

Ben Nussbaum

HC 421H Clark

Final Paper

### **Berkeley of the Northwest? Not quite.**

A wave of student activism swept the nation during the turbulent 1960's and 1970's. During this time, the University of Oregon earned the reputation as the "Berkeley of the Northwest"<sup>1</sup> in obvious reference to the chaotic and violent campus of the University of California at Berkeley during this time period. The connections between the two campuses run deep. Students and faculty moved between the campuses for educational purposes or to participate in the powerful social movements that enveloped both campuses during the '60's and '70's. Driven by congruent ideologies, the atmosphere found on both campuses was remarkably similar, especially in the students' and sometimes faculty's stance against the conflict in Vietnam. Students challenged the administrations and attacked the status quo on both campuses with the same passion, but the movement at the University of Oregon never reached the same scale as the one at Berkeley.

The students at Oregon never faced the opposition from the administration that their counterparts at Berkeley faced. The University of Oregon had a long-standing tradition of student rights, something the University of California at Berkeley lacked. An uncompromising administration and this lack of student rights led to the appearance of more violence on the Berkeley campus than at the University of Oregon. Sheer numbers were to Berkeley's advantage as well. Larger groups of protestors led to more conflict and disruption, and more press coverage. Finally, the backdrop of San Francisco and the rest of the Bay Area, being the epicenter of much

---

<sup>1</sup> Swanson, Mirjam. "Campus a hotbed, of activism, struck by loss of Prefontaine in '70's." *Oregon Daily Emerald*. May 17, 1999. 1, 6.

of the protest and counterculture movements of the 1960's and 1970's, inevitably gave the Berkeley students a larger stage for protest than Eugene could ever provide. Thus, while the atmosphere and passion for the issues of the time were much the same, to call the University of Oregon the "Berkeley of the Northwest" is an overstatement based on the magnitude of the protests themselves, the resulting reaction to the protests by the respective administrations, and the public perception of both movements, one gaining national prominence, the other relegated to local and statewide exposure.

During the Cold War era, universities became increasingly important institutions, training, molding, and educating the future leaders of America. By 1960, college students finally outnumbered farmers in the United States<sup>2</sup> and thus the dynamics on college campuses throughout the nation began to change as students immersed themselves in issues of local, national and world politics. Early on, the student movements across the nation dealt with issues that the universities had direct control over, like freedom of speech and the role of students in the university. However, this began to change after 1965 as students started relating campus issues with greater social and political issues that affected the world. According to some, this is the result of three problems:

- 1) American involvement in the war in Southeast Asia,
- 2) The slow progress of American society towards racial equality, and
- 3) Charges of "unresponsiveness against both the federal government and university administrations and against their repressive reaction to student demands."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. Bantam Books. New York, NY. 1993.

<sup>3</sup> Shari. "Student Protests at Universities Across the Nation."  
<http://eagle3.american.edu/~jr3778a/1945page4.htm>. December 7, 2003.

David Frohnmayer, the current President of the University of Oregon, made a similar assessment of the causes behind the protests, with a few small additions. Despite the slow progress of the Civil Rights movement in America, he asserted that it served to activate students and mold them into powerful political figures. The Civil Rights movement also led to the emergence of civil disobedience as a tactic for protest in the United States, which in turn was used during the initial bipartisan campus movements fighting for issues such as freedom of speech, like the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley. The Vietnam War and especially the Armed Services' Draft provided fuel for the fire that had been started within student movements nationwide. The Draft was especially troublesome because some students felt guilty about taking advantage of the college student deferment or because they might actually be forced to go to war. The final issue that Frohnmayer saw as a cause of student unrest during the 1960's and '70's was something called generational disequilibrium, a phrase coined by Frohnmayer's former colleague Gerald Bogen. This disillusionment with the powers-that-be provided for the rebellion of students worldwide against the "old guard" whose sharing of wealth and power was making the world unstable.<sup>4</sup> These issues drove the protests that occurred across the country. The University of California at Berkeley and the University of Oregon were no exception. Both campuses shared this background and thus, like many other liberal campuses, they were very similar.

The students participating in the social protests on both campuses shared many of the same ideological values. As the 1960's progressed the students were "becoming increasingly resistant to the large, impersonal 'multiversity'; students [were] coming to believe they have the right to some participation in educational decisions which directly affect them."<sup>5</sup> They were no

---

<sup>4</sup> Frohnmayer, David. Current President of the University of Oregon. Interview. October 13, 2003.

<sup>5</sup> "Berkeley, 1966." *Commonweal*. v. 85, December 23, 1966. 337.

longer satisfied with the paternalistic nature of the universities, instead wanting to be equal members. During this time, many students in Berkeley as well as in Eugene advocated for the integration of students into the decision-making processes on campus. This change in the students' perception of their role in the university marked a drastic shift, laying the groundwork for the other demonstrations that would define college-age Americans during the 1960's and 1970's. This influx of similar ideals can be accounted for, in large part, by the student and faculty connections between the two campuses as well as their familiar traditions and curriculum.<sup>6</sup>

The idea that the universities should be free from overbearing state influence was also seen on the Berkeley and Eugene campuses. "The university (any university) cannot allow itself to be victimized by society—even the society which supports it with tax money."<sup>7</sup> The University was seen, by students, as a place to explore intellectually and not be limited by the constraints of the community at-large. Governor McCall of Oregon and Governors Reagan and Brown of California put considerable pressure on their respective state institutions.<sup>8</sup> The handling of that pressure by the administrations at both universities set them apart, as Robert D. Clark stood up to McCall while Clark Kerr decided to take the suggested hard-line stance against the students. Both also felt considerable pressure from the community and supporters of the universities. The Regents at Berkeley and local business and community leaders in Eugene tried to influence the actions of the administrations, many times calling for a firm, disciplinary stance against the students, representing a way of thinking characteristic of an older, more conservative

---

<sup>6</sup> Bogen, Gerald. Former VP for Student Affairs, University of Oregon. Interview. November 24, 2003.

<sup>7</sup> "Berkeley, 1966." *Commonweal*.

<sup>8</sup> Clark, Robert D. Former President, University of Oregon. Interview. November 3, 2003, Berkeley Correspondent. "They March, Doubting They Will Overcome." *New Republic*. v. 153. October 30, 1965. 9, and "Berkeley, 1966." *Commonweal*.

generation. The students on both campuses did not feel that these outside agents had their best interests at heart, rebelling against them, refusing to give in to the pressure from the communities that surrounded them. This is illustrated by the closing off of 13<sup>th</sup> street, running through the heart of the University of Oregon campus, by students activists in Eugene, and the take over of “People’s Park” in Berkeley, which will be described in more detail later.

The solidarity that the students felt in uniting against their critics was only increased when examining the issues that concerned students on both campuses: student rights, civil rights, and the war in Vietnam. These are the same issues that captured the attention of college students around the nation, as they became “social activists more intent on changing society than discussing it.”<sup>9</sup> Gaining experience in protest through participation in the civil rights movement,<sup>10</sup> student leaders at both the University of Oregon and University of California, Berkeley went to school not just to learn, but also to make a difference in the world. Free speech and civil rights dominated early student activism, but soon the student advocates in Eugene and Berkeley, like many others throughout the country, turned their attention to the War in Vietnam. This issue seemed to create the most chaos on the two campuses as the focus of protest shifted towards a national subject that the universities had no direct control over.

At this point, students were protesting against the institution of the University when they really disagreed with the policies of the United States government in Washington, D.C. Dave Frohnmayer explained his disapproval of this form of protest because there was no connection between the war in Vietnam and the disruption of the universities. Protesting against institutions with no power to change a problem is not beneficial to the protestors or the institution. He feels that protest should be directed only at the institution with decision-making authority on the

---

<sup>9</sup> “Berkeley, 1966.” *Commonweal*.

<sup>10</sup> Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties*.

matter, in this case the Federal government, and mainly the White House and the Legislature, so the anti-war student movement was flawed from the beginning.<sup>11</sup> Thus, the shift from student and civil rights to the Vietnam War was the start of the countdown for the ticking time bomb representing student activism, culminating in the explosion of National Guardsman's rifles at Kent State, killing four protestors.

Berkeley and Eugene shared other ideals as well. The fusion of the emerging counterculture into the anti-war movements in Eugene and Berkeley was similar. This was due in part to the fact that the innovators of the counterculture movement such as Ken Kesey had major influence in both areas. Kesey helped to popularize the use of LSD and other mind-altering drugs in the Bay Area,<sup>12</sup> but his presence was felt in Eugene too, as drugs became a large part of the growing counterculture. His ties to Eugene go deeper still. He grew up outside of Eugene and maintains a residence there to this day. A small group of Oregon students even endorsed drug use, particularly marijuana, in the *Emerald*, Oregon's student newspaper.<sup>13</sup> Not only did Berkeley and Eugene share in their experimentation with drugs, they witnessed a revolution in music as well. The Grateful Dead, a beacon for the counterculture movement, based in the Bay Area also made frequent stops in Eugene, only adding to the connections between the Berkeley and Eugene counterculture movements. Eugene, just like the greater Bay Area, was a welcoming community for people who were thought of as different.<sup>14</sup>

The protests on both campuses were successful when keeping the focus on issues that the universities had control over. Once the protest shifted to Vietnam, the movements lacked the focus and support of their previous efforts. One such case is that of the ROTC. The presence of

---

<sup>11</sup> Frohnmayer, David. Interview.

<sup>12</sup> Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties*.

<sup>13</sup> "Pot Luck." *Newsweek*. v. 67, pt. 2. June 27, 1964.

<sup>14</sup> Williams, Dan. Former ASUO President, current administrator. Interview. October 27, 2003.

ROTC created enormous problems on both campuses, with bombs, fires and general disrespect for anyone who participated in the program.<sup>15</sup> However, according to Ival McMains, a top member of the University of Oregon's ROTC program from 1966 to 1970, the antagonism directed at the members of ROTC was completely unfounded as many of the cadets held the same beliefs as the protesting students. Furthermore, McMains argued, the protestors did not know the purpose behind the ROTC. It was set up as an organization to infuse the Army Officer Corps with educated, civilian officers, breaking up the hegemony that existed in the leadership of the Army.<sup>16</sup> Surely if the protestors understood this fact, they would have been more supportive of the ROTC and its goals, but they viewed the ROTC as an extension of the growing US military establishment. Whether or not their opinions on the ROTC were founded or unfounded, protestors had no right to steal the dignity of its members.

Misunderstandings such as these are just a few of the unnecessary problems that were created by overzealous and unforgiving protestors, at times allowing passion to get in the way of human decency. This particular problem illustrates the utter lack of communication between the parties involved and the polarization of the students in an 'us' versus 'them' mentality. This narrow-minded view of issues is still evident today, especially regarding the current national administration, who view dissent as unpatriotic.

The violence that often accompanied these ROTC protests was a change from civil disobedience that seemed to mark earlier student movements. This violence hurt the movements at both the University of Oregon and the University of California at Berkeley. At Berkeley, mass arrests had severely damaged the previous movements and "this time there would be no mass

---

<sup>15</sup> Clark, Robert C. Interview and Jones, John E. "UCPD Berkeley—History." <http://public-safety.berkeley.edu/police/ucpdhistory.html>. December 7, 2003.

<sup>16</sup> McMains, Ival. ROTC, University of Oregon 1966-1970. Interview. November 5, 2003.

arrests (which kill protest movements), nor would there be civil disobedience.”<sup>17</sup> The University of Oregon never quite reached this level of militancy, but the protest movement did seem to fizzle after the arrest of 61 students at Johnson Hall. The focus of the movement was effectively lost as much of the protest that followed dealt with liberating the captured friends of the movement. Furthermore, the presence of ultra-violent groups such as the Black Panthers and the Weather Underground on campus, took attention away from the true purpose of the movement.<sup>18</sup> A few “radicals” stole the show, giving a black eye to the movement and creating a negative stereotype thrust upon all ideological activists on college campuses.

As on most campuses, the protestors represented only a small portion of the campus population. “Those most vocal and active in pressing attacks on the administration at Berkeley are a minority and probably not representative of total student opinion.”<sup>19</sup> The same is true at the University of Oregon. Although it has been shown that many students did not support the war in Vietnam, large groups of them banded together to denounce the violent and disruptive actions of the protestors, even taking out an add in the *Emerald* to express their discontent.<sup>20</sup> The surrounding communities felt similarly. The residents of Eugene even went as far as to pass an anti-war referendum, calling for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam,<sup>21</sup> showing the overall support for the movement. However, the community uproar over the unrest on campus demonstrated the dissatisfaction with the tactics employed by the University of Oregon students and their compatriots.

---

<sup>17</sup> Berkeley Correspondent. “They March, Doubting They Will Overcome.” *New Republic*.

<sup>18</sup> Bogen, Gerald. Interview.

<sup>19</sup> “Berkeley, 1966.” *Commonweal*.

<sup>20</sup> “We, the undersigned University of Oregon students...” *Oregon Daily Emerald*. Paid Advertisement. May 1, 1970. 11.

<sup>21</sup> “Town and Gown for Peace.” *The Nation*. v. 212. June 14, 1971. 741.



This is where the similarities stop. While ideologically the movements were one and the same, the movement at Berkeley separated itself from all other campus movements, becoming a catchphrase in the American vocabulary representing chaos and unrest. Berkeley acted as a microcosm for the changes that were happening nationwide within the college-age people of America. Public perception of the movements at Oregon and Berkeley was significantly different, Berkeley's gaining national prominence and the University of Oregon simply fitting into the larger movement that was sweeping the country. This can be traced back to the origins of the protests on both campuses. By examining several factors, it's simple to demonstrate the disparity between the two movements.

First, the period of student activism at Berkeley originated with the Free Speech Movement in 1964.<sup>22</sup> The administration, headed by President Clark Kerr, felt that the students should not be able bring outside political activities onto campus. The students protested, organizing a sit-in at Sproul Hall, resulting in hundreds of arrests. However, the students eventually won the initial freedoms that they were fighting for because from the beginning, they had the support of the faculty and the greater public.<sup>23</sup> This is in stark contrast to the origins of the movement at the University of Oregon, which had a long-standing tradition of student rights, based on the comprehensive Student Conduct Code.<sup>24</sup> According to Robert D. Clark, former President of the University of Oregon, who had experience in the Bay Area, as the President of San Jose State University, the tradition of freedom of speech at the University of Oregon resulted in minor protests when compared to the protests in California, and especially at Berkeley.

---

<sup>22</sup> Shari. "Student Protests at Universities Across the Nation."

<sup>23</sup> "Berkeley's Civil War." *New Republic*. v. 152. March 27, 2003. 6-7.

<sup>24</sup> Williams, Dan. Interview.

This tradition of liberalism and freedom of expression, going back to the 1920's and Prince Lucien Campbell, former President of the University of Oregon, was in opposition of the tradition within the California system of not allowing students to discuss political issues on campus.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the Free Speech Movement was a revolt against tradition at Berkeley. The students at Oregon never needed to fight this battle as they were already provided with the rights for which the Berkeley students fought. Fighting for rights that are being denied produces more adamant and radical protest than simply trying to take advantage of rights that have already been guaranteed.

This is probably the single biggest reason for the differences between the two protest movements. Founded on different premises, protests at Oregon did not have the overwhelming support that the first protests at Berkeley had. The bipartisan nature of the initial movement at Berkeley served to create a much more politicized atmosphere, with vocal and active groups on both sides of the political spectrum, whereas from the start, the protests at Oregon were considered radical and often left wing. When a majority of the student population demonstrated support for an issue like the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, it could not be considered a radical movement. This is the problem that faces many protest groups today. Representing only a small percentage of a given population, there is only so much that can be achieved by an ideologically partisan protest as non-participants tend to dismiss it as an insignificant, radically driven cause.

Both the students at Berkeley and the students at Oregon challenged their respective administrations to take a stand on many social issues, but the conflict between students and the administration was exacerbated at Berkeley by the uncompromising stance adopted by Clark

---

<sup>25</sup> Clark, Robert D. Interview.

Kerr. President Robert D. Clark and President's Johnson and Fleming who preceded him sympathized with the students, but were still able to maintain a relative level of control over the university, earning the students respect and praise. This is demonstrated by the fact that while President Clark publicly expressed his opposition to the war in Vietnam,<sup>26</sup> he did not let these views affect his judgment of what was best for the University. He felt that the University as an institution should not take a stand on social issues because it should be a forum for the exploration of ideas, not another interest group trying to push its views on students.<sup>27</sup>

On the contrary, at Berkeley, Clark Kerr constantly alienated the protestors, vilifying the administration in the eyes of the public. This even resulted in the resignation of many administrators, later rescinded.<sup>28</sup> Granted, the University of Oregon administrators felt pressure from the outside—some even say that this pressure pushed President Charles Johnson to his death in a car accident in 1969<sup>29</sup>—they stood up to the outside authorities such as Governor Tom McCall. Thus, the intense conflict with the administration at Berkeley set the movement apart from the more sympathetic one found at Oregon.

This sympathy shown by Robert D. Clark was displayed once again when looking at his interaction with student leaders. Kip Morgan, ASUO President, was not fulfilling the requirements necessary to remain in office. Instead of dismissing Morgan from office, like he was supposed to do, Clark showed compassion, allowing Morgan to continue doing what he felt was necessary as the representative of the student body. Clark realized that he would only be

---

<sup>26</sup> “Mr. President...” Paid advertisement placed by G. Streisinger and R.E. Miller. *Oregon Daily Emerald*. May 8, 1970. 4.

<sup>27</sup> Clark, Robert D. Interview.

<sup>28</sup> “Berkeley’s Civil War.” *New Republic*.

<sup>29</sup> Metzler, Ken. *Confrontation: The Destruction of a College President*. University of Oregon Press. Eugene, OR. 2001.

creating unnecessary problems by dismissing him and that given the magnitude of the situation, his leniency was justified.<sup>30</sup>

The administration at Berkeley failed to show the same sympathy and leniency that Clark did. The Free Speech Movement had become such an enormous ordeal that its most visible leader, Mario Savio, had dropped out of school to lead the group in its fight against the administration. When he applied for readmission, the administration categorically rejected him, obviously still bitter over his role in the Free Speech Movement.<sup>31</sup> The Berkeley administration failed to realize the enormity of the situation and predictably showed the lack of understanding and compassion that college students found characteristic of their parents and grandparents' generations.

The most quantifiable evidence of the disparity between the protests at Berkeley and those at the University of Oregon is seen when looking at the overall scale of the protests. At Oregon, participation in the protests never reached the same levels seen at Berkeley. The most glaring example of this involved student arrests. In the Johnson Hall sit-in in April of 1970, 61 student arrests were made,<sup>32</sup> the largest number made at the University of Oregon during the 1960's and '70's. However, compared to Berkeley, the size of the protest movement in Eugene was miniscule. At a similar sit-in at Berkeley, in Sproul Hall, the administration building, 814 students were arrested,<sup>33</sup> more than ten times the number that were arrested at the University of Oregon. Furthermore, a few days before, an even larger protest arose when Jack Weinberg was arrested for distributing political literature on campus. Almost 10,000 students surrounded the

---

<sup>30</sup> Frohnmayer, David. Interview.

<sup>31</sup> "Berkeley, 1966." *Commonweal*.

<sup>32</sup> "61 Demonstrators Arrested Thursday." *Oregon Daily Emerald*. April 24, 1970. 2, 5.

<sup>33</sup> Boler, John F. "Behind the Protests at Berkeley." *Commonweal*. v. 87. February 5, 1965. 602-605.

police car he was in, refusing to allow it to leave the campus, using the roof of the car as a platform from which to speak.<sup>34</sup> The sheer scale of this protest puts it head-and-shoulders above anything that happened at the University of Oregon, which boasted somewhere around 5,000 protestors at its largest single protest. As the old saying goes, “strength in numbers.” Students at Berkeley definitely had that.

Furthermore, even when the focus of the protests turned to the Vietnam War, Berkeley maintained its numbers advantage. In October 1965, the Vietnam Day Committee at Berkeley organized a march on the Oakland Army Terminal. Berkeley police estimated that 15,000 activists marched, only to be peacefully turned back by the police.<sup>35</sup> While other estimates put the figure much lower, an estimate of 15,000 demonstrates the drawing power of the movement in Berkeley as well as the greater Bay Area. Nothing at the University of Oregon ever reached such a large number, demonstrating the vast difference in scale between the movements on each campus. Robert D. Clark and Gerald Bogen affirmed this in interviews with the Universities in Peace and War class during the fall of 2003 at the University of Oregon.<sup>36</sup>

In part due to this large discrepancy in scale, violence on campus never reached the same levels at Oregon as it did at Berkeley. Both campuses experienced arson and bombings by radicals, but the biggest difference in violence is discovered when examining the interaction between the students and the law enforcement agencies. Eventually, tear gas was used on both campuses to disperse large crowds, but the California National Guard holds the “dubious distinction of having initiated the first air strike against an American college campus,”<sup>37</sup> showering tear gas down on the Berkeley protestors below as the administration looked on. The

---

<sup>34</sup> Shari. “Student Protests at Universities Across the United States.”

<sup>35</sup> Berkeley Correspondent. “They March, Doubting They Will Overcome.” *New Republic*.

<sup>36</sup> Clark, Robert D. Interview and Bogen, Gerald. Interview.

<sup>37</sup> “The Battle of Berkeley.” *National Review*. v. 21. June 17, 1969. 579.

National Guard was brought in at Oregon, but Robert D. Clark protested adamantly against its presence on campus,<sup>38</sup> an attempt to thwart the governor's harsh crackdown on student unrest.

At Berkeley, the encounters between protestors and law enforcement were much more heated, with the administration's support. "After the Free Speech Movement, there were seven years of frequent, and sometimes violent demonstrations, including draft protests, strikes, bombings of the ROTC building and PG&E Towers, arsons and street battles."<sup>39</sup> While this may sound similar to protests at the University of Oregon, they go far beyond in their intensity and level of violence. A particular story about the protestors' take over of "People's Park" illustrates this very well:

In the pre-dawn hours of May 15, 1969, the University took back the park [designated for the construction of dormitories, taken over by protestors]. One Hundred California Highway Patrol officers surrounded the Park and the University ordered those sleeping in the park to leave. All but three left. They were arrested and all property was removed. A cyclone fence was erected by early morning.

That day, a rally was held in Sproul Plaza on Campus. At 1240 p.m., Dan Siegel told the assembled crowd to "Go and take back the Park." Two thousand persons marched to the Park and attacked the police. Several hundred protesters assaulted the police with bricks, rocks and bottles from the ground and roof tops. The Deputies of the Alameda County Sheriff's Department first responded with tear gas and then with bird shot fired from shotguns, but still lost many of the battles. Order was not restored until several hours later when the number of police officers reached 729 from agencies all over the Bay Area. In that one afternoon, 111 police officers were injured, including one C.H.P. officer who was knifed in the chest.

---

<sup>38</sup> Clark, Robert D. Interview.

<sup>39</sup> Jones, John E. "UCPD Berkeley—History."

In Eugene, the protestors never clashed with law enforcement this violently on such a large scale. While the police and National Guard were used to restore order on campus, they never fired on University of Oregon students at any point during the protests. Mob mentality did not lead to masses of students attacking law enforcement, demonstrating the relative timidity and calm of the protests at the University of Oregon compared to those at Berkeley.

By the time of the incident described above, the majority of the protesters were no longer Berkeley students, but outsiders looking for an adventure.<sup>40</sup> Ival McMains testified that this was also true at Oregon, breaking down the participants into three categories: 40% non-students, 40% students, and 20% professional agitators (all estimates).<sup>41</sup>

Part of the reason for this influx of non-student agitators is the drawing power of both the Bay Area and Eugene to those seeking refuge from the oppressive American society, usually people sympathetic to the student movements. However, the Bay Area provided a much larger arena for students from Berkeley to recruit similar thinkers. Eugene could never be expected to support such a large population of protestors simply based on the fact that it is a medium-sized college town compared to the vast metropolitan region known as the Bay Area. Eugene cannot be expected to compete with cultural centers like New York or Paris and for this same reason it cannot be expected to compete with Berkeley. Thus, Eugene never had much of a chance to rival Berkeley when looking at sheer numbers.

Finally, the press coverage of the respective movements says a lot about the scale and national importance of each. The protests at the University of Oregon were covered thoroughly by local and university papers, but none of the protests received national recognition. During the 1960's and '70's, only the issue of John Froines and his involvement in the Chicago Seven trials

---

<sup>40</sup> Jones, John E. "UCPD Berkeley—History."

<sup>41</sup> McMains, Ival. Interview.

and a conflict over the protection of sources by Annette Buchanan in the aforementioned story condoning marijuana use made it to print in any national publications.<sup>42</sup> However, in contrast, Berkeley was seen by many, including the press, to be the inspiration behind protests on other campuses nationwide. Stories on the chaos at Berkeley were in many national publications. In March 1965, *Time* did a story called “The Berkeley Effect,” giving credit to the students at the University of California at Berkeley for starting the movement that seized many college campuses.<sup>43</sup> Giving examples, like a co-ed sleep out at Kansas University, Berkeley was described as the epicenter of the earthquake representing student activism, sending far-reaching shock waves throughout America.

This coverage further heightened the reputation of Berkeley as the place to be for good times, mind-altering drugs, and a chance to change the world. Even though Eugene had a reputation as a welcoming place for counterculture ideals and people who felt out of touch with the rest of society—Gerald Bogen said that while he was in Europe doing Peace Corps work, he came across an underground paper in the Netherlands that said Eugene was the place to be for disaffected people<sup>44</sup>—Berkeley and the greater Bay Area were still the focal point of the counterculture movement in America. Berkeley quickly became a buzzword representing all of the revolutionary ideas and events that took place on college campuses throughout the United States.

The issues that dominated the 1960’s and 1970’s forced many young Americans to grow up fast. Civil rights, student rights and a seemingly unjust war pushed students to question authority and stand up for their own beliefs on the issues. This newfound assertiveness led to the

---

<sup>42</sup> Johnson, Gilbert. “Not Guilty, but...” *New Republic*. v. 163. July 25, 1970. 9-10 and “Reporting: Silence on Sources.” *Time*. v. 88, pt. 1. July 8, 1966. 49.

<sup>43</sup> “Students: The Berkeley Effect.” *Time*. v. 85, pt. 1. March 19, 1965. 48

<sup>44</sup> Bogen, Gerald. Interview.



protest movements that seized college campuses from coast to coast. The University of Oregon and the University of California at Berkeley were just two of the many campuses that were infused with a vigor for activism. However, Berkeley set itself apart from the rest, often acting as a standard bearer. The large-scale student movement in America started there in 1964 with the Free Speech Movement and continued to spread, reaching the University of Oregon shortly thereafter. While the student activists at Oregon shared many of the same values as their counterparts at Berkeley, they never were able to muster the same amount of support (in numbers). The effects of this disparity in scale can be seen in a number of ways, including the press coverage and the violent clashes with law enforcement. But, the human factor played a large role. The administrators at Oregon were simply more sympathetic to the students' cause, while the administrators at Berkeley seemingly had no patience with the students, preferring to take an adversarial stance. Overall, quantitatively, the protests in Eugene cannot be compared to those in Berkeley, but in spirit and purpose they were the same.

These protests set the precedent for student movements and protests in general, but both the universities and the students have learned from the successes and mistakes that were encountered during the 1960's and '70's. The University has taken measures to prevent the problems that it faced during a decade of chaos, making it more and more difficult to participate in the form of protest seen before, without harsh consequences. Students have also seen the effects of protest and to an extent they seem to have concluded that it's better to work within the system. The overall lack of protest on campus today is a product of this learning, not an indication that my generation just does not care. Mass protest has been done before and in the end, the decision comes down to the people in power, who often do not care what the public thinks as long as they can benefit from their decision. This new form of power politics seems to

have rendered civic and social protests irrelevant when in competition with the corporate powers that dominate national politics. My generation has learned this from our parents' generation and we need to find our own means of protest because otherwise the gains made by our parents' generation will be lost, squandered by us because we could not come to terms with the new political balance. Each generation seems to be provided with an event that defines them, like the Vietnam War did for the baby boomers, but unless we're ready to tackle the problem head on, we risk being swept under the rug.

## **Bibliography**

“61 Demonstrators Arrested Thursday.” *Oregon Daily Emerald*. April 24, 1970. 2, 5.

“Berkeley, 1966.” *Commonweal*. v. 85, December 23, 1966. 337.

“Berkeley’s Civil War.” *New Republic*. v. 152. March 27, 2003. 6-7.

Berkeley Correspondent. “They March, Doubting They Will Overcome.” *New Republic*. v. 153. October 30, 1965. 9.

Bogen, Gerald. Former VP for Student Affairs, University of Oregon. Interview. November 24, 2003.

Boler, John F. “Behind the Protests at Berkeley.” *Commonweal*. v. 87. February 5, 1965. 602-605.

Clark, Robert D. Former President, University of Oregon. Interview. November 3, 2003.

Frohnmayr, David. Current President of the University of Oregon. Interview. October 13, 2003.

Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. Bantam Books. New York, NY. 1993.

Johnson, Gilbert. “Not Guilty, but...” *New Republic*. v. 163. July 25, 1970. 9-10.

Jones, John E. “UCPD Berkeley—History.”

<http://public-safety.berkeley.edu/police/ucpdhistory.html>. December 7, 2003.

McMains, Ival. ROTC, University of Oregon 1966-1970. Interview. November 5, 2003.

Metzler, Ken. *Confrontation: The Destruction of a College President*. University of Oregon Press. Eugene, OR. 2001.

“Mr. President...” Paid advertisement placed by G. Streisinger and R.E. Miller. *Oregon Daily Emerald*. May 8, 1970. 4.

“Pot Luck.” *Newsweek*. v. 67, pt. 2. June 27, 1964.

“Reporting: Silence on Sources.” *Time*. v. 88, pt. 1. July 8, 1966. 49.

Shari. “Student Protests at Universities Across the Nation.”  
<http://eagle3.american.edu/~jr3778a/1945page4.htm>. December 7, 2003.

“Students: The Berkeley Effect.” *Time*. v. 85, pt. 1. March 19, 1965. 48.

Swanson, Mirjam. “Campus a hotbed of activism, struck by loss of Prefontaine in ‘70’s.” *Oregon Daily Emerald*. May 17, 1999. 1,6.

“The Battle of Berkeley.” *National Review*. v. 21. June 17, 1969. 579.

“Town and Gown for Peace.” *The Nation*. v.212. June 14, 1971. 741.

“We, the undersigned University of Oregon students...” *Oregon Daily Emerald*. Paid Advertisement. May 1, 1970. 11.

Williams, Dan. Former ASUO President, Current Administrator. Interview. October 27, 2003.