

THESIS

FEMINISM COMES TO CAMPUS:
WOMEN AT CSU 1960-1971

Submitted by
Andrea E. Russo
Department of History

In partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado
Summer 1994

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

FEMINISM COMES TO CAMPUS: WOMEN AT CSU 1960-1971

During the sixties students protested everything from restrictive social regulations to the Vietnam War. In this changing environment women, relying on skills learned in mainstream and protest activities, demanded changes for themselves. By the end of the decade these factors converged to foster the emergence of a feminist consciousness among some CSU women. In addition this thesis examines the important role of male student leaders, who had both a provocative and paternalistic relationship with women, in the development of feminism on campus.

Relying upon the student newspaper, the CSU Collegian, oral interviews, and other university materials from that era I demonstrate the importance of the campus to the emergence of feminism in the sixties and early seventies.

Chapter One examines the early protests of women and men against restrictive housing regulations and demonstrates that the fights against parietal rules was important for the formation of strategies and tactics that would be used later when feminists explicitly challenged gender-specific forms of university discrimination.

Chapter Two explores how local and national events of the mid-sixties influenced women activists at CSU and nurtured a budding feminist consciousness on campus.

Chapter Three, through an examination of women's organizations, shows that a feminist consciousness was clearly present on campus by 1968.

Andrea E. Russo
History Department
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523
Summer 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| ABSTRACT..... | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | v |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| CHAPTER I..... | 19 |
| CHAPTER II..... | 40 |
| CHAPTER III..... | 64 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 89 |
| SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 92 |

INTRODUCTION

Colorado State University (CSU) in Fort Collins, Colorado experienced a similar political and social unrest that affected campuses nationwide during the 1960s and 1970s. Tired of restrictive dormitory regulations and other rules that governed their social behavior and morals, American students challenged university administrations and rebelled against the universities' *in loco parentis* role. After demanding an end to curfews and dress codes, American students began to seek additional changes in university life. They demanded that ROTC leave their campuses and insisted on a greater role in university affairs. Of course, the antiwar movement and the civil rights movement were also central to campus unrest.

At CSU in the sixties and early seventies student efforts led to an end to dormitory hours for women, the establishment of a chapter of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), and the occupation of the Agriculture Building in a protest against on-campus recruitment efforts by Dow Chemical.¹ The campus environment was in flux.

¹James E. Hansen, II, Democracy's College in the Centennial State: A History of Colorado State University (Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, 1977), 444.

Traditional rules and roles were challenged and changed. In this changing environment women, relying on skills learned both in mainstream and protest activities, demanded changes for themselves. By the end of the decade these factors converged to foster the emergence of a feminist consciousness among some CSU women.

Local factors and conditions at CSU, an expanding university in a conservative town far from the media spotlights, shaped the tone of protest. By examining local conditions as well as student life and culture at CSU, one can gain a greater understanding of how student protest gave way to feminism for scores of young women in the 1960s and 1970s. Examining the activities of CSU women over the course of the 1960s and into the 1970s one can see how women's perception of their environment and their interests changed. Women became more political in their outlook and their demands evolved from demanding reform of parietal rules on the basis of their maturity to demanding alleviation of sexual discrimination.

In the early 1960s the student culture perpetuated traditional gender roles and stereotypes. An environment seemingly content with the status quo was not one that could nurture the development of feminism or encourage women to step outside traditional roles to demand equality with male students or to challenge a sexist university system (and society at large). As time went by the atmosphere at

universities was one in which students were encouraged by their peers to ask questions and to challenge traditional structures and authority figures. This environment was one in which the development of feminism was fostered, albeit inadvertently, and in which women felt more comfortable making demands for equal treatment.

The changing campus environment and women's participation in groups that challenged accepted modes of behavior were important elements in the development of feminism on campus. But the role of mainstream campus women's organizations in this process is also an important piece of the story. In order to survive in a changing campus environment mainstream groups had to adapt to meet the changing needs of the students that they served. While mainstream groups may have delayed demands for women's liberation by perpetuating stereotypical behavior and notions of womanhood they also served an important function. Thus, groups at CSU such as the Associated Women Students (AWS) and sororities were critical sites in which women developed leadership skills, and learned how the university system worked, and built support networks for women. The leadership and organizational skills proved critical to efforts to reform the system. AWS, in particular, was an example of a student organization that altered its mission in order to meet the increasingly complex needs of CSU women in a rapidly changing world. By the end of the 1960s AWS

had become one of the vehicles that feminists used to reform the system..

Male leaders and the campus press were also important agents in the development of campus feminism. The development over time of the relationship between male and female leadership and the ensuing relationship with the female student body is a critical element of the story. Male leaders on campus and particularly members of the student newspaper addressed gender issues in a provocative yet paternalistic fashion. While challenging women to take on the administration and demand greater freedom on campus they also tried to tell women how to make those challenges. Men initially encouraged women to reject parental restrictions but by the end of the 1960s women were rejecting male leaders and male structures and pursuing their own feminist agenda. What had begun as a movement for sexual freedom had by 1969 turned into a movement for sexual equality.

Before examining the development of feminism and the emergence of a women's movement at CSU it is first necessary to look at the reasons why the existing literature on the 1960s and 1970s is not adequate for a full understanding of women's lives on campuses across the country during this era. That literature includes histories of the new left, the feminist movement, and higher education. Histories of

the new left are important because they explore the emergence and context of the student protest movement, yet they ignore the importance of women and feminism in the movement.² The literature on the feminist movement obviously highlights the role of women in the movement yet fails to account for the development of feminism on campus. The literature on higher education in the 1960s and 1970s also misses the importance of university life in the development of feminism.

In describing those who participated in the new left movement Edward P. Morgan echoes other 1960s historians when he writes that

one persistent characteristic of the New Left was that its leaders were often among the most intelligent and imaginative students of their generation and that campus protest occurred predominantly at what were acknowledged to be the best institutions. Thus rebellion occurred not because students were exploited and left out of society's reward structure, but because they were most privy to those rewards.³

²Monographs on the 1960s protest include Edward P. Morgan's, The Sixties Experience: Hard Lessons About Modern America (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991), a memoir by SDS leader Todd Gitlin, The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage (New York: Bantam Books, 1987). Kenneth J. Heineman's Campus Wars. The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era (New York: New York University Press, 1993) examines anti-war protest at four large state universities. David Cate, The Year of the Barricades: A Journey through 1968 (New York: Harper & Row, 1988) and Ronald Fraser et al., Nineteen Sixty-Eight: A Student Generation in Revolt (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988) tackle the 1960s from a global perspective, as does Stephen Spender, The Year of the Young Rebels (New York: Random House, 1969).

³Morgan, The Sixties Experience, 116.

These purportedly defining characteristics of student activists and this periodization of the unrest exclude the efforts of both women and minorities who sought redress for long-standing forms of discrimination in the 1960s and into the 1970s, and excludes events at less prestigious universities. Other student demands for curricular changes, equality in athletics, higher minority enrollments, access to birth control, and other demands are relegated as addenda to "The Movement of the 1960s". In Changing the Future: American Women in the 1960s, Blanche Linden-Ward and Carol Hurd Green criticize the traditional periodization of the 1960s because it emphasizes "the conventional mode of identifying historical periods through presidents". They also point out that, according to this periodization, "for male political activists the promise of the sixties ended in 1969".⁴ Thus women are left out of the history of the sixties. This omission results in a "shaping of beliefs about the sixties" in which "the idealistic efforts of the sixties can seem dismissible as a grandiose failure".⁵

Monographs of the sixties do include women in their examination of the relationship between the counterculture, the sexual revolution and movement politics and draw the conclusion that sexual liberation was a different experience

⁴Blanche Linden-Ward and Carol Hurd Green in Changing the Future: American Women in the 1960s (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993), xvi-xvii.

⁵Linden-Ward and Green, Changing the Future, xvii.

for women than it was for men.⁶ The literature on the 1960s also examines the role of material culture in shaping the lives of young students. One characteristic of the youth of the sixties, particularly white youth, was that they grew up in a culture characterized by materialism, prosperity, opportunity, and privilege. This material prosperity had a profound impact on students. "Material comfort enabled many students to look beyond the quest for security. . .envisioning a post-scarcity society responsive to human values."⁷ Freedom from want accorded students, whites students in particular, the freedom to imagine a world different from their parents, to participate in protest activities, and ultimately to challenge the status quo. Forging the connection between the material culture and feminism, Wini Breines agrees that material conditions helped to make the movements of the 1960s, especially the women's movement, possible. Women, because of greater freedom from financial constraints were "freer to expand and

⁶Morgan, The Sixties Experience, 203. Morgan explains that "sexual "freedom" had its ugly side. Despite appearance, open sexual experimentation was not the same thing as sexual liberation". In Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), Sara Evans contends that some movement women "enjoyed their new "freedom". But many women were caught somewhere in the painful middle. They rejected social norms concerning sexual relationships but they were confused about what should replace them." 152.

⁷Morgan, The Sixties Experience, 88. Also see Linden-Ward and Green, Changing the Future, 399.

explore."⁸ As a result, historians argue, students became more introspective.⁹ This introspection, in turn, encouraged students to question "middle-class standards and lifestyles". For women this ultimately meant questioning "defining institutions like marriage and the family".¹⁰ Thus the affluence of American society provided fertile ground for the development of the third wave of feminism in the mid 1960s.

Although much has been written about the third wave of feminism, who the important leaders were, and when the important events occurred, very little has been written about the development and impact of feminism at the local campus level. Indeed, very little has been written to connect the third wave of feminism with campus protest. Historical literature that broadly covers the social and political movements of the 1960s concentrates on male leaders and their ideology. Although women were quite active in these movements, because they were excluded from positions of leadership their contribution to the movement is understated or absent. As Wini Breines explains,

We were active and important, but as a result of sexism, women wrote fewer documents and spoke less frequently than the men. . . . We women were leaders

⁸Wini Breines, Young, White, and Miserable: Growing Up Female in the Fifties (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992), 82.

⁹Evans, Personal Politics, 175 and Morgan, The Sixties Experience, chapter 5.

¹⁰Evans, Personal Politics, 175.

and were usually not taken seriously. As Sara Evans has pointed out, written histories of the new left use written sources, which confirm and exaggerate the invisibility of women.¹¹

All of this literature largely ignores the relationship between the campus environment and the development of feminism.

Literature on the women's movement is also centered on non-campus settings. It examines the rise of women's liberation from the civil rights movement and the new left and establishes the roots of liberal or mainstream feminism in such government agencies as the President's Commission on the Status of Women. This literature is important because it illuminates how women began to perceive the political nature of personal issues and how this new sensitivity spawned a feminist movement. The literature on the women's movement identifies the factors that influenced women to seek changes in society and to move beyond the sexism of the movement yet fails to identify how the daily experiences on campus contributed to this process. Yet clearly this process was being played out on college campuses when college women also began to perceive their environment in a new way and women's groups sprung up on campuses across the country.

¹¹Wini Breines, Community and Organization in the New Left: 1962-1968. The Great Refusal. (New York: Praeger, 1982), xiv.

To date the most important work on the roots of the women's liberation movement is Sara Evans' Personal Politics. Evans locates the origins of the women's liberation arm of the women's movement in organizations of the new left and the civil rights movement, specifically Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). The importance of Personal Politics lies in Evans' effort to show how women who were involved in other social causes gained an identity, and a feminist consciousness that propelled them to work on their own behalf. Women's experiences in the civil rights movement and the new left, and subsequently in their own consciousness-raising groups, enabled them not only to name the oppressor, but to claim an identity for themselves, as women and as feminists. Young women, for the first time, recognized their self-worth as individuals and their potential to gain power through a unified movement of women.¹²

Evans' focus is on the organizations of the new left and civil rights movement in which women were active and not on the activities and the atmosphere on campuses during the years of rebellion. Personal Politics is about specific groups of women who launched the women's liberation movement. Even so Evans articulates a number of reasons why the campus environment was conducive to protest and

¹²Evans, Personal Politics, see chapter 9.

subsequently to the development of feminist consciousness.

By the mid 1960s the student movement had increased both in its size and in its militancy. "The new campus militancy offered innumerable new opportunities for activism that were not as drastic, initially, as leaving to work in the south or in a ghetto."¹³ As the size of the movement expanded so too would the number of women who participated in protest activities. Simultaneously the focus of the movement began to change, protestors looked inward and began to see the oppression within their own lives. Students realized that the source of their oppression was the university.¹⁴ Evans argues that these changes, both the growth of the movement and this focus on improving the campus environment, had a tremendous impact on women who became more introspective and began to identify their own oppression as women.¹⁵ Yet as more and more students participated women got lost in the crowd. The movement had "rendered women invisible".¹⁶

What Evans fails to examine, however, are precisely those women who remained on campus, who did not go South or into Northern community organizing projects or to national

¹³Evans, Personal Politics, 171.

¹⁴Evans, Personal Politics, 174.

¹⁵Evans, Personal Politics, 174 and 175.

¹⁶Evans, Personal Politics, 176.

new left conferences. These women had to draw from their own experiences to launch campus women's movements.

Other literature on the women's movement also focusses on women who were not university students. Yet like Evans, a number of authors identify various reasons why university settings were important sites for feminist revolt. Writing in 1971 political scientist and movement activist Jo Freeman looked at the emergence of feminism on campuses.

The women's liberation movement did not begin on campus, but many of its roots lie deep within the academic setting, student movements, and movements in which students have participated in the last ten years. . . .The university has begun to be and will continue to be a testing ground for its ideas, an arena for some of its battles, a contributor to the conditions which make it necessary, and eventually a channel for furthering its goals.¹⁷

According to Freeman some of the factors contributing to the rise of feminism on campuses included an increase in the absolute number of both female and male students, as women became better educated they became "overqualified for the jobs offered them", and, finally, the university provided "a testing area for new interpersonal relationships which are causing women to question their roles within the traditional family structure".¹⁸ Linden-Ward and Green

¹⁷Jo Freeman, "Women's Liberation and Its Impact on the Campus," Liberal Education 57 (1971): 468.

¹⁸Freeman, "Women's Liberation", 469 and 470.

cite similar reasons why the university was a testing ground "for the new mores of the "sexual revolution".¹⁹

Sophisticated undergraduates scorned the naive innocence of traditional "panty raids". . . Rather, college women crusaded to end paternalistic *in loco parentis* rules that they sign in and out of dormitories, observe restrictive hours, and not have privacy with the opposite sex in their rooms. . . Other students targeted university health services for refusing to prescribe birth control pills to unmarried students.²⁰

Access to birth control and sexual exploitation in advertising are examples of local and personal issues that drew women to the women's movement. Breines explains that "like many other participants, I was oblivious at the time to many of the debates unfolding within the SDS leadership circles. Our local efforts proceeded independently of them, . . . That they did proceed independently was politically significant and informs my interpretation of the importance of the grassroots movement."²¹

Although not controlled by the national women's movement campus women were aware of the publicity surrounding it and aware that feminism was being played out at the national level. Flora Davis writes in Moving the Mountain,

¹⁹Linden-Ward and Green, Changing the Future, 370.

²⁰Linden-Ward and Green, Changing the Future, 370.

²¹Breines, Community and Organization in the New Left, xiv.

Though the mass media were, for the most part, hostile to feminism, they made its boom years possible. Starting in 1969, they lavished attention on women's liberation groups until there was hardly an American who hadn't heard of the movement. As a result, thousands of women joined feminist groups, tried consciousness-raising, and turned out for rallies and demonstrations.²²

While some women may have had a negative reaction to press coverage of feminist activities, for others the media attention given to the women's movement pushed them to question sexism and discrimination in their own lives and to seek strategies to eliminate it.

The literature on women in higher education also has a narrow focus that misses the impact of campus life on the development of feminism. It focusses on the academic aspect of women's lives: how women students were treated by professors, mostly male, the number of women pursuing higher degrees, the scant number of women in traditionally male dominated fields like the sciences. This literature examines the need for Women's Studies and how such programs were developing by the late 1960s and 1970s. In addition it examines the legal channels used to combat discrimination within the university setting.²³ What is missing from

²²Flora Davis, Moving the Mountain: The Women's Movement in America Since 1960 (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991), 106.

²³Mariam K. Chamberlain, ed., Women in Academe: Progress and Prospects (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988) and W. Todd Furniss and Patricia Albjerg Graham, eds., Women In Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Council on

this literature are the ways in which the social aspects of university life influenced the development of feminism and how women used the tools that they learned on campus and in campus organizations to develop a movement that addressed their concerns.

The most recent scholarship on women in the 1960s, Changing the Future, is the first to explore, albeit briefly, the social conditions at universities in search of the roots of feminism. Changing the Future suggests that restrictive social regulations such as early curfews could be a hindrance to a woman's ability to attend political strategy meetings. And yet it was these restrictions that first caused women to challenge traditional rules and to demand greater freedom in their lives. In the fight for an end to social regulations women learned how to fight the system. The experiences gained in this fight would be critical in future demands for women's liberation.

Similarly the Greek system, discriminatory in many ways, like women's governance structures, may also have had a paradoxical function. It provided "rituals to perpetuate mate-seeking",²⁴ and the sexual objectification of women, but at the same time it provided refuge for women from male dominated and sexist areas within the university. As places of refuge sororities could have delayed the development of

Education, 1974).

²⁴Linden-Ward and Green, Changing the Future, 159 and 89.

campus feminism. Yet, by teaching leadership skills and providing women centered activities, sororities may have provided an atmosphere within which women felt valued for the skills, talents, and ideas that they possessed rather than for their status as sex objects. Unfortunately inadequate documentation prevented a discussion of the role of sororities at CSU.²⁵

By the end of the 1960s organizers of women's caucuses, liberation groups, and women's studies sought to break down stereotypical myths about a woman's "proper" place in society. Within these groups women worked together to redefine their role on campus in order to gain a greater voice and presence in the traditionally male halls of academe. One can find some links between these seemingly dissimilar groups of women, sororities and liberation

²⁵My only source on sororities is my interview with Denise Burson-Freestone a student during the late 1960s and early 70s and president of Panhellenic in 1969-70. She said that women in sororities were mostly "concerned with personal success and not as interested in social change". Sororities were "holding on to tradition". However by 1970 Burson-Freestone said that Panhellenic realized the need for sororities to broaden their focus "outward and create change in the community" thus bringing the service function back to the Greek system. Sororities knew that they needed to change if they hoped to survive. Denise Burson-Freestone, interview by author, 3 May 1994, Fort Collins, Colorado, written notes.

Paula Giddings, In Search of Sisterhood: Delta Sigma Theta and the Challenge of the Black Sorority Movement, (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1988), 21, explains that the Black sorority Delta Sigma Theta, played an important role, both political and social, on campus during the 1960s. She also writes that "Black sororities have also had to grapple with how the concept of service is translated into political activism."

groups, while recognizing that the most obvious difference was the social emphasis of one group and the political emphasis of the other.

It is the aim of this thesis to examine the ways in which women students articulated their demands for change, developed strategies to bring about those changes at CSU, and interacted with male leaders and the campus press during a period of more than a decade of change, protest, and rebellion. By focussing on events at CSU, I hope to expand our understanding of the impact of student life and culture on the movement for women's liberation.

In chapter One I will examine the response of CSU women and men to social and housing regulations and demonstrate that the early fight against parietal rules was important for the formation of strategies and tactics that would be used later when feminists explicitly challenged gender-specific forms of university discrimination. Additionally Chapter One sketches the relationship between women leaders and men leaders, particularly Collegian editors, that at times was at the center of the women's quest for reform.

Chapter Two explores how the issues and demands of women had changed by 1966 and 1967, reflecting trends in the national women's movement and other campus social movements and demonstrating that a budding feminist consciousness was being nurtured at CSU. By 1967 women had learned the importance of working through mainstream organizations to

demand university reform while not yet ready to question male leadership in challenges to *in loco parentis*.

Chapter Three examines the events in the late sixties and early seventies when a clear feminist consciousness was evident on campus and demonstrates how this marked a change in how women perceived themselves and sexism in their campus community. In addition to forming feminist organizations, women confronted sexism and discrimination in various campus milieus from the student newspaper to the Department of Physical Education. In sum, I will demonstrate how women's involvement in mainstream campus organizations converged with student protest activities and women's increasing disaffection with inequality on campus to spawn a women's movement at CSU.

CHAPTER I

"TO KISS OR NOT TO KISS"

An era of unrest and discovery for American students began in the early sixties. From Freedom Summer to administration sit-ins, black and white students worked for and demanded civil rights, student rights and change in United States' policies toward other oppressed groups at home and abroad. Students at CSU were among those who participated in demands for social change. Most important to the history of feminism, by the early 1960s CSU students began to take notice of what they perceived to be constraints on their own lives and on their freedom of movement. Students' demands for freedom from social and living restrictions provided a training ground for activists who, later in the decade, would use these skills to make demands for increased input into university decision affecting student life and for others who would make feminist demands for women students. Indeed, students' response to CSU's social regulations reveals that campuses were important sites for the development of a feminist consciousness among the nation's young women.

CSU's student newspaper, The Colorado State University Collegian and other sources suggest that in the early sixties most women seemed to be ambivalent about hours and regulations. However a minority of women devised a variety of strategies either to evade or express their disdain for rules. Not yet feminist, this small group of women began to develop an awareness of themselves as women and a realization that women students were expected to perform under a set of rules that were both different from and unequal to those of their male counterparts.

The earliest protests at CSU centered around university housing and social regulations, particularly those governing women students. The Associated Women Students (AWS) was the governing body for CSU's women students. An elective body composed of an Executive Council, a Legislature and a Judicial Council, it was supervised by university housing personnel.²⁶ The AWS's Judicial Council was the body actually responsible for establishing house rules, rules that were supposed "to help women students develop personal responsibility and individual thinking. These rules should

²⁶Colorado State University, Associated Students and Student Personnel Services, CSU Student Handbook, 1960-61 (Fort Collins: Colorado State University, 1960), 28 and 52. The Student Handbook was provided by the Associated Students of Colorado State University and included information on university rules and regulations.

be regarded not for the discipline of but for the welfare of the majority".²⁷

University rules for women went beyond the regulation of hours in the early 1960s. In addition to regulating closing hours, which varied according to the day of the week and to the age or year of the student, AWS rules regulated the behavior of women students on and off campus. Not surprisingly, women had to abide by a number of rules that regulated their behavior with male dates, including curfews and prohibitions on entertaining men in their dorm rooms. Additionally, women's choice of living quarters was also restricted by University rules. Unless they lived at home, all women were required to live in university approved housing. For freshman that meant living in University residence halls. Other undergraduate women had the choice of living in residence halls, sorority houses, or university approved rooms in private homes. No undergraduate women were permitted to live in apartments.²⁸

Other guidelines required chaperons at all organized social functions and restricted kissing and other public displays of intimacy. The Handbook stated that "Public displays of affection, whether at the door, inside the

²⁷Student Handbook, 1960-61, 52.

²⁸CSU Biennial Catalog 59-60/60-61, (Fort Collins, CO: CSU, 1959), 41-42.

building, or in a parked car in the driveway, are considered to be in poor taste".²⁹

Although men had to abide by certain rules when in the presence of women and women's residences they were not restricted within their own living environments. Men did not have curfews. The Handbook stated that they "may come and go as they please providing their conduct and scholarship are satisfactory".³⁰

In loco parentis doctrines were alive and well at CSU as the sixties began. However, as the decade progressed, students began to protest university rules. Perhaps surprisingly, both male and female students were involved in these protests. Early protests were in the form of letters to the editor of the student newspapers. The first signs of discontent among CSU students surfaced in the spring of 1961 with letters from residents of Green Hall, a women's dormitory. The young women's criticism of social regulations was based on a desire to be treated as mature, responsible individuals. These women wanted freedom from restrictions and not equality with their male peers. Thus women were not quarrelling with the existence of social regulations on campus, per se, but with the rules that denied them the status of adults.

²⁹Student Handbook, 1960-61, 53.

³⁰Student Handbook, 1960-61, p. 54

On April 18 two letters appeared; one was signed by "some Green Hall residents" the other listed the initials of four individuals followed by the title "Fellow Sufferers".³¹ In addition to delineating the rules that had caused the most outrage, including new regulations regarding women's behavior in the dining room and rules monitoring their behavior when kissing men good night, the authors decried women's treatment as immature adolescents. The authors of one letter wrote,

We realize there must be certain regulations in force to manage a living unit of such size, but to make such living somewhat bearable there must be understanding on the part of those who enforce the rules.

College, as well as being a place for book learning, can be a person's only opportunity to acquire self-discipline, if it is permitted. We have come under the impression that we have surpassed the adolescent stage of irresponsibility.³²

Similarly the letter from the "Fellow Sufferers" entitled "Trapped in Green Cage" stated that "responsibility will be gladly accepted when placed at a sensible level in correspondence with our maturity. We have been out of grade

³¹Letter to the Editor, from Some Green Hall Residents, "Too Much Supervision," CSU Collegian, 18 April 1961, 2. Letter to the Editor, from Fellow Sufferers, "Trapped in Green Cage," CSU Collegian, 18 April 1961, 2.

³²Letter to the Editor, from Some Green Hall Residents, "Too Much Supervision," CSU Collegian, 18 April 1961, 2.

school for quite some time".³³ Subsequent letters and editorials on the dormitory issue cautioned university administrators that the students of today (1961) would never grow into responsible adults of tomorrow if constantly supervised by an "overly-strict parent".³⁴

Significantly, even though some students called on "Girls. . .[to] Unite Against Tyranny!"³⁵ there was no indication that women identified a need to fight against gender discrimination. Rather the women identified themselves as dormitory residents who demanded to be treated as adults rather than adolescents in their living units. They expressed anger over the university's refusal to grant them adult status yet seemed unaware that their experience also reflected gender inequities.

The women's protest letters apparently struck a chord with a number of CSU men. On April 20, 1961, two days after the first letters appeared, two hundred "angry young men" gathered at Green Hall to protest women's dormitory rules; the following day between three and five hundred male protestors demonstrated.³⁶ The Collegian claimed that

³³Letter to the Editor, from Fellow Sufferers, "Trapped in Green Cage," CSU Collegian, 18 April 1961, 2.

³⁴"Unrest in the Dorms," CSU Collegian, 19 April 1961, 2.

³⁵Letter to the Editor, from Fellow Sufferers, "Trapped in Green Cage," CSU Collegian, 18 April 1961, 2.

³⁶"Green Hall Rules Bring 200 Angry Young Men," CSU Collegian, 20 April 1961, 1. "Men Demonstrate Again At Women's Dormitories," CSU Collegian, 21 April 1961, 1.

men staged this protest against the "no necking in the lobby" regulation which they viewed as "ridiculous and overly restrictive".³⁷ The demonstration was apparently not an organized protest but a spontaneous gathering of men who were "egged on by female residents" of Green Hall.³⁸

Because the demonstration did not appear to have organizational support or leadership, university officials chalked it up to "spring fever";³⁹ it was unclear precisely why the young men gathered in front of the women's dormitories. A Collegian editor also saw the demonstration as an empty gesture. He claimed that there was no substance to the men's protest, writing, "One report we have from a reliable source is that the whole idea behind the. . ."riot",. . .was to have a panty raid".⁴⁰ However, subsequent letters to the editor showed that at least a couple of male students supported women's efforts to rid themselves of rules that accorded them the status of immature adolescents. One young man argued that "It is

³⁷Connie Tyler, "House Rules Touch off Riots," CSU Collegian, 26 April 1961, 1.

³⁸"Green Hall Rules Bring 200 Angry Young Men," CSU Collegian, 20 April 1961, 1.

³⁹"Green Hall Rules Bring 200 Angry Young Men," CSU Collegian, 20 April 1961, 1.

⁴⁰"Rioting Doesn't Help Situation," CSU Collegian, 21 April 1961, 2.

certain that something needs to be done to restore the self respect of which CSU's coed has been deprived".⁴¹

While disagreeing with the use of riot tactics The Collegian did find merit in the criticism of housing rules. In the days after the student protests and letters, The Collegian expanded the debate on women's social regulations by publishing a series of articles that examined the dorm rules and the reasons for the students' discontent. The Collegian took advantage of its position on campus to influence the debate and to attempt to direct the course of future action on the issue of women's hours. It seemed that the editor had little faith in women's abilities to handle the situation capably.

Significantly, The Collegian noted that the rules causing the most consternation were those established by women students themselves under the guidance of university administrators. Of all rules regulating students' behavior "AWS and house rules have been the target of much criticism".⁴² Furthermore, while The Collegian articles confirmed the legitimacy of the women's complaints they

⁴¹John R. McLaughlin, "Dorm Rules Paradoxical," CSU Collegian, 25 April 1961, 2. McLaughlin also suggested that AWS had no real power, "I believe the area in which greater responsibility should be given to women students is through Associated Women Students. At present this body supposedly has the needed powers to regulate the actions of women students. However, it would seem that it is being run by the administration rather than guided by it".

⁴²Connie Tyler, "Students Protest Dorm Rules," CSU Collegian, 25 April 1961, 1.

challenged the tactics used thus far by angry students. Though not opposed to organized demonstrations, The Collegian suggested that students work through rather than outside of the system to get the changes they desired.⁴³

A positive result of the uproar was that AWS was thrust into the limelight. The Collegian provided a forum for women to air their grievances while simultaneously criticizing the strategies that women were using to change the rules. Yet the assumption by the editor of The Collegian that he knew best how women at CSU could solve their problems was condescending and chauvinistic. This pattern would continue to surface throughout the 1960s as male leaders, particularly the editors of the newspaper, took on the role of protector of women. In the course of offering support to the women's cause they inadvertently perpetuated the notion that they were somehow superior to the women students and reinforced the very assumption that they were purportedly trying to break down - that women students were incapable of maturely handling their own lives.

At the same time the president of AWS also used The Collegian to address the campus community. In a guest column AWS president Fleeta Rowland tried to deflect student criticism, while telling women students that formal power

⁴³"A quiet protest demonstration might be one way to get attention from the powers that be, . . ." "Rioting Doesn't Help Situation," CSU Collegian, 21 April 1961, 2.

was available to them if they would only recognize and make use of it.

Every woman student on campus is automatically a member of this organization and therefore, has the means of helping to establish the government of matters of signing in and out, and determining hours after which she may not be out of her housing unit. Beyond this, just as each sorority sets certain standards to be met by girls living in its house, each dorm has a council which sets the standards it feels are minimal. . . for college coeds.

While there may be small minorities who wish to lower these standards, often these standards are elevated by individual girls who carry over ideals from home.⁴⁴

While Rowland insisted that only a minority of women were dissatisfied with their living regulations, the actions of this so-called minority generated a lot of debate and publicity. Indeed, for the first time, women, with the help of the Collegian, recognized the legitimacy of their discontent and brought their demands to the attention of the campus community.

Between 1961 and 1964 individual women continued to write letters to the editor indicating that they were chafing under university restrictions. Issues addressed in these letters included the small numbers of nights during which women were allowed to stay out until 2 a.m., dress codes, and other rules regulating dormitory behavior such as

⁴⁴Fleeta Rowland, "AWS Pres. Upholds Rules," CSU Collegian, 3 May 1961, 2.

the required distance between women's beds -- 18 inches.⁴⁵ However the AWS did not substantially reduce the restrictions of women students, presumably because the majority of women students did not oppose them.

It is difficult to determine precisely what most women thought of the regulations. Nonetheless, it is clear that the campus atmosphere in 1964 was not yet nurturing a feminist consciousness among women students. For those discontented with social regulations the rules were viewed as a bothersome reminder of the university's parental authority. Although students had become interested in other political issues they had not yet discovered the feminist or gender implications of challenges to *in loco parentis*. The campus had become a site for political discussion about other social and political issues between 1961 and 1964. There were challenges to compulsory R.O.T.C., guest lecturers were invited to CSU to speak about race relations and communism, and students staged protests against proposed tuition hikes.⁴⁶

Absent determined opposition to parietal rules from female students, John Hyde, editor of The Collegian, made quite clear his own opposition to them. Hyde opposed

⁴⁵Letter to the Editor, "Late Night Revision," CSU Collegian, 1 February 1962, 2. Letter to the Editor, "Why 18 Inches?" CSU Collegian, 22 January 1963, 2.

⁴⁶See the CSU Collegian for events during these years and the chapter entitled "From Silent Generation to Campus Unrest" in James E. Hansen II's Democracy's College.

parietal rules because they treated women like irresponsible children. Yet Hyde was even more critical of women for quietly by the rules than of the rules themselves.

Hyde's criticism was at a peak in 1964 when AWS was considering extending hours from ten to eleven o'clock on week nights for freshman women.⁴⁷ This was a golden opportunity for dissatisfied women students to become actively involved in making changes in the living requirements. Fearing that CSU women would squander the opportunity to "make all co-eds equal",⁴⁸ Hyde composed a scathing critique, not of parietal rules, but of women students' seeming indifference to them. Hyde wrote

If the girls of CSU fail themselves again, we can no longer hold any sympathy for their treatment as babies. Unfortunately the girls, particularly those in residence halls, have given every indication that they do not care whether or not they are forever to be the bird in the gilded cage.⁴⁹

Hyde's editorial is revealing for a number of reasons. First, Hyde's concern was with women's apparent lack of interest in "adult" freedom no with male privilege. Secondly, Hyde indicated that there was no solidarity among women. Women in the early 1960s identified themselves

⁴⁷John Hyde, "Hour Gang," CSU Collegian, 6 February 1964, 2.

⁴⁸John Hyde, "Hour Gang," CSU Collegian, 6 February 1964, 2.

⁴⁹John Hyde, "Hour Gang," CSU Collegian, 6 February 1964, 2.

according to age or year in school rather than by their sex. Thus not all women, particularly upperclass women, seemed to favor these new hours for freshman. Hyde "quoted" some of the reasons why women opposed later hours for freshman women.

Arguments against seem to have all the weight of any unreasonable line of reasoning: "we went through it why shouldn't they"; "this is our last superiority over underclassmen"; "there's nothing much to do after ten anyway"; and "who cares".⁵⁰

What Hyde did not recognize was that some women had individual strategies for dealing with the restrictions by circumventing rules and operating outside of normal channels. Ten months after Hyde's editorial one of his colleagues would be at the center of a controversy that demonstrated just how political and emotional women's individual challenges to *in loco parentis* could be.

An incident that occurred in the fall of 1964 indicates that some women, instead of voicing their discontent through AWS, letters to the editor, or other channels, chose to quietly break the rules and take the freedom that university rules did not grant them.⁵¹ Presumably women who broke

⁵⁰John Hyde, "Hour Gang," CSU Collegian, 6 February 1964, 2.

⁵¹"Dean Douglas Reports Rise in Women Student Violations," CSU Collegian, 23 April 1965, 1. The Collegian reported that the types of rules violations committed by women included "falsification of sign out, no sign out, disturbing the peace, and students entertaining a person of the opposite sex in their apartments or rooms".

the rules did so in order to find immediate relief rather than slow reform of a system in which the desired results were by no means guaranteed.

In December 1964 the university discovered that the Managing Editor of the Collegian, twenty-one year old Vicki Hays, had been living in unapproved housing, where hours were not enforced, since early fall of that year. Hays had moved off campus when she was still twenty. Thus she was in violation of university housing policy.⁵² Hays moved because her job at the Collegian required her to keep late hours which meant it would be impossible for her to meet university curfews. Hays had intentionally violated university policy. After Hays turned twenty-one the university discovered the violation and "she was given the choice of moving into a dormitory or leaving school. The fact that she had now reached adult status did not matter. . . . she had willfully violated a University regulation and would have to accept appropriate disciplining".⁵³ Hays appealed the decision and lost. Rather than move into a dormitory and return to being treated as an immature child

⁵²"Miss Hays asked to return to dorm," CSU Collegian, 1 December 1964, 1. Apparently breaking the rules was not uncommon. The Collegian reported that "a surge for freedom and independence in the last three years has created a rise in the number of CSU women students violating the University's policies concerning presence of in men's apartments and sign outs. . . ." "Dean Douglas Reports Rise in Women Student Violations," CSU Collegian, 23 April 1965, 1.

⁵³Hansen, Democracy's College in the Centennial State, 447.

she withdrew from CSU and enrolled at the University of Colorado.⁵⁴ Hays lamented that CSU would not treat her as an adult able to manage her own affairs. Hays's protests against university policy reflect those of the women protestors who preceded her. Hays wanted to be treated as a responsible, mature adult; she did not indicate that she felt singled out because she was a woman and thus subject to different standards of behavior than her male peers.

Throughout the ordeal Collegian editor John Hyde was anything but silent. In his defense of Vicki Hays, Hyde wrote eloquently on the topic of *in loco parentis*. Hyde wrote

It seems to me that the doctrines of "implied consent" and IN LOCO PARENTIS are two more forms of a rather unhealthy trend now existing in the nation which states, in essence that the people don't know how to govern themselves. . . .

What all of this is saying is that students should be allowed to learn for themselves, to live as they want to live, to make MISTAKES as they happen to, and to learn from those mistakes, and to do all of this under the CIVIL COURTS and not under university parentalism. . . .Students should be prepared to fight for their rights whenever they can.⁵⁵

According to historian James Hansen, Hyde's analysis "provided compelling rationale for the assertion of the

⁵⁴"Vicki Hays to leave; loses housing fight," CSU Collegian, 19 January 1965, 1.

⁵⁵John Hyde, "The Route We Shall Follow," CSU Collegian, 9 December 1964, 2 and 3.

student power movement".⁵⁶ Yet it seems that CSU students, including John Hyde, were not prepared to challenge the discriminatory nature of women's social regulations. In fact, although a minority of students expressed a negative view of university rules, according to a university survey conducted in the summer of 1965 shortly after the Hays incident, most students voiced support for the university's regulation of women students.

This survey was conducted by the CSU Office of Student Development conducted surveys to determine how various groups (students, parents, etc.) perceived the university's relationship with the students. The University was trying to determine what type of relationship should exist between students and the University in light of recent local and national events "which indicate substantial changes" in those relationships were needed. The University was attempting to prevent the outbreak of "violence and other extremes of protest" such as were recently experienced at Berkeley.⁵⁷

Responses to the survey showed that students believed that women should be treated according to their age (maturity) but did not believe that women should be treated

⁵⁶Hansen, Democracy's College, 448.

⁵⁷Burns E. Crookston, et al, "A Study of Attitudes Concerning University Relationships with Students," in Student Services Research Reports: Vol. IV, 3, by the CSU Office of Student Development (Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, 1966), 2.

equally with men. Although it did not enumerate reasons for the various viewpoints or break down the respondents according to gender, the survey is useful because it specifically targeted parental and student attitudes regarding the regulation of social and residential life. Section IV of the survey, A Study of Attitudes Concerning University Relationships with Students, focussed on university living regulations.⁵⁸ Participants were asked to agree or disagree with statements regarding living regulations for students. The report concluded that

Students appear to agree with statements that women should report where they will be when they plan to be away from campus for extended periods, that women over 21 should be allowed to live in housing of their own choosing, that men should be able to entertain women students in their living quarters, that there should be hours for women under 21, and that parents should be notified before their daughter is allowed to move from the residence hall.

Students appear to disagree with attitudes that would require hours of only freshmen women, allow men to visit women's rooms in residence halls, and require all freshmen to live in residence halls. On such things as allowing students to live in unsupervised residences, permitting men to visit women's rooms, allowing a son to move off-campus without consulting the parents, and limiting supervision of housing to campus situations, the students appear to be divided.⁵⁹

⁵⁸Crookston, et al., "A Study of Attitudes," 2-3.

⁵⁹Crookston, et al., "A Study of Attitudes," 26. Students strongly supported the statement that "Senior Women Should be Free to Come and Go Without University Restrictions" and on a related topic students indicated that Freshmen and Sophomores should be subject to more restrictions than older students; while seventy-nine percent of students and eighty-three percent of student leaders surveyed disagreed with the

PAINDIABSTRACT UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Although campus regulations were increasingly vulnerable to criticism, student responses indicate that the double standard was alive and well at CSU in 1965. Clearly the perception of how women should be treated and how women should behave changed as they became older. Not until a woman was twenty-one was she deemed mature enough to handle the same amount of freedom as the majority of male students, regardless of their age. That there were discrepancies between rules for men and rules for women remained perfectly acceptable.

The Student Development surveys provide only a partial glimpse at student feelings about living restrictions but combined with the results of a similar study done at UCLA one might speculate on some of the other reasons for support of women's hours. In order to combat problems administering women's hours, UCLA conducted a survey of student leaders in the early 1960s that measured how students felt about the rules. Although not conclusive, the resulting "list of points for and against continuing the closing hours system"⁶⁰ aids the understanding of women's reactions toward dormitory rules at CSU.

statement that "Restrictions on Men Students Should be Similar to Those Placed Upon College Women". Crookston, et al., "A Study of Attitudes," 27, 29, 30.

⁶⁰T. Roger Nudd, "Re-Examination of Closing Hours for College Women," The Journal of College Student Personnel 5 (March 1964): 173.

Women's support for regulations at UCLA indicated that women students felt that they were in need of both protection and guidance in social as well as academic milieus. Among women's responses were the following statements about women's hours,

Some women would stay out too late, and their studies would suffer if there were no closing hour.

Some women are happy to have this excuse [closing hours] to "get rid" of a date they don't like.

The later the hour, the less resistance a woman has to the advances of a man.

The later the hour, the greater the tendency for both men and women to let their emotions control their actions.

A woman student has to control the conduct of a date. Closing hours help her in setting standards that her parents would want her to follow.

On the other side students had this to say about regulation of women's conduct

Women should have the same privileges as men.

Closing hours offer no real protection for women since something can happen as easily before as after the stated hour.

The concept of closing hours implies distrust of the student.

At present some women feel that they must stay out until the closing hour to avoid the implication that they have not had a good time.⁶¹

Some of these responses were similar to the sentiments expressed in letters to the editor written by CSU women.

⁶¹Nudd, "Re-Examination of Closing Hours for College Women," 172-174.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY / HARRIS

Women were clearly ambivalent about their lives under *in loco parentis*.

In sum, at CSU, the campus environment had proven fertile ground for the airing of women's complaints. As late as the 1965/66 academic year CSU women students were still subject to restrictive social rules, but there had been a gradual relaxation since 1960.⁶² A minority of women, with the support of some male students, by employing a range of strategies had voiced their discontent with the rules. However, women were not yet willing to launch a unified fight on their own behalf. The reasons for the lack of unity among women in the early years seemed to stem from their own inability to transcend age and residential differences to identify with each other as an oppressed group.

Societal and university perceptions about women were also obstacles to an organized movement of women. Women under the age of twenty-one were deemed too immature to be granted full responsibility for their own lives. And although women students wanted greater room to develop into mature adults, apparently they were still hesitant to give

⁶²In 1960 all freshman women had a 9:30pm curfew while upperclass women had an 11pm curfew Sunday through Thursday. All women had a 1am curfew on Fridays and Saturdays. Student Handbook, 1960-61, 52. By 1964-65 freshman women's Sunday through Thursday curfew was also extended to 11pm. Student Handbook, 1964-65, 49. By May 1966 "Women students. . .if granted permission, by the Dean of Women, . . .may live anywhere they want to. . . ." "Dean's Office Liberalizes Women's Housing Rules," CSU Collegian, 13 May 1966, 1.

up some of the protections from men that parietal rules afforded them. There may have been a desire on the part of some women students to have arbitrary rules to fall back on to protect themselves from their own emotional (and hormonal?) desires and those of their male counterparts. Women sought greater freedom and trust from housing authorities at the same time that they mistrusted their ability to control their own moral conduct.

Although women were not yet organized, they successfully used the Collegian to draw attention to their cause and generated debate around campus. As we will see in the next chapter women used old tactics and developed new organizational strategies to demand equality with men in addition to freedom from social rules. The paradoxical relationship between male leaders and female students also persisted as women pushed harder for university reform.

CHAPTER II
WOMEN DECLARE WAR

At 10:45pm on May 11, 1967 2500 CSU students convened at Moby Gym for a Stay-Out to protest women's housing regulations.⁶³ This was the first large-scale protest against women's living conditions in the growing crusade for expanded student rights at CSU. Both the tactics and the attitudes of women students had changed since 1965 when Vicki Hays had been forced to leave CSU for violating university living regulations. For the first time women organized themselves to fight housing regulations and they also began to talk about equality with men.

How and why had the tone and tactics of women's grievances altered so dramatically? By 1966 the message of the Civil Rights movement was widespread, antiwar groups were organized and students were talking a lot about rights and democracy on a broad scale. Students were increasingly making a connection between their personal situations and

⁶³Mike Vaiana, "Stay-Out Climaxes With Mass Meeting," CSU Collegian 12 May 1967, 1.

broader societal problems.⁶⁴ Women borrowed the language and some to the tactics of these other causes to challenge university social regulations and break out of traditionally female modes of behavior.

At CSU, AWS also provided a necessary social space where women developed leadership experience thus, while movements for minority rights served as role models, and the ideology of the civil rights and student power movements provided a vision of a different future, women students also made use of traditional campus organizations to demand change. These ingredients were critical to the development of a feminist consciousness among women students at CSU. In her examination of the roots of women's liberation, Sara Evans speaks indirectly to the situation at CSU as she identifies the things that were "essential preconditions for an insurgent collective identity"⁶⁵.

(1) social spaces within which members of an oppressed group can develop an independent sense of

⁶⁴In Personal Politics, 173-4, Sara Evans examines the introspective turn that the Movement took. "There [at the university] they found much to protest: the community of scholars meshed in a thousands ways with corporate America, providing weapons research, training corporate managers, producing knowledge and technology according to corporate need, aiding the selective service, spying on its own students, acting as overzealous parent, continuing racial stratification through restrictive admissions policies, and exploiting the surrounding communities. Any of these issues could incite moral outrage, but in addition students not only saw their environment as corrupt, they saw themselves as oppressed."

⁶⁵Evans, Personal Politics, 219.

worth in contrast to their received definitions as second-class or inferior citizens;

(2) role models of people breaking out of patterns of passivity;

(3) an ideology that can explain the sources of oppression, justify revolt, and provide a vision of a qualitatively different future;⁶⁶

At CSU in the mid 1960s, women felt increasingly constrained by the *in loco parentis* rules under which they had to live. However, despite increasing irritation and discussion about women's hours, by 1964-65 very little had changed. Hours had gone from 9:30 p.m. on Sunday through Thursday for freshman women and 11 p.m. for upperclass women in 1960-61 to 11 p.m. Sunday through Thursday for all women. Curfews on Friday and Saturday nights remained unchanged at 1 a.m.⁶⁷ And CSU women were still expected to conform to certain standards of dress. The 1964-65 CSU Student Handbook stated:

It is expected that the women of Colorado State University will always represent themselves and the University in the most appropriate manner. It is with this in mind that these standards for dress have been set.

1. Bermuda shorts, slacks, and jeans should not be worn to classes, libraries, or in any University building during regular school hours. However, this attire may be worn in the bowling alley, the coffee shop and activities workshop of the Student Center.

2. If permission is granted by the instructor, bermuda shorts, slacks and jeans may be worn in

⁶⁶Evans, Personal Politics, 219-220.

⁶⁷CSU Student Handbook 1960/61, 52 and CSU Student Handbook 1964/65, 49.

laboratory classes, physical education classes, and during final week.⁶⁸

Although there had been little change in the rules regarding students' behavior, by 1966 administrators found it increasingly difficult to enforce parietal rules on a rapidly changing student body. In the period between Vicki Hays' departure and the Stay-Out, CSU students took greater notice of the political and social changes that were taking place beyond their immediate campus environs. The Vietnam War and the draft were the issues that garnered the most attention in the pages of the student newspaper. In the fall of 1965 the Associated Students of Colorado State University (ASCSU) passed a resolution stating its support for President Johnson's Vietnam policy and sent it to him along with a letter of support.⁶⁹ Although it appeared that a majority of CSU students supported the war, a minority of students began to speak out against U.S. policy in Vietnam. A chapter of Students For A Democratic Society (SDS) was formed at CSU in October in order to "locally. .

⁶⁸CSU Student Handbook 1964/65, 50.

⁶⁹"On Viet Nam," CSU Collegian, 13 October 1965, 2. A survey on student opinion conducted a week later indicated that a majority of those surveyed supported U.S. foreign policy. "Students Discuss Viet Nam," CSU Collegian 22 October 1965, 2.

.combat the policy of the war in Viet Nam".⁷⁰ In addition to an increasing number of debates on the war, racial discrimination on campus and in the Fort Collins community, academic freedom, and women's hours became frequent topics of discussion around campus.

The heightened interest in social issues was paralleled by increasing activism. The student newspaper reported during the early months of 1966 that involvement in AWS was on the rise. The CSU Collegian reported that the number of programs and opportunities for involvement available through AWS was the greatest reason for the "sharp increase in participation".⁷¹ "Clearly the interest in AWS is increasing. This fall over 30 women applied for the four judiciary positions in Corbett hall."⁷² One woman who was active in AWS explained the importance of her involvement

AWS gives 4,372 women the opportunity to learn and the challenge to change. It can broaden the education of the CSU coed, . . . By having women represented on its legislature, it can reflect some

⁷⁰"SDS Has Been Given Tentative OK," CSU Collegian, 21 October 1965, 1. In an editorial following the passage of the ASCSU resolution John Hyde argued that the reason for ASCSU support of the war was due to the fact that students don't care and have "no moral claim to the war". John Hyde, "All the world despises a coward," CSU Collegian, 19 October 1965, 2.

⁷¹Janet Niebruegge, "AWS Participation Increases; Possibilities Lean to Future," CSU Collegian, 24 January 1966, 3. The CSU Collegian accurately pointed out that AWS was an important place for women to gain experience and skills in leadership positions. Janet Niebruegge, "CSU Men Help Finance AWS," 21 January 1966, 8.

⁷²Janet Niebruegge, "CSU Men Help Finance AWS," CSU Collegian, 21 January 1966, 8.

of the viewpoints of the women to the administration, community and campus. When discovering the current concerns, it can translate them into a new program or change.⁷³

Not only was participation on the rise but AWS programs were evolving in order to meet the needs of women students. In addition to putting on social functions and investigating women's hours, AWS sponsored a program entitled "The Pill" in which a panel was to "lead a discussion of facts concerning contraceptives and their effects on the roles of women".⁷⁴

AWS's panel discussion of oral contraceptives is evidence of a significant move towards a feminist consciousness among CSU women. That women were discussing birth control demonstrated their interest in having greater freedom and control over their reproductive lives. Discussion about birth control at CSU also reflected a trend occurring in the national women's movement.⁷⁵ For feminists reproductive freedom was a critical ingredient in the fight against biological determinism.⁷⁶ At CSU women

⁷³Charlotte Cornelieus, "Associated Women Students' Elections Scheduled Tuesday," CSU Collegian, 20 February 20 1967, 5.

⁷⁴Janet Niebruegge, "AWS Presents Officer Candidates," CSU Collegian, 2 February 1966, 1.

⁷⁵Winifred D. Wandersee, On the Move: American Women in the 1970s (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1988) 89, suggests that "Birth control was a major feminist issue of the 1960s and 1970s which became politicalized by concern about the birth control pill, as well as the controversy over abortion".

⁷⁶Evans, Personal Politics, 215 and 217.

were able to discuss the pill but they were not able to obtain them on campus for "financial and moral reasons". The director of the Student Health Center reported that "the main reason for the pill's non-distribution is the dangerous nature of the pills. . . .If the pills could be refined to the point that they are safe. . .they would be prescribed only to married students".⁷⁷

By 1966 women students' view of *in loco parentis* policies had also changed. Women now saw parietal rules as more than just obstacles to maturity and greater responsibility. It was evident that women's consciousness was changing as they talked more about equality and less about freedom from parental authority. In addition to their feelings of displeasure at being treated like children, women students began to articulate an awareness of unequal treatment between women and men at the university.

Once again the primary target for criticism was dorm hours. In January 1966 Suzanne Palmer, a member of the CSU Collegian staff, wrote an editorial praising CSU for its

⁷⁷"Alley Discusses Pill's Place At CSU," CSU Collegian, 3 November 1966, 4. "In 1971, the Colorado legislature enacted a family planning statute establishing the state's policy on contraception. The statute directs that "all medically acceptable contraceptive procedures, supplies and information. . .be readily and practicably available to each and every person desirous of the same regardless of sex, race, age,. . .marital status, . . ."Dissemination of contraceptive information is authorized in schools. . . ." Alan Guttmacher Institute, Family Planning Services: Focus of State Initiative. Colorado (New York: Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1975) 11.

involvement in projects for human rights such as the Peace Corps and local anti-poverty efforts. However, Palmer suggested that CSU was neglecting, even undermining, the human rights of women students. Palmer suggested that university housing regulations were depriving women over the age of 18 of their rights. "In the state of Colorado, a woman can "be on her own" at the age of 18, but at CSU this isn't true."⁷⁸ Palmer challenged the idea that hours were a protective measure for women. For hours to truly be protective then "shouldn't hours be extended to the men, too?"⁷⁹ By drawing a connection between women's treatment on campus and women's treatment in the workforce Palmer demanded that action be taken to modify women's hours -- within reason.

I've heard educators and professional people complain that women cannot get the same salaries or opportunities as those of men. They say, however, that nothing can be done.

At CSU, however, something can and should be done.

. . .let's consider CSU's position and once again lead the way to equal opportunity and equal rights.

Let's allow upperclassmen to decide where they want to live regardless of their sex. Men need no parental permission to live off campus. Why should women?⁸⁰

⁷⁸Suzanne Palmer, "On Women's Rights," CSU Collegian, 6 January 1966, 2.

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Ibid.

Two weeks after Palmer's editorial another one appeared arguing that women's hours gave men an academic advantage, clearly suggesting that women's hours were an example of sex discrimination. Women's hours, 11 p.m. on weeknights, prevented women from taking advantage of the newly expanded library hours.

Thank you, administration, for so generously increasing the library hours for CSU men. . .

And isn't that precisely what you've done? . . . out of approximately 4,100 women who are enrolled at CSU and who expect to benefit equally with men from expansions of such programs as library service, a total of 3,293 cannot benefit from this particular improvement.

These 3,293 women live in "approved" housing and must therefore be back to their respective dwellings by 11 p.m. Sunday through Thursday. For most of them that would necessitate leaving the library premises by about 10:30 p.m.

It becomes rather obvious that these 3,293 are reaping absolutely no benefit from the added expense and effort on the part of the library to extend its hours to 12 p.m.

Maybe matters can be justified and the cause of equality preserved if women are given an extra two weeks to work on papers in lieu of the extra 7 1/2 hours per week advantage the men have on them. . . .

Wouldn't it just be easier to do something about women's hours?⁸¹

Although not yet willing to demand equal treatment for all women students, the rhetoric of the ongoing campaign for liberalization of social regulations had clearly changed. Some women were finally perceiving women's hours as a form of discrimination based solely on sex. But women were not

⁸¹Hoffman, "For Men Only," CSU Collegian, 19 January 1966, 2.

yet organized to fight the social regulations with which they were dissatisfied. Women would have to use more than just the editorial page to convince the administration to agree to expanded hours and freedom to live off campus for women.

Off campus housing rules would be the issue that galvanized women to organize on their own behalf. As of May 1966 upperclass women under the age of twenty one were only allowed to live off-campus if they had permission from the Dean of Women's Office. In order to be granted permission a woman would have to be in a "unique situation" that made it imperative for her to live off-campus. "Acceptable reasons for off-campus petitions include financial, health, psychological and other individual barriers that make it impossible for undergraduate women to reside in dormitories."⁸²

There was one woman who felt this restriction on women was too stringent. On January 23, 1967 the headline "Coed Urges New Views on Rights" splashed across the front page of the CSU Collegian. Sophomore Randi Black, fed up with restraints placed on women's housing options, "proposed [to AWS] that the girls should organize and prepare a resolution concerning their right to live off-campus. . . .as long as

⁸²Tom Noel, "New Housing Policy Modifies Existing Rules Explains Dean," CSU Collegian, 18 May 1966, 1.

they have parental approval."⁸³ Housing restrictions, argued Black, were preventing the CSU coed from having "the chance to face up to responsibility, responsibility that the coed must experience before she leaves this institution to make her own life".⁸⁴ Unlike previous attempts to change women's housing regulations, Black had obviously given her proposal a lot of thought because she had developed an organizing strategy. And, Black indicated that she was looking at the implications of *in loco parentis* beyond campus life. Her words suggested that she was aware that the traditional role of women in the outside world had changed and that CSU women were not being prepared to take on these new challenges. The CSU Collegian reported that Miss Black's group had formed three committees to organize the "protest actions."

(1) a law committee, which is checking up on the rights of women 18 years old and over; (2) a communications committee, which is checking into other University policies; and (3) a drafting committee, which will draw up the final proposal.⁸⁵

Black was not the only one fed up with being treated unfairly. Another student, in a sarcastic letter to the

⁸³Ken Elliot, "Coed Urges New Views on Rights," CSU Collegian, 23 January 1967, 1.

⁸⁴Ken Elliot, "Coed Urges New Views on Rights," CSU Collegian, 23 January 1967, 1.

⁸⁵Ken Elliot, "Coed Urges New Views on Rights," CSU Collegian, 23 January 1967, 1.

editor, accused the Administration of discrimination against women students. She charged that women were treated as immature and seen as intellectually and biologically inferior to men on campus. The author facetiously proposed some "new rules" for the CSU coed.

Whereas it is universally recognized that college females are. . .inferior to their male counterparts. . .we propose the following changes to be made as a logical result of current tightening dormitory policies. . . .Bathroom hours: 7:00-7:05 a.m. 4:00-4:05 p.m. There will be not [sic] taking of showers or flushing of toilets at any other than the above mentioned times as the noise is not conducive to successful study. . . . All women students must be in the residence hall one-half hour after sunset. A chart pertaining to hour of sunset daily will be distributed to each woman student for a small mandatory fee (\$3.00) to be included with the room and board fee.⁸⁶

Clearly there was an audience for Randi Black and her proposals.

Randi Black named her group Women Are Responsible (WAR)⁸⁷ and worked through AWS in order to take advantage of its resources. AWS knew what procedures and channels to pursue in order to seek reform. The WAR committee strengthened its position by garnering the resources and support of AWS.

After almost a month of research the WAR committee released its findings and its plan of attack. First Black

⁸⁶"New Rules," CSU Collegian 3 February 1967, 2.

⁸⁷"WAR Brainstorms Questions Tonight," CSU Collegian 8 February 1967, 3.

itemized the University's objections to the WAR proposal and then listed WAR's response to those objections.

In summary, the university objections to the proposed changes in women's housing regulations as seen by WAR, are:

-- The University has placed itself in a dangerous financial situation by over-building residence hall facilities.

--The University's role of in loco parentis requires that it act as guardian over students in the absence of parents.

--By requiring women to live on campus, the University protects them from temptations which they may not be prepared to handle.

--Secretary of the State Board of Agriculture Charles L. Terrell has questioned the advantages off-campus housing provides that residence halls do not.

In summary, the WAR committee's replies to these University objections are:

--Is it fair to place restrictions on women rather than men to rectify the University's financial mistakes?

--Institutions can rarely respond sensitively to individual needs but can only apply general regulations as impartially as possible.

--Women are confronted by sexual temptations at all times. If a woman wishes to lose her chastity or be promiscuous, residence hall closing hours and rules are not 'maximum protection.'

-- A student living in the residence hall must regulate his life to conform with dorm schedules and policies, which are not always to the student's advantage or best interests.⁸⁸

In addition to conducting research on women's living regulations the WAR committee worked hard to garner student support for changes through other student organizations. WAR gained unanimous support from AWS and SDS was also

⁸⁸"WAR Releases Reply Justifying Proposals," CSU Collegian, 24 February 1967, 4.

actively "petitioning for women's rights".⁸⁹ By early April WAR had revised its timeline in order to gain "approval of the Housing Advisory Committee and the Student Life Committee" before going before the State Board of Agriculture in May.⁹⁰ According to the Collegian towards the end of the month ASCSU passed a resolution

calling for the liberalization of women's rights at CSU. The resolution read "ASCSU Legislature strongly requests all University agencies and individuals involved in housing policy changes, including the Student Life Committee, to approve as soon as possible a revision of housing policy, so that any or all women will be allowed to reside off campus, if they so desire, in any housing they wish."

The resolution also called for the abolition of women's hours.⁹¹

In addition, ASCSU member, Bruce Randall claimed that dean of women, Janet Douglas, and dean of students, Burns Crookston both backed the "proposal of extending women's off campus rights".⁹²

⁸⁹Melanie Winter, "Women's Rights Get Yes In Unanimous AWS Vote," CSU Collegian, 3 March 1967, 8. At the same time Black clarified that the proposal did not have anything to do with women's hours but "it outlines a plan giving women, after their freshman year, the right to choose dorm or off-campus residences".

⁹⁰Cathy Rubin, "Additional WAR Action Hinges On University OK of Proposal," CSU Collegian, 15 April 1967, 1.

⁹¹Roger Lipker, "Women's Rights Get ASCSU Support," CSU Collegian, 26 April 1967, 1. Two days later the CSU Collegian reported that the Student Life Committee passed a resolution similar to the one passed by ASCSU. "Student Life Votes to End Hours, Required Housing," CSU Collegian, 28 April 1967, 1.

⁹²Roger Lipker, "Women's Rights Get ASCSU Support," CSU Collegian, 26 April 1967, 1.

At this stage in the campaign for liberalization of women's housing regulations an old trend resurfaced; men's voices and opinions on the issue were beginning to overshadow those of women. Collegian coverage focussed on the ASCSU resolution and redirected the debate from one on women's hours to one on student power.⁹³ Why were men so interested in fighting for women's rights? Was it because they felt solidarity with their sisters who were cooped up in university housing? It was more likely that men, in tune with the growing student power movement at campuses across the nation, saw in women's hours and housing restrictions a convenient target for their own burgeoning student power demands. What better issue to try out their rhetoric and organizing skills on than women's hours; lessons learned in this campaign would be useful tools for later student demands for more responsibility in running their own affairs on campus. Charlotte Davis, the Assistant Dean of Women in 1967 commented that CSU men who fought for women's rights saw themselves as "our protectors" and "I felt strongly that men didn't give a hoot about women's hours but used [hours] as a vehicle for student power/rights".⁹⁴

In their defense of women's rights male leaders brought out some important points while couching their words in

⁹³See the CSU Collegian, 1 May 1967 and 11 May 1967.

⁹⁴Charlotte Davis, interview by author, 6 May 1994, Fort Collins, CO, written notes.

sometimes patronizing tones. CSU Collegian editor John Gascoyne wrote,

The entire idea of rules for women which are substantially different from those for men is nothing more than a double standard. The school says to one segment of the student body that it is a mature group of young people capable of looking out for itself. . . .and says that the remaining segment of the population is too immature to be on its own. . . .The whole thing is really rather simple and should be easy enough for even the simplest coed to resolve. The Constitution of the United States guarantees freedom to all of its citizens. It is not the function of an institution to abrogate this freedom from 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. five nights a week. . . .To disregard rules which have an invalid basis is not to commit a moral wrong. Dear young ladies, if you want to stay out late, by all means do so. . . .The only thing that is necessary is for you to recognize the wrong and for enough of you to decide to act against it.⁹⁵

While offering his support to CSU women, Gascoyne was simultaneously reinforcing the attitude that the stereotypical woman was incapable of recognizing and solving her own problems without help from men.

Gascoyne was not the only man to question the women's ability to solve their problems. After attempts to create change through proper administrative channels did not meet with satisfactory results, ASCSU called "for a student strike against CSU's archaic and unequal housing regulations".⁹⁶ The Collegian published an editorial on

⁹⁵John Gascoyne, "Equaler Than Thou," CSU Collegian 1 May 1967, 2.

⁹⁶Editorial Staff, "Collegian Stand," CSU Collegian, 11 May 1967, 1. On May 10, 1967 the CSU Collegian reported that the ASCSU Legislature had passed a resolution requesting that

the front page signed by six male members of its staff eloquently praising the ASCSU action as a significant step for the future of student rights and student power at CSU. The discriminatory nature of women's rules was no longer the primary issue - student power was.

Let it be understood that this action is not hasty or ill-considered. This is not student revelry or fun and games. It is not an exercise. It is a question of moral principle and the basic human right of students to govern their own affairs. . . .We may see the first move towards significant student power on the CSU campus.

The Legislature has taken a strong stand on this issue and the reaction of students to the proposed strike may well determine the effectiveness of future action in the continuing move towards granting students a greater voice in their own affairs. We therefor encourage every student. . .to support the strike to the fullest extent of his capabilities. . . .The CSU COLLEGIAN supports this strike, not just on the question of women's hours, but on the firm belief that students should and must be given the predominate [sic] voice in regulating the affairs that concern them. . . .it is a travesty that student affairs should be controlled by the administration from a point of view of administrative convenience and out-dated in loco parentis considerations. . . . Students are beginning to recognize and reject the administrative attitude of a benevolent guardian's

the "State Board of Agriculture take immediate action on women's housing and hours. . . .If these actions are no taken by the State Board, the ASCSU has 'no alternative but to organize, encourage, and condone orderly resistance". . ." Kathy Rubin, "Women's Hours Resolution Referred to State Board," CSU Collegian, 10 May 1967, 3. The State Board of Agriculture on May 10 referred the resolution back to President Morgan for consideration thus prompting the ASCSU to take action. Paul Zito, "Governing Board Refers Women's Hours Resolution To Morgan For Decision," CSU Collegian, 11 May 1967, 1.

approach to social planning for a mass of students who are not recognized as individuals.⁹⁷

By May the campaign had been co-opted by the male dominated ASCSU and the Collegian. There was no evidence that WAR or AWS was upset that their power had been usurped. Although it is impossible to know why the women allowed the men to grab the spotlight away from them there may be two explanations. The women, so used to men being in control, may have seen the power play as typical behavior and did not think to oppose it. Or else the women were confident enough that their own well-planned strategy of going through the system would get the rules changed and that it was not worth becoming upset when the men grabbed the spotlight.

The ASCSU sponsored Stay-Out, overseen by ASCSU representative-at-large Bruce Randall, had the support of student leaders including AWS president Cam Corbin who stated "I am for this action in that in principle it shows equality of women".⁹⁸ Although the Stay-Out was supported by WAR and AWS, the power of women leaders had been usurped by men eager to drive the vehicle of student power.

Two weeks after the Stay-Out the ASCSU proposed a resolution to empower ASCSU to make further revisions in

⁹⁷Editorial Staff, "Collegian Stand," CSU Collegian, 11 May 1967, 1.

⁹⁸Cathy Rubin, "ASCSU Votes to Stage Demonstration of Concern For CSU Women's Rights," CSU Collegian, 11 May 1967, 1.

women's hours after Fall quarter 1967. One female legislator saw the resolution as a slight to AWS. The conversation that ensued illuminated at least one man's opinion of AWS.

Steve Johnson then asked AWS representative Janet Braly what the function of AWS is. She replied that the primary function. . .is regulating and making regulations toward women's hours. Johnson then stated that in his opinion "the more power we take from AWS, the better off the student body will be."⁹⁹

Clearly Johnson did not respect AWS. This lack of respect explains why rather than supporting WAR and AWS in their initial campaign, male leaders grabbed control and largely eliminated women from the process.

At 10:45 p.m. on May 11 students began assembling at Moby Gym. A group of six speakers, 5 men and one woman, was scheduled to begin speaking at 11:05 p.m., five minutes past women's curfew. An estimated crowd of 2500 students were assembled at the Stay-Out poised to hear the speakers.¹⁰⁰ In general the speakers praised the students for taking a stand for student rights. Collegian coverage of the event focussed on the words of male speakers both at the Stay-Out and at events that took place during the day reinforcing the fact that the rights of women were not a priority concern of the men.

⁹⁹Mike Vaiana, "ASCSU Slashes Own Funds; Coed Rights Resolution Tabled," CSU Collegian 24 May 1967, 1.

¹⁰⁰Mike Vaiana, "Stay Out Climaxes With Mass Meeting," CSU Collegian 12 May 1967, 1.

At an informal discussion in the CSU Student Center earlier in the day a number of male speakers criticized the women who would not be attending the Stay-Out. Former Collegian editor John Gascoyne said that he "considers the CSU women "Criminally selfish" who refuse to get off their "duffs" and do something about women's hours. . . .he termed the women who refused to participate. . ."not cowards, but 'chicken'". Another male student announced that "CSU coeds usually get what they deserve." He questioned how long the "CSU coeds are going to continue to put up with the hypocrisy of AWS and 'in loco parentis'". Still another Collegian staffer said, "If the CSU women can't cut the university umbilical cord, then they must remain choked by the University apron strings."¹⁰¹

Women's reaction to the Stay-Out and reasons for supporting the student strike were largely ignored by the student press. Yet it was women students who risked being penalized for breaking their curfews by attending the Stay-Out.¹⁰² Some women took it upon themselves to inform the campus community of their participation in the Stay-Out through letters to the editor. One woman wrote, "My own

¹⁰¹"Stump Session Discusses Women's Rights," CSU Collegian 12 May 1967, 5.

¹⁰²"Dorm Heads Say 'Late' Penalties Remain Uncertain," CSU Collegian 15 May 1967, 1. "We don't know what action will be taken against the women who attended the demonstration Thursday night," said Miss Jan Ingram, Green Hall head resident. Similar responses were received from the head residents of the other coed and women's dorms yesterday."

reason for supporting the demonstration was to try to make people realize that I am a human being with opinions and ideas. I am first a human being and then a female. I will not be satisfied with belonging only to the subset."

Another wrote "Let us take responsibility for our own lives at least. You cannot hold us off as thinking, acting persons for ever".¹⁰³

Marilee Rowe, reflecting on the Stay-Out nearly 27 years later, remembers that it was a "really heady experience. [I felt that I] was making a statement and doing something naughty. [The Stay-Out] was quite a scene". Asked why she participated Rowe said that "curfews were bothersome. They bugged me. Hours became a subject of discussion -- [it became] obvious that it was [affecting] all dorms and not just our dorm. The irony was the [notion] that we needed to be protected [yet] it was a very dark campus. . .rape [was] your fault."¹⁰⁴ Rowe stressed the personal significance of the Stay-Out yet conceded that most women probably did not see it in the larger context of women's rights.

¹⁰³Dixie Darr, "Dear Fred," CSU Collegian, 17 May 1967, 3 and Pamela L. Fair, "Good Thing Happening," CSU Collegian, 17 May 1967, 3. Other letters appeared on May 15, 1967. Also on May 17 two women wrote explaining that they did **not** support the Stay-Out. "Not Qualified," CSU Collegian 17 May 1967, 3.

¹⁰⁴Marilee Rowe, interview by author, 11 April 1994, Fort Collins, CO, written notes.

Finally on May 25 the CSU Collegian reported that President Morgan had released a statement on women's hours. President Morgan had reached a decision after carefully considering how students, parents, and the university would be affected by a change in housing regulations. President Morgan credited AWS and WAR for influencing his decision with the carefully researched information that they supplied to him. Then President Morgan announced the new rules.

Here is the summary of rules proposed to be in effect beginning fall quarter 1967:

1. The privilege of living off campus in unsupervised housing. . .be extended to junior women. . .[with] parental approval. . . .
2. The current 11 o'clock permission on week nights be extended to 12 o'clock and the 2 o'clock privileges on Friday and Saturday nights, now limited to a specified number of weekends each quarter, be allowed each weekend that school is in session.

Finally, I am approving the recommendation of AWS Judiciary that there be established a task committee to research and evaluate women's rules and regulations thoroughly.¹⁰⁵

The new rules represented minor changes in living regulations for women. Although the new rules represented only a partial victory for women students they had learned some valuable lessons during the campaign. Women learned to use mainstream organizations to challenge specific rules. The cooperative relationship between WAR and AWS was especially important. The women involved demonstrated both

¹⁰⁵"Morgan Releases Statement on Women's Hours," CSU Collegian, 25 May 1967, 1.

maturity and responsibility in the task that they undertook. In addition, the women who attended the Stay-Out reinforced the message that students were unhappy with the current state of affairs. At the very least they proved that they understood how to reform the system through the proper channels. At the same time, women reinforced their commitment to liberalized rules by risking punishment and turning out in force for the Stay-Out.

The campaign for liberalization of women's hours also revealed an apparent competition for leadership between men and women. Women had learned how to use mainstream organizations but were not yet questioning male leadership in any overt fashion.

ASCSU and the Collegian used women's hours as a vehicle for a compelling argument for student rights and power at CSU. Although they showed a tremendous lack of sensitivity and respect for the women of WAR and AWS, men's participation in the debate over women's rules was important. By organizing a mass action the male leaders provided an opportunity for many students to get involved in campus affairs and to pressure the administration for change. They were able to demonstrate to the administration that students supported an end to *in loco parentis* at CSU.

By the late 1960s CSU women would no longer be willing to quietly let men direct their agenda. In the past male leaders had provoked CSU women to reject the *in loco*

parentis role of the university. By 1968-69 male provocations would prompt women leaders to reject not only university sanctioned discrimination but male leadership and chauvinism as well demonstrating that a feminist consciousness had truly arrived at CSU.

CHAPTER III

WOMEN'S LIB: FROM THE DORM ROOM TO THE STEAM ROOM

In 1968 the tenor of student demands at CSU had changed. It had become clear during the late sixties that the campus environment was an important site for the development of a feminist consciousness, among both women students and faculty. The breadth of the movement provided a lot of opportunities in which women could participate. Women were affected by the changes that were taking place in their campus environment and a few committed women activist took special note of the national movement for women's liberation. CSU women took advantage of opportunities for involvement in campus affairs and also took on new personal challenges.

The late sixties was a period of many firsts for women on campus. For the first time a woman was named Editor of the Reach supplement of the Collegian in 1968.¹⁰⁶ In early 1969 Colleen O'Connor became the first woman editor of the Collegian since 1951.¹⁰⁷ Just days after O'Connor's

¹⁰⁶Bill Mann, "'Reach,' Sports Editors Are Named," CSU Collegian 4 October 1968, 1.

¹⁰⁷Roger Lipker, "Colleen O'Connor Named 'Collegian' Editor," CSU Collegian 21 February 1969, 1.

appointment Meredith Springs almost became the first woman president of ASCSU.¹⁰⁸

In addition to these "firsts" the women's movement became more sophisticated. The issue of housing and social regulations had not yet been put to rest but, in the closing years of the 1960s, women attacked these rules with more sophistication and greater fervor, followed through with their demands, and did not, as they had in the past, allow male leaders to co-opt their movement.

The reaction of men to the increasingly radical women's movement ranged from serious consideration of the issues to angry and defensive attacks against those women's "libbers". Some male leaders, tried to reframe the debate. It seems the young men at CSU could not easily shed the role of protector and the patronizing tones that indicated they knew better how to liberate women than women did. But the women activists of the late 60s and particularly of the early 1970s remained undaunted and stuck to their course of action - on their own terms.

Between 1968 and 1970 the CSU campus had undergone many changes and been the site and target of a myriad of student

¹⁰⁸Aurora Gallagher, "Miss Springs: Must Open Communication Channels," CSU Collegian 26 February 1969, 1. Meredith Springs, enjoying unanimous support from the Collegian staff, became a write-in candidate for the presidency.

The success of her candidacy forced a run-off election between herself and the incumbent (who was re-elected one week later). Lee Pierce, "Randall Wins In A Landslide," CSU Collegian 6 March 1969, 1.

protests. Broad demands for an end to *in loco parentis* and greater student involvement in university decision-making processes evolved into student demands that reflected the issues, characteristics, and militancy of national movements for social change.

Actions and issues were intensifying at CSU as they were at campuses across the country. Edward P. Morgan describes the Movement scene this way,

Consumed by the war overseas, rebuffed by a resistant mainstream culture, battered by repression at home, and spinning out of control, the Movement lost its sense of euphoria, its belief that it could save the world by simultaneously saving its soul. Despite the countercultural quest for community, the late Sixties and early Seventies were a time of chaos and division rather than purpose and unity.¹⁰⁹

Perhaps the most innocuous, but hardly unnoticed, of the large student demonstrations at CSU was one organized under the auspices of student power. In October of 1968 the ASCSU president engineered the liberation of the Student Center. This liberation centered around student demands for "full control" of the Student Center "including the authority to sell beer in the Center".¹¹⁰ Although in keeping with the theme, from earlier in the decade, of ending *in loco parentis* this protest demonstrated the great

¹⁰⁹Morgan, The Sixties Experience, 217.

¹¹⁰Hansen, Democracy's College 449. For a full account of the student center liberation and other student demonstrations see Hansen's chapter entitled From Silent Generation to Student Unrest.

lengths that students were willing to go to in order to draw attention to their demands.

Meanwhile the anti-war movement gathered steam. "At Colorado State University momentum behind the anti-war movement mounted steadily in accordance with the national political climate. . . .the pursuit of peace was often marred by decidedly unpeaceful overtones."¹¹¹ In addition to larger and larger anti-war demonstrations students occupied the Agriculture Building in protest against on-campus recruitment by Dow Chemical, the manufacturer of napalm.¹¹² Civil rights activism heated up when charges of university racism came to a head at CSU in 1969.¹¹³ Minority students had used proper channels to address their concerns but they also staged an occupation of the Administration Building and demonstrated on the front lawn of the president's home.¹¹⁴

Women's participation in campus protest prepared them for their own battles against gender discrimination. Women were not influenced by campus issues alone. By 1968 a new wave of feminism was sweeping the country and women at CSU

¹¹¹Hansen, Democracy's College, 453.

¹¹²Hansen, Democracy's College, 455.

¹¹³In addition to the formation of BSA, Chicano students also organized themselves. The Mexican-American Committee for Equality (M.A.C.E.) allied itself with B.S.A. in 1969 to demand minority student rights. Hansen, Democracy's College 457-458.

¹¹⁴Hansen, Democracy's College, 458.

were responding to this national movement that spoke directly to issues of gender. Betty Friedan's The Feminist Mystique had been on bookshelves for five years, the National Organization for Women, founded in 1966, was working for women's civil rights and by 1968 women in the new left were leaving male-dominated organizations and forming feminist ones.¹¹⁵ Campus women knew about the women's movement because feminist activity had gained the attention of the media.¹¹⁶ Feminists with their "outrageous assaults on such cultural icons as Miss America, motherhood, and marriage" had become newsworthy by the late 1960s.¹¹⁷

By late 1968 and early 1969 a discernible change in CSU's women's movement had occurred. Although women were still battling to change dormitory regulations their rhetoric and strategy had changed. Some women, an active few, had become radicalized. Birth control and abortion

¹¹⁵Linden-Ward and Green, Changing The Future, 410 and 413.

¹¹⁶Linden-Ward and Green, Changing the Future, 421. "Demonstrations were often small in scale, but gained media attention. . . ." One event that gained a lot of media attention was a demonstration to protest the objectification of women at the 1968 Miss America pageant. Sara Evans writes, "Even though the coverage of such events was likely to be derogatory--in reports of the Miss America demonstration the media coined the term "bra-burner"--the dramatic rise in media coverage in 1969 and 1970 provoked a massive influx of new members into all branches of the feminist movement." Personal Politics, 214.

¹¹⁷Evans, Personal Politics, 22.

increasingly became topics of discussion. Committees and task force were established to investigate discrimination. As they had for women in the movement around the country, consciousness-raising groups became an integral part of women's liberation at CSU. Just as the other social movements had become more violent and radical, so too did the women's movement adapt its strategy and rhetoric in order to adapt to the changing campus environment.

By 1969 the nature of AWS had changed although it was still at the forefront of the movement to change women's housing regulations. AWS was particularly interested in changing the rule requiring that sophomore women live in the dorms.¹¹⁸ AWS announced in 1968 that its focus was changing, "the emphasis it [AWS] has placed on social function is becoming passe, and a new wave of social responsibility has emerged".¹¹⁹ In 1969 an AWS representative stated that

AWS is tired of this traditional image of the woman's place. The role is keeping women home having babies and taking care of the kids, which isn't compatible [sic] with the college education women receive today. . . .¹²⁰

¹¹⁸"AWS Seeks Dormitory Reform," CSU Collegian, 27 April 1970, 8.

¹¹⁹"It's A Woman's World," CSU Collegian, 2 October 1968, 8.

¹²⁰"AWS Sponsors Women's Days," CSU Collegian 14 February 1969, 10.

The purpose of AWS events she said should be to "stimulate and challenge CSU coeds intellectually".¹²¹ In keeping with this more politicized role AWS sponsored panels and debates to facilitate discussions on birth control and abortion.¹²² AWS was on the cusp of feminist consciousness.

In the past the fight for changes in women's housing regulations lacked the sophisticated language that housing rules were a form of gender discrimination focussing instead on student rights and freedom. With this new outlook of AWS, women no longer molded their demands to fit the language of the student power movement.

The change in attitude at AWS was reflected in the more politicized demands for abolition of women's housing rules. AWS was no longer merely seeking an end to dorm regulations so that women could enjoy more freedom and responsibility. At issue for AWS was not the desire for women to be treated as adults but sex discrimination; sophomore women and not sophomore men were required to reside in the dorms.¹²³ Additionally when male leaders attempted to get in on the action AWS demanded that the men respect the ability of

¹²¹"AWS Sponsors Women's Days," CSU Collegian 14 February 1969, 10.

¹²²"AWS Sponsors Debate on Birth Control," CSU Collegian 3 February 1969, 11. and "Opinions on Legalized Abortion Vary," 24 February 1970, 4.

¹²³Tracy Ringolsby Jr., "Resolution Says Housing Rules Are Discriminatory," CSU Collegian, 23 November 1970, 1.

women to handle the issue in their own way. AWS President Barb Umlauf commented that

Because AWS has been working through channels and has planned a definite course of future actions. . .we (AWS) resent interference from. . .his group. They have never consulted us (AWS) and aren't informed on the issue of sophomore women's dorm requirements.¹²⁴

Umlauf emphasized that the men were "completely unqualified to represent the cause of women's liberation".¹²⁵

In the midst of its work to abolish the sophomore dormitory requirement AWS established a CSU Commission on the Status of Women the mission being "to create an environment in our society which will encourage women to use their abilities to their fullest potential".¹²⁶ The establishment of this Commission was a direct result of the national women's movement's effort to combat discrimination.¹²⁷ The Commission, in the fall of 1970

¹²⁴"AWS Seeks Dormitory Reform," CSU Collegian, 27 April 1970, 8.

¹²⁵"AWS Seeks Dormitory Reform," CSU Collegian, 27 April 1970, 8.

¹²⁶CSU Associated Women Students, "Annual Report of the Commission on the Status of Women 1970-71," (Fort Collins, CO: CSU Associated Women Students, 1971), 5. The Commission met for the first time on Oct. 1, 1970. It was established as an ad hoc committee of AWS comprised of "students, university faculty, administrators and community people". "Annual Report", 1.

¹²⁷Rosalind Rosenberg traces the development of Commissions on the Status of Women in her book Divided Lives: American Women in the Twentieth Century (New York: Hill and Wang, 1992). In 1960 President Kennedy, at the behest of Esther Peterson, established the Presidential Commission on

took the leading role in the campaign to end the sophomore living requirement. By maneuvering through the proper university legal channels the Commission successfully achieved an end to the discriminatory requirement. Finally in March of 1971 CSU's governing body, the State Board of Agriculture, voted to "do away with sophomore dorm requirements". The reaction to this move from the vice president of AWS was simply, "It's about time."¹²⁸

Although it is difficult to determine how many women were formally members of women's organizations (and it is possible that the same women belonged to more than one group) there were at least two identifiable groups that took on the cause of women's liberation. AWS, as we have already seen, was the mainstream organization that took on the challenge of reforming the system by going through proper channels. The other group, although usually just called feminists or members of Women's Liberation, was the CSU

the Status of Women (PCSW) "to explore ways of winning greater economic equality" for women. The PCSW submitted a report in 1963 that recommended "a series of changes in employment policies, state laws, and in the provision of social services. Changes should begin, . . . with the federal government, which should act as a showcase for the nation by leading the assault against discrimination". The PCSW "prompted the eventual establishment of fifty state commissions to carry on its work at the state level. . . . State commission laid the groundwork for future change. . . by bring together many knowledgeable and politically active women to deal with matters of direct concern to women. . . . As the evidence of women's disadvantages mounted, the commissions created pressure to fight for greater equality." 180 - 187.

¹²⁸Phil Cohenour, "Board Votes To Abolish Sophomore [sic] Dorm Rules," CSU Collegian, 9 March 1971, 5.

Radical Women's Caucus.¹²⁹ This group of radical women took part in consciousness-raising¹³⁰, encouraging women to "realize [themselves] as individuals, develop [their] abilities, and determine the direction of [their] lives".¹³¹ In addition, part of the mission statement of this group was to "regard the elimination of traditional female and male roles as vital to our own liberation. Both men and women must be freed from the dehumanizing and oppressive concepts of "masculine" and "feminine".¹³² Strategies to accomplish such goals included activities that ranged from taking karate classes to taking women's history

¹²⁹Pat Baker, "Be prepared for what might happen," CSU Collegian 7 October 1971, 9. Although rarely referred to by name in the sources some women who wrote letters or articles for the Collegian identified themselves as belonging to this group. From the sources available I am unable to determine whether this was a university recognized student group or an informal group of women organized around a common mission.

¹³⁰Consciousness-raising was a strategy used by women's groups across the country "to politicize individual women through informal, confessional discussions with friends about experiences of discrimination in their personal lives". Blanche Linden-Ward and Carol Hurd Green Changing the Future, 436. Sara Evans argues that consciousness-raising groups became the "primary structure of the women's revolt" because "the qualities of intimacy, support, and virtual structurelessness made the small group a brilliant tool for spreading the movement". Personal Politics, 215.

¹³¹"Sisterhood On Campus, Part I," CSU Collegian, 11 October 1971, 5.

¹³²"Sisterhood On Campus, Part I," CSU Collegian, 11 October 1971, 5.

classes to setting up women's health clinics and cooperative child care centers.¹³³

Although it is unclear whether the feminists at CSU defined themselves as "radicals" and "reformers", the projects that they took on reflect these differences. Historian Winifred Wandersee describes the differences among feminists at the national level as

differences of style, priority, personality, and ideology rather than substantial differences with respect to issues. The basic distinction . . . is between the "reformers" and the "radicals".¹³⁴

Essentially reformers worked through the system to influence public policy. "Reformers" were active in party politics and members of mainstream organizations like the League of Women Voters and the YWCA. "Radicals" saw the system as the problem and sought personal solutions to political problems. Radical feminists were the force behind women's centers, women's studies programs, and other alternative institutions designed to give priority to women's issues.¹³⁵

The two feminist groups took on a variety of issues at CSU. Dorm rules and their discriminatory nature were not the only targets of women's indignation. The objectification of women in the advertisements that graced

¹³³Pat Baker, "Be prepared for what might happen," CSU Collegian 7 October 1971, 9 and "Sisterhood on Campus, Part II," CSU Collegian, 12 October 1971, 4.

¹³⁴Wandersee, On the Move, xii, xiii, and xv.

¹³⁵Wandersee, On the Move, xv.

the pages of the school newspaper and equal access to campus facilities also caught the attention of both organized women's liberationists and individual women. Women had clearly begun to take notice of ways in which they were treated differently than men by the mostly male Establishment. Some women made it their mission to raise the consciousness of other women and men to this exploitation and discrimination.

In addition to the campaign against the sophomore living requirement there were three incidents that indicated the willingness on the part of women students to explore different avenues and strategies to bring the issue of discrimination, and the subsequent demand for change, to the attention of the CSU community.

One of the favored forms of protest throughout the sixties and the easiest way to garner the attention of a large segment of the student population was through the Letters to the Editor page of the student newspaper. In October 1970 a letter written by Peggy Slater indicated that the ideas of Women's Liberation had reached CSU. Slater was writing in regard to an advertisement in the Collegian for "Stud Boots" picturing a woman in a miniskirt straddling a pair of men's boots. Slater was objecting to the sexual connotations and the "tastelessness" of the ad.¹³⁶ A rash

¹³⁶Peggy S. Slater, "Tasteless Ad," CSU Collegian, 23 October 1970, 2.

of letters in support of and against Slater adorned the Letters to the Editor page in subsequent publications of the Collegian.

The tone of the letters written by women who supported Slater's opinion is significant. One letter in particular, signed by five women, demonstrated that the thinking of women had clearly changed since the days of demands to be treated as adults. Now women demanded equal treatment with and respect from men. The group of five wrote

As members of the female population of CSU, we should like to show our support to Miss Peggy Slater on her opinion of the 'stud boot' ad by the Alpine Haus. We believe that the ad does an injustice to women by implying that the purchase of these boots could lead to some 'certain favors' by them. We are also of the opinion that 'studs' have 4 shoes, not 2, and all that these do is protect the feet.¹³⁷

Another woman was curious "Why so many "men" feel that the only way they can assert their "manhood" is by exploiting women". In her mind, "A man is someone who is sensitive and considerate of everyone's rights, who thinks of a woman as a complete person and who, above all, looks on her as an equal".¹³⁸

Before the Slater incident there was no indication that CSU women were bothered by sexual exploitation of women. And if they were bothered they certainly were not prepared

¹³⁷"Support For Peggy," CSU Collegian, 26 October 1970, 2.

¹³⁸Rebe Ehrich, "Treat Women as Equals," CSU Collegian, 26 October 1970, 2.

to make their disgust public by challenging the male dominated Collegian. The fact that Slater was willing to call for an end to exploitation of women indicates not only that she was sensitized to gender discrimination, but that the campus community, at least parts of it, was ready to listen to her complaint. Slater's courage in challenging the male establishment gave other women the push they needed to express their disgust with sexism. Women were identifying themselves as belonging to a group when they realized that other women had experiences similar to their own. This new consciousness would have implications for all women at CSU as a minority of women tried to educate the majority about sexism on their campus.

Six months after the Slater letter a group of women staged a sit-in to educate the campus about sexual discrimination in the Physical Education Department. Women had learned from the civil rights and antiwar movements that the sit-in was a great tactic for bringing media attention to one's cause. The purpose of the women's action was to bring light to "the University's sexual [sic] discriminatory policies" in particular that "the Physical Education Department does not provide steam shower facilities for women".¹³⁹ On April 29, 1971 11 CSU women went to the men's locker room clad "in towels and swimsuits" and

¹³⁹Gary Kimsey, "Steam Room Hot; Coeds Steaming," CSU Collegian, 30 April 1971, 1.

"stormed the steam shower and occupied it for 30 minutes".¹⁴⁰ Needless to say the sit-in was awarded front page coverage in the student newspaper. The women released a statement to the press explaining the reason for their protest, "The emancipation of the steam room is not an end in and of itself, but rather a means to creating a new social consciousness in both the men and women on this campus."¹⁴¹ Again women were demonstrating that they were aware that discrimination went deeper than rules and regulations and was part of a larger problem of oppression based on the presumption of the traditional role of women in society that denied women equal access and opportunity.

Men were not blind to discrimination on campus. The editors of the Collegian had repeatedly during the 1960s taken on the role of campus rabble-rouser. Gary Kimsey, editor in 1971-72 took this role seriously. And, in the tradition of his predecessors John Hyde and John Gascoyne, Kimsey felt compelled to provoke the women of CSU into action. Even before he became Editor Kimsey used the editorial page to air his views on women's liberation. Kimsey's editorials were sympathetic to the feminist cause

¹⁴⁰Gary Kimsey, "Steam Room Hot; Coeds Steaming," CSU Collegian, 30 April 1971, 1.

¹⁴¹Gary Kimsey, "Steam Room Hot; Coeds Steaming," CSU Collegian, 30 April 1971, 1. Unfortunately the sources do not reveal what the outcome of this protest was. I do not know if the University made provisions for a female steam room in response to the women's demands.

up to a certain point. Kimsey went beyond just acknowledging that discrimination existed he actually backed up his editorials with statistics. For example, Kimsey documented the ratio of women to men on the CSU faculty, the number of women in the administration and pay discrepancies between female and male deans.¹⁴² Even so, Kimsey admitted that he practiced sexist behavior,

The editor and news editor, if confronted by a male and female of the same journalistic ability seeking the one remaining job on the staff, will hire the male. Why? . . . Discrimination is often the fault of women who cannot accomplish jobs as well as men.¹⁴³

The solution to end this discrimination, according to Kimsey, lay in the hands of the women students. Kimsey declared that "To change the men's discriminatory attitudes, the women will have to develop their abilities to match those of the men, and then prove these abilities during their every waking moment".¹⁴⁴

In October 1971 Kimsey wrote two editorials chastising the women of CSU for being "placid pillars". Kimsey's first editorial, sarcastic in tone, was deliberately written to raise the ire of the feminist population at CSU. In his

¹⁴²Gary Kimsey, "Kimsey's Wrath," CSU Collegian, 6 May 1971, 10.

¹⁴³Gary Kimsey, "Kimsey's Wrath," CSU Collegian, 6 May 1971, 10.

¹⁴⁴Gary Kimsey, "Kimsey's Wrath," CSU Collegian, 6 May 1971, 10.

editorial entitled "Our chickies--placid pillars" Kimsey wrote,

So far, this year has been great for CSU women fulfilling their traditional role as placid pillars of unusefulness. The women at CSU are objects not to be heard from but bodies to be viewed standing in local bars, hands on hips, with purlient [sic] smiles appealing to masculine instincts. . . .

Yep, it's nice to have around the chickees that are presently attending CSU. They're nice and cute and they never try to step out of their roles. Yea for CSU's girlies. Let's hope they keep that way. The last thing we need at CSU are women running around sticking their powdered noses into the business of men.¹⁴⁵

Kimsey's editorial provoked the desired response. Thirty women stormed the editor's office with a list of demands and a number of women were prompted to write letters in response to Kimsey's diatribe. The demands of the thirty women called for

1. Cessation of sexist advertising;
2. The exclusion of any terms refering [sic] to women in a derogatory sense, such as chickies, broads, etc.,;
3. A weekly page in the Collegian concerned with the womens' [sic] issue and a reporter assigned to that task;¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁵Gary Kimsey, "Our chickies - placid pillars," CSU Collegian, 29 September 1971, 2.

¹⁴⁶Kimsey and Billotte, "Miss September escorts women protesters," CSU Collegian, 30 September 1971, 2.

In addition the women wanted the opportunity to co-edit an entire issue of the Collegian in October.¹⁴⁷ Although Kimsey was enlightened enough to provide a forum for the women to show CSU what Women's Liberation was all about, like his former peers, his tone in granting some of the women's demands was patronizing. Kimsey believed that the success of women's liberation was contingent on an attitude adjustment on the part of women -- it was not so clear that he understood the societal and cultural reasons for discrimination or that cooperation on the part of men was also necessary for the liberation of women. Kimsey wrote,

As it now stands, the women at CSU have made no blatant headway in learning that they are actually equal to men.

It is not an easy task to teach today's women that they are exploited and discriminated against only because they allow themselves to be.

As long as women think they were born to play the role of sweet, little bimbled-brained females who only worry about "the lucky guy to take me out next," there will be exploitation and discrimination.

And there will be male chauvinist pigs that oink "chickie, girlie and broad."¹⁴⁸

Although well-meaning in his mission, Kimsey's words served to perpetuate stereotypical assumptions about women by insinuating that they were intellectually incapable of realizing their own oppression.

¹⁴⁷Kimsey and Billotte, "Miss September escorts women protesters," CSU Collegian, 30 September 1971, 2.

¹⁴⁸Kimsey and Billotte, "Miss September escorts women protesters," CSU Collegian, 30 September 1971, 2.

Members of the Radical Women's Caucus, however, rose to the challenge and submitted a special supplement to the Collegian. In this supplement the women discussed legal and social discrimination against women, women's hours, and consciousness-raising. The supplement articulately defined the meaning of women's liberation. The authors encouraged consciousness-raising in order to allow "sisters to come together and share experiences and "personal failures". Usually one finds out that many women have been through similar situations i.e., abortion, . . . male hassles, complexes about their bodies. . . ."¹⁴⁹ In addition women were urged to recognize "the inherent sexism which has been institutionalized in the universities. . . .Systematic sexism can probably be exposed through regulations of a university. For example: the ratio of women to men students, faculty, and administrators. Dorm hours and curfews, . . ."¹⁵⁰ The authors also pointed out ways women were exploited through popular culture, "Rock music reinforces the traditional stereotype of woman as a submissive helpmate and defiles our sexuality".¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁹"Sisterhood on Campus, Part II," CSU Collegian, 12 October 12 1971, 4.

¹⁵⁰"Sisterhood on Campus, Part II," CSU Collegian, 12 October 12 1971, 4.

¹⁵¹"Radical Feminist Paper," CSU Collegian, 11 October 1971, 5.

What the CSU Radical Women's Caucus was saying was similar to what women in feminist groups around the country were saying. They clearly understood the roots of women's oppression and by engaging in a dialogue with the student body and making substantive demands they were taking positive steps to eradicate it. Feminists were pointing to cultural and societal obstacles to women's equality and encouraging the campus community to think about gender roles in a new way.

One needs to look beyond the tangible gains made by these feminist groups to see their impact on the campus community. Women's liberation was challenging traditional roles and forcing women and men alike to examine their lives. It was a confusing time for many young people. This confusion was evident in the letters written by male students. Editorials, letters to the editor, and interviews demonstrate that although many men did not like what they were hearing the women were most definitely being heard. The fact that some men felt it necessary to make derisive and offensive comments about Women's Liberation indicates that they felt threatened by the growing power of this outspoken minority of women.

Some of the male response to Peggy Slater's campaign against exploitation of women in advertising was nothing short of nasty and showed no willingness, particularly from the ad's author, to try to understand the reason for

Slater's complaint. Slater was called "puritanical" and was instructed by the Collegian advertising salesman, "So look, chic, you are in college now and this is a college newspaper; you should be able to handle it. (Unless you have some hangup or frustration that you failed to mention) As college students, sex and sexual connotations are more prevalent in our lives than the general public's."¹⁵²

Another student was apparently distraught by the notion that there might be more women like Peggy Slater out in the world who were willing to disrupt traditional gender roles. He wrote, "Dear Women's Lib Women: Congratulations for standing up to be counted. It's really heartwarming to men nowadays to realize that they might not have women to go home to for a break of peace and solitude from this brave and hurried new world".¹⁵³

Others, in their observations of the women's movement, showed tremendous lack of understanding and insight about feminism. The temptation to write about Women's Lib members and their brassieres was apparently too great for a number of men. In an editorial entitled "Unshackling the bra burners" a male member of the Collegian staff described the movement as an "anti-women's social club" comprised of "chicks" who are members of "Betty Friedan's gang" ready to

¹⁵²Mark Goddard, "Stud Reply," CSU Collegian, 24 October 1970, 2.

¹⁵³Tim Menger, "Women Losing Support," CSU Collegian, 29 October 1970, 3.

set fire to their "playtex living bras". The author of this editorial was quick to qualify his indignation. It was not liberated women he had trouble with but the woman of Women's Liberation whom he described as "a girl who deludes herself into believing that by becoming a refugee from the mah jong crowd and joining Women's Lib (or Women's Liberation as some of the turchier [sic] sisters insist), she becomes an emancipated female".¹⁵⁴ He continued, "You're deluding yourselves into believing that you're important because you're one of the gang. But, you are only a bunch of faceless "feminists".¹⁵⁵ Apparently for men such as this there was no greater fear than a group of women getting together, there was no telling what they might be capable of. Another unsigned editorial sarcastically urged women to unite. "We feel the time has come for the lovely co-eds of the ululant university to join their sisters. Arise then, and rid yourselves of those obstreperous, ineradicable contraptions known as "bras"! "¹⁵⁶ Of course the common argument that women would never attain equality due to their

¹⁵⁴Lip, "Unshackling the bra burners," CSU Collegian, 1 October 1971, 2.

¹⁵⁵Lip, "Unshackling the bra burners," CSU Collegian, 1 October 1971, 2.

¹⁵⁶"Speaking Out," CSU Collegian, 6 October 1971, 2.

physiological makeup was another favorite of male authors.¹⁵⁷

Not all men, however, were hostile to feminists. The Collegian interviewed a group of nine male students and one male professor in an attempt to determine male attitudes regarding the "rise in female activism".¹⁵⁸ Although some of the men were opposed to Women's Lib and others seemed to be confused by it there was some tacit support for the women. Of the group the professor was the most sympathetic and supportive of Women's Liberation stating, "I'm all for it and any other liberation movement".¹⁵⁹ One of the students said that he supported Women's Lib but was unsure of how successful it was in its efforts. Another stated that he did not feel threatened by "militant women" and that if women are qualified for a job then they should obtain

¹⁵⁷ One writer indicated that the answer to women's trouble rests with either God or a doctor. "Some method of reproduction has to be designed where the woman can work without having to take off to have a baby". "Liberation's Allright If - - -," CSU Collegian 29 March 29 1971, 4.

Another wrote "equality is something you'll never get. . . .that women are culturally brought up to play passive, emotional motherly roles is simply due to the fact that they are better suited to play those toles [sic] because of their physiological make-up". David Edeen, "You're Better Off," CSU Collegian, 20 February 1971, 3.

¹⁵⁸Mike Hittesdorf, "Women's Lib discussed by male students, prof.," CSU Collegian, 7 October 1971, 4.

¹⁵⁹Mike Hittesdorf, "Women's Lib discussed by male students, prof.," CSU Collegian, 7 October 1971, 4.

it.¹⁶⁰ There was some thoughtful male support for Peggy Slater, too. One male supporter wrote to the advertising salesman responsible for the ad "People are objecting to your exploitation of women for materialistic ends. Selling boots is apparently more important to you than the feelings of women".¹⁶¹

Women's support for women's liberation was not monolithic. Although there was a clear feminist consciousness at CSU by 1969-70 some women were not at all convinced of its worth. One woman responded to the call for Sisterhood by the Radical Women's Caucus by writing, "I spent the first 16 years of my life attempting to appreciate the benefits of my own sex, and finally got sufficiently disgusted with female company. . . ." ¹⁶² This woman was convinced of the superiority of men and unreceptive to what the feminists had to say. She wrote, "women usually prefer male professors - they are more sensible and realistic and practical in their teaching approach because they aren't trying to prove anything to the students. . . . Women's Lib should sit down and listen; they could learn a lot from men".¹⁶³

¹⁶⁰Mike Hittesdorf, "Women's Lib discussed by male students, prof.," CSU Collegian, 7 October 1971, 4.

¹⁶¹Jim Tucker, "Male Support For Peggy," CSU Collegian, 29 October 1970, 3.

¹⁶²"FCP?" CSU Collegian, 15 October 1971, 3.

¹⁶³"FCP?" CSU Collegian, 15 October 1971, 3.

While clearly not supportive of feminism, this letter was evidence that feminists had succeeded in their efforts to get students talking about women's issues. Activist or not, students across the campus were confronted by the issues raised by feminist groups. Like their counterparts in 1961, women in 1971 used the Collegian to get their message across. But by 1971 women articulated a political message and used both mainstream and protest organizations to demand reform of traditional rules and structures. Moreover, women were no longer cowed by the provocations of male leaders but used them to their advantage. It had not been easy, but by 1971 feminism had clearly come to campus.

CONCLUSION

Clearly by 1970 Women's Liberation had arrived at CSU. As a result of women's efforts rules were liberalized, a task force established, and consciousness raised. Even men were talking about Women's Liberation. The University as a microcosm of larger society provided an environment in which "there was much to protest".¹⁶⁴ The early social and political movements (Vietnam, civil rights, student power) exposed to the women on campus the possibility for change through various strategies - reformist and radical.

Additionally the campus was a place to experience new things and to be exposed to new ways of thinking. One former student said of her experience at CSU in the 1960s "It was a time of stretching, of experimenting. It was a time for figuring out my own self-worth".¹⁶⁵ Sara Evans argues that students became more introspective and that this new way of regarding life was critical to the development of feminism.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁴Evans, Personal Politics, 174.

¹⁶⁵Marilee Rowe, interview by author, 11 April 1994, Fort Collins, CO, written notes.

¹⁶⁶Evans, Personal Politics, 175.

On campus, students in general, began making political connections to their personal situations. Campus living conditions sparked early women's protests. What had started as protests against bothersome social rules evolved into political protests against gender discrimination. Small gains on that issue spurred the women on to attack other areas of discrimination in the campus environment and in their personal lives.

But it had not been easy. It took ten years for women to abolish discriminatory dormitory restrictions. And the women who were committed to change had to endure insults from their sometimes hostile peers. Often women leaders had the support of the Collegian and male leaders in their campaigns yet even to their supporters the women often had to struggle to prove that they were capable of following through with their mission. And, women had to combat some men who thought that they knew better how to win gains for women than the women themselves did.

On this sometimes less than friendly campus women turned to the security of women's organizations. Mainstream organizations such as AWS were critical places for women to learn leadership skills and to become familiar with how to make changes by going through the system. And as the decade wore on AWS evolved to meet the challenges of a changing campus environment. Other women found support in consciousness-raising groups where they realized that they

had experiences in common with other women. These women sought to foster a community of women on campus who were dedicated to the self-determination of women.

Both groups of women borrowed tactics from other movements, like letter writing and sit-ins, to articulate to the campus community the aims and views of the movement for women's liberation.

Men on campus also played an important role in the development of feminism. They often provoked women to tackle campus issues and then provided a forum for women to debate those issues. At times paternalistic and chauvinistic, the men kept the women on their toes and pushed them to keep up the fight for an end to gender discrimination.

The women's movement at CSU had borne fruit by the early 1970s and the movement itself was born out of the legacy of student protest at CSU in the 1960s and out of a campus environment that was ripe for reform on the part of women activists. There was still much reform to be done but by 1970 it seemed that the new feminist contingent on campus was prepared to take on that challenge.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

INTERVIEWS

- Burson-Freestone, Denise. Interview by author, 3 May 1994, Fort Collins, CO. Written notes.
- Charlton, Sue Ellen, Ph.D. Interview by author, 28 April 1994, Fort Collins, CO. Written notes.
- Davis, Charlotte. Interview by author, 20 April 1994 and 6 May 1994, Fort Collins, CO. Video recording.
- Douglas, Janet. Interview by author, 20 April 1994, Fort Collins, CO. Video recording.
- Harris, Mims. Interview by author, 1 March 1994, Fort Collins, CO. Written notes.
- Hazaleus, Margaret. Interview by author, 20 April 1994, Fort Collins, CO. Video recording.
- Helburg, Jean. Interview by author, 20 April 1994, Fort Collins, CO. Video recording.
- Rowe, Marilee. Interview by author, 11 April 1994, Fort Collins, CO. Written notes.
- Schmidt, Tschudy. Interview by author, 20 April 1994, Fort Collins, CO. Video recording.

UNPUBLISHED WORKS

- Colorado State University Associated Women Students.
"Annual Report of the Commission on the Status of Women 1970-1971." Fort Collins, CO: CSU Associated Women Students, 1971. Office of Women's Programs, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO.

Crookston, Burns E., et al. "A Study of Attitudes Concerning University Relationships with Students." In Student Services Research Reports: Vol. IV, 3, by the CSU Office of Student Development: Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO. 1966. Morgan Library Stacks, CSU, Fort Collins, CO.

PUBLISHED WORKS

Colorado State University. CSU Biennial Catalog: 1959-60/1960-61. Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, 1959.

Colorado State University Associated Students and Student Personnel Services. CSU Student Handbook 1960-61. Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, 1960.

Colorado State University Associated Students and Student Personnel Services. CSU Student Handbook 1964-65. Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, 1964.

NEWSPAPERS

Colorado State University Collegian. 1960-1971.

SECONDARY SOURCES

BOOKS

Albert, Judith Clavir, and Stewart Edward Albert. The Sixties Papers: Documents of a Rebellious Decade. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1984.

Alan Guttmacher Institute. Family Planning Services: Focus of State Initiative. Colorado. New York: Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1975.

Breines, Wini. Community and Organization in the New Left: 1962-1968. The Great Refusal. New York: Praeger, 1982.

_____. Young, White, and Miserable: Growing Up Female in the Fifties. Boston: Beacon Press, 1992.

Burns, Stewart. Social Movements of the 1960s: Searching For Democracy. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990.

Caute, David. The Year of the Barricades: A Journey Through 1968. New York: Harper & Row, 1988.

- Chafe, William H. The Paradox of Change: American Women in the Twentieth Century. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- _____. The Unfinished Journey: America Since World War II. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Chamberlain, Mariam K., ed. Women in Academe: Progress and Prospects. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988.
- Cott, Nancy F. The Grounding of Modern Feminism. New Haven: Yale university Press, 1987.
- Davis, Flora. Moving the Mountain: The Women's Movement in America Since 1960. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991.
- Echols, Alice. Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America 1967-1974. With a Foreword by Ellen Willis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Evans, Sara. Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Fraser, Ronald, et al. 1968: A Student Generation in Revolt. New York: Pantheon, 1988.
- Freeman, Jo. The Politics of Women's Liberation. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1975.
- Furniss, W. Todd, and Patricia Albjerg Graham, eds. Women in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1974.
- Giddings, Paula. In Search of Sisterhood: Delta Sigma Theta and the Challenge of the Black Sorority Movement. New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1988.
- Gitlin, Todd. The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage. New York: Bantam Books, 1987.
- Hansen, James E., II. Democracy's College in the Centennial State: A History of Colorado State University. Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, 1977.
- Heineman, Kenneth J. Campus Wars. The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era. New York: New York University Press, 1993.

- Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. Campus Life. Undergraduate Cultures From the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987.
- Keniston, Kenneth. Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1968.
- _____. Youth and Dissent: The Rise of a New Opposition. New York; Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1971.
- King, Mary. Freedom Song: A Personal Story of the Civil Rights Movement. New York: William Morrow and CO., Inc., 1987.
- Linden-Ward, Blanche, and Carol Hurd Green. Changing the Future: American Women in the 1960s. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993.
- Marcuse, Herbert. One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society. 2d ed. With an Introduction by Douglas Kellner. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991.
- McAdam, Doug. Freedom Summer. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Miller, James. "Democracy is in the Streets": From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.
- Morgan, Edward P. The Sixties Experience: Hard Lessons About Modern America. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.
- President's Commission on Campus Unrest. The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1970.
- Rorabaugh, W.J. Berkeley At War: The 1960s. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Rosenberg, Rosalind. Divided Lives: American Women in the Twentieth Century. New York: Hill and Wang, 1992.
- Roszak, Theodore. The Making of A Counterculture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1969.

- Rupp, Leila J., and Verta Taylor. Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Spender, Stephen. The Year of the Young Rebels. New York: Random House, 1969.
- Solomon, Barbara Miller. In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Wandersee, Winifred D. On the Move: American Women in the 1970s. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1988.
- Weisbrot, Robert. Freedom Bound: A History of America's Civil Rights Movement. New York: Penguin Books, 1990.

ARTICLES

- Barlow, Andrew. "The Student Movement of the 1960s and the Politics of Race." The Journal of Ethnic Studies 19 (Fall 1991): 1-22.
- Breines, Wini. Review of Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left, by Sara Evans., In Feminist Studies 5 (Fall 1979): 496-505.
- _____. "Whose New Left?" Journal of American History 75 (September 1988): 528-545.
- Freeman, Jo. "Women's Liberation and Its Impact of the Campus." Liberal Education 57 (1971): 468-478.
- Nudd, T. Roger. "Re-Examination of Closing Hours For College Women." The Journal of College Student Personnel 5 (March 1964): 170-75.