THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENT ACTIVISM AND CHANGE
IN THE UNIVERSITY: WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE
TO MCGILL UNIVERSITY IN THE 1960S

by

Peggy Sheppard

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts

Faculty of Education
McGill University
Montreal, Quebec
June 1989

Relationship Between Student
Activism and Change: McGill
in the Sixties

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between student activism and change in the university. Not only did student power play a major role in the establishment of the medieval university as an institution but also student activism continued as a tradition throughout the centuries. During the 1960s, manifestations were world-wide. In the United States, protest was especially pervasive and contributed to unrest on Canadian campuses.

Activism at McGill University in the sixties is examined in historical context. Events are chronicled in order to determine whether students there had an impact on change. The results indicate that activism significantly affected curricula, _in loco parentis_ attitudes, and university governance. It also contributed to the modification of McGill's role in society.

Activism continues to effect change. To understand better the influence of students on the decision-making process and the power structure, additional research is needed. Attention should be focused on periods of relative calm.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette étude porte sur la corrélation entre l'activisme étudiant et la réforme de l'enseignement supérieur. Non seulement le pouvoir étudiant a joué un rôle important dans la création de l'université médiévale en tant qu'institution, mais il s'est perpétré comme tradition au fil des siècles. Durant les années 1960, les etudiants ont manifesté de par le monde entier. Aux États-Unis, l'agitation s'est fait sentir un peu partout et a contribue au malaise dans les universités canadiennes.

L'activisme a l'universite McGill dans les années soixante est analyse sous un angle historique. L'auteur fait la chronique des evenements pour determiner si les etudiants ont eu une incidence sur les reformes intervenues. Il ressort de cette etude que l'activisme a eu un impact sur les programmes, sur les attitudes in loco parentis (en lieu et place d'un parent) et sur l'administration de l'Universite. L'activisme a egalement concouru à modifier la perception du rôle de McGill dans la societe.

L'activisme continue d'être un facteur de changement. Pour mieux comprendre l'influence des etudiants sur le processus décisionnel et la structure des pouvoirs, des recherches plus poussées s'imposent. Il faudra notamment se focaliser sur les périodes de calme relatif.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express deep appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Margaret Gillett, whose patient guidance and encouragement, as well as her enthusiasm, were invaluable throughout the writing of this thesis.

Warm thanks are also extended to the archivists, Robert Michel and Phoebe Chartrand, who were both very helpful and supportive during many long months of archival research. I am also grateful to a number of McGill faculty and staff members who expressed interest in the thesis by providing both useful information and helpful hints.

Special mention must be made of the individuals who consented to be interviewed. All were most generous with their time and were willing to discuss their experiences during the sixties very frankly. They made the study more interesting and exciting and for this I am most grateful.

It is necessary to mention in particular Dr. Rocke Robertson who was kind enough not only to allow an interview but also to permit access to his diaries. I appreciate the contribution of Dr. Stanley B. Frost who encouraged me to undertake this project and who provided valuable insights. Mr. D. Lorne Gales was of exceptional assistance as not only did he discuss the sixties with me throughout the research and writing of the thesis but also he introduced me to many of the individuals whom I interviewed. In addition, he reviewed his diaries and taped relevant excerpts for the period 1967-69 so that I might have a greater sense of the reaction to the events

as they were happening at the time.

Finally, it is necessary to mention the many loyal friends who maintained their interest in the topic and provided encouragement until the task was completed.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS OF ASSOCIATIONS

ACE	American Council on Education
AUCC	Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
CAUT	Canadian Association of University Teachers
CEGEP	Collège d'enseignement général et professionel
CUCND	Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
CUS	Canadian Union of Students
FLQ	Front de Libération du Québec
MAUT	McGill Association of University Teachers
MUA	McGill University Archives
NCCUC	National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges
PIRG	Public Interest Research Group
ROTC	Reserve Officers' Training Corps
RSA	Radical Student Alliance
RSM	Radical Student Movement
SAC	Social Action Committee
SDS	Students for a Democratic Society
SDU	Students for a Democratic University
SNCC	Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee
SPU	Student Peace Union
SUPA	Student Union for Peace Action
UGEQ	Union générale des étudiants du Québec

INTRODUCTION

Intent of Thesis

This thesis was prompted by an interest in how universities develop and change. An underlying assumption of the inquiry is that universities are not stagnant or moribund but that they are vital and evolving, even though their basic organization remains the same. While it must be appreciated that the modern university is, in many respects, a different institution from its medieval progenitor, the fundamental organization, with its faculties, deans, rectors and chancellors, plus its degrees of bachelor, master, and doctor, has remained in place since the Middle Ages. Perhaps this stability permits the university to develop and absorb change without any significant modification to its nature or interruption of its normal activities.

The question of the shaping of the university is related to the broader issue of power. Who has the power to cause change to occur? How is this power exercised? Is it the administrators, the professors, the students, the government, or the surrounding society who press for change in the university? Perhaps all the groups play a significant role under different circumstances; perhaps not. The existing literature suggests that these questions are in need of further research.

In an attempt to better understand the complex issue of power and how it is related to the shaping of the university, this thesis focuses on students and explores their role in directing the course of the university. More specifically, it considers the possibility of a definite relationship between student activism and the

1

shaping of the university. Many studies have dealt with the causes of activism, with the characteristics of the students who become active, with the events which have taken place during student rebellions, and with the results of unrest. Very few studies have attempted to determine whether or not students play a role in the development of the university. In fact, student unrest has not long been a topic of scholarly study. It was virtually ignored until the widespread turbulence of the 1960s when a sudden deluge of literature on the topic was produced. The North American world, in particular, was taken by surprise when students on most campuses expressed their dissatisfaction with many things, including the university which they attacked with some fury.

The literature reveals that there is a general understanding of the issues and events of the 1960s as well as some consensus with respect to the reasons for the disturbances being so universal. While a number of results have been identified, analyses of the outcome are not conclusive nor is there a united opinion with respect to the meaning of the student rebellion. Insofar as results for the university are concerned, there is a void in the literature. Most research studies concern themselves with the impact which students did or did not have on economic, political and social issues. Few give more than passing mention of the changes which occurred in the university. Yet, despite the lack of in-depth research, there are strong opinions expressed with respect to the outcome for the university. Some analysts of the period suggest that the entire episode was simply a passing phenomenon, albeit somewhat alarming at the time. Others argue that the turbulence caused the university to change dramatically. Then there are those who insist that the period of unrest in the 1960s was merely an aberration; that such ferment had never occurred before

nor was it likely to occur again. The calm which has
settled over campuses for more than a decade since the
mid-seventies tends to give credence to this point of
view. Was the unrest of the 1960s so unusual? Were
students attacking their universities for the first time?
Were the complaints about the university valid or were
they simply a response to particular events outside the
university? Did the students play a role in bringing
about change in the university or would the changes have
occurred without student involvement?

The uncertainty about the significance of the revolt
in the 1960s may well be related to the lack of an
historical perspective in which to study student activism.
Sufficient literature exists about the Middle Ages to
allow some analysis of student influence on the
development of the university at that time, yet only
recently have a few authors, provoked by the events of the
1960s, looked back to study the situation in the Middle
Ages in terms of student activism. Relevant literature
for the long period between the sixteenth and nineteenth
centuries is woefully lacking. History texts, as well as
histories of particular universities, include references
to student protests stimulated by political events as well
as general descriptions of their boisterous behaviour.
Very few have considered their influence on the
development of the university during these centuries. It
is reasonable to assume that students had some criticisms
about their courses of study, professors, and other
aspects of university life. It is also reasonable to
assume that their criticisms may have influenced decisions
concerning life in the university. Both the topic of
student influence on the ongoing development of the
university and that of student life in general during the
period 1600-1900 have not been of serious interest to
scholars in the Western world. It is an unfortunate

lacuna which prevents setting this thesis topic in a more complete historical perspective.

More disturbing is that, since the furore of the 1960s has died down, again student activity in itself does not appear to be receiving sufficient scholarly attention. For the most part, authors continue to focus on the reasons for the events of the 1960s rather than attempt to consider possible long-term results. They deal with the issue as an episode which is over, rather than as behaviour which may be inherent in the life of the university. There is virtually no treatment of the present situation or of future possibilities. Only very few scholars, such as Philip Altbach and Nathan Glazer, appear to be committed to an ongoing study of the phenomenon. Author of <u>Student Politics: Perspectives for the Eighties</u> (1981), Altbach appears to be sensitive to the oscillations in activism. For example, in a relatively recent article, he asks: "Are We Witnessing a New Student Revolution?"[1] Glazer, in an earlier article entitled "Pondering the Aftermath of the Student Revolt of 1964-72," claims "An enormous outpouring of books, articles, and studies accompanied the revolt. Yet, amazingly, there has been no continuing effort to analyze what it meant and what it continues to mean for the American university and college."[2]

It is the apparent lack of consensus, and perhaps even lack of awareness, which has provoked interest in the topic of this thesis. An attempt will be made to show clearly whether or not students do play a real role in designing the fabric of the university. The period of the 1960s has been chosen for study because it is the time when university students most recently and very obviously expressed themselves with respect to their place in the university. McGill University has been selected as the specific example to investigate because it is a large,

mature university which is well-established and therefore might be expected to be more resistant to forces for change than would be a newer university which is in a state of flux with respect to its organizational structures. It is assumed that in the context of an established university, the impact of the activists may be more easily observed. Yet another reason for the choice of McGill is that the student unrest was considered to be very serious during the time period under study; many observers believed that the University's demise was a real possibility.[3] The emphasis is on the years 1965-69, the time of greatest unrest at McGill.

A further factor which suggests McGill to be an appropriate example to study is that there is some disagreement with respect to the outcome of the turmoil. Dr. Rocke Robertson, Principal during the period of disturbance, stated in a retrospective article: "I do not know what the long-term results have been, but I suspect that there have been few."[4] On the other hand, Dr. Stanley Frost, a Vice-Principal during the same period, wrote of the student unrest in the second volume of his history of McGill that: "It changed the nature of the University profoundly and permanently."[5] Further investigation is needed if the disparate views of such important observers are to be reconciled.

Research Approach

Two hypotheses underlie the thesis. The first is that students do play a role in shaping the university. It may well be that this role passes unobserved until periods of intense activity reveal their influence in bringing about change. The second hypothesis is that students become active in reaction to conditions in the larger society of which they are a part. Due to sophisticated means of communication, the larger society

in the 1960s included not only the city surrounding the
university but also the province, the country, and the
world. If the latter hypothesis is true, one must
determine whether the students' role in causing change in
the university is somewhat circumstantial and accidental
or intrinsic and ongoing.

Key terms, or words, being used in this study which
require definition are "activism," "change," and "shape."
Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (8th edition, 1976)
defines "activism" as a "doctrine or practice that
emphasizes direct vigorous action in support of or
opposition to one side of a controversial issue." The
Oxford Dictionary of Current English (1984) defines an
"activist" as "one who follows a policy of vigorous action
in a cause . . . ." It is the "vigorous action" expressed
by McGill students upon which this thesis is focused. It
should be noted that this thesis is not concerned with the
activism of the sixties as a student movement, which is
the perspective taken by virtually all studies of the
period. It is activism in itself and in its broadest
sense which is under consideration although the validity
and reality of a student movement is acknowledged.

One definition of "change" provided in Webster's
Third New International Dictionary (1968) is: "to make
different in some particular way but short of conversion
into something else"; also to "alter" or to "modify."
Change, according to Webster's can also mean "to make over
to a radically different form"; also to "transform" or
"convert." A further sense of "change" is "to give a
different position, status, course or direction to."
"Shape" is defined as: "to determine or direct the course
of." The central question is: did McGill students, in the
1960s, make the University different in some way; did they
play a role in directing or determining the course of the
University?

The secondary questions which have been explored in pursuing the theme of the thesis are concerned with what it was the students wanted and what they achieved. Were the reasons for their activities at McGill the same as those of students elsewhere in North America or were there significant differences? What did they do to achieve their ends? Did other groups or individuals, such as professors, alumni, or members of the public become involved? Were the results related to the causes and were they short-term or long-term; were they superficial or fundamental?

Other questions include why did the students attack McGill? Was the University unresponsive to their needs or demands? Were there real problems and were the students identifying them? Were the problems in the University or elsewhere? If changes did result due to the students' activity, would the changes have occurred anyway? If they did not cause change, did the students at least quicken the pace of change?

The approach used is an historical and descriptive analysis which attempts to examine the topic in relation to the questions posed. An ideological orientation, the usual context in which student activism has been studied, has been rejected as too constraining for an investigation which is interested in specific results rather than possible explanations of phenomena. Many sources were consulted because both breadth and depth were considered essential for an understanding and reasonable analysis of the interrelationship between the various dynamics which influenced the results. Extensive research was necessary to counteract the inevitable biases which are present when dealing with an emotional subject such as this one.

Secondary sources, both books and periodicals,[6] were used to establish the background provided in the first two chapters.

Chapter One explores student activism in its historical context and shows that activism began when the universities began. The ancient roots and outcomes of initial activism are discussed. The period from the Middle Ages until the 1960s is overviewed rapidly to illustrate that activism did not disappear although, for the Western world, the record is not as dramatic as it was in the Middle Ages. Chapter Two continues the historical setting and outlines the causes and results of activism in North America, particularly in the United States, during the sixties. Student activism in the United States had an impact throughout the Western world but most especially in Canada where conditions closely resembled those in the U.S. This chapter moves closer to the main task of the thesis.

Chapter Three is based primarily, but not exclusively, on secondary sources. It provides the necessary economic, political and social background for McGill University. While the years 1965-69 have been selected for detailed analysis, primary sources in the McGill archives for the period 1963-65 were also investigated to provide greater depth to the understanding of student activism. Chapters Four and Five discuss the issues, the tactics of the students, and the major events during 1965-69, the period of intense activity. Results are discussed within the context of the precipitating issues. These chapters rely mainly upon primary sources. A special bibliographical section indicates the specific sources which were consulted. Extensive use was made of the McGill Daily, student handbooks, Senate minutes, and papers and reports in the files of H. Rocke Robertson. Throughout the research, it was essential to determine whether or not decisions were influenced by the students. As minutes of key committees, in particular those of the Board of Governors, were frequently terse and rarely

revealed the reasoning which resulted in a particular decision, it was necessary to consult a variety of sources. For this reason, interviews were undertaken with people who were involved with the issues at the time. These individuals, who are listed in the appendix, included representatives of the administration, professoriate and the student body.[7] Numerous unnamed people who were not formally interviewed but with whom discussions were held throughout the writing of the thesis also provided information and useful insights.

It is realized that the probability of subjectivity places some limit on the reliability of information obtained in interviews. Furthermore, the passage of twenty years or more suggests the possibility of memory lapses and distortions which may arise from retrospection. It is true that biases were revealed and contradictions arose. The latter, however, stimulated more intense research which was usually able to resolve the ambiguity. One relatively consistent problem was that memories were selective and tended to favour only specific aspects, which frequently had had an emotional impact at the time. Few had contemplated the possibility of results in any depth. More troublesome, yet further justification for the topic being researched, was the fact that many individuals were resistant to the very idea that the students may have influenced change at all.

Despite the constraints on objectivity inherent in interviews, the information gained provided a major contribution to the thesis. Many relevant facts would not have been obtained from any other source. It is the opinion of this researcher that the interviewees, to a surprising extent, provided information and opinions which were consistent with the data found in newspapers, reports, letters, and other material in the archives.

Their viewpoints today reflect their behaviour and comments as recorded during the time of unrest.

Access to Principal Robertson's diaries, which are officially closed until 2000 A.D., was granted and provided yet another source of data. Due to the restriction placed on access and to the personal nature of the diaries, direct reference to information gained from the diaries is limited. The diaries were reviewed for the most intense period, November 1967-April 1969 and were invaluable in that they revealed the spontaneous reactions of one who was a most central figure at the time. In addition, factual information can be assumed to be accurate as it was recorded while events were taking place. Additional assistance in assessing the events of the time was obtained from selections for the same period from the diaries of Lorne Gales, who was Executive Director of the Graduates' Society. Not only did Mr. Gales work closely with many of the key administrative figures involved but also he had a friendly rapport with a number of informed members of the student body.

The final chapter discusses the results in relation to the questions posed. The analysis and conclusions are based on the changes which have occurred but also reflect the perceptions of those who were involved at the time.

This thesis claims an original contribution to knowledge for several reasons. The topic as outlined in its broadest sense is relatively unexplored. In addition, the lack of evidence to the contrary suggests that this study may be the first detailed analysis of activism at one university from the perspective of student influence on change. Finally, the primary and secondary sources have been combined and studied in an attempt to demonstrate not only that students can be a real force for change in the university but that they have been such a force for as long as universities have existed.

Review of the Literature

Existing secondary sources for the Middle Ages are very limited insofar as specific information relative to the students' role in shaping the university is concerned. The main texts, upon which subsequent authors rely heavily, are concerned primarily with the rise of the university, the chronology of events, the programs of study, and a description of the privileges which members of the university enjoyed. It is by studying the acquisition of privileges that one can begin to form conclusions about the role of students. Otherwise students are mentioned in terms of their life-style. From songs of the period, rather ordinary letters to parents and friends or benefactors, and other records of the era, it is possible to obtain reasonably clear impressions of how students lived. Unfortunately, there are no such records as student diaries which may have exposed more of the thoughts and activities of the students.

The chief general sources for this period, both of which have been based on an extensive study of primary material, are Father Heinrich Denifle's Entstehung (1885) and Hastings Rashdall's The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages (1936), the updated version of the latter having been consulted for this thesis. Subsequent authors have emphasized one or more aspects of medieval universities and may have expanded on one or more features; however, very little with respect to the influence of students has been added. Much of the material is repetitious. The more useful books, in addition to the two mentioned, include those by Helene Wieruszowski, Lynn Thorndike, Dana Carleton Munro, Gabriel Compayré, and Pearl Kibre. These works are essentially descriptive in nature; virtually no attention has been given to analysis. Expressions such as "activism" and "student power" are not to be found.

Only more recently, as a result of the revolt of the sixties have a few scholars looked back to previous periods to see if any such phenomenon had occurred. The most useful such study has been done by A. B. Cobban. In his book, <u>The Medieval Universities: Their Development and Organization</u> (1975), there is a chapter entitled "Medieval Student Power," which had appeared earlier as a journal article. Again, however, this work is short on analysis. There is an awareness of student activism in the Middle Ages in the works of Christopher Driver and Norman Zacour as well as in Joan Williamson's article in Douglas Radcliffe-Unstead's, <u>The University World: A Synoptic View of Higher Education</u> (1973).

As mentioned previously, literature for the period between the sixteenth century and the 1960s is very limited and provides little insight into the relationship between students and the university. On the other hand, there is sufficient evidence that student activism has been an ongoing phenomenon. Alexander DeConde in <u>Student Activism</u> (1971) tries to set the activism of the 1960s in an historical perspective; however, except for accounts of student rebellions in the nineteenth century in Austria, Germany, and the United States, he provides no additional information about activism in the Western world prior to 1900. Lewis Feuer in the <u>Conflict of Generations</u> (1969) offers a little more information about European countries and the United States. Feuer and others such as Seymour Lipset, Philip Altbach, and Calvin Lee have detailed the American experience, noting that the first expressions of student activism date back to the time of the American Revolution. Histories of individual universities, such as <u>The History of the University of Oxford</u> (1984), edited by T. H. Aston, provide evidence of ongoing town and gown disputes. From the perspective of this thesis, one of the most exciting works is <u>The Rise of the Student Estate in</u>

<u>Great Britain</u> (1970), by Eric Ashby and Mary Anderson. The stated theme of their study, which confirms the continuation of activism since the Middle Ages, is the influence of students on universities.

Rather than being limited, the literature for the sixties is overwhelming in its quantity. Studies of causes, events, characteristics of activists and results have been discussed from political, sociological, and psychological perspectives. Some authors, such as Lewis Feuer, Cyril Levitt, Richard Flacks, and Seymour Lipset have tried to establish theoretical bases within which to explain activism. Many studies attempt to better understand the New Left, which was the driving force behind activism in the sixties. Others have been interested in the concept of student movements and their effect on society. Among the more notable authors who have produced significant and comprehensive research about the period in the U.S. are Philip Altbach, Daniel Bell, Richard Flacks, Kenneth Keniston and Seymour Lipset.

As Chapter Two indicates, there is sufficient evidence that changes did take place in the university during the unrest of the sixties. While a number of authors make a claim for student influence, the evidence is not sufficiently conclusive to counter arguments satisfactorily that the changes were inevitable and would have happened in any case. One step towards establishing a definite relationship between student activism and change in the university would be to undertake detailed studies which attempt to understand fully the outcome of activism at particular universities.

A striking characteristic of much of the literature, and especially that which was written in the sixties, is its high degree of subjectivity. A disturbing number of articles and books, such as those by Andrew Greeley, Joseph Conlin, and Klaus Mehnert, are based to a large

extent on opinion and reveal distinct biases. This lack
of empirical support puts into question the validity of
many publications. Several national commissions and
committees have attempted to gather empirical data. An
extensive objective study, and one with a longitudinal
perspective, is documented by Alexander Astin in The Power
of Protest (1975). Larry Kerpelman is one of several
serious researchers who made a plea for objectivity. In
Activists and Nonactivists (1972), he sums up the problem
with much of the literature as follows:

> In a broad sense, one can fairly state that while the
> mass media and political figures in general have
> reacted negatively, or at least skeptically, to the
> left activist movement, social scientists in general
> have embraced it, or at least been sympathetic to it.
>
> In their rush to print or to the spoken word, both
> camps have been long on conjecture and short on solid
> evidence.[8]

Relatively little material has been produced since
the early seventies. Nor has there been any significant
interest in long-term results from the perspective of the
university although some strong opinions have been
expressed by authors such as Allan Bloom (The Closing of
the American Mind, 1987) and David Bercuson and his
co-authors (The Great Brain Robbery: Canada's Universities
on the Road to Ruin, 1984). Within the past couple of
years, a number of individuals who were participants at
the time have published what are primarily nostalgic
descriptions; they fail to provide new insights. The most
useful of the new books is Reunion: A Memoir (1988) by Tom
Hayden. Hayden provides a comprehensive account of the
main events of the era. In addition, he reveals the
thinking and goals of one who was amongst the most
important leaders of student activism in North America.

Insofar as Canada is concerned, the literature is
not plentiful and it lacks the depth of analysis for which
one would hope. Falling into this category, but

nevertheless useful, are Jack Quarter's <u>The Student
Movement of the Sixties</u> (1972) and Tim and Julyan Reid's
<u>Student Power and the Canadian Campus</u> (1969). A sense of
a tradition of activism is found in very few sources; one
recent piece of evidence is revealed in an article by
Keith Walden entitled "Respectable Hooligans: Male Toronto
College Students Celebrate Hallowe'en, 1884-1910." Much
work remains to be done in the archives of Canadian
universities as well as in the archives of newspapers and
professional associations such as the Canadian Association
of University Teachers and the Association of Universities
and Colleges of Canada.

Articles from a leftist magazine of the time,
<u>Canadian Dimension</u>, are useful in that they provide
information with respect to activism in Canada. Also they
reveal the thinking of a number of leading Canadian
activists such as Philip Resnick, James Laxer, and Stanley
Gray. Helpful material can be found in accounts with a
broader intention written by former senior university
administrators such as Claude Bissell, J. A. Corry, and
Robin Ross. Commission reports, most particularly that of
Sir James Duff and Robert O. Berdahl, provide useful
background. More recently, Cyril Levitt, in <u>Children of
Privilege</u> (1984), has provided some insights with respect
to the Canadian situation although his main focus is not
the effect of activism on the university. Myrna Kostash
has written an account, <u>Long Way From Home</u> (1980), which
is heavily nostalgic and dramatic. Its usefulness is
further compromised by factual errors such as the
statement that 15,000 demonstrators chanted outside McGill
gates during the "McGill Français" march.[9]

Two studies of note have appeared with respect to
McGill University. One can be found in Chapter 15 of
<u>McGill University: For the Advancement of Learning</u>, vol.
II, <u>1896-1971</u> (1984), by Stanley B. Frost. The other is

an article entitled "Ten Years After" by Rocke Robertson in <u>The McGill Journal of Education</u> (Winter 1980). A more radical perspective on several of the events can be found in Marlene Dixon's book, <u>Things Which are Done in Secret</u> (1976). As discussed earlier, the study undertaken in this thesis required extensive use of primary sources.

As a final note with respect to the literature, it is necessary to mention one particularly noticeable void in the literature, be it American or Canadian: the lack of attention given to periods of relative calm. This in itself causes limitations to the understanding of student activism, and in particular, of its relationship to change in the university.

CHAPTER ONE

THE TRADITION OF STUDENT ACTIVISM IN THE WESTERN WORLD

The Origin of the University

Universities and student activism arose virtually simultaneously in the Western world. From the very outset, activism, in its broadest sense, was an integral aspect of university life and as such has played an ongoing role in the development of the university. Alexander DeConde says:

> . . . student agitation has a long history. It is as old as the universities. Students, in one way or another, have always been active in the affairs of their universities, their communities, and their nations. They have frequently functioned as barometers of deep seated unrest and social change.[1]

A. B. Cobban is more specific. He says "The ideology of student power had its birth pangs in the legal soil of thirteenth-century Italy."[2]

Universities arose more or less spontaneously during the twelfth century, becoming firmly rooted as definite institutions in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries as the eventual result of teachers and scholars meeting for the sake of learning. Bologna and Paris, with Bologna (1158) predating Paris (1180), are generally considered to be the first universities. Along with Oxford (1186),[3] which was in essence much like Paris, these universities are considered to be archetypal universities upon one or the other of which virtually all universities in the Western world have been modelled. According to Charles Haskins, ". . . the university of the twentieth century is the lineal descendant of medieval Paris and Bologna."[4]

17

And it is with these universities that the tradition of student activism began.

In the Western world, higher education had existed prior to the Middle Ages, notably in the Greek and Roman cultures; however, before the period 1100-1400, it had never been formalized. Learning had evolved gradually to consist of the seven liberal arts. It was during the twelfth century that a combination of interrelated economic, social, and cultural factors created an environment conducive to the establishment of universities.

Although the Middle Ages was a time of much violence, the period was one of relative peace in comparison to the several preceding centuries. New towns were able to grow and trade increased, resulting in improved economic conditions. Both the towns, especially in Italy where cities were practically independent republics, and the trade guilds, which had arisen as a response to the merchants' need for protection, acquired political power. A more literate populace became essential; new knowledge, especially legal information for business documents, was required. Similarly, the large bureaucracies of the Papacy and the Roman Empire needed people who were educated. In addition, the growth of trade prompted interest in and suggested the feasibility of travelling in other lands. While still difficult and dangerous, conditions for travel had improved somewhat due to the relative security resulting from the feudal system. This increase in travel further fostered the expansion of towns which, with the resultant growth in population, generated the need for an improved and better regulated social life. A partial but important response was the establishment of corporations or trade guilds.

The expansion of communication resulting from travel and the attraction of people to cities led to the spread

of new knowledge to Western Europe from Italy, Sicily, and especially from the Arabs through Spain. Predominant in this new learning was the rediscovery of Greek and Roman knowledge, notably the works of Aristotle and Hippocrates as well as the Roman law. In Italy, the development in learning took a predominantly legal emphasis. The prodigious growth of Italian cities and the resulting need for social control caused the revival of Roman law which had never completely disappeared. In France, at Paris in particular, where the church was very influential, there was increased activity in theological studies. This twelfth century renaissance in learning, as it is commonly called, later spread to England, Germany and Spain.

Nor did the new learning exist in a vacuum as in both France and Italy schools were established. In France, a system of schools connected with monasteries and cathedrals had been created by Charlemagne. As the monastic schools gradually closed their doors to lay people, the cathedral schools, which were located advantageously in towns and at trade centres increased in importance. In Italy, church schools existed but they competed with lay schools which taught grammar and rhetoric, with the focus often being the practice of legal skills for the courts and the preparation of official documents. With the expansion of urban life and the increasing importance of this type of education, outstanding teachers attracted attention.

Irnerius (died 1140), who did much to develop and interpret Roman law and Gratian (died about 1160), who did the same for canon law, drew students from all over Europe to Bologna. Even more famous was Abelard (1079-1142) who had a large following in Paris where he influenced education both by what he taught (that reason and not faith should be at the basis of one's theological beliefs) and by how he taught (by introducing the scholastic method

with its stress on independent thinking). He raised so
much controversy that students and teachers flocked to
Paris to hear him. Irnerius, Gratian and Abelard, as well
as others such as St. Anselm and John of Salisbury, caused
meeting places for teachers and students to develop. It
was the willingness of great numbers of students to travel
long distances to learn from famous teachers which laid
the foundation for the establishment of the university.
At this point, the term "university" as known today did
not exist. Students studied in what was called a studium
generale. To qualify for the status of studium generale,
the student body had to come from all areas; the studies
had to be higher studies and had to include at least one
of the faculties of law, medicine, or theology; and the
subjects offered had to be taught by a number of masters
rather than one or a few. Successful completion of the
examinations and other conditions led to the degree, the
jus ubique docendi. This degree, which could be granted
only by a Pope or an Emperor, gave the right to teach
anywhere in the Roman Empire.

Very little is known about the students who were
eager to study with the most learned men of the time.
Many were prosperous although it was not only the wealthy
who were scholars. In the main, however, students were
not from the poorer classes. A great majority were
clerks, receiving financial assistance in the form of
benefices; at Paris and Oxford both students and masters
were clerics.

At Bologna, the students were mature, being in their
mid-twenties or older. Law, the outstanding field of
study, required a prior degree in Arts. Also a number of
the law students were individuals who had held positions
in the city or church. At Paris, where the Faculty of
Arts was predominant, the students were younger with
fourteen being the average age for admission to

university. The masters, who often were scholars in the
higher faculties, would be close in age to the students at
Bologna.

The absence of political boundaries and modern
bureaucratic requirements such as visas and passports made
travel easy in its non-physical aspects. Students could
choose to travel to wherever the desired teacher was
located. An important result is that the universities,
especially in Italy, were founded by foreign students. It
was only in the later Middle Ages, once the university was
firmly established as an institution, that local students
became increasingly the majority. These early students,
being a group apart from the surrounding society,
developed their own communities by organizing themselves
into nations. The nations varied in form to some extent;
for example, at Bologna they included only students
whereas at Paris both students and masters belonged.

All the literature describes the students as an
undisciplined group, despite the repressive rules that
governed them as members of the university. Amongst other
outrages, their vices consisted of insulting the citizens,
stealing, throwing stones and refuse, and assaulting
women. Frequently they were armed with weapons of various
types which were used to attack people or to hunt, often
where they were not supposed to do so. Gambling and
drinking were predominant characteristics. According to
Gabriel Compayré, there was an obvious lack of good
breeding and cleanliness on the part of the students.[5]
Haskins reports the students to be ". . . so litigious and
quarrelsome . . . ."[6]

Yet they were viewed in the main as being devoted to
study. Hastings Rashdall states that ". . . in medieval
times students were more anxious to learn than teachers
were to teach."[7] The pursuit of study soon became a
practical matter for the great majority of students who

were interested in securing employment. As both civic and
court life, as well as the theological world, became more
sophisticated, the demand for educated people increased.
It was the educated person who received a position in law,
medicine, or the church, and education quickly became the
means of entering the established social order. According
to Rashdall, one eventual outcome of the establishment of
the universities in the Middle Ages is that ". . . they
placed the administration of human affairs--in short, the
government of the world--in the hands of educated men."[8]

The Nature of Early Activism

Student activism was focused primarily on factors
external to the nascent university. Those who wished to
study under a particular master had to travel during a
time when it was dangerous to do so; robbery and attacks
upon the person were commonplace. Even after they arrived
in a particular town, survival was still a problem for the
students. The environment was hostile towards foreigners
and they needed some ensurance of security for their
person and their property. Once their protests had
secured some measure of satisfaction in this area, the
students found other causes with which to concern
themselves.

The arrival of large numbers of students in a
particular locale created a ready market which town
merchants were eager to exploit. Only by protesting could
students ensure that they received fair prices for
lodging, books, wine, meals, and other necessary
commodities. Beyond securing their immediate personal
comforts, they agitated to ensure that, if accused, they
received a fair trial and that appropriate punishment was
imposed for any offenses which either they committed or
which were committed against them. Other protests were
directed towards exemption from military service and the
paying of taxes. Ultimately, their complaints targeted

virtually any aspect of town life which could be seen as interfering with their studies. They protested against dirty streets, streets which required repairs, smells from the slaughtering of animals, the burning of tallow, and even against noises such as loud singing on the part of tradesmen. Throughout the Middle Ages, students continued in their attempt to overcome the various environmental factors which inhibited their pursuit of learning.

While the primary concerns of the students were directed towards very specific ends having to do with their living environment, they did direct a number of complaints against the university. When a professor was lax in fulfilling his duties, the students as a group actively endeavoured to resolve the problem. They protested if a professor was absent too frequently or if he became so involved in political or business activities that his teaching suffered. Nor did the students accept poor substitutes when the regular master was away. They rebelled against lecturing that was inadequate either in quantity or quality; they protested when it was too fast or too slow.

The students employed various tactics to achieve their ends. As their number grew in a particular city, they soon realized that they would have more power and be better able to protect themselves if they formed guilds. It was the Bolognese students who set the example. Being neither citizens, nor clerks protected by canon law, they were defenseless under the law of the city. The formation of guilds, known then as universitas, gave the students the same right to act as a group and to establish laws and officers for the corporation, as had all other guilds. At Paris, there was a guild of masters; however, the students formed nations which gave them a device for organized control. Both masters and students were members of the nations. At Bologna, the universitas was subdivided into

nations presided over by a rector. The various universitas controlled their membership; citizens could study at a studium but could not join the universitas.

Once they were organized into guilds, the students were able to employ effectively another device, the oath. Members of the universitas swore an oath to uphold the privileges of the guild and to honour the regulations as imposed by the rector. In some places, Bologna, for example, the rector was actually one of the students. The swearing of an oath was a serious matter as perjury was a mortal sin; disobedience was severely punished both with public humiliation and with spiritual penalties. As the students increased in power and effectiveness, they demanded oaths of the citizens. For example, city officials took an oath to protect the students; booksellers took an oath to observe regulations with respect to the sale and cost of books; even tavern owners took an oath to brew good beer.

The most effective form of group action was migration and it was a weapon which was used frequently, even when students were in the wrong. At this time, the university did not have its own buildings or other fixed assets. In addition, the masters had the right to teach anywhere as conferred by the jus ubique docendi. Thus, both students and masters could easily pack up their few belongings and leave a city overnight. At Oxford in 1209, several scholars were executed as the result of an incident in which one scholar reportedly killed a woman accidentally. Students and masters left Oxford and the founding of Cambridge was one result of this dispersion. Both popes and emperors wanted the cultural and political prestige of having a large number of scholars in their domain as well as the services these learned people could provide. In fact, a monarch in one kingdom would take advantage of discontent elsewhere as when Henry III

capitalized on the cessation at Paris in 1229. His invitation read in part as follows:

> . . . Humbly sympathizing with the exceeding tribulations and distresses which you have suffered at Paris under an unjust law, we wish by our pious aid, with reverence to God and His holy church, to restore your status to its proper condition of liberty. Wheretofore we have concluded to make known to your entire body that if it shall be your pleasure to transfer yourselves to our kingdom of England and to remain there to study we will for this purpose assign to you cities, boroughs, towns, whatsoever you may wish to select, and in every fitting way will cause you to rejoice in a state of liberty and tranquillity which should please God and fully meet your needs.[9]

This particular recruitment contributed to the growth and establishment of Oxford. While the municipalities loathed the privileged position of the students, they were more concerned with the considerable business stimulated by large numbers of students. Thus, both rulers and local authorities would usually bend in the students' favour when faced with either an actual or threatened migration.

Boycotts were another popular device. If a particular landlord or tradesman charged too much or sold unsatisfactory goods, the students boycotted his establishment. The boycott could be as long as five years and was enforced by means of the oath taken by students to uphold the university. Another means was to provoke a riot, frequently over the quality or price of wine or over a perceived or real assault on a student. The violence, often resulting in the death of a student or citizen, gave the students an opportunity either to express new demands or to reinforce acquired privileges. Nathan Schachner states:

> Indeed, by the frequency of riots one may trace the rise of the University to power and privilege. The more frequent the rioting, the greater the bloodshed, the more powerful the University when it emerged from the struggle.[10]

Those accused of an injustice against a student frequently had their rents fixed or prices dictated for a specific period of time.

Essentially the same methods were used to address concerns internal to the university. In the early days of the university, professors were dependent upon student fees for their livelihood, a situation which guaranteed a certain amount of student power. With the strength gained by their increased numbers, the academic idyll of students flocking to catch the pearls of wisdom from the masters soon disappeared. If a professor failed to measure up he would be boycotted. And one of the many oaths required students to report on any professor who was remiss in his duties. For lesser infractions, fines were imposed. The master was frequently required to deposit a sum with the <u>universitas</u> at the beginning of the year in anticipation of the fines which he would incur by, for example, being late for class. In more serious instances, the professor's salary was simply withheld by the students.

The tactics employed by the students were successful as they soon came to have the support of the kings and popes. The guilds provided an effective organizational mechanism for their protests; the oaths enabled the privileges or gains made to be enforced. While the various methods were taken to their greatest extreme at Bologna, the same tactics were employed at Paris, Oxford, and other places with much success until the end of the fourteenth century.

The Results of Early Activism

While the notion of scholarly privilege was not new and, in fact, dated back as far as the first century, the privileges gained by students in the Middle Ages were unprecedented. The students of the Middle Ages enjoyed genuine power.

As early as 1158, Emperor Frederick I, fearing a
migration, yielded to their demands. His most important
concession was the exemption of lay students from trial in
civil courts. His support was clearly shown when he
declared:

> For we think it proper, in order that they may be in
> their good works by our fame and protection, to defend
> from all harm, by definite special favor, those by
> whose knowledge the world is illumined unto obedience
> to God and to us his servants, and the lives of our
> subjects are molded.[11]

In the year 1200, Philip Augustus, King of France,
distressed by a migration which had dealt a severe blow to
the economy of Paris, gave his support to the students by
granting a number of privileges, including giving all lay
students the right to a trial in a church court. In 1229,
the loss of trade and prestige caused by a migration
motivated Pope Gregory to extend their privileges,
including removing virtually all the real power of the
chancellor. This was a significant development as the
chancellor, who was formerly the head of the cathedral
school in Paris, had been a powerful representative of the
Church in the affairs of the university. Removal of his
power gave the university much greater control over its
own affairs, especially the right to grant degrees.
Philip went so far as to grant the university the legal
right to suspend lectures if complaints were not readily
addressed. Earlier, Bologna students had received the
same privilege from Pope Honorius. At Oxford, as a result
of a town and gown riot on St. Scholastica Day in 1355,
the King of England ultimately granted the university
jurisdiction over the city and the tradesmen.

The privileges granted by these and a succession of
other papal and imperial responses to the tactics employed
by the students were many. Not only were the students
freed from trial in lay courts but also they could choose
either their professor or bishop as judge when tried in

the ecclesiastical court. Papal authority allowed beneficed clerks, who formed a majority of the students in many places, to keep their benefices while studying. Students were exempted from military service and other civic duties, the payment of taxes and travellers' tolls. Rents were controlled as landlords were required to charge rates which met with the student guild's approval; frequently the rates were fixed for as long as five years by city authorities anxious to keep the students. Furthermore, the availability and quality of housing were often guaranteed, with the students, in some cases, having the right to commandeer housing. Prices were also fixed for books and other commodities. These measures were backed up by the oaths which the landlords and merchants were required to take to uphold the prices and conditions set.

Scholars were guaranteed protection while travelling to and from the place of study and against theft and destruction of their property while living in the university towns. Although it is doubtful how well they were enforced, laws were passed to protect them even from bad odours and disturbing noises. A decree for the University of Padua more or less sums up the position enjoyed by students at this time: "Scholars shall be regarded as citizens with regard to matters advantageous, but not with regard to matters disadvantageous to them."[12]

The students had considerable power over the affairs of the studium. As pointed out earlier, the teachers, who were chosen by the students, were under their control financially. While student power was greatest at Bologna, teachers at Paris and Oxford were also sensitive to the threat of boycott or migration. Even where student-universities per se did not exist, it was accepted that students participated in university government. At the outset of each term, the conditions to be met in the

lectures were set down. The students ensured that the
agreed upon number of lectures, with the predetermined
content, were presented and that the professor was on time
for the lectures, which also had to end on time. The
quality of teaching was controlled to some extent by the
students as they penalized the professor if his lectures
were insufficiently interesting to attract a certain
minimum number of students. In effect, they influenced
the content, methods and duration of lectures.

On the surface, the privileges acquired by the
students appear to be related to immediate and practical
needs required to survive in the society in which they
resided. However, it is shortsighted to regard the
student protests simply as a reaction to the social and
economic conditions of the era. Time has shown that the
results of activism in the Middle Ages have been lasting
and of general significance in the Western world.

It can be easily argued that student activism played
a major role in the establishment of the university as an
institution in western society. The formation of a
student guild, with its subgroups of nations, at Bologna
gave the scholars a recognized organizational status which
enabled them to act as a corporate body. This example was
copied in one form or another elsewhere. The privileges
which group action brought about ensured that the
fledgling university had sufficient independence to govern
itself. The comparative security created by the
privileges granted attracted other students to the
studium, thereby reinforcing its status and gradually
allowing it to establish roots. Lowrie Daly says.

> The privileges obtained as a result of some of these
> petty struggles established the various centers of
> learning on a solid and independent basis at a time in
> history when, unless they had secured this
> independence, they might well have disappeared.[13]

In addition, the migrations were effective not only in
bringing about the desired results in a particular locale
but frequently led to either the founding or the expansion
of many other universities in England and Western Europe.

The very name, university, results from the forming
of guilds (known as universitas, as they were) at Bologna
and Paris. A universitas was originally a corporation of
any sort which was capable of communal action; the word
was never used on its own. Eventually, due to the example
set by Bologna and Paris, universitas of one or the other
variety became an inseparable component of the studium
generale. In the fifteenth century, the distinction
between the two terms disappeared and the word universitas
became synonymous with studium generale.

A study of the situation in the Middle Ages suggests
not only that students were important in the establishment
of the university but also that they have been responsible
for the appearance of its main characteristics. One could
consider the students' role as instrumental in the growth
of academic freedom, a concept now considered fundamental
to the university. At Bologna, the student guilds
prevented the masters from allowing the city to take over
control of the university. At Paris, the students'
protests led to the removal of church control of the
universities throughout France. Joan Williamson says:

> . . . where authorities imposed repressive control
> scholarship did not flourish. Therefore it becomes
> clear that a certain measure of freedom was necessary
> for vigorous university development and achievement.[14]

Other enduring features include the attraction of
students to universities with famous teachers and fields
of study in which they are reputed to be outstanding.
Related to this was the institution of the idea that the
university was the place to train for the professions;
that undergraduate and graduate studies be included along
with professional faculties; and that a set curriculum

with requirements leading to a degree be laid out. The idea that a university should have an international student body and teaching staff remains. Privileges such as price reductions are still extended to students by local entrepreneurs. Governments provide financial assistance for students, thereby confirming the tradition that the creation of an educated populace remains an interest of the state. And the university was and remains one means of social advancement in the perception of the students. Above all, students in the Middle Ages established the tradition of student activism which has become an integral part of the university.

To the extent that these characteristics were and are still essential aspects of the university, one can conclude that the students' role in the establishment and early development of the university has been both significant and permanent.

The Continuing Tradition of Activism

During the fifteenth century, the seat of power in higher education in Western Europe shifted. Students had succeeded in wresting control over education from the church and they either controlled the affairs of the studium, as in Bologna, or had a major role to play in the life of their university. This power was in very large measure due to the right of cessation and to the fact that the number of foreign students in a town was sufficient to form a cohesive guild from which to organize protest.

Townsmen remained interested in securing the prestige attached to belonging to a "university town" and the boost given to the economy by the influx of scholars and masters. They soon realized that a guaranteed wage would induce teachers to stay rather than to move on and continue to be at the mercy of the fee-paying students. At Bologna, in 1315, the commune decided to pay the

salaries of a certain number of professors. This was the first step in a process which led to the removal of power from the students. Gradually the town assumed responsibility for the salaries of the teachers; this resulted in the eventual loss by students of the right to select their teachers. Concomitantly, the teachers gained power thereby diminishing the role of the students in determining the curriculum and teaching conditions.

Subsequently the prestige of the universities prompted donations of land, buildings, books, and financial aid for students in order to encourage their stability. With the acquisition of property, the ability of students to migrate when aggrieved was rendered impractical. They thereby lost much of their independence and hence their influence over the university was reduced.

As the towns gradually acquired some control over the university, they began to renege on honouring many of the students' privileges. These privileges were bitterly resented. Reneging became easier as the excessive behaviour of the students when they fought for privileges was becoming a persistent issue by the middle of the fifteenth century. At the same time, civilian life throughout the Empire was being taken over increasingly by monarchs. This further weakened the students' position as appeals to the Pope for help no longer received the same measure of support. On the whole, monarchs were kindly disposed towards the universities; however, when the universities, with their no longer peripatetic staff, began involving themselves in the politics of the day, kings frequently were displeased. For example, when Oxford supported Wyclif, the King forced the University to expel him. In France, King Louis XI felt that members of the University were on the side of his enemies and he forbade the University to express political opinions. Gradually kings began to suppress the universities'

influence in the life of the kingdom by curtailing their privileges. In France, for example, the King began to limit the people to whom privileges might apply; soon he limited the number of years a person could pursue a degree program and be entitled to privileges. By 1499, he had ruled that cessation could no longer be exercised. By the end of the fifteenth century, throughout Western Europe, students had lost most of the privileges which had set them apart from the rest of the population.

A further factor contributing to the loss of student power was the establishment of universities by popes, kings, and even towns. A university established by decree began with external controls which did not exist when a university arose spontaneously. Cobban estimates that by 1500 there were about seventy universities. This increase in universities made it unnecessary for many students to travel to study and, in fact, some towns ruled that students had to remain at the local university. The resultant reduction in the number of foreign students in a university town and the accompanying increase in the percentage of local citizens attending the university curtailed the power of the "nations" as a lobby group.

Thus, by the end of the Middle Ages, power had shifted from the students to the state and towns. Never again have students enjoyed such a degree of control over either their university or their environment.

Student activism, however, did not die in the sixteenth century only to suddenly revive in the 1960s. While the literature is very sparse with respect to the influence of students upon the university in the intervening period, it does provide sufficient evidence that student activism has been continuous between the Middle Ages and the next major outbreak in the 1960s. In the long interval, student activism has not been as dramatic; there have been periods of apparent inactivity

and activism has been regional or situational rather than universal in character.

Students were an important factor in educational changes which took place at Oxford and Cambridge during the latter half of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The aristocracy had accepted with enthusiasm the new humanism, which included the notion that learning cultivated gentlemen. With the increased influence of the monarch, new positions were created and a university education became the route to increased employment opportunities in government. Simultaneously, the universities were losing their close ties with the church. The combination of these factors prompted large numbers from the aristocracy to go to university. Not only did the social make-up of the university change but also the process of education was altered. It was the students from the privileged class who demanded a more liberal education so that they might be educated in subjects useful for the world of affairs. They also wanted to study things which interested them. According to Mark Curtis, these students, with their curiosity about matters related to the world in which they lived:

> . . . even more than university divines, enlivened university interest in such matters and their imminent participation in public events both great and small linked the universities more closely than ever to the world about them.[15]

They influenced the university further by their persistent demands for a curriculum which reflected their interests. The university met these demands by setting up extra-statutory studies which went beyond the usual arts curriculum, thus challenging the established academic focus. The tutorial method of instruction evolved during this period.

The continued influence of students in the development of the university in Great Britain during the

nineteenth century is outlined by Eric Ashby and Mary Anderson in <u>The Rise of the Student Estate in Great Britain</u>. For example, students in Scotland were particularly involved in the life of their universities. In 1823, they began protesting to reinstate their right to elect the rector; by 1825 they had succeeded. Other examples of their influence at that time included agitation resulting in the removal of an incompetent professor. Students were accepted members of university committees and had a voice in issues concerning the curriculum and examinations. An 1876 commission studying the Scottish universities sought student opinion and acted upon it. By the late nineteenth century, the Scottish influence had spread to England where students had been less involved in affairs of the university. Gradually the English students developed organizations through which they presented their demands.

The primary focus of student activism changed as time went on. While battles for change in the university continued to be fought, sometimes in a desultory fashion, at other times with vigour, the issues became increasingly more political and centred in the world outside the university. Yet the university was frequently affected nevertheless. In Germany, students who had joined in the triumphant fight to oust Napoleon were inspired by their victory to form a student association to bring about a unified German nation. Demonstrations reminiscent of those in the Middle Ages, complete with a murder committed by a student, took place. The disquieting violence and potential power of the students resulted in increased control of the university by the state which suppressed freedom by various means, including posting officials to sit in on lectures.

Gradually the repression of academic freedom led to renewed student protests throughout Germany. Not only

were there clashes in the public domain but also the students agitated for reform in the university. Their demands included a national educational authority, freedom to attend any university, greater government support for education, open admissions, abolition of exams, new subjects in the curriculum, representation on governing committees, and participation in the choosing of rectors. The demonstrations were frequent; the behaviour often violent. By 1848, the students were a very disruptive force in society. They managed to control the whole city of Vienna for some months as their violent demonstrations intimidated the government. Citizens supported the students by providing food and drink. In Munich, the King ordered the University closed but was forced to rescind his order as landlords protested that the removal of students meant the end of their livelihood. The tradition of privilege and unruly behaviour was alive and well. The ultimate effect on the university was mixed. Priscilla Robertson in Student Activism states "Academic freedom did prosper mightily to be sure, but at the same time state control became more subtle."[16]

While the outbursts were sporadic and while their influence on the university, at least from a long-term perspective, is not clear, activism continued throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century in Great Britain, Spain, France and Germany. In North America, student activism took root very early in the establishment of universities. According to Seymour Lipset, "The first record of American students as a protest group may be found in the annals of the American Revolution."[17] He further states that for a half century after the Revolution students directed strong protests against the universities, in particular against the exam system and tyranny of the administration. From the late eighteenth century through the nineteenth and particularly

in the last couple of decades of the latter century, there was a series of outbursts. Students went on strike, demonstrated, occupied college buildings and rioted to protest issues including poor food, the examination system, curriculum content, participation in decision-making, the calling of police on campus, and above all, the power of the administration. Much of the confrontation was resistance to the religious views and strict discipline which colleges tried to impose. Harry Bowes, as quoted in Lipset, suggests that this resistance reflected "the growing liberalism of the age, a liberalism which was impatient with puritanical restraint and in some cases with religion itself."[18] He further indicates that the struggles resulted in "a deterioration of creativity, good scholarship, and inspirational teaching."[19] In the late nineteenth century, students managed to cause the dismissal of the president at a number of universities and they sometimes played a role in the selection of the president.

In the early twentieth century, students in the U.S. fought for free speech and opposed war activities. In the 1920s, there was renewed interest in university issues as the students protested the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) being on campus, the expulsion of radical students, the censoring of newspapers, the size of the university, the inaccessibility of professors, and outdated curricula. In the 1930s, a decade which Philip Altbach claims "was the period of most intense activism prior to the sixties,"[20] the first mass student movement appeared in the U.S. As in Europe earlier, the issues became increasingly external to the university. World War II saw a lull in obvious activism and a period of calm on campuses until the late 1960s.

Thus, by the twentieth century, student activism had a long history throughout the Western world. While

academic affairs were less frequently the motivation for protest and issues external to the university became more popular, there remained a concern with academic reform from time to time. It should be appreciated that even when students were pursuing non-academic issues, they were inevitably shaping the political and intellectual climate of the universities. Furthermore, involvement with outside situations inevitably led to activities which had an effect on the university. This was most clearly illustrated in the 1960s, particularly in North America.

CHAPTER TWO

STUDENT ACTIVISM IN THE SIXTIES

Background Factors

While student activism continued to be an ongoing
feature of university life during the following centuries,
it was not until the 1960s that there occurred another
period of widespread activity to match that of the Middle
Ages. Rebellion was of a global nature in the sixties;
however, activity in the major affluent, democratic
countries of the Western world was inspired by events in
the U.S.

This period of unrest in the Western world was
surprising for several reasons. It was widespread and
relatively well-organized compared to the more spontaneous
outbursts of the past. Most remarkable was the fact that
the issues and tactics in each country were more similar
than different. The disturbance developed on such a large
scale that there were observers who thought the university
as an institution would either crumble or, at the very
least, be altered beyond recognition. The most unsettling
aspect was that the rebellion was completely unexpected,
particularly in the U.S. According to Richard Flacks:

> . . . not a single observer of the campus scene as
> late as 1959 anticipated the emergence of the
> organized disaffection, protest and activism which was
> to take shape early in the Sixties.[1]

In 1959, as reported by Charles Morris, Clark Kerr,
President of the University of California, said:
"Employers will love this generation . . . . They are
going to be easy to handle. There aren't going to be any
riots."[2] Yet it was at the University of California,

Berkeley in 1964 that the activism of the sixties began
and subsequently spread to the major countries in the
Western world, in particular tc France, West Germany,
Italy, Britain and Canada, the latter being the country
most directly affected by the U.S.initiative. It is
necessary to be familiar with the situation in the U.S.
before attempting to understand unrest in the Canadian
setting. Rocke Robertson, Principal of McGill University
during the period under discussion said "In general,
students in Canada could only echo the cries of their
colleagues in the United States."[3]

The years 1964-72 are generally accepted as the
time-frame for the period known as the "unrest of the
sixties," with 1968-69 being the year in which unrest
reached its peak in intensity and frequency. Just prior
to this period, the U.S., along with the rest of the
Western world, was undergoing rapid economic and social
change. An economic boom following World War II had
allowed for accelerated industrialization and,
increasingly, technological expansion. World trade grew
at an unprecedented rate.

Concomitant with the economic expansion was a sudden
growth in population, resulting in part from European
immigration during and after World War II but more
importantly from the so-called "baby boom" which took
place in the twenty years after the War. The combination
of increased wealth and population caused an expansion of
the middle class, in particular the upper half of that
group. The newly affluent moved to suburban areas which
grew rapidly around major urban centres.

Coupled with expanded productivity was an increase
in research activities, the combination of which led to an
explosion of new knowledge especially in science and
technology. The U.S. had been jolted with the USSR's
Sputnik success in 1957 and this had led to a sense of

urgency to better educate and train its population. Increased productivity created a significant growth in the number of professional, managerial, and other high status positions which required an educated populace.

The ultimate outcome of these factors was a greater demand for university education which came to be seen as the key to success and upward mobility. Existing universities rushed to expand and new colleges and universities were built. At the same time, over the years of prosperity many universities had assumed a variety of new roles, in recognition of which the term "multiversity" had been coined. The traditional idea of the university as a community of scholars was significantly altered as the universities had tried to respond to a greater number of diverse and often conflicting demands and interests. No longer was the university composed simply of faculty units. Departments were growing both in number and power; in addition, there was the emergence of many institutes and centres which followed their own pursuits. Faculty members themselves had assumed new roles as outside employment was combined with university teaching. Coupled with these changes, the push for mass education was enabling larger numbers of individuals of various ethnic and social backgrounds to enter the university; higher education was no longer reserved for the elite.

Cultural change, provoked largely by the unprecedented increase in the sheer numbers of young people, was accompanying the changes on other fronts. (". . . the 'number' of people aged eighteen to twenty-four increased from 16.5 million in 1960 to 24.7 million in 1970, and 'that' was a 50 percent increase.")[4] A youth culture with very different music, both the sound and lyrics of which encouraged a spirit of revolt, preferred literature, dress and hair style, sexual attitudes, and belief system had been developing. It all

came to a head in 1964 both actually with the Berkeley riots and perhaps symbolically with the excitement of the Beatles' arrival in North America. Combined with all this was the exposure of students to existentialism which had spread from Europe to North America and, in particular, to the intellectuals in the universities. This philosophy, or "mood" as it has been called, not only focused on the ideas of human loneliness, God is dead, and the meaninglessness of life, but also included convictions about the purposefulness of violence. Existentialism appealed to a number of young people as it complemented the increasingly popular perception that efficiency in the form of science and technology was more important than ideals and humanism. This perception was reinforced by critically acclaimed works such as B. F. Skinner's <u>Beyond Freedom and Dignity</u>.

While there had been no major political issues to cause agitation, the civil rights movement had come to the fore during the years 1960-64. College students from both the northern and southern U.S. had become involved and thereby had been exposed to the issues of injustice and inequality as well as to the tactics of an activist movement.

In 1960, when John Kennedy was elected, the young were inspired and felt ennobled by much of what he had to say. Few of the era are unfamiliar with the inaugural words "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." All North America felt that an invigorating period of change and fulfilment of the American Dream had arrived. When he was assassinated in November 1963, the dreams and hopes were shattered. According to Calvin Lee:

> And symbolically, if not historically, that ended the dream and the belief in the words "We Shall Overcome". The anguish of Kennedy's death brought with it the end of an age of innocence, the belief that there is a good and a bad and that the good conquers in the end,

the belief that the good conquers if one works hard
enough.[5]

Against this background of change in all spheres of
life, came in 1964, the Berkeley student revolt. Known as
the Free Speech Movement, it was the first massive student
revolution in America and it shocked the university world.
This drama is seen as the match which lit the fire that
spread first throughout North America and then around the
world.

Characteristics of Student Activists

Any attempt to understand the issues which caused
the rebellion and which provoked the eventual results
requires an awareness of who were the active students.
While empirical studies are either lacking or inadequate
for various aspects of the unrest, a sufficient number,
with findings that are highly consistent despite different
methodologies and settings, have given an indication of
the characteristics of activist students. In particular,
studies by Kenneth Keniston, Richard Flacks, David Westby,
Larry Kerpelman, and Alexander Astin have been
well-recognized. Astin headed a major national study on
behalf of the American Council on Education. His research
is based on a large amount of empirical data gathered
during the period 1966-71. The results supported those of
earlier studies and helped to explain what might have
appeared to be contradictory studies by Rice and Redding,
and Kerpelman.

The activist students must be viewed within the
context of the economic, demographic, social, and cultural
background of the time. It must be explained that the
student activists are to be distinguished from those who
have been labelled variously as alienated, uncommitted,
hippies, dissenters or as members of the counterculture.
The youth movement, of which the activists were definitely

a part, did spawn a group which chose to withdraw rather
than to be involved and to which the combination of
characteristics described here would not apply. At times
members of this group, with which the student activists
did share some values, added their presence to protests,
thus helping to increase their effect.

While a number of characteristics have been
identified, certain major ones have been observed
repeatedly in studies and it is those which will be
mentioned. All studies have indicated that it was a
minority of students who was involved. In Spring 1968,
both a Harris poll and a Gallup poll in the U.S. showed
that only approximately 20% of the student population had
been involved in any political activities whatsoever.
Another Harris poll in 1968 showed that radical activists
constituted between 1-2% of the student population.[6]
Peterson's surveys in 1964-65 and 1967-68 agreed with the
Harris figures.[7] However, it should be remembered that
the total student population had increased significantly.
Although the percentage of involved students was not high,
the "critical mass" of the activist student was sufficient
to mobilize ever larger numbers and to control an
institution.   This was shown dramatically at Berkeley,
Columbia, and Cornell. Frequently, from within the group,
charismatic leaders such as Mario Savio, Mark Rudd, and
Tom Hayden, arose to inspire a following.

All analyses of this minority group have shown they
were predominantly children of upper-middle class parents
who were educated professionals living in urban areas.
Influenced by Freudian theories and Dr. Spock, these
parents had brought their children up in a permissive and
liberal manner encouraging self-expression. Many
researchers theorize that these parents, coming from the
more restrictive economic and social background of the
1940s and early 1950s, created a world full of promise for

their young by allowing their children greater freedom and more material goods than they had enjoyed. Other researchers, such as Altbach, suggest that the parents of activists were those who had been involved in the politicizing student movements of the thirties.[8] Some support is found for this view as Keniston[9] and others reported that a disproportionate number of student activists held political views similar to those of their parents.

A majority of the activist students were Jewish; the non-Jewish portion was either irreligious or had been raised in one of the more liberal religious traditions. The non-activist students and their parents, when surveyed, ranked marriage, career, and religion as important. Activists and their parents ranked these factors below the "world of ideas, art and music" and "work for national and international betterment."[10] Also career aspirations differed. Non-activists were decided upon careers in engineering, business, and other professions whereas activist students were less decided or tended towards teaching, the arts, or social work.

Academically, the activists were deemed superior as measured by grade point averages. The majority attended the larger and more selective, elite universities. An overwhelming majority was enrolled in humanities and social science programs. Evidence was found that they dropped out less frequently than other students, more often finished their degrees in the prescribed four years, and went on to graduate school in greater numbers. Some observers believe that activist students were enrolled in disciplines such as sociology and political science due to a concern for balance in a science and technologically-oriented society. A perceived lack of balance has been given as one of the factors contributing to this period of revolt.

Kerpelman and others have tried to show that some of the characteristics depicted with respect to intelligence and personality applied to both non-activists and activists of various persuasions and not just to the radical or New Left activist. Astin and Flacks and Mankoff have pointed out that the differences between both the various groups of students and the types of institutions afflicted by unrest narrowed later in the movement. This resulted from the larger number of students who became involved in protest as the movement subsequently spread to become nation-wide. Nevertheless, it must be realized that the research has focused almost entirely on activists with a leftist ideology and should be accepted with some caution.

The most outstanding characteristic of the activist student and one which has played a major role in the contradictory opinions with respect to the results of the unrest was the lack of a real objective. Interviews with students showed that they were dissatisfied with society and the university but that they had no ideas as to how reform might be achieved. Even though the activists verbally indicated that they were influenced by people such as Mao, Castro, Guevara, Marcuse, and Marx, no real understanding of these philosophies in terms of action was visible. J. A. Califano and others would argue that this situation was related to their permissive upbringing with its lack of religious, patriotic, or other fundamental guiding principles. Knott and Horn, on the other hand, stated: "As concerns motives it would appear that activists are genuinely concerned and altruistic."[11] While they recognized the lack of constructiveness on the part of students, they would not go so far as to support those who saw the only obvious objective of the students as being destruction.

As will be seen, the characteristics of the activist students were intimately connected with the causes of the revolt and, therefore, ultimately to the results as they affected the university.

The Causes of Activism in the Sixties

Campus unrest stemmed from a number of factors which have been documented in numerous empirical studies, most notably the President's Commission on Unrest, American Council on Education (ACE) research, and Peterson's work at the Educational Testing Service. Initially, the issues were external to the university; subsequently, they became internal to the university.

As mentioned previously, students had become involved with the civil rights movement and had been sensitized to the problems of oppression as well as to activist tactics. In 1964, the administration at Berkeley decided to oust students who were recruiting civil rights supporters on university property. The university argued that it was inappropriate to use the facilities for causes not related to the university's usual affairs. The students viewed the administration's behaviour both as oppressive in terms of freedom of expression and as unsympathetic to the civil rights issue. They staged a series of sit-ins in retaliation. When the news of the Berkeley revolt, along with the sensational arrest of over 800 students, spread throughout the country, racism in the larger society became a campus issue. As well, an old chestnut in American student activism, "free speech," was revived.

The Vietnam War, supported by the American public at the outset, by 1967 had come to be viewed as immoral. Watching villagers being killed with napalm on television along with the publication of other atrocities increased indignation. Added to this was the sorrow and anger

caused as news of the loss of sons and friends began to arrive. Tied in with the war was the issue of the draft which was seen as an interference in private lives in that it was compulsory, on the one hand, and, on the other, in that it kept young men's lives in limbo during the years 18-24. The protest became more vociferous in the late 1960s when college students were no longer exempt from the draft and the realities of the war thus became clearer.

While racism and the war were the two major societal issues upon which the students focused, there were others. Throughout the period of unrest, there was protest against big business. Especially criticized were those with war-related activities or with business in countries which tolerated racism, notably South Africa. Related to this issue was the concern for a society which was stressing the inhuman values of science and technology. Environmental pollution was an ongoing concern, one which had been stimulated by worry over nuclear testing during the intense Cold War period of the late 1950s and early 1960s.

Apart from the particular issues which were of concern, there were two other factors which must be recognized. A number of small, leftist groups were either re-surfacing or developing in American student society. The Student Peace Union (SPU), which was of significant size, had been very active during the period of the Cold War. It became instrumental in founding Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). This expanded to become a national organization and an important force on campus in the development of the so-called New Left. Branches of the society were established on university campuses and SDS leaders encouraged students to protest issues of racism and war and to demand freedom of expression. The SDS promoted:

> . . . . the idea that educated people constituted a kind
> of 'new working class' in a technological society and
> thus, in part, students had a role in furthering
> social change. This SDS emphasis gave student
> activists a greater feeling of self-confidence and the
> idea that they were part of a historical movement.[12]

Of a very different nature, and a political reality, was
the counter-culture which helped the atmosphere of protest
on campus with its anti-establishment views and general
sympathy for the views of the New Left. The stimulation
provided by the New Left was a major influence in
promoting rebellion and in directing protest against the
university.

Despite the concrete and serious nature of the
issues outlined, many observers of social phenomena felt
that these controversies were not sufficient explanation
for all the turmoil. The real issue was believed to be a
contradiction in the social order. Affluence, of a level
hithertofore unknown, had not solved the serious human
problems such as poverty, racism, and the threat of
nuclear war. Moreover, the social order appeared to leave
little room for individualism. Students seemed to feel
that their lives were being determined by forces beyond
their control. They demanded "participatory democracy"
both for society and, eventually, for the university.
According to Nathan Glazer, Berkeley was the first
rebellion by students to consider:

> . . . what is still wrong in a liberal, democratic and
> permissive society, and by what tactics and strategy
> revolutionaries can bring larger and larger numbers to
> agree with them that a great deal is wrong.[13]

As students began to see the university as a
cooperative partner in the "system," they brought the
larger societal issues to the campus. By 1968, the peak
protest year, campus issues had become the primary focus
of activity despite the fact that, according to several
surveys, the majority of students were satisfied with
their education.

Concern with racism had expanded to an awareness of the problems of minority groups in general. The university was urged to create special programs for the disadvantaged and to make admissions more democratic so that members of minority groups would not be excluded. In addition to services to aid their adaptation to university life, "relevant" courses of study such as black studies and later women's studies were requested. Furthermore, demands were made that the university remove its funds and other involvement from companies which were seen as supportive of racism.

Beyond the concern for the war in general, arose a number of university-related complaints. Despite their preferred status, students protested the draft laws, especially when the government asked universities to release student grades to assist them in deciding who should receive a deferment. They demanded that the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and credit for courses in that program be eliminated. The university was accused of further cooperating with the "military-industrial complex" by allowing military recruiters on campus. Recruiters from defense-related organizations such as DOW Chemical and the CIA came under similar attack.

Students gradually came to see the university as cooperating with big business and the development of science and technology at the expense of more human values and needs. Professors were viewed as being more concerned with research and entrepreneurial activities off-campus than with teaching and advising students. Demands for a greater focus on teaching were made along with demands for student evaluations of professors. To correct the perceived imbalance in values, protests were staged for relevant courses, fewer required courses and a broader choice of electives. The students claimed that the emphasis on professionalism was not preparing them for a

world with poverty, racism, and war. Class size had become a problem as the universities had responded to the demand for mass education, thus reinforcing the sense of impersonality and creating frustration with respect to course selection as the availability of existing courses became limited. More effective teaching methods allowing for greater expression and creativity were also called for. The grading system was regarded as a mechanism of social control and as setting limits on the free expression of ideas. Admissions requirements came under the same sort of attack as the heightened competition for places, particularly in the more prestigious schools, increased the need for good grades and high Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores. Grades were seen as forcing students to cooperate with the maintenance of "capitalistic" competitiveness.

Students had long resented the university's role of in loco parentis. Being larger in number and from more permissive backgrounds than previous generations, the students of the 1960s were less tolerant of the rules than their predecessors. They demanded that they be permitted to choose whether to live on or off campus, that they be responsible for dorm rules, that they determine regulations with respect to acceptable behaviour. Along with the demand for control of their life-style went the demand for freedom of speech. University censorship of student papers or exclusion of controversial speakers from the campus were no longer to be tolerated.

The demand for participatory democracy in society, when adapted to university concerns, was translated into power for students. Not only did they want control of their personal lives and social and extra-curricular activities but also they demanded participation, including voting rights, on committees concerned with the running of the university. They wanted a voice in determining course

content, degree requirements, hiring of professors, tenure
decisions, and other matters traditionally the preserve of
faculty and administration. Gradually student power
issues became predominant. Edward Sampson reports that a
1966 survey by Peterson showed ". . . less than 20% of
student activism occurs over this matter of student
participation in decision making."[14] By Spring 1969, a
Gallup poll showed that 42% of students were saying that
their biggest complaint was "not enough say in running the
college."[15] Alan Bayer and Alexander Astin have shown
that in 1968-69, "three-fourths of the colleges that had
either violent or non-violent disruptive protests during
the year also had protest on this issue."[16]

While racism, war and student power were the key
issues around which demonstrations and other forms of
protest were based, large elite universities at which the
rebellion began and at which the major protests occurred
had developed several conditions supportive of protest.
As they expanded, a greater number of teaching assistants
and young faculty had been hired. These people, according
to virtually all researchers, played a key role. Keniston
says "And in general, the most effective protest leaders
have not been undergraduates, but teaching assistants."[17]
The young faculty shared a number of the characteristics
of the student activists outlined earlier. They
reinforced many of the students' ideas not only by virtue
of their own inclinations but also by virtue of the
subject matter of their disciplines. Many taught in
sociology, political science and other social science
departments which are well-recognized for their greater
liberalism. When they participated in protest activities
such as sit-ins and teach-ins, they added incentive to the
students' protests. A survey conducted by the American
Council on Education in 1967-68 found that ". . . faculty
members were involved in the planning of over half the

student protests which occurred."[18] Seymor Lipset
considers the contribution of faculty was that they
"encouraged the political values underlying such
protest."[19] He further states "In this, they closely
resemble the parents of the student activists."[20]

Finally, and no less important than any one of the
myriad of issues and circumstances connected to this
period of unrest, were the characteristics of the
particular students who led the rebellion. The
intellectual and social background described earlier had
cultivated leadership potential in many. The combination
of affluence, time, and freedom from adult
responsibilities enabled those who were "protest-prone" to
exercise their leadership skills. Involvement in
disruptive action was undertaken with little worry for the
consequences as traditionally students have been exempted
from the penalties which would be applied to other members
of society who engage in protest. The universities
attracting these students had become large enough to
ensure a "critical mass" to support protest.

However, all the various social, economic, and
personal characteristics described in this thesis do not
necessarily lead to protest as vehement as that of the
sixties. David Westby claims:

> . . . it is necessary to note that, despite the
> confluence of such a set of propitious cultural and
> organizational conditions, there would have been no
> student movement in the United States in the 60s had
> there been no great moral issues around which
> organization was possible.[21]

It is generally accepted that activist students were not
concerned with issues to improve their own personal
conditions but with moral issues resulting from what
Keniston describes as "the emergence of major
contradictions in American society."[22] He adds that: "For
most student protests are directed against college

policies that appear to involve collusion with immoral forces in the society at large."[23]

The tactics employed by the activist students contributed in a major way to the spread and intensity of the unrest. Experience with the civil rights movement had taught tactics and organizational skills which future radical leaders, such as Mario Savio and Tom Hayden, brought back to the campus. These leaders, according to Jack Douglas, had a great influence on the events because:

> (1) they serve as the 'moral provocateurs', seeking out moral issues, conflicts, and absurdities that can be used to 'mobilize' a larger group of students around the created 'issues'; and (2) they can try to manage the properties of the situation in which the issues are contested so that they can indirectly affect the nature of the event and the meanings that will be created for them.[24]

It was during the Berkeley episode that the tactic of non-violent civil disobedience, in the form of a sit-in, was first used. An innovative measure used at a number of places was the teach-in which could last all night and in which faculty participated. Marches were organized at both the local and national level; in the peak years they could draw several hundred thousand demonstrators. More aggressive methods included the occupation of buildings or an area of the university, the barring of entrance to a building, holding administrators captive in their offices, interrupting classes, speeches and other functions, and damaging buildings or records. The traditional tactic of a general strike or boycott was also used.

The effectiveness of the tactics was related to the organizational skills of the leaders. They knew that it was necessary to mobilize the masses. Speakers who could stir up the emotions of students were invited to campus. Control was gained of the means of communication such as student papers and other publications. Underground newspapers were circulated. The students quickly learned

how to manipulate the very cooperative outside media by
calling press conferences to state their case and to
ensure coverage of planned confrontations.
Sensationalized television coverage of events such as
those at Berkeley and Columbia contributed much to the
spread of unrest across the country and around the world.

Confrontation was the cornerstone of the radicals'
strategy. Confrontation based on an issue of perhaps some
significance, more often one of minor consequence,
attracted attention to a "problem." If the initial
tactic, usually a non-violent sit-in, march, or picketing,
did not succeed, more drastic methods would be employed.
If the university conceded to the demands being made,
further demands, frequently "non-negotiable" ones, would
be put forward as the intention was to provoke the
university to retaliate by using force, in particular by
calling in the police. The long history of town and gown
disputes has engendered a deep-rooted hatred for police by
students. Thus police intervention invariably aroused
indignation and stepped up the pace of the revolt.
Violence often erupted, leading to the use of physical
force on the part of the police and, often, arrests of
students. At this point, it was "proven" that the
university was a cooperative partner with the repressive
and negative forces in society. A greater number of
students would be radicalized for future confrontations.

Eventually, even though the tradition of privilege
allowed for certain excesses, the tactics became too
extreme and had a negative impact. There was public
backlash, the government threatened to withhold or reduce
funding, and the more moderate students turned against the
radicals. Gradually, the moderates became more active as
they attempted to keep order and to provide more
acceptable modes of political action. This reaction by

the moderate students has had a long-term result, as will be seen.

The Results of Activism in the Sixties

Insofar as the university is concerned, two major difficulties have surrounded any analyses of the results of the student unrest. One has been determining the results. Related to this has been an apparent difficulty in separating societal outcomes from changes in the university. The second problem has been the attempt to evaluate the significance of the results, both in the short-term and the long-term. Opinions varied when the turmoil died down in the early 1970s; more recent literature reveals that opinions continue to vary. Unfortunately, too much of the literature is based on subjective opinion which may or may not be valid. What perhaps poses limitations in analyses of results is that too much is expected. Glazer states "This is why the universities stand relatively unchanged—because despite their evident inadequacies the student radicals have as yet suggested nothing better to replace them with."[25] Is it possible that subtle but significant changes go unappreciated? Then, too, it may be that commentators are hindered by looking for positive, or—in the case of the more cynical—negative, changes rather than simply looking for results per se as a starting point for later analysis.

Andrew Greeley, in a very negative essay in which he took some of his colleagues such as Kenneth Keniston to task, said "The Movement then proved an utter failure."[26] More recently, in 1982, Joseph Conlin said "The student revolution was a colossal sham."[27] And there are a number of other critics who write disparagingly about the period. On the other hand, there are those who say they believe there were concrete results. The larger number of positive, although primarily subjective analyses, are

supported by a reasonably convincing amount of empirical data gathered by several large scale studies such as those undertaken by the American Council on Education, the Carnegie Commission, and the President's Commission on campus unrest. There remains a need for serious studies to determine how the university has changed over the long-term.

The results which evolved over the period of the mid-sixties to the early seventies have generated mixed reactions. As early as 1967, Flacks claimed for the student movement: "Its impact on the campus and on the larger society has already been substantial."[28] Altbach stated ". . . the minority of activist students have shaped the political culture of the campus and by and large made it liberal in orientation."[29] He also says "By and large, the direction of the American university has not been determined by students, but by forces in society combined with the academic community itself."[30] Astin, with the weight of the comprehensive, empirical data of the ACE behind him, was much more definite about the changes effected due to the protest. He claimed:

> The legacy of campus unrest is far-reaching--from the dramatic changes in student enrollments, student views, and student life to the revolutionary curriculum approaches much publicized today.[31]

The study revealed: "Of the 101 administrators interviewed on case study campuses, all but 5 felt that some positive changes had resulted from student protests in the United States."[32] Moreover, 87 of the 101 claimed that their role as administrator had changed significantly over the years of unrest in several ways, including the lessening of their authority and an increase in their involvement with students. A number of observers (Kerr, 1982; Glazer, 1984) feel campus administrative leadership has either weakened or become less creative.

The areas in which the university changed show a very direct relationship to the major issues about which the students protested. Minority groups were given more attention with special admissions policies and relevant programs such as black studies. In fact, many institutions adopted a more open admissions policy in general. Kerr says ". . . universal access to higher education instead of the earlier mass access"[33] has come to be since 1972. Related to this has been the further increased size of already large universities. Access was made more democratic as prestigious single-sex schools such as Yale, Princeton, Vassar, and Skidmore became co-ed. Furthermore, the student unrest awakened women to their less than equal role in society and in the university; this awareness led eventually to pressure for women's studies programs.

Many institutions decided to discontinue credit for ROTC courses; others terminated the program on campus completely. A number of campuses either discontinued or became more selective about military research.

Various curricular changes and innovations took place. In response to the demands for relevance, core requirements such as foreign language were reduced or eliminated to allow for more elective courses. Individualized programs of study were permitted at a number of colleges. The granting of credit for life experiences and work-study programs were a further response to the demand for more linkages between the university world and life outside. However, Glazer points out that some of these changes appear to have been short-lived. He says "As for the content of the curriculum, by the later 1970s the tide was already running the other way: more requirements, more organized programs of study, less freedom of choice."[34]

Course and teacher evaluations were undertaken and published. Many institutions undertook to re-examine teaching techniques. Ironically, however, a reduction in teaching loads to allow for more research resulted in some places. First observed at Berkeley, Lipset offers an explanation: "Crisis, as Joseph Ben-David suggested, means greater bargaining power for faculty, and faculty use such power to reduce their teaching obligations."[35] Grades were de-emphasized as different grading and testing procedures were introduced; for example, pass/fail grading and term papers rather than an overly important final exam became popular.

The demand for participation in decision-making received an immediate response in many institutions. Students were placed on most committees concerned with academic policies. Membership was withheld on senates and boards of trustees in the majority of cases. A further result was that the faculty also became more involved in the new style of decision-making which John Millett terms "campus governance" and which he believes was a result of activism. "In general, it is accurate to say that campus governance underwent change after 1965. The ostensible cause, the precipitating event, in almost every instance was student activism and disruption."[36] He further states:

> All of the experiments in campuswide governance after 1966 had two characteristics in common. The new arrangements endeavored to formalize participation in an all-university senate or in a all-college council bringing together faculty members, students, and administrative officers, including the president, and involved elected, rather than appointed, student and faculty representatives.[37]

Yet observers claim that students seldom attend meetings or "participate erratically if they do."[38]

Students also gained more control over their personal lives as _in loco parentis_ rules were relaxed. Leaves were abolished and students could come and go as they wished.

In many instances, even at the more traditional schools, residences became co-ed. Students were given responsibility for policy-making with regard to residence life. In the extra-curricular area, student societies became responsible for the management of their finances. Universities made further efforts to humanize student life either by improving existing services, such as financial aid, tutorial, and counselling, or by establishing new services where necessary.

Many have claimed that the university suffered a loss of respect on the part of the public and that this was reflected by reduced funding by governments. Sue Schlesinger and J. Victor Baldridge suggest that the influence of students was in fact diminished as they say ". . . increased state control removed many decisions from the campus, farther and farther away from the arenas where students had even meager influence."[39]

Perhaps the most disputed result of the period of unrest has been whether or not student activism died. The fact that the New Left had ceased to exist by the end of 1969 left many feeling nothing was happening and that apathy had set in.[40] However, Astin's research led him to believe:

> The popular characterization of students of the mid-1970s as being more conservative, and less socially conscious than their predecessors during the 1960s gains little support from our comparative analysis of trends in student opinion. While incidents of massive student protests, widely publicized in the 1960s, have apparently declined in frequency, the relatively high proportion of current students endorsing liberal positions (as compared to student generations of the 1960s) is strong evidence that changes in student attitudes and beliefs that occurred during the 1960s have persisted well into the 1970s.[41]

He adds: "Apparently, one legacy of campus unrest is that yesterday's 'liberal' views have become today's 'mainstream' views."[42]

The previously mentioned moderates who have become more active reinforce his viewpoint. Arthur Levine and Keith Wilson argue that student activism was changed in form as the tactics of the sixties became counter-productive. They believe that students have learned new methods such as forming lobby groups, establishing chapters of Public Interest Research Groups (PIRGs), and litigation. Frank Kermerer and David Young support this viewpoint and add: "Today's students see greater gains from recourse to the court and the legislature . . . legislative lobbying has provided more benefits."[43] Schlesinger and Baldridge agree with this assessment.

Although additional research is necessary, there is substantial evidence and professional opinion to suggest that the tradition of activism has been reinforced by the unrest of the sixties. The experience of the sixties may well have resulted in the adopting of more sophisticated methods which will subsequently have a decided influence in causing ongoing change in the university.

CHAPTER THREE

MCGILL IN THE SIXTIES: GENERAL BACKGROUND

Socio-economic Background

The general demographic, economic and social
phenomena which formed the background for the upheaval of
the sixties in the United States were paralleled in
Canada. A close neighbour of the U.S., and to a
considerable extent economically dependent upon that
country, Canada reaped the benefits of the boom taking
place in the American economy. A corresponding growth in
population along with increased affluence led to the
development of suburbs at an unprecedented rate. The
enlarged middle class echoed the demand for increased
access to higher education as the development of new
technology and the expansion of knowledge made obvious the
need for further education. Increasingly during the
sixties, the idea that a university education was no
longer just for the elite gained momentum. As parents
assured their children that "If they completed their
university education, the centres of social and economic
power would readily open to them,"[1] there was a hurried
building of new universities, particularly in areas of
dense population, and an expansion and refurbishing of
older universities virtually everywhere. "Between 1960
and 1970, full-time enrolment across the country almost
tripled to 316,000. In the same period, expenditure by
Canadian universities increased 600 percent to $1.6
bill'on."[2] Although Quebec was unlike the rest of Canada
and the U.S. in that the birth rate had dropped
significantly between 1951-61, the demand for a university

education was not any less felt in that province.
Heretofore the participation rate, most especially in the
French sector, had been proportionately much lower than
that in the rest of Canada and there was a newly felt
sense of urgency to catchup.

The culture of many countries was affected by the
U.S. media but none more than that of Canada. The general
expansiveness in the economy and in education was
accompanied by emerging life-styles and values.
Traditional clothing was replaced by bold new fashion
trends such as the mini-skirt; long hair became
fashionable for both men and women. Changes in living
arrangements became inevitable as a new sexual freedom
developed in the climate of greater permissiveness which
prevailed. Commentators published controversial material
which further lit the fires for change and greater freedom
for the individual. Pierre Berton's The Comfortable Pew,
for example, gave rise to considerable controversy by
daring to make the case that the Church was out of tune
with the times. Drugs were viewed as facilitating the
expansion of the mind and enhancing creativity. It was
not only the more adventurous or those who were
withdrawing from society who took to using drugs; many of
the more serious and intellectually able experimented with
them also. The rapidity with which change was taking
place in society was particularly exciting for young
people and, in Canada as in the U.S., it was the students
who were to form the enthusiastic vanguard. John Fekete
commented:

> It was a period of expansion--the sky was the limit
> and people felt that the changes which were made would
> last and that the society could only become more
> democratic and better.[3]

The changes taking place in North America had
perhaps a greater impact on Quebec than on the rest of
Canada. A province which had been predominantly agrarian

and obedient to the Church was being shaken not only by external forces but also by a nationalistic awakening. By the late 1950s, the rise of urban centres and industrialization had sparked demands for economic reform on the part of French-speaking lay leaders who recognized that Quebec was out of the mainstream. The death of Premier Duplessis in the fall of 1959 signalled the end of more than two decades of paternalism and anti-intellectualism under the Union Nationale and the beginning of a period of ferment, known as the "Quiet Revolution," which questioned every aspect of life in Quebec. While change began immediately under the Union Nationale government itself, the new Liberal government, elected early in 1960, from the outset assumed a greater role in the management of all resources, including education which came under direct state control for the first time. This centralization of power caused the influence of the Church to decline with astounding rapidity. As well, an erosion of the economic dominance by the English-speaking businessman was soon underway.

As the French-speaking Quebecer came to realize the magnitude of the social and economic reform needed to catch up with the rest of the continent, a growing faction began to view the economic dominance and the better education facilities of the English as the result of exploitation. Pierre Vallières, who coined the phrase "white niggers of America," and others were agitating for a complete overthrow of capitalism and a separate Quebec. According to Sheila Arnopoulos and Dominique Clift, the civil rights movement in the U.S. had an effect in that "The American example unconsciously fuelled Quebec's determination to end English domination over the economy of the province."[4] Recognition of the need to bring the French-speaking Canadian into the mainstream was confirmed

at the national level in 1965 by the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism which said:

> We believe that there is a crisis, in the sense that Canada has come to a time when decisions must be taken and developments must occur leading either to its break-up, or to a new set of conditions for its future existence.[5]

The Commission further claimed "It is rather a conflict between two majorities; that which is a majority in all Canada, and that which is a majority in the entity of Quebec."[6]

McGill University's response to this Commission stated in part that it ". . . welcomed the 'quiet revolution' in Quebec and assured its French-speaking neighbours of its desire to co-operate constructively in the new planning and in the new practice."[7] French-English relations thus became, and continued to be, an issue throughout the 1960s. This controversy was to have a direct relationship to student activism at McGill.

From the very outset, it was clear that the basis of the Quiet Revolution was to be educational reform, a reform which as put by Stanley Cohen:

> . . . would dovetail with a world-wide reformation that was casting aside traditional structures in favour of largely untried progressive theories and a democratization of decision-making in which the often strident voices of students, parents and unionized teachers took education out of the classrooms and into the streets and the daily headlines.[8]

He added that "It would have been a sufficient challenge for this province to have coped with the one without running headlong into the other."[9]

The necessity to "plug into" the economic and technical advances sweeping North America generated a demand for scientists and engineers. An expansion of the existing provincial university facilities, particularly in the Francophone sector where education had previously focused on the humanities, was urgently required. The

only solution was financial help from the government and
in 1959, Duplessis' successor, Paul Sauvé, directed the
passing of legislation to help the universities acquire
the needed buildings and equipment. This was a most
significant piece of legislaticn, destined to alter the
relationship between the university and society. As
Jean-Marie Martin explains in Changing Patterns of Higher
Education in Canada:

> Besides being the first measure of government
> assistance of appreciable size, the legislation was
> also the first general measure of financial help of a
> statutory character to be passed in Quebec. This is
> significant, for it represents a beginning of a new
> conception of the university as a public rather than a
> private institution.[10]

This development ultimately became a factor in the
heightening of student activism at McGill.

It was not only in Quebec that universities became
public bodies. Throughout Canada, new universities were
created as public institutions while older, established
universities gradually lost their private status if not
legally at least in reality, as they came to depend
increasingly upon governments for funding. With greater
access to higher education and unprecedented amounts of
money being provided for the support of universities, it
was not long before attention was focused not only on the
resource needs of the universities but also on their
structure and management as well as their role in society.

One of the first studies was prompted by the Federal
government which asked the National Conference of Canadian
Universities and Colleges (NCCUC) in 1963-64 to provide
advice with respect to the financing of universities on
the national scale. The Bladen Commission on Financing
Higher Education in Canada which reported in 1965 served
to alert the country to the enormous resource needs of the
universities.

In the same period, another investigation resulted from a 1962 proposal by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) that there be a study of university government. This proposal was supported by the NCCUC (since 1965 known as the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada) and in November 1964, thanks to a Ford Foundation grant, Sir James Duff and Robert O. Burdahl spent a period of four months visiting universities throughout Canada. They were to examine charges:

> . . . that universities were becoming so large, so complex, and so dependent upon public funds that scholars no longer form or even influence their own policy, that a new and rapidly growing class of administrators is assuming control, and that a gulf of misunderstanding and misapprehension is widening between the academic staff and the administrative personnel, with grave damage to the functioning of both.[11]

Their report, which was published in 1966, contained recommendations for university government which addressed the structure and role of all major decision-making bodies including the Board of Governors, the Senate, the President, Deans, and Departmental Chairmen. The role of faculty associations, students, alumni, government and the public were also commented upon. Probably the most controversial report of the decade, at least at the national level, and one which had far-reaching results, it either initiated heated debate or added to existing controversy on Canadian campuses.

Between the time of the CAUT proposal in 1962 and the publishing of the Duff-Berdahl report in 1966, faculty concern about university governance was expressed in A Place of Liberty, published in 1964. The book, which consists of a series of essays by eminent Canadian academics, was intended to alert the public to the need for university reform. The authors agreed on several points, the most critical of which were: "The judgement

of the academic staff should influence all decisions made
by or on behalf of universities"[12] and "The powers and
authority assigned to lay Boards by charter in Canada are
inordinate and inappropriate."[13] The final chapter of the
book, written by George Whalley, the editor, elaborated on
the theme by suggesting a number of changes including that
the "monarchic-paternalistic position of the President"[14]
come to an end by involving academic staff in the main
decision-making processes. He further proposed that the
Senate become the most important governing body with
authority over all aspects of university life; that
faculty be represented on the Board of Governors; that the
role of the Board of Governors be more clearly defined and
limited; that faculty participate in selecting people to
fill senior positions, including that of the President.
These suggestions stemmed from a growing awareness by
faculty in the late 1950s that they were not being
permitted to play an appropriate role in the major
decisions affecting the university.

In 1968, the Hurtubise and Rowat Commission was
created jointly by the Association of Universities and
Colleges of Canada (AUCC), the Canadian Association of
University Teachers (CAUT), the Canadian Union of Students
(CUS), and the Union générale des étudiants du Québec
(UGEQ) to study the relations between universities and
governments, a topic not covered by the reports of either
the Duff-Berdahl or Bladen Commissions. The Commission
added the role of the university in society to its
mandate. Published in 1970, the Commission's report dealt
with many of the issues raised by various groups during
the era. While it did not have the impact of the earlier
studies, it did serve to highlight the complexity of
relations between the university, government and society.

Quebec universities were involved with, and affected
by, each of the national studies, all of which were widely

publicized and read with interest by both faculty and students. However, a provincial inquiry was to have the most profound results for Quebec education. In 1961, the Liberal government set up its own Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education (the report of which is commonly known as the Parent Report). While the final two volumes of the Report did not come out until 1966, changes were instituted immediately upon the release of the first volume in 1963. In 1964, a Ministry of Education was established for the first time. In addition, a Superior Council of Education was set up as the major advisory body to the Ministry of Education; its first task was to draft plans to restructure the universities. Later in the decade, in 1968, the Council of Universities was set up to advise the Ministry with respect to budgeting, development, research and other needs as well as to coordinate university programs.

Volumes two and three of the Parent Report were released in 1964 and they recommended a total reorganization of the structure and curriculum from kindergarten to the university level. The most important recommendation from the university perspective was that collèges d'enseignement général et professional (CEGEPs) be created.[15] By 1967, the first CEGEPs opened in the French-language sector, using buildings and facilities of the "collèges classiques" which were being replaced by these new institutions. In 1969, the first English-language CEGEP, Dawson College, opened.

The new structure meant that all students would have the same system of education with an equivalent curriculum. Previously, English students had finished grade eleven and then entered a four year university program for a first degree. French students had a more complicated route which required eighteen years of schooling for a first degree. With the advent of the

CEGEP, all students were to complete eleven years of schooling followed by two years in an appropriate college program which would be mandatory for admission to a three year university degree program. In addition to developing new three year degree courses, the English universities had further pressure in that they had to offer a two year CEGEP-equivalent program from 1969-72, at which point suitable facilities would be found for English students. The Parent Commission recommendations coincided with those of the various national reports being prepared on university financing, university government, and the relationship between the university and the society. Quebec universities, and McGill in particular, were suddenly faced with the simultaneous need to overhaul their curricula, analyse their financing, review their governing bodies and policies, and question their role in a society which was undergoing an economic. political, and social revolution.

The University Environment

At the outset of the decade, with a student body of 8,024[16] in 1960, McGill was already a relatively large university, by Canadian standards. Well-established and in a major metropolis, it was a prestigious institution with an international stature. As such it possessed the characteristics of its American counterparts where unrest was most prevalent. And indeed, McGill was one of the several Canadian universities at which activism was most dramatic and sustained in the 1960s.

Like many such universities, McGill had been traditionally conservative. However, coincidental with the birth of the Quiet Revolution in Quebec, there was an emerging liberalization of McGill's administrative structure. In the early 1950s, the McGill Association of University Teachers (MAUT) was formed. Once initial

concerns with respect to salary and benefits had been addressed, the Association began looking at other areas of the University. A number of MAUT members criticized the composition of the Board of Governors, a self-perpetuating group of Protestant English-speaking businessmen, few of whom had been to university. They maintained that the Board's control and influence over the institution was inappropriate, especially as there was no input from the academic staff with respect to its decisions. Significant inroads were made in that Senate did begin to deal with the issues raised by the academic staff and gradually there was a transfer of power from the Board to Senate and thereby to the faculties. It was due to MAUT demands for openness that Senate created a sub-committee on the academic and physical development of the University.[17] This ferment continued throughout the 1950s and by the end of that decade, the academic staff was much more vocal about its wish to have elected representatives on Senate and the Board of Governors.

This shift in power was seen as challenging the supremacy of the principal, Cyril James, who had run the University in a highly centralized, authoritarian manner for twenty-two years. He had also hired a number of administrators, of British origin like himself, who similarily exercised a tight control. Professor C. P. Leblond, in a letter to the McGill Daily in 1969 confirms this when he says ". . . the situation twenty years ago could be described as that of the autocratic university . . ."[18] and that "The democratization of the structure of the University began some 10 or 15 years ago when professors gradually acquired a greater voice in decision making."[19] An academic staff member interviewed for this thesis described one of this group of administrators as a "real dictator" and he felt that much of the professorial

reaction in the late 1950s and 60s was a reaction to "these tyrannical types."

The changing mood in the University, which made clear the need to decentralize authority, plus the general political and social upheaval which was creating new conditions in the province, convinced Cyril James to resign in 1962. Symbolic of the end of the James era and indicative of the growing influence of Senate, was the fact that Senate set up a committee to advise the Board on the selection of a new principal. Although not officially part of the selection process, the committee was listened to by the Board which previously had chosen a Principal without consulting other bodies. While the Senate candidate was not chosen by the Board, there was agreement on the final choice, Dr. H. Rocke Robertson, Dean of Medicine. This consultation marked the first step toward the representative process which is in effect today. By 1964, there was further responsiveness on the part of the Board which opened its membership to include Jewish people and Catholics, although there were still no academic staff or women members. It is interesting to observe, however, that these new members did not take the place of existing members but rather the Board increased in size.

Another event which occurred in 1962, was the death of John W. McConnell, who had been a member of the Board of Governors for thirty years (1928-58). Not only had he donated large sums of money himself but also he had been a major influence in persuading others, including the province through the Premier, to donate funds to the University. According to a McGill Daily article "The Duplessis régime being implacably anti-education, McGill was kept afloat by and under the thumb of John W. McConnell, owner of the Montreal Star."[20] Conrad Black, in his book Duplessis, described the close friendship between Duplessis and McConnell, who knew how to gain the

support of the Premier for his favourite interests, a
major one of which was McGill. Black claims that "Every
request that McConnell made for provincial government
assistance was acceded to at Duplessis's instructions,
immediately and completely,"[21] and that ". . . from
1946-59, in the life of the Duplessis-McConnell
arrangement, the largesse of the provincial government
flowed in a river, as never before and not since."[22]
Several of those interviewed agreed with this statement.
As for McConnell's personal generosity, one professor
interviewed remembers a day in the late 1950s when
McConnell opened his cheque book, asked how much was
needed for some particular venture, and then proceeded to
write a cheque for $12 million. McConnell's death marked
the end of individual funding on such a scale.

The financial picture for McGill underwent further
change during the sixties. In 1960, government grants,
which were negligible previously, began on a formal basis
as a result of the new government's realization that the
university sector required support. McGill's financial
situation thereby improved significantly in the early
1960s. On the other hand, as government funding became
both official and necessary, the private status of McGill
was eroded. In 1960, only 7% of the University's
financing was from the province.[23] By the end of the
decade, the government's portion of the University's
income had risen to 42%.[24]

By the mid-sixties, the financial picture had
altered and McGill began to experience financial
difficulties. They continued throughout the rest of the
decade and reached a point of severity by 1970 when a
deficit budget became a reality. In 1966, as a means of
restricting federal intervention in education, it was
agreed that federal funds would be paid to universities by
the provincial governments rather than being distributed

through the NCCUC as in the past. The effect of this
change was to make universities part of the provincial
system of public education because they now had to
negotiate with their governments for their portion of the
federal funding. At approximately the same time, the
provincial government ignored the recommendations of the
Gauthier Committee which it had set up as an advisory body
on university financing. The Committee's recommendations
had been based on a thorough study of the budgets of all
universities and would have provided McGill with its fair
share of the available resources. However, the government
decided to grant considerably less money to McGill than
had been recommended and this situation continued for
several years.

McGill received less funding per student due to what
the government perceived as its comparatively wealthy
position. As early as 1963-64, the McGill Daily reported
on an article which had appeared in Le Devoir calling for
a reduction in provincial funding for English-speaking
universities. The article attacked McGill in particular,
claiming that it received a large number of private
donations and, furthermore, was registering too many
students from other provinces, who were viewed as being
subsidized by the Quebec government. The government's
perspective, based on a principle termed "rattrapage," was
that more money should go to other universities so that
they could "catch up" to McGill. According to
Vice-Principal Robert Shaw, the government's penalizing of
McGill had the ironic effect of causing problems with
donors who, quite correctly, saw their donations going to
the province and not to the University. McGill solved the
problem by advising donors to give to specific items and
not to the operating budget which the government would
reduce in relation to the money which McGill raised on its
own. Nevertheless, by 1966-67, the University felt forced

to make its financial crisis public as for several years running it had not received the necessary funding requested from the province and the costs of expansion and accessibility were taking a serious toll.

Accompanying the financial problems and the critical stance taken by the provincial government and French-speaking universities with respect to the University's funding was the more general issue of rising French nationalism. McGill soon realized it had to consider its position in an increasingly French Quebec. As early as 1963-64, Principal Robertson advised Senate that there was a need to find a solution to growing difficult relations with some parts of the French-speaking community. It was suggested that a committee of governors, senators, and MAUT representatives be established as a consulting body. It was also pointed out that the University's character was changing and that it must be able to justify its role in a society to which it was being held increasingly accountable.

An initial measure was taken in the fall of 1963 when a French Canadian Studies Program was established as an attempt to help bridge the gap between the two cultures. The program was to reach beyond its primary academic role of teaching and research and to provide a community service by sponsoring a series of public lectures on aspects of French Canada. In the fall of 1964, Senate approved a motion that students be permitted to write their examinations for any course in either English or French. By 1969, the University had established a committee to study the use of the French language within McGill. A major debate throughout the decade was whether or not McGill should become a French-language institution. This ongoing issue, with the realities of the the financial penalties, had a

significant role to play in the student activism of the decade.

Stimulated not only by the French language question but also by the increasing need to be accountable, McGill began to consider its image in the surrounding community. A first step was the appointment in 1963-64 of a Director of Information. The goal was to improve both internal communication as well as communication with high schools and the general community. In 1964-65, McGill embarked on its own study of the academic and administrative aspects of the University. The results of this study, the 1966 McGrath report, were superceded by those of the Duff-Berdahl report, although Stanley Frost claims the McGrath report "forced all the departments of the university to consider their own goals and aspirations."[25] One of the areas that came under scrutiny was admissions. Sensitive to public pressure for accessibility, in 1963 Senate and the Board of Governors made the very deliberate attempt not to limit enrollment but to admit all those who met the requirements. In fact, several rules were bent with respect to deadlines and supporting information normally required for an application. The decision to admit all who were qualified was reinforced officially throughout the sixties.

While deciding in 1963 not to limit accessibility, the University was very concerned about space and facilities problems which had arisen due to the already rapidly increasing enrollment. New buildings were being constructed and planned; old buildings were being renovated. During the period 1960-67 sixty-three building projects had been completed, were underway or were in the planning stage. A new Arts building, several new science buildings, and buildings for medicine, law, management, and education amongst others of the professional areas, were constructed. A new library was

built. Students acquired a new building to house their activities and additional residence accommodation was constructed. The housing shortage was particularly critical for women as those from out-of-town were required to live in residence. Two hundred qualified women students had been turned down in September 1963 due to the lack of residence accommodations. This led to an easing of restrictions and in 1964-65 third and fourth year women from out-of-town could receive permission to live elsewhere.

Virtually every area of university life was affected by the growth of the student body. As early as 1965-66, Principal Robertson commented in his annual report that "three out of every four departments in the University either moved into new quarters or had their existing quarters enlarged and improved."[26] In a later report, he pointed out that the expansion was diverting attention from academic pursuits and that it created an "atmosphere of instability that is not conducive to good work or to peace."[27] The library collection, for example, had moved three times in eight years.

The acquisition of additional physical resources was accompanied by an increase in human resources. New administrative positions were created to manage the expansion. Subsequent to the appointment of a Director of Information in 1963-64, an Executive Assistant to the Principal was appointed the following year to help with the planning and business tasks resulting from the rapid growth. By 1966, an Office of Research for Planning and Development had been created. In 1968, a Vice-Principal Administration and a Director of Finance were appointed, the latter a direct result of the complexities resulting from underfunding. A Dean of Students was named in 1966.

Between 1962-63 and 1969-70, the student body increased 67.5% (from 9,743 to 16,317). This increase was

accompanied, in the same period, by an increase of 105% in the full-time teaching staff (from 660 to 1,227).[28] As at most Canadian universities, the majority of the new academic staff were young professors from the United States. A number of observers, such as James Steele and Robin Mathews in <u>Close the 49th Parallel etc: The Americanizatior. of Canada</u>, claimed that the Canadian universities were being Americanized as the "proportion of non-Canadians on faculty affects the offerings involving Canadian material."[29]

Changes in curricula and academic structures resulted from the new demands being made on the University. By 1965, the Institute of Education became a faculty, thereby recognizing the importance of that discipline in a world in which education was becoming prominent. New programs such as the French Canada Studies program already mentioned, Developing Area Studies, and innovative branches of law were developed. In 1968, a new Centre for Continuing Education was set up for the part-time and non-degree student. Numbers had also grown in that area and the University was concerned that it play a responsible role in the community with respect to adult education.

In the early sixties, the Faculty of Arts and Science had revised its curriculum to provide some specialization and reduce the general nature of its degrees. In 1964, the Faculty was reorganized into five divisions to allow for a more efficient and effective administration. At the same time, the School of Business, which was one of the five divisions, acknowledged a need to adjust its curriculum; in 1967-68, this division became the Faculty of Management.

By 1967, as the CEGEPs began to open, McGill was facing a major overhaul of virtually every undergraduate and professional program. The professional faculties had

to make sub_tantial adjustments as there was to be direct entry from CEGEP rather than after a bachelor's degree. All undergraduate programs had to be changed from four years to three for the CEGEP graduate. The programs also had to become more specialized as the CEGEP was to be the place for a general education; major and honours programs replaced general courses of study at the university level.

The Student Body

By 1960, while still predominantly English-speaking,[30] the student body had become more diversified. As immigration, particularly from Eastern Europe, had broadened the ethnic base of the city, so too had the University changed. No longer predominantly Protestant, it now had a significant number from other backgrounds, particularly Jewish and Roman Catholic (28.3% and 15.7% respectively in 1964, the last year for which such data were collected).[31] Unfortunately, there are no other demographic data available to allow for further objective elaboration.

Prior to the sixties, McGill students had a tradition of running their own affairs. There are precedents for their assertion of their independence. For example, in 1956, Cyril James forbade the McGill Daily to publish any further articles by Don Kingsbury, who was then a student and who later became a lecturer in the Mathematics Department. The presidents of the various student societies grouped together and persuaded Principal James to drop the issue if he wished to avoid an open protest. However, despite the occasional need to defend their interests and independence, the main concerns of the students prior to the mid-sixties were campus-based activities such as crowning queens and princesses of various events, the blood drive, debating competitions, and sports events. The most serious episode for the

Student Executive Committee in 1963-64 was disciplining a
freshman who had thrown a beer bottle during a football
game.

Jack Quarter, author of one of the few studies of
the student movement in Canada, commented on the lack of
data with respect to Canadian activist students. He made
the "unsupported assump ion" that the results of American
studies were "generalizable to Canada."[32] His assumption
seems fair enough, at least insofar as McGill is
concerned. Information gleaned from reading the various
archival sources and from interviews would suggest that
McGill activists reflected the characteristics of their
American counterparts as described in Chapter Two. Coming
from comfortable middle-class homes, the leaders formed a
small group, estimated to have a following of between 10%
to 20% of the student body. They reflected a liberal
upbringing. One activist student, who gained a certain
notoriety for his activities, commented that his parents
supported his activities as he was doing what he believed
in.

Support for the many U.S. studies which indicated
that the student activists were amongst the brighter
students is found in the McGill situation. The leaders of
protest were virtually all academically superior as
indicated by the scholarships they were awarded and by the
fact that most later completed post-graduate work at
prestigious universities. Both leaders and followers were
mainly from the humanities and social sciences, although a
few significant leaders were from Engineering.

As student activism accelerated during the sixties,
reaching a peak in 1967-69, the student activist was often
regarded as being unworthy to receive a university
education and as a person not to be taken seriously.
According to Dr. Maurice McGregor, the long hair and
sloppy way in which students began to dress was a shock to

adults. Yet pictures in the <u>McGill Daily</u> throughout the
period show that, with very few exceptions, the more
active students did not have particularly long hair and
they wore shirts and ties, again reflecting U.S. findings
which show that the student activist differed from those
students who were part of the counterculture. Robertson
reflected on this point when he was quoted in a <u>McGill
Daily</u> article as being opposed to beards and jeans but
realized that "the central core of reacting youth I
believe, is basically sound at least in its diagnosis of
the world's ills, if not in its proposed therapy."[33]
Professor James Mallory claimed there were not many "mere
radicals" among the students; most were intelligent and
competent people who believed in academic freedom.
Professor Robert Vogel supports this notion as he said
there were very serious students in the sixties who were
brighter and more active than previously. He believes
they were idealists who subsequently came to see
themselves as the power base. Professor Archie Malloch
echoes this as he is convinced students were encouraged by
their parents, and by adults in general, to see themselves
as important. He notes the prominence given to youth in
the Parent Report and the fact that the Premier himself
opened the new Student Centre. Contrary to the opinion of
a few individuals interviewed, the key student activists
at McGill were not American and there is no evidence to
support the idea that they were "fed by" Americans who
came to McGill.

In retrospect, one can see hints of the coming
change in mood as students gradually became more outward
looking and developed a concern for public issues. During
1963-65, the <u>McGill Daily</u> began to include articles on
issues relative to the larger society as well as to more
fundamental aspects of university life. Such items
included: civil rights in the U.S., the Vietnam War,

Marxism, French Canadian nationalism, student syndicalism, free education and residence rules. A Humanist Society was formed with the avowed purpose of pointing out the benefits of agnosticism. The Young Communist League became a club, while a <u>McGill Daily</u> article almost apologetically explained that all points of view must be allowed in an open society. By 1964-65, a few items on birth control appeared as did an article discussing the outdatedness of society's ideas on homosexuality. A very small indication of an awareness of women in education surfaced when a career day for women was held.

Students were gradually becoming more active with respect to the various issues. In 1963-64, the Students' Society reported on a survey which it had conducted with first and second year students in an attempt to find ways to ease the adjustment to university. The recommendations included: increasing the effort to sell both the concept of university as well as McGill itself to the general public; re-organizing the calendars so that they would be more helpful; providing freshmen orientation lectures; streamlining registration procedures; expanding the tutorial system; including a student voice on the Library Committee.[34]

That the student body remained basically conservative was obvious when the student who chaired the project was careful to ensure that the local newspaper reporter understood that the students were not trying to tell the University how to run its affairs but were merely seeking out student opinion. However, the report was circulated to student leaders across Canada, it was publicized in local newspapers and it was published in the alumni magazine in 1964.

Whether a direct result of these recommendations or not, the fact is that the Principal shortly thereafter promised improvements in the calendar and in registration

procedures for September 1965. He also activated the
Committee on Student Affairs, which had never been
convened. His goal was to improve communication between
the student body and the administration. In 1964, the
Dean of Arts and Science announced a plan to expand the
tutorial system to include freshman students. Later in
that academic year, students were included on the
newly-formed Library Committee which consisted of three
students and four professors. Several of the students'
suggestions, such as keeping the library open until
midnight from mid-February until the end of the school
year, were acted upon.

It should be noted that student initiative was not
new. For example, in 1953, students inaugurated an "open
house" program on a triennial basis and, in 1965, added a
bilingual component to the program. By 1966, the
University realized that open house was a means of gaining
public appreciation and support for the University. At
this point, Senate and the Board of Governors decided they
should work more closely with the students and provide
staff, administrative resources, and a major share of the
funding.

By March 1965, the content of the McGill Daily had
become clearly controversial, reflecting an increasing
restlessness on the part of the student body. Agitation
was reported in the form of marches against violence in
Alabama and the Vietnam War as well as in the activities
of such groups as Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA),
Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), and the
Student Action Committee (SAC). The incoming Students'
Society President was elected on a platform which
reflected the new mood including free education, greater
involvement of the University in society, and an
investigation of Senate and Board of Governors' control of
the Students' Society. Patrick MacFadden, a McGill Daily

reporter responsible for some of the more creative articles was selected as the paper's editor for the forthcoming year.

The general upheaval in Quebec society, the turmoil of expansion and the financial problems in the University along with the changing student culture set the stage for a potential explosion. The announcement of a fee increase by McGill in March 1965 heralded a new era of activism. The conservative and the more radical student were united in protest. The first group, under Saeed Mirza, the Students' Society President, presented the Principal with a petition signed by over 5,300 students asking that the increase not be implemented. The second group organized a rally and a sit-in. Yet as the year ended, the spirit of cooperation prevailed with Principal Robertson setting up a committee of faculty, administration, and students to search for solutions to the fee increase.

CHAPTER FOUR

STUDENT ACTIVISM AT MCGILL IN THE SIXTIES:
EXTERNAL ISSUES AND RELATED EVENTS, 1965-69

With the impetus provided by the announcement of a fee increase and a more provocative student newspaper, McGill students became more dramatically active in 1965. The quiet but steady efforts described in Chapter Three to improve university procedures, curriculum, transition to university life, libraries, and other areas of concern were over-shadowed for a time by more general issues. Like students elsewhere, and most notably like their peers in the United States, McGill students involved themselves with a number of issues which were viewed by many as external to the university. By 1967, again following the U.S. pattern, their main focus became the university itself and efforts to bring about change were significantly different from those of the past in that they were more demanding, insistent and radical. It was at this point, the period beginning in 1967 and lasting until 1969, that student activism was reminiscent in its intensity and pervasiveness to that of the Middle Ages.

It is not possible to separate completely the external issues from those which concerned the university more directly. The external issues were interwoven with the internal concerns for several reasons. Not only did they foster a general state of turmoil and excitement but also they served to heighten student awareness and involvement. At McGill, as elsewhere, they constituted the build-up leading to demands for change in the university and they continued to serve as a dramatic

backdrop throughout the period. At McGill, the external
issues were not directly connected with the more memorable
campus episodes. However, while perhaps not as obvious at
the time, the students did bring the external issues into
a concrete relationship with the university.

Civil Rights

By 1965, McGill activists had joined the protests
against racial conditions in the southern U.S. A steady
barrage of sensational news items and comments by
convincing speakers who had been invited to the campus had
had an effect. Furthermore, a number of Canadians had
been directly involved in the South and were able to
provide first-hand information. Cyril Levitt quotes a
former Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA) leader as
saying:

> Don't underestimate the number of people who were
> down--dozens and dozens of people were down from
> Canada, were in Mississippi for the voter registration
> drives and the other places. Ar.d a whole bunch of
> those people were later in SUPA.[1]

A SUPA group had already been formed at McGill. In
January 1965, McGill activists established a chapter of
the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), a
U.S. student organization working for civil rights.

When the tragedy of the racial situation in Selma,
Alabama became a world issue in 1965, the non-radical
president of the Students' Society urged McGill students
to attend a meeting to hear a speaker from the U.S. SNCC
Executive, who had been sent by the heroic figure, Dr.
Martin Luther King. They were then expected to support a
march on the U.S. consulate. Over 1,500 McGill students
took part in that march which was organized in part by the
more radical Student Action Committee (SAC). A McGill
Daily supplement for high school students revealed that
the civil rights issue had entered the classroom as well:

At McGill, too, students were shocked and later disgusted by the actions of the Southern Segregationalists. On the campus, the latest reports of what was occurring were relayed by word-of-mouth, while the moral implications of the events became the subject of classroom discussions led by various professors.[2]

Throughout the period 1965-69, the issues were kept alive by speakers such as Stokely Carmichael who were invited to the campus by activist students. Related events, such as a Black Power Conference, were held at the University. While demands for a black studies program were not successful, the University did decide in the summer of 1970 to subsidize the Da Costa Hall project. This scheme provided black students with extra instruction during the summer so that they could enter university in the fall under a special admissions program which relaxed the usual requirements.

The awareness students developed from the civil rights issue led to concern for oppressed groups elsewhere, notably in Rhodesia and South Africa. In the case of South Africa, they eventually turned their attention first to members of the Board of Governors who headed companies which had dealings with South Africa and then subsequently to the University's own investments in that country. It was not until the 1980s that McGill students achieved the goal sought by their predecessors in the 1960s and forced the University to agree to begin divesting itself of investments in South Africa.

In 1969, students protested the hiring of General Chaudhuri as a visiting professor by the Centre for Developing Area Studies. Chaudhuri was seen as having cooperated with British, American and Indian reactionaries against his own people. The support for his removal was not successful, in part because student activism was on the wane and the main protest came from Maoists rather than from main-line activist groups. However, Chaudhuri was not invited to stay beyond the one year of his

contract and it is believed that the University became
more cautious about hiring such controversial figures.

In addition to organizing protest marches, sit-ins,
and other attempts to convince the University to play an
active role in supporting the causes of the oppressed,
students did take practical action. Students from a
number of professional faculties, most notably medicine
and law, established highly successful clinics and
self-help organizations in the poorer districts of the
city while those from other faculties provided tutoring on
a voluntary basis for youngsters from these areas. These
activities reflected a view which was developing within
the student body with respect to the need to change the
university's role in society.

The War in Vietnam

By 1965, the war in Vietnam was becoming a major
concern of students, not only on U.S. campuses but also,
somewhat inexplicably, world-wide. Until the end of the
decade, students throughout North America were
increasingly affected by the war. A number of the more
senior staff interviewed maintained that Vietnam was not a
legitimate issue for students at McGill and other Canadian
universities but rather, to quote one individual, was a
"contrived one." On the other hand, staff who were
younger at the time, along with those who were former
students claimed that the war was a very real issue and
one which set the climate for much of what happened in the
University. Writing in 1969, in Student Power and the
Canadian Campus, Tim and Julyan Reid said "No Canadians
fight in Vietnam, yet the students know and feel that they
are part of the culture that is fighting."[3] They
explained that students saw the war as one in which the
technically superior industrialized world was using its
advantage against the poor of the Third World. The war

was a moral issue for students, who began to view leaders
in their own society as dishonest and to believe that
their own criticism was both justified and necessary. In
1969, the President of the Student Council, Julius Grey,
was urging McGill students to support their U.S. peers in
their demand that U.S. troops be withdrawn. He based his
appeal on the fact that the war was a moral issue and that
morality cannot be restricted by geography.[4]

The war and its related controversies were the
subject of many inflammatory articles which appeared in
the McGill Daily under the editorship of Patrick MacFadden
in 1965-66. One activist student who was interviewed
credits MacFadden for having raised his level of awareness
and for causing him to become involved. He is sure he was
not the only student whose emotions were so deeply
affected by what is often described as "MacFadden's
Daily."

At a more practical level, during the period
1965-69, student activists organized sit-ins, marches,
petitions, and teach-ins to protest the war. Initially
the protests were against the U.S. for its involvement and
against companies which manufactured war materials.
Subsequently, the protests were directed against the
Canadian government, which in not opposing the war
overtly, was seen as supporting the war effort. Charles
Taylor, in Snow Job: Canada, the United States and Vietnam
(1965-1973), provides information which supports the
students' conviction that the Canadian government was
rather heavily involved with the war. He says:

> . . . by 1965 Canada was effectively involved with the
> United States in its war against North Vietnam.
> Canadian officials were carrying American ultimatums
> to Hanoi, arguing America's case on the ICC,
> furnishing America with political and military
> intelligence and publicly supporting American policies
> in Southeast Asia. Canada was also selling about
> $300-million worth of arms and ammunition to the
> Americans each year: a large if undisclosed portion of
> this military hardware was being used in Vietnam.[5]

Ultimately, the University was a target of protest for not
taking a public stand and for having members on its Board
of Governors who were associated with the companies
manufacturing war materials. Senate and the Board of
Governors resisted pleas for special aid to help draft
dodgers. While not taking a stand on the war, Senate did
succumb to a demand by a student audience of 150 to
adjourn its meeting on October 15, 1969 in support of the
Vietnam Moratorium activities which were taking place on
campus. These activities involved several thousand
students and a considerable number of staff.[6]

It should also be noted that the war was a clearer
issue for McGill students than for those at other Canadian
universities. McGill has always been the only Canadian
university with a significant number of Americans in its
student body (839, 889, and 987 in '67, '68, and '69
respectively).[7] By 1967, these students were reporting on
how the horrors of war were affecting their families and
friends at home. The issue was very emotional. Julius
Grey said, both in his interview and in a speech to the
James McGill Society,[8] that the Student Union was actively
helping the draft dodgers in whatever way it could. Many
groups in Montreal and across the country were providing
aid. According to MacLeans's magazine, as many as 80,000
draft dodgers came to Canada during the Vietnam War.[9]

There was considerable reinforcement of the student
view from the professorial staff. For example, in
November 1967, 158 teaching and research staff sent a
petition to the Prime Minister protesting the war in
Vietnam and requesting that Canada get the U.S. to agree
not to use "nuclear bombs, germs or life destroying
chemicals under any circumstance."[10] The signators
included very senior, respected staff. A similar earlier
petition had been signed by 130 staff members. On
December 8, 1967, law professor John Humphrey, was quoted

as saying that U.S. intervention in Vietnam was "illegal, unnecessary, cruel and stupid."[11] This was but one of frequent comments against the war by professors.

One issue which caused considerable controversy over a period of three to four months in the 1967-68 academic year was the recruiting on campus by companies such as DOW Chemical, Hawker-Siddley, and CIL, which were involved in the production of war mat., ials. Students considered the University to be cooperating with the "military-industrial complex." A petition, which included names of a number of staff members, was circulated; demonstrations were held; Board of Governors members associated with such companies came under attack. Ultimately, a Senate/Board of Governors committee set up to study the matter recommended that recruiting should be permitted in order to respect the rights of those students who wished to be interviewed by the companies. Although 51 professors wrote an article for the McGill Daily opposing open recruitment, the student body, after much vacillation, voted in its favour. The issue did not have a dramatic outcome but it did attract the attention and involvement of a large number of students. Over 4,000 voted in the referendum.

A second and more significant event occurred as early as November 1966 when the McGill Daily published an article claiming that an Engineering professor was doing research intended to help the U.S. war effort. The Dean of the Faculty, supported by the Engineering student body, vigorously denied the charge. While the truth of the claim was never confirmed, the episode did have considerable impact. The editor of the paper, Sandy Gage, was fired. As a result, free speech became a reason for student agitation. After an investigation by the Canadian University Press Commission, which included journalists from outside the University, and a vote of support from the student body as a whole, the editor was reinstated.

In addition to stating that Gage was not guilty of any
breach of journalistic conduct or ethics, the Commission
found it significant that the professor in question had
not requested a formal retraction of the story. Demands
for the release of more detailed information with respect
to research projects became a larger issue which has
continued to the present day. A number of individuals on
the campus continue to be suspicious about the purpose of
various research projects and the source of their funding.

Quebec Nationalism and the Quiet Revolution

As pointed out in Chapter Three, the revolutionary
changes taking place due to the Quiet Revolution and
emerging Quebec nationalism became an issue with direct
effects which ultimately involved the students in the
affairs of the University. According to the students
interviewed, it was a serious concern throughout the
period from 1965 until the end of the decade.

As early as 1963-64, the McGill Daily was printing
articles dealing with aspects such as separatism, the
Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ) activities, and the
attitude of French people towards McGill, which they
viewed as the symbol of English domination. The Quebec
controversy became more concrete for the student body in
September 1964 when the French-language universities began
withdrawing from the Canadian Union of Students (CUS) to
form their own organization, the Union générale des
étudiants du Québec (UGEQ). The withdrawal from CUS was
not due to any opposition to CUS but rather was a direct
result of rising nationalism in the province. McGill
students soon saw themselves faced with a dilemma. They
wished to belong to the national body but realized, with
education being a provincial matter, that their most
important lobby group would be UGEQ. UGEQ rules did not

allow for membership in both organizations; in addition, the only language recognized was French.

In 1965, the question became a full-fledged controversy as the new Students' Society President, Sharon Sholzberg, with the help of the radical editorials of "MacFadden's Daily," fought to convince McGill students to join UGEQ. The basic argument was that:

> UGEQ offers McGill students a very progressive way to integrate themselves into Quebec society, and a viable organization to realize their aims of university reform and student social and political action.[12]

Despite a fundamental disagreement with UGEQ's basic principles, McGill did finally vote to join in February 1967, after much emotional debate and several previous negative referenda. It was probably no coincidence that the positive vote coincided with the period of accelerating student unrest in general.

The significance of UGEQ goes beyond the agitation resulting from the question of membership. From its inception, it was a very radical organization which was based on the philosophy of sydicalism which saw the student as an active and responsible worker in society. This notion, a reflection of the guild system of the Middle Ages, did much to provoke unrest. UGEQ students organized many demonstrations in support of other unionized workers as diverse as teachers and shoe factory workers. They were also active in protesting the Vietnam War and aiding draft dodgers. For the more radical, it was easy to relate the nationalistic cause to the civil rights issue and to the oppression of the people of Vietnam. UGEQ was also a major voice in the clamour for free education and accessibility.

Initially reluctant to join the various demonstrations, by 1967, McGill students were regular participants. The resulting heightened awareness led to pressure on the University to involve itself more in

Quebec society, to increase the use of the French language within the University, and to admit a greater number of French-language students. The students themselves took action. They published an issue of the newspaper in French to jolt people into a greater realization of the need to consider the French fact.[13] Seminars on Quebec affairs were held. As early as September 1965, the Student Council was proposing to offer a beginners' French course "so that foreign students will be able to communicate with French Canadians and to appreciate their culture."[14] As the more radical student groups grew and gained power on campus, it was the syndical concept on which they focused. This concept placed upon the students, the intellectual workers, an obligation to participate in and comment upon all dimensions of society.

The second major outcome of Quebec nationalism which brought students into conflict with the University was related to the restructuring of the educational system and, in particular, to the establishment of the new Institutes, ultimately known as CEGEPs (Collèges d'enseignement général et professionel).

There were three major points of concern. Although McGill claimed to support the Parent Report, it asked for special status for anglophone institutions. Specifically, McGill wanted to maintain its four year program by having a grade twelve or some other alternative to the CEGEP as the basis of admission. From the student perspective, McGill was reinforcing the view that it was not sympathetic with the "oppressed majority" and was refusing to be a cooperative part of Quebec society. A second point of contention arose soon after the first French-language CEGEPs opened in 1967 and it was realized that there would be a shortage of university places for graduates in 1969. In addition, there were unreasonable delays in setting up English-language CEGEPs. As McGill

was still preoccupied with its demand for special status
rather than focusing on the upcoming problem of
accessibility, student agitation increased. They
participated in the great number of marches which were
held by students from CEGEPs and other universities, in
particular French-language universities. Internally they
forced long Senate debates on the issue. Finally the
demand for an emergency meeting by the President of the
Students' Society was agreed to. At this special meeting
which was held on October 18, 1968, just days
before a march by 10,000 students, Senate approved a
student resolution which included the phrase: "Senate
welcomes this statement as an expression of the deep
concern which it shares with the students about problems
of education in this Province."[15] It also passed a
motion, the main points of which are included in the
following excerpts:

> (Senate) affirms its support of the statement on
> accessibility to education issued by the Superior
> Council of Education"; "expresses the hope that the
> implementation of this approach can be accelerated";
> "recognizes the difficulties and uncertainties being
> experienced by CEGEP students and urges the Government
> to provide the means that would enable CEGEPs to be
> established"; "welcomes the statement . . . that a
> second French-language university in Montreal will be
> in operation by September 1969"; "reaffirms its
> commitment to participate in the process of
> educational reform in Quebec.[16]

Interestingly, the motion added that Senate "expresses the
hope that the democratization of university government
which is now underway at McGill will prove successful and
that the experience of McGill in its implementation may be
of value at other institutions."[17] This event had much to
do with forcing McGill to accept the realization that
there was no avoiding the new system of post-secondary
education.

Once it was clear that McGill would be offering a
three year degree for CEGEP graduates, students were
amongst the first to voice concerns about a third matter.

They pressured McGill to find a way to continue admitting non-Quebec students to a four year program in order to avoid becoming a parochial institution. It was a student who first proposed a solution to Senate and while not accepted when suggested, it did in essence become the adopted policy. McGill's reaction to the whole CEGEP issue did much to make students more critical of the University. One senior staff member who was interviewed said, "Pompous arrogance was the reason McGill resisted CEGEPs and students were aware of this pompous arrogance."

The final major episode related to Quebec nationalism during the period of unrest was "Operation McGill" or "McGill Français," as it was more commonly called. In March 1969, a march of between 8,000 to 9,000[18] took place "to turn McGill into a working class university integrated into Quebec society and serving the majority of people in Quebec and not the ruling corporations that exploit the Quebec people."[19] A number of the more radical students, along with Stanley Gray, a recently fired professor who was one of the key organizers of the march, were involved. Prior knowledge of the event and elaborate precautionary measures, a story in itself, prevented the march from having any serious effect on McGill. However, the minority radical group was clearly outnumbered by the student majority who genuinely feared for McGill and became supportive of the University. The march sounded the death knell for student extremism. Shortly thereafter McGill decided to withdraw from UGEQ because it was regarded as having become too nationalistic and radical. No doubt the frightening drama of "McGill Français" had an influence on this decision.

Social Change: The New Left and Related Organizations

Social change was the fundamental goal of the New Left, a movement which was supported by young people and

led by students. A sixties phenomenon which was short-lived and which did not achieve its major objectives, the New Left did have a significant impact on the decade in general and on the universities in particular. The dominant, parental New Left organizations influenced a number of existing groups and inspired the development of a number of relevant sub-groups on university campuses.

In the U.S., the New Left orginated with virtually one individual who decided to revive a moribund leftist student organization[20] under the rubric Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Founded in 1960, the SDS remained just an idea in the minds of a few activists until it was defined and given focus in the Port Huron Statement which was written in 1962. Most of the main authors of the movement's "manifesto" were students, many of whom had been deeply involved with the SNCC and had come to the realization that there were a number of fundamental issues in society, other than civil rights, which needed to be addressed.

By 1964, a similar situation was developing in Canada. The New Left was evolving from the peace movement of the 1950s, which for students was centered in the Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CUCND). By 1964, the CUCND, while maintaining its policies with respect to disarmament and nuclear testing, had expanded to embrace social issues and to adopt the concept of community organization which was at the basis of much early civil rights activity in the U.S. In late 1964, Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA) was founded as the successor to CUCND and it became the key New Left group in Canada during the sixties. Also, according to James Laxer, "SUPA served as the major instrument for drawing American New Left ideas into Canada and for diffusing them among Canadian youth organizations."[21] He

claims that the main concepts resulting from contact with
American radicals were:

> the idea of participatory democracy; suspicion of
> institutional structures and all complex forms of
> social organization; and belief in minority groups and
> the poor as central agents for social change.[22]

These concepts were well-suited to the UGEQ notion of
student syndicalism which was adopted by SUPA in Quebec.
As early as March 1965, SUPA sponsored a seminar at McGill
on syndicalism. Later the campus organization, Students
for a Democratic University (SDU), a SUPA off-shoot
organization, was a major force lobbying for McGill to
join UGEQ.

The demand of the New Left activists for social
change was seen "as a response to the gap between the
ideals of their society and the actual conditions which
blatantly stood in contradiction to them."[23] Just before
the founding of SUPA, its predecessor CUCND was appealing
to students to take an active role by issuing such
statements as:

> If the student wants to act for a world of freedom and
> dignity for all men, he must find a way to use his
> personal power to continually challenge the society in
> the most fundamental ways possible.[24]

It was the New Left philosophy which increasingly led
students to see themselves as a power group. In the words
of one activist who was interviewed, "Students began to
see themselves as the prime movers in society." According
to George Bereday, the sense of student power was
reinforced in Quebec in 1963 when the voting age was
lowered to eighteen, "thus lending tremendous political
force to the student movement."[25] John Sampson and Walter
Phillips, along with L. Lehtiniemi, support the view that
student protests were the expression of an attempt to
redefine their role and "As a result, the student status

was redefined as more important to the ongoing concerns of society than it had been in the past."[26]

As the students moved from working with community-based organizations to collaborating with fellow workers, the University became part of the experience. As mentioned earlier, community activity, considered socially radical by at least one senior administrator, was manifested in the clinics and other help-oriented activities which students established in poorer districts. One consequence of the identification with other workers, apart from the noisy and unsettling demonstrations from time to time, occurred when a teachers' union representative was invited by the students to address Senate and ask for support for the teachers' strike. The situation caused embarrassment on the one hand as Senate was unaware of the invitation and outrage on the other. After much vigorous debate Senate did decide, out of a sense of courtesy, to invite the man to speak. Equally gracious, he declined.

Neither community involvement nor identification with workers brought success in terms of social change as the students had expected. By 1967, after considerable experience with the strategies of protest and a more radical stance which was now influenced by Marxism, the focus of the students turned inward to the university. The seeds for such a change in orientation had been planted in one of the documents presented as early as 1964 at the SUPA founding convention. As reported in Levitt, it said:

> But just as the university cannot prepare the student to take responsibilities . . . also it cannot prepare him to take a critical role in society except by making that a central part of his work at the university. In other words, the university itself can only contribute to society the kinds of individuals required for an age of rapid change by itself adopting a role suited to that age.[27]

It continued: ". . . students who would make the university relevant to the needs of the age must themselves attempt to become relevant to the age, using the university as a base."[28]

The immediate goal was to democratize the university by breaking down elitism and allowing greater accessibility. For these views, the students had ample support from other sources. For example, they had as evidence comments published in The Vertical Mosaic, a landmark work by the prominent Canadian sociologist, John Porter. Porter made clear the educational advantages of the elite and urged greater access, in particular for the French-speaking in Quebec. Martin Shapiro, a moderate student activist during the peak years, reflects the elitist concern some years later in his book Getting Doctored. He claims not only do medical school admissions favour the off-spring of doctors but that in his entering class of 1969 "Only a handful of students were from working class families, and just one from a family that was genuinely poor. The rest were from the various strata of the middle class and upwards."[29] He added "We had a 'relatively homogeneous social background', and few of us would have been thought destined for 'lesser' careers."[30] Student demands for greater accessibility were supported by the Prime Ministers of both Canada and Quebec who had come out in favour of free higher education in 1964-65.

One of the main effects of SUPA was that it influenced existing groups, most notably the Canadian Union of Students (CUS), and spawned other more radical groups such as, in the case of McGill, the Student Action Committee (SAC), the Students for a Democratic University (SDU), and the Radical Student Alliance (RSA). CUS, which had been a conservative group concerned with obtaining privileges for students, decided to become more radical. In January 1967, its President was "fed up with student

governments which abdicate their responsibilities by
giving priority to yearbooks and dances than to social
change."[31] CUS was now concerned with all the issues of
the day and was becoming a driving force for university
issues such as accessibility, governance, quality of
education, and the various other areas which eventually
came under attack. It too had become "firmly committed"[32]
to the student-citizen concept of UGEQ and SUPA.

* * * * * *

It was the various New Left groups which had the
major effect on issues and events at McGill. In their
view, the external issues--civil rights, the war in
Vietnam, support for the oppressed--and the associated
ideas of democracy, equality, and powerlessness were
intrinsically connected with the university. McGill was
seen as having an increasing influence in that it was
training people to fit into the existing society rather
than teaching independent thinking and leading the search
for alternatives to the status quo. According to one
activist who was interviewed, the university was "moving
from the margins of society to a more critical position;
it was losing its cultural sense and becoming part of the
"military-industrial complex."

The objective of the more radical student was to
create a "critical university" which was defined by the
President of the Students' Society in 1968-69, Robert
Hajaly, as ". . . a University conscious of its potential
as an agent of social change."[33] The New Left related the
social concerns to university-based issues such as
governance, the relevance of courses, and research
activities. It is the concept of the "critical
university" which united the various issues and influences
and which gave power to the pressures for change in the
university.

CHAPTER FIVE

STUDENT ACTIVISM AT MCGILL IN THE SIXTIES:
INTERNAL ISSUES AND RELATED EVENTS, 1965-69

Although it was not until 1967 that the University
itself became the focus for student activity, virtually
all the issues directly related to the University had
begun to surface by 1965. During the period 1965-67,
heightened awareness and tactical experience gained by
students through their involvement in activities related
to the external concerns were steadily contributing to the
clarification of the internal issues. In the peak years,
1967-69, the University was the target of endless
criticism, analyses, and disruptive measures designed to
force change.

While other issues that were ultimately more
predominant continued to brew, the quality of teaching
emerged as the first significant concern. As the New Left
gained strength and influence, the numerous specific
complaints began to solidify into the issues which caused
the greatest turmoil: the abolition of _in loco parentis_
rules and attitudes, democratization of the University,
and re-evaluation of the role of the University in
society. The quality of teaching continued to come under
attack, although it took on a new emphasis which reflected
the other issues which were quickening in action.

The internal issues provided the impetus for change
in the University. Closely connected with the external
concerns, they were also very interrelated in themselves.
As the external issues coalesced into a unifying goal--to
bring about social change--so too did the internal issues
find a corresponding pivotal goal--to change the

University's role in society. It was this intention which became the unifying theme for all the action directed against the University by the students.

Quality of Teaching

The announcement in 1965 of a fee increase, and its perceived significance, initiated the intense period of unrest and served to alert the administration that the forces for change would insist on being heard. It is appropriate, however, to examine first the controversy which developed with respect to the quality of teaching, an issue which had a subtle yet definite influence on subsequent events. The quality of teaching is considered in its broadest sense to include activities related to the process of education.

The 1963-64 student survey mentioned in Chapter Three has indicated it was necessary to do more to ensure the success of students in their university studies. Some of the recommendations included: providing more information with respect to the various programs of study, both in the calendar which was rather terse in its descriptions and by initiating an orientation program for incoming students; allowing for greater access to faculty advisors and to an expanded tutorial system; clarifying policies with respect to course requirements. Shortly after the survey was produced, an undergraduate student elaborated on these needs within the context of impersonality in two articles published in the McGill News.[1]

For some time, Donald Kingsbury, a lecturer in the Mathematics Department, had been expressing his views with respect to the need for alternatives to the lecture system. In 1965-66, with the cooperation of "MacFadden's Daily," he was able to publish a number of articles and letters designed to produce discussion about the need for

reform in the University, and, in particular, in the area of teaching. He extended an invitation to students to join him in a Project in Course Design during the summer of 1966; over fifty students volunteered, with student Mark Wilson being the project coordinator. Students learned about course design and then prepared one-hour sample modules; the experience persuaded them that there were more effective and alternative ways to impart knowledge.

During the same summer, a Course Guide sponsored by the Arts and Science Undergraduate Society was produced. It too had received inspiration and support from Don Kingsbury. Undertaken with the cooperation of the administration, its purpose was to evaluate courses and staff competence. While the Course Guide was "viewed as a useful and important contribution by student and professor alike"[2] for the most part, not all professors were happy with the outcome. They found some support for their distress when Leslie Roberts, a prominent commentator, trivialized and ridiculed the Course Guide in a leading editorial in the Montreal Star.[3] John Fekete, one of the editors of the Course Guide, said: "It was an honest effort to communicate but people attributed motives to the students which they did not have."[4] Admitting the inadequacies of this first attempt, he declared one of its purposes was to serve as "a tool meant to exert pressure in the direction of course improvement."[5] In subsequent articles and interviews, several professors did state that commentary about themselves had led them to make changes in their classroom performance.

The less controversial Project in Course Design fared better at the time. In March 1967, the Senate Committee on Educational Procedures, as a result of joint meetings with students, recommended that the University establish a Department of Higher Education which would be

"responsible for making available to McGill teachers
advice related to general principles and expertise in the
several specialities of university instruction."[6] The
Committee also recommended that a Project on Course Design
be set up as soon as possible, noting that "a pilot
project of this sort has held the enthusiastic interest of
the undergraduates, who initiated it, and who have
presented the case for such a project to the Committee."[7]

The students had an additional impact on the
creation of a Department of Higher Education as a result
of the McGill Conference on Teaching Affairs which was
held in October 1966. The Conference, considered to be
the first of its kind in North America, was organized by
students with the blessing of the administration.
Participants came from Canadian and American universities
as well as from industry for the four day event which
studied "contemporary educational technology--course
programming, learning systems, and testing procedures--at
the university level."[8] When the Department of Higher
Education was finally given official approval in 1968, the
Principal referred to the Conference, stating that ". . .
there is little doubt that this exposure to innovation in
educational techniques influenced the thinking of many
people."[9] He added that he saw the Department of Higher
Education as "a mechanism which will facilitate change in
higher education along constructive lines, and provision
will be made for continuing student-faculty collaboration
in these problems."[10]

When the Department of Higher Education came into
existence in June 1969 under the revised name, Centre for
Learning and Development, Don Kingsbury stated: "Basically
it was a response to student demands."[11] The current
Director of the Centre, now known as the Centre for
University Teaching and Learning, confirmed that Don
Kingsbury and student pressure had much to do with its

establishment.[12] Curiously, several senior administrators
interviewed were loathe to acknowledge any student
pressure and would give credit only to Michael Oliver, the
Vice-Principal Academic, who had provided the necessary
administrative input.

Between the years 1966-69, complaints continued with
respect to large classes, impersonality, curriculum
content, the lack of choice in course selection, and,
increasingly, the relevance of programs of study.
Students were critical of the importance given to research
over teaching, one of the factors which had prompted the
interest in teaching methods. They were concerned about
statements such as that in a 1965 report of the Senate
Committee on Educational Procedure which was reported in
the McGill Daily as follows:

> The value of a university education depends much more
> critically on the scholarly qualities of the
> professors involved in the teaching than on the
> particular techniques of teaching that are involved.[13]

Support for their criticism was provided subsequently by a
few individuals such as Michael Oliver who confirmed that
teaching was under-emphasized in the modern university in
favour of research. He believed that course evaluations
by students could be one measure to alleviate the
problem.[14] Another ongoing complaint centered around the
libraries which the University acknowledged were
over-crowded and out-of-date. The construction of new
library buildings and implementation of the Library of
Congress cataloguing system were then in progress.
However, students were also concerned about restrictive
regulations which prevented direct access to the stacks
and limited hours of library use.

The University did respond to these complaints. As
early as 1961, the problem of large classes had been
recognized. Experiments in T.V. teaching were proudly
touted, although there were only three classes using

closed-circuit T.V. by 1965 when student pressure brought about expanded use. A freshman orientation program was finally set up, the tutorial system was expanded, and compulsory advising for freshmen was initiated in 1966-67. As mentioned previously, in September 1966, the position of Dean of Students was established to coordinate and develop educational support services. Degree requirements were altered to allow students who were having difficulty to take a reduced course load; in the case of a failed course, only the course and not the entire year would need to be repeated. Courses and programs were constantly under revision. Major programs were expanded to avoid having to choose between excessive generalization as in an honours program on the one hand and the perceived irrelevance of a general degree on the other. The need for subject specialization was reduced when new programs with an interdisciplinary approach were introduced. Some of these included Jewish Studies, Industrial Relations, North American Studies and East Asian Studies. Requirements about which students had protested were dropped; for example: Latin in first year, a second year in a foreign language, the faculty course in third and fourth year, and eventually the core program taken by freshmen in Arts and Science. To allow for even greater flexibility in course options, approval was given in 1966-67 for students to take a certain number of courses not only in faculties other than the one in which they were registered but also at other universities in the Montreal area. By 1969-70, the occasional student-directed course was being offered in a few departments such as political science and psychology.

The quality of teaching, with its considerable number of related aspects, was not the cause of any of the more dramatic events on campus despite the fact that, ironically, this issue was considered by many senior

administrators and faculty to be the students' one
legitimate grievance. One can only speculate about both
these points. Perhaps the students realized that much of
the problem was a direct result of the rapid expansion of
the student body and the explosion of new knowledge and
not due to the various flaws of which the University was
later accused. From the administration and faculty
perspective, the same awareness could allow for the
legitimacy of a complaint which was not especially
threatening in that it did not attack the power structure.

Nevertheless, student involvement with this issue
had far-reaching effects which were not realized by many,
neither at the time nor a number of years later as was
revealed in many of the interviews with the more senior
staff. Don Kingsbury's articles continued to keep the
issue alive as he provided material for the McGill Daily
throughout the decade. Faith Wallis supported this point
when she said that while Don Kingsbury's course design
idea did not bear fruit, his activities were an important
contribution to the atmosphere at the time.[15] It is clear
that he did cause concern in the administration as he was
reprimanded in 1965 by the Dean of Arts, H. D. Woods, for
using the McGill Daily as a forum rather than going
through "proper" channels. According to Kingsbury, Woods
feared a Berkeley-type incident. In March 1968, Senate
expressed concern about comments by Kingsbury which
appeared in the student paper and which were seen as
reflecting adversely on his colleagues; they decided
against taking any action. Don Kingsbury feels he
survived the decade without any serious personal
consequences because he did have a large following and any
action against him could have had repercussions. Also the
recognized legitimacy of the issue may have protected him.

The most significant observation, however, is that
the students who produced the Course Guide and, to an even

greater extent, those who were involved in the Project in Course Design became key activists. Don Kingsbury and others have acknowledged that the Project in Course Design in particular served as a training ground for activism. Professor Archie Malloch stated that: "Don Kingsbury invited students to scrutinize the quality of education. They learned to question things which had been taken for granted."[16] A number of the more radical activists, most notably John Fekete, Mark Wilson, and Robert Hajaly, had been driving forces in the projects which he had inspired. Mark Wilson, for example, claims that his initial interest was simply in pedagogy but the experience he gained led him to participate actively in the student movement as he had become aware of the University's inertia and had begun to question injustices.[17]

In Loco Parentis

In loco parentis rules and attitudes were the target of much protest. What many failed to realize was that students were questioning and redefining their role both in society and in the University. Comments made in several interviews revealed that a number of individuals continue to see the issue as having been centred around changes in residence regulations. Others, who saw the concept in somewhat broader terms, were perplexed by student demands for greater control of their lives. They considered McGill students to be in a rather privileged position as the Students' Society, from its inception in 1910, had been uniquely independent compared to such organizations at other universities in North America. Robert Shaw said that "The University got into trouble because it did not show enough understanding of students."[18] While obviously not a total explanation for the events of the time, it was this lack of understanding which underlay much of the University's response to

student demands. Shaw's viewpoint is supported by an
article in Old McGill '69. Attempting to explain the
reasons for the student revolt, it states: "Part of the
reason is that students are not considered full-fledged
human beings, either by universities or by the larger
society."[19] The student-citizen concept which prevailed
in Quebec provided an orientation which supported this
sentiment.

For students seeking responsibility for their own
lives, residence rules offered an obvious challenge. The
women's residence, Royal Victoria College, imposed a far
greater number of restrictions than were in force in the
men's residences. Apart from rigid rules relative to
eating hours, remaining at dinner until the Warden left,
and a strict leaves policy which determined the number of
times and until what hour one could be out during each
week, there were impractical rules such as one which
forbade the wearing of slacks. Faith Wallis, writing an
account for We Walked Very Warily, described the system as
one typified by a "lack of trust and officious
restriction."[20] The prevailing attitude is revealed in a
comment by the Warden in a 1968-69 report to the
Principal. She proclaimed that male and female guests had
always been "permitted" at dinner and that the "privilege"
had been extended to include lunch.[21] Further evidence of
a lack of awareness of the current social reality was her
comment to the effect that she was amazed when the women
in residence voted to have "open house" on week-ends.
This meant that they could have male visitors in their
rooms. Claiming that when the students arrived at the
University "they became our responsibility,"[22] she wrote
to 500 parents for their comments. Only five responded,
with two supporting the change and three opposed.

The men's residences had fewer restrictions although
again, for example, it was not until 1967-68, after much

protest, that they were no longer required to wear jackets
and ties to their cafeteria dinners. There was a greater
effort by students in the men's residences, aided at times
by the Student Council Executive, to gain control of the
decision-making process. Residence academic staff
strongly resisted students "taking control"; other
academics came to their aid, on occasion recommending the
dismissal of a more permissive warden.

It is interesting to note that while there were
unceasing complaints and a certain restlessness, there
were no major expressions of protest concerning residence
life. Surprisingly, residence policies changed more
slowly than those related to other areas of University
life. Nevertheless, by the end of the sixties, the
residences were very different from what they had been.
Virtually all restrictions of the type described had been
removed. In 1969, a proposal was put forward to make one
residence co-ed; this was approved by the University in
1970. By some, this was seen as a somewhat desperate
concession to stop the flow of students leaving residence
to live elsewhere. In fact, this later form of pressure,
somewhat reminiscent of the migrations of the Middle Ages,
did do much to change residence life-style and to hasten
the establishment of residence policies that were set by a
committee with significant student representation.

The desire to be freed of the parental role of the
University was reflected in a much more fundamental way
both in the demands to be an active participant in all
facets of University life and decision-making, as well as
in the anger and polarization generated whenever the
University exhibited punitive and authoritarian postures.
The issue was defined most clearly and dramatically by the
events surrounding the "Daily Crisis" which began on
November 3, 1967 and which did not end until March 26,
1968. This one event forced the University to give up its

strenuous resistance and to come to terms with the changing role of the student. It also sharpened the struggle for democratization and pressured the University to examine its role in society.

On November 3, 1967, the McGill Daily, which had become increasingly provocative during the fall of 1967, reprinted a satirical article which had appeared in The Realist some months earlier. The article dared to specify rarely mentioned and less savoury aspects of the characters of J. F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson and to ridicule Mrs. Kennedy in a satirical depiction of an act of perversion imagined by the author to have taken place subsequent to the assassination of J. F. Kennedy. This offensive article was published in a recently created column, "The Boll-Weevils," written by John Fekete. From the outset, the columnist's stated purpose was to shock. However, the article which appeared in the November 3, 1967 issue was viewed as "going too far" by Principal H. Rocke Robertson, who decided immediately to press charges of obscene libel against three McGill Daily staff members. He was soon supported in his action by alumni and members of the public and media who demanded that the University punish the students. Members of the SDU were quick to point out that the case was one which fell within the jurisdiction of the Student Council as the newspaper was responsible to the student body, not to the administration. When the Principal refused to drop the charges, despite both the students' request and the urging of a number of faculty and administrators, the battle lines were drawn.

At first, support for Fekete, who unlike his two accused colleagues did not apologize, was minimal. Sympathy developed gradually as students increasingly decided the affair was not the business of the administration. During the five months through which the affair dragged on, student militancy increased for two main reasons. The New Left, in

particular asrepresented by the SDU, gained power during
that time by using the opportunity to press for changes with
which a substantial number of students were in basic
agreement. In addition, the administration made a number of
tactical errors, repeatedly revealing itself as punitive and
authoritarian, thereby adding to the students' sense of
being "victims" and, in their eyes, justifying both their
behaviour and their demands.

On the students' side, initiatives included the
challenge of a reprint of the offending article with
signatures, followed by demonstrations and a sit-in. The
latter resulted in the most dramatic tactic, occupation of
the Principal's office, which led to removal by the police
and disciplinary action by the University. In addition, the
McGill Daily published a spate of letters and articles with
sensationalistic headlines; they debated what was wrong with
both the laying of the charges and with the University. A
number of academic staff, particularly from the English
Department, were supportive as they fought to prove the
validity of the satirical nature of the article and to
demand that the charges be dropped. A statement, prepared
by the students who staged the sit-in in the Administration
Building, outlined their position and included
recommendations for the Committee on Student Discipline.
The recommendations reflect the main issues around which the
students rallied during the episode and thereafter:

> 1. Students must be regarded as full members of both
> society at large and of the university community. As
> such they must participate fully in all aspects of
> university life.
>
> 2. . . . . the power of persons external to the
> university should be curtailed, while the power of
> students and faculty be greatly increased.
>
> 3. A new Disciplinary Code should be drawn up,
> recognising the complete autonomy of student activities.
>
> 4. A committee composed equally of students, faculty,
> and administration should be established in order to
> maintain a continual dialogue among all groups on campus
> . . .23

On the University's side, decisions were reversed continuously throughout the dispute. To begin with, the initial charge was illegal and was changed a few days later to one which was probably equally illegal but was more creative:

> Participating in the publication on campus of an article which contravenes standards of decency acceptable by and in this University . . . the whole incompatible with your status as a student of this University.[24]

The first case which was to have been brought to the Senate Committee on Student Discipline was that of the twenty-eight individuals who had been removed during the occupation of the Administration Building. The University wanted to interview each person individually or in small groups and in closed session. This session was set for December 20, 1967 when exams would be in progress and the McGill Daily no longer publishing. However, this very obvious ploy of "divide and conquer" was regarded as an unfair use of administrative power and the University lost much credibility with the student body. Student protest caused the administration to reschedule the hearing for February 1968 and to agree to interview all the students together.

The first meeting of Fekete's hearing was cancelled as he walked out when denied the facility of closed-circuit T.V. simply because he had declined the offer initially. As a consequence, he was suspended. The President of the Student Council intervened with the Principal and the decision was reversed due to "widespread campus concern."[25] It should be noted that the hearing for Fekete's two colleagues had taken place earlier over closed-circuit T.V. Soon after the appearance of the offending article, a scholarship which had been awarded to Fekete by the Beta Sigma Phi Sorority was withdrawn due to the "infamous publicity"[26] which he had received. Later in the year, the University Scholarships Committee denied Fekete a McConnell Fellowship by persuading the assessors, all of whom had

given his application a top rating, to revise the decision. According to an interviewee, who was a member of the Committee, two professors resigned from the Committee in disgust. This action was viewed as blatant injustice and as prejudicing Fekete's case by declaring him guilty in advance of his hearing. Senate later refused to establish an investigatory committee despite receiving a petition from 1,000 students and 35 staff. Another committee failed in its attempt to refuse his admission to the Graduate Faculty.

During this period, the administration was attempting to find legal grounds on which the ties between the McGill Daily and the University could be severed. (One administrator was prepared to arrange for its paper supply to be cut off.) The hope was to have the McGill Daily separated from the Student Council and thereby be forced to pay for itself. When this effort proved to be unfruitful, in February 1968, the Principal tried to persuade the Committee on Student Activities to support him in various plans to restrict the McGill Daily.[27] In particular, he proposed the establishment of a committee to study the fee collection and distribution arrangement between the Students' Society and the University. Despite the students' opposition, he went ahead and gained the Board of Governors' approval. The Student Council declared this move to be a "life and death threat to the existence of the Students' Society."[28] However, when the matter was referred to the Tripartite Commission, itself an outcome of the crisis, the administration was again foiled. The Commission recommended that the Board drop its suggestion and the question was not raised again. Had the students known that, behind the scenes, the administration was debating preventing Fekete from writing his final exams and hence from completing his degree, there would have been even greater repercussions. Fortunately, "more sober fellows who believed in freedom of expression and protection of the oddball," to quote one

interviewee, prevented the Principal from "going as far as he would have liked."

Ultimately all three <u>McGill Daily</u> staff members were declared guilty of the charge but they received nothing more serious than a reprimand, the lowest form of disciplinary action. The Committee on Student Discipline said that it could find no evidence of any ulterior motives on the part of the students responsible for publishing the article. In Fekete's case, this judgement was not rendered until March 26, 1968. His reaction was: "Never have so many labored so long for so little."[29] The final triumph was indeed Fekete's. He received a ten minute ovation at convocation in June of the same year.

The Fekete affair had a number of significant results. For example, during the sit-in on November 8, 1967, Senate voted to hold open meetings of its Committee on Student Discipline and asked that two students be appointed full members. Also the University took up the SDU's suggestion and established the Tripartite Commission on the Nature of the University with a mandate "to examine the nature of the University, its function, its qualities and its values."[30] The Commission's interim report in April 1968 included position papers which directly reflected the students' issues: the university and society, the evolving curriculum, and university government. Yet another demand put forward in the statement of the sit-in group was taken seriously by the University when it decided to establish a university newspaper as one means to alleviate the complaints about lack of communication. The <u>McGill Reporter</u> began publishing on September 25, 1968.

From the students' perspective, the decisions rendered signalled the breakdown of the tradition of <u>in loco parentis</u>. Each time the University reversed itself on some point, the students learned that they did indeed have power. The New Left became sufficiently influential and popular

that three radical activists, Robert Hajaly, Peter Foster
and Ian Hyman, were elected to key Students' Society
positions for 1967-68. As one professor who was interviewed
said: "The Fekete affair raised many issues and gave focus
to the student movement at McGill." Julius Grey said the
affair "set things off and they did not settle down until
1970."[31]

Subsequent to the Fekete episode, the determination to
end the parental disciplinary role of the administration
continued with the fight for a new code of student
discipline. In fact, a new code had been approved as
recently as December 1965. The Student Council had been
consulted but had made no comments or proposals. Now,
however, the code was seen as inappropriate. The key demand
was that the new code apply to every member of the
University community and not just students. This point was
the stickler as it represented the emerging notion of
students not simply as participants but rather as equal
participants in the University. The code was the subject of
debate from 1968 until the end of the decade at which time
there was still no decision.

Another question was the proposal that the Students'
Society constitution be altered so that future changes would
not be subject to Senate approval. As a preliminary step,
the Students' Society had incorporated itself in 1968; this
was later found to be illegal and was reversed. Nor did the
proposed constitution change occur once the constitution in
effect was discovered to be invalid. Students were more
successful in their insistence that they should choose their
own representatives to Senate and its committees. As late
as 1969-70, the administration was still attempting to
control the student body by insisting upon a voice in the
selection of student representatives. As should have been
expected, that right was won finally by the students
themselves.

Democratization of the University

By the beginning of the decade, virtually everyone was
in agreement about the need for greater democratization of
the University. By and large, those responsible for running
universities in Canada felt that this was happening
naturally as the rapidly changing social, economic and
political conditions were causing a greater number of people
from more varied backgrounds to enter university. The
students' perspective, particularly that of the New Left,
was not so simplistic. They believed that the university
was decidely undemocratic, that power was too centralized,
and that a number of fundamental changes were necessary to
alter the situation. In 1965, the President of the McGill
Students' Society was elected on a platform which included a
number of related intentions such as pressing for free
university education, questioning the control of Senate and
the Board of Governors, and increasing the participation of
students in the process of their own education. By 1967,
student pressure with respect to democratization had
gathered considerable momentum and the issue had become the
focal point of the activists. Their highly controversial
terms for greater democratization provoked fiercer
struggles, a larger number of disturbances, and more
strenuous, often emotional, resistance on the part of the
faculty and administration than did their demands on any
other issue.

The announcement of a fee increase in March 1965
provoked an unprecedented reaction on the part of the
students. Immediately there were sit-ins, marches, rallies,
and the publication of a special issue of the McGill Daily
which had ceased publication for the year. A petition
protesting the fee increase and signed by 5,300 students was
presented to the Principal. Sharon Sholzberg, the incoming
President of the Students' Society, was a leader in the fee
protest. When the new school year opened in September with

Patrick MacFadden as editor of the McGill Daily, the stage
had been set for the activities which would continue for the
rest of the decade.

The fee increase was seen as being contrary to the
many public commitments to encourage greater accessibilty.
It was particularly odious as the Liberal government elected
in 1960 had promised free education at all levels of
education.[32] To add fuel to the fire, the long awaited
Bladen Commission Report which appeared in early October
1965 was a huge let-down as it did not support free
education but rather recommended increasing fees. It did
state that a greater number of bursaries and loans should be
made available for those in need. The University was
sympathetic to the students' concerns and met with student
leaders to explain that the University's financial plight,
the result of inadequate government grants,[33] made the
increase necessary. A committee which included students was
established to explore possible solutions.

Ultimately, this particular issue died down and the
students did not carry out their threat to withold second
term fees. However, the effects were far-reaching for
McGill. The Social Action Committee (SAC), a newly-formed,
high-power leftist organization of which one could be a
member by invitation only, according to Mark Wilson, had
used the opportunity to stimulate action over an issue to
which the average student could relate and had thereby
raised their general consciousness with respect to social
issues. With the help of cooperative McGill Daily
editorials and articles, the idea was planted that the
Principal was "challenging the new power of the student
movement in Quebec."[34] The agitation inspired demands for a
review of the administration's plans for financing the
University in the future and for Senate and the Board of
Governors to open their meetings to students.
Democratization of the University became a concrete issue.

The major turning point occurred in January 1966 with
the release of the Duff-Berdahl report on <u>University
Government in Canada</u>. With the publication of this report,
democratization became firmly centred around governance.
The call for reform had been initiated in the 1950s
throughout Canada by faculty who were concerned that the
University was expanding but that governance remained in the
hands of a small, self-perpetuating group with little
faculty voice. <u>A Place of Liberty</u> (1964) had publicized
these views in its attack on the university power system.
The particular focus of the faculty members was the Board of
Governors. The aim of faculty members was to shift power to
Senate. By 1960, this goal had been achieved in
considerable measure. However, in 1962, a more formal
attack was mounted when CAUT and AUCC co-sponsored a study
of university governance in Canada. When the Duff-Berdahl
Report finally appeared in 1966, many changes had already
begun and it was regarded by most as "too little and too
late,"[35] to quote Robin Ross. Nevertheless, it did force
universities to study themselves. Students were
particularly unimpressed with what they viewed as
condescending recommendations with respect to their role.
The more politically-minded students quickly took advantage
of the debate going on around them and began to echo the
demands of their professors. In response to the
Duff-Berdahl report, McGill set up a Joint Governors-Senate
Committee on University Government, the key concern of which
would be:

> the role of students and faculty in the government of
> the University as expressed in the powers and
> composition of the Senate and the Board of Governors and
> their committees, the primary decision-making bodies of
> the University.[36]

During 1966-67, while the Committee was meeting, a few
key activists kept busy on the issue. On behalf of the
Students' Society, David Ticoll had undertaken a review of

student representation on Senate committees. No progress
had been made since 1963-64 when students had been appointed
to the Libraries Liaison Committee. In October 1966, as a
result of his study, Senate agreed to place students on
committees dealing with matters such as job placement,
student health, financial aid appeals, and scholarships.
Previously, apart from the Libraries Committee, students had
been on committees dealing with athletics, student
activities, the book store and lodging. The gain was viewed
as tokenism because all were service committees and were not
concerned with academic matters. The "forces responsible"
for these concessions promised to continue their
"crusade."[37] A number of faculty members became alarmed and
expressed their opposition to further participation by
students for fear that they would soon be "running the
University." The Dean of Arts, H. D. Woods, who was perhaps
one of the most adamant, made many forthright comments
including "I don't think students should sit in on
decision-making and have a vote."[38] He did concede that
they should act in an advisory capacity, expressing what
became a majority faculty and administration opinion.

In May 1967, David Ticoll, Mark Wilson and John Fekete
presented a brief to the Joint Committee on University
Government. The meeting to which they were invited to
discuss their brief was not a success as the Committee did
not agree with their perspective. Their demands covered a
number of sensitive points. In terms of the students' role
in University government, the recommendations were that the
meetings of Senate, the Board of Governors, and their
respective committees be open, that their minutes be made
public, and that students be represented on Senate and the
Board. In September, after Mark Wilson had been elected
External Affairs Vice-President of the Students' Society and
John Fekete its Director of Education, the same brief, with
explanatory preamble, was presented to the Student Council.

At that time, it was pointed out that the McGill Joint Committee on University Government was one of very few such committees in Canadian universities which did not allow for student membership. Members of the administration were invited to meet with the Council to discuss the brief. Strenuous opposition from Dean Woods and the Vice-Principal Academic, Michael Oliver, was sufficient to create indecision amongst members. Wilson and Fekete resigned their positions and decided to pursue their struggle in the columns of the McGill Daily. One immediate outcome was the appearance of the ill-fated "Boll-Weevils" column.

When the report of the Joint Committee on University Government finally was tabled in Senate on November 15, 1967, it did not create a big stir as its appearance coincided with the more sensational Fekete affair. Demands with respect to participation were kept alive in the McGill Daily and in the discussions of the Tripartite Commission of which David Ticoll was a member. However, it was only after the radical student slate was elected for the 1968-69 session that pressure for change in the governing bodies began in earnest.

The final report of the Joint Governors-Senate Committee on University Government was postponed until July 1968 to allow input from the new Student Council. Their brief was based on the earlier document written by Ticoll, Wilson and Fekete. In terms of change to Senate, the first arm of University government slated for reform, they insisted that the three students proposed for Senate be increased to seven plus the President of the Student Council as an ex-officio member. They also demanded that Senate and Board meetings be open.[39] As a result of the students' brief, the Committee's original recommendations were revised to include these requests, although the University was to participate in the selection of the student senators. As an interim measure for the impending academic year, the

students were permitted to choose their representatives.
The Committee also reaffirmed that students should
participate in Faculty Council and committee meetings.[40]

In September, Senate became the arena for university
reform.[41] Six of the seven student members were elected as
a radical slate; the seventh member was a moderate but
nevertheless committed to reform. Their first battle was to
acquire the right to elect their own representatives to
Senate and Senate committees. This was won only after
overcoming vigorous and prolonged opposition by the
administration. The f·ght to be placed on all Senate
committees saw some wins and some losses. Difficulty was
encountered when the Academic Policy Committee, an important
body from the student perspective, agreed to have student
representatives and to open its meetings but was over-ruled
by Senate and the Board of Governors. Eventually student
pressure won out. Soon realizing that the Nominating
Committee was a control mechanism, students made it a key
target. When students agreed to cease disrupting a meeting
of the Committee, the item was moved to the top of the
agenda and the Committee voted in favcur of student
representation. Senate subsequently over-ruled the vote.
Students continued to press unsuccessfully for open meetings
of the Nominating Committee but gave up the idea of
representation when they realized it would nullify their
right to choose their own members to committees. By
September 1970, they had managed to achieve representation
on the majority of 25 standing committees of Senate. The
holdouts were those dealing with research, retirements,
staff relations and the Steering Committee.

Motion after motion was presented by the activists in
their effort to effect change in the educational process,
the role of the student in the University, governance, and
the role of the University in society. They complained that
their issues were not being discussed, that there was a

proliferation of new committees to prolong discussion and delay decisions. The faculty complained that disruptions by student observers were making it impossible to conduct business, that student senators dominated discussion and that student issues had enlarged the Senate agenda to an unreasonable length. Interestingly, it was the radical Student Council President, Robert Hajaly, who proposed that more authority for routine business be given to the Steering Committee so that Senate could spend its time debating important issues. Students ensured the openness of meetings by requesting and receiving the installation of closed-circuit T.V. for those who could not obtain tickets. When a meeting scheduled for a Saturday in early January 1969 could not be advertised because the University papers were not publishing, the Student Council had the temerity to take out ads in the public press--and to request that the administration pay the bills! Complaints by staff in Senate resulted in a motion, moved by a Dean, who said ". . . it was a proper act for the Students' Society to place the advertisement."[42]

By the end of the 1968-69 academic year, Senate proceedings had begun to settle down. Many individuals from the administration and faculty have admitted that part of the problem had been that the students had come to Senate better prepared to discuss issues and more skilled in debate than were the faculty members. Others stated that had the more reactionary types not reacted to every disruption and breach of protocol with righteous indignation and had the University not used resistance tactics on almost every issue, most of the turmoil would have been avoided.

Once students gained representation on Senate, they began to focus on the democratization of other elements in the power structure. They had learned that influence on changes in curriculum, course requirements, standards of

teaching, and other issues directly related to their education meant representation on faculty and departmental committees. At the departmental level, the rallying call was for parity. Again positions hardened. The Faculty of Arts and Science which suffered the disruption of a Council meeting in November 1968, later in the same month, voted for open meetings and student representation. The final agreement was that 37 students would sit on the Faculty Council, despite the concern of some that students were "taking over." While most of the agitation was in the humanities and social sciences areas, virtually every department soon met the demand to include students in their decision-making bodies. In the science departments, where there were fewer activists, students gains were not as great. Nevertheless, architecture, engineering, law, and medical students conducted strenuous campaigns, with the occasional boycott of classes to increase pressure.

In most departments in the humanities and social sciences, students gained strong representation for several reasons. Early in the departmental phase of democratization, the English Department opened up its committees and went so far as to grant parity on several. In November 1968, students in the Department of Economics and Political Science carried out a ten-day strike and sit-in when faculty turned down the proposals of a joint student-staff committee. During the sit-in, which was closely watched not only by staff but also by the public press, negotiations continued. At the end, the students won most of their original demands including one third representation on all but one or two committees. This dramatic event, with its potential for disruption and violence, had much to do with encouraging other departments to concede to similar demands. A large part of the students' success at the departmental level seems to have been due to the fact that they increased their

power base by organizing themselves in departmental unions or associations from which to present their demands. It should also be noted that the New Left was at the peak of its power in 1968-69. Although there was much dissension in the student ranks, with a gradual shift to more moderate behaviour becoming obvious, the New Left was in control of the key Student Council positions, the editorship of the McGill Daily, the presidency of the Arts and Science Undergraduate Society, and student seats in Senate. Comments found in the files of senior administrators, statements made in the interviews, and excerpts from the diaries of Dr. Robertson and Lorne Gales reveal that there was widespread fear on campus and in the McGill community at large. This fear resulted in a strong desire to avoid any major confrontation. It must also be said that many people in the administration and faculty were changing their views. They were conceding that frequently the students' demands were reasonable enough and that often their own opposition was without substance.

Both in Senate and at the faculty and department level, students began to demand a voice in new appointments and promotions of staff. Students argued that they should be able to help determine who was best qualified to give them the education which they were seeking. At the department level, there was intense lobbying to be on the staff promotions committees. Many departments managed to resist; others allowed limited membership. An incident which took place in the English Department suggests reasons why faculty resisted student membership: John Fekete presented a list of professors whom he believed should be dismissed. The list was actually taken seriously and discussed by a departmental committee. Either no one remembers or no one is willing to say if Fekete had any success.

From the administration's perspective, the Sociology Department's decision to hire a controversial activist, Marlene Dixon, was disturbing. The Department, perhaps wishing to avoid a strike of the sort which had torn apart the Department of Economics and Political Science, had submitted to student pressure. The Board of Governors was dissuaded from its attempt to interfere with the appointment. MAUT members soon became alarmed by the student pressure for a voice in staffing promotions. Disagreement arose between those who strongly supported student involvement and those who felt that students should not be making staffing decisions. Others on staff began to support student input within the context of staff evaluations along the lines of the <u>Course Guide</u>. Once the cause of controversy, such evaluations now became more acceptable as the lesser of two evils.

The big push in Senate was to be on selection committees for Deans and, once Dr. Robertson announced his resignation, for the Principalship.[43] By April 1969, after the matter had been referred to the Committee for the Continuing Review of University Government for a decision, Senate approved the right for students to be on Deans' selection committees. Earlier, in February, the students had registered their point more concretely by conducting a poll for the position of Dean of Arts. While the top candidate did not become the Dean, the incumbent Dean, who had opposed the students on virtually every demand both in Senate and elsewhere, fared poorly. A large number of people remain convinced that the results of this poll, given the temper of the times, prevented him from running for the second term for which he was eligible and which it is believed he would have otherwise sought. It was widely believed that the poll and the public judgements which it generated strongly influenced the decision to include students on the selection committees.

During the following year there was the usual committee discussion and delay with respect to membership on the Principalship committee. In March 1970, another poll was undertaken, this time with no particular outcome although the "winner" later did become the Dean of Arts. Subsequently, by refusing to participate in the selection process after being granted membership,[44] students gained a slightly increased voice on the committee and forced withdrawal of the stipulation that the Board of Governors could over-rule the nomination put forward by the joint Board-Senate committee.

The Board of Governors opened its meetings in January 1969. However, student representation faced continued resistance by the Principal and Board members, despite the fact that Senate, in May 1969, approved a motion that the Board be asked to add three students. Those in opposition felt that students could hope for representation by having one of their senators chosen as a Senate representative to the Board. A student did sit on the Board in that capacity in 1969-70. Student pressure for official representation continued but did not succeed in the 1960s.[45]

Despite the gains made during 1968-69, the increasingly disruptive nature of the tactics employed had led to the growth of both a more moderate group of activists and a number of decidedly right wing opponents of the New Left. The disruptions of Senate, the Board, committees and classes provoked by the SAC, RSA, and SDU (all three inspired in large measure by a young professor, Stan Gray) had "turned off" many students. When a more moderate group ran for Student Council, they were given financial support for their election campaign, secretly, by helpful members of the administration with whom they had been conspiring to some extent during 1968-69. This help, the support of a student body in a new mood, and the

sobering prospect of the rumoured "McGill Français" march probably account for their victory. Not radicals, but nevertheless activists committed to reform, the new Council continued to fight for issues in the name of democratization.

The student senators continued relentlessly to keep Senate on its toes and to raise new issues. They were insistent that action on restructuring University government continue. When the Committee for the Continuing Review of University Government had failed to meet for some time, they forced the Principal to call a meeting. They kept up criticism of the Board which they saw as an authoritarian body to be either democratized or abolished. One of their suggestions was that the University adopt the system of unicameral government which they considered to be more democratic. This goal was resisted, although the Principal who had been opposed to the concept in 1968 was, by 1970, beginning to reverse his opinion.[46] However, by this time the pressure for unicameral government had ceased.

The students also tackled specific areas of discrimination. For example, a student motion led to the establishment of a committee to study sexual discrimination. When the committee reported several months later, it confirmed that there was discrimination at McGill. This marked the beginning of an awareness of the position of women academics and administrators and the launching of a still on-going campaign for genuine equality.[47] It was a student motion which removed questions with respect to religion and father's military past and education as well as photos from the application for admission.[48] For several months, a Senate debate with respect to scholarships with discriminatory conditions was led by students. While the specific case which sparked the issue was not resolved, mainly due to the large amount

of money involved, they did gain approval for attempting
to amend such terms for all existing scholarships and for
not accepting any new scholarships with discriminatory
conditions.

During 1969-70, debate in Senate became less
volatile on both sides. No doubt the moderates benefited
from the gains which had been made by their predecessors.
They did not have to deal with a strongly opposed
administration but rather with one which was calmer now
that radicals were no longer in control of the Student
Council and the leading staff activist, Stan Gray, had
been fired. By the end of the period 1968-70, the major
issues with respect to governance had been resolved. The
students' role was accepted and meetings of the various
governing bodies had returned to their normal protocol,
frequency and length.

Role of the University in Society

Throughout the sixties, McGill activists maintained
that there was a pressing need to change the relationship
between the University and society. The moderate
activists believed the University should open up and
become more responsive to the needs of the surrounding
community. For the radical activist, the aim was first to
reform the university and then to use it as an "agent" to
bring about change in society.[49] The conviction that the
University must respond actively to economic, political,
and social problems provided a unifying logic for many of
the demands for change in the University.

"Relevance" became a slogan associated with the
agitation in the universities. While an interest in
teaching methods sparked the various demands for change
with respect to the quality of education, the focal point
later became the relevance of what was taught. The
curriculum was expected to reflect the problems of

contemporary Quebec and North American society. For
failing to do so, the curriculum was considered to be too
narrow. Another complaint was that students were unable
to select courses relevant to their educational aims.
Many regarded the cry for relevance as the primary
motivator for faculty and departmental decisions to remove
core requirements, to create interdisciplinary programs,
and to expand course offerings. To give one example of
the increased breadth of coverage in a discipline, a
glance at the course calendars shows that the English
department which had 34 course offerings in 1959-60 listed
63 in 1970-71. While the relevance debate was in the
humanities and social sciences, for the most part, a
universal complaint was that there be less emphasis on
theory and more on the practical application of knowledge
in the service of society. To some extent, students
initiated an extension of the classroom experience and
brought the University to the people by establishing
medical and legal clinics, volunteering various forms of
educational and social services, supporting labour
disputes, and organizing demonstrations to persuade
governmental and other bodies to alter specific political
or social conditions.

Activist students believed that society's many ills
were largely the result of the competitive and
materialistic dominance of corporate and military concerns
over human considerations and values. As noted earlier,
the University was viewed as being aligned with this
"military-industrial complex" and thus as a contributor to
a repressive society rather than a force for improving the
lives of people. One of the reasons for a relevant
curriculum was to force a connection between knowledge and
the objectives of knowledge and in the process to expose
subject matter in the service of the "system." It was
this same motivation which stimulated the demand for more

public information with respect to the nature of research conducted by the University. Immediately after his election to Senate, the moderate student senator proclaimed that "his main concern on Senate would be to try to reduce the amount of military research done at McGill, and to break all ties with the American military-economic establishment."[50] The Senate Committee on Communications rejected demands for information with respect to sponsoring agencies, amount of grant monies, terms of reference, and conditions imposed with respect to publishing the results of research. Senate voted against the motion for student membership on the Committee on Research. Despite University denials that there was any secret research being conducted and assurances that all the necessary information was publicized in various University reports, students remained suspicious.

The more radical element saw the grading system as serving the corporate world in that it was a determinant in the selection process for jobs, forcing students to compete for marks rather than enjoy learning for its intrinsic value. Robert Hajaly said "Marks and grading can be viewed as a very alienating mechanism within the system, i.e. alienating students from their own subject."[51] In response to this thinking, some professors opted to give pass or fail grades. Interestingly, the conservative Faculty of Medicine submitted to student pressure to issue only pass or fail grades. Less well-known is the fact that numerical grades were kept by professors of Medicine for use when needed to support letters of reference and the like.

The University's alignment with the corporate establishment was again confirmed in October 1968 when the University decided to give an honorary degree to the Chief Executive Officer of Noranda Mines. The announcement set off an embarrassing flurry of protests provoked by the

company's reputation for the exploitation of French-speaking workers in Quebec. Students at once sought, and were granted, membership on the Honorary Degrees Committee. Another example of opposition to corporate influence was the demand to abolish the Faculty of Management because it "trains the managerial elite and its accountants for corporations exploiting the population and resources of Quebec."[52] The SAC presented this demand as one of several when it disrupted the first open meeting of the Board of Governors. The fact that the building to house the Faculty was to be constructed on land which the students wanted for a student cooperative residence may suggest mixed motives.

For proof that McGill was dominated by corporate interests, students believed one need only look at the membership of the Board of Governors. Virtually all were powerful members of the Canadian corporate establishment.[53] The Board was additionally unrepresentative of society as a whole in that every member was an Anglo-Saxon male, with most being Protestants. Feeling the winds of change, the Board expanded its membership in the mid-sixties to include a small representation from the Jewish and French-Canadian communities. The first woman member of the Board, Clare Kerrigan, was elected at the end of 1969, as a representative of the Graduates' Society. As a result of the studies on university government, members of Senate were added to the Board in 1968-69 and meetings became open. However, students maintained that more had to be done to break the corporate influence in the affairs of the University.[54] Enlarging on ideas expressed in the Duff-Berdahl Report, they insisted that not only should there be members from their own ranks but also that the Board must become truly representative of the larger society. The Students' Society's brief to the Joint

Committee on University Government recommended that 15
people on a proposed 32 member Board should reflect those
sectors most affected by the University, with
representatives coming from government, professional
associations, and workers' unions.[55] Eventually student
activists advocated integrating the Board and Senate to
form a unicameral governing body to allow for
participation by each interest group in all matters
related to the University. One-third representation for
students, university faculty and staff, and society's
representatives was proposed. The unicameral form of
government was not adopted; however, the addition of
faculty and, eventually, non-academic staff
representatives did ensure a more open approach to Board
membership.

Much of the rationale for change in the University's
role came from the radical activists who were working
towards the ultimate goal of a "critical" university, a
university which would serve as an agent to build a better
society. The chief proponent of the critical university
was a young political science professor, Stan Gray. A key
figure in the founding of several New Left groups, most
notably the SDU and the SAC, he is considered to have been
the source of inspiration for the radical students who
were elected to the Student Council and to Senate in the
1968-69 session. It was these students who seized the
opportunity presented by their positions to put forth the
critical university concept.

The major tenets of the radical perspective are
summarized in two comments from the Student Council's
"Statement of Position on University Government":

> The university, once on the margins of society, is now
> one of its chief driving forces, a source for both
> material and social development; an institution in
> which individuals can (ideally) liberate their
> intellect and realize their potential. This position
> of central importance immediately creates its own
> questions: Which social classes will benefit most from

university-fed development? In which direction and to what degree will human potential be encouraged to grow? How will tension between the demands of the corporate world and those of personal development, between the university as agent of social change and as perpetuator of the status quo, be resolved?[56]

The key to the argument is that the present structure of the university encourages and reinforces a corporatist attitude, while a thoroughly open and democratic community would effectively destroy it.[57]

The activists saw Senate as the body which would take stands on the various economic, social and political issues. In November 1968, Senate rejected a motion which would have approved the principle of a critical university although the students were successful in having Senate agree to the statement in support of educational reform in Quebec which was cited in Chapter Four. Ultimately, pressure of a varied nature forced Senate to hold a special, eight-hour, Saturday session in February 1969 to discuss two questions: the university and its role in society and the role of Senate. Dr. Robertson expressed the majority faculty viewpoint against Senate's taking positions on issues as follows:

It is vital to the academic freedom of the members of the university that they be entirely free to express their considered opinions on all matters. So long as the university itself maintains a strict neutrality on issues it can vigorously protect its members' rights in this respect.[58]

Throughout the tumultuous years of 1967-69, and most especially during the year 1968-69, members of the University spoke out vigorously against the critical university and in support of the pluralistic university which allowed the tradition of academic feeedom.

By the end of 1968-69, the activists had concluded that Senate was "an unlikely instrument for social change."[59] A split in the New Left occurred with Stan Gray and a few of the more frustrated radicals moving off campus to continue the fight for social reform in association with French nationalist organizations.

"McGill Français," of which Stan Gray was a leader, was
the final disturbance with respect to the debate
surrounding McGill's role in society. Both the threat
posed by "McGill Français" and the subsequent firing of
Stan Gray put an end to the idea of the critical
university.[60] In the fall, the more moderate Student
Council under Julius Grey, came out in support of the
pluralistic university.

Although the whole concept had never been
particularly well-articulated, as later confirmed by Stan
Gray himself,[61] the campaign for a critical university was
the issue which caused perhaps the most alarm amongst
administration and staff. The considerable response to
"relevance" and "participatory democracy," key components
in the critical university debate, made many wonder how
far the University was prepared to go to accommodate the
demands for change. The firing of Stan Gray, ostensibly
for leading disruptions of various meetings, was a
reassuring statement that threats to academic freedom, the
bedrock of the university, were not to be tolerated.

Apart from the critical university concept which
threatened the University in a fundamental way, the
clamour for change in the University's role was a worry
from another perspective. McGill was in the rather new
and unfamiliar position of relying upon government
funding. The loss of financial independence caused many
to fear the likelihood of increased government control and
intervention. When student proposals for a more
democratic form of governance invariably included
participation by government representatives, the
possibility of additional loss of independence became
menacing.[62] As the media gave broad, and frequently
provocative, coverage to virtually every happening
connected with the students' protests, the University's
sense of vulnerability was heightened.

Increasingly the University felt a need to prove its value to the public. A Committee on Community Relations was set up in 1967. It prepared a listing of the University's contributions to the community ranging from the public service provided by its graduates in education, law, medicine and other fields to unique services such as the Dairy Herd Analysis Service available to Quebec farmers to its revamped extension department which provided educational opportunities for those who could not be full-time students. The University's relationship with the French community was particularly sensitive. McGill reassured the public that it would be supportive of the CEGEPs, that it was actively attempting to increase its French-speaking enrolment, and that gradually the various departments were becoming able to provide essential information and services in the French language. One outcome of a newly created Committee on the Communication of Information was a series of rather impressive dinners for leading editorialists and reporters to keep them informed as to how McGill was reforming its entire organizational structure, implementing educational reforms and ensuring admission to all who qualified academically. To further offset the negative publicity received due to the students' well-reported criticisms of the University on the one hand the the public distaste for their antics on the other, senior University staff seized every opportunity to speak at public gatherings so that they might defend the University. McGill's unprecedented efforts during the sixties to inform the community of its activities was in itself indicative of a changing relationship with the world outside the University.

CONCLUSION

This detailed account of events at McGill University
supports the hypothesis that there is a relationship
between student activism and change in the university.
Moreover, the evidence reveals that the relationship is a
very direct one. The unrest of the 1960s was not an
aberration, neither in the general context of North
America nor in the specific instance of McGill. Student
activism has historical antecedents and the outburst of
the sixties was part of a recurrent trend which will, in
its turn, become an antecedent for future episodes.

The research undertaken confirms that throughout
history, student activism has been in large measure a
reaction to circumstances in society. During the sixties,
a sudden transformation of socio-economic conditions and
organized educational reform were revolutionizing Quebec
society. Such a situation finds a response in students·
who are intelligent and who are at an age when the urge
towards self-expression makes them particularly responsive
to new ideas and change. While a variable force in the
university at all times, students appear to come to the
fore and provide the necessary energy to help the
university adapt in times of major social change. With
fewer vested interests than other members in society and
the university, students have less to lose by challenging
the status quo.

There were several reasons why McGill students had a
significant impact on the University. For one thing, the
fact that their demands were based on legitimate social
issues and concerns, made it necessary for the University
to respond. This imperative to respond was particularly

138

strong when the high moral ground belonged to the
students, as it frequently did. While the major events of
the period were instigated by the fervour of a few
students (encouraged by a handful of the younger
professors), the disturbances were given additional
potency by members of the administration who provoked the
students with blatantly resistive tactics. Resistance to
student demands only increased their indignation and
strengthened support for their protest. The students had
both historical precedence and the force of currently
changing times on their side.

Furthermore, the students were right about the fact
that all was not well in the University itself. This
became apparent as administrators and faculty increasingly
agreed with many of the demands made by the students. The
drama of upsetting events such as the "Daily Affair"
instigated by Fekete and the "McGill Francais" march
blinded people to this fact.

The methods used by the students were not always
popular but they did reflect the temper of the larger
society. Why would young people not attack the university
with vehemence in, for example, 1968-69, a year which saw,
in addition to the war in Vietnam, the assassination of
two heroic figures, Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy,
the invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the bombing of
Cambodia? All these violent events had been preceded by
ugly race riots in the U.S. Global fear and concern were
generated by the apparently ceaseless barrage of
atrocities which formed the backdrop to campus
disturbances. At McGill, as the archival material clearly
shows, there was deep concern that the intensity of the
riots and upheavals disrupting American campuses would
spread to Canada. This uneasiness caused the University
to make greater concessions than it would have made in
less worrisome circumstances.

Student activism affected the nature, degree and pace of change in the University. The various changes which McGill students either provoked, or to which they contributed, included a number of innovations in teaching, the modification of academic procedures, curriculum revisions, and improved academic services. Fundamental aspects of the University such as its long-established *in loco parentis* role disappeared. University governance was transformed by the inclusion of students in virtually every stage of the decision-making process. The students helped to bring about a more open University and to increase its sensitivity to the exigent need to interact more cooperatively and closely with the community. Many people remain convinced that whatever changes took place during the turmoil of the sixties would have happened without student intervention. However, the evidence suggests otherwise. While it is true that students were responding to conditions around them, by so doing they sharpened the issues for the University. They instigated many specific changes which the University would not have considered otherwise.

The degree of change was extended as students forced the University to adopt reforms it was not then interested in considering. Activism in the quieter times prior to 1965 had resulted in student participation with faculty and administration on some ad hoc committees. The University was responsive to student initiatives which, at that point, were almost exclusively related to the educational process. The administration increasingly agreed to consult students on matters which were of very specific concern to them. As students became more active about a greater number of issues, the administration did not at first accept the students' conviction that they had a contribution to make in every aspect of university life. Only strong agitation on the part of students led to their

membership with voting rights on all but a few Senate and
faculty committees. This marked a fundamental reform of
the decision-making process in the University.

It was the students who provoked acceptance of the
idea of broadening the participation of faculty in
decision-making to include assistant professors and
lecturers. At the beginning of the decade, neither
representation on the Board of Governors nor open meetings
of that body were particular faculty concerns. It was
student pressure which hastened the opening of board
meetings and the participation first by faculty,
subsequently by students, and ultimately by non-academic
staff.

Of equal significance is that the students
influenced the pace of change. Faculty had been striving
for elected membership on Senate for about ten years.
When students became contenders for seats on Senate, they
achieved their goal in less than two years. By so doing,
they hastened the shifting of power from the Board of
Governors to Senate. In forcing student representation on
selection committees, students solidified the emerging
role of faculty on these bodies. Overall, it can be said
that by increasing student power, the students acted as a
catalytic agent in bringing greater power to the
professoriate. Students speeded up change in other areas
as well. For example, Principal Robertson acknowledged
that the students "have spearheaded the movement for
improvements in all aspects of the academic programme."[1]
He believed that the students' efforts would bring them
about faster than they would have occurred otherwise.

All changes resulting from the activism of the
sixties were not necessarily positive. With the passage
of time, there is a growing belief that there have been
some less discernible and more equivocal outcomes.

A number of authors have suggested that the curriculum was altered in a very fundamental and adverse way. Levitt and, much more strongly, Bercuson and his colleagues state the case for Canada. Recently Allan Bloom has made the point for the U.S. Allegedly a prime negative outcome is that "relevance" has reduced quality. A number of McGill professors agree. They believe the University responded too quickly to student pressure to change the curriculum and that contemporary issues became the focus at the expense of true relevance in terms of timeless and enduring knowledge. More insidious is the belief held by some professors that the turmoil which resulted from the challenge to authority caused the University to take deliberate measures to remove not only Stan Gray but also other radically-minded professors to avoid the possibility of further trouble. These individuals believe the University has learned to spot potential "trouble makers" sooner. The result, they argue, has been a homogenization of viewpoints and less vitality in academic life.

There are those who are convinced that opening the Board of Governors, Senate, and other committees actually had an adverse effect. Rather than distributing authority more democratically, it is suspected that the administration became more sophisticated in manipulating power. Others in the McGill community claim that a number of committees, and in particular, Senate and the Board of Governors, became too large and cumbersome to be effective and so they are often bypassed. A major divergence of views surrounds student representation on committees and other governing bodies. On the one hand, some commentators claim that putting students on committees did not have any impact on the University beyond the first couple of years because the younger people were soon successfully co-opted. Others suggest that administrators

use their power to withhold information, control agendas, or simply to circumvent students through the use of ad hoc committees.

Despite the controversy surrounding the outcome of the activism of the sixties, the students did win clear victories. For the first time in the history of the University, student representation is firmly entrenched as a legal fact in the structure of the institution. Students do have an official voice which they can and do exercise when they feel it is necessary. While a somewhat intangible aspect of university life, there is agreement amongst the administration and faculty that the experience of the sixties has fostered respect for students' opinions and for their possible reaction to decisions. There is a general consensus that the paternalistic attitude toward students has disappeared and that the faculty and administration accept that they are partners, albeit perhaps not equal, in the decision-making process. This acceptance became obvious almost immediately in 1969 when Julius Grey began to work within the traditional structures.

Activism is still alive despite the fact that the fervour of the sixties has disappeared and a much lamented apparent student apathy has become identified with the seventies. Many of the changes proposed in the sixties were adopted during the seventies. Moreover, it is the ideas which excited students in the sixties which continue to be expressed.

During the sixties, all areas of the University felt the need for self-examination. Even relatively peripheral entities such as the Graduates' Society conceded a need to change some of its attitudes and activities. This idea of self-examination continues in the University to the present day with an ongoing cyclical review procedure in which students participate. Continuous pressure to oppose

apartheid finally had success in 1985 when the University
responded to protest demonstrations by agreeing to divest
in South Africa. More recently, when students discovered
that two professors were conducting a project to perfect
new bombs called fuel air explosives, they pressured the
University to undertake a review of its guidelines on
research from military agencies. The students are not
satisfied with the answers which they have received and
they continue to question military connections.

Further evidence that the idealism and ideological
convictions of the sixties are not dead is found in the
continued involvement with community and social issues. A
recent development in 1989 has been the establishment on
campus of a chapter of PIRG. The goals of this group are
"research, education and action on issues of public
concern, and to work for beneficial social change."[2] It
is interesting to note that the students' first project,
paper recycling, is being undertaken as a cooperative
effort with the administration. Another echo of the
sixties' concern with humanistic values is a proposal by a
group of engineering students that a humanities and social
sciences minor program be offered for those who are
interested. The Faculty of Engineering agreed to
implement their suggestion.

It can be concluded that, contrary to Principal
Robertson's view, the results of student activism in the
sixties were not few. They were many and they touched the
University in fundamental ways. Gains were made with
respect to virtually every issue which the students forced
on the University's attention. However, the controversial
and evolving nature of the results makes it impossible to
determine at this time whether they changed the nature of
the University profoundly as Dr. Frost believed.

It is obvious that the role of students in the life
of the University has been both underestimated and

misunderstood. Students can be a compelling force for positive change. There is also evidence that the university, from a sense of vulnerability, may capitulate in times of more turbulent activism to demands which are not beneficial in the long term. On the other hand, a key observation emerging from this research is the ongoing nature of activism. Change is not necessarily dependent on violent tactics. The innovations which took place in the period just before and after the dramatic time of 1967-69 illustrate this point. Accusations of student apathy may be another revelation of the lack of understanding of the dynamics of student behaviour. Attention has been given only to more dramatic manifestations and to the more vociferous individuals, such as those representing the New Left ideology in the sixties. There is very little awareness of the role which is played by the moderates and right-wing students. That they are clearly an active force is shown in this thesis. The bewildered administration and faculty actually needed and depended upon the more moderate approach of Julius Grey and his supporters to help the University to get back on track. Throughout the sixties, the moderates and those of the right-wing caused an ebb and flow in the fortunes of the New Left. There is a need for research on student activism during periods of relative calm to provide a more balanced analysis of the students' role and to better understand the nature of reform in the university.

The historical record suggests that future eruptions are likely. While it is not possible to predict the timing or the precipitating causes, it is certain that social conditions of some sort will provide the basis for revolt and will produce leaders both in society and in the university. Many questions raised in the sixties deal with perpetual questions which have not yet been satisfactorily answered. What form future activism might

take is uncertain. No doubt the age-old tactics of
demonstrations and the more modern approaches of sit-ins
and use of the media will be employed. As society is
increasingly litigious and appeals to charters of human
rights are becoming more common, one might speculate that
at least some future student protest will take place
through the courts.

It is not inconceivable that the student body could
take the University to court should injustices be
perceived. This is a realistic prospect because the
sixties brought about one reform which may ultimately
prove to be of the utmost significance. The medieval
notion of student "privileges" which prevailed through the
centuries has been replaced by the concept of student
"rights." The principle of rights suggests that in the
future the relationship between student activism and
change in the university will become stronger.

APPENDIX

INTERVIEWEES: NAME AND POSITION

The following individuals were interviewed during the period May - September 1988.

Name	Position in the Sixties	Current Position
Donald, Janet	Not at McGill; arrived in 1973.	Director, Centre for University Teaching and Learning.
Edward, J. T.	Professor, Dept. of Chemistry.	Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Chemistry.
Fekete, John	Student. B.A. 1968; M.A. 1969.	Chairman, Dept. of Cultural Studies, Trent University.
Frost, Stanley B.	Dean, Graduate Studies: 1963-69; Vice-Principal, Professional Affairs: 1969-70; Vice-Principal, Prof. Affairs and Administration: 1970-74.	Director, History of McGill Project.
Gales, D. Lorne	Executive Director of the Graduates' Society and of the McGill Fund Council.	Retired. Occasional consultant for fund-raising.
Grey, Julius	Student. B.A. 1968; M.A. 1969; B.C.L. 1971. President of the Students' Society: 1969-70.	Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, McGill University. Lawyer.

Kingsbury, Donald	Lecturer, Dept. of Mathematics.	Retired. Author.
Leblond, C. P.	Chairman, Dept. of Anatomy. Senator during period of unrest.	Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Anatomy.
MacFadden, Patrick	Student. B.A. 1966. Editor of the McGill Daily, 1965-66.	Associate Professor of Journalism, Carleton University.
Malloch, Archie	Assoc. Professor, Dept. of English. Senator during period of unrest.	Retired.
Mallory, James R.	Chairman, Dept. of Economics and Political Science; Chairman, University Scholarships Committee: 1959-69.	Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Political Science.
McGregor, Maurice	Assoc. Professor, Faculty of Medicine: 1961-65; Dean of Medicine: 1967-72.	Medical Doctor, Royal Victoria Hospital.
Noumoff, Sam	Assistant Professor, Dept. of Economics and Political Science.	Assoc. Professor, Dept. of Political Science.
Pavlasek, Tom	Professor, Dept. of Electrical Engineering; Assoc. Dean, Planning and Development, Faculty of Engineering: 1967-68; member of Senate, Board of Governors, and many other committees during the sixties.	Professor, Electrical Engineering.
Piehler, Paul	Assoc. Professor, Dept. of English as of 1968.	Assoc. Professor, Dept. of English.
Robertson, H. Rocke	Principal: 1962-70.	Retired.

Shaw, Robert F.	Vice-Principal, Administration: 1968-March 1971.	Retired.
Thompson, Tom	Program Director, Dept. of Athletics.	Deputy Director of Development and Director of Annual Giving.
Vogel, Robert	Chairman, Dept. of History: 1966-71; Vice-Dean of Social Sciences Division: 1969-71; appointed Dean of Arts 1971.	Professor, Dept. of History.
Wallis, Faith	Student. B.A. 1971.	Head, Osler Library; Assist. Professor.
Wilson, Mark	Student 1960-64 and 1968-69; B.Eng. 1968.	Owner, Mark Wilson Translation Services.
Yaffe, Leo	Chairman, Dept. of Chemistry: 1965-71. Senator during period of unrest.	Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Chemistry.

Interviews Held During Exploration of Topic

Neilson, Helen	Director, School of Household Science. Member of Disciplinary Committee for Fekete "Daily Affair."	Professor Emeritus. Dept. of Household Science.
Ramsey, James O.	Assist. Professor, Dept. of Psychology.	Chairman, Dept. of Psychology.
Ross, Aileen D.	Professor, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology.	Retired.

FOOTNOTES

Introduction

1. <u>The Chronicle of Higher Education</u>, 11 February 1987, 42.

2. <u>The Chronicle of Higher Education</u>, 11 July 1984, 64.

3. Vice-Principal Robert Shaw, in an address to the Montreal Bar Association on March 24, 1969, expressed the fear of many when he said: "Gentlemen, you, the public, had better do a thoughtful assessment of McGill right now because its very existence is threatened." Amongst the threats to the University, he stressed that posed by the students. From a reprint in the <u>Student Handbook</u> for 1969-70, 101-106.

4. H. Rocke Robertson, "Ten Years After," <u>McGill Journal of Education</u>, XV, no. 1 (Winter 1980): 20.

5. Stanley Brice Frost, <u>McGill University: For the Advancement of Learning</u> vol. II, <u>1896-1971</u> (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984), 455.

6. An ERIC search was conducted. To ensure as thorough a search as possible, every suitable descriptor was used. Much material was provided for the situation in the United States. The search was unsuccessful in locating studies dealing with the Canadian situation.

7. It must be mentioned that some people requested that they not be quoted by name at all; others asked that they not be identified with certain of their comments. These wishes have been respected.

8. Larry C. Kerpelman, <u>Activists and Nonactivists</u> (New York: Behavioral Publications, Inc., 1972), 122-123.

9. All official estimates state that the number of participants and observers ranged from 7,000 to a maximum of 10,000.

Chapter One

1. Alexander DeConde, ed., <u>Student Activism</u> (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), 4.

2. A. B. Cobban, <u>The Medieval Universities: Their Development and Organization</u> (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1975), 194.

3. As the universities arose over time, precise founding dates do not exist. The dates given are generally accepted approximations based upon historical records which indicate that these cities had become definite centres for higher studies by the dates indicated.

4. C. H. Haskins, <u>The Rise of Universities</u> (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1957), 3.

5. G. Compayré, <u>Abelard and the Origin and Early History of Universities</u> (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), 277.

6. C. H. Haskins, <u>The Rise of Universities</u> (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1957), 62.

7. Hastings Rashdall, <u>The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages</u>, vol. 3, eds. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden (London: Oxford University Press, 1936), 452.

8. Ibid., 456.

9. A. O. Norton, <u>Readings in the History of Education</u> (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1909), 95.

10. Nathan Schachner, <u>The Mediaeval Universities</u> (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1938), 340.

11. A. O. Norton, <u>Readings in the History of Education</u> (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1909), 82.

12. Ibid., 99.

13. Lowrie J. Daly, S. J., <u>The Medieval University</u> (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961), 197-98.

14. Joan B. Williamson, "Unrest in Medieval Universities," in <u>The University World: A Synoptic View of Higher Education</u>, ed. Douglas Radcliff-Umstead (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh, 1973), 79.

15. Mark H. Curtis, <u>Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-1642</u> (Oxford: The Claredon Press, 1959), 126.

16. Priscilla Robertson, "Students on the Barricades: Germany and Austria, 1848," in <u>Student Activism</u>, ed. Alexander DeConde (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971): 70.

17. Seymour Martin Lipset, <u>Rebellion in the University</u> (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), 127.

18. Ibid., 132.

19. Ibid., 133.

20. Philip G. Altbach, "From Revolution to Apathy - American Student Activism in the 1970's," <u>Higher Education</u> 8, no. 6 (November 1979): 612.

Chapter Two

1. Richard Flacks, "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest," <u>Journal of Social Issues</u> XXIII, no. 3 (July 1967): 54.

2. Charles R. Morris, <u>A Time of Passion: America 1960-1980</u> (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), 75.

3. H. Rocke Robertson, "Ten Years After," <u>McGill Journal of Education</u> XV, no. 1 (Winter 1980): 21.

4. Charles R. Morris, <u>A Time of Passion: America 1960-1980</u> (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), 71.

5. Calvin B. Lee, <u>The Campus Scene</u> (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970), 113.

6. Seymour Martin Lipset, "The Activists: A Profile," in <u>Confrontation: The Student Rebellion and the Universities</u>, eds. Daniel Bell and Irving Kristol (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968), 51.

7. James C. Dickinson, <u>Student Activism and the Characteristics of Activists</u>, Unpublished paper, 1969, Dialog, ERIC, ED 033 388, 3.

8. Philip G. Altbach and Patti M. Peterson, "Before Berkeley: Historical Perspectives on American Student Activism," in The New Pilgrims, eds. Philip G. Altbach and Robert S. Laufer (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972), 23.

9. Kenneth Keniston, "The Sources of Student Dissent," The Journal of Social Issues XXIII, no. 3 (July 1967): 117.

10. Richard Flacks, "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest," Journal of Social Issues XXIII, no. 3 (July 1967): 68.

11. John L. Horn and Paul D. Knott, "Student Activists and Student Activism: A Profile and Prognosis," in Student Activism, ed. Paul D. Knott (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1971), 186.

12. Philip G. Altbach, Student Politics in America: A Historical Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974), 221.

13. Nathan Glazer, "'Student Power' in Berkeley," in Student Activism, ed. Alexander Deconde (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1971), 297-298.

14. Edward E. Sampson, "Student Activism and the Decade of Protest," The Journal of Social Issues XXIII, no. 3 (July 1967): 20.

15. C. H. Ruedisili, "The Student Revolt and the Honors Program," Journal of Higher Education XLI, no. 4 (April 1970): 286.

16. Allan E. Bayer and Alexander W. Astin, "Violence and Disruption on the U.S. Campus, 1968-1969," Educational Record 50, no. 4 (Fall 1969): 344-345.

17. Kenneth Keniston, "The Sources of Student Dissent," The Journal of Social Issues XXIII, no. 3 (July 1967): 122.

18. Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest, by William W. Scranton, Chairman (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), 81.

19. Seymour Martin Lipset, "The Politics of Academia," in
     Perspectives on Campus Tension: Papers Prepared for
     the Special Committee on Campus Tensions, ed. David
     C. Nicols (Washington, D.C.: American Council on
     Education, 1970), 86.

20. Ibid.

21. David L. Westby, The Clouded Vision: The Student
     Movement in the United States in the 1960s (Cranbury,
     New Jersey: Associated University Presses,
     1976), 254.

22. Kenneth Keniston, "What is Bugging the Students?" in
     Perspectives on Campus Tension: Papers Prepared for
     the Special Committee on Campus Tensions, ed. David
     C. Nicols (Washington, D.C.: American Council on
     Education, 1970), 51.

23. Ibid., 62.

24. Jack D. Douglas, Youth in Turmoil: America's Changing
     Youth Cultures and Student Protest Movements (Chevy
     Chase, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health,
     Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, 1970),
     167-168.

25. Nathan Glazer, "'Student Power' in Berkeley," in
     Student Activism, ed. Alexander DeConde (New York:
     Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), 317.

26. Andrew M. Greeley, "The End of the Movement," Change
     4, no. 3 (April 1972): 45.

27. Joseph Robert Conlin, The Troubles: A Jaundiced
     Glance Back at the Movement of the Sixties (New York:
     Franklin Watts, 1982), 107.

28. Richard Flacks, "The Liberated Generation: An
     Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest," The
     Journal of Social Issues XXIII, no. 3 (July 1967):
     74.

29. Philip G. Altbach, Student Politics in America: A
     Historical Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill Book
     Company, 1974), 214.

30. Ibid., 210.

31. Alexander W. Astin, et al., The Power of Protest: A National Study of Student and Faculty Disruptions with Implications for the Future (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975), 1-2.

32. Ibid., 59.

33. Clark Kerr, "The Uses of the University": "Postscript 1982," Change 14, no. 7 (October 1982): 23.

34. Nathan Glazer, "The Aftermath of the Student Revolt," ABG Records 26, no. 6 (November/December 1984): 26.

35. Seymour Martin Lipset, Rebellion in the University (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1971), 221.

36. John D. Millett, New Structures of Campus Power: Success and Failures of Emerging Forms of Institutional Governance (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978), 196.

37. Ibid., 253.

38. Clark Kerr, "The Uses of the University": "Postscript 1982," Change 14, no. 7 (October 1982): 29.

39. Sue Schlesirger and J. Victor Baldridge, "Is Student Power Dead in Higher Education?" College Student Journal 16, no. 1 (Spring 1982): 10.

40. Kenneth Keniston, "What is Bugging the Students?" in Perspectives on Campus Tensions: Papers Prepared for the Special Committee on Campus Tensions, ed. David C. Nicols (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970), 63.

41. Alexander W. Astin, et al., The Power of Protest: A National Study of Student and Faculty Disruptions with Implications for the Future (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975), 189.

42. Ibid.

43. Frank R. Kermerer and David A. Young, Student Power Reincarnated, Miscellaneous document (adapted from a previous article which appeared in Change), Fall 1977, Dialog, ERIC, ED 149 692, 3.

Chapter Three

1. Cyril Levitt, _Children of Privilege_ (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 16.

2. John D. Dennison and Paul Gallagher, _Canada's Community Colleges: A Critical Analysis_ (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986), 81-82.

3. Interview with John Fekete, Montreal, August 31, 1988.

4. Sheila McLeod Arnopoulos and Dominique Clift, _The English Fact in Quebec_ (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1980), 48.

5. Leon Dion, _Quebec: The Unfinished Revolution_ (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1976), 41-42.

6. Ibid., 42.

7. McGill University, _Annual Report 1964-65_, 2.

3. Stanley M. Cohen, _Fifteen Years of Reform: Education in Quebec Since 1960_. (Montreal: The Montreal Star, 1975), 3.

9. Ibid.

10. Jean-Marie Martin, "Quebec," in _Changing Patterns of Higher Education in Canada_, ed. Robin Harris (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966), 69-70.

11. Sir James Duff and Robert O. Berdahl, _University Government in Canada: Report of a Commission sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada_ (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966), 3.

12. George Whalley, ed., _A Place of Liberty_ (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Company Limited, 1964), vii.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid., 172.

15. When proposed, and during the initial planning
     stages, the new colleges were called Institutes.

16. Registrar's Office, "Fulltime Registration by Degree
     Programme: Distribution by Sex 1960/61-1969/70."
     From the Annual Report of the Registrar to Senate.

17. Interview with Professor Tom Pavlasek in Montreal on
     September 22, 1988.

18. Letter to the Editor, McGill Daily, 29 January
     1969, 4.

19. Ibid.

20. "McGill in Quebec: A review", McGill Daily, 12 March
     1971, 4.

21. Conrad Black, Duplessis (Toronto: McClelland and
     Stewart, 1977), 607.

22. Ibid.

23. McGill University, Annual Report 1959-60, 224.

24. McGill University, Annual Report 1969-70, 348.

25. Stanley Brice Frost, McGill University: For the
     Advancement of Learning vol. II, 1896-1971 (Montreal:
     McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984), 430.

26. McGill University, Annual Report 1965-66, 2.

27. McGill University, Annual Report 1969-70, 4.

28. Ibid., 3.

29. James Steele and Robin Mathews, "The universities:
     takeover of the mind," in Close the 49th Parallel
     etc.: The Americanization of Canada, ed. Ian Lumsden
     (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), 172.

30. S. B. Frost, reports that in 1965, the first year for
     which data are available, that 73.6% of the student
     body was English-speaking. See The History of McGill
     in Relation to Montreal and Quebec (Study
     Commissioned by Commission D'Étude Sur Les
     Universités, 1978), 56.

31. Ibid.

32. Jack Quarter, <u>The Student Movement of the Sixties</u> (Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972), 59.

33. "Principal raps bearded set," <u>McGill Daily</u>, 19 January 1966, 1.

34. "Report Highlights Problems of Adjustment to University," <u>McGill News</u> XLV, no. 1 (February 1964): 13-14.

Chapter Four

1. Cyril Levitt, <u>Children of Privilege</u> (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 209.

2. "High School Supplement," <u>McGill Daily</u>, 14 May 1965, 8.

3. Tim Reid and Julyan Reid, eds., <u>Student Power and the Canadian Campus</u> (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Limited, 1969), 13.

4. <u>McGill Daily</u>, 10 October 1969, 1.

5. Charles Taylor, <u>Snow Job: Canada, the United States and Vietnam (1954-1973)</u> (Toronto: House of Anansi Press Limited, c.1974), 85.

6. Tom Hayden claims that as many as ten million Americans participated in the Moratorium in one way or another. See Tom Hayden, <u>Reunion: A Memoir</u> (New York: Random House, 1988), 357.

7. Registrar's Office, "Geographical Distribution of Students," statistics for 1967, 1968, and 1969.

8. Julius Grey, "New Directions at Old McGill? Reminiscences of Student Life in the 1960's," Paper presented at a meeting of the James McGill Society, 26 November 1986.

9. Bob Levin, "The Magic of a Rearview Mirror," <u>MacLean's</u>, 21 March 1988, 43.

10. <u>McGill Daily</u>, 17 November 1967, 4.

11. Ibid., 8 December 1967, 3.

12. Ibid., 16 October 1965, 2.

13. The publication of one issue in French was considered sufficiently newsworthy to be an item in _The Montreal Star_. See _The Montreal Star_, 2 October 1967. The students were ahead of their time in many ways. The _McGill Daily_ later instituted the regular publication of one issue each week in French.

14. _McGill Daily_, 8 October 1965, 4.

15. MUA, R.G. 8: _Secretariat of Senate_, Minutes of Meeting, 15 October 1968, 98.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. The numbers vary from one source to another. The data used in this thesis come from a letter dated 9 April 1969 from H. Rocke Robertson to Mr. L. W. Douglas found in MUA, R.G. 2: _Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor_, Office of Principal H. Rocke Robertson, 1962-1970, c. 401, file: "Operation McGill."

19. Stanley Gray, "The Struggle for Quebec," _Canadian Dimension_, 6, no. 6 (December-January 1969-70): 24.

20. It was the Student League for Industrial Democracy which had been founded in 1905.

21. James Laxer, "The Americanization of the Canadian Student Movement," in _Close the 49th Parallel etc.: The Americanization of Canada_, ed. Ian Lumsden (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), 281.

22. Ibid., 279.

23. Cyril Levitt, "The New Left, The New Class and Socialism," _Higher Education_ 8, no. 6 (November 1979): 643.

24. Cyril Levitt, _Children of Privilege_ (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 163.

25. George Z. F. Bereday, "Student Unrest on Four Continents: Montreal, Ibadan, Warsaw, and Rangoon," in _Student Politics_, ed. Seymour Martin Lipset (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967), 100.

26. John H. Simpson and Walter Phillips, "Understanding Student Protest in Canada: The University of Toronto Strike Vote," Canadian Journal of Higher Education 6, no. 1 (1976): 64.

27. Cyril Levitt, Children of Privilege (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 165.

28. Ibid., 166.

29. Martin Shapiro, Getting Doctored: Critical Reflections on Becoming a Physician (Kitchener, Ontario: Between the Lines, 1978), 14.

30. Ibid.

31. McGill Daily, 10 January 1967, 1.

32. McGill Daily, 14 October 1966, 3.

33. McGill Daily, 24 January 1969, 1.

Chapter Five

1. John R. Hyslop, "Impersonality," McGill News, XLVI, no. 1 (February 1965): 25-27 and XLVI, no. 2 (April 1965): 27-28.

2. McGill Daily, 23 September 1966, 1.

3. MUA, McGill University Scrapbook of Press Clippings, vol. 17, 369. Clipping from the Montreal Star, dated 17 September 1966, "'Evaluate the Professors'; The Parlour Game any Number Can Play."

4. Interview with John Fekete, Montreal, August 31, 1988.

5. John Fekete, "Students look at lecture(r)s," McGill News, January 1967: 20.

6. MUA, R.G. 8: Secretariat of Senate, Minutes of Meeting, 19 April 1967, 727. Document entitled "Report to Senate from the Committee on Educational Procedures 28 March 1967."

7. Ibid. 728.

8. McGill Daily, 28 October 1966, 8.

9. MUA, R.G. 49: _Public Relations Office_, c. 106,
    "McGill Bulletin", no. 13 (February 1968): 5.

10. Ibid.

11. _Plumbers' Pot_, 8 October 1969, 5.

12. Interview with Janet Donald, Montreal, September 1,
    1988.

13. _McGill Daily_, "Review," 30 September 1966, 5.

14. _McGill Daily_, 24 November 1969, 1.

15. Interview with Faith Wallis, Montreal, July 20, 1988.

16. Interview with Archie Malloch, Montreal, June 22,
    1988.

17. Interview with Mark Wilson, Montreal, July 11, 1988.

18. Interview with Robert Shaw, Montreal, August 22,
    1988.

19. Leslie Waxman, "Why do students revolt?" _Old McGill
    1969_, 164.

20. Margaret Gillett, _We Walked Very Warily_ (Montreal:
    Eden Press Women's Publications, 1981), 274.

21. MUA, R.G. 2: _Office of the Principal and
    Vice-Chancellor_, Office of Principal H. Rocke
    Robertson, 1962-1970, c. 359, file: "Royal Victoria
    College 1969." From a report written by the Warden
    of Royal Victoria College.

22. _Montreal Star_, 19 November 1969. From the clipping
    found in MUA, R.G. 2: _Office of the Principal and
    Vice-Chancellor_, Office of Principal H. Rocke
    Robertson, 1962-1970, c. 359, file: "Royal Victoria
    College 1969."

23. MUA, R.G. 2: _Office of the Principal and
    Vice-Chancellor_, Office of Principal H. Rocke
    Robertson, 1962-1970, c. 467, file: "Principal's
    Notes McGill Daily." From a document entitled
    "Statement of the Students Who Refused to Leave the
    Administration Building," 4-5.

24. _McGill Daily_, 25 January 1968, 5.

25. MUA, R.G. 2: <u>Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor</u>, Office of Principal H. Rocke Robertson, 1962-1970, c. 467, file: "Principal's Notes McGill Daily." From a letter dated 10 February 1968 from Perry Meyer, Chairman, Committee on Student Discipline, to Peter Smith, President, Students' Society.

26. <u>McGill Daily</u>, 28 November 1967, 3.

27. MUA, R.G. 2: <u>Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor</u>, Office of Principal H. Rocke Robertson, 1962-1970, c. 348, file: "Student Activities Cttee Minutes." From minutes of the Committee on Student Activities meeting held on 22 February 1968.

28. <u>McGill Daily</u>, 27 February 1968, 1.

29. <u>McGill Daily</u>, 27 March 1968, 1.

30. Tripartite Commission on the Nature of the University, <u>Interim Report</u>, April 1968, 1.

31. Julius Grey, "New Directions at Old McGill? Reminiscences of Student Life in the 1960's." Paper presented at a meeting of the James McGill Society, 26 November 1986.

32. There was considerable support for free education. A poll conducted in October 1965 revealed that 59.4% of those polled were in favour of it. <u>McGill Daily</u>, 25 October 1965, 5.

33. In 1965-66, McGill asked for a grant of $3.5 million. The government offered $98,000.

34. <u>McGill Daily</u>, 20 September 1965, 4.

35. Robin Ross, <u>The Short Road Down: A University Changes</u> (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1984), 35.

36. McGill University, <u>Annual Report 1966-67</u>, 13.

37. <u>McGill Daily</u>, 7 October 1966, 8.

38. Ibid., 2 November 1966, 3.

39. MUA, R.G. 2: <u>Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor</u>, Office of Principal H. Rocke Robertson, 1962-1970, c. 348, file: "University Government 1968." From a document entitled "Students' Society of McGill University: Statement of Position on University Government," 3 June 1968.

40. Ibid. From a document entitled "Addendum to the Report of the Joint Governors-Senate Committee on University Government at McGill University of November, 1967," dated July, 1968.

41. The first meeting of the "new Senate" was held on October 31, 1968. It had been enlarged from 35 to 62 members.

42. MUA, R.G. 8: <u>Secretariat of Senate</u>, Minutes of Meeting, 11 January 1969, 223.

43. Many people have speculated, and a number insist, that Principal Robertson decided to resign due to the distress caused by student activism. Robertson, when interviewed, denied that the student unrest was the reason for his resignation.

44. Students frequently used this ploy to exert pressure on the administration which they correctly guessed would be hesitant to meet without the student representatives.

45. The Board finally extended membership to students in 1972.

46. MUA, R.G. 2: <u>Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor</u>, Office of Principal H. Rocke Robertson, 1969-1970, c. 361, file: "University Government 1969." Comments made in a letter dated 31 October 1969 from Robertson to Dr. Claude Bissell.

47. By and large, and despite the fact that Sharon Sholzberg was President of the Students' Society in 1965-66, women were not visible amongst the activists although Registrar's Office statistics reveal that 38% of the student body in the years 1967-69 was female. The first student senators were all male. One of the ironies of the students' efforts to democratize the University is that at no time did anyone comment, at least publicly, about the lack of women in leadership positions.

48. Students were aware of discriminatory practices. One of the student senators responsible for this motion, a number of years later, wrote in <u>Getting Doctored: Critical Reflections on Becoming a Physician</u> that a member of the admissions committee had said: "Only two things really matter: marks and pull." 16.

49. The origin of this idea is found in the Port Huron Statement, the founding document of the Students for a Democratic Society. See Robert A. Goldwin, <u>How Democratic is America? Responses to the New Left Challenge</u>, 1-15.

50. <u>McGill Daily</u>, 31 October 1968, 1.

51. "Interview: Rebels with a cause," <u>McGill News</u> 49, no. 6 (November 1968): 6.

52. MUA, R.G. 2: <u>Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor</u>, Office of Principal H. Rocke Robertson, 1969-1970, c. 467, black binder entitled "Memoranda." From a SAC document entitled "Confront the Board of Governors Today."

53. John Porter, <u>The Vertical Mosaic</u> (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), 300-301.

54. Marlene Shore, in <u>The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, tne Chicago School, and the Origins of Social Research in Canada</u>, and Dr. S. B. Frost in <u>McGill University: For the Advancement of Learning</u>, vol. II, <u>1896-1971</u>, describe examples of the pervasive control which the Board of Governors exerted over McGill, particularly in the first half of the twentieth century. Board minutes for the sixties reveal that the Board decided on an incredible range of matters from requests to hold a class dance off campus to staff appointments to approval of the University's budget.

55. MUA, R.G. 2: <u>Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor</u>, Office of Principal H. Rocke Robertson, 1962-1970, c. 348, file: "University Government 1968." From a document entitled "Students' Society of McGill University: Statement of Position on University Government," 3 June 1968, 9.

56. Ibid., 1.

57. Ibid., 2.

58. <u>McGill Reporter</u>, 6 March 1969, 7.

59. "The Board rules; Senate governs," <u>Student Handbook</u>, 1969-70, 12.

60. It is suspected that the February 1969 fire in the computer centre at Sir George Williams University played a role in the University's decision to take action against Gray. The University notified Gray of possible dismissal just hours after the destruction of the computer centre. The Sir George Williams episode is regarded also as having had a sobering effect on the McGill student body, over 4,000 of whom signed a petition deploring the excessive violence at Sir George Williams. (The fire resulted in two million dollars damage.)

61. Stan Gray, "The 60's at McGill: Student Radicalism." Speech given at McGill University, 4 April 1965.

62. The Chancellor's concern, which also reveals a sense of the potential influence of students, was expressed in a letter to the Principal in 1965. He wrote: "Sharon Sholzberg has already said in the Press that the students would rather see the University in the government sector of the economy than the private enterprise sector. I therefore conclude that this subject is going to get raised in definite terms fairly soon and I would like us to do the raising." MUA, R.G. 1: <u>Office of the Chancellor</u>, Chancellor Ross Files, c. 21, file: "McGill University: Various letters, papers, etc." From a letter dated 2 September 1965 from Howard Ross to Principal Robertson.

<u>Conclusion</u>

1. MUA, R.G. 2: <u>Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor</u>, Office of Principal H. Rocke Robertson, 1962-70, c. 568, file: "Addresses and Other Papers: 1969." From a document entitled: "Statement to Senate," dated 1 February 1969, 4.

2. <u>McGill Daily</u>, 17 February 1988, 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Altbach, Philip G. Student Politics in America: A Historical Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

_____, ed. Student Politics: Perspectivŗs for the Eighties. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1981.

_____, ed. The Student Revolution: A Global Analysis. Bombay: Lalvani Publishing House, 1970.

Altbach, Philip G. and Robert S. Laufer, eds. The New Pilgrims: Youth Protest in Transition. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972.

Arnopoulos, Sheila McLeod and Dominique Clift. The English Fact in Quebec. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1980.

Ashby, Eric and Mary Anderson. The Rise of the Student Estate in Great Britain. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Astin, Alexander W., et al. The Power of Protest: A National Study of Student and Faculty Disruption with Implications for the Future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.

Aston, T. N., ed. The History of the University of Oxford. Vol. 1, The Early Oxford Schools, ed. J. I. Catto. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Bell, Daniel and Irving Kristol, eds. Confrontation: The Student Rebellion and the Universities. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.

Bercuson, David J., Robert Bothwell, and J. L. Granatstein. The Great Brain Robbery: Canada's Universities on the Road to Ruin. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1984.

Bissell, Claude. _Halfway up Parnassus_. Toronto:
University of Toronto Press, 1974.

Black, Conrad. _Duplessis_. Toronto: McClelland and
Stewart, 1977.

Bloom, Allan. _The Closing of the American Mind_. New
York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Califano, J. A. _The Student Revolution: A Global
Confrontation_. New York: W. W. Norton and Company,
1970.

Caute, David. _Sixty-eight: The Year of the Barricades_.
London: Hamish Hamilton, 1988.

Clark, S. D., J. P. Grayson, and L. M. Grayson, eds.
_Prophecy and Protest: Social Movements in
Twentieth-Century Canada_. Toronto: Gage Educational
Publishing Limited, 1975.

Cobban, A. B. _The Medieval Universities: Their
Development and Organization_. London: Methuen and
Co. Ltd., 1975.

Cohen, Stanley M. _Fifteen Years of Reform: Education in
Quebec Since 1960_. Montreal: _The Montreal Star_,
1975.

Compayré, Gabriel. _Abelard and The Origin and Early
History of Universities_. New York: Charles
Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Conlin, Joseph Robert. _The Troubles: A Jaundiced Glance
Back at the Movement of the Sixties_. New York:
Franklin Watts, 1982.

Corry, J. A. _Farewell the Ivory Tower: Universities in
Transition_. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University
Press, 1970.

Curtis, Mark H. _Oxford and Cambridge in Transition
1558-1642_. Oxford: The Claredon Press, 1959.

Daly, Lowrie J., S. J. _The Medieval University, 1200-1400_.
New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1961.

DeConde, Alexander, ed. _Student Activism_. New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.

Dennison, John D. and Paul Gallagher. <u>Canada's Community Colleges: A Critical Analysis</u>. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986.

Dion, Leon. <u>Quebec: The Unfinished Revolution</u>. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1976.

Dixon, Marlene. <u>Things Which are Done in Secret</u>. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1976.

Douglas, Jack D. <u>Youth in Turmoil: America's Changing Youth Cultures and Student Protest Movements</u>. Chevy Chase, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, 1970.

Driver, Christopher. <u>The Exploding University</u>. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971.

Feuer, Lewis S. <u>The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements</u>. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1969.

Foster, Julien and Durward Long, eds. <u>Protest! Student Activism in America</u>. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1970.

Fraser, Ronald, et al. <u>1968: A Student Generation in Revolt</u>. London: Chatto and Windus, 1988.

Frost, Stanley Brice. <u>McGill University: For the Advancement of University Learning</u>. Vol. II, <u>1896-1971</u>. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984.

Gillett, Margaret. <u>A History of Education: Thought and Practice</u>. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Company of Canada Limited, 1966.

_____. <u>We Walked Very Warily: A History of Women at McGill</u>. Montreal: Eden Press Women's Publications, 1981.

Gitlin, Todd. <u>The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage</u>. New York: Bantam Books, 1987.

Goldwin, Robert A., ed. <u>How Democratic is America?: Responses to the New Left Challenge</u>. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969.

Harris, Robin S., ed. <u>Changing Patterns of Higher Education in Canada</u>. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Haskins, Charles Homer. The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

_____. The Rise of Universities. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1957.

_____. Studies in Medieval Culture. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1929.

Hayden, Tom. Reunion: A Memoir. New York: Random House, 1988.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. Institutions in Transition: A Profile of Change in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. and Richard L. Meeth, eds. Power and Authority: Transformation of Campus Governance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971.

Keen, Maurice. The Pelican History of Medieval Europe. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1968.

Kerpelman, Larry C. Activists and Nonactivists. New York: Behavioral Publications, Inc., 1972.

Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University: With a "Postscript-1972". New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972.

Kibre, Pearl. The Nations in the Medieval University. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Medieval Academy of America, 1948.

_____. Scholarly Privileges in the Middle Ages. London, England: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1961.

Knott, Paul D., ed. Student Activism. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1971.

Kostash, M. Long Way From Home: The Story of the Sixties Generation in Canada. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, 1980.

Laurie, S. S. The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1887.

Lee, Calvin B. The Campus Scene 1900-1970. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970.

Levitt, Cyril. Children of Privilege. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. Rebellion in the University. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1971.

_____. Student Politics. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Loken, Joel O. Student Alienation and Dissent. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd., 1973.

Lumsden, Ian., ed. Close the 49th Parallel etc.: The Americanization of Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Mallett, C. E. A History of the University of Oxford. Vol. 1, The Mediaeval University and the Colleges Founded in the Middle Ages. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1968.

Mann, W. E. Social and Cultural Change in Canada. Vol. 2. Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1970.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Arrogance on Campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970.

McGill, William J. The Year of the Monkey: Revolt on Campus 1968-69. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982.

McGuigan, Gerald F. Student Protest. Toronto: Methuen, 1968.

Mehnert, Klaus. Twilight of the Young: The Radical Movements of the 1960s and Their Legacy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1977.

Millett, John D. New Structures of Campus Power: Success and Failures of Emerging Forms of Institutional Governance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

Morris, Charles R. A Time of Passion: America 1960-1980. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1984.

Munro, Dana Carleton, ed. The Medieval Student. Philadelphia: The Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania, 1899.

Niblett, W. R., ed. Higher Education: Demand and Response. London: Tavistock Publications, 1969.

Nichols, David C., ed. <u>Perspectives on Campus Tensions:</u>
  <u>Papers Prepared for the Special Committee on Campus</u>
  <u>Tensions</u>. Washington, D.C.: American Council on
  Education, 1970.

Norton, Arthur O. <u>Readings in the History of Education</u>.
  Cambridge: Harvard University, 1909.

Porter, John. <u>The Vertical Mosaic</u>. Toronto: University
  of Toronto Press, 1965.

Powicke, F. M. <u>Ways of Medieval Life and Thought</u>.
  London: Odhams Press Limited, 1949.

Quarter, Jack. <u>The Student Movement in the Sixties</u>.
  Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in
  Education, 1972.

Radcliff-Umstead, Douglas, ed. <u>The University World: A</u>
  <u>Synoptic View of Higher Education</u>. Pittsburgh,
  Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh, 1973.

Rait, Robert S. <u>Life in the Medieval University</u>.
  Cambridge, England: University Press, 1912.

Rashdall, Hastings. <u>The Universities of Europe in the</u>
  <u>Middle Ages</u>. 3 vols. 2nd ed. Edited by F. M.
  Powicke and A. B. Emden. London: Oxford University
  Press, 1936.

Reid, Tim and Julyan Reid, eds. <u>Student Power and the</u>
  <u>Canadian Campus</u>. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates
  Limited, 1969.

Ross, Aileen D. <u>Student Unrest in India</u>. Montreal:
  McGill-Queen's University Press, 1969.

Ross, Murray G. <u>The University: The Anatomy of Academe</u>.
  New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

Ross, Robin. <u>The Short Road Down: A University Changes</u>.
  Toronto: The University of Toronto, 1984.

Roussopoulos, Dimitrious, J., ed. <u>The New Left in Canada</u>.
  Montreal: Our Generation Press-Black Rose Books,
  1970.

Schachner, Nathan. <u>The Mediaeval Universities</u>. London:
  George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1938.

172

Shapiro, Martin. Getting Doctored: Critical Reflections on Becoming a Physician. Kitchener, Ontario: Between the Lines, 1978.

Sheffe, Norman, ed. Issues for the Seventies: Student Unrest. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Shore, Marlene. The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origins of Social Research in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Taylor, Charles. Snow Job: Canada, the United States and Vietnam (1954-1973) Toronto: House of Anansi Press Limited, (c.1974)

Thorndike, Lynn. University Records and Life in the Middle Ages. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.

Vallières, Pierre. White Niggers of America. Montreal: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1971.

Waddell, Helen. The Wandering Scholars. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1927.

Westby, David L. The Clouded Vision: The Student Movement in the United States in the 1960s. Cranbury, New Jersey: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1976.

Whalley, George, ed. A Place of Liberty: Essays on the Government of Canadian Universities. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Company Limited, 1964.

Wieruszowski, Helene. The Medieval University: Masters, Students, Learning. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1966.

Zacour, Norman. An Introduction to Medieval Institutions. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1969.

Periodicals

Altbach, Philip G. "From Revolution to Apathy--American Student Activism in the 1970s." Higher Education 8, No. 6 (November 1979): 609-626.

Aron, Raymond. "Student Rebellion: Vision of the Future or Echo From the Past?" Political Science Quarterly LXXXIV, No. 2 (June 1969): 289-310.

Astin, Alexander W. and Alan E. Bayer. "Antecedents and Consequents of Disruptive Campus Protests." Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance 4, No. 1 (April 1971): 18-30.

Barber, Benjamin R. "Cultural Conservatism and Democratic Education: Lessons from the Sixties." Salmagundi No. 81 (Winter 1989): 159-173.

Bayer, Alan E. and Alexander W. Astin. "Campus Unrest, 1970-71: Was It Really All That Quiet?" Educational Record 52, No. 4 (Fall 1971): 301-313.

Bayer, Alan E. and Alexander W. Astin. "Violence and Disruption on the U.S. Campus, 1968-1969." Educational Record 50, No. 4 (Fall 1969): 337-350.

Blume, Robert A. "Quiet on the Campus." Today's Education 61, No. 5 (May 1972): 38-40, 62-63.

Classen, Peter. "Association of Teachers and Learners: The Medieval View of the University." Journal of Western European Education 13 (Fall 1981): 28-37.

Flacks, Richard. "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest." The Journal of Social Issues XXIII, No. 3 (July 1967): 52-75.

Giusti, Joseph R. "Students and the 1970's: Calm After the Storm." School and Society 97, No. 2319 (October 1969): 360-363.

Glazer, Nathan. "The Aftermath of the Student Revolt." ABG Reports 26, No. 6 (November/December 1984): 23-28.

Gray, Stanley. "The Struggle for Quebec." Canadian Dimension 6, No. 6 (December-January 1969-70): 23-26.

Greeley, Andrew M. "The End of the Movement." Change 4, No. 3 (April 1972): 42-47.

Grey, Julius. "The Paradox of Stanley Gray." Canadian Dimension 6, No. 5 (October-November 1969): 6-9.

Hyslop, John R. "Impersonality." McGill News XLVI, No. 1 (February 1965): 25-27.

Hyslop, John R. "Impersonality." McGill News XLVI, No. 2 (April 1965): 27-28.

"Interview: Rebels with a cause." McGill News 49, No. 6 (November 1968): 2-10.

Keniston, Kenneth. "The Sources of Student Dissent." The Journal of Social Issues XXIII, No. 3 (July 1967): 108-137.

Kerr, Clark. "The Uses of the University": "Postscript 1982." Change 14, No. 7 (October 1982): 23-31.

Kibre, Pearl. "Scholarly Privileges: Their Roman Origins and Medieval Expressions. "American Historical Review LIX, No. 3 (April 1954): 543-567.

Langdon, Steven. "CUS." Canadian Dimension 6, No. 7 (February-March 1970): 6-8.

Lauderdale, William B. "Change in Universities: A Cultural Perspective." The Educational Forum XXXIX, No. 2 (January 1975): 199-209.

Laxer, James. "The Student Movement and Canadian Independence." Canadian Dimension 6, Nos. 3-4 (August-September 1969): 27-34, 69-70.

Lentiniemi, L. "A Tested Theory of Student Unrest." The Alberta Journal of Educational Research 18, No. 1 (March 1972): 51-58.

Levin, Bob. "The Magic of a Rearview Mirror." MacLean's, 20 March 1988, 43.

Levine, Arthur and Keith R. Wilson. "Student Activism in 1970s: Transformation Not Decline." Higher Education 8, No. 6 (November 1979): 627-640.

Levitt, Cyril. "The New Left, The New Class and Socialism." Higher Education 3, No. 6 (November 1969): 641-655.

Mankoff, Milton and Richard Flacks. "The Changing Social Base of the American Student Movement." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 395 (May 1971): 54-67.

Martin, Warren Bryan. "The Legacy of the Sixties: Innovation-Bloodied but Unbowed." Change 14, No. 2 (March 1982): 35-38.

Mayhew, Lewis B. "Higher Education--Toward 1984."
Educational Record 53, No. 3 (Summer 1972): 215-221.

Newcomb, Theodore. "University, Heal Thyself." Political
Science Quarterly LXXXIV, No. 2 (June 1969): 351-366.

"Report Highlights Problems of Adjustment to University."
McGill News XLV, No. 1 (February 1964): 13-14.

Rice, Joy K. and Juliette L. Redding. "Personal
Adjustment and Social Orientation Among Activist and
Nonactivist Student Groups." Youth and Society 7,
No. 1 (September 1975): 84-96.

Robertson, H. Rocke. "Ten Years After." McGill Journal
of Education XV, No. 1 (Winter 1980): 7-22.

Ruedisili, C. H. "The Student Revolt and the Honors
Program." Journal of Higher Education XLI, No. 4
(April 1970): 283-290.

Sampson, Edward E. "Student Activism and the Decade of
Protest." The Journal of Social Issues XXIII, No. 3
(July 1967): 1-33.

Schlesinger, Sue and J. Victor Baldridge. "Is Student
Power Dead in Higher Education?" College Student
Journal 16, No. 1 (Spring 1982): 9-17.

Shaffer, Jay C. "Students in the Policy Process."
Journal of Higher Education XLI, No. 5 (May 1970):
341-349.

Simpson, John H. and Walter Phillips. "Understanding
Student Protest in Canada: The University of Toronto
Strike Vote." Canadian Journal of Higher Education
6, No. 1 (1976): 59-67.

Trenton, Thomas N. "Left-wing Radicalism at a Canadian
University: The Inapplicability of an American
Model." Interchange on Education 14, No. 2 (1983):
54-65.

Walden, Keith. "Respectable Hooligans: Male Toronto
College Students Celebrate Hallowe'en, 1884-1910."
Canadian Historical Review LXVIII, No. 1 (1987):
1-34.

Commission Reports

Financing Higher Education in Canada: Being the Report of
a Commission to the Association of Universities and
Colleges of Canada, successor to the National
Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges, and
its Executive Agency, the Canadian Universities
Foundation. By Vincent W. Bladen, Chairman.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Reform on
Campus. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.

Duff, Sir James and Robert O. Berdahl. University
Government in Canada: Report of a Commission
Sponsored by the Canadian Association of University
Teachers and the Association of Universities and
Colleges of Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto
Press, 1966.

Frost, S. B. The History of McGill in Relation to
Montreal and Quebec. Study Commissioned by
Commission D'Étude Sur Les Universités, 1978.

Hurtubise, René and Donald C. Rowat. The University,
Society and Government: The Report of the Commission
on the Relations Between Universities and
Governments. Ottawa: The University of Ottawa Press,
1970.

Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest.
By William W. Scranton, Chairman. Washington, D.C.:
Government Printing Office, 1970.

Material Obtained Through An Information Service

Dickinson, James C. Student Activism and the
Characteristics of Activists. Unpublished paper,
1969. Dialog, ERIC, ED 033 388.

Kermerer, Frank R. and David A. Young. Student Power
Reincarnated. 1977. Dialog, ERIC, ED 149 692.

Long, Durward. The Impact of Activist Students in
        Changing the Governance and Culture of the Campus.
        Paper presented at the 25th national conference of
        the American Association for Higher Education,
        Chicago, Illinois, March 3, 1970. Dialog, ERIC, ED
        039 852.

McCarthy Joseph M. When Students Rebel: The American
        Collegiate Experience. Paper prepared for the 1970
        Duquesne History Forum, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania,
        29-31 October. Dialog, ERIC, ED 055 577.

Speeches

Gray, Stanley. "The 60's at McGill: Student Radicalism."
        Speech given at McGill University, 4 April 1985.

Grey, Julius. "New Directions at Old McGill?
        Reminiscences of Student Life in the 1960's." Paper
        presented at a meeting of the James McGill Society,
        26 November 1986.

McGill University Archives (MUA): Published Material

For periodicals, the complete runs between the dates
indicated were consulted.

Annual Report. 1963-64 - 1970-71.

Arts and Science Undergraduate Society. Course Guide:
        1966.

McGill Daily. Vol. 53 - Vol. 60 (September 1963 - June
        1971).

McGill News. Vol. 44 - Vol. 52 (1963 - 1971).

McGill Reporter. Vol. 1 - Vol. 3 (September 25, 1968 -
        June 1, 1971).

McGill University Scrapbooks of Press Clippings.
        Vol. 16 - Vol. 18 (March 9, 1963 - February 22, 1969,
        end of the collection).

Old McGill. 1963 - 1972.

The Plumbers' Pot. Passim 1967-69.

Students' Society. Student Handbook. 1963-72.

Student Organizations. Miscellaneous publications of
     various student groups.

McGill University Archives: Unpublished Material

R.G. 1: Office of the Chancellor. Howard Irwin Ross,
     1964-1970.

R.G. 2: Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor.
     Office of Principal H. Rocke Robertson, 1962-1970.

R.G. 2: Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor.
     Office of Executive Assistant to Principal Robertson,
     G. A. Grimson, 1964-1968.

R.G. 3: Offices of the Vice-Principals. Office of
     Vice-Principal, Academic, Michael Oliver, 1966-1971.

R.G. 3: Offices of the Vice-Principals. Office of
     Vice-Principal, Administration, R. F. Shaw,
     1968-1971.

R.G. 4: Secretariat of the Royal Institution for the
     Advancement of Learning and the Board of Governors.
     Minutes of Governors' Meetings. Reviewed for the
     period February 18, 1963 - February 3, 1973.

R.G. 8: Secretariat of Senate. Minute Books of Senate.
     Reviewed for the period September 25, 1963 - December
     16, 1970.

R.G. 8: Secretariat of Senate. Records of Committees of
     Senate: Tripartite Commission on the Nature of the
     University.

R.G. 32: Faculty of Arts. Miscellaneous records.

R.G. 49: Public Relations Office. Miscellaneous editions
     of "McGill University Bulletin."

R.G. 76: Associations of McGill Graduates. Miscellaneous
     records.

M.G. 1026: <u>Maxwell Cohen Papers</u>. Records pertaining to the Duff-Burdahl report and the report of the Tripartite Commission.

M.G. 2001: <u>H. Rocke Robertson Papers</u>. Microfilm of Diaries of H. R. Robertson. Reels total: 6. Reviewed for the period November 1967 - April 1969.

<u>Registrar's Office</u>

"Fulltime Registration by Degree Programme: Distribution by Sex 1960/61-1969/70." From the Annual Report of the Registrar to Senate.

"Geographical Distribution of Students." Statistics for 1967, 1968, and 1969.