

2013

A Midwestern culture of civility: Student activism at the University of Northern Iowa during the Maucker years (1967-1970)

Christopher J. Shackelford
University of Northern Iowa

Copyright 2013 - Christopher J. Shackelford

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd>

 Part of the [History Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

Shackelford, Christopher J., "A Midwestern culture of civility: Student activism at the University of Northern Iowa during the Maucker years (1967-1970)" (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 29.
<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd/29>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

A MIDWESTERN CULTURE OF CIVILITY: STUDENT ACTIVISM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
NORTHERN IOWA DURING THE MAUCKER YEARS (1967- 1970)

An Abstract of a Thesis
Submitted
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Christopher J. Shackelford

University of Northern Iowa

August 2013

ABSTRACT

This project examines the changing social dynamic of those affiliated with the University of Northern Iowa during the latter half of the 1960s, with special emphasis on student activism and the changing attitudes of administrators and community members. This project intends to use the medium of alternative newspapers as a central component in the analysis of the time studied and as an unfiltered voice of student dissent. By narrowing the focus of this project to an individual university and community, an intimate narrative emerges that acts as a testament of the overwhelming atmosphere of change that engulfed American colleges throughout the late 1960s. Furthermore, I suggest that apathy at American colleges may not have derived from the characteristics of students, but, in fact, was the result of policies and an authoritarian culture that stressed civility and limited social activism. This culture of *cultivated courtesy* made Iowa aesthetically pleasing, a place where rural folk were courteous, smiling and civil. But when it came to student protest and dissent, the influence of *cultivated courtesy* was powerful: protesters were dismissed, vilified, and delegitimized when perceived to be failing to adhere to the social expectation of manners and civility. Finally, this project examines the relationships between administrators, faculty members, and students from within the context of education. This line of analysis suggests a schism in the ideological approaches to instruction; with one school of thought embracing structure and stability, while the other, promoted controversy and experience as modes of self-enlightenment.

A MIDWESTERN CULTURE OF CIVILITY: STUDENT ACTIVISM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
NORTHERN IOWA DURING THE MAUCKER YEARS (1967- 1970)

A Thesis
Submitted
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Christopher J. Shackelford
University of Northern Iowa

August 2013

This Study by: Christopher J. Shackelford

Entitled:

A Midwestern Culture of Civility: Student Activism at the University of Northern Iowa
During the Maucker Years (1967-1970)

has been approved as meeting the thesis requirement for the

Degree of Masters of Arts

Date

Dr. Brian Roberts, Chair, Thesis Committee

Date

Dr. John Johnson, Thesis Committee Member

Date

Dr. Fernando Calderon, Thesis Committee Member

Date

Dr. Michael J. Licari, Dean, Graduate College

I dedicate this thesis to my
parents Kelli Carlson and
Rodney Shackelford who have
inspired and supported me in
all my endeavors

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would not have been able to complete this thesis without the help of my personal editor and emotional base, Kelsey Kohlmeyer. I would like to express my gratitude to my professional and insightful thesis committee, specifically my advisor Dr. Brian Roberts. Additionally, my fellow graduate students have provided an unquantifiable amount of support and ideas during this process. Melinda Stump has been a tremendously influential colleague. I am grateful to have such an approachable faculty of first class historians to turn to in times of need. Lastly, I would like to thank Gerald Peterson and the entire staff of the University of Northern Iowa's special collections in Rod Library for their expedient and thorough assistance with research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION TO CULTIVATED COURTESY.....	1
CHAPTER 1: THE HOFFMANS AFFAIR 1967-1968.....	17
CHAPTER 2: A CLIMATE OF CHANGE 1968-1969.....	48
CHAPTER 3: AN ERUPTION 1969-1970.....	74
CONCLUSION.....	109
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	115

INTRODUCTION TO CULTIVATED COURTESY

“You can’t jail the revolution! Dare to struggle, dare to win!” proclaimed Bob McLane of the University of Northern Iowa after being jailed along with twenty eight classmates in April of 1970. Twenty-six UNI students and two community members were sentenced to a week in the Black Hawk County Jail for intruding into a university disciplinary hearing. They shattered a glass door, stormed into the board room, and halted the proceedings. These criminals, as dubbed by the community, represented a proportion of the student body that had embraced confrontational activism by 1970. During this era administrators, lawmakers, and community members cultivated a culture of courtesy and shunned the actions and opinions of the activists at UNI, all while, students forged new conceptions of politics, education, and culture. The three academic school years between 1967 and 1970 represented a time of substantial change in the culture of the university both at the national and local level.

The 1960s in America presents a perplexing challenge for any historian to diagnose or comprehend in an entirety. The political roller-coasters, assassinations, full-scale war, and domestic unrest altered the American experience. The decade seems to have been a time for factions of the American youth to speak-up and speak-out against the status quo policies of the prior generation. Disillusioned by Cold War rhetoric and isolated politically, young Americans nationwide began to reexamine the social constructions that encompassed their lives. A barrage of new ideas emerged as mainstream political issues such as civil rights, social gender constructions, and new

perceptions of sexuality emerged, along with an overwhelming push to the left politically. The movement, as it later would be termed, seems to have originated amongst college age-students and intellectuals who appeared to look at their world from a different perspective than their parents.¹ The left-ward shift which occurred was not exclusively political. Rather cultural norms were challenged on a variety of levels. This political transition has been labeled by scholars, the rise of the New Left. Many New Leftists were anti-consumption, environmentalist, and egalitarian in nature.² The youth of the late 1960s challenged traditional conceptions of public dissent, education, and authority regularly via activism both public and private. Especially on college campuses confrontational and reform activism fostered an environment conducive to dissent. One concept challenged on college campuses was the practice of *in loco parentis*, or in lieu of parents. A social conception embraced by a significant amount of American

¹ Part of this cultural shift was defined by C. Wright Mills in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Historian Daniel Geary wrote: "Rather than [rely] on the Labor movement, Mills argued, radicals might find promise in the 'youth intelligentsia' of the world as 'a possible, immediate, radical agency of change.'" Geary reveals that New Left ideologies were a part of a global phenomenon; he also contends that Mills had a larger influence upon global ideology than previously portrayed in scholarship. Daniel Geary, "Becoming International Again': C. Wright Mills and the Emergence of a Global New Left, 1956-1962," *The Journal of American History* Volume 95 Issue 3 (December 2008), 710-736.

² The term new left is used here to describe the political movement that arose during the 1960s as proportions of the electorate challenged the old guard politics of the Democratic Party with an increased emphasis on personal politics, community based advocacy, and the economically and socially disenfranchised. John McMillian, *Smoking Typewriters: the sixties underground press and the rise of alternative media in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 12 defines the term new left as demographically including, "predominately white, nonconformist, college-aged youths of the 1960s who rebelled against American racism, imperialism and bourgeois social relations." Cyril Levitt, "The New Left, the New Class and Socialism" *Higher Education* Vol. 8 No. 6 (November, 1979), 641 described the term as: "a polycentric social movement . . . led by students from universities and colleges. . . The New Left everywhere challenged the three major politically organized forces on the left: liberalism, social democracy, and Moscow-oriented communism."

administrators before the 1960s. The concept of *in loco parentis* allowed those in power to incorporate social and moral virtues into their administrative responsibilities, commonly evoking the spirit of paternalism.³

The war in Vietnam was a pervasive topic debated and analyzed during the late 1960s. Anti-Vietnam War sentiment began to permeate across the nation by 1967. Not all Americans of the late 1960s shared the conviction that the war was a folly, but a sizable faction agreed the war in Vietnam must end. Many scholars have published on the Vietnam War era. At the beginning of the war the public generally supported Lyndon B Johnson's decision for military action. Yet by 1967, as thousands died across the Pacific Ocean, factions of the American public began to question the military strategy and motives of the war. Dissent escalated even further as the draft expanded. Especially on or near university campuses, anti-war activities became more prevalent from 1967 to 1968.

³ *In loco parentis* has been utilized in education since the eighteenth century according to John C Hogan, "In Loco Parentis in the United States, 1765-1985," *Journal of Legal History* 8.3 (1987), 260-274. Hogan describes that *in loco parentis*, "grants teachers the right of correction and discipline over students based on a delegation of authority from parents." Hogan evaluated the 1985 United States Supreme Court case of *New Jersey v. T. L. O.*, which addressed the constitutionality of searching private property at public schools. The decision sided with the public school; Hogan argued the decision expanded administrative authority and broadened *in loco parentis* practices. Hogan suggests that the resistance to the concept of *in loco parentis* during the 1960s ultimately failed to ensure long standing reform and the practice has continued to be utilized by universities and public schools. Additionally, *in loco parentis* has been employed as a means of censorship as described by Timothy Reese Cain, "Of Tempests, Laughing Horses, and Sacred Cows: Controlling College Student Presses Between the World Wars," *American Journalism* 29.3 (2012), 9-39. Cain argued that university administrators claimed ultimate authority over students by marginalizing and demonizing college student publications in the 1920s and 1930s based upon perceived insolence. The concept of *in loco parentis*, in practice, empowered administrators to facilitate discipline based on moral perceptions.

Most scholars tend to focus on the elite schools in their analysis of anti-war sentiments on university campuses schools like Berkeley, Columbia, Cornell, Michigan, or Wisconsin.⁴ These studies are valuable for they offer important national commentary on culture and context, yet they neglect the sizeable population of students attending state schools outside the national limelight. The history of the 1960s will be incomplete until scholars confront a larger cross section of the American experience. Remote and obscure localities demonstrate the experienced cultural transformations of the era. Therefore it is vital to highlight the national relevancy of state schools as well as elite schools. State schools may not have been coast-to-coast talking points, but they were profoundly influential on a local and regional level. This study intends to focus on a state school in order to enhance and fill a void in the current scholarship, and, perhaps, it suggests a regional context in which to evaluate universities of the Midwest.

Historian Kenneth J. Heineman, in his 1993 publication entitled *Campus Wars: the Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era* argues that the fixation on large prestigious schools originates from the cultural memory of the 1960s, specifically the mental images we associate with the anti-war movement. Heineman contends that media coverage of the era heightened events occurring at elite schools for political reasons as well as to create a shock value by introducing the American public to affluent young adults challenging authority. This project will not focus on elite

⁴ W.J. Roabaugh, *Berkeley at War: the 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Roger Rosenblatt, *Coming Apart: a memoir of the Harvard Wars of 1969* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1997).

universities, rather it will supply a chronological analysis of Iowa's smallest state university during a time of immense change and controversy.⁵

Melvin Small agrees with Kenneth Heineman in *Coverning Dissent: the Media and the Anti-Vietnam War Movement*. Small's publication contextualizes the Vietnam era via the prism of the national media. Small substantiates Heineman's interpretation that the media framed the national discourse. Small concludes that the national media of the 1960s dictated the relevancy and imagery of select events or movements, and that they orchestrated opinions on a macro level. Both Heineman and Small agree localized events and histories are absent from the standard narrative of the Vietnam era and by widening the gaze of historical inquiry a more comprehensive understanding of the 1960s could be achieved.⁶

The Midwest and in particular, Iowa, is frequently neglected by mainstream scholars. Yet, a few historians have conducted evaluations that traced cultural and political changes at Midwestern universities such as Robbie Lieberman's 2004 work, *Prairie Power: Voices of 1960s Midwestern Student Protest*. Lieberman brilliantly chronicles, through the transcriptions of oral histories, the late 1960s from the perspective of three state universities: the University of Kansas, Southern Illinois University and the University of Missouri. Lieberman contends that activism was far-

⁵ Kenneth J. Heineman, *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era* (New York: New York University Press, 1993).

⁶ Melvin Small, *Coverning Dissent: The Media and the Anti- Vietnam War Movement* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1994).

reaching and prevalent even in America's heartland. Lieberman never defines the term "Prairie Power," and she neglects to adequately suggest a Midwestern ethos different than that of activists from around the country. Her publication does highlight student's demonstrations against *in loco parentis* and university's restrictions on protests and free speech.⁷

One author who focused on one Iowa school is David Anthony Tyeme Clark. Clark describes the experience of students at Graceland College in southern Iowa from 1965-1973 in an article titled *This Side of the Cornfield: Reform Activism at Graceland College*. Clark contends that small, rural schools of the Midwest can be quite revealing within the appropriate local context and profoundly important to the overarching narrative of the late 1960s. Yet, Graceland College is fundamentally different from UNI; Graceland was small and privately funded, UNI was the third largest school in the state and had a regional reputation for its teacher education program. Similarities between the schools were noteworthy, the demographic compilation and cultural upbringings of the students were comparable. Yet as a state regents' school, UNI had more clout within the state and throughout the region. Both schools' brand of activism is comparable in regards to advocacy against the Vietnam War, their resistance to *in loco parentis* ideologies, and anti-authoritarian activism.

In 1967 at the University of Northern Iowa an important controversy ensued involving a professor who published an article in the on-campus newspaper promoting

⁷ Robbie Lieberman, *Prairie power: voices of 1960s Midwestern student protest* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2004).

draft resistance. The subsequent debate at UNI provoked a massive dialogue (both locally and throughout the state) about freedom of the press, freedom of expression, and the appropriateness of dissent in public institutions. In the following school years (1968-1969 and 1969-1970) students of UNI published an avant-garde newspaper that enabled students to express the very freedoms being suppressed by their administration. The news sheets were designed in accordance with the social phenomenon that had emerged in 1965 in major urban settings and expanded to campuses nationwide. The politically left newspapers were dubbed by their readers and editors as “underground newspapers.”

Underground newspapers exploded during the late 1960s. In 1965 there were couple dozen publications and by 1970 there were thousands being published across the American landscape. The newspapers were inherently different from the mainstream press; they covered issues relevant to the youth-oriented social movements affiliated with dissent and change. Contrary to the implications of the word “underground,” these newspapers were widely read by thousands of Americans and peddled by street corner vendors. When investigating a single underground newspaper it becomes clear that the writers of these publications were approaching the troubles, questions, and ideas of their era with feverish commitment and a sense of urgency. The underground press also projected a degree of satire. The transcendence, beauty, comedy, and chaos of the counterculture mixed with the fervor, anti-authoritarian,

greed, and organization of American politics yielded the underground newspaper movement.

Scholars tend to agree that regional studies of the underground press must be undertaken to accurately create a comprehensive perspective on the complicated social reforms of the era. Rather than focusing on nationally circulated publications, it can be equally as important to interpret the local writings of less well known papers in order to understand the complexities of the general movement. Despite obvious value in evaluating local papers, many historians have attempted to write about alternative journalism from a national context.⁸ The scholars who fall within the latter school of thought typically portray a larger picture of the phenomenon, and they tend to gravitate toward citing the most popular and most circulated papers of the era such as *The Berkeley Barb* (California), *The East Village Other* (New York), or *The Rag* (Texas). Other authors have conducted Midwestern evaluations, which seem to use the underground press as a supplementary aspect of their arguments and neglect to place the underground papers at the center of their analysis.⁹ Furthermore, there seem to be very few scholars who have specifically cited any of Iowa's underground papers, let alone

⁸ See McMillian, *Smoking Typewriters* (2011); Bob Ostertag, *People's Movements, People's Press: The Journalism of Social Justice Movements* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006); Rodger Streitmatter, *Voices of Revolution: the dissident press in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001); Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: years of hope, days of rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1987); Abe Peck, *Uncovering The Sixties: The Life and Times of the Underground Press* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985); Lauren Kessler, *The Dissident Press: Alternative Journalism in American History* (London: Sage Publications, 1984).

⁹ Mary Ann Wynkoop, *Dissent in the Heartland: the sixties at Indiana University* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002); Lieberman, *Prairie Power* (2004).

examined them in great detail. By exploring Cedar Falls' underground papers, a more comprehensive understanding of UNI's student ethos may be achieved.

This project examines the changing social dynamic of those affiliated with the University of Northern Iowa during the latter half of the 1960s, with special emphasis on student activism and the changing attitudes of administrators and community members. This project intends to use the medium of alternative newspapers as a central component in the analysis of the time studied and as an unfiltered voice of student dissent. By narrowing the focus of this project to an individual university and community, an intimate narrative emerges that acts as a testament of the overwhelming atmosphere of change that engulfed American colleges in the late 1960s. Furthermore, I suggest that apathy at American colleges may not have derived from the characteristics of students, but, in fact, was the result of policies and an authoritarian culture that stressed civility and limited social activism. This culture of *cultivated courtesy* made Iowa aesthetically pleasing, a place where rural folk were courteous, smiling and civil. But when it came to student protest and dissent, the influence of *cultivated courtesy* was powerful: protesters were dismissed, vilified, and delegitimized for failing to adhere to the social expectation of manners and civility.

Cedar Falls, Iowa is an ideal candidate for themes about Iowa culture to emerge, partially due to the fact that the vast majority of UNI students originated from the state. Topics such as civil rights, the Vietnam War, debates about the First Amendment, and elements of the counterculture emerged in its history. The more pervasive cultural

influences were the ones acquired on the local level. Therefore, by participating in activism students felt united with a national movement, but the brunt of their activism was absorbed by administrators who were perplexed by how uncivil student activism at UNI appeared. Student activists were dubbed radical and were perceived as threatening. When challenging authority, students challenged the Iowa concept of cultural civility. Administrators were uncomfortable with confrontation and feared violence would erupt on campus as it had at peer institutions. Of course all of this occurred within the realm of education. Education at UNI evolved during the 1960s from a controlled authoritarian environment where classrooms acted as the pulpit of knowledge to a much wider and sometimes chaotic context.

Part of the context of education is what Paulo Freire, an intellectual theorist, calls “the banking concept of education.” In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, first published in Portuguese in 1968, Freire contends that the modern education system encouraged passive learning and created a reciprocating model of complacency that was oppressive toward student power. Freire’s analysis of education suggests that the institutional hierarchy saw the social order as static and encouraged students to mold themselves accordingly and assimilate into society. Freire argued that a system structured upon the notation that knowledge can just be deposited into the brain of the pupil creates a social schism based on power. He indicated that counteracting the “banking concept” requires inquiry and community dialogue or active learning. By questioning the entire concept of what knowledge truly represented and the purpose of education, the

students and faculty at UNI resisted the “banking concept” ultimately challenging the established order of higher education. Lastly Freire highlighted the need for a revised student-faculty relationship. Freire recommends that the relationship between faculty and students should be collaborative. He argues that education should primarily be fixated on analytical analysis and “problem-posing education.”¹⁰

There are three distinct groups examined throughout this project: the administration, the faculty, and the student body. Each experienced the late 1960s in different ways, but it is the interactions between these three groups that define the era. The administration is analyzed primarily from the perspective of President Maucker. At the onset of the 1967 fall semester, President Maucker was entering into his eighteenth year as the chief administrator. Maucker’s style of administrating was rooted in the tradition of *in loco parentis*. Educated in the 1930s, Maucker’s conception of higher education was dissimilar to the new generation. He perceived education as curricular and structured. Maucker and his administration tried to ensure safety and order on campus as students expressed their dissent on a variety of subjects. He even proposed anticipatory policies that defined acceptable and unacceptable behaviors. When students originally began to demonstrate against the war in Vietnam they obtained permission to protest. Maucker respected their rights as long as their actions were perceived as civil. During the final year of Maucker’s tenure factions of the student body began to express dissent outside of the administration’s definition of appropriate

¹⁰ Paulo Freire, translated by Myra Bergman Ramos, "The Banking Concept of Education" *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 2000).

behavior. When students' passions and concerns were expressed in a perceived radical manner, the administration's encouraged culture of civility ultimately was used to silence student dissent. Like a parent punishing their children, the administration instituted disciplinary actions against students who challenged their authority. Whether jailed, suspended, or escorted off campus students lost their legitimacy when their actions were seen as ill-mannered. Maucker and his administration encouraged this culture with good intention, but in the end the approach limited students' expression.

The faculty, like the students, was demographically diverse. And, just like the students, factions of the faculty expressed dissent. Educators, such as Josef Fox or Edward Hoffmans, recognized the value in *experience* as a means of obtaining knowledge. They emphasized "problem posing education" or active learning. Controversial dialogue and community gatherings were perceived as valuable educational experiences to those faculty members who broke away from the traditional conception of instruction. This style of education was sometimes seen as messy or chaotic. Some faculty, such as Hoffmans, led by example and challenged students to be critical of authority. Administrators, community members, and lawmakers highlighted the dangers in a teaching style that rejected cultural standards of decency and civility. The contrast that was created between administrators and instructors, like Hoffmans, can most simply be described as an ideological difference in thought. Additionally, the faculty-student relationship was much closer than the relationship between administrators and students. The faculty that emulated Paulo Freire's recommended

style of education not only enlightened their students but they also gained knowledge and ideas from their pupils as well.

Students at UNI during this era underwent a profound transformation. Students were influenced by faculty members and their peers around the nation. They tried to project their disagreements with paternalism, the Vietnam War, and authority. At first students expressed their dissent in a calm, polite manner. Examples of this type of expression were highlighted by the behaviors of those who attended the November 1968 Seerley Park rally or those who participated in the 1969 National Moratorium. Eventually, students' rhetoric became more confrontational and administrators feared violence. In the spring of 1970 students' tactics of expression evolved. Students used more aggressive means such as demands, sit-ins, rhetorical slander, and disruption as methods to insert their power. The escalation of antagonistic expression by the students was not thwarted by the administration through brute force; rather, the students were proscribed based upon their perceived lack of civility.

The first chapter of this thesis traces the foundations of the university through the spring of 1968. The central event explored in chapter one is the Edward Hoffmans controversy where themes regarding publishing rights, resistance to the draft and the limits of administrative authority are explored. The second chapter chronicles the summer of 1968 through the summer of 1969. This chapter provides context (both nationally and locally) in which to interpret events that occurred in Cedar Falls. Additionally, chapter two describes the legislative measure known as the "anti-riot bill."

The final and third chapter portrays the increased activism that erupted on the campus of the University of Northern Iowa as national disapproval of the Vietnam War became more prevalent and local students expressed their resistance to administrative paternalism in the school year of 1969-1970.

The current historiography on Cedar Falls is laced with affection and nostalgia. Early portrayals by local citizens are beneficial to the historical memory of the community, yet they fail to place the city within a national context.¹¹ Scholarship on UNI has primarily come from former administrators. The standard narrative of UNI is William C. Lang and Daryl Pendergraft's *A Century of Leadership and Service* published in 1995. *A Century of Leadership* (specifically volume II) discusses the events in this thesis but fails to contextualize or interpret their significance. Lang and Pendergraft, both former administrators, are reluctant to portray controversial circumstances as potentially undermining the established authorities of UNI. Additionally, *A Century of Leadership* lacks a student's perspective during contentious events and rarely implies interpretive material involving culture. Lastly, *A Century of Leadership* neglects to reference the underground newspapers being published by the students of UNI.¹²

¹¹ One of the most adored early "promotional" publications about Cedar Falls was published by town mayor: Peter Melendy, *Historical Record of Cedar Falls: The Garden City of Iowa, containing a brief history of Iowa, of Black Hawk County, and a full and complete description of industrial and picturesque Cedar Falls* (1893), and relates the foundations of Sturgis Falls up until the establishment of federal buildings in Cedar Falls; a second vital reference is Brian C. Collins, *Cedar Falls, Iowa* (Charleston, S.C.: Arcadia, 1998), which pictorially relates the political and social history from inception of the town until the 1980s.

¹² William C. Lang and Daryl Pendergraft, *A Century of Leadership and Service: Iowa State Normal School 1876-1909 Iowa State Teachers College 1909-1961 State College of Iowa 1961-1967 University of*

This project constructs the bulk of the chronological narrative from newspaper articles and editorials. Newspaper sources are beneficial when seeking diverse opinions from a variety of people. Editorials can be tremendously revealing about the most relevant political topics of a given location. Much of the chronological context for this project is from *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*. *The Record* was independent from the university, yet it habitually reported on major events and affairs occurring at UNI. *The Record* commonly republished news articles from nationally syndicated sources, while maintaining a commitment to local news. The *Northern Iowan* and *The College Eye* are frequently cited as a means to supply opinions from students and faculty members. Both publications were sponsored by the university. UNI has a long tradition of student papers, beginning with *The Offering* in the late 19th century. Like most college campuses, the student newspapers were used for event announcements, administrative statements, forums on local affairs, and a place where editorialists could express opinions to a large student audience. The third set of newspapers consulted is the underground press, *The Campus Underground* and *The New Prairie Primer*. These publications were designed and disseminated by students and young community members. The alternative press provides a cultural vibrancy which previously has been lacking from the history of this time period in Cedar Falls. Most underground news

Northern Iowa 1967- A Centennial History of The University of Northern Iowa Volume II 1928-1976 (Cedar Falls, IA: University of Northern Iowa, 1995). Another important contribution is by the leading Archivist in the University of Northern Iowa's Special Collections at Rod Library: Gerald L. Peterson, *University of Northern Iowa* (Chicago: Arcadia, 2000).

sources are used as a supplement to the larger narrative of this thesis and help punctuate the opinions and activities of the students at UNI.

CHAPTER 1

THE HOFFMANS AFFAIR 1967-1968

Where It All Began

The town of Cedar Falls was founded in 1845 upon the south bank of the slow-paced, rocky-bottomed, Cedar River. Cedar Falls is located in the western half of Black Hawk County.¹³ Cedar Falls became connected to the railroad in 1861 and sent a sizable population of young men into the South during the Civil War.¹⁴ Following the war an orphan home was established by Annie Turner Wittenmyer about 2 miles south of the Cedar River to accommodate the children of the region orphaned by the Civil War. In 1866 thanks to local and state funding the orphan home was rebuilt on a forty-acre plot of land southwest of Cedar Falls proper.¹⁵ By the late 19th century the civil war orphans home was slated to close. The state reinvested in the orphanage by reassigning its purpose. In 1876 the site was declared a Normal School or a teacher training institution. The state appointed James Cleland Gilchrist the first principle of the Iowa State Normal School. The Normal School provided economic stimulation to the region. Although in

¹³ The location of Black Hawk County is disaffiliated from the native lands of the Sauk people. Black Hawk, the individual, has never been documented to have visited the location which now bears his name. Yet, as a lasting testament to his place in Iowa history the country forever memorializes the warrior in the contemporary vernacular. For a reference on the history of Black Hawk County refer to: Linda McCann, *Lost Black Hawk County* (Charleston, SC: History Press, 2011); and for information on Black Hawk see: Kerry Trask, *Black Hawk: the Battle for the Heart of America* (New York: Owl Books, 2007); lastly a good resource on the Black Hawk War is: Patrick J. Jung, *The Black Hawk War of 1832* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007).

¹⁴ Kenneth L. Lyftogt, *From Blue Mills to Columbia: Cedar Falls and the Civil War* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1993).

¹⁵ Gerald L. Peterson, *University of Northern Iowa* (Chicago: Arcadia, 2000), 9- 19.

reality distinctly separate, institutionally and administratively, Cedar Falls and the school south-of-town grew simultaneously and enjoyed a prosperous partnership.¹⁶

In 1909 the state changed the name of the Normal School, as individual academic departments were organized, to the Iowa State Teachers College. By the late 1940s the college had organized into fifteen academic departments and the school's enrollment increased considerably following WWII. Near the end of the 1940s principal of the Teachers College, Malcolm Price, stepped down leaving vacant the head administrative position. Succeeding Malcolm Price was Dr. James William Maucker. James William Maucker was born in 1912, in Rock Island, Illinois. After finishing his undergraduate work in chemistry at a local college, Maucker enrolled in graduate school at the University of Iowa in Iowa City. As a young man Maucker decided to embark on a career in education. Maucker worked diligently and obtained a Ph.D. in educational tests and measurements in 1940. During the subsequent decade he worked a variety of positions, predominantly administrative, throughout the Midwest. In 1946 he became the Dean of the School of Education at Montana State University. In 1950 he became the fifth administrative head of the Iowa State Teachers College in Cedar Falls, Iowa.¹⁷

The new president emphatically advocated the agenda of education as a means for social mobility and opportunity. Maucker's legacy has taken on a life of its own. He is

¹⁶ Peter Melendy, *Historical Record of Cedar Falls: The Garden City of Iowa, containing a brief history of Iowa, of Black Hawk County, and a full and complete description of industrial and picturesque Cedar Falls* (1893), 5-9, 57-66; Lyftogt, *From Blue Mills to Columbia* (1993), 3.

¹⁷ "Name Maucker President: Price given professorship in Ed Dept.," *The College Eye*, 7 July 1950.

without doubt one of the most discussed and memorialized presidents in UNI's history.¹⁸ He guided the school through a prosperous and expansive time period. Construction projects and frequent enrollment increases tangibly portrayed the thriving school and community. In 1961 after eliminating the required teacher's certification test as a prerequisite of graduation, the college was renamed the State College of Iowa. During Maucker's tenure significant cultural transitions occurred. When the school was originally founded a strict daily itinerary was followed by the entire student population. The institution and Principal Gilchrist followed the practice of *in loco parentis*, or taking personal parental responsibility for the enrolled students.¹⁹ During World War I, male students took military training instead of physical education. Students were told where to live, when to eat, and what to study. The authority of the administration was challenged during Maucker's tenure. A realignment of how to institute *in loco parentis* and a reevaluation of administrative authority occurred, making Maucker's tenure a watershed moment for relations between students, faculty, and administrators.

In 1966, the Board of Regents and the Iowa Legislature approved the transformation of the State College of Iowa into an accredited state university. In February 1967 the Iowa House of Representatives passed a bill with 114 in favor to 4 against the transformation of the school into the University of Northern Iowa. The House vote followed the 51 to 7 vote by the Iowa Senate and the approval of the Board

¹⁸ "Maucker's Legacy Alive and Well at UNI," *Waterloo Cedar Falls Courier*, 11 March 2012.

¹⁹ A Latin term meaning "in the place of parents."

of Regents.²⁰ Iowa Governor Harold Hughes's signature of the bill on Friday March 10, 1967 in his office in Des Moines solidified the change. The Governor signed the bill in the presence of President Maucker, Dean of Instruction William Lang, and *College Eye* editor Bob Davis.²¹

On July 1, 1967 the name and status officially changed which left many parties involved contemplating the ramifications that would follow such a transition. The most visible and immediate alteration was made to the administrative hierarchy. At the end of June *The College Eye* interviewed several administrators including Dean of Instruction Dr. William Lang who commented; "A university means the reorganization of the administrative structure into colleges . . . another layer . . . we will have separate deans for each college."²² Another visible change to the campus was the addition of new faculty, "over 100" according to *The College Eye*. Additionally, the popular student newspaper, *The College Eye*, felt it was appropriate to alter their name along with their institution. In the fall of 1967 the student paper made a transition to become the *Northern Iowan* effective on October 1, 1967.²³

The university had a nearly 10 % increase in enrollment to 8,213 students in 1967. New construction projects were proposed at the onset of the semester to

²⁰ "Representatives Pass Bill on University Status," *The College Eye*, 28 February 1967.

²¹ "Hughes Signs Bill: SCI to University of Northern Iowa," *The College Eye*, 14 March 1967.

²² Janice Hitshusen, "Building a University, a look toward the future," *The College Eye*, 30 July 1967.

²³ "College Eye to become the *Northern Iowan*," *The College Eye*, September 1967.

accommodate the increased enrollment. In the fall of 1967 the *Northern lowan* featured many complaints about the facilities. “Crowded faculty offices, sometimes six to an office, where it is impossible for an instructor to have a confidential talk with his students. . . Long lines everywhere as we pack 8,000 some students into a campus built for far fewer,” complained a concerned student in the student newspaper.²⁴ Two new “tower” dormitories were slated for construction on the land north of campus to accommodate the substantial increase in students.

The beginning of the semester began with a lot of optimism. Northern Iowa’s football team won its homecoming game and the campus joyously celebrated the victory with a parade, dance, and coronation ceremony. Everything was branded as the “first” – such as “first homecoming at UNI,” or “first homecoming queen of *The University of Northern Iowa*.” The Homecoming game was played on Saturday October 7; however, by Wednesday nobody was talking about the game or the house parties that may have followed. Rather, an article published in the *Northern lowan* rattled the campus and shaped the political dialogue for the remainder of the school year.

²⁴ “Some Suggestions for Things to see,” *Northern lowan*, 6 October 1967.

“Hell No, I Won’t Go”

On Tuesday October 10, 1967 a second year English instructor submitted an editorial to the *Northern Iowan* regarding Vietnam and domestic draft inductions. The article was written and submitted by Edward Hoffmans. The article was titled, “From Dissent to Resistance: ‘Hell No, I Won’t Go!’” The full page piece provoked almost instantaneous criticism from the community due to the out-right promotion of draft evasion by Hoffmans. Hoffmans wrote:

As the war escalates and American imperialism keeps expanding, totalitarianism replaces democracy at home through the instrumentality of the draft. . . Mass civil disobedience toward the draft should be made the focus of anti-war strategies: Registrants should publicly mutilate, destroy, or turn in their draft cards, refuse induction, halt operations of induction centers, and disrupt pre-induction physicals by refusing to obey orders.²⁵

Hoffmans’s article became widely discussed around Cedar Falls and throughout the state of Iowa. For the remainder of the semester, a heated debate ensued that reflected the changing American political attitude during the Vietnam era. The episode ultimately shaped the remaining years of the 1960s in Cedar Falls.

Edward Hoffmans had been hired in the fall of 1966 as an English instructor. Hoffmans began to organize against the Vietnam War soon after accepting the job. In September of 1966 he delivered a special lecture on campus titled “Viet Nam: Shame of America,” sponsored by the National Coordinating Committee to End War from

²⁵ Edward Hoffmans, “From Dissent to Resistance: ‘Hell No we Won’t Go!’” *Northern Iowan*, 10 October 1967.

Madison, Wisconsin. Even in 1966, when much of the American public still favored President Lyndon Johnson's decision to be involved in Vietnam, Hoffmans detested the justifications, tactics, and perceived geopolitical necessity of fighting a war in Southeast Asia. An editorial published after his lecture in 1966 *The College Eye* commented that the crowd seemed to be evenly split between those who supported Hoffmans and his views and those who did not.²⁶

In the spring of 1967 Hoffmans continued his advocacy during his second semester with the school by holding daily "silent vigils" outside the library on campus. An advertisement published in February of 1967 explained that between noon and 1 p.m. daily, Hoffmans along with others would gather and reflect in a state of meditation, "to express our sorrow and our protest."²⁷ Hoffmans's passionate criticism of the war in Vietnam was visible throughout his first year teaching for the State College of Iowa. Therefore, to those who may have known Edward Hoffmans personally, the publishing of "From Dissent to Resistance: 'Hell No, I Won't Go,'" may not have been a surprise.

Hoffmans's activities, discussed avidly in the student newspaper, became talking points on and around campus. The young professor broke away from the traditional standards of instruction, or as described by Paulo Freire the "banking concept of education." He promoted critical analysis, confrontational opposition, and community

²⁶ "Committee to end war meets tonight," *The College Eye*, 27 September 1966; "Hoffmans gives opinion of Vietnamese War," *The College Eye*, 30 September 1966.

²⁷ "Until Americans stop killing and being killed in Viet Nam," *The College Eye*, 28 February 1967.

dialogue. By attending a vigil students would not merely receive information, they partook in a valuable teachable moment that enhanced their educational experience. It would be hard to infer the administrators' perception of Hoffmans or his style of teaching prior to the fall of 1967, but after his publication Hoffmans's philosophies and instructional practices became publically scrutinized.

Hoffmans's writings were controversial due the overt promotion of illegal behavior by resisting the draft. Hoffmans unabashedly stated:

The Vietnam War is the ugliest illegitimate offspring of an incestuous relationship between American imperialism and the draft. Thus Americans can oppose the war and their country's imperialism most directly and effectively by emasculating the draft- that is, by removing the draft its manpower.²⁸

The controversy created by the article centered upon whether Hoffmans was within his legal rights to publish in a university funded newspaper an article that questioned the ethical motives of the draft and promoted illegal activities. On the surface, Hoffmans's article was exclusively a personal manifesto for the philosophies of disobedience and resistance. Yet, it is important to consider Hoffmans's motivations and his audience. By publishing this article in the on-campus newspaper Hoffmans challenged the student body to think critically about the institutions that governed their lives. He presented an opinion and tactic that was perceived as abrasive by administrators and community members, but Hoffmans was not targeting them as his audience. The article was designed for students. The article, just as the vigils of the previous spring had done, was

²⁸ Hoffmans, "From Dissent to Resistance: 'Hell No we Won't Go,'" 10 October 1967.

a means of education that challenged students to think critically about the world around them and encouraged them to participate in controversial expression and political activism. Almost immediately after the publication of Hoffmans's article, community members (specifically staff writer for the *Waterloo Courier*, William Severin) exclaimed that Hoffmans should be fired due his opinions expressed in the *Northern Iowan*.²⁹

The ensuing episode framed the experience for Iowans who found themselves engaged or witnessing the Hoffmans controversy. The culture of UNI underwent a transition during this important time. This time period in UNI's history showed the penetrating depth of new left ideologies in the American Midwest, all while emphasizing how individual localities experienced reform during the latter half of the 1960s. The Hoffmans controversy became a starting point for a transition to occur. Prior to the events in the fall of 1967 UNI seemed removed from the new left movement and dormant when it came to radical expression. During the years between 1967 and 1970, an outpouring of activism erupted on campus. The university experience changed. Students' educational curriculum was no longer defined in terms of how many hours were spent in a classroom. Thanks to Hoffmans and others, students began to identify more intimately with the knowledge gained in public discourse and thru active participation in demonstrations. For example, in the fall of 1967 students felt compelled to rally behind their university president while simultaneously they lobbied for the retention of a controversial staff member. Protests and demonstrations signaled a shift

²⁹ William Severin, "UNI Should Fire Hoffmans," *Waterloo Courier*, 13 October 1967.

in expression by the student body. Students vocally and symbolically started challenging the *in loco parentis* authority of administrators and lawmakers. Whether dissatisfied with the draft or motivated to argue for the retention of First Amendment principles, the University of Northern Iowa's students were involved in a cultural transition that redefined appropriate expression, administrative authority, and the role of university education. The origins of this transition at UNI must be traced to the Hoffmans controversy, for the university emphatically changed following the incident. The controversy emboldened certain students while provoking others (some for the first time) to engage in contentious debates about freedom of speech or the Vietnam War.

Edward Hoffmans's opinions and actions were examples of the growing dissatisfaction the American public had with the Vietnam War by 1967. The anti-war movement gained a valuable ally in Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. when he spoke out against the war in April. Several scholars have recognized that the momentum gained in 1967 provided the groundwork for larger dissent in 1968 and into the 1970s.³⁰ Chronologically aligning with the Hoffmans controversy, there were mass protests at the Pentagon building in Washington D.C. on October 21-22. In Cedar Falls the Hoffmans affair not only aroused conversation about the war in Southeast Asia, it also produced debates concerning freedom of expression and academic liberty.

³⁰ Melvin Small in *Covering Dissent: the Media and the Anti-Vietnam War Movement* discusses the way the national media portrayed the anti-war movement during the middle to late-1960s. Small argues that the media at times reinforced or glorified the movement early during its inception; Small continues by describing the about-face inversion by the media during 1967 and 1968, while elaborating on the ramifications of such portrayals. Small's analysis substantiates the interpretation that 1967 served as a pivotal moment in anti-Vietnam War sentiment. In: Small, *Covering Dissent* (1994), 66-68, 70-84.

President Maucker undoubtedly recognized the controversial climate. Could or would Maucker fire a professor for expressing a controversial opinion? Six days following Hoffmans's article Maucker released a prepared statement about the issue.

Maucker's statement read:

To some it appears that a man has expressed improper and dangerous ideas and he should simply be gotten rid of by dismissal from the University staff. . . I believe the most important thing at stake in this instance is the maintenance of freedom of thought and expression in the University community. . . While I personally disagree with Mr. Hoffmans' [sic] recommendations regarding draft resistance, I would consider it a distinct disservice to the University, and, in the long run, to the state of Iowa- for the University to take punitive measures against Mr. Hoffmans because of his ideas he has expressed or might express in the future.³¹

Shortly after the release of this statement a flood of support amounted for Maucker from all corners of the UNI community. The local chapter of American Association of University Professors (AAUP), community members, and students commended Maucker for his rhetorical preservation of free speech.³²

By submitting the "Statement on Freedom of Expression," Maucker placed himself in a precarious middle ground. Rhetorically, Maucker preserved Hoffmans's right of free speech. Maucker whole-heartedly disagreed with Hoffmans's opinions about the draft. Therefore it could be stated that Maucker disagreed with what Hoffmans was

³¹ James Maucker, "Dr. J. W. Maucker issues Statement on Freedom of Expression at UNI," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 16 October 1967.

³² "Professors' Group Backs President Maucker in Hoffmans Controversy," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 18 October 1967.

saying, but he recognized his constitutional right to publish opinions. Yet in the following weeks Maucker was challenged as pressure mounted from community members and from his own faculty to fire Hoffmans.

On October 13, three days after the publication of "From Dissent to Resistance," a group of prominent faculty member formulated a petition denouncing Hoffmans and the *Northern lowan's* decision to publish the article. The statement was signed by: James Blanford (Business), Lloyd Douglas (Business Education), Lyle Fisher (Speech), Ernest Fossum (Speech), George Glenn (Theater), Herbert Hake (Broadcasting), Donald Howard (History), Howard Jones (History), Leonard Keefe (Marketing), Milo Lawton (Alumni Services), Raymond Schlicher (Extension Director), Guy Wagner (Education), Donald Whitnah (History), James Witham (Physical Education), and Stanley Wood (Theater). The statement said "We believe in freedom of speech but we do not believe it is proper for a state subsidized- university newspaper to be used to encourage university students to break the law. Consequently, we will take any legal means at our disposal to see that this type of material is discontinued."³³ As the debate continued this position taken by the coalition of faculty members became challenged and was argued to be contrary to the true intentions of the First Amendment.

The *Northern lowan* editorial staff and the University Board of Student Publications quickly acted by passing a resolution to prevent future incidents in their paper. The resolution was passed within 6 days after Hoffmans's article, it stated:

³³ "Contrary to Best Interests of Students, Staff, School," *Northern lowan*, 13 October 1967.

“Henceforth, our policy will be that we will not knowingly print material that advocates illegal acts.”³⁴ The expedience of Mike Hanna and his editorial staff’s decision to change their publication policy is striking. Less than a week after Hoffmans’s article the prominent faculty members, William Severin, and the *Northern Iowan* editorial staff chose to adjust their political posturing away from Hoffmans.

Edward Hoffmans complicated the situation by participating in an anti-war rally in Cedar Rapids, Iowa on Monday October 16. Hoffmans, along with Steve Morris and Fred Barnett (both from Iowa City), collectively handed over their draft cards to a U.S. Marshal. Hoffmans was not arrested, but several believed his actions in Cedar Rapids increased the likelihood of his termination from UNI. By turning in his draft card, which was interpreted by many as a criminal act, Hoffmans became a target for even greater public attention and strengthened his opponents resolve to see that he be removed from the faculty of UNI.

James Maucker, following Edward Hoffmans’s actions in Cedar Rapids, provided statements to Mike Hanna, news editor for the *Northern Iowan*, regarding the incident.

Maucker explained:

I understand he wasn’t arrested in Cedar Rapids. As far as I’m concerned he’s innocent until proven guilty. If he is arrested for his overt actions against the draft, then it may be grounds for university to begin dismissal procedures. But this is a question I’m going to have to sweat out myself. At this time, there is no

³⁴ “UNI Publications Board Changes Editorial Policy,” *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, October 1967.

special review of Mr. Hoffmans' [sic] competence as a teacher. There are no dismissal proceedings either formal or informal underway against him.³⁵

Maucker's comments pertaining to the effectiveness of Hoffmans's instruction are revealing within the context of hindsight. From the onset of the controversy Maucker continually remained consistent with his opinion that the only grounds for termination from the university was based upon Hoffmans's performance as an instructor. Although Maucker denied the existence of "dismissal proceedings," in his statement, he prematurely revealed the very grounds for Hoffmans's eventual removal. Only ten days after the publication of Hoffmans's article, the importance placed on "Mr. Hoffmans' [sic] competence as a teacher," disclosed Maucker's logic. Despite the denials of inquiry, teaching effectiveness would become the official explanation for Hoffmans's termination.

Eight days following the article, six Black Hawk County elected officials collectively submitted a statement to the Board of Regents calling for Hoffmans's job. Representative Don Bowin, Representative Melvin Story, Representative James Gallagher, Senator Francis Messerly, Senator Chester Hougen, and Senator Gene Condon all endorsed the letter which read, "We do not question the right of free speech or expression, but there is a limit to such liberties and that the following individual [Edward Hoffmans] has violated such rights. . . We believe that this man has shown himself unqualified to serve in a public tax supported university and should be

³⁵ Mike Hanna, "Maucker Declares Hoffmans Innocent 'Til Proven Guilty," *Northern Iowan*, 20 October 1967.

immediately suspended.”³⁶ The elected officials continued by recommending a “loyalty oath,” for all new employees of a state run institution to sign upon accepting employment. The six Black Hawk county officials believed Hoffmans’ writings were treacherous and subversive and wished to establish a more rigid procedure for ensuring patriotic loyalty.³⁷

In contrast to the non-negotiable position of the lawmakers and the William Severin who wished to see Hoffmans dismissed immediately, Maucker’s “Statement on Freedom of Expression,” appeared amicable to several parties on or near campus. On October 19 Maucker received overwhelming support from the student body, when over 3,000 students and staff gathered around the iconic Campanile (a clock tower in the middle of campus built in 1924) to rally in support of their administrative leader. A petition was circulated amongst the attendees. Bruce Upchurch, the student body president, collected 5,000 student signatures along with 376 faculty signatures supporting Maucker’s position on freedom of expression throughout the previous week. The large mass of students and faculty walked the couple hundred yards to the on-

³⁶ “Elected Officials Speak on Hoffmans Controversy,” *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 18 October 1967.

³⁷ Ellen Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (Oxford University Press, 1986) portrayed the McCarthyistic tactics used during the 1950s against university professors. She argued that anti-communist inquisitions during the Cold War limited the academic freedom of American professors. Schrecker’s analysis described the political schism between the right and left regarding inquiries into faculty’s political persuasion, and the ultimate demonization of those deemed subversive. Schrecker’s interpretation is critical of loyalty oaths and explained how oaths were used by conservative politicians as a means of academic censorship; interpreted as censorship of both scholarship and instruction. The Black Hawk County politicians who insisted upon a loyalty oath were continuing the tradition founded in the 1950s, and proposed a hindrance of academic freedom in Iowa.

campus residence of James Maucker and his wife and presented them with the petitions. Maucker received the crowd and was quoted saying, "I appreciate this tangible expression of support."³⁸

The mounting pressure to fire Edward Hoffmans originated from editorialist William Severin (the Iron Duke) of the *Waterloo Courier*, increased by the coalition of faculty members, and strengthened with the statements by the six Black Hawk County elected officials. Students supported the retention of Hoffmans for varied reasons. Some ideologically allied themselves with Hoffmans's opinions of the draft and the Vietnam War, while others supported his freedom of expression. President Maucker strategically chose his words in those first few weeks. He was commended by many for his rhetorical support of the article. During the following months Maucker contemplated what would be the most appropriate course of action in response to the controversy. Ultimately Hoffmans was dismissal.

The students of UNI had to have been evaluating the scene unfolding around them. A few might have thought about Vietnam, while others the value of the First Amendment. The Hoffmans controversy sprouted new activism and dialogue in Cedar Falls, evident by the October 19th vigil of 3,000. Some students, such as Barry Benson, reacted by questioning the opinions being circulated, such as those of William Severin:

Bill Severin seems to emanate from the mouth of that huge society which continuously seeks to impose its values of traditional complacency and

³⁸ "Students Signing Statement in Support of Dr. Maucker; Plan Rally, Vigil Tonight," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 19 October 1967; "Students and Faculty Rally to Support Freedom Policy," *Northern Iowan*, 24 October 1967.

mediocrity. . . This generation has been called the alienated generation. Could the 'Tune in, Turn on, Drop out' philosophy of a segment of these alienated persons be based on actions by the adult society such as this attempt to silence Ed Hoffmans?³⁹

Benson critically analyzed the logic of social commentators. His perspective on Severin or the "society which . . . seeks to impose its values," sheds light on the transformation that was occurring amongst the students in regards to their conception of authority and expression. Benson recognized the hypocrisy in Severin's position and the control gained from censorship.

By late October, many faculty members became concerned regarding the letter sent to the Iowa Board of Regents by the six Black Hawk County Representatives and Senators.⁴⁰ The letter not only asked for Edward Hoffmans's termination, it also asked for a loyalty oath to be signed by employees of Iowa's state funded institutions. Maucker denounced the recommendation, as did the majority of the faculty on campus. In the waning days of October, Iowa Governor Harold E. Hughes aligned himself with Maucker and the faculty. Hughes stated, "I'm not worried about youth reaching decisions supporting democracy, once they have heard all the arguments." Governor Hughes explained that by establishing a loyalty oath there would be a possibility for individuals to be terminated based solely on their opinions. From Hughes's perspective

³⁹ Barry Benson "To the editor: Motives Can Be Questioned," *Northern Iowan*, 20 October 1967.

⁴⁰ "Elected Officials Speak on Hoffmans Controversy," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 18 October 1967.

the freedom of speech must be safeguarded regardless of the agenda that may be propagated from university faculty.⁴¹

Governor Hughes's comments followed an October 30th special meeting called by faculty secretary Dr. Marshal Beard of the UNI registrar. The special meeting called the entire university staff to attend and discuss the letter sent to the Iowa Board of Regents by six Black Hawk County elected officials. Over 200 faculty members attended with an overwhelming disapproval of the recommendations by the Representatives and Senators. The special meeting voted and passed a measure that would send two UNI faculty members to oversee the subsequent Board of Regents meetings as a measure to ensure the academic freedom of the university staff. Outspoken professor Josef Fox commented shortly after the meeting, "I think it represents a machinery by means of which people outside a university can exercise a degree of control over educational decisions."⁴²

"What Was the REAL Reason"

Amidst the Hoffmans controversy, fundamental debates ensued about the freedom of academic expression and freedom of opinion. A coalition of faculty members and students collectively compiled a new newspaper that personified the right of expression. In November 1967 a newspaper-formatted publication circulated around

⁴¹ Harold Hughes quoted in: Ila Wales, "Hughes Said It Well," *Northern Iowan*, 3 November 1967.

⁴² "Watch-Dog Committee to Study Loyalty Oath," *Northern Iowa*, 3 November 1967.

campus entitled, *The University Free Press*. The purpose of such a publication was eloquently defined by editor, and senior in history, Dave Krause:

The University Free Press is a journal of opinion, not a newspaper. We define a journal as a place where all people may express their opinions on topics of concern, no matter if these opinions are or are not popularly accepted. . . In no way is this publication in competition with other media. Nor is it directly connected with The University of Northern Iowa. . . *The University Free Press* is not a daily, weekly, bi-monthly, or monthly publication. We will publish from time-to-time, whenever adequate financial and copy requirements are met.

Dave Krause's explanation held true, for the November edition of *The University Free Press* remains the sole copy surviving in the University of Northern Iowa's archives located in the Rod Library of Cedar Falls. It would be presumptuous to infer that this was the only issue ever drafted or published, but there is no empirical evidence that suggested another issue was ever circulated. If the November copy of *The University Free Press* was the only edition, an explanation for the failed continuance might be insufficient financial support, a poor reception of the first issue, or outright apathy.

The University Free Press operated as an open forum of opinion. Essays were published pertaining to university honors societies, potential free education (along with complaints about increased tuition), and multiple forums discussing the First Amendment right of expression. The headlining article in the November 1967 issue of *The University Free Press* was composed by university faculty member Josef W. Fox. Fox argued that those who spoke out against Hoffmans's right to publish a controversial opinion were grossly on the wrong side of the debate. He argued:

For, if I know anything about American history and the American tradition, the meaning of America is exactly opposite of what these people seem to think it is. What these people are saying is that it may be all right for a private university to grant freedom of speech to its faculty, but that it is wrong for a public university to do so. The correct interpretation of the American tradition, of course, is exactly the opposite of this.⁴³

Fox by 1967 was well known on campus for his commentary on current events. He expanded his argument by playing-up the hypocrisies of censorship and academic oppression.

Fox was hired by the Iowa State Teachers College in the fall of 1947 by President Malcolm Poyer Price as an English instructor.⁴⁴ During the 1950s, he became an instructor of philosophy and occasionally provided political anecdotes and editorials about current affairs in Cedar Falls. Most of his writings were hypothetical and philosophical and could rarely be condensed into easily quoted prose. Yet Fox gained a reputation amongst students and faculty for being a reasoned perspective to turn to amidst controversy or uncertainty.

By mid-November several observers, including state Senator Chester Hougen, were frustrated by the inaction during the weeks following Hoffmans's article. The Board of Regents decided to retain Hoffmans in collaboration with President Maucker and Governor Hughes. Senator Hougen, along with others, detested the Board of

⁴³ Josef Fox, "Obiter Scripta," *The University Free Press*, November 1967.

⁴⁴ "College Adds Ten Members to Fall Staff," *The College Eye*, 1 August 1947.

Regents' decision and vocally expressed discontent with the issue. Hougen commented in mid-November:

In view of the failure of the Board of Regents to take any action in the Edward Hoffmans case, and the protection being given by Dr. Maucker and other members of the staff at UNI, it is time we insist on the out-right termination of Mr. Hoffmans [sic] services and perhaps of the forces supporting this protection. They [Board of Regents, Maucker, and UNI staff] hide behind a smoke screen, including 'freedom of speech,' to motivate their radical ideas.⁴⁵

Hougen's opinion fell upon deaf ears as the Governor, Board of Regents, and university president all remained determined to preserve the right of expression although all appeared to condemn Hoffmans's opinions. From Hougen's office in Des Moines it might have appeared that Maucker and his administration had taken no action other than release comments and statements. But by mid to late November a committee of colleagues in the English department and the English Department Head H. W. Reninger, sanctioned by Maucker and the administrators, began to work together on a review of Hoffmans's effectiveness as an instructor.

Hoffmans continued to be vocally active following the controversy. On November 10, Hoffmans submitted a full page advertisement begging students to "not forget about the draft, because it will not forget about you."⁴⁶ Hoffmans's style of teaching students continued. He persistently challenged students to insert their voice and challenged them to be more politically aware. In late November the media frenzy

⁴⁵ Chester Hougen quoted in: "Hougen Calls for Hoffmans' Dismissal, Investigation of University and Department of Instruction by Committee," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 13 November 1967.

⁴⁶ Edward Hoffmans, "To all draft registrants," *Northern Iowan*, 10 November 1967.

had slowed substantially, although occasional articles surfaced in the *Waterloo Courier* such as a petition drafted in late November signed by Black Hawk County residents that continued to insist on Hoffmans's termination. Yet by early December it was unclear what, if anything at all, would come of the Hoffmans affair. As winter break approached and the semester wound to an end the debate over Hoffmans, the Vietnam War, and the freedom of speech continued amongst the community.

Upon returning from winter break the students and the UNI community were told that Edward Hoffmans's contract as an instructor would not be renewed. The decision had been made on the basis of "teaching ineffectiveness." A committee of English department faculty as well as Department Head H. W. Reninger submitted their recommendation to dismiss Hoffmans to Dean William C. Lang in early December. Dean Lang subsequently presented the findings to President Maucker, who concurred with the department's recommendations. Maucker claimed Hoffmans's dismissal was unrelated to the October 10th article and Hoffmans's anti-war activities. According to William Lang and Daryl Pendergraft's 1995 publication, *A Century of Leadership*, Hoffmans's competence as an instructor would have been evaluated regardless of the October article. Lang and Pendergraft quote a private letter from Maucker to Josef Fox, where Maucker stated:

I felt an equally strong obligation to judge Ed's tenure status as objectively as possible without prejudice either way, a task I knew would be made especially difficult by virtue of the fact that he was under attack. I knew that he had been judged to be a weak teacher last year. I decided that if he showed appreciable improvements, he should be retained another year- even though the wolves

would howl- but if he showed little or no improvement, he should not be retained even though this would appear to many to be an act of appeasement.⁴⁷

The administration decided to allow Hoffmans's contract to expire in June 1968.

Hoffmans reacted by saying, "I think the majority of students and faculty members here are missing entirely the significance of my dismissal. Most think it is due to my anti-war opinions. I frankly cannot believe that, I know as much about it as anyone else." Hoffmans disagreed with the evaluation that described him as an inept instructor. Hoffmans was quoted saying, "It is very harmful for an instructor to be evaluated on the basis of classroom performance only."⁴⁸ Hoffmans's teaching method transcended the classroom. Possibly inflated by his own principles and opinions on political matters, Hoffmans encouraged public expression and non-traditional approaches to learning. Mike Hanna, executive editor of the *Northern lowan*, interviewed Hoffmans following the announcement and said "Hoffmans believes the system of faculty evaluations should be revised so that the teacher's classroom performance is not the primary criteria." Hanna made sure to emphasize that "all instructors at the university who have less than three years' experience here are reviewed by faculty committees each year before a decision to renew their contracts is made."⁴⁹

⁴⁷ James Maucker to Josef Fox, 24 December 1967 in Lang and Pendergraft, *A Century of Leadership* (1995), 293.

⁴⁸ Mike Hanna, "Hoffmans Not Foreclosing Right to Appeal Dismissal," *Northern lowan*, 9 January 1968.

⁴⁹ Hanna, "Hoffmans Not Foreclosing Right to Appeal Dismissal," *Northern lowan*, 9 January 1968.

Maucker and those who supported Hoffmans's dismissal perceived education within a more rigid dynamic. They saw college education as something that needed to be structured, finite, and regulated. To those who recommended Hoffmans be dismissed, Hoffmans's strategy of instruction may have appeared ineffective. They could not come to terms with Hoffmans's role as a teacher. His style was not the traditional model, considered by many, most effective for student development. Plenty of people felt the official explanation for the dismissal was a ruse, and felt that the true motivations for his dismissal were because of his article. A significant faction of the UNI community did not believe Hoffmans's dismissal had anything to do with his teaching effectiveness. Rather, many believed it was due to the pressure mounted by elected officials, editorialists, and factions of the faculty who saw Hoffmans as a subversive.

An editorial in the *Northern Iowan* at the beginning of the spring semester encapsulated the debate on why Hoffmans was fired:

The controversy of whether Edward Hoffmans . . . should be fired changed now to what was the REAL reason behind the decision not to renew his contract? The president surely anticipated the reaction to his decision. Whatever action he took, he would be attacked for it. He would have to be able to defend his decision. For it is indeed a political matter. Six state legislators and the *Waterloo Courier* have taken it from the UNI campus and put it on the doorstep of every home in Iowa.⁵⁰

Maucker surely realized that his decision would be open for interpretation. And criticism poured in regarding his choice to dismiss Hoffmans, such as that from state Senator

⁵⁰ Ila Wales, "What's a President to Do?" *Northern Iowan*, 9 January 1968.

Chester Hougen who, immediately after the announcement, submitted a letter to the *Waterloo Courier* saying:

It is gratifying that Mr. Hoffmans' [sic] services as instructor will be terminated, although belatedly. . . But for President Maucker to terminate his services on grounds of incompetence after only recently defending him upon the same grounds is a mockery of every conceivable instructional standard and policy, and is even an injustice to Mr. Hoffmans. This kind of face-saving is a degradation of the administrative abilities of the president himself. Everyone knows why Mr. Hoffmans is being fired.⁵¹

Maucker stood by his position that, "the overriding responsibility of the University is, of course, to provide effective instruction. Hence, it is the unique responsibility of the university to judge Mr. Hoffmans essentially as a teacher of composition." What Maucker and the UNI English department failed to do was evaluate Hoffmans's style of instruction outside the classroom.⁵² It could be fair to infer that the decision to release Hoffmans was multifaceted: in that, those with authority did not adequately understand Hoffmans's teaching method, judged him with a traditional definition of teaching effectiveness (dissimilar from how Hoffmans's preferred to convey education), and although rhetorically supported his activism- condemned him for it.

⁵¹ Chester Hougen, "Ending Hoffmans' Contract Doesn't End Policy Issue," *Waterloo Courier*, 18 December 1967.

⁵² Hoffmans's style of instruction was in complete opposition to "the banking concept of education," as described by Paulo Freire. Hoffmans did not see knowledge exclusively obtained in a depository manner. Hoffmans's teaching method required controversial problem solving, questioning of authority, and active learning outside of the confines of a structured classroom. Viewed as messy and inefficient, and possibly threatening; those who evaluated Hoffmans's "teaching effectiveness," were using a rubric that failed to consider alternative methods of instruction. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968), reprinted and translated in 1970.

Throughout the Hoffmans affair President Maucker's statements said one thing, while his actions said another. Some viewed the affair as a victory for the constitutional right of free speech. The student body and faculty praised Maucker for his position on freedom, and he openly disagreed with the elected legislators of Black Hawk County and thwarted their recommendations for a loyalty oath. The local chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) also praised President Maucker for his advocacy of the First Amendment, even after the decision to dismiss Hoffmans was announced. Maucker never wavered from his explanation of why he dismissed Hoffmans. In early-February 1968 the local AAUP chapter nominated President Maucker for the prestigious Alexander Meiklejohn Award. The annual, national award was intended for, "an American college or university administrator or trustee . . . in recognition of an outstanding contribution to academic freedom preferably in the past year." Maucker was chosen by national AAUP representatives to receive the award in April of 1968 despite Hoffmans's dismissal.

Preparing for the Worst

Although the spring of 1968 in Cedar Falls experienced a lull in controversial events, the American public as a whole experienced night-after-night the reports from Vietnam concerning the 1968 Tet Offensive. On January 31, 1968, Viet Cong forces in South Vietnam coordinated a multi-pronged attack on several major cities including an attack on the American embassy in Saigon. As reports emerged over the following weeks it was clear the Viet Cong had not succeeded routing the Americans and South

Vietnamese forces. Yet Americans at home began to question the likelihood of all-out victory in Vietnam. Large samples of historians concede to the importance the Tet Offensive had on Americans' perception of the war.⁵³ Anti-war activities escalated in 1968 and a larger proportion of the American public believed the Vietnam War might have been a mistake.

One of those who became more vocally critical of the war following Tet was Josef Fox of the philosophy department. By mid-February Fox began to devote an increased amount of writings toward the subject of American foreign policy and Vietnam. Fox commented, "I see no reason why we should be in Viet Nam. . . If we got out of Viet Nam, we would save 15,000 American lives, 100,000 American casualties, and 25 billion dollars, to say nothing of Vietnamese lives and casualties and wealth."⁵⁴

The visible unrest following the onset of Tet in 1968 made several Iowa administrators uneasy. Aware of national events and domestic unrest at other schools across the U.S. the Iowa Board of Regents decided in the spring of 1968 to put into place a revised policy involving "demonstrations on campus." Originally proposed by UNI President James Maucker, the reformed policy permitted demonstrations in a condensed capacity. The policy suppressed activists from responding spontaneously,

⁵³ Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 232-235; Small, *Covering Dissent* (1994), 86; James S. Olson and Randy Roberts, *Where the Domino Fell: America and Vietnam 1945-1995* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 177-179; a solid reference of the entire Tet Offensives and the impacts on domestic America can be found in: David Schmitz, *The Tet Offensive: Politics, War, and Public Opinion* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005).

⁵⁴ Josef Fox, "Forced to write on Viet Nam," *Northern Iowan*, 16 February 1968.

requiring authorization for space and prohibited disruptive behavior. The policy declared that demonstrators “not obstruct or interfere with the operation of the institution . . . [or] use obscene or libelous statements.”⁵⁵

The proposed revision to the demonstration policy at UNI was a byproduct of national anxiety of confrontational activism. By limiting the spontaneous nature of most protests, the administration enabled safety nets and enacted precautionary policies to combat violent confrontation. Several, including Hoffmans, argued it was dangerous to restrict expression on a university campus. Hoffmans accused the new demonstration policy of being authoritative and imposing. Hoffmans described his opinion by writing:

UNI administrators apparently want to limit student contact with highly controversial ideas to their lives outside the classroom . . . hence the only purpose served by this rule is to control the kinds of ideas expressed with the use of campus property . . . UNI demonstrations policy is paternal. . . UNI administrators have placed themselves firmly in the tradition of those who toadied to the British in 1776. I wonder how many teachers and students will follow their example.

He framed the administration as an imposing regulator of actions and ideas. Hoffmans argued that censorship limited the educational development of the students attending a university. He argued that a system that “gives students the right to demonstrate under conditions which, if violated, could mean the removal of that right by the school is an exercise in thought control.”⁵⁶

⁵⁵ “Regents to Consider Policy on Campus Demonstrations,” *Northern Iowan*, 6 February 1968.

⁵⁶ Edward Hoffmans, “An exercise in thought control; UNI demonstrations policy,” *Northern Iowan*, 16 February 1968.

The 1960s are commonly associated with the concept of change. Civil rights paved the way throughout the 1950s and again revived in the late 1960s by activists and cultural dissenters. The changes that occurred at UNI during the academic year of 1967-1968 were substantial. Not only did the school become a full-fledged university, UNI made headlines throughout the state due to the changing ideologies of professors and students regarding the Vietnam War and the draft. Topics such as academic freedom, the right to demonstrate, freedom of the press, and administrative authority were all under question during the university's first school year. The spirit of dissent and a generational disconnect so vividly highlighted in 1967-1968 would thrive and blossom during the subsequent school years. Students in 1970 would look back at the Hoffmans affair as a starting point, a starting point of protest and a starting point of activism. New students and new ideas would materialize from 1968 to 1970, but originating with the Hoffmans controversy UNI became exposed to political and cultural disagreements in profound new ways. The individuals associated with the university collectively had to have been perplexed and confused as national events unfolded around them during the final weeks of the school year.

In March, after the Tet Offensive and while battles still raged in Southeast Asia, President Lyndon Johnson organized peace talks with the North Vietnamese. Disillusioned with the Vietnam War and facing criticism from fellow Democrats, Johnson announced on March 31, 1968 that he would not be seeking a second term as the U.S. President. Antiwar protesters were ecstatic. Others were shocked by Johnson's

announcement.⁵⁷ The ensuing presidential campaign revealed dichotomies amongst the American public. Exasperating the already volatile American psyche was the assassination of Martin Luther King in early April of 1968. Hoards of Americans grieved the civil rights leader's death, including those at UNI. Compounding American anxiety was the sit-in of facilities at Columbia University in April of 1968, where Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) occupied five buildings on campus to protest research contracts from the U.S. government.⁵⁸ The previous February students at Harvard, Radcliffe, and Boston University went on a four day hunger strike as a nonviolent way to protest the war in Vietnam. Confrontational activism was on the rise, causing several institutions to evaluate their own readiness for an insurrection or potentially violent encounter with their students.

As parting-words for the school year Fox wrote an editorial diagnosing national student unrest, and in a cautionary tone, elaborated on the disconnect between the students protesting and those attempting to understand why or how to stop it. Surely, a

⁵⁷ Bruce J. Schulman, *Lyndon B. Johnson and American Liberalism: a Brief Biography and Documents* (Boston: Boston University, 2007), 176-177.

⁵⁸ The protests at Columbia University in 1968 grabbed the nation's attention as multiple university buildings were occupied by protesters. SDS students questioned their school's research contracts and suggested a correlation between the contracts and the Vietnam War. An additional element was present that exasperated the unrest at Columbia; a gymnasium was constructed in a city park adjacent a Harlem neighborhood, activists argued the gym segregated the residence living near the facility. A coalition formed between the African Americans affiliated with the Harlem debate and the white students at Columbia. Echoing this act of solidarity was the students at the University of Northern Iowa in the spring of 1970 as the Afro-American Society of Cedar Falls allied with the University Activists Coalition that March. For more information on the Columbia University protests of 1968 see: Stefan Bradley, *Harlem vs. Columbia University* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009).

select few students while departing campus for the summer of 1968 stewed over Dr.

Fox's words. He remarked:

Student disturbances are not crusades. They are protests- protests against their own impotence, protests against the dehumanized mechanism of institutional operations, protests against the ludicrous irrelevance of much of the curriculum, and protests against the deep-dyed conservatism of the university power structure. . . Potentially, they can produce revolt on every campus in America . . . they could produce revolt on this campus . . . On this campus, that will take some doing. Paternalism [in loco parentis] will have to go. The dictatorial power structure will have to be democratized. The curriculum will have to be modernized. And- above all- the faculty will have to be improved. Who's working on it?⁵⁹

Prophetically Fox foreshadowed successive debates that arose at UNI, and in doing so, established a framework of dialogue. His criticisms of the university and its practice of *in loco parentis*, hierarchical status quos, and curricular stagnation, were all topics of debate in subsequent semesters. Fox may have believed activism would blossom at UNI, yet by his own admission, "that will take some doing." As if Fox knew by peering into the eyes of the students who witnessed the Hoffmans controversy, a tide of change would slowly seep onto campus.

⁵⁹ Josef Fox, "Real causes of student unrest," *Northern Iowan*, 17 May 1968.

CHAPTER 2

A CLIMATE OF CHANGE 1968-1969

While speaking in front of the local Cedar Falls Lions Club at the dawn of the 1968 fall semester President of the University of Northern Iowa, James Maucker, remarked; "There's a wide spectrum of dissent on a college campus. . . We at UNI have been fortunate in that there has been no rioting or seizures. But I say this with my fingers crossed. It could be going on right now."⁶⁰ Maucker was visibly worried about potential tensions that may arise on his beloved campus. Surely, Maucker had seen images from Columbia University and the riots at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. He contemplated how he would administrate while avoiding outright confrontation with the increasingly vocal faction of his student body. With the protection of his new demonstration policy and a campus free of Edward Hoffmans, Maucker hoped his campus that he had presided over for the past eighteen years would remain calm and peaceful.

In late August, as students filed onto the campus, undeniably some were considering the events that had just occurred in Chicago. Following the March announcement by President Lyndon Johnson that he would not be seeking the nomination for president a heated campaign ensued that culminated at the 1968 Democratic National Convention. In Chicago the Democratic Party selected a nominee

⁶⁰ James Maucker, "Maucker Views Student Unrest," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 15 October 1968.

for President while young college-aged students protested and rioted in the streets outside the convention hall. The summer campaign exposed the divide the Vietnam War had brought upon the American public as well as revealed the dichotomies within the new left movement itself. The American public was torn, figuratively and literally, due to politics both domestic and foreign.

The 1968 presidential campaign featured the antiwar candidate Eugene McCarthy from Minnesota, Robert Kennedy, and Vice President Hubert Humphrey. Humphrey mainly avoided the primaries as Kennedy and McCarthy battled state after state for the Democratic nomination. In June, while celebrating a narrow victory in California, Robert Kennedy was assassinated by a gunman named Sirhan Sirhan. Following Kennedy's murder the dynamics of the presidential campaign changed considerably. Most of Kennedy's delegates began to endorse South Dakotan George McGovern who also advocated the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. By August, with the antiwar faction of the Democratic Party split, Vice President Hubert Humphrey appeared to be the strong favorite for his party's nomination.⁶¹

From August 25th to the 30th of 1968 the Democratic National Convention was held in Chicago. Outside the convention hall thousands of young adults gathered in opposition to the nomination ceremony and the Vietnam War. Amongst the protesters was an organization called the Youth International Party, better known as Yippies. The Yippie movement, organized by Jerry Rubin and others, made confrontation their

⁶¹ Isserman and Kazin, *America Divided* (2008), 241-244.

primary agenda. Chicago police, under the instruction of Mayor Richard Daley, clashed with the demonstrators in a historic battle on the streets of Chicago that featured hand to hand combat between the Chicago police and the protestors. Tear gas canisters rained down upon the demonstrators, with 688 people arrested and hundreds more were injured. The images of the 1968 Democratic National Convention were discussed on almost every major American media network during the immediate aftermath, despite the Chicago police's attempt to curb reporters during the violence. Due to the increased availability of televisions and major communication advancements during the 1950s and 1960s, like never before in history, Americans across the nation could personally experience the riots. There is sparse evidence suggesting UNI's students were present during the riots. Yet, the historic event helped shape students national identity and provided context to a generation of activists.

“Students Wake Up and Live! Student Power, Show Your Face!”

Back at UNI, Josef Fox recognized the volatile dynamic of the contemporary youth culture. In his standard rhetoric, he synthesized the power struggle being played out in 1968. Fox remarked during the first week of classes:

It seems to me that one of the significant cultural phenomena of our times is a rather widespread challenge to authority. . . Most people think of when we speak of authority is the authority of the state . . . the state tends to be rather crude and obvious- sometimes even brutal- in the exercise of its authority. . . The authority of the state is being challenged as rarely before in our history. Riots have become commonplace and civil disobedience has become

respectable. . . Are we indeed experiencing some sort of decline or breakdown of authority?⁶²

Fox's perspective is extremely insightful. Civility must have appeared to have broken down. Those in power, such as Maucker, feared how far the challenge to authority would penetrate. Fox framed his perception of authority as something to possess. He saw the concept as something that "declines" or wavers. He pointed out that the "state" tends to be "crude" or even "brutal," as it tries to ensure its authority. In Iowa it was perceived as rude to be crude or brutal. Therefore in order to retain authority, Maucker and the members of his administration avoided confrontational suppression of dissent. Instead Maucker encouraged a culture on campus based in civility. A culture rooted in paternalism. The administration allowed activism, as long as the activists exhibited moral restraint, but as Fox pointed out, paternalistic authority was "being challenged as rarely before in our history." Over the few years the "challenge to authority" that was sweeping the nation would come to Cedar Falls.

The fall semester began with a significant increase in student enrollment at UNI. With 9,058 students, enrollment had jumped nearly 10% from the fall of 1967 to the fall of 1968. The student population had nearly doubled since the fall of 1962.⁶³ Maucker viewed the increased enrollment anxiously. He saw the American trend of increased college attendance as a precarious tendency that enforced the student's conception of higher education as a right instead of a privilege. Maucker argued increased attendance

⁶² Josef Fox, "Challenges to Authority," *Northern Iowan*, 13 September 1968.

⁶³ Gerald L. Peterson, "UNI Fact Sheet," Rod Library *Special Collections* (7 September 2011).

yielded an atmosphere more conducive to radical behavior. He was quoted saying in October of 1968, "It's a different situation when college education is looked upon as a right. They [the students] know they have to be pretty far out before we take this 'right' away."⁶⁴ This line of thinking, that Maucker endorsed, rejected student power. The idea that higher education is a privilege makes the university a hallowed-hall of reserved opportunity, set aside for those who fall in line and respect their elders. Maucker's concept of a university was ripe with elements of *in loco parentis*. To no fault of his own, Maucker's fundamental conception of higher education was drastically different than the new generations of students enrolled at his university.

The student cultural transition that occurred from 1967 to 1970 became even more detectable during the school year beginning in 1968. The onset of minor protests and the manifestation of an underground newspaper testified to an ongoing shift away from administrative paternalism. Additionally, the school year of 1968-1969 exhibited an escalation in policy by administrators, lawmakers, and the state Governor designed to forestall confrontational activism. The national events occurring during this period helped contextualize the reality for those who were affiliated with the University of Northern Iowa.

President Maucker was visibly concerned about the possibility of violence on his campus. Before homecoming week Maucker declared a curfew for the students. Maucker asked the students to avoid "group demonstrations" after 10 p.m. during the

⁶⁴Maucker, "Maucker Views Students Unrest," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 15 October 1968.

night of homecoming. He justified his request by stating, "at this point in the development of this university, it is crucial importance that we not get ourselves into a mob scene."⁶⁵ Through a simple request, Maucker's paternalistic governance became the law of the land for homecoming weekend, and as requested, homecoming came and went without an incident to report. Although the football team lost the Saturday contest, the students peacefully celebrated the annual event and reportedly respected the imposed curfew.

A few students perceived their campus in hibernation thanks to the events of the previous school year. Mary Secl, a senior in higher education, encouraged her peers to shed their apathy and speak up. Secl remarked early in the semester; "Now that the 'subversives' like Ed Hoffmans . . . are not here to challenge us to react and to live what we believe, it is evident that this could be a dull, dead year at Northern Iowa. Students wake up and live! Student power, show your face!" Secl's emphasis on Hoffmans's dismissal and her recognition of the perceived threat Hoffmans brought to the campus dynamic, speaks to the prestige Hoffmans had gained amongst the student body. Her comments suggest that students recognized they would need to mobilize in order to insert a student's voice. Secl could not have known in October of 1968 that within a year

⁶⁵ "Maucker asks curb on demonstrations during homecoming," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 4 October 1968.

her university would become a boiling caldron of confrontational activism, civil disobedience, and a hot bed for antiwar sentiment.⁶⁶

The sizable increase of students allowed UNI to hire additional staff as well as expand the administration by adding new deans. With 124 new staff members and five new deans, the University of Northern Iowa during its second year was expanding substantially.⁶⁷ A new education center was planned on campus, two new dormitories nicknamed “the towers” were near completion in 1968, and a new student union was slated to be completed by December. The expansion on campus symbolized the changes occurring at UNI. The rate of expansion could not keep up with the rate of increased enrollment and the campus became inundated by large crowds. The new enrollees may have contributed to the cultural changes that occurred in 1968. With diverse ideologies students could network with similarly minded groups of people and collaborate on a variety of projects. This would include the creation of a new student newspaper, designed by and for students of the new left.

On October 17, 1968, the community newspaper, *The Record*, pronounced that a new “journal” was going to be published in Cedar Falls. The journal was the brain-child of 24 year-old Douglas Warrington. Warrington had reportedly spent the prior three years working on a student journal in Oregon. The journal was planned to accommodate campuses in Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, and South Dakota. The title Douglas

⁶⁶Mary Secl, “Dull, Dead Year,” *Northern Iowan*, 8 October 1968.

⁶⁷ “Five New Deans Appointed,” *Northern Iowan*, 17 September 1968; “Maucker Appoints 124 New Staff Members” *Northern Iowan*, 13 September 1968.

Warrington chose for his journal coincided with the underground newspaper movement that had been gradually growing around the nation during the prior few years, he named it the *Campus Underground (CU)*.⁶⁸ Warrington selected Cedar Falls as the epicenter in which to disseminate the *Campus Underground*. He was quoted saying “the reason we are publishing the journal in Cedar Falls instead of Iowa City [is] to avoid any possible stigma or prejudice attached to publications originating from Iowa City- the source of several leftist journals.”⁶⁹ The name of the paper itself carried implications about the purpose of the publication. Warrington unapologetically acknowledged the radical, left-wing slant of the paper.

The journal was planned with the intention of establishing a communication network between the different universities affiliated with the project, as well as providing a medium that would improve the relationship between the students and the faculty. Warrington commented: “Since the relationship between student and faculty is ordinarily much closer than that between student and administration, we feel that we can do much to improve and facilitate student-faculty communication.”⁷⁰ Recognizable names such as Josef Fox, Edward Hoffmans, Jack Breithaupt, and cartoonist Gary Hoff all

⁶⁸ For more information about the underground newspaper movement see: John McMillian, *Smoking Typewriters* (2011); McMillian highlights the importance the underground press played in shaping and enhancing the new left movement. McMillian stresses the communicational component of the underground press, as well as, the cultural aesthetics each paper projected.

⁶⁹ Rock Gallagher, “Campus ‘journal seeks to improve communications,’” *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 17 October 1968.

⁷⁰ Gallagher, “Campus ‘journal seeks to improve communications,’” *The Record*, 17 October 1968.

were reported to be collaborating on the pending journal. Warrington appointed a 21 year-old UNI student named Bruce Niceswanger the editor of the *Campus Underground*.

Bruce (Bruno) Niceswanger was a senior undergraduate in the English department. He was an Iowa native, having graduated from Kuemper High School in Carroll, Iowa. Niceswanger came to UNI in 1964, and became involved with an on-campus art and opinion magazine *The Seven*, which had been operating since the summer of 1963.⁷¹ Recognized for his innovative writing style and philosophical tangents he ascended to editor of *The Seven*. In 1968 when Warrington approached him about the editor position for *CU*, Bruno had established a reputation on campus. A four-year high school honors student, and a two-year Dean's List recipient, Bruno stood out as an intellectual and out-spoken commentator with liberal tendencies. He declared his excitement for the *CU* by stating that the paper will be, "the truest form of the student voice."⁷²

Douglas Warrington's aspirations may have been overly ambitious. Originally the *CU* had 30 interested campuses in 5 different states wanting to collaborate on the publication. Yet, after a few issues the commitment seemed to fade from many contributors and the *Campus Underground* began to focus almost entirely on events in Cedar Falls. A retrospective account, presented by student author Steve Pederson, was

⁷¹ "Art and Opinion Magazine given approval by board," *The College Eye*, 31 May 1963.

⁷² Gallagher, "Campus 'journal seeks to improve communications,'" *The Record*, 17 October 1968.

published in the *Northern Iowan* in the spring of 1971 describing the *Campus*

Underground's inception. Pederson remarked:

The lack of resources and communication led to less participation by the other campuses, and Cedar Falls soon became [the *Campus Underground's*] primary audience. Warrington was said to make many valiant efforts to get the paper off the ground: driving his own beat-up Rambler around the state with 5000 *Undergrounds* in the back, going from campus to campus trying to boost circulation. But it was given up due to the lack of participation. Remember, this was 1968, in Iowa.⁷³

Warrington's ambitions may have not been realized, but he continued to dream of establishing a paper that would go national. Warrington believed, ". . .the Midwest [was] a fine nucleus from which we can eventually go nationwide."⁷⁴ His dream never materialized.

The first edition of the *Campus Underground* was distributed on October 21, 1968. *CU's* central office was located at 401 ½ Main Street in Cedar Falls. The staff was a compilation of representatives from adjacent communities: Shad Wooley and Mike Mac Namara from Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Christopher Colby from Austin, Minnesota; Janes Bertinusin from Dubuque, Iowa; and Greg Woolever from Mt. Vernon, Iowa. Contributing editors were Julia Patterson and John Jacobs (both from Cedar Falls) under the titles of the managing editor and associate editor respectively. Writers for the *Campus Underground* reported in the first issue news about the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and provided information about the Vietnam War and the

⁷³ Steve Pederson, "Everything You Ever Wanted to Know about the Primer," *Northern Iowan*, 12 February 1971.

⁷⁴ Gallagher, "Campus 'journal seeks to improve communications,'" *The Record*, 17 October 1968.

Selective Service. The paper became an information hub for students and community members. For writers and readers alike, the *Campus Underground* offered a new way to discuss politics and education.

One of the most interesting aspects of the new paper was the contribution by Edward Hoffmans, who had become a full time activist in Iowa City after he had been dismissed from UNI. Hoffmans regularly submitted editorials under the title "Draft Facts." "Draft Facts" appeared in almost all the issues of *Campus Underground* during the fall and spring of 1968-1969. Hoffmans's articles commonly discussed draft law and related tactics on how to resist induction. His views about the Vietnam War had become more crystallized as the war continued month after month. Hoffmans remained affiliated with the students at UNI via the *Campus Underground*.⁷⁵

Students at UNI in the fall of 1968 exhibited a deeper commitment to anti-Vietnam War expressions. A month into the semester two students, Bill Jacobson and Dave Quagg, and a professor, Louis Hellwig, obtained a permit from the city of Cedar Falls to hold a peace rally in Seerley Park, 2 blocks east of the UNI campus. The request for the permit explained the reason for the rally as a way to "exercise the right to dissent, we believe this rally to be an appropriate avenue for students of UNI and

⁷⁵ Edward Hoffmans took up residence at 324 South Clinton in Iowa City. Hoffmans roomed with fellow activist Dan Bray who had turned over his draft card within weeks after Hoffmans in the fall of 1967. They devoted most of their time disseminating draft information. Hoffmans became so closely affiliated with Douglas Warrington that while asking for donations toward his resistance movement an incentive would be a free subscription to the *Campus Underground*. Hoffmans's relentless drive in opposition to the draft is extremely noteworthy, as this young professional devoted a significant portion of his early adult life to a cause that overwhelmed his obligations. Information found in: Edward Hoffmans, "The Iowa Resistance," *Campus Underground*, 10 February 1969.

citizens of Cedar Falls to voice their opinions to our government's policies in the Republic of South Vietnam without resorting to unlawful and often violent actions which have occurred on other campuses around the nation."⁷⁶ The rally was slated to take place on Sunday November 3. The explanation given for the rally by the two students and professor further emphasized the connection UNI students made to events occurring around the nation. Unlike large urban settings, most student activists had to create the atmosphere of protest. The students were aware of what their fellow peers were doing around the nation, and they had to manufacture a platform in which to protest. Certain students felt drawn to rally against the atrocities of the war and they felt compelled to gather in opposition.

Unlike Columbia or Berkeley, UNI's students remained generally calm and peaceful while expressing their frustrations. They even obtained permits before gathering to protest. By avoiding radical tactics of dissention, the students who partook in the November rally reflected the culture of civility encouraged in the state of Iowa. The letter of request expanded upon this point by stating, "That type of activism is anti-ethical to the very belief of many who oppose the war on humanistic and moralistic grounds."⁷⁷ It was to the advantage of the participants to adhere to the authority of the city and university.

⁷⁶ "Student Peace Committee to Sponsor Anti-War Rally," *Northern Iowan*, 29 October 1968.

⁷⁷ "UNI group issued permit for anti-war rally Sunday," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 28 October 1968.

Over two hundred students, faculty, and community members gathered in Seerley Park. Those who participated in the rally considered it a success. The protesters played music and listened to speeches. They also engaged in conversations and debates about the war. The November 5th issue of the *Northern lowan* described the calm non-violent rally with great interest. They gathered for different reasons, but the result was education. Whether via conversation, experience, or observation those who attended were partaking in a non-traditional educational experience. As Hoffmans had demonstrated the previous school year, education transcended the classroom and controversial dialogue yielded genuine knowledge. The calm and non-violent rally in the fall of 1968 was not criticized or repressed by the administration, but as activists' passions and frustrations intensified in subsequent semesters their actions became perceived as abrasive. It was only when students' actions were deemed impolite or rude that the culture of civility silenced their dissent.

In the *Northern lowan's* coverage of the rally, there appeared a large image depicting a young man with long hair, thick glasses, and scruffy facial hair. The protester was dressed in a ragged coat with a single word embroidered onto it- "Ogden." The man portrayed was Tony Ogden. Ogden is sparsely present in the historical record at UNI prior to 1969, with the exception being the November 3rd rally. Ogden became affiliated with the off-campus underground press, *Campus Underground*, in the spring of 1969. He was a leading contributor to its successor *The New Prairie Primer*. In subsequent school years Ogden became one of the most vocal and radical students on-campus. His

participation in the November 3rd rally was the first representation of his activism. He would become more visible in the fall of 1969.

Amidst the report on the November 3rd rally is the first reference to the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) at UNI. At the rally in Seerley Park, SDS member and student at UNI, Bill Jacobson attempted to convince attendees to join him and his group on a march in Des Moines planned for Tuesday November 5th. Jacobson, one of the original organizers of the Seerley Park rally, was able to convince twenty to thirty students to join him in Des Moines. Jacobson explained in the *Northern Iowan* that the march in Des Moines was designed to perpetuate three principles: (1) traditional politics were inefficient; (2) the Vietnam War must end immediately; and (3) the rhetoric of law and order was a cover for racism. Jacobson argued that “the elections are a hoax.” He stated that, “elections are a device used by the ruling class to deceive American workers and students into giving up their struggles and depending instead on ruling class politicians.” A second concern Jacobson and his fellow SDSer’s wished to express was, “[the] immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam.” And lastly Jacobson and his supporters believed, “the law and order issue [was] a cover-up for racism and government suppression of the black-liberation movement, the student anti-war movement and the growing labor movement.”

Although SDS never obtained a sizeable influence at UNI, the presence of the group on campus symbolized the increased activism by students in 1968. SDS was a

national organization with its own long and complex history.⁷⁸ The group is rarely mentioned in the historical record of Cedar Falls except in the local coverage of national events. The *Campus Underground*, although occasionally reporting on SDS activities, had little to no actual affiliation with the group. Neither Bruno nor Douglas Warrington was ever affiliated with SDS.⁷⁹ But, it is extremely interesting to highlight Bill Jacobson's membership and his activities in November of 1968.

The November 5th march on the state capital coincided with the presidential election of Richard Nixon. The general election turned out to be extremely close, with Nixon winning by a margin of about 1%. The majority of Southern states went to the American Independent candidate George Wallace of Alabama. Wallace complicated the election and nearly blocked an electoral majority. Iowa's electoral votes went to Nixon,

⁷⁸ Students for a Democratic Society came to national prominence in the mid-1960s. The group originated at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. The group became a key organization and rapidly expanded in the late 1960s as new chapters were sanctioned across the nation. With an emphasis on participatory democracy SDS grew to be the largest student activists' organization in U.S. history, until the fractionalization of the group in the summer of 1969. For further information on SDS or its resonance refer to the following: The classic book by Kirkpatrick Sale, *SDS* (New York: Random House, 1973) is one of the first academic evaluations of SDS, effectively Sale set the standard with this publication exhaustingly missing little detail of the organization; an additional sympathetic treatment of SDS is James Miller, *Democracy is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987); and lastly, although a completed historiography is near innumerable, David Barber, *A Hard Rain Fell* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2008) specifically tries to analyze how SDS declined after 1969 and how racial issues shaped the organization.

⁷⁹ Although I feel confident asserting the claim that neither individual was associated with SDS, it is hard to prove with absolute empirical certainty. Yet, according to the documents left by Bruno and Warrington I have yet to find a single shred of evidence that may indict them of being involved with the national organization.

yet the primary swing states of Ohio, California, and Illinois turned out to be the deciding push Nixon needed to obtain more than 270 electoral votes.⁸⁰

Bill Jacobson declared after the march in Des Moines that the rally was a failure. He complained that the permit the marchers obtained led them through sparsely populated areas with few observers giving little attention to the 200 person march. Additionally, Jacobson was dissatisfied with the speeches delivered, arguing they were of poor quality. The marchers were escorted by several Iowa State patrolman and Des Moines police officers, more than likely in the hopes of avoiding a situation like that which had occurred in Chicago the previous August. Jacobson and his SDS supporters generated little wake in Des Moines. The *Northern lowan* covered the story, yet pushed its report to page 11 and only supplied a brief three paragraph entry on the march.⁸¹ It would be a folly to not recognize the courage the protesters demonstrated. Under police observation, escorted away from densely populated areas of Des Moines, and marginalized as radical; Jacobson, and the UNI students who joined him, bravely acted on their deeply held convictions and publically displayed their beliefs.

Two days following the election, a teach-in was held on campus by four professors: Charles Quirk, assistant professor of history; Robert Ross, associate professor of political science; Josef Fox, of the philosophy department; and John Eiklor,

⁸⁰ For a well done historical recreation of the 1968 election see: Lewis L. Gould, *1968: The Election That Changed America 2nd edition* (Chicago: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, 2010).

⁸¹“30 Northern lowans Join Des Moines March,” *Northern lowan*, 8 November 1968.

associate professor of history. The teach-in focused on the outcome of the Presidential election. Specifically, Fox felt the election emphasized the omnipresence of the Vietnam War. Eiklor argued during the teach-in that George Wallace's success during the election may have symbolized a fervent resistance by the South toward civil rights. Wallace was popular throughout the South for his defense of segregation. At the teach-in, 150 to 200 students joined the four faculty members.⁸² The teach-in could be seen as a substantial event in the changing dynamic of education at UNI. Four liberal arts professors brought together a collection of intellectually interested students. Again students were encouraged to move outside of the classroom to blend education with discussions on contemporary affairs.

Senate File 123 and the Spring of 1969

A relatively unexpected issue arose during the months of December and January. The matter revolved around racism on campus and the prospect of an increase in African American study programs and lectures. A speak-out was held at the end of the fall semester entitled, "Blacks, and Whites at UNI."⁸³ Again, the speak-out was an example of non-classroom based education. Upon returning to campus in January 1969, students opened the *Northern lowan* to find an eight page section devoted entirely to the issue of racism on campus. Executive editor of the *Northern lowan*, Mike Hanna, framed the eight page section by declaring his "hope that students on the Northern

⁸² Jean Seeland and Erv Harless, "Profs Give Opinions of Election at Teach-in," *Northern lowan*, 12 November 1968.

⁸³ "Speak out: Blacks, Whites at UNI," *Northern lowan*, 17 December 1968.

lowan campus were concerned enough about the issue of white racism to take the time to read them [the articles] in full.” Mike Hanna continued by stating, “Although Northern Iowa only has about 59 black students on campus this year, it still illustrates that the campus of a white university is one of the few places where white and black youth have come together; a union which is mutually beneficial.” Hanna along with others on campus viewed the racial reality at UNI as a pressing issue. By the late 1960s, despite legislative reforms in the United States Congress, racial tensions were visible throughout America. Hanna explained that reforms must be undertaken to meet the desires of black students. He described these desires as “an extension of scholarship programs, a new course or courses in Afro-American history or literature, the addition of black professors to the faculty, and the end of ‘white only’ memberships in fraternities and sororities.”⁸⁴ The eight pages devoted to African American issues was a compilation of personal accounts by African Americans growing up in a white dominated society, editorials reprinted from other newspapers by Black Panthers from around the nation, and highlights of commonalities whites and blacks had with one another.⁸⁵

During the fall of 1968, a newly created university committee named the Committee on University Responsibility in Minority Group Education (COURIMGE), had discussed potential new courses designed for minority studies. One change COURIMGE

⁸⁴Mike Hanna, “Commentary: Area of Student Concern,” *Northern lowan*, 10 January 1969.

⁸⁵ *Northern lowan*, 10 January 1969.

enacted was the creation of an Afro-American History course.⁸⁶ Despite meeting monthly, COURIMGE was accused of lethargically enacting real change on campus. This prospective was shared by several observers including Mike Hanna who saw the movements of black-power and student-power as interrelated and encompassed within a single umbrella of new left social reforms. Support for the African American cause expanded in subsequent school years, especially in the spring of 1970. In the spring of 1969 visible support could be seen in the *Northern Iowan* and in the *Campus Underground*.⁸⁷ During the following school year the topic of racism and educational reform for the benefit of African Americans would become one of the most talked about issues on the UNI campus. The December and January discussions frame the foundation for subsequent activism.

Despite the increased awareness of the African American plight at Iowa's universities, the dominant topic for the remainder of the 1969 spring semester was a proposed legislation in the Iowa Statehouse. On January 30th, thirty one republican Senators introduced a bill in the Iowa Senate which would have created hefty consequences for students or employees of a state funded-institution if they were perceived to be participating in any event that could be interpreted as a riot.

⁸⁶ Marcia Brewer, "Minority Group Discusses Afro-American Course," *Northern Iowan*, 4 October 1968.

⁸⁷ "Aid Des Moines Panthers," *Campus Underground*, 10 February 1969.

Introduced as Senate File 123, and better known as the riot bill, the bill was reprinted in its entirety in the Cedar Falls' underground press. The bill read as follows:

An act relating to riot activity or seizure of public property or strikes against authority by students or employees of public schools or educational institutions. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

Section 1. Any person, enrolled as a student in any publicly supported educational institution, who shall engage in any riot activity, seize the control of public property from the persons in lawful control thereof or participate in such seizures, or attempt thereto, or engage in a strike against the authority of the institution, shall be summarily dismissed from his enrollment.

It shall be a mandatory condition of every contract of employment by any publicly supported educational institution that if the employee engages in any riot activity, seizes control of public property from the person in lawful control thereof or participates in such seizures, or attempt thereto, or engages in a strike against the authority of the institution, he shall be summarily dismissed.⁸⁸

Outraged faculty members and students protested the bill within days of its introduction. Josef Fox wrote in the *Campus Underground*, "The bill is so repressive and so utterly disdainful of the American tradition of due process and measured justice that it will tend to provoke the very actions which it seeks to forestall."⁸⁹ The most prevalent complaint was the bill's language. Its assertion that if a staff member or student, "engages in a strike against the authority of the institution, he shall be . . . dismissed." To some observers the bill was an attempt to put into law a policy of zero tolerance toward dissent.

Supporters used the language of the bill as a justification for support. These supporters included Black Hawk County State Senator Francis Messerly, who stated

⁸⁸ "Legislature Launches Full-scale Attack on Students," *Campus Underground*, 10 February 1969.

⁸⁹ Josef Fox, "His Soul Goes Marching On," *Campus Underground*, 10 February 1969.

“When you consider the language of the bill, why should this type of student attend a state supported university or instructors be allowed to draw salaries provided by the taxpayer’s money.”⁹⁰ Using the same arguments put forth during the Hoffmans controversy, conservative members of Iowa’s legislature did not feel they needed to financially support behaviors or ideas they deemed subversive.

Several students mobilized in mid-February in opposition to the legislative bill. On Tuesday February 11th over 2,000 students and faculty members gathered in the Commons Ballroom to discuss and debate the proposed anti-riot legislation. Petitions were drafted by students and faculty members denouncing the measure. Fiery speeches were delivered to the packed room. President Maucker spoke during the rally, yet refrained from making any provocative statements regarding the anti-riot bill. Maucker concentrated on the appropriations legislation concurrently being discussed by the Iowa Senate in Des Moines.⁹¹

The three legislative topics discussed simultaneously in February at UNI were the anti-riot bill, the State’s proposed funding for UNI, and a measure that would decrease the voting age in Iowa from 21 to 18 years of age. February was declared “Student Legislative Action Month,” as these three topics were ferociously discussed by the student body and other Iowa citizens. Without doubt, the anti-riot bill made a large

⁹⁰ Francis Messerly in: Peg Wherry, “Bill Proposed to Crack Down on Riots,” *Northern Iowan*, 4 February 1969.

⁹¹ Peg Wherry, “Rally Sparks Student Legislative Action,” *Northern Iowan*, 14 February 1969.

splash on campus in the spring of 1969. Entire issues of the *Northern lowan* were devoted toward Senate File 123, and students were encouraged to contact their local representatives regarding the proposed bill.⁹²

In late February the faculty adopted two resolutions on the legislative matters. Both resolutions were introduced by Josef Fox. The first asked the lawmakers in Des Moines to provide the full funding asked for by the Iowa Board of Regents, and the second denounced Senate File 123. A fever-pitched environment at UNI was evident by early March as more and more students and faculty members foresaw the potential dangers of the proposed anti-riot bill. The *Campus Underground* described the bill as being a “crackdown” and a “full-scale attack on students.”⁹³ A common perception of the bill by the *Campus Underground* was that it would establish an all-out authoritarian rule on campus. Article after article in the *Northern lowan* denounced the actions being taken in Des Moines. Students and faculty members alike clearly recognized the danger in suppressing dissent.

Bruno encapsulated the mood of the students in March by stating, “students are bracing themselves for guns, dismissals, \$100 tuition raises, Vietnam, [and] professional

⁹² An often encouraged tactic of reform was sending students home to their diverse communities where they could influence a larger network of people. During these sojourns students would represent the university in which they attended, changing the entire mindset of the state. Speculatively speaking, it would be easy to infer that most lowan’s based their assumptions about universities like UNI based upon their experiences with students on break or at home (especially parents); “Students, Go Home,” *Northern lowan*, 18 February 1969.

⁹³ Bruce Niceswanger, “Crackdown on Campuses,” *Campus Underground*, 10 March 1969.

'outsiders' to replace the gun-shy local night watchmen."⁹⁴ By late March the administration of UNI began to focus almost exclusively on the issue of decreased appropriations for UNI while more and more students remained concerned about the anti-riot bill.

One of the most relevant student journalists in the spring of 1969 was Margret (Peg) Wherry. Wherry contributed extensively to the *Northern lowan* as she covered the developments of the anti-riot bill. Wherry would become, in the fall of 1969, one of the most out-spoken authors in the *Campus Underground's* successor *The New Prairie Primer*. She became editor of the *Primer* in the spring of 1970 while Bruno worked on his master's thesis. Wherry exemplified the changes that occurred at UNI during this era. Young, impressionable, and passionate, Wherry became emotionally involved in the topics she covered. Politics became personal for Wherry, she actively challenged authority and encouraged her peers to break away from their apathetic ways and participate in new forms of expression.

In 1968, when Wherry was a freshman, she joined the staff of the *Northern lowan*. Previously she had served as the editor of her high school newspaper at Carlisle Community High School. Within a short time period, her articles became front page news in the *Northern lowan*. She devoted an extensive amount of time and energy reporting on the anti-riot bill. Week after week her name became synonymous with the topic, as she interjected her opinions on the subject while the story dragged into April

⁹⁴ Niceswanger, *Campus Underground*, 10 March 1969.

and May. She whole-heartedly detested the legislation and tried to encourage students to do something about the proposed bill. Her perspective on the subject was summed up by the title of a May article: "Riot Amendment is Absurd."⁹⁵

At the conclusion of the spring semester, the anti-riot bill was still being discussed by Iowa's lawmakers. It was not until after the students had been dismissed on summer break that the announcement was made that the bill had been incorporated as a provision of the 1969 appropriations bill to the Iowa Board of Regents. The measure was described as "forbidding the use of the appropriations granted to the Board of Regents to pay or educate students or faculty members convicted in court of rioting or inciting a riot in which material damage or personal injury resulted."⁹⁶

The debate and eventual enactment of the anti-riot bill highlighted the lawmakers' perception of the campus dynamic. Iowa lawmakers witnessed campus unrest around the nation and saw in their own students similar discontents. The lawmakers proceeded to establish a legal standard to curtail any future insubordination. The changing ethos of UNI's students is more subtle in this debate. Yet, the *Campus Underground* framed the anti-riot bill as an authoritarian measure of domination. No riotous behavior had been attempted at UNI, nor had any property ever been destroyed in demonstrations or protests. Rather the anti-riot bill inferred student radicalism. It vowed to make the consequences of such behavior so dire that students would avoid

⁹⁵Peg Wherry, "Riot Amendment is Absurd," *Northern Iowan*, 9 May 1969.

⁹⁶ "Anti-riot Amendment Is Law," *Northern Iowan*, 27 June 1969.

activism and avoid demonstrations. The effect of the anti-riot measure, whether intended or not, was the preservation of authority and the promotion of student apathy. In the short term at least, the anti-riot amendment of the appropriations bill only polarized the students further.

The following school year saw an explosion of activism by students in ways yet to be exhibited in Cedar Falls. Huge 3,000 person marches would occur in the fall of 1969 as well as the occupation of President Maucker's residence in the spring of 1970. It would be fair to say that students leaving campus in the summer of 1969 were primed for confrontation in the subsequent semester. With increased tuition, a failed campaign to block the anti-riot bill, and increased resolve against the Vietnam War, UNI's students were ready to challenge the authorities that governed their lives.

By mid-summer Edward Hoffmans returned to Cedar Falls in order to "work with people who are seriously concerned with how people can act freely in such a way that will oppose, hinder or disrupt institutions that restrict and constrain people."⁹⁷ Hoffmans would become a counseling liaison for the advocates of Cedar Falls during the subsequent school year. The university community Hoffmans returned to had changed. The staff of the *Campus Underground* organized a new newspaper without Douglas Warrington, and catered exclusively to the student body in Cedar Falls. The new publication continued to print Hoffmans's "Draft Facts." Hoffmans's return provided a link between the Class of 1970 with the Class of 1968.

⁹⁷ "Hoffmans Returns to UNI Area," *Northern Iowan*, 18 July 1969.

In the 1967-1968 school year, students watched as their university became a debate hall for issues such as constitutional free speech and draft resistance. Activists during this period did not exhibit a confrontational style. Instead they displayed civility and restraint. In the ensuing months and years students' confidence expanded. Culturally a more vibrant faction of students emerged. This development stemmed in part from Edward Hoffmans's initial match-stroke. It was compounded by the anti-riot amendment to the university's appropriations bill. Administrators and lawmakers might have had good intentions in their preemptive policies, but as Fox had warned in February of 1969 the policies could "provoke the very actions which it [sought] to forestall."⁹⁸ Student culture was changed even further by national events and influences. By August, the stage was set for the most controversial academic school year of President Maucker's tenure. Students began to use more aggressive means of expression such as submitting demands, staging sit-ins, and disrupting administrative hearings. The 1969-1970 school year would be the last year Maucker served as university President. By years end, the concept of a university and its authority would change at UNI and throughout the nation.

⁹⁸ Fox, "His Soul Goes Marching On," *Campus Underground*, 10 February 1969.

CHAPTER 3

AN ERUPTION 1969-1970

On April 20, 1970 thirty to forty UNI students were forcefully removed from the Board Room of the Administrative Building after storming into a university disciplinary hearing. The hearing was held in order to determine the punishment of seven UNI students who took part in a sit-in at President Maucker's residence. While being escorted out by Black Hawk County sheriffs and the Cedar Falls police, the throng of students chanted "power to the people" and "fuck the pigs" as they filed out of the Board Room. Within a week twenty-eight students were arrested and eventually suspended from UNI. Students in the spring of 1970 instituted a more aggressive approach when expressing dissent. The tactics used were perceived as disruptive and impolite by administrative authorities. The result was a vilification of student activists. By breaking away from the culture of civility, student dissent was silenced.

The academic year of 1969-1970 was the last year of President James Maucker's twenty-year tenure. Arguably, Maucker faced more controversy in his final year than during any other time of his administration. The previous year Maucker had received a Danforth grant, which allowed him to take a leave of absence from August to November 1969. During his absence the student population held large antiwar rallies. In November, a group of African Americans known as the Afro-American Society of Cedar Falls presented a list of demands to the UNI administration. The demands led to

activism on campus. Students, by spring, challenged their administration's authority like never before.

More so than in previous years, the student culture at UNI incorporated elements of the counterculture. A sense of vibrancy was projected in the student culture. Local retailers used the imagery of the counterculture. Advertisements depicted girls dressed in "hippie" looking attire. Music venues around Cedar Falls booked rock bands, easily filling their schedules. And the consumption of LSD, psilocybin mushrooms, and marijuana was discussed avidly in student publications. Nowhere can the cultural transitions be traced more thoroughly than in Cedar Falls' underground newspaper.

The popular alternative newspaper in Cedar Falls, the *Campus Underground*, went through a transitional period during the year of 1969. *Campus Underground* published its last edition in the spring. The following autumn the alternative paper became syndicated with the Liberation News Service and the Underground Press Syndicate using the name, *The New Prairie Primer*. The staff stayed the same for the most part, with Bruce (Bruno) Niceswanger staying on as editor. Both *Campus Underground* and *The New Prairie Primer* were published out of an office located at 401 ½ Main Street in Cedar Falls, although the *Primer* eventually moved to the Bethany House on 23rd street which was directly adjacent to Dean Lang's on-campus residence. The new paper continued the advocacy outlined by its predecessor. It placed a large emphasis on free speech, political dialogue, and satire. The "*Primer*," became the affectionate short-hand for *The New Prairie Primer*. The newspaper was published

monthly, or bi-monthly from October 1969 to December 1970. With a new staff and a new look, *The Primer* symbolized a vibrant student culture in Cedar Falls.

The New Prairie Primer was aesthetically different than the *Campus Underground*. *The Primer* continued a lot of things *CU* had done, such as Edward Hoffmans's "Draft Facts." The general tone was more anti-authoritarian. At times, the paper even became militant. *The Primer* more-openly discussed recreational drug use. It referred to Cedar Falls as "Seedy Falls" as a playful spin on the town's name. From what can be inferred from *The Primer*, marijuana, LSD, and psilocybin mushrooms were culturally more accepted by UNI students during the 1969-1970 school year. It should be emphasized that drug use remained a minority activity throughout this time period, yet it is significant to recognize that *The Primer* avidly discussed student experimentation. In the first copy of *The New Prairie Primer*, Bruno related that due to the drugs he consumed at Woodstock, he had trouble writing articles or concentrating on his graduate studies. Bruno's "Woodstock" article became extremely popular on campus. One retrospective observer remarked in 1971, "the 'Woodstock' article . . . set a tone that couldn't have been more right for the time. Everyone wanted to have been there, and one way to get there, in a way, was to read *The Primer*."⁹⁹ Bruno had returned to UNI as a graduate student, which allowed him to continue his work on the underground press and participate in student activism. By the spring of 1970, Bruno's graduate studies limited his contributions and participation. Dr. Josef Fox chaired Bruno's thesis

⁹⁹ Pederson, "Everything You Ever Wanted to Know about the Primer," *Northern Iowan*, 12 February 1971; Bruce Niceswanger, "Woodstock," *The New Prairie Primer*, October 1969.

committee. Bruno immersed himself intellectually in the new left. His thesis philosophically evaluated the identity of protesters, which was titled “Versions of a Radical.”

Moratoriums in Cedar Falls

In the fall of 1969, students at UNI participated in the national Vietnam War Moratorium that occurred on October 15, 1969. The demonstration was organized by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, a coalition of anti-war advocates organized in the spring after the failed presidential campaign of Eugene McCarthy. The national protest was designed to unite, in spirit, geographically separated groups and individuals in a day of peace. The purpose was to promote community discussions about the Vietnam War. Designed as a respite from the mediocrity of daily life, the Moratorium asked citizens to set aside a single day for reflection and dialogue. Dennis Ryerson, during the first week of classes, described the necessity of such a protest. Ryerson echoed Edward Hoffmann’s insistence that peace could only be obtained by taking personal initiative. Ryerson, in the *Northern Iowan*, stated, “The war is no longer the folly of the administration. It is the responsibility of each of us who call ourselves peace-loving Americans, yet who have failed to commit ourselves to world peace. He concluded by asking students to “Support the Vietnam Moratorium.”¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰ Dennis Ryerson, “Vietnam Moratorium, Peace Commitment,” *Northern Iowan*, 9 September 1969.

Tony Ogden, a leading contributor of *The New Prairie Primer*, was a co-coordinator of a new campus organization *STOP* (Students to Organize for Peace). During the first week of October *STOP* submitted a request to become a legitimate university organization. The group organized and promoted itself as well as the scheduled moratorium throughout the month of October. *STOP* held, "peace vigils between the Union and Sabin Hall from 10:50 a.m. to noon every day until Oct. 15."¹⁰¹ Ogden had attended the November 1968 anti-war rally at Seerley Park. In 1969, Ogden increased his participation and distinguished himself as a leader of the anti-war movement in Cedar Falls.

In the fall of 1969, the *Primer* released two free editions that were devoted entirely to the Vietnam War and draft enlistment.¹⁰² In light of the Moratorium, the writers challenged their readers to actively display their discontent with America's involvement in Vietnam.

To be against the war in Vietnam and to do nothing about it is indefensible. To see your brother, your school mate, your son or your neighbor's son dragged off to the slaughter or to prison, and to do nothing about it is inexcusable. To sit back passively month after month and wait for a Richard Nixon or a Melvin Laird to admit that our country was wrong and that we are going to bring our men home without delay is a transgression of our own reason and humanity. It isn't going to happen until the American people make it happen. That is why we must go to the people. They are sitting there behind those closed doors seething over Vietnam and what it has brought them: death, taxes, inflation, and

¹⁰¹ "STOP seeks UNI status," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 2 October 1969.

¹⁰² "Free Vietnam Issue," *The New Prairie Primer*, October 15, 1969; "FREE: War War War War," *The New Prairie Primer*, 13 November 1969.

disenfranchisement. They are waiting for a spark, and that is what we intend to provide.¹⁰³

The language used by the author of this piece was strong and assertive. “The Action Statement” emphasized the frustrations students at UNI had with the war. Not only were several of their peers’ lives literally at stake, with the possibility of being drafted, but those who were not directly at risk (such as female students) appeared to be demonstrating a strong commitment to opposing the war. Students were concerned about the future of America and the future of their world. The author suggests that actions and vocal opposition were adequate means for expressing discontent, and advocacy was a vehicle for change. “The Action Statement” was reminiscent of “From Dissent to Resistance.” Hoffmans’s ideas, once perceived as radical, had become an accepted doctrine by the fall of 1969 by the student body.

By joining the national Moratorium in mid-October UNI students actively participated in the national antiwar movement. Fostering support seemed effortless as hundreds vowed participation in the country-wide demonstration, including whole organizations such as the local chapter of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, *The New Prairie Primer*, the local Conscientious Objectors’ Organization, and the *Northern Iowan*.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ “Action statement,” *The New Prairie Primer*, October 15, 1969.

¹⁰⁴ “Against War: Groups Join Moratorium,” *Northern Iowan*, 12 September 1969.

As the day approached several people and groups wished to suspend all university operations in observance of the Vietnam Moratorium. But much to *STOP*'s dismay, the student government ruled that UNI lacked a standardized attendance policy therefore "classes [would] be conducted as usual." Although classes were not cancelled, several professors- including Josef Fox, David Crownfield, Nathan Talbott, and Donald Whitnah- allowed their students to participate in the Moratorium.¹⁰⁵ The education gained through the experience of attending the Moratorium, at least from Fox's perspective, far outweighed the need to meet in lecture. Knowledge, in October of 1969, was being attained not from within a structured classroom setting; rather, it was acquired through experience and dialogue.

The Moratorium reflected Iowa's culture of civility. *STOP* gained legitimate institutional approval for the demonstration. The city government was willing to accommodate space for activities, and the coordinators of the protest urged participants to act with restraint. Tony Ogden, writer for the *Primer* and Chairman of Students to Organize for Peace, submitted a letter to the editor in the *Northern Iowan* on October 14th pleading for a mannered protest. Ogden emphasized, "The key words in our campaign are non-violence, non-disruption, dignity, courtesy, and peace."¹⁰⁶ The October protest demonstrated how important polite expression was at UNI. In this instance, students' dissent was legitimized and respected as long as it was civil. The

¹⁰⁵ "Viet Moratorium Gains Momentum," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, October 1969.

¹⁰⁶ Tony Ogden, "Peace and Dignity on October 15th," *Northern Iowan*, 14 October 1969.

following spring, when students' frustrations provoked less courteous activism, students were vilified by the administration based upon moral perceptions of their behaviors.

The Moratorium began on the eve of the 15th with a candlelight procession that originated from the Campanile and rendezvoused on the northwest boundary of campus for the lighting of a bonfire.¹⁰⁷ The following morning, at 9 a.m., a teach-in was scheduled in the campus Union; speakers included Tony Ogden and Josef Fox. Local churches held vigils for the Iowa soldiers killed in Vietnam, and a campus-wide march was slated for 1 p.m.¹⁰⁸ The march attracted around 3,000 students and faculty members according to Roger Kruse of *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*.¹⁰⁹

Despite cold weather, a quarter of the student body gathered on the east lawn near the old Spanish cannons next to President Maucker's residence. Participants read aloud the long list of Iowa casualties suffered in Vietnam. They planted a "tree of life" in their memory.¹¹⁰ After the demonstration on the east lawn, a crowd of people marched toward downtown Cedar Falls. The march of solidarity was a way to spread the anti-war message beyond the confines of campus and into the community. The march allowed students to express their frustrations about the war. Big signs were carried in the march. White arm bands were distributed by the crowd of about one thousand. The route

¹⁰⁷ "Campus Happenings: Moratorium Begins," *Northern Iowan*, 14 October 1969.

¹⁰⁸ "Moratorium Activities," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 15 October 1969.

¹⁰⁹ Roger Kruse, "For many, it was Wednesday as usual," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 16 October 1969.

¹¹⁰ "Moratorium Activities," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 15 October 1969.

ended at Island Park along the bank of the Cedar River, approximately 2 miles north of the UNI campus. Upon arriving, legislator contact information was distributed along with the circulation of a free edition of *The New Prairie Primer*.¹¹¹

The climax of the day was the meeting scheduled for 7:30 p.m. at the Cedar Falls City Hall. A representative of *STOP*, Bud Troutner, commented on its significance, "The only relationship between the University and the community," he declared, "has been at the higher levels, those of the President Mauckers and the Mayor Mckinleys, not on the lower levels, those involving the common students and the citizens."¹¹² The public meeting highlighted the value of Iowa's culture of civility. From all accounts the discussion was productive. Dissent was respected and legitimized. The board room was packed with college students, high school students, and community members. Around 150 people attended, according to *The Record*.¹¹³

Tony Ogden opened the meeting with remarks related to social prejudices and the labeling of demographics such as "hawks" and "doves." He went on by commenting on the atrocities committed in Southeast Asia such as the My Lai Massacre of 1968. Eventually, he challenged members of the crowd to express their own opinions and encouraged debate. Many subjects were explored during the meeting, including

¹¹¹ "Symbol of Protest," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 16 October 1969; "Dialog Explores Wide Range of Viet Views," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 16 October 1969.

¹¹² "Climax of Moratorium: Dialogue Allows Exchange of Views," *Northern Iowan*, 17 October 1969.

¹¹³ "Dialog Explores Wide Range of Viet Views," *The Record*, 16 October 1969.

domestic dissent, methods of troop withdrawals, the ethical incentive in leaving Vietnam, as well as the perceived importance of remaining in Vietnam. Despite differing opinions, the meeting adjourned late into the evening without disruption.¹¹⁴ The episode was one of the few student-organized-protests that was respected and embraced. Would it have been if Ogden and *STOP* had not stressed “non-violence, non-disruption, dignity, courtesy, and peace?”¹¹⁵

The Moratorium was able to unite different factions of the community under one issue. One of the most important aspects of the demonstration was that participants experienced an American event. Millions around the nation participated. The day may not have brought the war to an end, but the social resonance was felt around the country. Historian Melvin Small describes the national media’s reaction to the October 1969 Moratorium. Small explains that the major broadcasting networks (CBS, NBC, and ABC) devoted almost all of their nightly news coverage to the event. Additionally, he stresses that the Moratorium expanded the anti-war movement, as well as, solidified activists’ resolve.¹¹⁶

A month following the nationwide protest, a centralized gathering was planned by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee to take place on the mall in Washington D.C. On November 15th almost a half a million people gathered in the United States capital. The

¹¹⁴ “Dialog Explores Wide Range of Viet Views,” *The Record*, 16 October 1969.

¹¹⁵ Tony Ogden, “Peace and Dignity on October 15th,” *Northern Iowan*, 14 October 1969.

¹¹⁶ Small, *Antiwarriors*, 109-111.

demonstration was gigantic and featured passionate speeches, marching, chanting, and rock and roll music. The November 18th copy of *The Primer* provided extensive coverage of the event. Thousands of people made the sojourn to D.C. *The Primer* included a three page transcription of an interview conducted with Chicago Seven defendant and Youth International Party (YIP) leader, Jerry Rubin.

The November Moratorium was not observed with as much vigor in Cedar Falls as the October demonstration. Yet approximately 400 students and faculty members marched from campus to Island Park, as they had done the previous month. The two mile trek exposed the Cedar Falls community to the antiwar advocates of UNI for the second time in two months. Peg Wherry wrote an editorial in the *Northern Iowan*, accentuating the November 15th march. She described her experience:

Everybody knows [about the] march. . . But everybody doesn't know everything that happened on the march. . . A little boy leaned against a phone pole downtown. A marcher gave him a button and a couple copies of the Vietnam edition of *The New Prairie Primer*. He grinned and made a clumsy, inexperienced 'V' [a peace sign] - his first. . . A straight-from-the-beauty-shop type of housewife was standing at the curb taking pictures. 'Join us, join us,' the marchers urged. She did. . . The Cedar Falls police were calm and helpful. . . And at the end of the march [there] was a bonfire and a big 'hug-in.' The marchers all hugged each other in one gigantic circle of warm, caring humanity.¹¹⁷

Wherry's article was revealing for a couple of reasons. She made sure to note that the Cedar Falls community was interested and curious with the student marchers. She explained how local high school students and business owners portrayed a positive

¹¹⁷ Peg Wherry, "Marchers Manifest Commitment" *Northern Iowan*, 18 November 1969.

reception. On several occasions, the iconic peace-sign was signaled, additionally numerous motorists honked at the demonstrators in support. Some even joined the march. This observation shows that when acting civil and mannered dissent was tolerated, sometimes even embraced. "Hug-ins," waving, smiling, and handshakes do not evoke the imagery of a militant movement. These behaviors were derived from Iowa's culture of kindness.

The October and November Moratoriums enabled advocates to express dissent throughout the community. The administration at UNI did not criticize their activities as long as they imbued civility. In the subsequent months, students' actions became more passionate and contentious, and administrators evaluated their actions based upon moral perceptions of students' behaviors. When students' actions crossed a perceived line of decency, they were deemed radical. The administration encouraged a culture of civility, and when students were perceived as radical, that culture silenced student dissent.

Uncivil Civil Rights

Although the Vietnam War was an omnipresent concern for the activists of Cedar Falls, other civil issues were confronted near the end of the fall semester. African Americans' concerns about institutional diversity was off most people's radar in the fall of 1969, but due to confrontational activism by the Afro-American Society of Cedar Falls - civil rights became an important issue in the spring of 1970 at UNI. Student activists

rallied behind the Afro-American Society of Cedar Falls. Individuals such as Tony Ogden and Peg Wherry became so involved in activism that they simultaneously published dissent in the underground newspaper, organized rallies and demonstrations, and challenged administrative authority.

In conjunction with national inquiries about racial equality, the University of Northern Iowa's community confronted racial issues at the dawn of the 1970s. Several students and student organizations began to question the rights and representation of minorities in the community. Maucker believed that racial inequality must be eradicated from campus and the community of Cedar Falls. Additionally, many believed that the university's curriculum lacked adequate attention to ethnic studies.

Charles E. Quirk, assistant professor of history, in 1968 proposed a reform that challenged the existing racial dynamics in the Cedar Falls community. Quirk's proposal materialized when President Maucker asked Daryl Pendergraft, the Executive Dean and Vice President for Student Affairs, to establish The Committee on University Responsibility in Minority Group Education (COURIMGE) in March of 1968.¹¹⁸ The committee continued its responsibility of reconciling racial discontent and offering reform for racial progress in the fall of 1969. A primary concern for COURIMGE was the lack of diversity amongst the student body as well as the faculty at UNI. During the period from 1965 to 1969, African American enrollment increased with little alteration in the racial diversity of the faculty. In fact, the entire campus population had almost

¹¹⁸ Lang and Pendergraft, *A Century of Leadership and Service* vol. II, 255.

tripled in enrollment between 1960 and 1970.¹¹⁹ COURIMGE argued that the explosive student population limited the administration's ability to act decisively on social or civil issues that arose.

By November of 1969, several African Americans challenged the administration to enact real change on campus. On November 6 William Lang, Vice President of Academic Affairs received a list of demands from the African American Society of Cedar Falls. The members demanded that the university promote several existing minority faculty members and asked for a modernized curriculum that incorporated minority studies. UNI, the Society proclaimed, was "a racist institution." They wanted to see adequate changes enacted by the following semester. The list of demands criticized COURIMGE for lacking expedient reform. Furthermore, the Afro-American Society of Cedar Falls wished to boost admissions of black students by granting enrollment to a higher percentage of minorities and have the percentage of African American students to 10% by the fall of 1972.¹²⁰ The fourth and last demand of "a cultural house for the Afro-American students on campus" challenged the logistical authority of the university administration.¹²¹

William Lang, the administrator who received the demands, first sought to explore the legitimacy of the grievances. President Maucker, who was on leave for the

¹¹⁹Gerald L. Peterson, "UNI Fact Sheet," Rod Library *Special Collections* (7 September 2011).

¹²⁰ "The Demands," *Northern Iowan*, 11 November 1969.

¹²¹ "Administration Reply to Demands," *Northern Iowan*, 11 November 1969.

semester after receiving the Danforth grant, was contacted by fellow administrators in the fall of 1969 in order to decide whether or not to meet the demands. Maucker responded by saying, "These demands cannot be met as made. . . . We are unable and unwilling to operate the university on demands."¹²² A question several administrators had was; *or what?* The demands submitted to the administration, and subsequently forwarded on to COURMIGE, did not indicate what would happen if these demands were not met. The demands were seen as abrasive by the administration.

The following day, Friday November 7, a boycott was staged by the Afro-American Society in the campus Union. Several black students picketed and requested students eat elsewhere instead of buying from the university. According to the reports from the *Northern lowan*, "Some students and faculty did not patronize the food line; possibly to show support for the blacks and possibly because they just did not want to get involved."¹²³

The demands presented to the university were handled administratively by COURMIGE, Vice President Lang, and President Maucker. It took weeks for the administration to formulate a response. This pace was unsatisfactory for many protesters and several felt that "the waiting game [was] being played out at UNI."¹²⁴

¹²² "Administration Reply to Demands," *Northern lowan*, 11 November 1969.

¹²³ "Help Us Do Our Thang," *Northern lowan*, 11 November 1969.

¹²⁴ "UNI Blacks," *The New Prairie Primer*, 18 November 1970.

William C. Lang and Vice President of Student Affairs, Daryl Pendergraft, interpreted the fall of 1969 in their 1995 publication, *A Century of Leadership and Service*:

. . . it became apparent that the whole episode fit neatly into well-established significant social change. Once a group that has felt oppressed and discriminated against has secured an alteration in the status quo, it expected continued and rapid responses to accumulated actual and supposed grievances. The aggrieved, with a simplistic view of the power structure that has engulfed them, view delay as a tactic of denial. When Lang pointed out that he had no power to unilaterally grant any of the demands. . . Some participants demurred and accused him of stalling.¹²⁵

Objectively, Lang and Pendergraft justified their delay by insisting that the Afro-American society was “simplistic” and misunderstood administrative proceedings. The Society interpreted the delay as an administrative admission of being threatened. Lang and Pendergraft, in *A Century of Leadership and Service*, refused to admit their anxiety although it was implied by their rhetoric.

During the latter half of November and proceeding after winter break into January and February of the following year, committees and administrators debated and analyzed the details of the demands. The faculty constructed a five member panel to discuss the demands viability. The committee consisted of Ruth Anderson (Social Work), Josef Fox (Philosophy), Howard Jones (History), Leonard Keefe (Business), and Charles Quirk (History). The challenge of creating a cultural house had yet to be adequately addressed by mid-spring. President Maucker and others needed the approval of the Board of Regents in order to establish new facilities. A comprehensive response had yet to be unveiled by early March 1969. Students grew impatient with their administrators.

¹²⁵ Lang and Pendergraft, *A Century of Leadership and Service*, 267.

The writers of *The New Prairie Primer* voiced their support for the African American Society of Cedar Falls. *The Primer* and the *Northern Iowan* called for increased student participation and support for the Society.¹²⁶ Despite the apparent discontent that seemed to be mounting, many citizens and students were surprised to hear that nine students refused to leave President Maucker's residence on the evening of March 16. They refused to leave until President Maucker approved the foundation of a cultural house.¹²⁷

The original members of the sit-in were Bryon Washington, Terry Pearson, Chip "the Token" Dalton, Tony Stevens, Joe Sailor, Ann Bachman, and (the President of the Afro-American Society) Palmer Byrd. In the following days those who originated the protest would become known as the UNI 7, a compilation of six African Americans and one "token" white guy. Maucker refused to sign anything under occupation, yet allowed the students who wished to remain in his residence to stay throughout the evening.¹²⁸

Local media, as well as a sizable group of students, began to congregate outside the President's house the following morning. According to William Lang and Daryl Pendergraft in their history of the university, an additional 22 students joined the protesters the following morning.¹²⁹ With a threat of a court injunction, the occupying students vacated the premises without receiving an official endorsement of the

¹²⁶ "Senate Must Institute Change," *Northern Iowan*, 6 March 1970.

¹²⁷ Ginger Crabb, "Black Students Sit-in At Maucker Home," *Northern Iowan*, 20 March 1970.

¹²⁸ Crabb, *Northern Iowan*, 20 March 1970.

¹²⁹ Lang and Pendergraft, *A Century of Leadership and Service*, 271.

proposed cultural house.¹³⁰ The group continued to attract a sizeable following as they proceeded a couple hundred feet into the Administrative building. According to Tony Ogden, “the sit-in moved en masse to the Board Room of the Administration Building,” he explained that, “frequent suggestions that [Dean of Students Edward] Voldseth’s office [should] be taken. After a meeting of about half an hour, the students decided to end the sit-in with no press release, ‘to keep ‘em guessing.’”¹³¹ The crowd that had gathered became personally involved.

The scene inside Maucker’s home is hard to piece together. There are reports of a pizza being ordered after Maucker and his wife had gone to bed. The morning produced chaos. As reporters, photographers, and students flocked toward Maucker’s residence. As more students joined the UNI 7, something blossomed. Students recognized that a new line had been crossed against the authority of the administration. During the weekend before spring break (March 20-21, 1970), the university administration suspended seven participants. A committee was formed to address disciplinary measure. The seven participants who faced suspension or even expulsion were chosen, “. . . because they were positively identified as being, [as] Dean Voldseth

¹³⁰ Jack Hovelson, “Students end 17 hr. Sit-in at U.N.I. President’s Home,” *Des Moines Register*, 18 March 1970.

¹³¹ Tony Ogden, “Which One Will They Make an Example Of?” *The New Prairie Primer*, 31 March 1970.

[put it], ‘among those whose leadership role, according to those present, was significant.’”¹³²

A significant proportion of the student body disapproved of any disciplinary action against the UNI 7. The first issue of *The Primer* to be published following the incident encouraged students to protest the Disciplinary Committee that had been established by the university. The entire second page of the March 31st issue was a letter addressed to President Maucker by a white, female, student. She began by conceding that the actions taken by the UNI 7 could be perceived as impolite. She challenged Maucker to consider the source of blame:

Sir, after all, did not the university commit the first wrong in creating and allowing to continue to exist a university setting which reflected only white middle class values and culture instead of making sure that the university reflected multitudinous culture and values of the great melting pot? . . . Why most of the time it is the black, the poor, the culturally different who receive the punishment while the white and those in position of power receive the rewards.¹³³

Students began to mobilize and increase their activism following the sit-in. The UNI 7 inspired other student activists. The event opened a flood gate of anti-authoritarian demonstrations and rhetoric. The administration witnessed the student body become increasingly confrontational. Students’ frustrations produced expressions that were seen as uncivil and threatening. When students’ actions were perceived as

¹³² Ginger Crabb, “Controversy Centers around Administrative Reaction,” *Northern Iowan*, 3 April 1970.

¹³³ Virginia M. Hollins, “Letter to President Maucker,” *The New Prairie Primer*, 31 March 1970.

radical, the administration placed even greater emphasis on civility. As the conflict intensified, so too did students' resistance to administrative paternalism. Maucker and his administration encouraged this culture with good intention, but in the end, the approach limited students' agency and power.

"Unrepentant Recalcitrance"

The months of March and April at the University of Northern Iowa were ones in which demonstrated an intensified rhetoric around campus. Speak-outs were held on several occasions, and the *Primer* continued to run articles supporting the African Americans' demonstration and cause. Piggybacking on the published dissent being dispersed, tangible activism began to increase in late March and early April. Several documents describe this period as nothing short of controversial and contentious.

Students involved in the newly created University Activist Coalition succeeded in gaining seats on the student government, and projected an anti-authoritarian perspective. The University Activist Coalition was founded with the intention of promoting reform in Cedar Falls. The ten new members of the Student Senate, who labeled themselves as "freaks," joyously proclaimed a new Provisional Revolutionary Student Government or (PRG). They named officers and satirically bragged that they had staged a coup d'état. The PRG officer titles included: PRG Minister of Propaganda, PRG Minister of Tactical Revolutionary Theory, PRG Central Coordinator, PRG Women's Liberation Minister, PRG Minister of Culture, PRG Minister of Defense, PRG Minister of

Outside Agitation, and PRG Minister of Rhetorical Tricks. Tony Ogden and Al Woods led the effort with support from Bruno, who was named the PRG Minister of Propaganda.

The PRG recommended five reforms. The group's proposals reflected their dissatisfaction with administrative authority. The PRG recommended:

- A new, more responsive Dean of Students
- Courses with relevance. In sexuality and black culture and history. . .
- Student power over student lives [end of *in loco parentis*]
- An end, not a reduction, to tuition [free education]
- Control over tenure as it is used by some inept professors¹³⁴

The PRG's dissatisfaction with the Dean of Students Edward Voldseth was mirrored around campus as more and more became emotionally involved with the UNI 7 case. The following week, the announcement was made that a disciplinary hearing would be held the first week of April for the UNI 7. Several felt the university would eventually suspend the participants.¹³⁵ On the 6th of April the Disciplinary Committee gathered to decide a punishment for the seven students involved with the sit-in. The original intention was to have a closed door meeting. Shortly after the procedures began a group of about 150 students stormed into the room and disrupted the proceedings. The committee chairman, Dr. M. B. Smith, felt he was forced to adjourn

¹³⁴ "Revolutionary Student Government Declared," *The New Prairie Primer*, 31 March 1970.

¹³⁵ Lyn Blere, "UNI 7 Allowed to Return to Classes: Senate Statement Says UNI 7 Were Not Granted Due Process," *Northern Iowan*, 3 April 1970.

the proceedings due to the student's disruption in the board room. The following day, Smith resigned from the committee.¹³⁶

Smith explained his decision the following day, which was reprinted in the *Northern Iowan* on the 10th of April. He stated, "In my opinion, there has been allowed to develop on this campus an unhealthy atmosphere and mood which fosters the appearance of roving bands of irresponsible individuals who, under the guise of the ethic of demonstration, are seriously damaging the fabric of the University community."¹³⁷ Smith was clearly threatened by the students' behavior. But to others, such as Tony Ogden, the committee represented an authoritarian approach to deciding the fate of the UNI 7. Ogden argued, ". . . forget about the cultural house and the sit-in. Just tell them it's not going to be a secret trial."¹³⁸ Soon after the April 6th fiasco a second meeting was planned for the 20th of April. Dr. Edward Rutkowski, professor of education, was assigned to the committee in lieu of Smith. By the 9th of April the committee had ruled that all seven would be evaluated as a group.¹³⁹

The April edition of *The New Prairie Primer* featured a petition which sought signatures that would endorse a vote of no-confidence for Dean of Students, Edward

¹³⁶ "Student Hearing Procedures Studied," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 8 April 1970; Dennis Ryerson, "300 attend UNI speak-out on discipline procedures," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 8 April 1970.

¹³⁷ Dr. M. B. Smith, "Smith Explains Resignation," *Northern Iowan*, 10 April 1970.

¹³⁸ "Smith calls UNI mood unhealthy; quits committee," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 7 April 1970.

¹³⁹ "'UNI 7' to appear as group, discipline committee agrees," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 9 April 1970.

Voldseth.¹⁴⁰ Many students following the UNI 7 ordeal had lost almost all confidence in their administrative representatives. By voting against Voldseth, students declared their own personal challenge to authority. Peg Wherry, the new acting editor of the *New Prairie Primer*, pronounced her discontent:

A major reason we cannot trust the administration is that they were so secretive about setting up the student discipline committee, Dean Voldseth, Dean Holmes, Dr. Pendergraft, and the university lawyer. Was legal counsel for the Seven present? Were any of the Seven present? No. It is a strange and untrustworthy judicial system which allows the prosecution to play a major part in establishing procedures while excluding the defense.¹⁴¹

A long list of student leaders on campus endorsed the no-confidence bid, including: Brian Thies, editor of the *Northern Iowan*; Mike Bennett, Student Senate Attorney General; Cyndi Hovden, Student Senate President 1968-69; Tony Ogden, man of many titles- yet in April of 1970 was known as the representative of the University Activists Coalition; Peg Wherry, managing editor of the *New Prairie Primer*; Douglas Dunham, Executive Assistant to Student Senate President; Sammie Dell, President of the Afro-American Society 1968-69; and Annette M. Reed, Coordinator of Vietnam Moratorium Committee. Noticeably there was a “no comment” by the UNI Student Senate President Mike Conlee when asked if he had confidence in Voldseth.¹⁴²

¹⁴⁰“Voldseth Must Go,” *The New Prairie Primer*, 14 April 1970.

¹⁴¹ Peg Wherry, “Do It,” *The New Prairie Primer*, 14 April 1970.

¹⁴² “Voldseth Faces the Folks,” *The New Prairie Primer*, 14 April 1970.

Mike Conlee seems to have supported Edward Voldseth. Conlee argued that the Dean of Students may have been falsely targeted. The Student Senate, after the disrupted disciplinary hearing, voted on a bill to hold a referendum which would measure the “confidence” students had in their dean. By Sunday April 12th Mike Conlee announced he would veto the referendum which was scheduled for Thursday the 16th and Friday the 17th. Conlee’s grounds for vetoing the bill were “That the validity of a referendum would be impaired by the controversy surrounding the seven students who participated in a sit-in at the home of UNI President Maucker.”¹⁴³ The anti-authoritarian climate in Cedar Falls was intensifying by the day, despite Conlee’s efforts to hinder that expression.

The fate of the UNI 7 was still pending following the disrupted disciplinary hearing in early April. Mike Bennett, a writer for the *Primer* articulated the noticeable friction on campus in an April 14th article by saying, “The UNI 7 have succeeded because they have raised the level of dissent on this campus to a higher level. Whether proved guilty or not guilty, right or wrong, they have asserted our existence at this University in a wholly different way.”¹⁴⁴ Clearly the actions taken by the seven members of the African American society of Cedar Falls fostered a renewed identity amongst the student body, an identity rooted in the opposition of *in loco parentis*. Outrage toward

¹⁴³ “Student president vetoes Voldseth confidence vote,” *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, April 1970.

¹⁴⁴ Mike Bennett, “Know the Real Enemy,” *The New Prairie Primer*, 14 April 1970.

Dean Edward Voldseth continued to increase throughout the month of April. Voldseth, as Dean of Students, found himself at the center of the student's anti-authoritarian expressions. Bennett commented on Voldseth in his April 14th article by opening his editorial piece with a growing popular phrase on campus, "Dean Edward Voldseth is still alive and well."¹⁴⁵ The phrase used by Bennett and others symbolized, in a satirical manner, that violence has not been used despite the emphatic indignation many students felt.

On April 2, 1970 *The Cedar Falls Daily Record* announced a change in the month's event itinerary. The brief entry stated that former head of SDS Mark Rudd would no longer be visiting UNI and in his place would be Jerry Rubin, a member of the so-called Chicago Seven.¹⁴⁶ Jerry Rubin gained notoriety from the mass protests that ensued around the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. Confrontation with the Chicago police yielded injuries and arrests. Furthermore, the literal war-in-the-streets were publicized nationwide for all to see. It took several days for the violence to subside in Chicago. During the following months, the courts decided to press charges against Rubin and seven others for their role in promoting a riot. Bobby Seale, member of the Black Panthers, was severed from the case due to outbursts and was placed in contempt of court. Therefore, the case has been remembered by the name of the Chicago Seven.

¹⁴⁵ Bennett, "Know the Real Enemy," *Primer*, 14 April 1970.

¹⁴⁶ "Jerry Rubin of Chicago 7 set at UNI," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 2 April 1970.

The Chicago Seven case, presided over by Judge Julius J. Hoffman, was a trial that captured the attention of many Americans in 1969. The flamboyance of Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, David Dellinger, Rennard Davis, Tom Hayden, Lee Weiner, and John Froines during their trial enhanced their prestige amongst the radical youth aware of the case. In February 1970 the Chicago Seven were found not guilty to the conspiracy of promoting a riot but were found guilty of crossing state lines with the intent to incite a riot. Two months after the verdict, Jerry Rubin, co-founder of the Yippies and co-ringleader of the Chicago riots, decided to visit the campus of UNI.

Considering that Rubin's visit was no more than four weeks removed from the sit-in at President Maucker's home, one week removed from the no confidence vote of Dean Voldseth, and amidst growing dissent of the disciplinary procedures of the UNI 7, pressures mounted on Maucker to cancel Jerry Rubin's event. A week before Rubin's April 28th visit Maucker submitted a statement that was published in *The Record*. Maucker was quoted saying, "Rubin is a phenomenon of one extremely important part of the current scene- whether one agrees with his ideas or not. . . What's at stake is the ability of the university to maintain law and order while at the same time assuring freedom of thought and expression."¹⁴⁷ Maucker reasoned that despite the community pressures to cancel the speech, he knew that Rubin and the UNI student body had the First Amendment Right to conduct such an event. Maucker's remarks reflected his anxiety and fear of the potential scene Rubin might provoke. Maucker's control was

¹⁴⁷ "Maucker says he won't ask Rubin cancellation," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 23 April 1970.

fading, his policies of suppression were failing, and his campus culture of paternalism was on the decline.

Unintentionally fast-forwarding to May, Bruno published a three page article titled “The Americanization of Protest,” which was pre-dated April 28, 1970. The article began with the empirical fact, “Rubin is here, in Cedar Falls.”¹⁴⁸ The account presented by *The Primer’s* editor is unsubstantiated and more than likely exaggerated. What is important to recognize about Bruno’s description of the event is the moments that stood out to the involved observer. Bruno’s language reflected his excitement, and his emulated perspective of Rubin. Bruno described how Rubin led a procession of around 200 individuals from the Women’s Gym on the northwest corner of campus to the track across 23rd Street. According to Bruno, the bleachers at the track were filled with an estimated six thousand patrons, and as soon as the track meet finished Jerry Rubin led his crowd of followers out in the middle of the field and began to speak to the large crowd. “Come down! Come on down! You’re free! Come on! Come down!” Rubin challenged the crowd. According to Bruno a moment of hesitation ensued, but gradually a couple hundred people poured down out of the stands in front of Rubin. Bruno recognized the polarization of the audience:

Six thousand people are polarized in a football stadium: one thousand freaks, joyous, fanatically partisan, and high on the ground, and an ‘audience’ of five thousand in the stands, by turns scornful, peeved, guilty, mad, cheering, and laughing, but always, by virtue of that initial polarization, on the ‘other side.’¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁸ Bruce Niceswanger, “The Americanization of Protest,” *The New Prairie Primer*, 16 May 1970.

¹⁴⁹ Niceswanger, *The Primer*, 16 May 1970.

Rubin spoke to the crowd that refused to budge from their cozy seats. Bruno explained that Rubin told them they were cowards and afraid. Rubin asked, “Are you afraid to cross the fence? Are you afraid to try pot? Are you afraid to say no to the government?” Rubin after continually antagonizing the crowd in the bleachers began to embark on a lengthy monologue about Vietnam, President Johnson, the free speech movement, the Weathermen, the Yippies, Civil Rights, and President Nixon. Bruno described the moment with such ecstasy it is nearly impossible not to see the idolization of Rubin by Niceswanger. The crescendo of Rubin’s speech was a chant boisterously repeated by the “freaks on the field,” when they shouted “Fuck Richard Nixon! Fuck Richard Nixon!” over and over. Bruno admitted willingly that, “few people will go away believing it, but it is the most crucial part of Jerry Rubin’s appearance in Cedar Falls.”¹⁵⁰ The chant continued for several minutes, and according to Niceswanger, it unsettled the remaining people in the bleachers.

The event highlights in several ways the changed conception of an educational experience by the UNI student body. Rubin’s speech was teachable moment. Furthermore, the scene demonstrated the widening gulf between those who filed onto the field and those who stayed in the stands. The students who were present at Rubin’s speech must have felt connected to something larger, something national and important. The collective forces of the University Activists Coalition, the Provisional

¹⁵⁰ Niceswanger, *The Primer*, 16 May 1970.

Student Government, and Jerry Rubin's influence emboldened students. Student dissent was becoming increasingly more confrontational. Those in authority, such as Voldseth, Maucker, or Smith, were threatened by this new brand of student activism. Several observers described the growing tension in early April. It was only a matter of time before confrontation ensued.

"Northern Iowa Will Be Better Off Without You"

Fourteen days following the first attempted meeting by the Disciplinary Committee, the administrators gathered once again on the 20th of April. Hours before the Disciplinary Committee commenced their proceedings, hundreds of students gathered at the campus Union in defiance of the planned hearing. By 4 p.m. the Board Room of the Administration Building was crammed with committee members, administrators, student protestors, and President James Maucker. Outside the locked doors of the Board Room were "helmeted, club-carrying deputy sheriffs and Cedar Falls police."¹⁵¹ The law enforcement was confronted by numerous students who wished to enter the proceedings. After being denied entrance, the student protesters grew restless. Many pounded on the door and shouted obscenities at the guarding officers. After several verbal exchanges and a shattered glass door, the policemen opened the doors to the Board Room and the disgruntled students rushed in. Within minutes, the crowd grew in size and the committee realized that the chaos limited their ability to

¹⁵¹ Lang and Pendergraft, *A Century of Leadership and Service vol. II* (1995), 274.

conduct an adequate hearing. The scene around the Administration Building was tense and chaotic. An outright challenge to the authority of procedure was underway.¹⁵²

Within a week after April 20th, many students were arrested for their actions taken during the disciplinary hearing. Positively identified thanks to video tapes and photographs, eight students were immediately identified and arrest warrants were issued for interfering with university operations, including: Tony Ogden, Peg Wherry, Dennis J. Baxell, Jim W. Booker, Nancy Wilson, Michael J. Steffen, Alan E. Smith, and Annette M. Reed.

Judge Blair Wood of Black Hawk County signed the initial injunction forbidding disturbances at the April 20th hearing. Judge Wood issued contempt charges to those who violated the court order. By the following week nine UNI students were sentenced to seven days in county jail. Judge Wood's sentencing was transcribed in an April 27th article:

I can't help but have sympathy with many of the things you have said (speaking to the defendants). The one answer I can make, and it is not as factitious as it sounds, is that 75 percent of the harm done in this world is done by people who mean well. . . I believe in the law. . . It is my considered opinion that the orderly processes of the University of Northern Iowa will be better off without you people for the next seven days.¹⁵³

Within a week after the original nine students were sentenced to terms in the Black Hawk County Jail, Judge Wood ordered twenty-one more young activists to his

¹⁵² Jack Hovelson, "Storm Hearing in U.N.I. Case," *The Des Moines Register*, 21 April 1970.

¹⁵³ Blair Wood, "Judge Wood's complete statement as he sentenced 9 UNI students," *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, 27 April 1970.

courtroom. In the end, 28 protestors were sentenced to a week in jail for violating the court injunction that forbid disrupting university proceedings. The group of 28 included Chip “the Token” Dalton and Palmer Byrd (members of the UNI 7) as well as PRG coordinator Al Woods.

The experience of being sent to jail resonated as a learning experience for several of the detainees. Tony Ogden reflected on his time in jail by writing an article for the *Primer* that read, “I’ve never been able to really analyze the revolution I am wrapped up in. . . I want to thank Judge Wood for providing a week-long retreat training camp for the revolution in this province. The revolution will succeed, the question is, how bloody will the piggies in control of the world make it?”¹⁵⁴ President Maucker was fully aware of the explosive dynamic which manifested itself at UNI. On April 22, 1970 on a local television news station, KWWL, Maucker announced that he was suspending all disciplinary hearings currently scheduled at UNI. Maucker decided that the fate of the UNI 7 would be decided by a newly formulated advisory committee composed of predominantly African Americans. Maucker admitted that UNI had been experiencing “real difficulties” over the previous few months.¹⁵⁵ In a way, even time in jail served as an educational experience. The outgoing President realized that less than

¹⁵⁴ Tony Ogden, “A Loudmouthed, Mal-contented Misfit Talks to Himself,” *The New Prairie Primer*, 16 May 1970.

¹⁵⁵ “Maucker Maps Student Discipline Procedures,” *The Cedar Falls Daily Record*, April 1970.

four weeks remained in the semester and he wished to bring the academic year to an end without further incident.

The school year of 1969-1970 hosted sit-ins at the university president's house, multiple anti-Vietnam rallies, racial tensions on campus, protests of administrative committee hearings, and a vote of no-confidence of Dean of Students Edward Voldseth. By early May the scene on campus could only be described by the *Primer* with disillusionment and frustration. "'Controversy' is a mild word for what has been happening at UNI during the past two months" an author of the *Primer* stated in early May.¹⁵⁶ As President Maucker began to formulate the new disciplinary committee, a significant event occurred on the national level that altered the focus of many residents of Cedar Falls and the UNI community. President Nixon authorized military operation within the nation of Cambodia by the U.S. military in late April 1970. Students nationwide were outraged.

Universities following the Cambodian invasion played host to massive student rallies that opposed the military's actions being conducted in Southeast Asia. On May 4, 1970 four students were shot and killed by National Guardsmen at the Ohio University, Kent State.¹⁵⁷ Massive opposition was mounted by students nationwide, including the University of Northern Iowa. It appeared that the students of UNI shifted their

¹⁵⁶ Peg Wherry, "Keep your Faculties Intact," *The New Prairie Primer*, 16 May 1970.

¹⁵⁷ Joseph Lelyveld, "Protest on Cambodia and Kent State are Joined by Many Local Schools," *The New York Times*, 6 May 1970.

preoccupation to a larger national context and the Vietnam War.¹⁵⁸ The oscillation of the students' focus and activism from one issue to another articulated the diversity of interests and personal politics being contemplated by UNI's activists. Clearly American students were changed by the killings that occurred in Kent, Ohio.

The academic year of 1969-1970 was a challenge not only for students but for the administrators of UNI. President Maucker and faculty held an informational meeting at the Union to discuss the circumstances surrounding Cambodia and Kent State. Over a thousand students gathered to hear what the administration had to say.¹⁵⁹ After the meeting concluded the group of UNI students staged a march across town to Island Park in opposition to America's military actions. Proposals and petitions were circulated within the *Primer* that sought to end all involvement in Vietnam.¹⁶⁰ President Maucker and his staff contemplated shutting down the university for the semester.

Following the national turmoil that erupted around the crisis at Kent State, over three hundred universities shut their doors for the remainder of the semester.¹⁶¹ On Monday May 11th President Maucker announced a plan that would allow students to withdraw from their courses without penalty or they could take their current grade for credit if desired. The offer was instituted to accommodate students who might "fear for

¹⁵⁸ "Student Strike Activities Call for Peaceful Demonstrations," *Northern Iowan*, 8 May 1970.

¹⁵⁹ Lang and Pendergraft, *A Century of Leadership and Service*, 367.

¹⁶⁰ *The New Prairie Primer*, 16 May 1970.

¹⁶¹ Lieberman, *Prairie Power*, xv.

their safety in campus or want to devote their full time to political activities against the Indochina War.”¹⁶² The announcement upset many faculty of the university; they believed their power as instructors was being infringed.¹⁶³ Many students and authors of the *Primer* differed in their responses to Maucker’s announcement. Yet when analyzing the rhetoric which is purveyed in the *Primer* and in the on-campus newsheet the *Northern lowan*, students’ attention and discourse had all but shifted away from the circumstances surrounding their local community and became exclusively focused on ending the Vietnam War. Therefore, few rallied on May 7th when Dean of Students Edward Voldseth and President Maucker announced that the UNI 7 plus the indicted members of the disrupting crowd that served a week in jail would be suspended until June 1, 1971.¹⁶⁴

Using the same tactics used in the Hoffmans’s case, the administration argued that it was not what the students were saying but how they were saying it. The disruptions and protests challenged the university’s authority. By suspending the perceived subversives, the administration reinserted its power over the students. By removing the students involved, the administration exhibited its conception of education as a privilege. Student dissent was silenced due to their apparent rejection of civility.

¹⁶² “Students get Option on Leaving,” *The Telegraph-Herald*, 12 May 1970.

¹⁶³ Lang and Pendergraft, *A Century of Leadership and Service*, 368.

¹⁶⁴ Edward Voldseth, “Letter to the Editor,” *Northern lowan*, 12 May 1970.

The University of Northern Iowa in the spring of 1970 was experiencing a phenomenon that was echoed nationwide on hundreds of college campuses. Fortunately, the protests that were occurring in Cedar Falls, Iowa were predominantly non-violent, unlike some other scenes that were occurring on campuses such as the University of California Berkeley and Kent State University. The events of 1970 were the culmination of political, social, and economic dissent that had infiltrated deep into the youth ethos of America over the previous decade. Angry over race relations, student rights, and the Vietnam War students of America's universities felt disenfranchised by the contemporary American culture. UNI underwent a transformative rebirth in 1969-1970. Increased activism inherited a perception of radicalism. A staff writer for the *Northern Iowan* retrospectively analyzed the academic year by stating:

The 1969-1970 academic year at the University of Northern Iowa was everything from outstanding scholastic achievement to outstanding humanitarian achievement. . . Some people find it very hard to believe that conservative little 'State College' had made such a fuss. . . Many still don't believe it. But the plain truth is this school has come out of its cocoon. It may not be able to fly well yet, but it is a butterfly nonetheless.¹⁶⁵

In the spring of 1970 students' tactics of expression evolved. Students used more aggressive means of dissent such as demands, sit-ins, rhetorical slander, and disruption as methods to insert their power. The influence of cultivated courtesy prevailed: protesters were dismissed, vilified, and delegitimized for failing to adhere to the social expectation of manners and civility.

¹⁶⁵ Craig Bancroft, "69-70 Saw Protest at UNI Become the Rule Instead of the Exception," *Northern Iowan*, Cedar Falls, IA: 15 May 1970.

CONCLUSION

The controversial ending to the 1970 spring semester symbolized the changing dynamic of activism and administrative authority at the University of Northern Iowa. People such as Tony Ogden and Peg Wherry became personifications of an American cultural transition that infiltrated deep into the heartland and changed UNI. The university environment during this era opened new avenues of expression, provided a release for suppressed ambition, and introduced students to a variety of demographics which helped establish networks and culture. The changing conception of education by faculty members such as Edward Hoffmans and Josef Fox challenged the *in loco parentis* authority of administrators and questioned what Paulo Freire called the “banking concept of education.” UNI’s students were culturally influenced by polarizing national events and symbols, helping embolden students to become more overt in their expressions. Ultimately, thanks to compounding contradictions of ideology, both actual and perceived, administrators tried to cultivate a culture of courtesy as a means to ensure authority and defuse controversy. Maucker and his fellow administrators used civility with good intension, but by vilifying those who they perceived as radical, students’ dissent was marginalized.

The Edward Hoffmans affair still arouses debate in the Cedar Falls community. What were the true reasons behind the dismissal of Hoffmans? We may never know. But if we are to assume it was indeed his teaching inefficiencies that got him fired, considering his style of instruction is important. Hoffmans teaching style was not

designed to be “the banking concept” of lecture and student regurgitation. Hoffmans challenged his students to think critically. A year before his controversial article the English Department had been critical of his instructional habits. But, following the publication of “From Dissent to Resistance,” Hoffmans became an in-the-flesh controversy. His time had to have been stretched between interviews, antiwar activities, lecture prep, grading, and in class instruction. Hoffmans was juggling responsibilities and convictions. Maucker rhetorically supported Hoffmans, yet was threatened by his opinions and style of teaching. Hoffmans encouraged students to resist authority. Maucker never deviated from his explanation for the dismissal of Hoffmans, and remained steadfast that it was Hoffmans’s ineptness as an instructor that led to his dismissal. Nevertheless I believe that Hoffmans was dismissed due to his radical opinions and expressions, as well as, his threatening teaching style that encouraged the resistance of administrative paternalism and active learning outside the classroom setting.

There was an immense amount of pressure upon Maucker to fire Hoffmans. William Severin of the *Waterloo Courier*, prestigious faculty members, and state lawmakers all encouraged Maucker to assert his authority over his campus. Hoffmans may have been a bad teacher, he may have been a horrible teacher, but in one of those great hypotheticals of history, if he had not published “From Dissent to Resistance,” would the administration have looked into his teaching competency? The inept teaching explanation may have been nothing more than a scapegoat of a reason in which to

dismiss Hoffmans. The administration rhetorically supported the preservation of Hoffmans's First Amendment rights, while actively restricting his rights in practice. As the situation began to snow ball and pressure mounted from Des Moines and Waterloo, Maucker had to have been searching for a legitimate reason to release Hoffmans. If he just broke down and fired him, Maucker would have appeared hypocritical and a weak leader. Instead, it appears that Maucker and his administration hid behind a cloud of ambiguity. The announcement was made (over winter break when the students were absent), an explanation was provided, and Maucker and his administration moved on, leaving many to speculate (including historians) about true motives.

The Hoffmans controversy scarred the student-administration relationship and marred Maucker's credibility with some students. Generally, Maucker is revered at UNI (even today) for his long beloved tenure as the president. During his twenty year presidency, Maucker witnessed unprecedented achievements academically and established a positive reputation in the state of Iowa for the teachers college. But, seen from within the context of his last three years, Maucker's legacy becomes a bit more complex. Maucker's commitment to *in loco parentis* and a culture of courtesy damages his reputation. The sources suggest Maucker was genuinely committed to the university and the students under his authority. He did what he felt was right. Awarded the Meiklejohn Award from the American Association of University Professors, Maucker had mixed criticism from his faculty. Appropriately so, Maucker has become a larger-than-life figure in the history of UNI and Cedar Falls. The Union built in 1968-1969 was given

his name, permanently memorializing his legacy. Maucker confronted controversy, made good decisions and some poor ones, and left a reverberating mark on the history of UNI and Cedar Falls.

An additional and lasting legacy forged during the last three academic school years of the 1960s was the publications *Campus Underground* and *the New Prairie Primer*. Aesthetically different than any other publication to have ever have been printed in Cedar Falls, the underground newspapers showed the cultural changes which altered the social dynamic of the entire community. The *University Free Press*, in the fall of 1967, was published as a preservation of free speech during the Hoffmans controversy. *CU* and *The Primer* were published with the intent to continue that fight for free speech and provide a networking base for college students throughout the region and Cedar Falls. The rhetoric from the pages of the underground press provided a cultural vibrancy and a literal ideological collaboration for the student dissenters on and off campus. *The New Prairie Primer* folded and ceased publication in December of 1970 due to lack of funding and subsiding campus activism. The papers were manifestations of active learning, played a pivotal role in forging social bonds, dictated and reacted to cultural deviations, and exasperated already contentious circumstances. The ad hoc journalists who contributed to *The Primer* or *CU* played a major part in organizing protests and defining talking points around campus. By becoming syndicated with the *Underground Press Syndicate*, *The New Prairie Primer* became coupled with the national underground newspaper movement.

The interplay of influences between local conditions and national forces altered the social dynamic of Cedar Falls. Administrators, students, community members, and faculty all experienced this alteration in their social reality. The chronological events related in this thesis provide a historical testament to this observed change during the time period evaluated. The history relayed suggests there was a tactic of cultivated courtesy by those in power as means to suppress confrontation. The moralistic principles dictated during the final years of the Maucker administration were conducive to the American conservative movement which gained steam in 1970s and 1980s. Maucker's concept of education and administrative authority may have become the norm. Although real opposition mounted during the late 1960s, compartmental education and encouraged civility are persistent characteristics of Northern Iowa's campus.

Preserved in an elegant display case in the majestic Great Reading Room of Seerley Hall, only one floor above the administrative offices at the University of Northern Iowa, sits a small exhibit accompanied with a photo of Edward Hoffmans.¹⁶⁶ The text praises Maucker for his preservation of free speech and refusal to fire a professor on the grounds of his expressions. The exhibit neglects to mention Hoffmans's dismissal. The display makes you think how courteous Maucker must have been for not firing this man, and how disruptive and radical Hoffmans must have been. That is the message and legacy of the Maucker years: be nice and courteous to each other, and

¹⁶⁶ Great Reading Room, room #116 Seerley Hall Wisconsin St, Cedar Falls, IA 50614.

don't cause disruptions, for the university will guide your academic development in the place of parental authority. This, of course, is oppressive to students and is counterintuitive to critical analysis and active learning.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barber, David. *A Hard Rain Fell*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2008.
- Bradley, Stefan. *Harlem vs. Columbia University*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
- Cohen, Allen. "The San Francisco Oracle: A Brief History," *Voices from the Underground*, 131-164. Tempe, AZ: Mica's Press, 1993.
- Frost, Jennifer. *An Interracial Movement of the Poor: community organizing and the New Left in the 1960s*. New York: New York University Press, 2001.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum Books, 1993.
- Geary, Daniel. "'Becoming International Again': C. Wright Mills and the Emergence of a Global New Left, 1956-1962," *Journal of American History* 95, no. 3 (December 2008).
- Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. New York: Bantam Books, 1987.
- Gitlin, Todd. *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Glessing, Robert J. *The Underground Press in America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.
- Gould, Lewis L. 1968: *The Election That Changed America 2nd Edition*. Chicago: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, 2010.
- Heineman, Kenneth J. *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era*. New York, London: New York University Press, 1993.
- Isserman, Maurice. *If I had a hammer: the death of the old left and the birth of the new left*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.
- Isserman, Maurice and Michael Kazin. *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Kessler, Lauren. *The Dissident Press: Alternative Journalism in American History*. London: Sage Publications, 1984.
- Lang, William C. and Daryl Pendergraft. *A Century of Leadership and Service: Iowa State Normal School 1876-1909 Iowa State Teachers College 1909-1961 State College of Iowa 1961-1967 University of Northern Iowa 1967- A Centennial History of The*

- University of Northern Iowa Volume II 1928-1976*. Cedar Falls, IA: University of Northern Iowa, 1995.
- Levitt, Cyril. "The New Left, the New Class and Socialism" *Higher Education* 8, no. 6 (November 1979): 641.
- Lieberman, Robbie. *Prairie power: voices of 1960s Midwestern student protest*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2004.
- Lyftogt, Kenneth L. *From Blue Mills to Columbia: Cedar Falls and the Civil War*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press, 1993.
- McCann, Linda. *Lost Black Hawk County*. Charleston SC: History Press, 2011.
- McMillian, John. "Our Founder, the Mimeograph Machine: participatory democracy in student's for a democratic society's print culture." *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 2, no. 2 (2009): 85-110.
- McMillian, John. *Smoking Typewriters: The Sixties Underground Press and the Rise of Alternative Media in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Melendy, Peter. *Historical Record of Cedar Falls: The Garden City of Iowa, containing a brief history of Iowa, of Black Hawk County, and a full and complete description of industrial and picturesque Cedar Falls*. Cedar Falls, IA: published by author, 1893. Reprinted by the Cedar Falls Historical Society. Cedar Falls, IA: Congdon Printing Company, 1981.
- Miller, James. *Democracy is in the Streets: from Port Huron to the siege of Chicago*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987.
- Olson, James S. and Randy Roberts. *Where the Domino Fell: America and Vietnam 1945-1995*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Ostertag, Bob. *People's Movements, People's Press: The Journalism of Social Justice Movements*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2006.
- Peck, Abe. *Uncovering The Sixties: The Life and Times of the Underground Press*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- Peterson, Gerald L. "UNI Fact Sheet," *Rod Library Special Collections*. 7 September 2011.
- Peterson, Gerald L. *University of Northern Iowa*. Chicago: Arcadia, 2000.
- Rorabaugh, W. J. *Berkeley at War: the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Sale, Kirkpatrick. *SDS*. New York: Random House, 1973.

- Schlesinger, Arthur M. *Almanac of American History*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1983.
- Schmitz, David. *The Tet Offensive: Politics, War, and Public Opinion*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005.
- Schrecker, Ellen W. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Schulman, Bruce J. *Lyndon B. Johnson and American Liberalism: a brief biography and documents*. Boston: Boston University, 2007.
- Small, Melvin. *Antiwarriors: The Vietnam War and the Battle for America's Hearts and Minds*. Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2002.
- Small, Melvin. *Covering Dissent: The Media and the Anti-Vietnam War Movement*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994.
- Stewart, Sean. *On the Ground: An Illustrated Anecdotal History of the Sixties Underground Press in the U.S.* Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2011.
- Streitmatter, Rodger. *Voices of Revolution: the dissident press in America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Wachsberger, Ken ed. *Voices from the Underground, Vol. 1, Insider Histories of the Vietnam era Underground Press*. Forward by Abe Peck. Temple, AZ: Maryland Institute College of Art, 1993.
- Wynkoop, Mary Ann. *Dissent in the Heartland: the sixties at Indiana University*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.