assigning a scandalously large share of their teaching loads to part-time teachers, to whom they paid low hourly wages. There was a surplus of trained teachers, as well as many other people with college and university training, who suddenly found themselves overqualified and underemployed.

Campus Turmoil

American college students of the 1950s had been called "the silent generation." Those who reached college age in the 1950s had been born in the 1930s, and when these "depression babies" became young adults, they were too driven by anxiety about material success to be interested in any form of political or social dissent. Students took virtually no part, for example, in the University of California loyalty oath controversy.

The college students of the middle and later 1960s, on the other hand, were part of the great wave of postwar babies, born and reared in relative affluence, but in such numbers that they badly overcrowded the public schools and the colleges and were often discontented with the crowding. Some of them discovered that their massive numbers could be a form of power.

Stirrings of student unrest in California had appeared as early as May 1960 when a crowd of college students, protesting their exclusion from a hearing of the House Un-American Activities Committee in the San Francisco city hall, jammed the rotunda by sitting down in the balcony. The police washed them down the stairs with fire hoses and drove them from the building with clubs. At about the same time, black college students in the southern states began to attack the racial segregation of lunch counters with the tactic of the *sit-in.* This was a form of civil disobedience in which demonstrators occupied seats and refused to move until arrested. In the early 1960s, however, the federal courts ruled that the racial segregation of lunch counters was unconstitutional and therefore that those who had participated in the lunch counter sit-ins were merely demanding their constitutional rights and could not be validly arrested.

Several students from the University of California at Berkeley had spent their summers in civil rights activities in the deep south, and when they returned to the campus in the fall of 1964, they organized sit-ins and other demonstrations to protest racial discrimination by Bay Area businesses. In September the university administration announced that a sidewalk area at the southern entrance to the campus—an area previously thought to belong to the city of Berkeley and thus to be beyond university control—was university property and ordered all student groups to stop using the area for setting up tables, recruiting members, or otherwise organizing for off-campus political activity. The groups affected by the university's order included student civil rights organizations, as well as groups ranging in their political philosophy from the far left to the far right. When the administration attempted to enforce its new order, students organized the Free Speech Movement (FSM), called a student strike, and used the civil rights tactic of mass civil disobedience against the university.

The university charter law of 1868 and the state constitution of 1879 (Article IX, section 9) had sought to keep the state university free from "political or sectarian influence," and the regents had long chosen to interpret that phrase as forbidding any political advocacy on a university campus. This had never been the true meaning of the provision. The full sentence forbade "political or sectarian influence *in the appointment of [the university's] regents and the administration of its affairs*" [italics inserted]. Every governor of California with the possible exception of Earl Warren had flatly violated this provision by appointing regents for political reasons. But the regents, like the governors, preferred to ignore this aspect of the matter. Apparently they also chose to ignore the advice of their own attorneys that their rules against political speech and advocacy on campus were in violation of the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Edwards v. South Carolina* in 1963. This ruling stated that "student speakers may even advocate violations of the law provided such advocacy does not constitute a clear and present danger . . ." and that "much of the conduct that the public finds objectionable is constitutionally protected."

Thus the student rebellion at Berkeley in its beginnings was truly a free speech movement against unconstitutional restrictions, and in this particular sense it was successful. Following the disciplining of several students who defied the administration's order restricting political activity, crowds of students occupied the campus administration building. In December 1964 the largest sit-in occurred at Sproul Hall, and Governor Brown ordered state and local police to intervene. In the largest mass arrest in the state's history, more than 700 persons, mostly students, were dragged or carried from the building. Less than a week after the Sproul Hall arrests, the Berkeley faculty passed resolutions that the university should not regulate the content of political advocacy, but should regulate only the time, place, and manner of it in order to prevent interference with normal university functions, and the university administration agreed to liberalize its rules governing student political activity.

The Free Speech Movement of 1964 gave Berkeley a considerable reputation as the cradle of student revolt in America, and in the subsequent years this reputation attracted many young radicals, some of them students and others former students, to the university campus and to parts of Berkeley and Oakland to the south of it. Protest against the escalation of the war in Vietnam and a continuing crusade against racism at home were now the major channels of youthful rebellion.

As the conflict in Vietnam escalated, protests against it also intensified. In October 1967 a major draft riot occurred after a crowd of antiwar demonstrators, trying to shut down the Oakland induction center, were routed by police who sprayed them with a temporarily blinding chemical known as Mace. The new vogue of student power spread across the country. In August 1968, during the Democratic national convention in Chicago, there was a violent confrontation between police and the mass of young militants who had gathered in an effort to pressure the convention into taking a stand against the Vietnam War. Prominent among the leaders of the Chicago demonstrations were two Californians: Tom Hayden, a leader of the radical Students for a Democratic Society, and Jerry Rubin, once a graduate student in sociology at Berkeley but now a full-time "revolutionary."