sympathy from people in the audience.\(^4\)

Other speakers who brought contemporary thinking to the campus at Eau Claire in 1967 and 1968 included Pearl S. Buck, whose insights into Asian problems over a lifetime she shared with her forum audience; Dr. James Pike, the churchman whose "situation ethics" were disturbing the more conservative; and Dr. Clark Kerr, who spoke on "Higher Education and Its Discontents."\(^4\)

The presidential campaign of 1968 brought national candidates to the campus. Eugene McCarthy, whose campaign for the Democratic nomination was supported by many idealistic young people of America who were attempting to mobilize dissent into a practical political force, spoke in the fieldhouse in February 1968. A month later, at the same podium, candidate Richard Nixon promised the standing-room-only crowd "to bring the enemy to the conference table" and "to secure America from domestic violence," a platform that won him the White House that year.\(^4\)

**Students for a Democratic Society: Charter or No Charter**

Students for a Democratic Society, founded in 1962, claimed and received credit for much of the campus protest of the decade. Active on the Madison campus, the organization attempted to found chapters at the Wisconsin State Universities. In 1966, President Samuel Gates of the state university at La Crosse refused to recognize the SDS chapter organizing on that campus. In 1967, Dr. Leonard Haas faced the difficulty of making a decision.\(^4\)

The proposal for founding an SDS chapter at Eau Claire was a combined student and faculty ef-
fort, involving some faculty members who had been members of SDS chapters on other campuses. At
issue was not whether SDS had the right to organize, but whether it would receive chartered status.
Recognition under student personnel rules meant that a group could use university facilities to hold
its meetings and recruit members, have a mailbox in the student center, and be listed in appropriate
university publications. As each organization’s charter was channeled through the organizations com-
misson of the student senate, that body could grant or deny official status to the petitioners. As
was the case in most student legislative matters, the university president had the final say in the
form of a veto of student senate actions.

At Eau Claire, vice president for student affairs
Dr. Ormsby Harry investigated the national activities
of SDS and warned Dr. Haas that other ex-
tremist groups would be eligible for chartering once
a precedent was established: “These would include,
in addition to SDS, groups such as campus Nazi
associations, campus KKK clubs, etc.” Local law
enforcement officials, townsfolk, and other university
presidents sent opinions to Dr. Haas and literature
on SDS.46

On March 23, 1967, President Haas denied the
SDS organizers a charter, even though the group
had the support of the student senate and a student
opinion referendum. In a public statement, the
president charged that the national affiliation of
SDS was not compatible with “university stand-
rds.” The national organization, he said, “subverts
the meaning of the free university.”47

Reaction to the president’s decision brought let-
ters both of praise and protest. A number of com-
munity people found his action commendable. The
American Civil Liberties Union, which had earlier
found that President Gates had acted on “guilt by
association — very remote association,” questioned
the factual basis of Dr. Haas’s decision. The Ameri-
can Federation of Teachers Local 917 charged that
President Haas had not lodged specific charges
against the local SDS group and resolved to urge
him to reconsider his action.48

The student senate, appealing the issue to the
board of regents, hoped that that body would over-
rule the president. Although Attorney General
Bronson LaFollette had stated that university presi-
dents could deny charters on factual evidence, if
such evidence “establishes a reasonable basis for
discriminating against a particular organization,”
he had told students that no evidence had reached
him that would justify denial of a charter. At the
regents’ meeting held in Eau Claire on April 15,
1967, the board refused to reconsider the charter
rejection at La Crosse or at Eau Claire.49

The SDS group became active in Eau Claire with-
out university sanction and participated in the
housing demonstration and in protests against mili-
tary recruitment, and in the marches.

“WSU-EC Peace: It’s Wonderful”

Once students at Eau Claire discovered the Viet-
man War, they began to imitate their peers on other
campuses who engaged in marches, teach-ins, and
rhetoric, but in a basically peaceful manner. An
ad hoc committee active in Eau Claire through the
early months of 1967 sponsored a march to coincide
with the national “Day of Mobilization” on April
15, 1967, and on that morning some 56 persons
walked from Owen Park through downtown Eau
Claire to the federal building on South Barstow
Street. Bystanders were both curious and antag-
nostic, some holding signs “Commiss Go Home”
and yelling derisions, “Where’s your red flag?” At
the federal building, Dr. Howard Lutz, professor of
history at WSU-Eau Claire, urged the government
to “use methods more humanitarian than it is
currently using in an effort to gain peace.” The
Reverend James Lovejoy, Roman Catholic priest
in the campus ministry, concluded the ceremony
with a prayer and a charge: “Following God is
easy, too easy to remain silent . . . it’s more difficult
to speak out, be committed, to take a position.”
Letters in the local press expressed indignation with
Father Lovejoy’s involvement, and the feeling that
the police had probably gone too far in “protecting
you ‘peaceniks.’”50

On the eve of Thanksgiving vacation in 1968,
November 26, a teach-in was held in Davies Center,
with some 2500 students and 100 faculty members
taking part. The purpose, Professor Edward Muzik
told the press, was “to prevent another Oshkosh and
to begin instead a sane discussion of ideas.” In
different rooms of the center, ad hoc panels made
up of both students and faculty promoted discussion
of such topics as racism, student rebellion, religion,
university structure, drugs, justice, student media,
communication, and the war. The idea for the
teach-in came out of a leadership conference for
student organizations held the weekend before with
Paul Cashman, vice president for student affairs
at the University of Minnesota, as the keynoter.
Hastily arranged, the teach-in event took place on
the Tuesday before students would go home for
Thanksgiving; “women’s hours” were set aside.
John Lavine, publisher of the Chippewa Herald-
Telegram, participated in the discussion on com-
munication and told his readers:
There was not only a chance for students to feel their views are aired and listened to by the faculty and administration, but there was also the chance for the faculty and administration to learn what the students really felt and to prove by their diverse comments that they too were divided on the correct solution to the complex problems facing institutions of higher learning, as well as society.

The following year, the experiment of the teach-in was repeated, touching on several topics: the controversial Summerhill education philosophy, mysticism, "responsibility," and other areas of open-ended experience or discussion. The second teach-in added films and multimedia presentations to the basic idea of free-flow interchange. "The teach-in provided a safety valve for pent-up opinions which elsewhere are voiced in violence and destruction," the Herald-Telegram writer commented. Eau Claire's Daily Telegram reached the same conclusion, praising the teach-in in an editorial entitled, "WSU-EC Peace: It's Wonderful."52

"Candles in the Rain": Vietnam Moratorium, October 1969

When the Eau Claire Vietnam Moratorium committee announced plans for participation in the nationwide observance, John Laird, a student at Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire, the son of Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird made it known that he would join the protest. To the press he said, "We want to show the concern all over the country and the hope that the war will be over soon, and that a peaceful demonstration like this can help bring an end to the war."54

As the Moratorium week began on October 10, students promoted observance by distributing literature and black armbands at a table in the lobby of the W. R. Davies University Center. The group leaders stressed the ad hoc nature of their effort in a flyer: "It is not the work of the CIA, the Young Dems, or any other single campus organization." The main event was to be a march on Wednesday night, October 15.55

On the national scene, the Moratorium was planned to promote a cessation of "business as usual." At many campuses this was interpreted to imply a general strike by students and faculty, but at Eau Claire President Haas stated in a circular letter that officially "business as usual" would be maintained. Students and faculty would be expected to be in classes on M-Day, yet absence from classes would not bring special retributions. The university itself would attempt to remain neutral: "It would be inappropriate for the university as a public agency to take a formal position," Dr. Haas told the faculty.56

On October 13, a 42-hour vigil was begun at the federal building, with students alternating in reading the names of 40,000 Americans who had died in Vietnam. Those taking part in the observance saw it as a memorial service: "All of us don't get out to march and scream," one participant told the press.57

An estimated 2000 persons observed the Moratorium in Eau Claire, not counting the instructors and students who may have postponed their scheduled class work to discuss the war. The two-hour morning debate in the fieldhouse attracted a crowd that came and went. Like other campuses in the region, WSU-Eau Claire was "very quiet."58

We were so close there was no room
we bled inside each others wounds
we all caught the same disease
and we all sang the songs of peace
some came to sing, some came to pray
some came to keep the dark away
so raise the candles high
cause if you don't we could stay
black against the sky
raise them higher again
and if you do we could stay dry
against the rain.53
At 6:30 that evening, members of the university community met on campus for the march downtown. As they reached the Owen Park bandshell, they paused for prayers and keynote speeches. Then through the rain, behind a large banner, "Save Faces — Not Face," the marchers, estimated at 1700, crossed the bridge over the Chippewa River into downtown Eau Claire, shepherded by marshals wearing white armbands.

CBS cameramen, shoulders loaded with equipment, accompanied the march to catch pictures of John Laird. At the federal building, two minutes of silence were observed as a black wreath was set before it. When a minor scuffle broke out between a marcher and a police officer who mistook a banner for a Vietnam flag, Dr. Phillip Griffin shielded the incident from the CBS cameraman with his umbrella. The Eau Claire professor of philosophy recalled the march as "orderly and fine." Lit by streetlights and flickering candles, the gathering moved on to Wilson Park for a short meeting. Then banners were struck, candles were put out, and cars took over the streets once more.69

New Causes: the Spring of 1970

Students returning from holidays to the second semester of 1969-70 found a new cause in the Environmental Teach-In called for observance all over the country by U.S. Senator Gaylord Nelson from Wisconsin. On a January evening, at 20 degrees below zero, the Davies Theater was filled by students and faculty who listened to John Lavine of the Chippewa Herald-Telegram keynote the question of pollution of the environment and what can be done about it. A number of representatives of governmental agencies and interested townspeople joined in the groups which formed to kick off studies of air, land, water, population, ethics, aesthetics, health, politics, education, industry and commerce, and outdoor recreation, which continued to meet during the winter and early spring in anticipation of Earth Day, April 22.66

Richard Nixon added his support to the national observance when, in his State of the Union address, he said: "The great question of the '70s is: Shall we surrender to our surroundings, or shall we make peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, to our land, and to our water?" Earth Day was a turnout of approximately 5000 people who viewed multimedia shows, exhibits, and presentations in every room of the Davies Center and who heard two noted authorities speak in the university arena: Robert L. Herbst, executive director of the Izaak Walton League of America, on "The Future of Humanity," and Mrs. Ruth Chickering Clusen, second vice president of the League of Women Voters of the United States, chairman of its water resources committee, on "Shaping Change — a Plan of Action."61

Out of the Environmental Teach-In at Eau Claire came a continuing organization, Eau Claire Area Ecology Action, which holds bi-weekly meetings open to all interested persons, publishes a news letter, and has been the prime mover in establishing recycling operations in the university and in the city of Eau Claire.62

Another cause which aroused a much smaller group of students and faculty was the trial of the "Chicago Eight," activists who were charged by the government with conspiracy to disturb the Democratic National Convention of August 1968. "We, too, are filled with contempt and disgust for the injustices perpetrated against these men. . . . If these men were conspirators in this cause, then we are conspirators as well," read a pamphlet distributed by the protestors who gathered in front of Schofield Hall on February 25, 1970, to march to the federal building for a brief rally in the cold winter air.63

In May, the Young Democrats sponsored a talk by one of the Chicago Eight, David Dellinger. The country was experiencing a growth of fascism that "comes in waves and exists in pockets," Dellinger warned. Coming as it did just a week after Cambodia and Kent State, his remarks had a special meaning: the "military machine" must be overthrown by "strikes, boycotts, non-payment of war taxes, and other non-emotional political acts. . . . I do not rule out destruction of property . . . there is little that is sacred about property but there is much that is sacred about human life." Yet several citizens were enraged, and once more Dr. Haas replied that all viewpoints deserve to be heard on the campus of a free university, whether or not such viewpoints are held by its administration.64

Cambodia, Kent State: Student Anguish

During the first week of May 1970, Americans learned that the Vietnam War had been extended into Cambodia. Protest, sparked by a sense of post-Moratorium betrayal, emerged again in a nationwide, simultaneous student strike at some 415 colleges and universities. A demonstration at Kent State University in Ohio led to the destruction of an ROTC building and the calling up of the National Guard. On May 4, 1970, thirteen students were shot. Four died.65

At Eau Claire, a rally brought out 3500 students on a day so beautiful as to seem a piercing contrast
to war and killing. Seated on the mall, just south of Davies Center, the crowd was quiet as the Reverend Robert McKillip of the Cooperative Campus Ministry called for one minute of silent prayer for each of the Kent dead, intoning the admonishment of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., "Help Us to Be Responsible Citizens." Dr. Howard Lutz of the department of history, taking as his theme "What We Believe In Is Life," spoke of university campuses as appropriate places where young people should get together and show their feeling of indignation, but he warned that "whatever form it takes should show reasonable concern and respect on both sides." President Haas showed that he cared deeply for the feelings of the students and that he personally deplored the actions of the nation that lead to unnecessary loss of life — "young people have physical involvement and idealistic visions." He advised that only through political processes can there be hope for solutions, and that polarization on campus should be avoided. The choice was open to boycott classes, that was a matter of individual conscience, but the university would continue as normally, faculty meeting classes, and all students had a right to attend their classes if they so wished.86

Allen Curtis of the department of English, stating that he was speaking for himself, expressed himself as "angry and afraid." For the students, Randy Surbaugh spoke — "this rally is sparked by emotion and regard for life, which is a rational feeling." A black student stated, "for the first time, the fear blacks have had for the last 10-20 years has finally reached Eau Claire." The Eau Claire paper re-
The only noise was the singing of a bird, the squeaking of a light pole, and the sound of a jet airplane. It reflected the atmosphere of the day.\textsuperscript{767}

Concluding the rally, a voice vote by students declared their intention to strike, and it was announced that a march would take place to the National Guard Armory that evening. As hundreds of students gathered on upper campus for the march, Dr. Haas recalled,

One of our professors got up and gave a great talk. He was respected by the students who were leading the demonstration and had been accepted by them. He said, "We need to show by every way that we can that we are against the use of force, whether it is in Vietnam or at Kent State. We need to publish it, and the world needs to know it, and there should be no misunderstanding about where we stand. . . . But you are not going to gain anything if you use the same tactics that are used by those who are operating in places like Vietnam and Kent State. I'm going to march with you tonight and if any of you picks up a stone, if there is any desire on your part to throw it against a person or an object, give me a chance to get between that stone and that person or object." There wasn't a stone thrown on that march, it was completely orderly, and they accomplished their purpose. . . . In that same week the students marched down to the federal building, and of course some of the police were there, and when the program which climaxed the whole week was completed, the leader of the student activities said, "Some of you who have been here have had some run-ins with the police, but I want to thank them today for not interfering with anything that we have done during this week." And that whole group got up in one great standing ovation to the police department here in Eau Claire at a time when the police were being denounced all over the country as "pigs."\textsuperscript{768}

Classes remained open all during the week of the strike. The student senate passed a resolution supporting the right of students either to attend or to boycott classes. The faculty senate executive committee recommended to the administration that there be no demand on department chairmen to account for what classes were held or for those faculty who might not have met their classes. On the last day of the strike, May 8, the political science department sponsored an all-day open forum. In the afternoon four flowering crabapple trees were planted on the mall in memory of the "Kent Four."

The student conduct during the difficult week won the praise of President Haas and of the local press, which wrote: "Today's generation firmly believes that actions describe a person's character more accurately than words. By that yardstick WSU-Eau Claire students and faculty stand tall in the current crisis."\textsuperscript{769}

Robert Jauch, student body president, and Randy Surbaugh, vice president, formally expressed gratitude to Dr. Haas: "You showed a great deal of respect and sympathy toward the students, which was felt and appreciated by all."\textsuperscript{770}

\textbf{Campus Trouble in the 1960s: Why Did It Happen?}

As the 1970s overtook the 1960s, historians attempted to piece together the causes and effects, the ideologies and events, of the student rebellion. In the larger institutions, this is a crucial study of an institution's influence on the outside world. In the smaller universities, like Eau Claire, it is very often an attempt to discover how alma mater escaped the deluge.

Looking back on the decade of the 1960s, Chancellor Haas noted a number of factors which may have contributed to turbulence:

- There was no place else in society which housed so many of the young of the current generation. More than one-fourth of the total population of the United States at that time was between the ages of 14 and 25; in other words, the high school, college, and immediate
post-college years took more than one-fourth of all the people and there was massive concentration of people on campuses that were not ready for them.

- It was not only the young, but the young with the greatest intellectual assets. The most radical time in a person's life is probably between the ages of 16 and 26. If you are ever going to be radical, you will be radical then.
- This tremendous population bulge was almost a youth cult and culture, and this was coupled with a traditional position that parents have that the next generation must always have better opportunities than the last one, that this is a right they have and they must always get the best. But there was an open rejection on the part of youth of all we had to give — they saw through the catering to them. With money to buy 5th Avenue clothes, they bought blue jeans and cutoffs.
- We had the youngest faculty ever, with great sympathy for youth movements and what was going on elsewhere.
- Both students and young faculty — the intelligentsia, so to speak — turned their intelligence toward a series of questions that dared to challenge the establishment in all its rational point of view. They thought, with all their numbers, and the university considered as the great intelligence of the country, they could use the university to try to accomplish social ends. But they failed to protect this delicate institution, the university.
- The turbulence was really associated with events taking place outside the university, particularly the Vietnam War. The Vietnam War was many crises — the crisis of the draft and how it was administered, what the draft did to students and universities, and the war seen on television in livingrooms and student lounges. The whole thing contributed to a questioning of those in authority.\(^71\)

**How Did Eau Claire Survive?**

Certain circumstances that existed at other universities, particularly the large ones, were not in the picture at Eau Claire: there was no ROTC unit, there were no large federal grants in support of military-industrial activities, there were no teaching assistants who, on other campuses, were a kind of academic proletariat and served as an organizing force for protest.\(^72\)

Again, in Dr. Haas's view, there were many positive factors:

- The serenity of the campus.
- Those campuses that were "closer to the soil," in the rural area, had a better chance of surviving.
- The campus and university were still small enough so that people knew one another and could get acquainted as persons at teach-ins.
- The cooperation of the Eau Claire police.
- The openness with people on the campus: "If I were building an administration building, I'd have my office located right on a visible corner, all glass, and let people know that I was in there and the door would be open. You might as well be free and open with people, and that is the attitude we took."
- Very good student leaders on this campus.
- Enough people on this campus, both faculty and students, whose intuition told them that we have to care for the university and its balance, or who through their own intelligence understood those forces so that they had a vision that was very significant. People like Karl Andresen, Howard Lutz, and Edward Blackerby, who told his class after the Whitewater crisis: "Whenever an academic community becomes so torn with emotion that it cannot be thoughtful, cannot be deliberate, that it must be a mobocracy, that it must have violence, then it is no longer an intellectual climate. It is no longer serving its function."

This is not to say that Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire was untouched by the dynamic decade. The Forum series selection for 1970 surveyed topics of compelling interest to students: Ralph Nader, on "Corporate Responsibility and Consumer Protection"; Dr. Harvey Cox, on "Culture Crisis and Religious Change"; Gloria Steinem and Floryncz Kennedy, on "Women's Liberation"; and Dr. Paul Ehrlich, speaking on "One Year After Earth Day." The student Public Interest Research Group, also known as "Nader's Raiders in Wisconsin," attempted to establish a plan whereby $1 per semester of the student activity fee would pay for a group of professionals who would work in the public interest area. An Eau Claire student, Jeanie Plahmer, was chosen one of two student representatives on the National Commission on State College and University Goals and Roles, sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and supported in part by a grant from the Ford Foundation, which began its work in 1971. Presidential hopefuls spoke to packed Arena audiences — Edmund Muskie, George McGovern, Eugene McCarthy, Henry Jackson, Hubert Humphrey — in 1972, fielding penetrating questions from students, whose politicization was an outgrowth of the
events leading up to the 1970s' mass protests. As poet William Saroyan has written:

There are grown men and women of some intelligence who feel that the boys and girls at universities are communist, Chinese, sexually depraved, irreligious unbathed bums. But the answer is that even if they were, what's that got to do with the protest? Is anybody else doing anything about anything anywhere? If the kids also can be bullied into not protesting, the jig is up, isn't it?73

CHAPTER VIII — FOOTNOTES
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Established universities in the East were the scene of attack from students and citizens throughout the 1930s, although this wave of protest was halted by World War II and postwar recovery. Handlin, pp. 67-69. Events of the 1950s served to postpone the renewal of campus dissent; New Left writer Jack Newfield has noted, "America missed a whole generation of radicals that should have matured during the 1950s, but was aborted by McCarthyism, apparent prosperity, and the Cold War." Jack Newfield, A Prophetic Minority (New York: Signet, 1966), p. 132.

Christopher Lasch has traced dissent as an ideology in his book, The New Radicalism in America (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), in which radical dissent is seen as having evolved from the Populist movement of the late 1880s and the Progressivism of the early years of the 20th century.


1 Manchester, op. cit., p. 1111. Eau Claire Daily Telegram, September 30, 1965. Among the Eau Claire students and graduates who served in the Peace Corps were: James and Linda Ahlen Bingen, Dahomey, W. Africa; Gerald Boehm, Peru, and Lawrence Boehm, Colombia; James Converse, Kenya; James Derouin, Brazil; John and Janice Durand, Philippines; Nancy Jean Gardner, Brazil; Stephen Kurth, Morocco; Joan Laycock, Peru; Wanda Meinen, South America; Lynn Nelson, British Honduras; Jane Rowe, Sarawak; Kenneth Stallman, Peru; Dennis Tepler, Samoa; Vickie Voves, Brazil; Richard M. Zank, Nepal.

1 Manchester, op. cit., p. 1279; Lee, op. cit., p. 115.

Newfield, op. cit., p. 57; Manchester, op. cit., p. 1166.

1 Daily Telegram, November 25, 1963. John Anderson, '66, worked for the Eau Claire newspaper while in college, and subsequently became director of news and publications at UW-Stevens Point.

*A detailed account of the events at Berkeley can be found in Hal Draper, Berkeley: The New Student Revolt (New York: Grove Press, 1965); also see Newfield, op. cit., p. 1277.

1 Spectator, October 28 and November 4, 1964; April 29 and November 18, 1965.


1 Milwaukee Journal, February 26, 1969.


1 Interview, Jenswold with Haas, April 2, 1975.


1 Excerpts from "Ferment and Freedom on the Campus" in The View, Winter 1966, p. 7; full address in Archives, UW-Eau Claire. The Most Reverend James P. Shannon and President Leonard Haas were classmates in some graduate education courses at the University of Minnesota.

1 Handlin, op. cit., pp. 22, 36.

1 Interview, Jenswold with Ormsby L. Harry, assistant chancellor for student affairs, UW-Eau Claire, February 24, 1974.


1 Spectator, September 14 and October 5, 1967.

1 Letter, John Morris to Richard Hibbard, May 1, 1968, President's Correspondence, UW-Eau Claire.

1 Spectator, February 9, 1967. Chippewa Valley Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union, Chapter Bulletin No. 5, December 1968.


1 Ibid., February 8, 1965.

1 Spectator, March 2, 23, 1967.

1 Ibid., April 13, 20, 1967.

1 Milwaukee Journal, February 9, 1968.

1 Documents: Statute 37.055; Proposed Housing Code, City of Eau Claire, 1969.

1 Interview with Douglas Hallatt, January 1972.

1 Spectator, September 29, 1960.

1 Interview with Leonard Haas, March 25, 1975. Spectator, May 10 and 17, 1962, terms college senate "Mickey Mouse," and a junior posts 12 complaints on the office door of President Haas, explaining that he did not take his com-
plaints to the senate because it is “too involved in trivialities to care about me as an individual.”


E. H. Kleinpell, In the Shadow: Reflections of a State College President (River Falls, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin-River Falls Press, 1975), pp. 165-77, “The Constitution Comes to the Campus”: “While presidents might speculate about the impact the civil rights movement would have upon their institutions, they had no idea that the courts would take a stand on campus disciplinary matters, reversing the procedures used and determining whether the rules were reasonable or not. Nor were they alerted to impending danger at the national meetings by educational and legal experts who, by the middle sixties, would be accusing them of institutional neglect and a lack of administrative foresight.”

Spectator, February 8, 1968. In calling for political involvement, the Spectator staff could have checked earlier files (November 18, 1965), when the senate passed a resolution in favor of U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War which was overturned only through petition from the freshman women of Sutherland Hall. “All Power to the People” amendment, April 21, 1970. The authors have taken the liberty of borrowing for the heading of this section the apt phrase “Sandbag or Soapbox” from Robert H. Shaffer, “Student Government: Sandbag or Soapbox?” in Julian Foster and Durward Long, Protest!: Student Activism in America (New York: Wm. Morrow & Co., 1970), pp. 498-99, 503.


Spectator, February 21, 1968. In his address reprinted in The View, Kissinger verbally agreed to having his address reprinted in The View, it was never possible to secure his written consent.

“Text of the Andersen introduction, Archives, UW-Eau Claire; Daily Telegram, February 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 1967, both news coversages and letters to the Voice of the People.

Interview, Jenswolf with Haas, April 30, 1975.

Clark Kerr address reprinted in The View, Fall 1968, pp. 4-8.

Spectator, February 22 and March 21, 1968.


Daily Telegram, April 15, 21, 22, 1967.

Ibid., December 6, 1968.


Daily Telegram, October 10, 1969.

Ibid., October 11, 1969.


Daily Telegram, October 13, 1969.

Ibid., October 15, 1969.


President’s Correspondence, May 1970, Archives UW-Eau Claire.

Manchester, op. cit., pp. 1484, 1487-89.

Flyer, “Strike!” calling for the rally of Wednesday, May 6: “The Four Who Died at Kent leave us in the university community no alternative; we must strike. Their death revealed the harsh extremes the military will enact to suppress peaceful dissent against American foreign policy. We at Eau Claire can no longer retreat into the hollow security of apathy; we must strike, now! . . .” Dr. Phillip Griffin, a member of the faculty senate executive committee at that time, recalls that it met at the request of President Haas six to eight times before the rally, to deal with the request that classes be shut down in the wake of the Kent State and Jackson State killings, proposed by about 300 students meeting in Schneider 100. Dr. Hibbard, chairman of the group, was much concerned about rules and his responsibility for rules: Dr. Marshall Wick was primarily concerned that the faculty act in such a way that there would be no chance of the board office making the decision on what was to be the rule on campus, Dr. Griffin remembers. Dr. Griffin himself asked more than once of the committee: “Would you say anything if a class didn’t meet when the basketball team went to Kansas City, or if students did boycott class? Would there be any record if for some extraordinary reason such as death of a prominent person a class didn’t meet, or students boycotted class?”


Interview, Jenswolf with Haas, May 14, 1975.


Letter, Robert Jauch and Randy Surbaugh to President Haas, May 13, 1970. Letters to Dr. Haas and comments from faculty indicate that many thought his handling of the situation contributed greatly to the stability of the campus during the May 1970 crisis, and that his whole approach to students during the turbulent late ’60s was a factor in keeping the campus quiet.


William Saroyan, Look at us: let’s see; here we are; look hard, speak soft; I see, you see, we all see; stop, look, listen; beholder’s eye; don’t look now, but isn’t that you? (us? U.S.) (New York: Cowles Educational Corporation, 1967), p. 78; used with permission of the author.