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Abstract

This thesis examines the dynamics of the counterculture at Macalester College from 1966 to 1974 using oral histories with alumni and articles from *The Mac Weekly*. The thesis demonstrates that at Macalester the social ferment of the counterculture and the political activism of the antiwar movement were inseparably linked. At Macalester, students adapted the activities of the national counterculture to suit their own ideals and values. This caused the counterculture at Macalester to develop differently than larger national movements, with the antiwar movement forming the center of countercultural activity on campus. This led to an unusual and complicated counterculture guided by personal adherence to the ideals of an imagined national movement. The lived experiences and voices of alumni that attended Macalester between 1966 and 1974 challenge the traditional narrative and models of the national counterculture, which present this group as politically apathetic and culturally unconstrained. Sheltered by their liberal administration, Macalester students were not as active as students at other colleges like Columbia or Berkeley. Instead, they constructed a counterculture that reflected the prominent antiwar sentiments of their student body. This essay also asserts that the predominance of antiwar sentiment on campus led to the development of the counterculture as the dominant culture at Macalester. This caused the marginalization of less visible populations like conservatives, women, and economically disadvantaged students.
Preface

I was brought to this project by an interest in my grandparents’ generation. A sophomore year history course entitled *The US Since 1945* directed my attention to the 1950s and 60s and the counterculture in American history. But what were my grandparents doing during this turbulent time in U.S. history? Why does my grandfather, who was a graduate student at Oregon State University in the late 1960s, have nothing to say about antiwar protest, civil rights activism, or the counterculture? Why does my great-uncle Bill refuse to talk about his service in Vietnam? Why did he serve in Vietnam while both of my grandfathers did not? Even though my politically inactive grandparents were unwilling to give answers, I was determined to understand the lives of those who took a stand in the 1960s. So I turned instead to my own community at Macalester College. Today Macalester students pride themselves on being politically active and globally aware individuals but was this true in the 1960s? Where did the traditional Macalester values that I pride myself on possessing originate?

To answer these questions, I turned to Macalester alumni, reaching out to the wider community of “Macites.” In my interviews with Bev Fritz, Christina Baldwin, Glenn Olsen, Bill Houghton, Al Currier, and James Flannery, as well as the large pool of alumni who emailed me their support, I developed a sense of the strong group of activists and agents for social change that Macalester students and alumni are, both on campus and beyond it. Interviews with these alumni turned into conversations that made me think critically about my place in society, particularly in the turbulence of post-election America in 2016. My conversations with these individuals slowly evolved into a larger project which is presented in this essay. I would like to extend a special thank you to the
individuals who took time from their busy schedules to have coffee with me, speak on the phone, and respond to my many follow-up emails. Thank you for sharing your stories. I would also like to give special recognition to Professor Ernesto Capello, my advisor. Thank you for reading my many drafts, listening to my complaints, and encouraging me to continue even when I wanted to quit. This project would not have been possible without your support. Thank you.

To my committee members, Professors Crystal Moten and Karin Aguilar-San Juan, thank you for reading my draft and asking intriguing questions. I appreciate the time you took to meet with me in the months leading up to my defense and the numerous suggestions and resources you provided me in these meetings. Your enthusiasm about this particular project and the 1960s and 70s more generally is inspiring.

To my capstone instructor, Professor Karin Velez, thank you for your painstaking notes on the very first writing I completed regarding this topic. The initial questions you asked aided in the later creation of this project’s central arguments.

Finally, a very special thanks goes to the Macalester College archivist, Ellen Holt-Werle. Thank you for your patience with my many appointment requests and for dealing with the numerous hours I spent slowly sifting through boxes of documents and photos. This project would not have been possible without you support, enthusiasm, and guidance. Thank you.
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Abbreviation Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFSC</td>
<td>American Friends Service Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALCAV</td>
<td>Clergy and Laity Concerned about Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNVA</td>
<td>Committee for Non-Violent Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEO</td>
<td>Expanded Educational Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>Fellowship of Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Mac-Mekong Project for the Children of Can Tho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>Macalester College Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODM</td>
<td>Office of Defense Mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANE</td>
<td>Sane Nuclear Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>Students for a Democratic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLID</td>
<td>Student League for Industrial Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMC</td>
<td>War Manpower Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAF</td>
<td>Young Americans for Freedom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Loosening the Definition of the Counterculture

On July 25, 1969 the front page of Macalester College’s student newspaper, The Mac Weekly, featured a psychedelic drawing of a man playing the tabla and the Albert Camus quote “Beginning to think is beginning to be undermined.”¹ The rest of the paper, a shorter edition produced for the summer months, included an article on plans for a Vietnam Moratorium Day, a review of an Alice Cooper concert, two political cartoons, and a piece entitled “A Short History of Grass.”² The zany assortment of politics, art, drugs, and music found in the July 1969 issue of The Mac Weekly clearly demonstrates the disparate and complicated ideals of the counterculture.

Figure 0.1. The front page of The Mac Weekly, July 25, 1969. Photo courtesy of Macalester College Archives, St. Paul, Minnesota.

¹ The tabla is an Indian hand drum. This image is representative of a hippie mysticism that was a common feature of the counterculture. In this image Indian culture and religion are used to represent an exotic other world that many hippies aspired to join. This orientalist hippie sensibility was also clearly present at Macalester College during this time period.
“Counterculture” is difficult to define. The term possesses vastly different connotations for separate audiences. The definitions put forth by a variety of scholars provide a deeper understanding of this movement. The term “counterculture” was first coined by Theodore Roszak in 1968 to describe the youth culture of the 1960s. Roszak applied the term to analyze a larger cultural shift and defines the phrase as a culture “that radically diverges from values and assumptions that have been in the mainstream of our society.”³ Later historians, like Nancy Zaroulis and Gerald Sullivan, paint the counterculture less favorably using words like “licentious” or “sexually promiscuous” and carefully differentiate between antiwar activists and members of the counterculture.⁴ Gretchen Lemke-Santangelo follows a similar path in establishing a divide between the political New Left and the counterculture. However, she extols the virtues of this group and posits that its members “believed that social change depended upon a shift in human consciousness.”⁵ Historians like Zaroulis, Sullivan, and Lemke-Santangelo define the counterculture by drawing a clear line between political movements and cultural rebellion.

While some historians distinguish between political activists and individuals participating in a hippie subculture, others take a more holistic approach, viewing the counterculture as a mindset instead of a prescribed set of behaviors. David Farber, for instance, opts for a more expansive explanation of the counterculture, stating that it “was

---
a way of life, a community, an infrastructure, and even an economy, not just a few lifestyle accoutrements like long hair and an occasional toke on an illegal substance."\(^6\) Farber broadens his definition to include antiwar protesters and other political activists, moving beyond a picture of the counterculture as merely a form of aesthetic choice. Reinforcing Farber’s definition, historians Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle assert that:

> The countercultural mode reveled in tangents, metaphors, unresolved contradictions, conscious ruptures of logic and reason; it was expressly anti-linear, anti-teleological, rooted in the present, disdainful of thought processes that were circumscribed by causation and consequence. Countercultural knowledge can’t be accurately represented by a straight line, or even the squiggly line; a more evocative figure would be the matrix, or perhaps the concentric circle.\(^7\)

In spite of this original approach to conceptualizing the counterculture, the majority of historians still view this group as a consolidated movement and attempt to explain it in linear terms. In order to truly understand the makeup of the counterculture as it occurred on a broad scale in the United States, and more specifically on Macalester College’s campus, we must examine it in a manner that is not linear or continuous. The definition I rely on in this essay is the counterculture as remembered by alumni and *The Mac Weekly*. It is an amorphous, complicated, and loose coalition of mentalities, political ideals, and popular culture.

The alumni interviewed for this project each possessed their own ideas about how to define the counterculture. Some explicitly identified themselves as members of the

---


counterculture while others were more reluctant to associate themselves with this movement. Macalester alumni Reverend Alvin Currier and Bill Houghton eagerly identified themselves as participants in these movements, providing a wide definition of the counterculture. Currier defined the counterculture by positioning it in opposition to the dominant culture of the 1960s, explaining: “the prevailing culture was going to war in Vietnam. The counterculture was saying no, this is a violation of what we stand for...it was more than just Vietnam. It was a whole climate of change.”8 Similarly, Bill Houghton described various subscenes that he believed constituted this movement, adding that “one of the themes of the counterculture was a much more politically aware element.”9 By including politics and a variety of other subscenes into their definitions of the counterculture both Bill Houghton and Al Currier categorized themselves as active members of this group.

In contrast to Houghton and Currier, the other alumni interviewed for this project did not verbally identify themselves as participants in the counterculture. Interview informants Christina Baldwin and Bev Fritz centered the conversation mainly on drug use and hippie aesthetics when asked about the counterculture. Christina Baldwin avoided characterizing herself as a part of these movements, saying instead, “it was a pretty amazing time. I think when you’re living through it you don’t know what you’re living through.”10 Her lack of identification with the counterculture, despite her participation in the political and social movements of the 1960s, is influenced in part by societal

8 Alvin Currier, Macalester College Faculty Member, 1964-1975, interview by Sara Ludewig, February 4, 2017, 3-4.
10 Christina Baldwin, Macalester College Student, 1964-1968, interview by Sara Ludewig, September 6, 2016, 10.
perceptions of these groups during this time period. She was hesitant to align herself with
the counterculture because of the negative stereotypes of the 1960s. Similarly, Glenn
Olsen did not explicitly identify himself as a member of this group and chose to separate
the counterculture in the Twin Cities from the presence of activism on Macalester’s
campus. When asked about the presence of these types of movements on campus Olsen
recalled, “over on Cedar Riverside that used to be where a lot of what you’d call the
hippies or counterculture was.” Not only does he refuse to identify himself as a member
of the counterculture but he also distinguishes this movement from the events that
occurred on Macalester’s campus. To Olsen the counterculture was a faraway event,
happening in other parts of the Twin Cities but not in his familiar environment.

Alumni perceptions of the counterculture reveal a great deal about how
individuals who lived through the 1960s interpreted their experiences and how societal
expectations influenced their understandings. While some alumni proudly labeled
themselves as members of the counterculture, others hesitated to categorize themselves as
a part of these groups. Much of this reluctance stemmed from perceptions of antiwar
protesters and counterculturalists held by the dominant culture in the 1960s. Participants
in the counterculture were viewed, and still are in some settings, as unpatriotic, drug-
crazed, grimy degenerates. To avoid these negative stereotypes, many individuals
participating in these movements classified their political action and search for authentic
lifestyles using different terms.

It is also important to note that the term “counterculture” was one used by
historians and sociologists to describe the radical youth culture and political activism of

the 1960s and 70s. It was not a term individuals or groups used to identify themselves during this time period. As a result, the counterculture developed not because of a label dictated from above, but as a group of forward-thinking individuals attempting to build their own like-minded community. Individuals involved in these movements, whether participating in political activism, communal living, drug use, free love, or a mixture of these or other subscenes, all saw themselves as engaging with new, more authentic ways of thinking and living. To members of the counterculture authenticity meant a search for personal fulfillment outside of white, middle class suburban consumption. To these individuals conformity to the social standards of the 1950s appeared fake and contrived, leading them to search for alternate lifestyles. By searching for modes of living that supported their values of authenticity, these individuals came into contact with other like-minded individuals and developed a loose sense of community. As the counterculture developed it drew on the idea of itself as a larger, unified movement while simultaneously functioning as a scattered assemblage of ideas and lifestyles.

Methods

In order to better understand the lives of students on Macalester’s campus during the Vietnam War, I reached out to alumni from the classes of 1964 to 1973 through the institution’s alumni magazine: Macalester Today. In total I received over twenty replies to my call for participants. Alumni shared their experiences through email, volunteered to be interviewed, and even sent me photographs of their experiences during the Vietnam War era. In total I interviewed six alumni, four men and two women. Two of these

13 See Appendix A on page 108.
14 See Appendix B on page 109.
individuals were faculty members at the college during the 1960s and 70s in addition to being alumni. The stories and anecdotes collected through these interviews are intended to show the lived experiences of Macalester students and faculty during the Vietnam War. In addition to my interviews with alumni, I conducted research in the Macalester College Archives, examining documents from the chaplain’s office and the college’s diversity and inclusion files. I also consulted old editions of the student run newspaper, *The Mac Weekly*.

The alumni who were interviewed for this project came from a variety of backgrounds. Bev Fritz, known as Bev Braun during her time at Macalester, came to the college in 1969 from Rochester, Minnesota. Her experiences as a first generation college student and the fact that she had both a brother and a boyfriend serving in Vietnam greatly impacted her activism while at Macalester. Bill Houghton dropped out of college in 1967 in order to pursue peace activism on a larger scale. Houghton registered as a conscientious objector and served with the American Friends Service Committee for the remainder of the war. Christina Baldwin, a member of the class of 1968, was active in antiwar activities through her work in the chaplain’s office. Her time at Macalester sparked her interest in other areas of protest including the women’s rights movement. Glenn Olsen, class of 1969, was the most engaged with countercultural subscenes of all the alumni I interviewed. He attended the Woodstock Music Festival, participated in a march on Washington, and registered as a conscientious objector following his graduation. Alvin Currier served as the chaplain at Macalester from 1964 to 1975 having graduated from the college in 1953. He took a theological approach to peace in Vietnam and played a prominent role in antiwar activism as a faculty mentor for activist students.
Finally, James Flannery graduated from Macalester in 1963 and returned as a professor in 1969. He took a more moderate approach to the war and privately criticized the stance of the liberal administration. Many of the alumni I interviewed did not readily identify themselves as members of the counterculture. However, their participation in antiwar protest at Macalester in the late 1960s shows that the various movements in which they were involved shared many of the same goals with the counterculture. These alumni all had their own individual experiences with the counterculture and the antiwar movement at the college and their stories demonstrate the distinctness of Macalester’s countercultural involvement.

**Understanding Macalester’s Counterculture**

The lived experiences and voices of alumni who attended Macalester between 1966 and 1974 challenge the traditional narrative surrounding the counterculture, which presents this group as politically apathetic and culturally unconstrained. As is further discussed in Chapter One, traditional methods of studying the counterculture divide the upheaval of the 1960s and 70s into separate categories of political and social ferment. Typically, studies of the activism of this era examine the organizational structure and activities of specific political or social groups. Individuals participating in these movements are usually presented as disorderly and politically disinterested hippies that constituted a separate group from the politically active members of the New Left. Macalester challenges this narrative, as students readapted both political and social movements from the national level to create a unique counterculture on campus.

---

15 James Flannery is a pseudonym, as this participant wishes to remain anonymous.
Alumni stories, as well as student articles in *The Mac Weekly* also show that at Macalester the social ferment of the counterculture and the political activism of the antiwar movement were inseparably linked. As can be seen in Chapter Two, at Macalester the antiwar movement functioned as the center of countercultural activity on campus. The centrality of the antiwar movement to the college’s counterculture caused it to develop in a way that differed from the larger national movements presented in Chapter One. This variation led to an unusual and complicated Macalester counterculture guided by personal adherence to countercultural ideals based on an imagined national organization.

In the coming pages I also argue that Macalester students of the 1960s and 70s created their own peculiar version of the national counterculture on campus, one that defies the models for the counterculture developed by historians. The model for the national movement developed by historian Kenneth Heineman and described in Chapter One, attempts to create a universal understanding of the countercultural participation of students at colleges and universities across the United States. However, Macalester students did not conform to these classifications of the counterculture on college campuses. I argue that the counterculture at Macalester defies the models of historians, highlighting the college’s liberal administration and the complacency of students in the face of antiwar consensus on campus. Macalester students were not as active as students at other colleges across the United States and they created a counterculture that reflected the intellectual and relatively undivided antiwar sentiments of their student body.

After developing these arguments in Chapter Two, in Chapter Three I assert that the suppression of the opinions and activism of minority students on campus complicated
the unanimity and complacency of the counterculture at Macalester. To support this argument, I consider three groups of individuals marginalized by the counterculture on campus, economically disadvantaged students, women, and prowar activists. An examination of these neglected voices reveals the contradictions and hypocrisy of the counterculture both at Macalester and across the nation.

I deliver these arguments in three parts; outlining the contours of the counterculture on the national level, situating the Macalester movement in relation to this national model, and then interrogating the narrative of the counterculture by examining its treatment of minority voices. In Chapter One I begin by tracing the origins of the counterculture in American history. Next I discuss these movements on the national level, devoting particular attention to models created by historians that are meant to examine the counterculture on college campuses. This chapter also involves a brief history of various antiwar and countercultural groups on the national scene in the 1960s and 70s. Chapter Two centers around Macalester’s counterculture, and stresses the ways in which the college’s antiwar movement readapted national movements for social change to suit their own needs on campus. This section also focuses on Macalester’s defiance of national models for the counterculture. Chapter Three involves a discussion of the ways in which the Macalester counterculture marginalized the voices of women, economically disadvantaged students, and conservatives. This section concentrates on the implications of a counterculture that acted as the dominant culture on Macalester’s campus during this time period.
Chapter One: Creating a National Movement

[The counterculture] gave us the opportunity to have a very complex view of social life in America. I would say it gave white middle class kids an opportunity to have a much more complex, sometimes cynical [view, and] sometimes a sense of betrayal [after]...growing up in the 1950s in a white porridge. It changed us.

Christina Baldwin, Macalester Class of 1968

Throughout the 1960s and 70s Macalester College students engaged in protest against the Vietnam War and worked to create a campus community that supported a new, carefully cultivated set of values. In creating their own counterculture on campus Macalester students drew upon the idea of a nationally organized movement to create their own, unique countercultural community on campus. The counterculture on the national level took a variety of different forms. Rooted in distrust of the political system and a strong aversion to the inauthenticity of a consumerist society, the counterculture of the 1960s never fully coalesced into a nationally unified movement. Rather, political dissent and cultural rebellion began on a smaller scale and became only slightly more consolidated over time. Even at its height in the late 1960s, political factions and cultural disagreements plagued the counterculture and it never became a united, centrally organized group of individuals.

The counterculture on the national level was invented from the ground up, drawing on the discontent of the postwar period and a long tradition of American peaceful protest. The counterculture developed as a variety of fluid social movements, with each of these social movements creating their own specific model for protesting the war and the cultural norms of 1960s society. When exploring their own ideas regarding

---

16 Baldwin, 5.
cultural dissent and peace in Vietnam, Macalester students relied on what they believed to be a unified national counterculture. Yet, students at the college did not simply mimic the countercultural organizations that existed on a national level. Instead, the counterculture at Macalester responded to and subsequently reinvented national social movements to reflect their own values and ideas.

While it is easy to discuss the impact of a movement, it is more difficult to discuss the societal effects of a loose, amorphous group. In spite of this, the counterculture on the national level, no matter how loosely organized, powerfully influenced the activism of individuals throughout the United States, including Macalester students. In order to understand the involvement of Macalester students with the counterculture and how the counterculture on the college’s campus was distinct, we must examine a selection of events and groups that contributed to the semblance of a nationally organized counterculture that so greatly influenced students at Macalester. These events and groups from larger national movements are essential to our understanding of how Macalester defied national models of the counterculture created by historians. National counterculture organizations provided the basis for countercultural activity on Macalester’s campus and through studying them we are able to see how students adapted these movements to create their own peculiar counterculture on campus.

This chapter explores the variety of events and groups that constituted the national counterculture of the 1960s and 70s. I begin by tracing the origins of the counterculture to the postwar period in American history. In this section I discuss the importance of family values and the Cold War on the creation of a youth counterculture in the 1960s and 70s. Next, I consider a model for the counterculture and antiwar protest on college campuses
proposed by historian Kenneth Heineman. This section carefully outlines Heineman’s model as the basis of comparison for Macalester, devoting particular attention to the role of the college administration in antiwar protests and the counterculture. The following section provides a brief history of a number of important antiwar and countercultural groups that existed on a national level in the 1960s and 70s. These groups, which include Students for a Democratic Society, the Weather Underground, the Yippies, and the draft resistance movement, demonstrate the wide range of values held by antiwar groups as well as the diffuse and divided nature of the counterculture.

Postwar Countercultural Origins

Historians attempting to understand the counterculture often reach further back in history, sifting through historical context to find an explanation for the seemingly sudden explosion of rebellious youth culture that occurred in the mid-1960s. Their narrative asserts that the Vietnam War and other political events were not the catalysts for the social dissent of the counterculture. Although many youth identified with the counterculture as a result of the war in Vietnam, these young individuals were also poised to rebel because of their upbringing in the 1940s and 50s.¹⁷ Most of the young adults involved in the cultural rebellion of the 1960s were raised in middle class families in a haze of consumerism and the Cold War. In order to better understand how Macalester students contradicted and complicated this point of view, a more in-depth examination of the social and political atmosphere of the 1940s and 50s is required. This section will explore how postwar attitudes towards women and childcare, the politics of the Cold

War, and rampant consumerism contributed to the creation of the counterculture of the 1960s and 70s.

Societal norms surrounding childcare in the 1950s are cited as an early source of the cultural ferment of the 1960s. Following the instability of the Great Depression and World War II, middle class Americans clung to the stability that family life seemed to offer. As the family became the center of American culture in the late 1940s and early 50s, society placed more emphasis on adhering to family values and parental authority. Additionally, by the early 1950s the majority of white, middle class Americans were college educated and enjoyed some level of prosperity. These educated, professional parents in turn attempted to raise college educated, professional children by cultivating skills like independence and self-confidence. Parents in the 1950s intended these skills to eventually help their children create their own middle class, professional lives. However, the social and political climate of the era instead led youth to rebel and use these skills for political and cultural dissent.

Middle class families in the postwar period also often felt pressure to conform to the standards of the time. The media portrayed happy suburban homes that became the ideal for many Americans at the time. In an effort to gain a sense of security amidst the tensions of the Cold War, families strove to achieve this unattainable image of middle class life. Advertisers stressed that this middle class standard of living could be reached through increased consumption of material goods and maintenance of gender roles and behavioral norms. However, these standards proved oppressive and in many cases

---

18 Ibid., 26.
19 Ibid., 46-47.
20 Lemke-Santangelo, Daughters of Aquarius, 40.
created tension within families. Expected to shore up “class standing through consumption, entertaining, and maintaining a clean, orderly, and tasteful home environment” many women felt frustrated and constrained by their role as housewife.\textsuperscript{21} The discontent of women and the inability of families to live up to the impossible expectations set by advertising created tension in many middle class American families in the postwar period. Media projected images of the happy suburban household regularly masked larger issues of domestic violence, divorce, alcoholism, and struggles over assigned gender roles.\textsuperscript{22} Raised to be independent and self-confident middle class citizens, the youth of the 1960s questioned the gender roles and behavioral standards that caused such discord in their families. A portion of the creation of the counterculture of the 1960s and 70s can be attributed to the search by these individuals for the authenticity their childhoods had lacked.

Middle class parenting techniques were also overwhelmingly influenced by mass consumerism in the decade following World War II, which in turn shaped the counterculture of the 1960s. Following World War II, the United States experienced an economic boom that brought prosperity to many middle class families. Appliances, food, cars, clothing, and other goods were mass produced at a rapid rate and material goods came to symbolize social status and personal identity for many individuals.\textsuperscript{23} This “frenzy of consumption” went hand in hand with the social conformity of most middle class Americans.\textsuperscript{24} Middle class, professional parents who were economically well off had plenty of extra time and resources which they used to lavish attention on their

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 39.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 40.
\textsuperscript{23} Braunstein and Doyle, introduction to Imagine Nation, 10.
\textsuperscript{24} Cavallo, A Fiction of the Past, 22.
children. Instilled with values of self-confidence and individualism and then encouraged by their parents to conform to social standards, many children of the 1950s were drawn instead to the counterculture. Raised in an era that encouraged them to use consumerism as a route to greater happiness, young adults in the 1960s utilized their independence-based upbringing to question the limits of authority. By joining the counterculture, 1960s youth rejected the consumerism and conformity of their parents’ generation and embraced a new mode of authentic living.

Cold War politics in the postwar era also powerfully shaped the lives of children growing up in this period. As a result of Cold War tensions with the Soviet Union, Americans lived in uncertainty throughout the 1950s and 60s. Under the perpetual threat of nuclear attack, American society lived in a mode of constant stress. As the government urged citizens and businesses to build fallout shelters to protect themselves against a potential nuclear blast, these citizens began to question the implications of nuclear war. Americans contemplated “questions of personal ethics...as well as questions of national identity and the ultimate morality of the kind of world created by a nuclear exchange.” Children growing up in this time period were particularly affected by the stress of potential nuclear warfare. The fear and anxiety caused by fallout drills at school, as well as the moral concerns of their parents, greatly influenced these children as they came of age in the 1960s. As college students in the 1960s, this generation of

---

25 Farber, *The Age of Great Dreams*, 176. Farber also uses the argument of consumer based happiness to explain the counterculture’s affinity for drug use. Thus, many young counterculturalists embraced consumerism for the pursuit of pleasure through drugs while at the same time rejecting the use of consumerism to define one’s identity. This contradictory mix of ideals is emblematic of the complex and often absurd nature of the counterculture.


27 Ibid., 10.

28 Ibid., 127.
individuals questioned the authority of a government that was willing to risk their obliteration through nuclear war with the Soviet Union. The stress of life under the constant threat of total destruction also caused many individuals to embrace the seemingly carefree lifestyle of the counterculture by dropping out of college or experimenting with mind altering drugs. The ever-present fear of nuclear war in the 1950s and 60s often translated to a distrust for the government’s decisions and a rejection of traditional methods of enacting political change. Therefore, Cold War politics contributed to the development of the counterculture in the late 1960s.

Moral objections about nuclear warfare led to the creation of several peace organizations in the late 1950s that laid the groundwork for much of the political activism of the counterculture. The escalation of the arms race and the continued testing of nuclear arms throughout the 1950s drew the attention of many established peace activists. In 1957 established and respected peace organizations like the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) and the Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) sought to mobilize radical pacifists in order to strengthen popular opinion against nuclear armament. The result was the creation of two prominent peace organizations: the Committee for Non-Violent Action (CNVA) and the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE).29 Like the counterculture and the antiwar activists they later inspired, these groups were loosely organized and only vaguely associated with one another. Despite their decentralized nature, SANE and CNVA were both committed to convincing the nation’s leaders to implement nuclear test ban treaties and move towards nuclear disarmament.30

30 Ibid., 32.
peaceful protests at nuclear test sites and at the White House, members of SANE and CNVA held prayer vigils, rallies, and submitted petitions to President Eisenhower.\textsuperscript{31} However, their attempts to show government officials, and the general public, that “America’s choice was not between total surrender or total annihilation” via nuclear warfare remained largely ignored.\textsuperscript{32} In fact, the nuclear arms race escalated during this period.

Although efforts to lessen nuclear armament during the 1950s remained relatively unsuccessful, these activists handed down a long American tradition of peaceful protest to a new generation of individuals. With the rise of anti-nuclear activism in the late 1950s, the values of pacifism and social justice maintained by organizations like AFSC or FOR were remodeled for a new group of individuals. Alienated by marketed expectations of perfection and consumerism and having grown up in fear of annihilation by Soviet missiles, many youth of the 1960s were attracted to the values of anti-nuclear peace movements. Organizations like SANE or CNVA, as well as the anti-nuclear pacifist movement more broadly, provided the youth of the 1960s with an opportunity to exercise the independence and self-confidence their parents had imbued in them. Drawing on the loose organization of these early peace groups and their resolve to question authority, countercultural youth established their own movement devoted to peace in Vietnam and a search for authentic lifestyles. As we will see in Chapter Two, Macalester students participating in the counterculture were also greatly influenced by their upbringing in the postwar period.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 31-33.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 45.
A National Model for the Counterculture

Looking for guidance in their own countercultural experiment, Macalester students were greatly influenced by movements that occurred on other college campuses across the United States. Schools like University of California Berkeley, University of Michigan, and Columbia University are common examples found in the historical scholarship on student protest movements and the counterculture. Upon examining protest movements as they occurred on college campuses across the nation, historian Kenneth Heineman created a model for anti-Vietnam War protests. Responding to scholarly focus on elite universities like Berkeley or Columbia, his main premise is that “one cannot simply superimpose the Berkeley or Columbia model on other universities, thereby ignoring the differing cultural and historical context of each campus community and the ways in which those differences affected antiwar protest.”

Heineman’s model relies on four smaller, less affluent state schools like Kent State and Michigan State University as examples of the role the counterculture and protest against the Vietnam War played on college campuses more broadly. He uses these examples to create what he views as an alternate, inclusive model of campus protest that more accurately reflects what occurred on college campuses across the United States in the 1960s and 70s.

In keeping with the broader narrative of the roots of the counterculture, Heineman argues that a large number of students in the 1960s were influenced by an “escape from parental supervision, the mounting popularity...of vaguely anti-authoritarian rock ‘n’ roll music, and the increased prevalence on the campus of marijuana and psychedelics” which
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contributed to the creation of a countercultural lifestyle on college campuses across the
nation.\(^{35}\) He maintains that in order to understand the basic structure of campus antiwar
protests it is also important to examine prowar or apathetic students, faculty, and
administration as this was the nationally dominant ideology at the time.\(^{36}\) Heineman’s
model is centered around the assertion that campus antiwar protest in the 1960s and 70s
was mainly a battle between an institution’s liberal, pacifist faculty and students and its
politically conservative administration.

The political conservatism of many college administrations during the 1960s and
70s originated in the Cold War policies of the postwar period. Heineman examined ten
private universities and ten public universities in 1966, to demonstrate the large number
of defense related grants given to all types of academic institutions during the height of
the Cold War.\(^{37}\) In addition to the flow of defense and national security allocated funds
into these institutions, members of the college administration regularly served in federal
agencies or defense corporations during World War II.\(^{38}\) The increase in military and
defense spending in private and public universities during World War II was further
cemented by the acceleration of Cold War containment policies. According to Heineman,
“the advent and intensification of the Cold War, and the United States’ commitment to
contain Communism...firmly joined together the university and the military.”\(^ {39}\)
Administrations with ties to the federal government, and with an influx of funds allocated
to weapons research and national security, firmly established the majority of university

\(^{35}\) Ibid., 77.
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all involve large universities and there are no small colleges, like Macalester, represented in the data.
\(^{38}\) Ibid., 15-17.
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administrators in opposition to the antiwar movement. According to Heineman’s model, this conservative administration was deeply at odds with its more liberal students and faculty.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s the faculty base at U.S. colleges and universities underwent a notable shift. Older professors, many of whom had received little professional training, were joined by young professors with elite educations who were determined to become notable academics in their respective fields.\footnote{Ibid., 43. Heineman also explains the role many of these senior professors played in the development of federal foreign policy, particularly during and immediately after World War II. He goes on to state that new and young professors in the 1950s and 60s objected to the “intellectual corruption” of their colleagues and worked to re-center the university’s focus on academic work.} This new guard of young professors was overwhelming opposed to the war in Vietnam, ranging from liberal and religious pacifists to radical participants in the politics of the New Left.\footnote{Ibid., 43-46. Heineman provides statistical analysis to support his assertions. See page 43.} These young and liberal faculty members also welcomed a new generation of students to their classrooms in the mid-1960s. Brought up amid the consumerism and false harmony of the postwar period, these students were prepared to consider the world in a different manner. Escaping the supervision of their parents, young people worked to create a new image of the student. Students became a “part of a new social class, a class which was neither blue nor white collar and which stood apart from the larger society.”\footnote{Ibid., 77.} As the college and university system expanded in the years following World War II with the introduction of the GI Bill, a larger section of American society was granted access to higher education.\footnote{Ibid., 77.} This, combined with postwar upbringings and a sudden lack of parental supervision, proved explosive to the antiwar movement and the counterculture. Students seized their
new position of power, utilizing it to create organizations like Students for a Democratic Society, the New Left, and the Yippies.

While Macalester students gathered momentum from the countercultural communities at larger institutions like Pennsylvania State University or the State Universities of New York, their position as students at a Midwestern, private, liberal arts college made their situation unique. Historians examining Macalester’s engagement with the counterculture and the antiwar movement will see that it does not match Heineman’s proposed pattern. Instead, Macalester students adopted the social movements they saw on the national level and reinvented them to suit their own needs. The counterculture on Macalester’s campus was supported by a liberal administration which led to unique manifestations of countercultural sentiment on campus. Subsequent chapters will further explore Macalester’s deviance from national models of the counterculture.

**National Counterculture Groups and Splinters**

Many of the young Americans who embraced countercultural ideals of authentic living were deeply concerned by American military involvement in Vietnam. These individuals saw the war in Vietnam not only as morally wrong, but also as a manifestation of the consumerist Cold War society they rejected. However, historians frequently separate antiwar protest and countercultural activities, choosing to categorize the political Left as straight living and the countercultural Left as unruly and politically apathetic. Events at Macalester College show how deeply intertwined anti-Vietnam sentiment was with the counterculture. Many authors use the term “hippie” to differentiate between what they see as legitimate antiwar protests and countercultural youth. Hippie is a term that is difficult to navigate in the scholarly literature of the
counterculture. Some historians, like Braunstein and Doyle, view hippies and the counterculture as existing in two distinct groups with hippies signifying a particularly bohemian aesthetic and lifestyle.\footnote{Braunstein and Doyle, introduction to Imagine Nation, 11.} Other authors, like Gretchen Lemke-Santangelo, consider the word hippie to have a positive connotation and use the terms counterculture and hippie interchangeably.\footnote{Lemke-Santangelo, Daughters of Aquarius, 7. It is worth noting that Lemke-Santangelo declares a particular eagerness to use countercultural language in her work in an attempt “to ‘get down’ with the material.” She clearly identifies with the values held by the counterculture. This may have some influence on her work and her choice of language.} A few historians have more negative perceptions of the hippies. Melvin Small describes hippies as “bearded, sandal-clad youthful dropouts” and goes on to argue that they only attended antiwar demonstrations as a venue to listen to music and consume drugs.\footnote{Melvin Small, Antiwarriors: The Vietnam War and the Battle for America’s Hearts and Minds (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2002), 79-81. On page 81 Small goes on to say that the counterculture hurt the legitimacy of the antiwar cause when “serious” political activists were associated with hippies, a cultural scene supposedly hated by the American middle class. This argument neglects the overlap between the so-called hippies and political protesters and the distinct countercultural atmosphere of many antiwar events, something that is evident in the lived experiences of many of these protestors.} Historians Nancy Zaroulis and Gerald Sullivan take a similar approach, clarifying their very definition of the anti-Vietnam War movement with a statement that it “was not a movement of licentious counterculturals.”\footnote{Zaroulis and Sullivan, Who Spoke Up?, xii. Zaroulis and Sullivan’s work on the counterculture may also be impacted by the time period in which they were writing. In 1984 the counterculture was still fresh, and often controversial, in American memory. Their main argument attempts to establish that the antiwar movement was led by a group of democratic, idealistic individuals of all ages. The negative connotations of the counterculture in the 1980s would have complicated this vision of democracy they were trying to create. As a part of their argument, Zaroulis and Sullivan point out that many “straight-living” individuals were involved in antiwar movements. While this is certainly true, even straight living individuals embodied the ideals of the counterculture through the very act of protesting the war in Vietnam.} However, these authors overlook how deeply countercultural in nature many protest events of the 1960s and 70s were, and the important role cultural rebellion played in protesting the Vietnam War.
The role of the counterculture in protesting the Vietnam War is often overlooked by historians because, for students, one of the most visible national groups for peace in Vietnam was political: The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). SDS was not an organization created specifically to protest the war in Vietnam. Rather, SDS originated as the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID) early in the twentieth century. In 1960 a branch of SLID met at the University of Michigan with a plan for converting their organization into an activist group for leftist students called Students for a Democratic Society. In its early years SDS advocated for civil rights and political radicalism among students and by 1961 it had grown to twenty chapters. The popularity of SDS dramatically increased with the creation of The Port Huron Statement in 1962. This manifesto, written by SDS leader Tom Hayden, proclaimed SDS’ bold commitment to radical social change for the purpose of building a better future. The Port Huron Statement was a “call to arms, meant to rouse youth from complacency” particularly in regards to the Cold War and racial injustice in the United States. Critical of the American political system and American society in the 1950s, the manifesto shared many values with the counterculture as it condemned the apathy of Americans in the postwar period. With the creation of The Port Huron Statement in 1962, SDS became a nationally recognized organization with chapters present on college campuses across the United States.
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The University of California, Berkeley’s Free Speech Movement of 1964 and ‘65 continued to develop the ideas introduced by *The Port Huron Statement* in 1962. Headed by Mario Savio, the Free Speech Movement protested a ban on political advocacy instated by the administration at University of California Berkeley in 1964.\(^{54}\) Savio, a civil rights activist, felt that this ban particularly targeted the civil rights movement and he became the unofficial advocate for greater academic freedom and free speech at the university.\(^{55}\) Drawing momentum from these early movements, SDS began to advocate for an end to the war in Vietnam as early as 1964. Students involved in SDS argued that an escalated conflict in Vietnam was harmful to both American and Vietnamese citizens in addition to being inherently immoral.\(^{56}\) Throughout the war, SDS remained one of the most prominent organizations in opposition to the war in Vietnam despite the decentralized nature of the movement. Mainly focused on the Vietnam War, civil rights, and other political issues, SDS maintained a degree of distance from the counterculture throughout the 1960s and 70s.

Other organizations, like the SDS splinter group the Weather Underground, took a more politically radical and in many cases violent approach to the issues of the 1960s. At the 1969 National SDS Convention an article entitled “You Don’t Need a Weatherman to Know Which Way the Wind Blows…” in the SDS newspaper, *New Left Notes*, caused a great deal of controversy.\(^{57}\) Named for a lyric in Bob Dylan’s “Subterranean Homesick


Blues,” this article was the founding statement for a new youth organization: the Weather Underground. It’s writers argued against what they referred to as the “US imperialist system” and suggested the creation of a revolutionary youth movement as well as a “white fighting force to support the black liberation movement.”58 The Weather Underground split from SDS in 1969 and, relying on the theories of their socialist heroes Che Guevara and Fidel Castro, the Weathermen worked to create a revolutionary army that could engage in armed struggle against US imperialism and capitalism.59 The Weather Underground clearly operated under a drastically different agenda than Students for a Democratic Society and their methods were the complete opposite of the mostly peaceful protests and marches of other antiwar organizations. Throughout the early 1970s the Weather Underground engaged in bombing campaigns aimed at government buildings.60 The Weathermen formed the guerilla political fringe of the counterculture of the 1960s and 70s. While most Macalester students at the time preferred the peaceful political protest of SDS or the cultural absurdity of the Yippies, the Weather Underground provides a good example of the variety and division present within the counterculture.

Unlike SDS, the New Left as a whole strategically used the counterculture to their political advantage. The creation of SDS in 1962 set in motion a new way of thinking about leftist politics. SDS and The Port Huron Statement established a young, New Left that was decidedly different from previous liberal political movements. The New Left critiqued organized labor and Marxism, the main principles that guided liberals from
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previous generations, and chose instead to focus on social issues and structures of authority in society. By the mid-1960s, the New Left had expanded beyond SDS and many of their ideals aligned with those of the counterculture. Like hippie counterculturals, members of the New Left rejected the consumerism of the postwar era, arguing that it resulted in unfair systems that disenfranchised certain groups of people. Instead, they supported the idea of authentic living as a form of political activism, arguing that a truly just society would allow all people to live authentically and to connect with other like-minded individuals. This mentality was very much aligned with the counterculture’s embrace of free love, honest living, and their rejection of the values of the dominant culture. By the late 1960s the New Left had become increasingly radical and countercultural in their mode of political operation in order to attract new members and to effect political change. In essence, as the political ideas of the New Left became more left wing, so too did their means of displaying these radical politics. Eventually, the New Left and the political element they represented were fully integrated into the countercultural scenes of the 1960s and 70s.

The culturally revolutionary fringe of the New Left, the Youth International Movement, eagerly embraced the ideals of the counterculture. In 1968 Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman formed the Youth International Party, whose members were referred to as the Yippies. Inspired by the Free Speech Movement, the Yippies became highly involved in the antiwar movement and relied heavily on the ideals of the counterculture.

---
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to support their goals. The Yippies appealed to a section of society that was not traditionally involved in political demonstration: the hippies. The eccentric actions and rejection of societal standards that characterized the Yippie movement encouraged wayward counterculturals to become politically involved through opposition to the Vietnam War.\textsuperscript{64} In addition to attracting the attention of the more fringe countercultural sectors of society, the absurd and colorful nature of the Yippies also garnered the attention of the press.\textsuperscript{65} This press was often negative, but Yippie theatrics and unruliness brought the anti-Vietnam War movement much needed media attention.\textsuperscript{66}

The Yippies took left wing politics to the radical extreme, using countercultural absurdity to deliver their political message. This is evident in one of the most notable Yippie events, the protest at the Pentagon. At this 1967 protest Hoffman, Rubin, and the Yippies:

\begin{quote}
passed out noisemakers, wild costumes, and witches’ hats to intrigued protesters. It was comic theater and a genuine hunger for the liberating force of the irrational lined up against the fierce and deadly reason of the Military Machine. All together they chanted, sang religious songs, and attempted to levitate the Pentagon three hundred feet in to the air in order to shake out all its evil spirits.\textsuperscript{67}
\end{quote}

The protest attempting to levitate the Pentagon is demonstrative of the joking absurdity the Yippies used to deliver their message against the war in Vietnam. The Yippies employed similar tactics to express their antiwar and anti-establishment sentiments at the 1968 Democratic National Convention held in Chicago.

\textsuperscript{64} David Farber, “The Intoxicated State/Illegal Nation: Drugs in the Sixties Counterculture,” in \textit{Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and 70s}, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (New York: Routledge, 2002), 35. In this section Farber refers to the hippies recruited into the Yippie movement as “drug-using.” However, the Yippies encouraged hippies of all sorts, as well as straight-living individuals, to “turn on” to the anti-Vietnam War movement.
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The political message of the Yippies, while decidedly antiwar and anti-authority, was not always in line with the antiwar message and political sentiments of SDS and the New Left. While SDS and the New Left presented logical political arguments about the immorality of the war in Vietnam, the Yippies preached cultural liberation and a total rejection of the political system. A major component to this cultural liberation was the use of illegal drugs. The Yippie teachings of Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman relied heavily on a new form of “consciousness” and a clearer way of thinking that they asserted only drugs like marijuana or LSD could provide. The Yippies’ reliance on drug consciousness and radical cultural liberation caused many adults and more politically minded youth to mistrust the Yippies and their raucous version of the counterculture.

Subsequently, Yippie events like the 1968 Festival of Life at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago promoted psychedelic drug use, carnivalesque displays of protest, and violence against the system. The Festival of Life was meant to serve as a public spectacle “confronting, overwhelming, and freaking out the convention of death.” In doing so the Yippies showed their opposition to the actions of members of the Democratic Party, like Lyndon Baines Johnson or Hubert Humphrey, who were complicit in the death and destruction of the Vietnam War. The Festival of Life placed the Democratic Party’s perpetuation of the Vietnam War in direct contrast to Yippie
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celebrations of vibrancy and vitality. Ironically, this celebration turned violent as protestors and police clashed and the event became a riot.\footnote{Ibid., 199-200. Eight participants in the Chicago protests, including Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, were charged with conspiracy to incite a riot at the Chicago Democratic National Convention. The trial was highly publicized and inspired its own set of protests. The eight individuals were eventually acquitted of any crime.} The Yippie movement clearly took the ideals of the counterculture to their most radical cultural extreme. Yet, despite their carnival antics and their vulgarly vocal disdain for the system, the Yippie movement introduced a great number of dissatisfied youth to the anti-Vietnam War movement.

Groups like Students for a Democratic Society, the Weather Underground, and the Yippies provide a brief overview of the political and cultural climate of the 1960s and 70s. They demonstrate the wide variety of political views and cultural antics that are included within the counterculture. Students at Macalester did not actively participate in all of these nationally organized groups. However, these organizations were social movements that served as the inspiration for much of the activism on Macalester’s campus. These students took elements from these nationally organized movements and adapted them to suit their own values. While these countercultural groups were prominent during the 1960s and 70s, a great deal of antiwar activism in this time period also centered around the issue of the draft.

**Countercultural Protest by Defying the Draft**

During the Vietnam War the draft became a contentious political issue. The Selective Service instated a system that selected individuals for the draft at three different levels; the individual, the community, and the federal government. The federal level of selection involved a complicated system of draft exemptions and deferments used to
channel young men into education or specific careers.\textsuperscript{73} These deferments, especially the 2-S student deferment, encouraged many young men to attend college or pursue careers in farming, military defense, or education.\textsuperscript{74} However, this complex system of deferments and exemptions also raised questions about the equity of the draft. By granting exemptions to students the Selective Service created a system where “working class men who lacked the financial resources to attend college full time...were more likely to be drafted than middle-class, full-time students.”\textsuperscript{75} Thus, the draft became a divisive issue for students at colleges and universities. Students protested the draft either due to a moral opposition to war or because they objected to the unfair system perpetuated by the draft. Regardless of their reason for protest, the majority of male students remained protected from the draft, facing the dilemma of conscription only after graduation. As a result, student participants in the draft resistance movement occupied a place of power and privilege.

The anti-draft movement began with religious antiwar groups and traditional peace activist organizations rather than with the radical cultural protest of the counterculture. The issue of the draft in the Vietnam War was a cause first adopted by groups that had long been devoted to pacifism like the Committee for Non-Violent Action (CNVA) or the War Resisters League (WRL).\textsuperscript{76} Additionally, draft laws prior to 1965 only permitted conscientious objector status for members of a church with
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opposition to military service explicitly stated in their creed.\textsuperscript{77} This naturally led to the large presence of religious organizations in movements against the Selective Service. Groups like Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam (CALCAV) united spiritual leaders from different religious affiliations in protest against the war in Vietnam.\textsuperscript{78}

Presbyterian minister William Sloane Coffin, the chaplain at Yale University, was one of the most prominent figures in the draft resistance movement. Instrumental in the formation of CALCAV, Coffin was a powerful orator who presided over many draft protest events and encouraged churches and synagogues to shelter draft resisters.\textsuperscript{79} In 1965 the draft laws were changed to allow secular opponents of war and violence to request conscientious objector status.\textsuperscript{80} However, religious groups remained the dominant voice advocating against the draft throughout the duration of the Vietnam War.

The draft resistance movement, with its blatant disregard for the authority of the U.S. government, was eventually incorporated into the absurd displays and radical antiwar politics of the counterculture. Despite the strong leadership of William Sloane Coffin and other religious groups, draft resistance remained a very personal choice and there was never a nationally organized movement protesting the draft. Instead each individual faced the choice of fleeing to Canada, declaring conscientious objector status and facing alternative service, going to jail for draft evasion, or serving in Vietnam. Those who chose to resist the draft were enacting the goals of the counterculture by working to create their own community that differed from the dominant culture through
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their belief in an alternate form of patriotism and democracy.\textsuperscript{81} Additionally, the anti-draft movement, with its blatant disregard for authority, incorporated the colorful displays and strong antiwar sentiments of the counterculture. Individuals who opposed the draft were “rebelling against the fundamental structure of American society” and rejecting “mainstream America” in their quest for an authentic and moral lifestyle.\textsuperscript{82} Like their youthful student contemporaries, draft resisters of all ages and political beliefs were embodying the ideals of the counterculture by adhering to their own personal convictions as a form of political protest.

In examining political and countercultural organizations of the 1960s and 70s there are a number of clear patterns that emerge. The origins, history, and actions of groups like SDS, the New Left, the Weathermen, the Yippies, and the draft resistance movement demonstrate the vast and contradictory nature of the counterculture. All of these organizations were rooted in the countercultural values of authenticity and community whether their goals were political, social, or cultural. These organizations also all utilized the counterculture’s notion of radical absurdity in different manners. SDS, the New Left, and the draft resistance movement were radical through their determined but peaceful advocacy for social and political change. In contrast, the Weathermen and the Yippies relied heavily on the idea of countercultural absurdity, pushing the boundaries of culture and politics and often using equally radical tactics to achieve these goals. These groups all fit with the principle that the counterculture was an amorphous, often disorganized coalition of ideas and mentalities. Very few of these
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groups were centrally organized and none of them united with one another in significant ways. The counterculture was only loosely constrained and the supporters and chapters of these groups remained scattered across the United States.

Yet, these were the organizations that Macalester students looked to for inspiration in their own countercultural experiments. Macalester students, along with other college students across the nation, imagined the counterculture and the antiwar movement to be a strong, unified front that objected to the war and the cultural complacency of the previous generation. Macalester students sought to mimic this national movement on their own campus and through their personal convictions. However, the set of circumstances in which students staged their protests and developed new, countercultural mentalities profoundly impacted the structure of the Macalester counterculture. As a result, the anti-Vietnam War movement and the counterculture at Macalester varies from the national model for campus counterculture outlined by Heineman. Instead, these students created their own unique countercultural scene to suit the Macalester community.

As a whole, the counterculture and antiwar movement in the United States developed as a series of shifting social movements in response to the major political and social events of the 1960s and 70s. Mostly comprised of the younger generations, these social movements expressed youthful discontent with the societal expectations of the postwar period and relied heavily on long-standing American traditions of political dissent. The events and social movements that comprised the counterculture on the national level helped shape Macalester perceptions of the counterculture and served as the guide for students’ own countercultural experiments. Historians studying the
counterculture and the antiwar movement at colleges across the United States, like Heineman, have used these social movements to create a national model of the college counterculture at colleges and universities. Macalester defies this national model for the counterculture. Expanding on the descriptions of the national counterculture developed in this chapter, Chapter Two will examine Macalester students’ readaptation of national social movements to fit their own values as a community.
Chapter Two: The Counterculture on Macalester’s Campus

Because the college administration was antiwar there was no attempt to censor the antiwar movement...At one point it wasn’t really necessary to do anything because everybody was opposed to the war.

James Flannery, Macalester Faculty 1969-Present

In May of 1970 the lawn at Macalester College was covered in white gravestone crosses, each smeared with red paint to resemble blood. Located at the busy intersection of Grand and Snelling Avenues in St. Paul the crosses were easily visible to passersby and they were intended to make a bold political statement. Students installed this dramatic and public proclamation just a few days after Nixon began the Cambodian Invasion. Meant to represent the many U.S. soldiers and Vietnamese citizens who were killed each week in the war, the display also quickly became a symbol of mourning and protest after the shootings at Kent State on May 4, 1970. This photo published in The Mac Weekly reveals a great deal about how Macalester students responded to events occurring on the national stage. Current events like the Cambodian Invasion and the deaths of student protestors at Kent State in Ohio had a significant impact on the daily lives of students in St. Paul, Minnesota. Reacting to the news, these students adopted their own forms of protest to fit their unique campus environment. As the crosses on the lawn demonstrate, Macalester students in the 1960s and 70s were engaged in a process of adoption and reinvention. This process occurred both as a reaction to current events and in response to the nationally organized movements for social change discussed in the previous chapter.
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This chapter demonstrates the way that Macalester students of the 1960s and 70s adopted and reinvented the ideas and actions of the counterculture to suit their own values and circumstances. After exploring the ideas, organizations, and models that constituted the national counterculture, a close examination of the counterculture at Macalester is required. The college did not comply with Heineman’s model for campus protest, standing apart from this model mainly because of its liberal administration. Unlike other colleges and universities at the time, Macalester was not a hotbed of controversy over countercultural activity and protest against the war in Vietnam. For the most part students, faculty, and staff were in consensus regarding their opposition to the Vietnam War. While students did adopt and reinvent aspects of the counterculture they were doing so in an environment that did not necessitate or produce active involvement in these movements. In order to better understanding the atmosphere on Macalester’s campus in the 1960s, I conducted interviews with college alumni from the classes of
1964 to 1972.\textsuperscript{85} The stories and anecdotes collected through these interviews are intended to show the lived experiences of Macalester students and faculty during the Vietnam War. To supplement the perspective provided by these individuals, I also conducted archival research in the Macalester College Archives and turned to the columns of *The Mac Weekly*.

This chapter explores several key aspects of the counterculture on Macalester’s campus between 1966 and 1974. I argue that these students reinvented social movements that occurred on the national level to suit their own values. However, campus consensus against the war in Vietnam rendered students fairly inactive compared to students participating in antiwar movements at other colleges and universities. I begin by comparing national explanations for the origins of the counterculture with stories of how Macalester students became involved with countercultural modes of thinking and living. Next, I outline distinct moments of antiwar and countercultural involvement on campus, analyzing the way students reinvented national movements for social change to align with campus ideals. Following an examination of these instances of political activism on campus, I turn to cultural subscenes of the counterculture to identify how students experienced and adapted the counterculture to suit their own needs. Finally, I conduct an in-depth analysis of Macalester antiwar movements in comparison to Heineman’s model for campus protest.

\textsuperscript{85} See Introduction pages 12 to 14 as well as Appendix A on page 107 and Appendix B on page 108 for more information on interview methodology and extensive background information on the six alumni who participated in this project. Also see Figure 2.2 on page 45 for abridged background information and a reintroduction to the individuals discussed in this chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Graduating Class</th>
<th>Hometown</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
<th>Yearbook Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Braun Fritz</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Rochester, MN</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>First generation college student, Brother and boyfriend served in Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Houghton</td>
<td>Did not graduate, left in 1967</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Dropped out of Macalester in 1967, Served as a conscientious objector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Baldwin</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Wayzata, MN</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Worked in the Chaplain’s Office at Macalester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Olsen</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Beloit, WI</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Attended Woodstock, Served as a conscientious objector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Flannery</td>
<td>1963, began as faculty member in 1969</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Both a Macalester student and faculty member, Moderate approach to the war</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin Currier</td>
<td>1953, Returned as a faculty member in 1964</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Served as Macalester’s radical chaplain from 1964-1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2.2. Table of alumni interviews.*

Photos courtesy of Bill Houghton and Macalester College Archives, St. Paul, Minnesota.
Countercultural Origins at Macalester

Macalester students involved with the counterculture provide an interesting new perspective to the narrative tracing the formation of the counterculture to the political and social climate of the 1940s and 50s. Bev Fritz attributed much of her involvement in antiwar protests and the counterculture to the college environment, stating: “it just felt like it was [a group of] diverse thinkers.”

She expressed the belief that “the 60s really brought a generation of kids [to college]...because of their parents. Their parents valued education...It was a lot of their generation that brought this on too.”

Christina Baldwin also traced her involvement with the antiwar movement back to her upbringing, saying that “growing up in the 1950s in a white porridge, it changed us.” In her opinion, the antiwar movement and the campus counterculture gave students “the opportunity to have a very complex view of social life in America...it gave white middle class kids an opportunity to [be] much more complex, sometimes cynical, sometimes [it gave them] a sense of betrayal.”

In keeping with the main narrative of the creation of the counterculture, these women saw their involvement in anti-Vietnam War protest as a part of something larger and as a personal reaction to previous attitudes and events.

However, the counterculture on Macalester’s campus in the 1960s and 70s was much more complex than the straightforward path this narrative presents. While both Fritz and Baldwin attributed a degree of the social and political dissent on campus to larger social occurrences, they also identified the Vietnam War and other major political
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movements as the impetus for their rebellion. Prior to her engagement with antiwar protest, Baldwin was very involved in civil rights protest. She cited a trip to Mississippi in 1966 as “quite an eye opener.” While speaking about the civil rights movement she explained that she “was more comfortable in that movement. I think it really seeded [in me] my deciding to stand forward.”\textsuperscript{90} For Baldwin, political and social injustices were clearly a major determining factor in her decision to rebel against the dominant culture of the time. While she gives some credit to her parents’ generation, her political and cultural dissent were also connected to her personal beliefs and a precise “wake up” moment in her life.

Bev Fritz did not experience this wake up moment when she actively decided to protest the war in Vietnam. Instead, she thought she was led to join campus activities opposing the war by “a friend that was probably a little bit stronger minded than I was on the issue.”\textsuperscript{91} She gradually joined the antiwar movement and slowly developed her ideas about why involvement was important to her. This decision was influenced, in part, by her family’s situation. “I had both a brother and a boyfriend in Vietnam at this time...as much as I felt a need to protest there was still this push, pull. I actually had a note in my diary that said my boyfriend wrote me and said that the U.S. college students were all wrong about this, they shouldn’t be doing this. I was like, ‘Oops!’”\textsuperscript{92} Unlike Baldwin, Fritz was not compelled to join protest against the war in Vietnam because of one specific social or political issue. Instead she came to the movement by slowly piecing

\textsuperscript{91} Fritz, 3.
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together and exploring her beliefs. The decision was also a more difficult one for Fritz because she had to go against the beliefs of people who were close to her.

Overall, the stories of these two women defy the national image of the counterculture and paint a complex picture of the antiwar movement and counterculture on Macalester’s campus. Both women were greatly impacted by their parents’ values and the circumstances of their 1950s upbringing. However, they each came to the antiwar movement in their own way and they each separately developed personal opinions about the counterculture. The motivations behind the involvement in the antiwar movement and the counterculture of these two students is illustrative of the diversity and complexity that made Macalester’s counterculture such a unique movement.

**Reinventing National Movements**

A great number of Macalester students engaged in antiwar politics in the 1960s and 70s as well as in the social defiance of the counterculture. Macalester students engaged with three specific movements that demonstrate the ways in which students reinvented national movements against the Vietnam War to fit their unique campus circumstances. The Vietnam War Moratorium Day, the Yippie movement, and religious opposition to the Vietnam War all drew the attention of college students in the late 1960s. The participation of Macalester students in these groups also shows that anti-Vietnam War sentiment was essential to the very existence of the counterculture at Macalester College.

The Vietnam War Moratorium Day is a particularly good example of the way Macalester students reworked national countercultural organizations to suit their own values. The first Vietnam Moratorium Day which occurred on October 15, 1969 was a
nationally organized, but decentralized, event that encouraged people to stop work or class in recognition of their disapproval of the war in Vietnam. Individuals across the United States showed their opposition to the war for an entire day and for each month the war continued, a day was added to the event. The Moratorium, in both its national and Macalester forms, was decidedly countercultural in nature. For example, the method of protesting the war utilized by the Moratorium was highly decentralized, leaving the specific details of the event to the discretion of local organizers. This hands-off approach is emblematic of the counterculture, encouraging freedom of expression, and in keeping with the loose conglomeration of ideas and lifestyles that characterized the counterculture. The lack of national guidelines for the project also left room for Macalester students to practice countercultural ideals of freedom of expression by creating an event that matched the college’s values.

Macalester’s Vietnam Moratorium Day was a strange mix of events that reflects a shift in the opinions held by the student body. The schedule consisted of a rally on the chapel mall with music and a guest speaker, leafleting in the surrounding neighborhoods, and a political rally with speeches by Georgia Representative Julian Bond and Minnesota Senator Walter Mondale. What is striking about the Moratorium Day on Macalester’s campus is that it ran in direct opposition to traditional student culture. In fact, the event fell in the middle of the college’s homecoming week, “mixed in with the trike race, the pickle eating contest and the moment when some radiant, well-scrubbed beauty is crowned our queen.” By even thinking the war was wrong, much less protesting against
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it, Macalester students were going against the college’s traditional culture. In rejecting the idea of a beauty queen in order to focus on GIs dying in Vietnam and by trading pickle eating contests for picketing, Macalester students involved in the antiwar movement were tuning in to the counterculture. Rejecting the long-established college culture meant embracing an alternate lifestyle and finding a new community of like-minded individuals. Additionally, by deciding to continue with the event despite its conflict with the traditional homecoming celebrations students showed their commitment to advocating for an end to the war in Vietnam. These students were reinventing elements of the national antiwar movement and placing their pacifism and advocacy in direct opposition to traditional collegiate culture. Thus, Macalester students used techniques of readaptation to engage with countercultural ideals and lifestyles.

While the events of the 1969 Vietnam Moratorium Day were deeply at odds with the traditional student culture of the 1960s, there was surprisingly little controversy over the interruption of the homecoming celebrations. The October 10, 1969 edition of *The Mac Weekly* was filled with commentary on the upcoming Vietnam Moratorium Day and speculation about the repercussions of interrupting the homecoming celebrations. However, the next edition of *The Mac Weekly* on October 24, 1969 contained a great deal of praise for the success of the Moratorium and only one mention of homecoming. In a letter to the editor one student named Chuck Horton complained that homecoming participation had been lacking as “it isn’t hip or sophisticated enough for everyone to get together and have community fun without having drugs or psychedelic lights or sounds.”[^96] His complaint was not about the Moratorium or the political activism of

students. Rather, the author laments a changing student culture at Macalester. Bill Houghton echoed the idea of a changing atmosphere on campus by stating, “the literature I got from the college after I was admitted talked about the sort of normal attire for male students going to class will be a sport coat and tie...I got to campus and it just wasn’t true. There was a sort of holdover attitude. It was trying to reinvent itself.”

The comments about student culture made by Chuck Horton in his editorial and by Bill Houghton in his interview reveal a rapidly changing college environment in the 1960s. The lack of outrage about the interrupted homecoming celebrations and the abundance of praise for the success of the Moratorium demonstrate that Macalester politics and culture were moving towards a countercultural consensus.

In addition to this basic level of engagement with the counterculture, students designed subsequent Vietnam Moratorium Days to include events that evoked the ideals of the counterculture and engaged with a wider countercultural community. This is evident in the December 1969 Vietnam Moratorium Day. Macalester students partnered with students from the University of Minnesota to create an event that included picketing against the Honeywell plant, a free performance by the Guthrie Players, and a free lunch provided by the YMCA. Through their partnership with students from the University of Minnesota, Macalester College students were interacting with the larger countercultural community. Although picketing at the Honeywell plant shows a desire to continue traditional forms of political protest, the free performance and the free lunch indicate that Macalester students often blended countercultural techniques with the politics of the antiwar movement. The Diggers, one of the Haight-Ashbury’s whimsical countercultural
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groups in the late-1960s, were very concerned with the ideology of “free” and they distributed free goods and services to the general public. The free entertainment and free food distributed by Macalester and the University of Minnesota as a part of the December 1969 Moratorium Day is in line with The Diggers’ countercultural philosophies. Minnesota college students adopted a prominent component of The Diggers’ nationally recognized lifestyle and combined it with political activism in their December Moratorium Day. Overall, the members of the antiwar movement at Macalester tentatively engaged with countercultural activities that were inspired by nationally prominent countercultural groups.

Students also cautiously engaged with the Yippie movement and its radical countercultural associations. In April of 1970, the Macalester Community Council brought Youth International Party leader Jerry Rubin to campus to share his insights on the current political climate in the United States. An amateur film shot by a group of Macalester students who called themselves “Yippie Films Ltd” contains a scene showing the Macalester Yippies greeting Jerry Rubin at the airport before his speech. In this scene the students, bedecked in face paint and creative costumes, are raucously escorting Jerry Rubin from the airport to Macalester in an American-flag-painted hearse. This showy behavior demonstrates that the college’s students rejected dominant American culture and turned instead to the theatrics and disorder of the Yippie counterculture. However,

---

99 Michael William Doyle, “Staging the Revolution: Guerrilla Theater as a Countercultural Practice, 1965-68,” in Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and 70s, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (New York: Routledge, 2002), 80-81. In the following pages Doyle further outlines the concept of “free” as defined by The Diggers. Doyle asserts that The Diggers were only able to implement their free programs due to the post scarcity society of the 1950s and 60s. It is important to note that none of these free programs were truly free as they all relied on donations and charities to provide goods and services.
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according to a 1970 opinion article in *The Mac Weekly*, Rubin’s speech “espoused the rather traditional anti-intellectual arguments: calling for action rather than thought, experience rather than education, demonstration in place of discussion.” This stance angered a great number of students who considered their approach to antiwar protest to combine cultural disobedience and intellectual discussion. These students felt that they could not solely rely on Yippie theatrical practices to achieve their goal of ending the war in Vietnam.

**Figure 2.3.** Jerry Rubin during his speech at Macalester College, 1970. Photo courtesy of Macalester College Archives, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Although Macalester students agreed with many of the countercultural political tactics of Jerry Rubin and the Yippies, they also clearly believed in reinforcing Yippie theatrics with intellectual arguments and discussions. Hesitant to fully embrace the Yippie political ideology, or lack thereof, the Macalester Yippies combined their countercultural, theatrical methods for protest with the more substantial political ideology of the New Left. Macalester students instead believed that “to question more, to think
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more, to attempt to generate knowledge is a formidable task. This entails searching for new ways to let individuals think independently and critically. Being bound in power struggles and violent expressions hinders that effort for some of us.” Overall, while many Macalester students chose to show their solidarity with the antiwar movement through countercultural Yippie modes of personal expression, they simultaneously rejected the Yippies’ anti-intellectual political ideals and created their own unique version of the Yippie movement on campus.

Religion also played a prominent role in the development of unique antiwar protest and the counterculture at Macalester. Like with the Moratorium and the Yippies, the Macalester community adapted religious modes of political protest and countercultural living to suit campus purposes. While Reverend William Sloane Coffin captured the national attention with his high profile activism against the Vietnam War, Macalester found its own outspoken religious peace activist in Reverend Alvin Currier. Christina Baldwin worked closely with Reverend Currier as a student employee in the chaplain’s office:

The first thing that happened at Mac is that the chaplain’s office really led the way...There was a kind of wild, almost *Doonesbury* kind of chaplain...William Sloane Coffin was this same kind of radical chaplain at Columbia University (sic). I think Al Currier kind of fashioned himself off of that. He was very much a political Christian in a way, talking about the radicalism of Jesus.”
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103 Baldwin, 3. Baldwin states that William Sloane Coffin was the chaplain at Columbia. This is incorrect, he was chaplain at Yale between 1958 and 1975. For more detailed information on the antiwar activism of William Sloane Coffin see Foley, *Confronting the War Machine*, 5, 94-95, and 120-125. *Doonesbury* refers to a comic strip started at Yale in the 1960s. The *Doonesbury* comic strip is known for its biting social and political commentary and it still runs today.
A graduate of the Macalester class of 1953, Reverend Currier began his career at Macalester in 1964 after an intense study of Christian-Marxist dialogue at the Free University of Berlin. During his years as the college chaplain Currier brought a number of influential speakers to campus and offered draft counseling services in the chapel on a weekly basis. In a 1970 interview with the chaplain, The Mac Weekly noted that “like other people around here, his hair has gotten longer, his mustache has started to curl up at the edges. Sometime in the last five years, a black beret entered the wardrobe. Then an inverted cross and a multi-colored vest.” The Mac Weekly portrays Currier in a decidedly countercultural light, highlighting his youth and his ability to relate to the radical politics of the student body.

Figure 2.4. Reverend Alvin Currier, 1970.
Photo courtesy of Macalester College Archives, St. Paul, Minnesota.
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105 “God is Alive but Rationalism is Dead,” The Mac Weekly (St. Paul, MN), May 19, 1970. The mention of Alvin Currier’s black beret may demonstrate his desire to show solidarity with the Black Panther Party who were known for their uniforms that included a black beret.
In addition to Reverend Currier’s outward identification with the counterculture, he also promoted a Christian theology that adopted countercultural ideals. In February of 1967 Currier invited Reverend William Sloane Coffin to deliver a special Religious Confrontation Service on the topic of “God, Man, and Change.” This sermon, which Coffin also delivered at the Southeastern Massachusetts Technological Institute in 1967, directly condemns the war in Vietnam and calls for coordinated student action against the war. The following semester, in September of 1967, Currier asked Macalester librarian James Holly to present a sermon entitled “The Hippies—God’s Gentle People.” In his Sunday sermon, Holly boldly asked, “who then is more freaked out? The hippies on pot and LSD, or the straights on LBJ and AT&T?” The parade of high profile and radical speakers that Currier brought to speak at religious events shows a reworking of the national model of religious protest and also demonstrates how prevalent antiwar sentiment was on campus. The sermons delivered by Holly and Coffin at Macalester were both presented at events that had required attendance for students. Antiwar sentiment became commonplace at Macalester, even permeating into mandatory student worship services. Many national movements against the war in Vietnam, like the draft resistance movement or William Sloane Coffin’s crusade against the Vietnam War at Yale, featured fiery orators and charismatic leadership. On the other hand, Currier, while embodying the pacifist ideals of these national movements, was not nearly as
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outspoken as his national counterparts. Instead, he adopted an understated countercultural existence and a role as a religious mentor that focused on building authentic modes of living at Macalester.

Reverend Currier’s experiences working with students as the college’s chaplain demonstrate the ways in which he shaped national modes of religious protest to fit his constituency at Macalester College. While discussing a sit-in that occurred on Grand Avenue he expressed, “I was very strongly opposed to the war. Somehow I had the gut feeling that a sit-in was counterproductive. I remember being part of a swift moving series of events...to channel the energy from sitting in the street to going to Washington...to set up conferences with Senator Mondale.”\textsuperscript{110} Citing another incidence of a sit-in on campus, Currier remembered that when he was called upon to help diffuse the situation he felt “there was no way I could go over there and tell them they were wrong if the war kept going on.”\textsuperscript{111} Instead, Currier participated in the sit-in with the students until “we sort of all came to the conclusion that this is a dead end. There’s another way to handle this. We’re just creating enemies.”\textsuperscript{112} These recollections demonstrate how Reverend Al Currier interpreted his role in the Macalester antiwar movement. While religious leaders on the national scale were spirited objectors to the Vietnam War and centered campus antiwar movements around their vibrant personalities, Currier guided student protest in a different way. He placed his students in positions of leadership and let them shape the direction of their own antiwar convictions. He also brought speakers to campus to provide a
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variety of different religious views on the antiwar movement instead of delivering these sermons himself. Overall, Currier looked to national forms of religious protest for inspiration but adapted these movements to fit his own leadership style.

**Embracing Countercultural Subscenes**

In the 1960s and 70s Macalester students adopted and modified national movements to match their personal ideas and values. This led to the incorporation of a large variety of social, political, and cultural movements into the Macalester counterculture and antiwar movement. However, not every movement embraced by students was remodeled. Many elements of the national counterculture existed at Macalester relatively unchanged from their national presence. This is most visible in countercultural subscenes on the college’s campus. In the words of Bill Houghton, the counterculture “was a lot more complex than the perception of it now. There were a lot of sort of subscenes going on.”\(^{113}\) Chief among these subscenes, especially at Macalester, was protest against the Vietnam War. Yet, there were other subscenes like drug use, sexual freedom, music, fashion, back-to-the-land farming, and communal living. In addition to involvement with the political elements of the counterculture, many students sought involvement with the counterculture’s numerous other subscenes.

As discussed in the introduction, very few of the Macalester alumni interviewed for this project explicitly identified themselves as a part of the counterculture. However, they were all quick to remind me of the large role the counterculture played in anti-Vietnam War protest on campus. Christina Baldwin captures a unique image of the counterculture when describing her involvement with protest movements in Washington, \(^{113}\) Houghton, 9.
D.C: “It was exhilarating to be in that much energy. We said we were going to levitate the Pentagon and we tried...there was a kind of a carnival aspect to that much young energy.”

This youthful energy often incorporated radical subscenes of the counterculture into the political framework for protesting the war in Vietnam.

One of the subscenes that captivated the attention of Macalester students was music and freedom of expression. Following the consumerist, teenage “bubblegum pop” of the 1950s and early 60s, musicians of the late 1960s and early 1970s took a political and social stance through their music. Folk musicians like Bob Dylan and Joan Baez, as well as rock musicians like The Rolling Stones, creatively articulated youthful frustrations with political events and cultural expectations. Youth participating in political protest often engaged with the antiwar movement through music and popular culture. Christina Baldwin demonstrates the important role of music in bringing young people into the antiwar movement, stating: “I had hanging in my room at college the famous Joan Baez poster, with her and her sister saying, ‘Girls say yes to boys who say no…’ just think about that. Really! It was the sexiest young woman figure in the peace movement.”

Musicians like Baez who spoke out against the Vietnam War in their songs used their hip or sexy public persona to encourage young people to think critically about the war.

114 Baldwin, 4. Baldwin is alluding to the 1967 Pentagon protest conducted by the Yippies. At the protest the Yippies passed out costumes to interested antwar protesters. The flippant goal of the Yippies was to exorcise the Pentagon of evil war spirits by levitating it three hundred feet in the air. See Farber, Chicago ’68, 13.
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Glenn Olsen, who attended the Woodstock Music and Art Fair in 1969, spoke of music as a rallying point for antiwar sentiment.

As I left Macalester and graduated in that summer, four of us from Macalester went out to Woodstock. That was just a whole separate experience itself...[the] music was great, and it was realistic. The same helicopters that were in Vietnam were flying the bands in... That whole combination of things, the music and what was taking place in terms of the whole antiwar movement. You saw a lot of that through the music. It just continued to ramp up until finally things started to change.\footnote{Olsen, 6.}

Olsen viewed Woodstock, which is regarded by some as a three-day celebration of countercultural debauchery, as an event with profound political significance. For Olsen the Vietnam War helicopters flying in the bands, contrasted with the peaceful message of much of the music, served as a reminder of the war and as an important symbol of the counterculture’s ongoing fight for social and political change. Music influenced the activism of Macalester students and made meaningful contributions to antiwar protest. Not all students who listened to the music of Janis Joplin or The Grateful Dead were inspired to engage with the antiwar movement. However, for the majority of Macalester students, the national music scene played a decisive role in their introduction to the peace movement, contributing to their mode of protest and perceptions of their own advocacy.

Another, more controversial, subscene of the counterculture was recreational drug use. Despite the negative connotations of drug use, many people used LSD, marijuana, and other drugs for what they viewed as constructive purposes to bolster their political activism. Historian David Farber argues that despite attempts to classify all drug users under the category of the counterculture, there was a distinct difference between those using LSD and other mind altering substances merely for the thrill of the high and those...
attempting to develop a new cultural and spiritual understanding.\textsuperscript{119} All the alumni I interviewed spoke of the presence of drugs on Macalester’s campus during the late 1960s and early 1970s. James Flannery described drug use on the college’s campus in the late 1960s as a growing problem, stating that “the college became reputed to be a center of the drug trade” with “widespread drug use.”\textsuperscript{120} Al Currier echoed this perception, stating that it was “totally alien to most of the background of most of the faculty and staff. It was really a strange situation….we lost two students, one actually died from overdose.”\textsuperscript{121}

While drug use negatively affected the lives of some students, other individuals believed that drugs had a positive effect on the political and social movements of the era. Christina Baldwin discussed many of her friends’ experiences with LSD and marijuana. She stressed that along with the negative impact of drugs, there was also “what drugs did in a constructive way, in decontextualizing the kind of mental barriers that people had.”\textsuperscript{122} Students on campus engaging with the counterculture through antiwar protest faced the choice of how much to immerse themselves in this particular countercultural subscene. Although viewed as dangerous and criminal by many, turning on to marijuana or LSD also served to create new cultural values and modes of thinking that contributed to the progress of the anti-Vietnam War movement.

These distinct subscenes all directly contributed to the larger counterculture and antiwar movements at Macalester. However, it is important to remember that personal
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identification as a part of the counterculture was not contingent upon participation in these subscenes. Conversely, participating in one or more of these subscenes did not mean inclusion in the counterculture. As Bill Houghton said, the counterculture “was a lot more complex than the perception of it now.” Participation in the counterculture meant searching for a better, more authentic way of living. Using this definition, at least five of the alumni I interviewed qualify as members of the counterculture. As students at Macalester during the Vietnam War these individuals all actively chose to act in opposition to the war because they personally believed the war was immoral. Their decision to work for a better life in both America and Vietnam, along with their unique methods of advocating for change, merits their inclusion in the amorphous category of the counterculture.

**Defying the National Model**

The antiwar movement was driven, in part, by the counterculture’s resistance to societal norms and search for authentic lifestyles. As protest against the Vietnam War became one of the central movements of the 1960s, Macalester students became involved in antiwar activism. As we saw in Chapter One, Heineman constructed a model for examining national protest against the war in Vietnam. His model is intended to create a new, more inclusive paradigm for understanding what occurred at college campuses across the United States during the 1960s and 70s. Heineman argues that “one cannot simply superimpose the Berkeley or Columbia model on other universities, thereby ignoring the differing cultural and historical context of each campus community and the ways in which those differences affected antiwar protest.” However, this is exactly
what Heineman achieves through the creation of his new model for the counterculture at U.S. colleges and universities.

Heineman focuses mainly on major state universities which, according to historians Anthony Edmonds and Joel Shrock, leaves a large section of institutions of higher education unexamined. They propose that a “mid-sized Midwestern university” like Ball State University in Indiana provides a broader example of the way antiwar protest affected campus communities. Yet, the information provided by Shrock and Edmonds adds little to the creation of a new model for examining campus antiwar protest. Instead they establish that students at Ball State University were either apathetic or militantly prowar. This halfhearted attempt to characterize antiwar protest at mid-sized, Midwestern state universities contributes little to our understanding of what occurred at Macalester College between 1966 and 1974. Macalester bears little resemblance to the large state universities described by Heineman or the mid-sized university described by Edmonds and Shrock. Very little scholarship has been conducted regarding anti-Vietnam War protests at small, liberal arts colleges. Therefore, Heineman’s model, despite its flaws, serves as the basis for my comparison of Macalester to a national model for campus protest. Macalester, as an institution greatly impacted by antiwar protest in the 1960s and 70s, defies Heineman’s model, demonstrating that his attempt to create a more inclusive model of campus-based antiwar protest does not go far enough.

126 Ibid., 143.
127 Ibid., 146.
One of the chief premises of Heineman’s model is that colleges in the 1960s were run by conservative administrations. However, Macalester’s campus reflected a vastly different reality. According to James Flannery, under the leadership of President Arthur Flemming the college was a very liberal place. He remembered that “Flemming’s administration was very much to the left of any administration back then.” President Arthur Flemming served as Macalester’s eleventh president between 1968 and 1971. Prior to accepting the position as Macalester’s president, Flemming served as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on President Eisenhower’s cabinet and his biographical information clearly labels his political party as Republican. Additionally, during World War II and the early years of the Cold War Flemming was a member of the War Manpower Commission (WMC) as well as the director of the Office of Defense Mobilization (ODM). This aspect of Arthur Flemming’s career is aligned with Heineman’s proposed model for the antiwar movement. Like the majority of college presidents and board members in the 1950s and 1960s, Flemming was an active participant in government sponsored military and defense organizations. However, Flemming’s political stance as the president of Macalester was the complete opposite of the conservative administrative policies Heineman lays out in his scholarship.

As the president of Macalester, Arthur Flemming promoted liberal policies regarding student antiwar activism on campus. In November of 1968, the college hosted a
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Symposium on International Student Militancy. The event involved a panel of guest speakers, but an article in the *Minneapolis Tribune* focused on the opening remarks delivered by Arthur Flemming. During the symposium Macalester’s president took to the stage to express that “‘student activists can and should go further than they have.’”\(^{132}\) This statement spurred a later speaker to chastise, “‘My God, what kind of school is this where the college president has to tell the students to get off their asses and be activist?’”\(^{133}\) With Flemming as president, students had an ally instead of an adversary in their college administration. This entirely changed how students engaged in protest. Unlike at other colleges and universities across the United States, Macalester students interested in pursuing countercultural lifestyles or protesting the war in Vietnam did not have to battle the administration to have their voices heard. Instead, they could deliver their message of cultural and political dissent without any restrictions imposed by a higher college authority.

Despite the freedom they were granted by the administration, Macalester students did very little to exercise this power. According to James Flannery the administration’s support for student protest led to complacency among students, where “at one point it wasn’t really necessary to do anything because everybody was opposed to the war.”\(^{134}\) Thus, administrative support for student political activism greatly impacted how students chose to engage with the antiwar movement and the counterculture. In some cases, it provided student protest movements with a heightened ability to spread their pacifist message. However, the environment of consensus on campus also promoted a degree of

\(^{133}\) Ibid.
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complacency among students. Without a conservative administration to fight against and lacking in conservative voices on campus, students did not need to possess the same degree of militancy that was required at other institutions. SDS leaders advocated for the creation of a Student Syndicalist Movement that sought a student authority that did not “work through existing channels” or wait for faculty or administrative approval. Macalester students could not operate within this new student movement because they had their administration’s approval and their antiwar activism would always be viewed as responsible and acceptable by the college administration. Inability to engage with many of the radical ideas and approaches of the national counterculture created a degree of stagnation within Macalester’s counterculture. While there was a fair amount of antiwar activism on campus the majority of students remained complacent because of the consensus of antiwar opinion at Macalester.

Under Flemming’s liberal administration it was the faculty who embodied the more conservative perspective on campus. Flannery remembered “the faculty was pretty divided between World War II vets and young radicals...many members of the faculty did not agree with the student position on the war. The administration did.” This effectively flips Heineman’s model of antiwar protest on college campuses. Instead of a
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conservative administration that opposed the pacifist and liberal views of the faculty, a liberal administration was at odds with a faculty that was a mix of both pro and antiwar individuals. Heineman discusses the divide between more conservative old guard professors and the younger, radical new guard of academics.\textsuperscript{137} Macalester exemplified this portion of Heineman’s model, with its faculty divided over their opinion on the Vietnam War.

Christina Baldwin mostly interacted with faculty members who opposed the war in Vietnam, remembering: “there was a lot of sympathy about the war movement... There were several members of the faculty who were Quakers... They stood with us, they talked about non-violence, and they taught non-violence.” However she conditioned this statement with the caveat that “it was an active conversation.”\textsuperscript{138} James Flannery had more specific recollections on the political divide between faculty members as well as the political disconnect between the faculty and the administration. He voiced that “because the college administration was antiwar there was no attempt to censor the antiwar movement [even though] there were the guys in languages who had been in the military, [and] the Econ guys were all conservative.”\textsuperscript{139} The dynamics between the faculty and the administration at Macalester in the 1960s was the opposite of the model for campus protest outlined by Heineman.

The Macalester student body also contradicted the national model for campus antiwar movements. Students did conform to Heineman’s description of a liberal student body opposed to the war in Vietnam. However, the student body organized in a manner
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that differed from students at other colleges and universities. To begin with, Macalester students were generally unable to engage with the nation’s most prominent antiwar group, SDS. Glenn Olsen stated “I don’t think we had an SDS chapter on campus” and that antiwar activism was “more in terms of individuals not organizations.”140 The lack of this nationally recognized political organization impacted how Macalester students engaged with the ideas of the counterculture and the antiwar movement. Lack of an SDS chapter on campus in some cases led to lack of a unified message regarding the war in Vietnam. According to Bill Houghton, he, along with other students, “were basically saying, ‘Please stop the bombing. What are we doing in that place?’ Fairly naive in terms of what we were saying.”141 Lack of an SDS chapter meant a slightly calmer, at times unsophisticated, political climate on campus. The general agreement about antiwar sentiment on campus combined with this less contentious political message to create an overall sense of passivity at Macalester. Lack of an SDS chapter and other political organizations at times meant a fairly dormant campus movement despite the strong antiwar attitudes held by the majority of the student body.

In comparison to Macalester, colleges that had an active chapter of SDS, like Michigan State University (MSU), had a much more politically charged and controversial antiwar movement. At MSU members of the student government were highly involved with SDS, providing an opportunity for students to directly challenge the authority of the administration.142 SDS members at institutions like MSU were also able to protest the war by attending national SDS conferences. At Macalester, not only was there no
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administration to challenge but there was also no SDS for students to use to bring their protest to the national level. Instead, students found more personal and community-driven ways to engage with the antiwar movement. Glenn Olsen remembered “times...when Grand Avenue was blocked off, [and that] sit-ins [were]...popular in that time period.”\textsuperscript{143} Similarly, Bill Houghton remembered that Macalester activism entailed “going out to locations around the Twin Cities, mainly St. Paul, and doing demonstrations, leafleting...a lot of supermarket parking lots...we were handing out leaflets. We were trying to get this voice out there in the community.”\textsuperscript{144} As a result of their uncommon situation, Macalester students were simultaneously granted and deprived of a larger audience. The consensus of students and the administration regarding the Vietnam War allowed student protestors to deliver their message to the surrounding community. However, unanimity of antiwar tendencies and a lack of nationally organized groups on campus prevented students from participating in forceful and effective modes of protest and from extending their activism to the national level.

Macalester students worked diligently to recreate nationally organized social movements to suit their own needs and values. These students created their own meaningful counterculture on campus that defied Heineman’s national model for the counterculture. However, with a liberal administration supporting the antiwar sentiments of the students the campus developed an air of complacency. This meant that the meaningful counterculture that students worked so hard to create at Macalester accomplished very little on campus or in the surrounding community. Students
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advocating against the war in Vietnam remained encased in their like-minded community which led to inactivity on campus. As we will see in Chapter Three, Macalester’s counterculture was more complicated than it originally appears in the historical record. Antiwar consensus at Macalester concealed dissenting voices on campus and led to the marginalization of certain groups of students within the counterculture.
Chapter Three: Marginalization Within Macalester’s Counterculture

The prevailing culture was going to war in Vietnam. The counterculture was saying, “No, this is a violation of what we stand for.” There was a climate but it was more than just Vietnam. It was a whole climate of change.

Alvin Currier, Macalester Faculty 1964 to 1975

Beginning in 1969, the voice of the counterculture on Macalester’s campus became very prominent. The Mac Weekly of the early 1960s reported on homecoming queens, marriage announcements, and campus life but beginning in 1969 campus culture took a dramatic shift. As we saw in Chapter Two, with a liberal administration and semi-liberal faculty Macalester students faced no real barriers to participation in the counterculture which often led to complacency and inaction. At Macalester cries for peace in Vietnam and freedom of expression were so common that at times they were even mundane. By examining The Mac Weekly of the late 1960s and early 1970s or listening to the stories of five of the six alumni I interviewed, it appears as if almost everyone was in agreement in their opposition to the war in Vietnam. However, the prominence of the counterculture on campus hides the voices of three groups of individuals present at the college in the 1960s and 70s: economically and racially diverse students, women, and students who supported the Vietnam War.

In this chapter I will examine the position economically disadvantaged students, women, and prowar sympathizers occupied on campus and their treatment by members of Macalester’s counterculture. Traditionally, the counterculture and the antiwar movement were viewed as a very small segment of society, the “freaks” and the “traitors” who did
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not fit with America’s “traditional” values.\textsuperscript{146} I argue that the counterculture occupied an unusual position at Macalester. At Macalester the counterculture was the dominant culture and its membership marginalized economically and racially diverse students, women, and individuals supporting the Vietnam War. This chapter is divided into three sections, each highlighting the way the college’s counterculture interacted with a different group of students on campus. The first section examines the position of students of color and economically disadvantaged students in the counterculture, devoting special attention to Macalester’s Expanding Educational Opportunities program meant to increase racial and economic diversity on campus in the late 1960s. Next I discuss the role of women in the counterculture, investigating connections between the antiwar movement and the beginning of the second wave feminist movement. Finally, I delve into the presence of conservative voices on campus and their relationship with members of the counterculture at Macalester.

The prominence of the counterculture and the antiwar movement at Macalester make it difficult to uncover the voices of women, racially and economically diverse students, and prowar sympathizers on campus. In interviews alumni provided some information about the relationship between the antiwar movement, the civil rights movement, and the women’s rights movement. However, these alumni were a self-selecting group of individuals who expressed interest in being interviewed because of their participation in the counterculture at Macalester. Of these alumni there were two women, one prowar sympathizer, and no people of color. These alumni interviews accurately portray the largely white, middle class makeup of the counterculture in the
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1960s and 70s. However, their stories contribute very little to the narrative of communities marginalized by the Macalester counterculture. While I rely on some insights from interview informants, the majority of sources in this section are archival. I carefully examined the Macalester College Archives, *The Mac Weekly*, and larger Twin Cities newspapers to uncover the voices of communities obscured by the prominence of the counterculture at Macalester.

**Disadvantaged Students and the Counterculture**

In 1968, under the liberal leadership of President Arthur Flemming, the college decided that it was “educationally important to provide a community which is more representative of the economic, social, cultural and racial diversity of the entire nation.”\(^{147}\) Between 1968 and 1975 Macalester worked diligently to increase the diversity of its students, its faculty, and its curriculum. However, while Macalester as an institution became more economically and racially diverse during this time period, the college counterculture remained mainly comprised of white, middle class students. I argue that the efforts of the administration to increase diversity on campus and the counterculture’s focus on antiwar activism placed students of color and economically disadvantaged students in an uncomfortable position that made it difficult for these individuals to participate in the counterculture at Macalester.

In December of 1968 the Macalester Advisory Council created a plan for raising student diversity at the college, called the Expanded Educational Opportunities program (EEO). Beverly Fritz described EEO as a program that “actively recruited inner city kids from Detroit and Chicago and other areas, mostly in the Midwest, to come to Macalester.

\(^ {147}\) MCA, Expanded Educational Opportunities (EEO), EEO 1968-1969.
to raise our diversity status.”\textsuperscript{148} A more sophisticated explanation is provided by the proposal for the creation of the program in December of 1968. A memo from the college Advisory Council to members of the faculty stated that:

Macalester College should provide total scholarship aid for...students each year whose parents can provide them with no financial assistance and whose backgrounds limit their opportunities for higher education. This will provide for the College a student body with greater economic, social, and racial diversity. While there are important educational opportunities in such a program, it requires significant reexamination of present attitudes and procedures.\textsuperscript{149}

The program included full financial aid for minority students, enriched curriculum and the addition of minority faculty members, a summer program, and increased academic and support services for students enrolled in the EEO program.\textsuperscript{150} Macalester’s EEO program was a part of the nationwide Black Campus Movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s where students of color pushed for diversification within institutions of higher education.\textsuperscript{151} The engagement of the Macalester administration with conversations regarding race coincided with increased student participation in the Black Power movement, beginning in 1968.\textsuperscript{152} President Arthur Flemming was instrumental in the creation of the EEO program and raising the funds necessary to pay the tuition of underprivileged students. The budget for EEO for the 1969 to 1970 school year surpassed $500,000 including expenses for recruitment and evaluation of the program.\textsuperscript{153} To raise
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the funds for the program Flemming and his Advisory Council held fundraisers both on and off campus.

The EEO program was intended to provide economically disadvantaged students with educational opportunities that would have otherwise been financially out of reach, and it accomplished this goal. However, EEO unintentionally placed these students, particularly students of color, in an uncomfortable position on campus. EEO fostered a great deal of criticism and controversy on campus. This is reflected in the intense debates about race and financial aid in *The Mac Weekly* throughout the early 1970s. One of the most common complaints made by students about the EEO program revolved around financial aid. A memo from the Associate Dean of Students to the Student Personnel Staff shows the reservations many students had regarding the newly created EEO program. The report expressed that students experienced “a certain amount of resentment in being asked to pay for another’s education when one is struggling to pay for his own.”¹⁵⁴ Bev Fritz also harbored some resentment towards the EEO program: “they were given everything. They were given their tuition and their room and board and their books. For the rest of us who grew up in poor families...there was that divide. I was a first generation college student too. How come I’m not getting this kind of stuff?”¹⁵⁵ Before EEO program participants even arrived at Macalester, other students begrudged their presence on campus.

After the EEO program began in 1969, students of color participating in EEO faced constant and undisguised animosity from their classmates, especially within the
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pages of *The Mac Weekly*. On October 15, 1971 *The Mac Weekly* published two full pages of opinion letters regarding the issue of financial aid for minority students. These letters were all written in response to a letter expressing the discontent of students of color on campus published in the previous edition of *The Mac Weekly*. The author of the original letter, Roland Hayes, wrote that “the administration makes education too expensive for minorities to afford, thus effectively eliminating us, or owning us body and soul...and we accept these conditions because we have no alternatives...the price of our ownership is always high, for we pay out the interest in our dignity, pride and honor, and then are accused of ‘getting everything.’”156 Unlike at many other colleges and universities, Macalester students like Roland Hayes who were engaging in the Black Power movement faced hostility from white students who refused to acknowledge their own complicity in preserving institutionalized racism.157 The debate over race and financial aid raged across the pages of multiple issues of *The Mac Weekly*, clearly demonstrating the difficult position that students of color occupied on campus.

As tensions surrounding the EEO program intensified and the student body at Macalester became increasingly diverse in the late 1960s and early 70s, the college counterculture remained relatively homogeneous. Bill Houghton remembered not perceiving the counterculture as a diverse movement at the time but while recently reading old copies of *The Mac Weekly* he noticed an ad that said, “‘Please Stop the Bombing’ and then it had the names of all the people who had signed on to it...diverse
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names and names of people whose ancestry was not England or Scotland.\footnote{Houghton, 8. See also “Dear Mr. President, Stop the Bombing,” The Mac Weekly (St. Paul, MN), May 12, 1967.} Difficulties arise with this characterization by Houghton. He admits to not viewing the counterculture at Macalester as diverse while he was a student from 1967 to 1968. Instead, he revises his memory of past events and labels the counterculture as diverse based on the names of people in The Mac Weekly. A more reliable characterization of student diversity at Macalester comes from Glenn Olsen. Olsen remembered “you had a high proportion of African American students that were going to the war. A higher proportion than was actually a part of the population of the United States. There were those connections and conversations but there was still a distance there. They would join in some things but also there was a separate part that took place.”\footnote{Olsen, 6. For more information on racial disparities in the Vietnam War draft see Peter Levy, “Blacks and the Vietnam War,” in The Legacy: The Vietnam War in the American Imagination, ed. D. Michael Shafter (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1990), 211.} As students of color at Macalester were alienated by the general student body, their involvement with politics and campus activities became increasingly separated from that of white students.

This separation between the activism of students of color and white counterculturals at Macalester reflects national tensions over the war in Vietnam. On the surface the civil rights movement and the antiwar movement appear linked by their similar criticisms of American society and for many young, white activists the two movements were associated.\footnote{Hall, Peace and Freedom, 2.} Yet, many black activists saw the anti-Vietnam War movement as hypocritical, advocating for the rights and opportunities of Vietnamese citizens while ignoring the suffering and oppression of African Americans in the United
States.\textsuperscript{161} Students involved with the Black Power movement and its international perspective were often also more focused on the African solidarity movement and anticolonial struggles in countries like Angola or Guinea-Bissau than on U.S. entanglements in Vietnam.\textsuperscript{162} Additionally, participation in many of the demonstrations and protests against the Vietnam War required “money and time off work,” rendering it a largely white, middle class activity.\textsuperscript{163} Braunstein and Doyle echo this sentiment, stating that in hip neighborhoods like Haight-Ashbury or the East Village the counterculture’s “adoption of virtual poverty...was regarded as cruel mockery by the black, Hispanic, and immigrant residents of these neighborhoods, who dreamed of attaining entry into the very material world the hippie children had casually...repudiated.”\textsuperscript{164} On the national level, people of color viewed the counterculture with suspicion and chose to focus their energy on advocating for civil rights rather than fighting against the war in Vietnam or pursuing authentic lifestyles.

Students of color at Macalester echoed the sentiments expressed by people of color across the nation. These students felt isolated at their college and were charged with navigating racial tensions on campus instead of advocating for an end to the war in Vietnam. In 1969 there were only approximately one hundred and thirty students of color attending Macalester out of a student body of over one thousand.\textsuperscript{165} Darryl Everett III wrote in a poem for an EEO promotional brochure: “Last year I was the only black on my

\begin{footnotes}
\item[161] Ibid., 111.
\item[162] Biondi, \textit{The Black Revolution on Campus}, 250.
\item[164] Braunstein and Doyle, introduction to \textit{Imagine Nation}, 12.
\end{footnotes}
wing out of 32 guys.” Not only were students of color represented in small numbers on campus but they also faced the difficulty of transitioning from their diverse hometown communities and neighborhoods to the white and affluent Mac-Groveland neighborhood. Bill Houghton remembered facing prejudice when trying to rent an apartment with a black roommate, “I thought the landlady was going to faint when she opened the door...it was of course illegal to refuse to rent to someone on the basis of race [but] it was still pretty common, people would find excuses.” Learning to adjust to a completely different setting, facing racism from the surrounding community, and feelings of isolated among students of color at Macalester made it difficult for these students to become involved in the mainly white, middle class counterculture. Students of color were focused on advocating for their civil rights in the city of St. Paul and at their college rather than fighting against a war in distant Vietnam. Therefore, isolation and prejudice served as one barrier for students of color trying to participate in the college’s antiwar movement.

Economically disadvantaged students participating in the EEO program also faced barriers to participating in the counterculture. Working class students of all racial identities experienced psychological tensions as their parents, who had sacrificed financially for their education, urged them to focus on their studies instead of engaging in antiwar protests and other countercultural activity. On some occasions this limited the involvement of working class students in the countercultural activities prevalent among their peers. As a first generation college student, Bev Fritz remembered curtailing her involvement in the antiwar protest and other elements of the counterculture because “we
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still had a sense of what we needed to do...we weren’t slackers...I had a Dayton scholarship from the Dayton family which paid for my entire tuition. That’s maybe part of the reason I wanted to stay straight and narrow.”

Although Bev Fritz was not a part of the EEO program her situation reflects the experiences of many EEO students on campus who received a full scholarship to Macalester on the condition of good grades and good behavior. Her words demonstrate how racially and economically diverse students often reduced their involvement in the counterculture and the antiwar movement in order to reconcile the tension between their parents’ wishes, their financial situation, and their own convictions.

Despite their lessened involvement in antiwar movements at Macalester, EEO program participants on campus were not all inactive on campus, fearing the loss of their scholarship. Instead many of these individuals took part in the growing Black Campus Movement at Macalester. Many students of color at Macalester participated in this larger national movement to introduce diversity into the college curriculum. In January of 1969 Macalester students of color pushed for the creation of an interim term project that focused on black culture and arts. Later in 1969 the college established a Black House on the urging of students who wanted to “end isolation” for black students on campus. These two specific programs are examples of how students of color engaged with a larger community and involved themselves in other meaningful activities and forms of activism on campus outside of the antiwar movement. Students of color even created a newsletter
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entitled *Imani* to counter *The Mac Weekly* and to engage students of color in a black campus community. The newsletter, which began in 1970, contained news, opinion, music, sports, and other sections and its staff was composed of only students of color.\(^{173}\)

Thus, even as EEO program participants faced barriers to entering the antiwar movement at Macalester, they were avid participants in other organizations and forms of activism on campus.

With the implementation of the EEO program in the late 1960s Macalester strove to become a more diverse, open-minded campus. However, the administration did not provide enough support to students of color and racial tensions on campus often left students of color feeling isolated. Additionally, the majority of students at the college in the late 1960s and early 1970s focused their political activism and their outrage on the war in Vietnam. This was alienating to many students of color who believed focus should be placed on domestic injustices against people of color rather than international affairs. It was also difficult for economically disadvantaged students to reconcile their personal convictions with their financial necessities in order to participate in the counterculture. As a result, many students of color and EEO program participants sought out other forms of activism, organization, and community while at Macalester. Overall, despite attempts to increase racial and economic diversity on campus the Macalester counterculture remained fairly homogenous. The voices of racial and economic minority students were marginalized by the dominance of the counterculture on campus and by the administration’s failure to soothe racial and financial tensions exacerbated by the creation of the EEO program at Macalester.

\(^{173}\) MCA, Multicultural Affairs, *Imani.*
In April of 1967, as Macalester students were first becoming aware of the war in Vietnam, a group of students hosted an event called the Mac-Mekong Project for the Children of Can Tho (MAC). The project, headed by student Huong Norton, advised by Reverend Al Currier, and endorsed by Senator Walter Mondale, aimed to raise funds for orphans and refugees of the Vietnam War. The Mac Weekly advertised the following as part of the fundraising drive: “Bigelow Hall’s Women’s Association of Slaves will be available to do ironing, mending, and similar tasks for the fellows.” This early incidence of Macalester opposition to the war in Vietnam demonstrates the sexism inherent in the counterculture of the 1960s and 70s. Women were relegated to traditional, domestic roles in a movement that was unmistakably political. Female participants in the counterculture were expected to adopt traditional roles like cleaning, cooking, and typing instead of planning political rallies and events. In this section, I argue that the Macalester counterculture and antiwar movement attempted to constrain the roles of women, consigning them to traditional roles despite the radical politics of the antiwar movement. However, I also demonstrate how women in the Macalester counterculture were able to maintain a degree of agency and leadership, making meaningful contributions to the antiwar movement. It was through their experiences with sexism in the antiwar movement that women at Macalester were introduced to ideas that began the second wave feminist movement.
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Unfortunately, very little scholarship exists regarding the status of women in the counterculture. Historians devote much more attention to the rise of second wave feminism in the late 1960s rather than studying the position of women during the earlier anti-Vietnam War protests of the counterculture. However, it is important to understand that many feminist political tactics, like consciousness raising, were inspired by countercultural ideals of authenticity, self-realization, and consciousness expansion through drug use.\textsuperscript{176} Many of the women who participated in second wave feminist movements began their activism in the civil rights movement or the antiwar movement. In many cases, the sexism inherent in these movements inspired women to carve out their own space in the counterculture through the feminist movement.

The counterculture, as well as the dominant culture, perpetuated stereotypes about the role that women played in the movement. The underground press “reinforced mainstream images of the brainless, sexually promiscuous hippie chick and the clueless, accommodating domestic drudge...it placed women outside of the cultural revolution.”\textsuperscript{177} Historian Lemke-Santangelo argues that women defied these stereotypes, and in many cases they did; however the perpetuation of these stereotypes by the counterculture and the dominant culture doubly constrained the role that women played in these movements. The counterculture promoted a narrow role for countercultural women as sexy and cool or earthly and mothering while the dominant culture painted women in an equally

\textsuperscript{176} Debra Michals, “From ‘Consciousness Expansion’ to ‘Consciousness Raising:’ Feminism and the Countercultural Politics of the Self,” in Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 60s and 70s, ed. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (New York: Routledge, 2002), 46-50. Michals also describes protests at the 1968 Miss America pageant as an act of countercultural performance. She uses this example to demonstrate that the feminist movement was a part of a larger countercultural search for more authentic lifestyles and explains that feminists often employed countercultural techniques to deliver their political message.
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constraining manner. Whereas countercultural men were viewed by the dominant culture as experimenting and working through a rebellious phase before settling down, countercultural “women and girls not only betrayed their class and race but also stepped outside of prevailing gender constructs.”\textsuperscript{178} According to societal standards women were expected to remain domestic, obedient, clean, chaste, and well-behaved while their male counterparts were allowed a period of wild countercultural exploration.\textsuperscript{179} These stereotypes went beyond simple outside categorization to actually shape the roles that women were expected to take on in their participation with the counterculture and the antiwar movements.

Expectations about the conduct of women promoted by both the dominant culture and the counterculture had a dramatic impact on the lifestyle choices made by women at Macalester. Women at Macalester experienced a great deal of pressure regarding societal expectations for women’s sexuality. Christina Baldwin remembered “At that time we’d sit around and we’d talk and talk, girls clustered around talking about sex. Talking about should we or shouldn’t we. Will we be good girls?”\textsuperscript{180} For Baldwin, living up to expectations on women’s sexuality became a point of stress, shaping her actions and her conversations with other women on campus. Baldwin also recognized that she and her classmates lived in a period of transition, stating “it felt like we were the last class that graduated as virgins and expected to get married and thought we’d have 1.2 children.”\textsuperscript{181} Dominant opinions about the conduct of women greatly shaped Christina Baldwin’s college experience and her experience with the counterculture. While she participated in
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the antiwar movement and the feminist movement on campus, she also frequently engaged in worried conversation about societal perceptions of her actions, especially in regard to her sexuality.

Macalester’s counterculture also shaped the position that women occupied in social movements on campus. In her book, *Daughters of Aquarius*, Gretchen Lemke-Santangelo presents eight images of women from the underground press and concert posters to show the way that women were portrayed by the counterculture.182 Among these images is a picture entitled “Naked Woman on Grass” that depicts a nude woman lying naked in the idyllic countryside.183 This image demonstrates that the counterculture assigned women to two contrasting roles, using nudity to represent either an open sexuality or a deep spiritual connection to motherhood through nature. The front page of the December 12, 1969 edition of *The Mac Weekly* carries the same image, accompanied by a Dylan Thomas poem entitled “In the White Giant’s Thigh” that invokes images of sex and nature.184 Macalester’s counterculture perpetuated the same set of stereotypes about countercultural women as the larger national counterculture. Women were expected to fit into the role of the promiscuous hippie dropout or the domestic earth mother, even at Macalester.
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Women were also often constrained to traditional gender roles within the antiwar movement at Macalester. When asked about the connection between the women’s rights movement and the antiwar movement on campus Glenn Olsen declared that the antiwar movement “didn’t affect women as much personally but [it] did for the men...there weren’t that many...females that were involved with the war itself in terms of deployment.” According to Olsen, women were not directly threatened by the prospect of being sent to Vietnam and therefore there was no real reason for women to become meaningfully involved in the antiwar movement. Women “faced no draft, no jail or exile for evading military service, and no Vietcong bullets” and according to many men this limited their ability to truly advocate for an end to the war in Vietnam. This sentiment led to diminished roles for women within the counterculture and the antiwar movement.
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Like in the case of the MAC fundraiser for Vietnamese orphans, women were expected to take a secondary position to men in these movements, and leadership was left to the men who were directly impacted by the Vietnam War draft policies. Figure 3.2 clearly shows the division of labor along traditional gender lines within the antiwar movement at Macalester. In this image the women are in their own group, distinctly separated from the men, ironing shirts as a means of participating in the antiwar movement. In the antiwar movement women “marched, spoke, sang, typed, cooked, and wondered why the expression ‘Girls say yes to guys who say no’ felt just a bit uncomfortable. In spite of their skills, their experience, and their hard work, many women in the antiwar movement felt marginalized.”\textsuperscript{187} The voices of women in the antiwar movement remained largely ignored as women, like the Macalester women depicted in Figure 3.2, were relegated to domestic work in the background.

\textbf{Figure 3.2.} Women students iron shirts to raise money for the Mac-Mekong Project for the Children of Can Tho, 1967. Photo courtesy of Macalester College Archives, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Despite male perceptions and the muted role women were expected to play in antiwar movement, female students at Macalester found ways to make thoughtful
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contributions to anti-Vietnam War activism on campus. Beverly Fritz spoke at length
about the intense reflection that went into her decision to protest the war: “I never saw
my dad cry until my brother went to Vietnam. That was the only time that I saw him
weep openly. Those are the things that make you think, ‘Well this can’t be right.’ Then of
course all the deaths and the death toll every night...I think most of us probably made up
our mind based on the media.”188 Contrary to the beliefs of Olsen, and many men at the
time, the Vietnam War had a deep personal impact on Fritz even though there was no risk
that she would be drafted into the war. This personal connection to the war encouraged
her to speak out in protest and made her contributions even more significant because they
put her “exactly on the opposite side of the person that [she] love[d].”189

While Fritz became involved due to a personal connection to the war, Christina
Baldwin discussed her political activism by saying: “I felt that I was ahead of my class all
four of those years, in terms of my political awareness and the kind of leadership I ended
up taking during that time.”190 Baldwin’s activism shows how women redefined
leadership and made meaningful contributions to the antiwar movement even though they
did not always occupy authoritative positions at protests and events. Through her work in
the Macalester chaplain’s office and her numerous conversations with women on campus,
Baldwin occupied an inconspicuous position of leadership. She also described a transition
at Macalester from traditional gender roles and expectations of marriage and family for
women to a more active participation in academic and political matters on campus. She
felt she was more progressive than her female classmates, and in order to participate in
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the antiwar movement she was constantly pushing boundaries and fighting for a voice in a movement that was predominantly led by men. Christina Baldwin and Bev Fritz are examples of the hard work required by women to find agency in the college’s male dominated counterculture. Both of these women found ways to make meaningful political contributions to the counterculture beyond the traditional roles expected of them.

The marginalization women faced within the antiwar movement prepared many women to participate in the second wave feminist movement. The relegation of women to mainly supportive roles in the antiwar movement caused many women to challenge the traditional positions of women in society. The idea of “marches rather than marriage, teach-ins rather than PTA meetings, and arrests for civil disobedience rather than children all became subjects of discussion and action for women who sought an identity beyond husband, home, and children.”

Bev Fritz echoed this awareness of the limited options available to women at the time remembering “when I...prepared for college in my high school a lot of it was talking about what profession might be available to me. At that time it was a teacher or nurse...nobody ever said I could be a doctor or...the next scientist to invent a cure for cancer.”

Similarly, Baldwin said that at Macalester the antiwar movement contributed to changing expectations for women on campus. The college “was just coming out of...particularly traditional roles for women. There were a lot of young men...focusing on business and...pre-med...women were getting education degrees. We were just phasing out of the phase where you went to college in order to meet the kind of

---

193 Fritz, 7.
man who goes there.” At Macalester, participation in the antiwar movement helped women conceptualize new roles for themselves both on campus and in society.

Involvement in the antiwar movement at Macalester also put women in connection with resources and individuals who were helpful in instilling feminist values. Christina Baldwin described a campus atmosphere of “curiosity and curious debate” brought on by anti-Vietnam War activism. She remembered:

I was really supported by one of my English professors...I was starting to get interested in the whole women’s issue. He said to me, ‘You’re such a feminist.’ I went, ‘I am? What’s that?’ He challenged me and gave me permission no matter what the story was...to come at it from a feminist perspective in all my papers...All of that just worked together in that environment. He was very much antiwar too.

After considering women’s issues as a whole, Baldwin was introduced to the feminist movement by one of her professors with antiwar sympathies. Campus countercultural involvement created an environment that was conducive to the growth of the women’s rights movement. Additionally, the atmosphere of change and sexual freedom associated with the counterculture on campus created a climate that encouraged other radical shifts on campus. Baldwin stated that one of the major changes associated with the counterculture on campus was “the sexual revolution...the birth control pill became available during that time.” The 1960s and early 70s were a period of dramatic social change at Macalester. Women began questioning their role in the antiwar movement and the counterculture at the same time that modern technologies like the birth control pill brought women a different type of freedom. It was in this atmosphere of rapid social change
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change and liberalness that women at Macalester chose to participate in the growing women’s rights movement.

The counterculture at Macalester relegated female students to traditional gender roles and often perpetuated stereotypes about the type of woman who participated in these movements. Countercultural women were portrayed in the media as sex-crazed hippies or nurturing earth mothers but in daily life were expected to take on traditional and mundane roles like cleaning, ironing, or typing to benefit the antiwar cause. This way of thinking of the antiwar movement came from the immediacy of the draft and the war’s physical impact on men. The experience of being told the antiwar movement did not pertain to them was disappointing to many women, like Christina Baldwin or Bev Fritz, who were motivated to join the counterculture because of the personal effect the Vietnam War had on their lives. Their frustrations with the sexism inherent in the antiwar movement, as well as the liberal atmosphere created on campus by the counterculture inspired many women to embrace feminist activism in the 1970s.

**Conservatives and the Counterculture**

The April 3, 1970 edition of *The Mac Weekly* contained a survey meant to ascertain the “degree of liberalism” at Macalester College. Although the survey size was too small to have much statistical significance, with only seventy total responses out of over a thousand students, the article makes an interesting statement about the political leanings of students during this time period. Results show that eighty-six percent of the students surveyed favored military withdrawal from Southeast Asia. Only two percent of the people surveyed were labelled as conservative. The information gleaned by this
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survey is useful in developing our understanding of the role of the counterculture on campus. The results of this survey point to the numerical dominance of the counterculture on campus. However, I argue that not only were individuals in support of the war a minority in numbers but their voices were also treated as insignificant in campus conversations surrounding the war.

The lack of prowar voices on Macalester’s campus is particularly strange, as it does not reflect what was occurring on a national level during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Historian Marc Jason Gilbert writes “the status of those that speak of peace in time of war never varies; they are always outsiders.”200 This was certainly the case for the United States as a whole, where in 1969 sixty nine percent of Americans viewed antiwar protest as “harmful to American life.”201 However, Macalester students acting against the war were certainly not outsiders on their campus. Rather, the outsiders at the college were prowar sympathizers and conservatives, many of which belonged to the organization Young Americans for Freedom (YAF).

Young Americans for Freedom was the most prominent prowar, conservative group on college campuses in the 1960s and 70s. Typically, YAF activities supported the war in Vietnam through demonstrations, working to counter leftist organizations like SDS, and supporting conservative political candidates like Barry Goldwater.202 While the majority of the members of YAF wholeheartedly supported the Vietnam War, as the war
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dragged on into the 1970s many members developed a pro-war, but anti-draft stance.\textsuperscript{203}

In addition to conservative students there were also a large number of students on college campuses across the United States who were apolitical and apathetic towards the war in Vietnam. While students on the left and right of the political spectrum were in constant debate with each other, both YAF and liberal groups like SDS attempted to gain the interest and support of apolitical students.\textsuperscript{204} Across the nation YAF was an active organization that contributed to prowar sentiments that possessed the dominant voice in American society of the 1960s and 70s.

Macalester students supported the war in Vietnam for a variety of different reasons. Bill Houghton shared a memory from 1966: “one of my classmates had a brother who was serving...she had a sweatshirt that read, ‘Bong the Cong.’ I remember talking with her at one point and saying, ‘You know what you’re talking about is killing people. You’re comfortable with that as a Christian?’ She went, ‘It’s a war. It’s a just war....’ basically it was, ‘My brother is over there and I’m supporting him.’”\textsuperscript{205} Other individuals like Macalester’s YAF chairman Richard Rogers, interviewed in \textit{The Mac Weekly} on October 31, 1969, supported the war because they felt it aligned with their political principles. Rogers, a libertarian, backed the war because he felt it helped protect his individual freedom.\textsuperscript{206} Others, like James Flannery, were not necessarily in support of the war but they were decidedly against the behavior of the counterculture. Flannery spoke of
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his disgust for drug culture, his problems with the disruptions student strikes caused on
campus, and his distaste for the “mocking and criticizing of the parents’ generation.”
Flannery also expressed his frustrations with the outcomes of the antiwar movement.
President Flemming’s extravagant spending on liberal student programs were at odds
with the politics of the college’s major donors. This caused these individuals to withdraw
a large portion of funding and led to major faculty and scholarship cuts at the college.
Flannery, referring to the college’s financial difficulties, remembered that the antiwar
movement “had an effect but it wasn’t the effect that the students had planned. It was a
huge negative event. It set the college back a decade...[and] they didn’t stop the war,
that’s for sure.” Individuals who supported the Vietnam War did so for a variety of
reasons. Whether supporting family members, maintaining specific political views, or
opposing a counterculture they viewed as frivolous all of these individuals were united by
their approval of the war in Vietnam.

Despite the presence of conservative values and prowar attitudes on campus, the
voices of individuals in support of the war were frequently marginalized at Macalester. A
good example of this can be seen in the Vietnam Moratorium Day of October 1969. An
article in *The Mac Weekly* describing the events of the Moratorium stated that “all
persons at the rally were not in sympathy with the proceedings. A group of about forty
Young Americans for Freedom (YAF), carried signs which read ‘Victory then Peace’ and
shouted ‘Bong the Cong’ and ‘Work for the Flag’ until they were shouted down by the
majority.” This incident demonstrates a great deal about the dominance of the
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counterculture at Macalester. To begin, the attendance at the rally the author wrote about was over five thousand people from the college and the surrounding community. Not only was the group speaking out in favor of the war small, they were also treated with disdain by the antiwar protestors. However, what is more telling is the surprisingly little attention *The Mac Weekly* devoted to counter protests. These proceedings garnered less than a paragraph and one photograph in the October 29, 1969 paper.

![Figure 3.3](image.png)

**Figure 3.3.** Young Americans for Freedom protesting at the Macalester Vietnam Moratorium Day, 1969. Photo courtesy of Macalester College Archives, St. Paul, Minnesota.

In general, *The Mac Weekly* in the 1960s and 70s presents very little information regarding conservative viewpoints. Any attention that is given to alternate positions regarding the war and the atmosphere of change in the 1960s is found in the opinion section of the paper. The other sections of each paper are heavily biased towards liberal rally was open to the public, it is difficult to discern whether these students were solely Macalester students or if the group contained students from other colleges in the area. However, we can be sure this group was comprised of only college students as YAF was an organization created to house conservative activists on college campuses.
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ideals. In his interview James Flannery declared, “a lot of people supported the war. You don’t hear their voices anymore.” However, my close examination of *The Mac Weekly* and the Macalester College Archives demonstrates that the voices of individuals in support of the war were not heard in their time either. At Macalester the counterculture became the dominant culture on campus. The student newspaper, the faculty, and even the administration supported an antiwar stance. The voices of prowar individuals were not heard or they were listened to and then quickly shot down. The atmosphere on campus was not one of debate and constructive conversation, leaving the voices of individuals who supported the war in Vietnam relatively silent both at the time and in the historical record.

This returns to the argument posited in Chapter Two that at Macalester consensus rendered the antiwar movement inactive. Macalester turned the national paradigm on its head, making the counterculture the dominant culture and marginalizing the voices of conservatives on campus. The dominance of the counterculture at the college caused difficulties for individuals on both sides of the political spectrum. Consensus on campus rendered the counterculture fairly inactive while it simultaneously silenced the voices of prowar, conservative students.

In a strange twist on the national model, conservative voices became the minority at Macalester College in the 1960s and 70s. In the 1960s the Vietnam War was favored, or at least not openly condemned, by the majority of American college students. Members of the counterculture were portrayed as freaks, deviants, and the minority in their communities. However, at Macalester prowar, conservative voices were the
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marginalized group. The lack of conservative activism on campus had the opposite effect than is expected. An absence of resistance to liberal ideals and antiwar activism, as well as the overwhelming consensus about the Vietnam War on campus, created an atmosphere of complacency. Students were not as militant or as active in politics as they may have been if they had something or someone to fight against. As a whole, the scarcity of prowar activism at Macalester had a doubly negative effect, marginalizing the voices of the few conservatives at the college and rendering activism on campus fairly dormant.

Examining the role that women, economically and racially diverse students, and conservatives played in the counterculture at Macalester reveals the complexities and deep contradictions inherent in the counterculture. The counterculture was commonly heralded by its supporters, as well as by historians, as a utopian experiment in free love, expanded consciousness through drug use, equality, and living out personal values. However, the situation at Macalester shows that while members of the counterculture worked to support these values, they were also hypocritical in their treatment of women, minority students, and prowar sympathizers. Examining the circumstances of these different groups of students heightens our understanding of the college’s counterculture, and the counterculture in general. Contrary to our preferred method of imagining such movements, the antiwar movement and the counterculture were not utopian movements where people lived in harmony and cured the nation of its social ills. While these movements did signal new ways of thinking for many individuals they did not exist without the stigma of sexism, racism, and intolerance. In the case of Macalester, the
homogeneity and inequality of the counterculture hindered its ability to create lasting change on campus and in the greater community, as consensus and a lack of diversity bred passivity.
Conclusion

Many historians conclude their discussion of the counterculture by examining its relevance in today’s society. Indeed, the counterculture and protest against the Vietnam War had a strong impact on the renewed conservatism of the politics and culture of the 1980s and 90s. The idea of the radical left and extreme forms of protest also have increased relevance in today’s society at a time when many Americans are considering how they can enact meaningful change within the bounds of democracy. However, it is not my intention to use the counterculture as a manual explaining how to subvert political and social standards in order to enact change. Instead, the counterculture both nationally and at Macalester provides interesting insight into the gaps in the historical scholarship of the counterculture.

The counterculture points to the complex forms that cultural and political dissent take and the strong historical roots of any movement for social or political change. While the Macalester counterculture may initially seem to carry little importance for those outside of the college’s community, this unusual movement actually markedly enhances the larger narrative of the American antiwar movement. The unique nature of the counterculture at Macalester provides a different method of examining the events and social movements of the 1960s and 70s. To begin, the Macalester counterculture was self-indulgent, it emerged despite a sympathetic administration and even without the guidance of an SDS chapter on campus. Students acted out their ideals even though the liberal atmosphere on campus did not create an immediate need for antiwar advocacy at Macalester. Despite the opportunities provided by the consensus between students, faculty, and administration regarding opposition to the Vietnam War, Macalester students
let a lack of dissent render their movement complacent. While students did take action against the war in Vietnam, activism on campus was relatively tame compared to the atmosphere at other colleges at the time.

Additionally, the overwhelming popularity of countercultural ideals on campus silenced any potential for disagreement and avoided the criticism of those marginalized by these movements. The counterculture at Macalester demonstrates the importance of dissenting and minority voices in the narrative of the counterculture, urging historians to reexamine these voices in this historical narrative. At Macalester the counterculture became the dominant culture and also acted as a marginalizing force for many individuals on campus. This peculiar situation introduces a new area of study for historians: the significance of the counterculture as an oppressive force in 1960s and 70s society.

Many of the alumni interviewed for this project did not explicitly identify themselves as members of the counterculture though they all admitted to its presence on campus. This points to the misrepresentation of the counterculture both in historical scholarship and in popular culture. Rebellious students of the 1960s are generally portrayed as drugged out, barefoot, long-haired hippies. Instead we need to expand our interpretation of what constitutes the counterculture in order to develop a richer, overarching picture of the cultural and political climate of the 1960s and 70s. Reconfiguring the definition of the counterculture allows us to encompass the ideals that formed the many social movements of this era; peace, authenticity, and community.

The Macalester counterculture does not fit with models created by historians, like Heineman, to represent student activism on college campuses. As historians, our narratives of the counterculture still too often represent this amorphous group as
homogeneous and unified. Macalester is a strong example of Braunstein and Doyle’s suggestion that countercultural narratives cannot be represented by a straight line. Instead, the counterculture was messy, contradictory and confusing, its narrative better represented by a squiggly line or a circle. This method of examining the counterculture provides a new way of envisioning radical protest movements and periods of cultural change as a whole. These movements are not centrally organized or unified. They are diffuse, contingent on local or personal factors, and in many cases serendipitous in their timing.

Macalester’s counterculture also points to the need for greater scholarship on the counterculture at a variety of colleges and universities across the United States. Heineman’s model does not accurately represent the counterculture on all college campuses. While his model breaks the traditional pattern of examining only affluent and prominent schools like Berkeley and Columbia it does not represent the varied nature of the counterculture on other college campuses. Shrock and Edmonds attempt to expand on Heineman’s model in their examination of the rural and mid-sized Ball State University but their scholarship provides little for the creation of a new, more accurate model of the counterculture. More historical research is needed on the counterculture at small, liberal arts colleges in order to encompass the experiences of Macalester students and other students like them. In order to create a better understanding of the counterculture of the 1960s and 70s, historians need to develop a more holistic and inclusive approach for examining the counterculture on college campuses during this time period. My work attempts to fill some of the silences in the record of this era by demonstrating
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Macalester’s deviance from existing national models and by highlighting voices that were underrepresented within the counterculture on campus.

The conservatism and consumerism of the 1950s bred a new generation of countercultural liberals who worked to see their nation embrace the authentic lifestyles they sought for themselves. These individuals were participants in the counterculture through their rejection of traditional society and their desire to build a community of individuals who sought autonomy and truth in their daily lives. A diverse and expansive movement, the counterculture had many different cultural and political focal points. At Macalester the counterculture adopted the Vietnam War as the central issue in their fight against the complacency and traditionalism of the dominant culture. The Vietnam War prompted the encounter of Yippies, hippies, and political groups with government and citizen groups that opposed their radical protest. Through confrontation over the issue of the war in Vietnam, American youth encountered a larger community of like-minded individuals. In many ways, the war in Vietnam cemented the weak bond that growing up in Cold War America in the 1940s and 50s had created among many young adults, building the momentum for the loose configuration of the counterculture.

Macalester students drew upon an imagined national community in their own encounters with the Vietnam War on campus and readapted it to fit the situation on campus. At Macalester, the Vietnam War did not pit the administration and the students against one another, but opposition to the war in Vietnam did spark debate over the convergence of intellectualism and action on campus. Eventually, anti-Vietnam War sentiment at Macalester College lost momentum in the mid-1970s. In 1971 the college’s largest donor, DeWitt Wallace, withdrew his financial support of the college. Although
Wallace gave no clear reason for his financial withdrawal, the college’s “permissiveness” of student activism and the fiscal irresponsibility of President Arthur Flemming may have been an element in Wallace’s decision to curtail his financial support.\textsuperscript{213} After President Flemming resigned in 1971 the college faced a period of financial difficulty. Student scholarship funds were reduced, faculty members, including Reverend Al Currier, were cut, and the overall student population size dwindled. By the time the Vietnam War finally ended in 1975 there was very little student activism against the war remaining on Macalester’s campus. The focus on campus had shifted from student activism to financial survival. Despite financial sanctions, students did not lose their liberal ideology. The anti-Vietnam War movement and the counterculture at the college in the 1960s and 70s led the way to future movements for social change on campus. In the 1970s and 80s students remained involved in the women’s rights movement and the continuing struggle to maintain the EEO program and bring diversity to campus.

In the end, Macalester students contributed to the creation of an unusual counterculture on campus. Beverly Fritz summed this up by stating that the Vietnam War, “really brought the global and national awareness to our attention. It really drew you in, it kept drawing you in to a point where it felt like there had to be something that you could do.”\textsuperscript{214} The Vietnam War truly pushed Macalester students to their limits, prompting personal and unique involvement in the cultural and political dissent of the counterculture.
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Appendix A

The following is the call for participants published in the Summer 2016 version of the Macalester Today alumni magazine. The call was a part of a larger article written by the Macalester Communications Department about a class project that was conducted by Professor Karin Aguilar-San Juan and her students regarding the People’s Peace Treaty and anti-Vietnam War protest at Macalester College. It should be noted that James Flannery and Alvin Currier did not respond to this call for participants, I sought out each of these individuals for an interview as they each possessed notable opinions regarding activities on Macalester’s campus in the 1960s and 70s. All interviews are used with the permission of the participants.

Sara Ludewig ‘17 (Northfield, Minn.) is conducting research on the antiwar movement at Mac for her honors thesis. She wants to interview alumni from the classes of ‘68, ‘69, ‘70, and ‘71 about their perceptions of the anti-Vietnam War movement on campus. To participate, email sludewig@macalester.edu.
Appendix B

The following are the questions asked to all alumni during interviews. The order of questioning and phrasing of questions may have changed slightly during the interview process but all alumni were asked these essential questions. Full transcripts of four of these interviews can eventually be found digitally at the Macalester College Archives.

Questions
1) Please state your name and the year you graduated from Macalester.
2) What was the general atmosphere on campus when you attended Macalester? Did this change over the years you attended Mac?
3) Is there any event or issue that stands out in your memory about this period of time at Macalester?
4) What do you remember about the anti-Vietnam War movement on campus?
5) Were you personally involved in these movements? If so, how?
6) How did the administration deal with the antiwar movement?
7) Did Macalester students interact with outside antiwar organizations or was the movement mostly contained to campus?
8) What Macalester organizations and groups were most involved with the antiwar movement on campus?
9) What was the involvement of faculty and staff in these types of movements?
10) How did Macalester’s campus and general atmosphere change as a result of the antiwar movement?
11) Is there anything else that I haven’t covered here that you’d like to add?