Dissent, A Study of Student Dissent at The UWEC 1968-1970

Jamie Hass

December 21, 1992

"Hell no we wont go!" One two three four we don't want this f~~~~~ war!" These words have become a part of my personal memory. I remember them as the chants of the Vietnam War protestors in Madison. I grew up in Madison. As a young boy I attended two marches on the Capital Square and was able to view, from my fathers shoulders, the surge of people united in a common cause. I can't recall specifics. I recall only raw emotion. I think it was anger.

I have questioned my middle-aged parents several times and have asked them about their experiences during the Vietnam years. I receive the same answers, we had you kids, we were done with college, we were settled, we weren't really involved. I ask them how they felt about the war. They reply that they felt angry. Angry at a government that was unresponsive to its citizens and that continued a war which seemed to have no purpose or end.

As I have researched my paper I begin to see how people like my parents fit into the grand scheme of things. They were a portion of the Nation that drew together to express their opposition to the War. They were a sampling of the grass-roots participants in the anti-war demonstrations.

The Kent State shootings in May of 1970 and the subsequent shock waves it caused in campuses around the nation led N.L. Zaroulis, author of Who Spoke Up, to conclude the following. "The Magnitude of these events showed clearly that the opposition to the war had passed far beyond a radical vanguard and now embraced virtually an entire younger nation." 1 N.L. Zarelous also concluded that " in 1969, energy of the new mobilization to end

the war drew mostly upon the energy of many varying independent groups." Most of these groups ..."did not... have national offices." 2

My parents claimed not to have marched until the 1970's. If we are to accept the intrepretation of N.L. Zarelous, then it is apparent that there was a period before 1970 when the resistance to the Vietnam War was something different. The pre-1970 period, the period that laid the ground work for the grass roots movement of the 1970's, is the period of the anti- Vietnam War movement at home that my paper will explore.

My approach to the subject will be a microscopic one that combines a study of the University of Wisconsin Eau Claire with discussions of national trends and politics. It's my hope that in using this approach, the relationship between our own university and the nation will be seen. Equally important, I hope that an understanding of the evolvement and nature of student dissent on the UWEC campus as well as the nation will be understood. To accomplish this task I will explore student dissent, student orgainizations, and relationships between students and authority.

In my focus on student dissent I will discuss the evolution of student dissent from the civil rights movements. This will be followed by a exploration of issues that led students to participate in various forms of dissent. The section on student dissent will be concluded with examples of dissent at both Eau Claire and around the nation.

My section on student orgainizations will focus on Students for a Democratic Society.(Here after SDS) This group is regarded

as the most influential and powerful student group of the 60's. An understanding of SDS will tell us two things. What the nature of the counterculture of the 1960s was and why a large student organization like SDS collapsed.

My final section will address the relationship between students and authority. This section will attempt to look at how student dissent ultimately led to violence. The section will examine student dissent at the UW Madison and the UW Eau Claire. The purpose of this section will be to answer a question. "Why were there no violent protests at the UWEC?"

After examining student dissent, student orgainizations, and student relationship to authority, it is possible to understand the Vietnam ERA at universities around the country and at the UW Eau Claire. What becomes obvious is that the violent protests at other Universities like Colombia and Berkeley are replaced, by 1970, by a more peaceful localized grass roots campaign. The UW Eau Claire never had violent protests. The Vietnam War becomes an issue much later than at other schools and is preceded by other issues. By the time the war becomes " the issue" at the UWEC, violence and counterculture have become discredited. The students at the UW Eau Claire, by 1970, have shown a willingness to challenge the school and the government. The difference seems to be that the evolution of protest at the UW Eau Claire evolves more slowly and peacefully.

Student Dissent

To understand student dissent one must understand that it

evolved. Dissent was hatched by the Civil Rights Movement in the South. The Civil Rights Movement moved from the South to the college campus where relationships and the overall function of the Campus were questioned. The Vietnam War didn't become the crucial issue in student dissent in the early sixties. When the Vietnam War became an acceptable issue students had already shown a willingness to show dissent.

The Civil Rights movement began in the upper South in February 1960 when black students sat in at white lunch counters. 3 These protests were directed at the legalized segregation in the south. These strikes were characterized by their non-violent civil disobedience.

Perhaps most importantly, for the purpose of this discussion, the sit-ins provided the model for campus protests. An organization called the Student Non-Violent Civil Disobedience Coordinating Committee was established in 1964. The organization attracted 1,000 white students to its summer training session in Oxford Ohio. 4 Many of these students returned to their respective campuses as activists.

In 1964 students as California Berkeley held sit-ins to protest narrow curriculum and the Universities refusal to support the efforts of students to promote the Civil Rights Movement on campus. 5 In 1967 students held strikes in support of hiring more black faculty at San Francisco State, UW Madison, and Harvard. 6

At the heart of the Civil Rights dissent was the issue of the role of the university. The role was being questioned, the "in loco parentis", (in place of the parents' role) seemed outdated.

The Civil Rights Movement had exposed much of the hypocrisy of democracy and the status- quo. The new role of the University, reflected in the Berkeley sit-ins, was that it should reflect the views and interests of the students.

On the U.W. Eau Claire Campus students were also questioning the role of the University. The first major issues at Eau Claire were not civil rights, minority hiring, or the war. The major issue was faculty control. Especially control over expression and hiring of academic staff.

The issue regarding faculty control over free expression came to a head in the fall of 1968. It was then that the Students for a Democratic Society attempted to gain a charter on campus as an organization. The University Administration rejected the charter because of the SDS bylines which advocated unlawfulness to achieve its goals. The charter was rejected because it violated Resolution 3161 of the Board of Regents. Article 3161 stated that,

> " It is therefore stated policy by the Board of Regents to refuse to approve, recognize or encourage any disruptive, subversive or anarchistic organization or activity."

Chancellor Haas claimed in his memoirs that SDS "... included within its documents that it would not abide by the rules and regulations of the University." 7

Reaction to the rejection of the SDS charter was attacked in the Spectator as "A say nothing excuse" to exclude groups the

administration felt were undesirable. 8 Also implied in the attacks on the decision was the belief that the administration was censoring what students could experience. 9 Freedom of expression was being denied.

Another topic of debate involved academic faculty hiring. In the 67-68 school year there were a series of articles run that questioned why various faculty had left. In the spring of 1968, "40 students and faculty marched single file around the halls of Schofield Hall ." They called themselves the Ad-Hoc Committee for the Resinkoffs. 10 The Resinkoffs were a husband and wife team who had been denied tenure. The denial of the tenure was not unusual, the university had hired many faculty on a short term basis with the intention of keeping only a few. 11 The protest was a surprise. The protest seemed to serve as the ultimate form of showing dissatisfaction with administration as well as its power.

The nature and the reason for student dissent in Eau Claire against the University and policy was not identical to Berkeley or Madison. The essence, however, was the same. It was a basic challenge to the power of "in loco parentis" and the power of administration.

The final evolution of student dissent was directed at the Vietnam War. The presence of trained activists and the willingness to protest issues were in place. Now, the War became the focal point of the student dissent.

Before plunging into student dissent towards the war, it seems proper to review its history. It's difficult to see what the

basic objection to the War was without understanding the events in the context of their time.

The role of the U.S. in Vietnam began after the French pullout. The Geneva Convention of 1954 divided Vietnam in half and set elections for 1956 to determine leadership. From 1954 to 1959 Vietnam was calm. Slowly, combat escalated between communists of the North and the South under Premier Diem . 12 The U.S. entered on the side of the South. Cold War politics, opposition to communism, drove U.S. policy. The US began sending military advisors. By 1963 there were approximately 200 military advisors in Vietnam. 13 In 1965 the U.S. began bombing across the 17th. parallel. In April 1965, 3,600 bombing missions were flown in an attempt to cut off supplies to guerrillas in the South.14 In June President Johnson asked Congress for 400 million dollars and 40,000 ground troops. 15 It was granted.

In January-February 1968 the communist South Vietnamese struck thirty six S. Vietnamese Cities. 16 Television captured the Tet Offensive. The horror and impossibility of the situation were seen by all. The Tet Offensive exposed the gravity of the situation and soon many were doubting a favorable outcome.

The press was the key element in exposing the true situation of the War. The Wall Street Journal reported on February 23 that, "...everyone had better be prepared for the bitter taste of defeat beyond Americas power to prevent." 17 NBC War Correspondent Frank McGree showed footage of the Tet Offensive with optimistic statements from President Johnson. This exposed the hopelessness of the situation while exposing the governments

position, that the war was being won, as false. McGree concluded, "The War is being lost by the administrations definition. All that remains is a mutual capacity for further destruction." 18

The reaction following the Tet Offensive served to polarize positions regarding the war. Sixty one percent of Americans still considered themselves hawks and favored escalation. The remaining 31% opposed the war.19 The net result of these opinions spelled doom for President Johnson. He was stuck between those unhappy with the progress of the War and those who opposed it. He could not win and he could not pull out.

The 1968 Democratic Primary highlighted the unpopularity of Johnson. The February New Hampshire primary showed anti war Minnesota Senator Eugene McCarthy capturing 40% of the vote.20 On March 31st. 1968, Johnson, realizing the impossibility of his position, withdrew from the race for president.

The popular support for McCarthy was, as exit polls later showed, an anti-Johnson vote. Fifty percent didn't know his position on the war.21 Tom Bates, the author of RADS wrote, "...the negative vote..." against Johnson, "...was widely interpreted as an endorsement of McCarthy's peace plank, which called for an immediate halt to U.S. bombing of North Vietnam and a negotiated withdrawal." 22 With the popular support of McCarthy it became mainstream and even respectable to oppose the war.

The U.W. Eau Claire certainly was affected by the popularizing of the Vietnam War as an issue. Students supported McCarthy and his anti-war platform. A mock election published in the Spectator

showed McCarthy receiving 612 votes to Nixon's 412 and Johnsons 105. 23 McCarthy was not the only Democrat opposing Johnson, but he was the only candidate who favored immediate negotiations to pull out.

Student dissent at the UWEC directed towards the war, while not bountiful, was present in 1968. One of the most active groups was the Draft Resistance Union. In 1969 student involvement in the Vietnam Moratorium Day would serve as perhaps the largest single student protest involving the War. It is through the work of the Draft Resistance Union and the Vietnam Moratorium Day that the War movement at the UWEC is be best characterized.

The Draft Resistance Union was a student group on campus that opposed the war by attempting to disrupt the draft legally. Its members methods involved informing a draftee of his legal rights and options. The key message the group adopted was that nobody had to go off to fight the war if they didn't want to. 24

The group picketed the Minneapolis Federal Building as well as the Federal Building in Eau Claire. The group released the following statement to the Spectator outlining their purpose. "We wish to announce our support of the men of the draft age who refuse to serve in the U.S. Armed Forces. This is our way of saying no to the continuing barbarism of the Vietnam War." 25

Vietnam Moratorium Day was an event observed by millions of people around the nation. It was a chance to express feelings about the war in a format that allowed many people to take part. Some expressed support for the troops, some lamented the dead, others protested the war. There were marches and quiet gatherings

to read the names of dead. Moratorium Day brought the war to the attention of the nation.

The UWEC held a moratorium Day march on October 1969. The march was attended by an estimated 2,500 people.26 The purpose of the march in Eau Claire was to remember those who had died and to protest the war. The Eau Claire march began on Barstow Street. The marchers walked "On past Woolworths, Walgreens, the Hollywood Theatre, Sammy's Pizza... and on to the old post office building." 27 Like the rest of the non-student country, Moratorium Day in Eau Claire was peaceful. Moratorium day in Eau Claire was also mainstream and respectable. Like the Draft Resistance Union, the Moratorium Day activities were within the boundaries of the law.

The Moratorium Day march in Eau Claire to protest the War contrasted sharply with anti-war protests two hundred miles south at the UW Madison. In October 1967, student sit-ins in buildings where Dow Chemical was conducting interviews led to "Dow Day." 28

Tom Bates, the author of RADS writes that in the beginning, the peace movement in Madison had been "broadbased" and "non-violent".29 "Dow Day" would change the face of campus protest at the UW Madison. On October 18 1967, seventy five people, most of them students, were injured when police stormed the students preventing the Dow interviews.30

The police in Madison, when interviewed after the incident reported , "...deep alarm stirred in them by members of the San Francisco Mime Troupe who pranced in front of them in whiteface like clowns at a bullfight." 31 " A student trying to get through

to an interview with the Dow recruiter in Room 104 found himself in a choke hold applied not by police but by demonstrators." 32

While it is generally agreed that the police in Madison overreacted, it is also apparent that students are at least partly to blame for provoking the police.

Now that the nature of protests at the UWEC and the UW Madison have been explored, it is time to ask other questions. There are obvious differences between "Dow Day" and the Vietnam Moratorium day protests. Why was the protest at Madison violent? Why were students at Madison protesting the war actively two years before students at the UW Eau Claire?

I believe that there were two main reasons, two forces that at Madison pulled against each other. Two forces that at Eau Claire seemed to coexist. These two forces are the counterculture and campus authority.

SDS and the Counter Culture

For the purposes of discussion I have lumped my discussion of the Counter Culture under the heading of student organizations. I have also chosen SDS as the student organization I will study. It seems to be generally acknowledged that prior to 1969, SDS was the largest and most influential national student organization. SDS is a good group to study at the UWEC because it never became a major player in student life. SDS never received a campus charter but never really went away, it continued to meet off campus.33 The question is why a group that boasted of eighty to

one hundred thousand members by 1969 never became influential on the Campus of the UW Eau Claire? To answer this question it is first necessary to see how SDS evolved.

Nationally the SDS movement grew from the Civil Rights movement of the 1960's. The original purpose of SDS was social equality and is reflected in the SDS purpose statement, the Port Huron Statement of 1962.

> "...We seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation governed by two central aims, that the individual share in these social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and to provide the media for their common participation..."34

From the start SDS had a vague notion of its own purpose, it seemed to be present wherever there was anger but it lacked the central organization, cohesiveness, and vision to organize meaningful national protest.

An example of this is lack of organization became most apparent as the war became an issue. As Moratorium Day was being planned SDS issued a vague statement telling each chapter to make up its own mind about participation.

By 1969 SDS had become torn by infighting. The group, with its non-exclusion policy had taken in all elements of the anti-war as

well as counter cultural scene. There were disagreements between the communists and democrats, between the pacifists and those advocating urban warfare, and between those wishing to change society and those who wanted something altogether new.

SDS, which had 280 chapters in 1968 and 304 in 1969, ultimately failed because of the infighting which prevented unity around the war as an issue.35 As I have already concluded, the War became the central issue in the late 1960's. As many authors have concluded, SDS became a victim of the times. SDS was born from outrage over the human degradation evident in civil rights. SDS promoted equal rights and the dignity of all men. It took on all groups interested in these goals. When the Vietnam War came, SDS could not unite and formulate a single program against the war. In the end SDS disintegrated due to infighting.

The last SDS convention was attended by fifteen hundred delegates. The Progressive Labor Party, (Here after PL) which controlled seven hundred and fifty delegates, had long been more interested in promoting socialism.36 Jared Israel, the PL leader said of the SDS delegates, "...they were on an egomaniacal trip and were so much into drugs that half the time they didn't know where they were..."37

The final SDS convention of 1969 emphasized the gulf between the various dissatisfied elements of society. In the last SDS convention, the activist and the hippie clashed and split.

The breakup of SDS reflected the split between the activist and the hippie. The PBS video, Making Sense of the 60's identified the hippie as an individual who has rejected society.38 Making

Sense of the 60's also concluded that the hippie dropped out of school, didn't work, and often lived communally.39 Theodore Rosak, author of The Making of a Counter Culture, concluded that the activists and hippies "...never marched together..."40 In essence, the protest movement split between the activist who wished to work within the system, and the hippie counterculture who were interested in creating an entirely new society and were not interested in working within the system.

At the UWEC an SDS organization, as I have mentioned previously, was rejected by the administration for violating Article 3161 of the Board of Regents. SDS also seemed to be rejected by students as well. Like student dissent to the War, student interest in organizations also seemed to be mainstream and towards the orderly.

Chancellor Haas said in his memoirs that SDS never got off the ground because, "...people categorize them as a revolutionary group, and wondered why we even permitted them on campus."41 Professor Marcus, a history professor, could not recall SDS playing any great role in student life.42 The Spectator, following its coverage of the denial of the SDS charter, provided really no meaningful coverage.

There certainly were, however, some suggestions that counterculture existed at the UWEC. A four part series on the "Eau Claire Student" in the Spectator concluded in March 1969. This survey revealed that some students had "non-traditional" norms. One specific example was the survey on sex in the March 13 edition. This survey revealed that sixty eight percent of

women and eighty percent of men believe that pre-marital sex was acceptable.43 Robert White, a counselor at the UWEC in 1969, interpreted the survey results and concluded, "...the traditional sexual morals expressed by the Judeo-Christian tradition are not the norm for many people today." 44

Another example that pointed to the existence of a counterculture was a group known as the Responsible Action Group. The Responsible Action Group held a march in support of the Chicago Ten on March first 1969.45 (Hereafter RAD)(On trial for plotting to overthrow the government.) At this march an estimated twenty five marched down Barstow Street waving six North Vietnamese flags and chanting, "Ho, Ho, Ho, Chi Minn any old leftist were going to win." 46 The RAD march, from my research, seemed to best characterize the counterculture at the UWEC. Based on a student enrollment of seven 8,850, roughly one out of every 314 students participated in this march in which North Vietnamese flags were being waved. The Vietnam Moratorium Day march, however, was attended by an estimated 2,500. This protest, subdued, mainstream, and law abiding, was attended by roughly one out of every three students.47 These results seem to tell us that the mainstream and respectable march was more acceptable to UWEC students.

A final analysis of student organizations both abroad and at the UWEC really tell us two things. Activists and counterculture didn't coexist in student organizations. Secondly, the existing counterculture at Eau Claire, was small, and like SDS, did not receive widespread attention or support. UWEC students were

willing to protest but were not interested in supporting non mainstream movements or violence.

It also seems apparent that by 1969 the counter culture in the U.S. was beginning to acquire an unfavorable impression in the population at large. The famous Charles Manson lived in a communal group and used counterculture ideas to defend his actions. The Chicago Conspiracy trial of 1969 exposed a plan to promote gurellia warfare in the U.S. Members of the Hells Angels motorcycle gang assaulted fans in 1969 at a Rolling Stones Concert.

SDS was the student movement in the 1960s. SDS was a revolutionary group that wanted to remake the democratic system as we know it. SDS broke apart because it accepted all groups and became unable to mean or do anything. The inability of SDS to seize the Vietnam War as an issue ultimately led to its decline.

Authority and the Student

The final section of my paper will explore the relationship between authority and students. The fundamental question here is why the UWEC was never subject to violent student protests as on other college campuses. My hope is that by examining the nature of the Eau Claire student and the role of authority figures, we can gain some insight into the nature of the UWEC. In addition, I will examine some experiences of students on other campuses and attempt to explain why they ended up with violent protests.

Chancellor Haas wrote in his memoirs that, "Our location...

the Midwest, and the semi rural setting, there were generally less of the violent type of unrest...." 48 Dr. Marcus described students as upwardly mobile, paying for their own education and not in a position to disrupt it.49

Whatever the reason for the lack of violent protest, the evidence seems to support the idea that the UWEC was indeed, in comparison, a peaceful place during the War. A good example is the reaction at the UWEC following the Kent State shootings. Five hundred thirty six campuses were shut down and three hundred and fifty went on strike involving some four million students.50 The reaction to the Kent State shootings on the UWEC campus were mixed. Haas commented that he believed that "... a majority of students were attending class."51

The UWEC administration allowed a certain level of dissent on campus. The two most common types of dissent were the teach-ins and striking class. As I will discuss later, the administration was perhaps more willing to allow such dissent because the students had not displayed a tendency to confront violently. Thus strikes and teach-ins were held with the full consent of the administration.

The first teach-in at the UWEC occurred on November 26, 1968.52 The topics discussed were bigotry, academic freedom, and the role of the University. An estimated 2500 students attended.53

Chancellor Haas said, of the teach-ins "... I hadn't had a specific invitation extended to me;... it was a general invitation to everybody but me personally. I participated in

those. My wife participated. We sat with the students, and we, I think, took a position that we weren't going to be surprised or naive at their language or some of the thoughts they expressed as you might expect."54

While Chancellor Haas attended teach-ins, other campuses had similar experiences regarding the administration and teach-ins. The first teach-in at Michigan in 1965 were regarded as purely anti war and was attended by some 3,00 faculty and students.55 The Berkeley Teach-ins excluded the administration while debating the role of the University. These teach-ins weren't confrontational and were very much like the UWEC. These teach-ins were held in 1965, when the anti-war protest was characterized by its spontaneity and non-violence. As the 60's progressed the character of dissent on these campuses would change. UWEC's never did.

The second form of dissent on the UWEC campus was the student strike. Student strikes were proposed during moratorium day and following the Kent State Shootings.

Strikes were generally a means of shutting down a University by refusing to attend class. In November 1968 students went on strike at Colombia University to protest the schools development of land in an adjoining park.56 The question the students at Colombia were asking was, "...who controls Colombia and for what ends."57 The demands of the students of the strikers were that the school sever ties with the military and that all future decisions be made by a student-faculty committee.58

This question fell into line with what other students at other

campuses were asking. The same question, of the role of the University, appears in the book by N.L. Zaroulis, Who Spoke Up? Zaroulis writes that the object of the students was "...to force the University to become an institution that would reflect their views... to become a weapon with which they could attack the system."59

Strikes and teach-ins were used at the UWEC and at other schools with differing degrees of intensity and goals. The teach-ins at Michigan were to protest the war. The teach-ins at the UWEC were for discussion of a broad range of issues with no particular viewpoint being forced. Strikes at Colombia closed down the school in 1968. The strikes at the UWEC following Kent State were attended for one week by an estimated two hundred people.

Geography and social factors obviously played a role in student attitudes towards protest. However, prior to 1968 the vast majority of protests had been non-violent teach- ins. There was an experience that students at larger schools like Madison and Berkeley had been through and affected by that students at the UWEC had not.

The main ingredient lacking at the UWEC that had turned other campuses into battlegrounds was police violence. This police violence was seen first on a national scale at the Chicago Democratic Convention in August 1968.

Many of the students who were in Chicago for the Democratic Convention were there to protest the war. The Chicago Police and the National Guard were called to Chicago in masses to meet the

protestors and prevent them from disrupting the convention.

A participant from the UW Madison wrote, "They had machine guns mounted. They had national guardsmen planted on top of the buildings. The same helicopters they used in Vietnam flying overhead."60 Another participant described the police attacking demonstrators stating, "They didn't care about arrests. The two people in front of me were clubbed brutally."61

Karl Andresen, a political science professor at the UWEC at the time attended the convention as a Wisconsin delegate. Andresen described the police action as having a "...facist like mentality."62 The events in Chicago, according to the PBS series, Making Sense of the Sixties, gave the student movement a militant character.63 Students saw themselves as being oppressed by authority and the police. They began to believe that the only way to end this oppression was to fight back. N.L. Zaroulis concluded of the Chicago convention that "...authority had run amok and the issue of how to challenge it were literally being thrashed out on the streets."64

Events like the Chicago Democratic Convention led students to take a stand against police. Students were no longer naive. They had seen what police were willing to do to nonviolent protestors. This led to incidents to further violence and turned many college campuses into war zones. One example of such a campus was the UW Madison during the Mifflin Street Riots of 1969.

The Mifflin Street Riots began when the mayor refused to grant students a block party permit for the traditional May party. On May the party was held anyway.65 At 5 p.m. the Madison Police,

showed up in full riot gear with a new jumbo sized zip gun for firing tear gas. Students, by an eyewitness account, "snack-danced up and down Mifflin, taunting the cops with a pigs head on a pike and daring them to use their new weapon." 66 The police obliged the students and fired the gun engulfing the block in teargas. For next three days riot conditions prevailed.

The simplest explanation for why events like Mifflin Street never occurred on the UWEC campus was that there simply weren't enough students to create a sizeable unrest. This is incorrect though. Disturbances were reported at other state system schools.67 Ninety students were suspended at Oshkosh and a racial disturbance occurred at White Water. The answer seems to lie more in how the administration at the UWEC handled crisis situations. The events at the UWEC following Kent State provide a good example of hoe the administration worked.

On May 4th. 1970, four students at Kent State University were shot by national guardsman during an anti-war protest. The reaction to the shootings started a wave of protests across the nation which shut down many campuses. The reaction at the UWEC were considered by Chancellor Haas to be the largest protests to take place on the UWEC campus. The Kent State Protests on the UWEC campus provide my final example of interaction between students and the administration.

The shootings occurred on May 4th. but the situation was not addressed by Chancellor Haas until May 7th. On May 7th. an estimated 3,000 students gathered on the lawn behind Davies Center to hear the Chancellor speak and to decide what to do.68

The situation was tense to say the least. The night before 2,000 students had marched from upper campus to the Army Reserve Center.69 There was serious talk of a student strike on classes.

The 3,000 students gathered behind Davies Center were told by Haas that "If your conscience dictates to you that you can best express your position....you have the choice open to you to boycott your classes."70 Stephen Shaw, a chemistry professor, expressed the need to take action but cautioned, "At the first rock thrown at a building, I'll leave the group and stand against the wall the rocks are hitting."71

The main ideas stressed at the Kent State gathering was that action was ok, but it would be respected and meaningful only if it was nonviolent. Faculty members like Shaw were instrumental in shaping the form of protest. The open forum of the meeting allowed for expression and allowed Chancellor Haas to express his disgust. The experience was shared

From the gathering a group of students emerged. The Spectator ran a story on the "community interaction" some 60 students participated in.72 The community interaction group boycotted classes for the week and visited an estimated 250 homes in Eau Claire.73 The students sought to exchange ideas about the War.

The feelings of students towards authority in many schools around the country was that it was marked by a sense of distrust and anger. The relationship between students and authority at the UWEC was shaped by a relationship that allowed a certain amount of expression. Chancellor Haas seems to have attempted to understand and share in the experiences of many students. Student

Body President Robert and Vice President Randy Surbsugh, both in office during Kent State, said to Haas, "You showed a great deal of respect and sympathy toward the students, which was felt and appreciated by all." 74

Conclusion

I have discussed student dissent, student organizations, and the relationship of students to authority. I have done this to capture what I consider the essence of the anti-War movement at the UWEC as well as the rest of the nation. The question must now be what have we learned about the anti-War movement? And perhaps more importantly, what do we now understand about the nature of the anti-war ERA at our own university?

Dissent evolved from the civil right movement and provided an example to students around the country. The early period of the anti-war movement was peaceful and not a major movement in the early 60's.

SDS, the largest student organization of the 60's collapsed in 1969. The breakup of SDS illustrated the influence of the counterculture as well as its inability to coexist with activists. It also illustrated the increasing discrediting of the counterculture.

The nature of student dissent became violent because of the perception that they were being oppressed. The events of the Chicago Democratic Convention and the reaction of police to protests on college campuses led students to confront and resist

authority.

The UWEC had its own period of resistance to the war. Unlike the campuses where violent protests occurred, there was a strong voice for restraint. Protest was ok, but at the UWEC it was respected only if it was nonviolent. Students also did not show much of an appetite for violence or extremism. This seems to be evidenced in the fact that SDS was never a major player in student life and the low turnout for protests like the RAD flag waving in March 1970.

UWEC students were willing to engage in more mainstream forms of protest. Vietnam Moratorium Day is one example, the Kent State March is another. The students at the UWEC also had an administrator, in Chancellor Haas, who seemed willing empathize with students.

1 N.L. Zaroulis, Who Spoke Up? (Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1984), p.163.

2 Zaroulis, p. 237.

3. Making Sense of the Sixties, Volume 1. WETA Intl. Productions, 1991. (Imc film collection.)

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. Leonard Haas, An Oral History of the UWEC, July 1991. Tape Recording. (University Archives.)

8. The Spectator, 7 March 1968, p.2.

9. Ibid., p.1.

10.The Spectator, 7 March 1968, p.1.

11. Interview with Haas.

12. Judith and Stewart Albert, The Sixties Papers, Documents of a Rebellious Decade. (New York: Prager Pub., 1984), p. 283.

13. Making Sense of the Sixties, Vol. 1.

14. Charles DeBenedetti, An American Ordeal. (Syracuse: Syarcuse Press, 1990), p.104.

15. Ibid.

16. Zaroulis, p. 151.

17. Zaroulis, p. 153.

18. Zaroulis, p. 156.

19. Zaroulis, p. 155.

20. Zaroulis, p. 157.

21. Ibid.

22. Tom Bates, RADS. (New York: Harper Collins, 1990), p.94.

23. The Spectator, 28 March 1968, p.1.

24. The Spectator, 17 March 1968, p. 3.

25. Ibid.

26. The Spectator, 23 October 1969, p.1.

27. Ibid.

28. Bates, p. 90.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. Bates, p. 87.

33. Interview With Haas.

34. Albert, p.176.

35. Zarelous, p.255.

36. Zarelous, p. 251.

37. Ibid.

38. Making Sense of the Sixties. Vol. 2. WETA Intl. Productions, 1991. (IMC Video)

39. Ibid.

40. Ibid.

41. Interview With Haas.

42. Interview with Dr. Kenneth Marcus, Eau Claire, Wisconsin, November 1992.

43. The Spectator, 13 March 1969, p.12.

44. Ibid.

45. The Spectator, 5 March 1970, p.10.

46. Ibid.

47. Hilda Clark and John R. Jenswold, The University of

Wisconsin-Eau Claire, A History, 1916-1976. (Stevens Point WI: Wozalla Publishing, 1976) p.561.

48. Interview with Haas.

49. Interview with Marcus.

50. Fred Halsted, Out Now! A Participants Account of the Movement Against the Vietnam War.(New York, Monad Press, 1978) p.103.

51.Interview with Haas.

52. Clark, p. 157.

53. Ibid.

54. Interview with Haas.

55. Halsted, p. 46.

56. Albert, p. 235.

57. Ibid.

58. Albert, p. 236.

59. Zaroulis, p.236.

60. Bates, p. 101.

61. Ibid.

62. The Spectator, 19 September 1968, p.1.

63. Making Sense of the 60's, v. 2.

64. Zaroulis, p. 200.

65. Bates, p. 119.

66. Ibid.

67. Carter, p. 98.

68. The Spectator, 7 May 1970, p.1.

69. Ibid.

70. Ibid.

71. Ibid.

72. The Spectator, 14 May 1970, p.7.

73. Ibid.

74. Carter, p.102.

Primary Works

Judith and Stewart Albert, The Sixties Papers, Documents of a Rebellious Decade. (New York: Prager Publishing, 1984).

Tom Bates, RADS. (New York: Harper Collins, 1990).

Leonard Haas, An Oral History of the UWEC, July 1991. Tape Recording in Written Form. UWEC Archives.

Fred Halsted, Out Now! A Participants Account of the American Movement Against the Vietnam War. (New York: Monad Press, 1978).

Kenneth Marcus, Interview by James Hass, 13 November 1992. Tape Recording.

The Spectator, 19 September 1968, p.1.

The Spectator, 6 March 1968, p.2.

The Spectator, 13 March 1969, p.3.

The Spectator, 20 March, 1968, p.1.

The Spectator, 28 March 1968, p.1.

The Spectator, 23 October 1969, p.1.

The Spectator, 5 March, 1970 p.10.

The Spectator, 7 May 1970, p.1.

The Spectator, 14 May 1970, p.7.

Secondary Sources

Allan Bogue and Robert Taylor, The University of Wisconsin, One Hundred and Twenty Five Years. (Madison WI: UW Press, 1975).

Hilda Carter and John R. Jenswold. The UW-Eau Claire, A History, 1916-1976. (Stevens Point WI: Wozalla Publishing, 1976).

Charles DeBenedetti, An American Ordeal. (Syracuse: Syracuse Press, 1990).

Making Sense of the Sixties, Vol. 1-3. WETA Video Productions, 1991, 180 minutes. (IMC Film collection)

Allen J. Matusow, The Unraveling of America: A History of Liberalism in the 1960's. (New York: Harper & Row, 1984).

The War At Home, MPI Video, 1986, 60 min. (IMC Film)

N.L. Zaroulis, Who Spoke Up? (Garden City NY: Dobleday, 1984)