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 After four students from North Carolina A & T University in Greenboro, North Carolina, organized a sit-in at the Woolworth’s Department Store on 1 February 1960, the on-going Civil Rights Movement entered a new phase. This initial protest was followed by a wave of student sit-ins throughout the South, and widespread demonstrations and boycotts of Woolworth Stores in the North and Midwest. Before the Greensboro student sit-ins, elementary, secondary, and college students’ participation in the on-going civil rights campaigns were organized by Martin Luther King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) or James Farmer’s Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). Young people in the NAACP Youth Councils had been engaged in nonviolent direct action protests in various cities from the 1930s.[[1]](#endnote-1) However, when Youth Councils organized sit-ins in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, in August 1958; in Wichita, Kansas, in September 1958; Kansas City, Missouri, in January 1959, and other cities, the leaders of the NAACP contacted the groups and demanded that they end these direct action protests. After the Greensboro sit-ins, however, black and white students in over sixty locations participated in lunch counter protests, and following the conference organized by SCLC leader Ella Baker at Shaw University in Raleigh, North Carolina, in April 1960, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) was formed and the student members began organizing civil rights protests in many southern cities and towns.[[2]](#endnote-2)

 The launching of civil rights protests by African American students at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) spurred student activism at predominantly white institutions of higher education. When University of Michigan student Tom Hayden and others issued the “Port Huron Statement” at a meeting of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in June 1962, in addition to protesting against the increasing bureaucratization of the university and apathy of students, and supporting universal nuclear disarmament and the reform of the Democratic Party, the students called attention to “Discrimination in America” against African Americans and other non-whites. After presenting statistics on the disparities in housing, wages, schooling, and employment between whites and non-whites, the students pointed out that most white Americans believe that race relations in the United States are fine. “Not knowing the non-white, however, the white knows less of himself. Not comfortable around `different people,’ he reclines in whiteness, rather than preparing for diversity. Refusing to yield objective social freedoms to the non-white, the white loses his personal subjective freedom by turning away from `all these damn causes.’”[[3]](#endnote-3)

 SDS chapters and members refused to turn away and began working with civil rights organizers and providing assistance to various southern campaigns in the fall of 1962. For example, SDS chapters responded when SNCC sent out a call for food, clothes, and other supplies for African Americans in LaFlore County, Mississippi, after many loss their jobs and housing following the launching of a voter registration campaign. Fearful of the conditions for people there as the winter of 1962-63 approached, SDS chapters gathered food, medicine, and other resources, and began ferrying them to SNCC workers in LaFlore County. In January 1963 Michigan State University students Ivanhoe Donaldson and Benjamin Taylor were arrested in Clarksdale, Mississippi, after they arrived with a truckload of food, clothing, and medicine for black families. Local police claimed that the shipment included narcotics donated by physicians. Charges against the students were later dropped when the local grand jury refused to indict them. By the end of February, SNCC and the Council of Federated Organizations (COFO), an umbrella organization, had distributed food and other resources, gathered and shipped by SDS chapters, to 22,000 African Americans across the state of Mississippi.[[4]](#endnote-4)

Student activists in SDS became even more involved in civil rights activism with the formation of the Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP) early in 1964. SDS members in northern cities began working on “interracial projects” to assist the poor and working class residents in mobilizing to change the conditions under which they were living. SDS helped local people organize “rent strikes” against absentee landlords who refused to make repairs to their buildings. The students organized and participated in marches and demonstrations at municipal housing departments calling on the officials to make improvements in the conditions of deteriorating federal housing projects. In some cities SDS members worked with local CORE chapters in protesting discriminatory employment practices, particularly in the building trades.[[5]](#endnote-5)

 Many of the students who participated in SNCC’s “Freedom Summer” campaign and worked on voter registration campaigns and taught in “freedom schools” in Mississippi in 1964 were members of SDS. The hundreds of northern students who went south came to witness firsthand the poverty, violence, and terrorism that was used to maintain the status quo and the racist social order in the South. When they returned to their campuses in the 1964-65 school year, many became involved in the Student Rights Movement and anti-Vietnam War protests that took place in the late 1960s. Some SDS members also joined with African American, Chicano, Women, and Asian American students in bringing about diversity in the curriculum, faculty, and administration of institutions of higher education throughout the United States.[[6]](#endnote-6)

STUDENT RIGHTS AND STUDENT ACTIVISM

 There is little disagreement about the relationship between the Civil Rights Movement and the launching of the Student Rights Movement in October 1964, following the demonstrations for “free speech” at the University of California, Berkeley (UCB). Mario Savio, who had worked on SNCC “Freedom Summer” campaign in Mississippi in 1964, became the outspoken leader of the Free Speech Movement after he and other students were arrested for their protests over the refusal of university officials to allow them to canvass for student support for SNCC’s voter registration campaigns in the South. The Free Speech Movement served as the spark for the student rights campaigns that took place on college campuses around the country between 1965 and 1970. Among the changes students brought about was student participation in decision-making process at the university, the end of parietal regulations that restricted student autonomy, an increase in the numbers of ethnic and racial minority student enrolled, the creation of Ethnic Studies and Women’s Studies programs, and the hiring of faculty from ethnic and racial minority groups.[[7]](#endnote-7)

 Two other complaints that students made to university officials, not just in California, but throughout the country, closely associated with the Student Rights Movement were the right to invite controversial speakers to campus to lecture and the right of student groups to take a public stand on social and political issues outside the university. On most college campuses up to the 1960s, administrators assumed their right to veto the bringing of certain speakers to campus who were outside the political mainstream. This administrative veto power was used most often when student groups sought to bring in speakers who were members of the Communist Party. For example, in the 1960s historian Herbert Aptheker was considered by many “the Most Dangerous Communist in the United States.”[[8]](#endnote-8) A prolific scholar, Aptheker founded the American Institute of Marxist Studies in 1964, but was prevented by conservative university officials from being hired or even lecturing at most U.S. universities. In January 1966 Aptheker traveled with SDS leader Tom Hayden and Yale Professor Staughton Lynd to Hanoi, North Vietnam, in hopes of sounding out the North Vietnamese on the possibility of a negotiated peace with South Vietnam and the United States. Upon their return the U.S. State Department attempted to take away Aptheker and the others’ passports, citing a law forbidding U. S. citizens to travel to communist countries that required a U.S. passport. Though the charges were later dropped, this decreased the possibility that Aptheker would be given an academic appointment. Student invitations to Aptheker to speak on college campuses in the 1960s were withdrawn by college officials, thus stirring students’ demands for right to invite speakers, even controversial ones, to campus.

The ban on student groups taking a stand on political events outside the university became a major issue at the University of California, Riverside in 1965. The UC Riverside student senate, under the leadership of six student senators, passed a resolution on 26 March 1965 calling on President Lyndon Johnson to dispatch federal troops to protect civil rights marchers who were planning on making the journey from Selma to Montgomery after the police attacks on nonviolent activists on the Pettus Bridge on “Bloody Sunday,” 7 March 1965. When UCR Chancellor James Hinderacker rescinded the student resolution, six members of Associated Students of University of California, Riverside (ASUCR) resigned from the student senate in protest. As a follow-up to the student “free speech” demonstrations and protests at UC Berkeley in fall 1964, Jerome Byrne, Special Counsel to the UC Board of Regents, was appointed to head an investigation of the student protests. In the *Report of the University of California Special Committee of the Regents*, issued in May 1965, also known as the Byrne Report, there was detailed discussion of the events at UC Riverside.

In March 1965 the president and five other members of ASUCR, the elected student government, resigned because of U.C. president Clark Kerr’s directive banning student organizations from taking public positions on “off-campus matters.” In the Byrne Report, it noted that the ASUCR senators were told to rescind the resolution or face being disbanded. In this instance, there were no protests or sit-ins as in the fall at UC Berkeley, however, student “government was exposed…as an ineffectual instrument of student opinion.” The Byrne Committee sided with the UC Riverside student senators in their protest. “We fail to see how the University itself is involved in off-campus issues so long as ASUCR Senate announces the vote results and the announcement makes it clear that the body which took the vote was not the University itself.” The Byrne Committee even suggested that at UC Berkeley in the fall, “student government could well have been a funnel for the grievances that existed and might have averted or at least ameliorated the conflict that developed. University regulations should encourage the students to actively participate in student government, this regulation does not.” Thus in its final recommendation to the UC Regents, the Byrne Committee declared that “student government be permitted to take and announce positions on issues of importance to the membership, within and outside the University, provided that the membership wishes to commit that power to its governing board, the vote on the issue is announced, the announcement identifies the group, disclaiming authority to speak for the University.”[[9]](#endnote-9) There is little evidence that the UC Regents followed the recommendations of the Byrne Committee in general, or on the issue raised by the student senators’ protest at UC Riverside in particular.

The student rights movement beginning in 1965 became the source of the peace activism and antiwar protests on campuses around the country. The escalation in the war in Vietnam spurred a large-scale peach movement, often led by students who had formerly been active in civil rights campaigns and campus protests. Students were particularly involved in protests against the war because it was only as long as they remained in school that they would receive deferments from the military draft. As the war continued, the student deferments would be eliminated making more and more young men vulnerable to induction into the military. SDS branches at universities around the country often organized peace activities with the first “teach-in” on the history of U.S. involvement in Southeast Asian politics and conflicts held at the University of Michigan in March 1965. Within months teach-ins were held at hundreds universities across the country. And by the fall of 1965 violent conflicts erupted on campuses between antiwar student protesters and campus and local police and these disturbances continued into the early 1970s, with the murder of student protesters at Kent State University in Ohio and South Carolina State University in Orangeburg receiving the most national and international attention.[[10]](#endnote-10)

STUDENT ACTIVISM AND BLACK STUDIES

While there is much consensus about the origins of the Student Rights Movement in the free speech demands made by UC Berkeley students beginning in October 1964, the origins of the Black Studies Movement is traced to the East Bay area of California and the Afro-American Student Association formed by African American students at UC Berkeley in September 1960. The association organized study groups and held meetings and lectures and attracted African Americans from Merritt College in Oakland and San Francisco State College. Huey Newton and other black students at Merritt College called for courses in African American history. At nearby San Francisco State College in November 1968, African Americans presented the school’s president with a list of ten demands that included the creation of a “Department of Black Studies” and the appointment of sociologist Nathan Hare as chair. When the demands were not met, the minority and majority students at San Francisco State launched a strike that lasted from November 1968 to March 1969. The “Third World Liberation Front” was organized and it maintained solidarity among African American, Native American, Chicano, and Asian American students during the prolonged protest. When the strike ended, the first Black Studies Department was formed and attracted several notable faculty members, including poets Amiri Baraka and Sonia Sanchez.[[11]](#endnote-11)

It is clear that the Black Studies Department at San Francisco State and the programs started at over 200 colleges and universities between 1969 and 1972 came about as a result of black and white student activism. Student protests led to the formation of Black Studies programs and departments at colleges and universities from California to New Hampshire; and while the Student Rights Movement fed into the anti-Vietnam War protests, the campaigns for Black Studies led to the formation of Women Studies, Chicano, and Asian American Studies programs. The advent of multicultural educational programs at elementary, secondary, and higher educational institutions in the 1970s and 1980s can be traced directly to the demands by African American students first for courses in African American and African history and culture and subsequently for Black Studies programs. Historians and other researchers have documented the development of multiculturalism, beginning in the late 1960s, in U.S. institutions of higher education.[[12]](#endnote-12)

 In his examination of the “Black Campus Movement,” Ibram Rogers suggests that black student activism entered a new phase as a response to the violence and murder associated with the march from Selma to Montgomery in March 1965. Students on campuses around the country responded the way ASUCR senators did and passed resolutions, signed petitions, and held rallies calling on President Johnson to send federal troops to protect nonviolent protesters. The black campus movement, according to Rogers, “like any social movement, needed a societal trigger. It received three in 1965. The assassination of Malcolm X, and Bloody Sunday within weeks of each other in early 1965 first did the job, then the Watts rebellion in the summer completed the spawning triad.”[[13]](#endnote-13) However, these protests in 1965 did not lead to the formation of Black Studies programs. That did not occur until 1967 at San Francisco State College. And among the demands of the Third World Liberation Front that led the strike at San Francisco State was the creation of a “Department of Raza Studies” as part of the new “School for Ethnic Studies.”[[14]](#endnote-14)

STUDENT ACTIVISM AND CHICANO STUDIES

College and high school students played important roles in the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement. When labor leader Cesar Chavez formed the National Farm Workers Association (NFWA) in 1963 to organize Mexican American farm workers, and launched strikes against California farm owners in 1964 and 1965, he received much support from Mexican American students and young people. In his famous 250-mile march from the Coachella Valley to Sacramento, California, in April 1966 to inspire farm workers to join the union, thousands of Mexican American students joined him. The march was successful and many grape producers signed their first contracts with Cesar Chavez’s NFWA. Historians believe that young people’s participation in the successful march served as a foundation for their involvement in the 1960s Chicano Movement.

On Friday, 1 March 1968 in the midst of the grape boycott, Mexican American students at Wilson High School in Los Angeles walked out of their classes. Deeming the subject-matter “inappropriate” for teenagers, the principal Donald Skinner cancelled the student production of the play *Barefoot in the Park*. This was the last straw for students who had been complaining for months about the poor facilities, the lack of resources, and the absence of bilingual classes, Mexican American teachers, and Mexican heritage classes at the school. The protest at Wilson was followed on Monday, 4 March, by hundreds of students walking out of their classes at the Lincoln High School; and on Tuesday, 5 March, over 2,000 students from Garfield High School joined the protests. By Friday, 8 March 1968, it was estimated that 15,000 students in the Los Angeles area were on strike.

The high school students’ boycott or “blowouts” drew national attention to the ongoing police brutality leveled against Mexican American youth as well as poor educational conditions in East Los Angeles public schools. In addition, the high school students’ demands for courses in Chicano history and culture spurred the mobilization of Mexican American college students who came together and soon formulated demands for the creation of Chicano Studies programs. In April 1969 at the Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education conference held at UC Santa Barbara, the various student groups represented – United Mexican American Students, the Mexican American Student Confederation, the Mexican American Youth Association, and the Mexican American Student Association – decided to unite into one new organization, El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán – MEChA; and they adopted “El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán,” which outlined future activities and programs. One goal was the formation of Chicano Studies programs on university campuses that would be controlled by Chicano students and faculty.

The institutionalization of Chicano programs is the realization of Chicano power on campus. The key to this power is found in the application of the principles of self-determination and self-liberation. These principles are defined and practiced in areas of control, autonomy, flexibility, and participation.[[15]](#endnote-15)

The first Chicano Studies Department was formed at the California State University, Los Angeles in fall 1968. The Third World student strike at UC Berkeley in fall 1969 led to the formation of the first Ethnic Studies Department, which included a Chicano Studies program. As was the case with Black Studies programs, it was student activism that led to the formation of these programs whose goal was self-determination and the creation of new knowledge about Mexicans and Mexican Americans.

WOMEN’S LIBERATION AND WOMEN’S STUDIES

“Women’s Studies came out of the women’s liberation movement.” Twenty women at San Diego State University in 1969 who had been active in the women’s liberation movement came together to form the “Women’s Studies Committee.” The goal was to create a “broad based women’s center” that would “not only include academic women’s studies but six other components labeled research, publication, child care, storefront, cultural center, and recruitment, and tutorial.” Historian Marilyn Jacoby Boxer made it clear that Women’s Studies “brought advocacy for women to higher education to the academic structure and the curriculum,” similar to the Black Studies and Chicano Studies programs.[[16]](#endnote-16)

And student activism also served as the springboard for the formation of Women’s Studies programs. Marilyn Boxer makes it clear that “the genesis of Women’s Studies” was “in the radical student movement of the 1960s.”

The first text in the field *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, edited by Jo Freeman, came out of the protests over the firing of a female professor at the University of Chicago in 1968. The students organized a sit-in and afterward began researching women’s history at the university, offered a non-credit course, and the text grew out of that class. Freeman made it clear that the text “was a response to the sit-in.”[[17]](#endnote-17)

After San Diego State University, the next Women’s Studies program was at Cornell University in the 1970-71 school year. Feminist theory and history was an important foundation for the grounding of Women’s Studies. Boxer points out that “The importance of feminist advocacy in the women’s liberation movement as a foundation is reflected in the readings in these first courses…” Works by Margaret Benston, Pat Mainardi, Judy Syfers, Del Martin and Phyllis Lyons, and the Boston Women’s Health Collective were used in courses and circulated by the underground press and especially in the newly founded women’s bookstores. The Women’s Studies programs proliferated with 150 by 1975, and 300 by 1980, “reached 450 by mid-decade, and exceeded 600 by the 1990s.” In explaining this exponential growth in Women’s Studies programs, Elaine Showalter, one of the founders, made the connection to the formation of Ethnic Studies departments. “When the ideas could be spoken, the teachers were there, for unlike blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, or American Indians, women are already represented in the academic world in substantial numbers.”[[18]](#endnote-18)

STUDENT ACTIVISM AND ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES

When the Third World Liberation Front organized the strike at San Francisco State College in 1967, Asian American students were included. However, several weeks into the strike S. I. Hayakawa, a conservative Japanese American linguist, was named interim president of the college and he took a hard line against the strikers. Hayakawa viewed himself as representative of the advantages of non-white students and professionals seeking assimilation into the mainstream of American society. In *Chains of Babylon: The Rise of Asian America*, Daryl J. Maeda reports that four divergent positions soon emerged surrounding Hayakawa:

First, Hayakawa styled himself a racial middleman who was neither black nor white and was therefore able to act as a neutral arbiter of racial conflicts. Second, strike opponents pointed to him as a person of color whose nonmilitancy constituted an implicit rebuke to campus radicals. Third, some white strike supporters attacked Hayakawa in racialized and racist ways. Finally, strike supporters assailed his authenticity as a “Third World” person, claiming that he thought and acted like a white man.[[19]](#endnote-19)

From the outset Hayakawa made his opposition to the student strike, but also agreed with the demands for a Black Studies Department. But he was also opposed to a School of Ethnic Studies that included Asian American Studies because he believed that Japanese and Chinese Americans had already assimilated into American society. “We are a colored race of non-whites,” Hayakawa declared. “We’ve been through the same thing but we’ve been able to come through it better than the Negroes have.” There was no need for Asian American Studies because “Asian Americans possessed intact cultures and awareness of their histories.”[[20]](#endnote-20)

The Asian American communities in general and the Japanese American organizations in particular were split over Hayakawa’s actions at San Francisco State and some organizations supported him, while other groups and individuals denounced him as a “lackey for the white supremacist power structure.” The Asian American Political Alliance (AAPA), a well-established organization in the Bay Area, opposed Hayakawa because “his actions reflected badly on the Japanese American community’s relationship with the black community.” The AAPA also opposed Hayakawa for his embracing of the “model minority thesis” which suggested that Asian Americans had become accepted into the white mainstream due to their hard work and lack of protest against discrimination. The AAPA rejected this thesis because it was inaccurate – Asians in the United States were still victims of discrimination; and because it separated Asians from other oppressed Third World people.[[21]](#endnote-21)

When a settlement was finally reached in March 1969, the School of Ethnic Studies was formed with departments of American Indian Studies, Asian American Studies, Black Studies, and La Raza Studies; and Japanese American anthropologist James Hirabyashi served as dean between 1970 and 1976, a visible sign of self-determination in the movement for Asian American Studies. Daryl Maeda reports that the student activism “had lasting repercussions, for three decades after the strike there were Asian American Studies programs at thirty-seven colleges and universities, and many more institutions offered courses.”[[22]](#endnote-22)

CONCLUSION

In order to understand the origins of diversity and multiculturalism in U.S. higher education, it is necessary to study the history of student activism in the 1960s and 1970s. Historians have pointed out that student activism is an inherent component of student culture. In the long history of higher learning in Western societies, significant changes in instruction, hiring practices, student evaluation, and university relations with the government and economic institutions have been impacted by student activism.[[23]](#endnote-23) The events in the 1960s and 1970s were part of this much longer movement in European and United States history.

In his book *Freedom’s Web: Student Activism in an Age of Cultural Diversity*, Robert A. Rhoads documented student movements and protests to demand Chicano Studies, Women’s Studies, Native American, and Gay or Queer Studies at U. S. colleges and universities in the 1990s.[[24]](#endnote-24) And thus even in an “age of diversity” student activism has been a significant factor in bringing about educational change. And as we receive more and more information about university investments in multinational corporations that engage in unfair labor practices in the developing world, students are again mobilizing and calling for divestment by university boards of trustees and regents. Student activism is a continuity that brought great changes in higher education in the United States and other Western nations, including the increased diversity found on university campuses in the twenty-first century.
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