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ABSTRACT

KELLY MORROW: Navigating the “Sexual Wilderness”: The Sexual Liberation Movement at the University of North Carolina, 1969-1973
(Under the direction of Jacquelyn Hall)

This thesis asks how the “sexual liberation movement,” which emerged at the nexus of the sexual revolution, the New Left, and women’s liberation, began, took shape, and affected students on the campus of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill between 1969 and 1973. Although today many people associate the sixties and seventies with sexual anarchy, an analysis of this movement reveals that its leaders saw it as bringing order to young people’s sexual lives. Galvanized by the lack of sexual information and products available to students during the 1960s, female and male faculty members and students came together in the early 1970s to develop discourses and services that taught an ethic of responsibility and promoted gender equality. In doing so, the movement’s leaders at this southern university rose to national prominence, and their innovative programs became models for hundreds of other schools throughout America.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In 1970, Morrison Dormitory at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) sponsored “Sexual Revolution Month.” Robert Wilson, the dorm’s sophomore student governor, believed that this would be the “the most important and informative theme” month he would have all year, even trumping issues such as race relations in its significance. He explained the month’s goal as an “attempt to give the students something they [could not] get on main campus.” Throughout October, hundreds of male and female students trekked across campus and crowded Morrison’s lobby where they found displays of detailed anatomical models; horrifying illegal abortion tools; samples of contraceptive devices; and a small library, which included a new booklet made for UNC students that listed local places where they could obtain contraceptives and safe abortions. Some students watched films about birth control, abortion, homosexuality, venereal disease, and childbirth. Others participated in a discussion on “Physiological and Ecological Aspects of Reproduction” sponsored by a women’s liberation group, and many came to hear “the most controversial speaker on campus,” physician Takey Crist, who had “a long reputation at UNC for being blunt with the facts of sex.”

---

1 Robert Wilson to Takey Crist, August 1970, box 6, Sexual Revolution Month, Takey Crist Papers, Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina (Hereafter cited as Crist Papers).

“Sexual Revolution Month” signaled a new phase of activism on the UNC campus — an attempt to redefine the sexual revolution. Galvanized by the lack of information available to sexually active women and men on the campus throughout the 1960s, female and male faculty members and students came together to develop discourses and services that advocated an ethic of responsibility, encouraged an acceptance of diverse sexual identities, and championed gender equality to unmarried undergraduates. They built their own institutions outside the control of the university, while simultaneously demanding that UNC alter its practices by taking on the role of sex educator and providing students with services to protect them against the unintended emotional and physical consequences of sex.

The activities of these faculty members and students on this southern campus were part of a larger grassroots movement sweeping across college campuses in all areas of America during the early 1970s, which I call the “sexual liberation movement.” Although we may imagine that southern states, such as like North Carolina, remained wrapped in a cloak of Bible belt morality, the sexual liberation movement simultaneously found its way down south and radiated from it. This movement did not germinate on the coasts or come from the

---

3 My naming this movement as the “sexual liberation movement” might need some explanation. This terminology, no doubt, invokes Michel Foucault’s *History of Sexuality, Volume 1*, first published in 1976. Indeed, Foucault’s work was a reaction to the “sexual revolution” of the late 1960s and early 1970s. He argued that his contemporaries, many like those who participated in the movement discussed here, mistakenly believed that sexuality could be “liberated” by speaking more about it. The “repressive hypothesis,” which maintained that sex became a secret, hidden, and silenced by the Victorians, was a historical inaccuracy. He contended that talk about sexuality, instead, proliferated and became a central and controlling aspect of Westerners’ identities and institutions. It is not my intention in this thesis to prove or disprove the repressive hypothesis. I argue that despite its validity or falsity the repressive hypothesis did form an epistemological and practical underpinning for the people I discuss in this paper. The leaders of the sexual liberation movement believed that institutions, such as the university, kept certain practical truths about sexual activity, such as knowledge about protection against pregnancy, from young people. They felt that increasing certain types of sexual discourses, which emphasized sexual and emotional health, would “liberate” the students from confusion and ignorance. The circle of people at UNC discussed in this paper believed that they could transfer knowledge and, thus, power to the students on campus by inundating them with what they believed was correct scientific knowledge about sex. In so doing, they bolstered the authority of scientific knowledge, but at the same time, instigated what Foucault would call a proliferation of discourses and a discursive reversal. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley, Vintage Books ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1990).
ideas and beliefs of a few radicals; it had multiple epicenters on liberal college campuses from Seattle to Chapel Hill. The University of North Carolina developed its own sexual liberation movement while in conversation with universities and organizations around the country, but during the early 1970s, its leaders rose to national prominence, and its innovative programs became models for hundreds of other universities, colleges, and even high schools throughout America. For these reasons, the University of North Carolina provides an excellent case study of how the sexual liberation movement began, took shape, and influenced students’ sexual lives.

The 1960s and early 1970s marked a shift in the sexual culture of the United States and the sexual practices of many of its citizens. Contemporaries endlessly commented on a “new morality” among American youth, which made abstinence before marriage seem passé, and encouraged unmarried college couples to engage in sexual relationships described as “promiscuity with affection.” To many adults, young people’s libidos seemed out of control, and the vestiges of “Victorian sexual morality” seemed to flicker away with each passing year. This image of an uncontrolled, hedonistic sexual free-for-all dominated many contemporary American’s perceptions of the “sexual revolution,” and it proved to be such a powerful representation that it has withstood the test of time. Conservative politicians and pundits today, for example, maintain that “the idea behind the sexual revolution was . . . you


are free to do whatever pleases you” in order to wage their contemporary battles against gay and lesbian marriage, women’s reproductive rights, and sex education.⁶ Yet, the students at Morrison Dormitory certainly did not use the term “sexual revolution” in this way. They instead envisioned the changes in attitudes and behaviors in which they were engaged as a grassroots movement aimed at bringing order to young, unmarried people’s sexual lives by disseminating sexual knowledge, promoting morality, and even endorsing the idea of restraint — an impulse that is absent from the historical memory both of the conservatives the of American public in general, but nonetheless, that is a crucial element of the sexual revolution.

Only recently have historians and other scholars begun to provide a more nuanced understanding of the sexual revolution. John D'Emilio, Estelle B. Freedman, and David Allyn date changes in sexual behaviors and attitudes to the 1950s, citing the founding of *Playboy* and the relaxation of obscenity laws as evidence of a new frankness about and imagery of sexuality in American popular culture.⁷ Jane Gearhard and Sandra Morgen link

---

⁶ Maeve Reston, “Santorum Blasted for Boston Remarks,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 14 July 2005, A-1. For more evidence of this rhetoric, see, for example, Roger Scruton, “Perversion,” *National Review*, 14 June 2004; and Linda Feldmann, “How Lines of the Culture War Have Been Redrawn,” *Christian Science Monitor*, 15 November 2004, 1. Interestingly, a simple search of the Right’s major newspapers, magazines, and websites shows how invested they are in the negative language of the “sexual revolution.” They often invoke the “sexual revolution” in order to create panic about the demise of religious values, changing gender roles, and the increase in “perversion” (homosexuality). In the late 1960s, the Left, in particular second-wave feminists, did critique the sexual revolution by arguing that sexual access was a way for men to subjugate women. John D'Emilio and Estelle B. Freedman, *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), 308-9. Nonetheless, this language is virtually absent from the Left’s publications in the past ten years, which suggests a much more ambiguous historical memory of this era. Thus, as historians, we must be careful to use such a loaded word that, more likely than not, will invoke a singular image in the public’s mind and deny the complexity of historical reality by conflating it with historical memory of a single political ideology.

the sexual revolution of the late 1960s and 1970s to women’s liberation and the women’s health movement by stressing how second-wave feminists associated sexual pleasure and control over their reproductive bodies with cultural and physical emancipation. In a case study of the University of Kansas, Beth Bailey argues that the sexual revolution was an attempt to reconcile a disjuncture between “traditional” public morality and private acts. According to Bailey, throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, “[w]hat people did in private was quite often radically different from what they admitted in public,” and the sexual revolution focused on combating this “hypocrisy.”

Although most historians agree that the “sexual revolution” was composed of many, often, contradictory, strands, the use of this all-encompassing term can confuse these elements by invoking an unrepresentative, single image that does not apply to many of the diverse activities that occurred. The sexual liberation movement, for example, embraced frankness about sexuality and supported women’s reproductive rights. Yet, it combined such concerns in innovative ways, while putting forth unique ideologies and practices centered on responsibility, maturity, and equality for young adults that, thus far, have failed to capture historians’ attention.

Furthermore, the sexual liberation movement was not only a strand of the sexual revolution but also a strand of New Left activism of the sixties and early seventies. Historians have analyzed various aspects of what Van Gosse calls the “movement of movements,” especially civil rights, anti-war protests, women’s liberation, and more recently

---


gay liberation.\textsuperscript{10} Still, missing from these studies are events such as Morrison’s Sexual Revolution Month and many other elements of student activism revolving around sexual knowledge, practices, and ideology. The sexual liberation movement drew its energy and ideals from multiple New Left groups, and, like the others, it too attempted to create a more democratic and equitable society.

This thesis argues that the sexual liberation movement should be seen as a significant aspect of the histories of the sexual revolution, the New Left, and second-wave feminism and as emerging at the nexus among them. This grassroots social movement attempted to transform everyday realities, institutions, and cultural discourses about sex and gender.\textsuperscript{11} Because movement leaders believed that sexual liberation and individual empowerment came through knowledge and gender equality, this movement dovetailed with the objectives and practices of the women’s health movement and the larger second-wave feminist movement. Although never explicitly calling their goals “feminist,” male and female leaders of the


\textsuperscript{11} Although the terminology of “social movement” contains inherent ambiguity for historians and sociologists alike, I use Doug McAdams and David A. Snow’s definition of social movements as a “collectivity acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional channels for the purpose of promoting or resisting change in the group, society, or world order of which it is a part.” Doug McAdam and David A. Snow, \textit{Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics} (Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company, 1997), xviii-xix.
sexual liberation movement challenged both the ideological and structural underpinning of
the sexual double standard, which not only held women to a different standard of sexual
morality, but also expected them to prevent and cope with sexual consequences alone. This
movement not only changed the ways in which people understood and experienced sex; it
reflected a shift in how young women and men communicated and reacted to one another.12

Between 1969 and 1973, the sexual landscape of Chapel Hill changed drastically. When
students arrived at the University of North Carolina in 1969, most had never had formal sex
education; the university’s in loco parentis rules restricted women’s behaviors; and Student
Health Services refused to dispense birth control devices.13 Over half of the undergraduates
on campus were sexually active, but most seemed woefully unaware of and helpless against
the potential physical and emotional consequences of their sexual activities.14 College
women and men were equally ignorant, but women endured most of the burden of protecting
themselves against and coping with the results of unwanted pregnancies. Their boyfriends
and lovers appeared to shirk responsibility both before and after insemination, an ethic that
the university seemed to condone and even promote.

12 When using the term gender, I invoke Joan W. Scott’s famous article. Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful
Category of Historical Analysis," The American Historical Review 91, no. 5 (1986): 1053-75. I define gender
not only as a set of cultural beliefs attached to the biological female and male, but also, how these constructions
relate to one another and the gendered nature of symbols, institutions, and discourses. The sexual liberation
movement attempted to alter all of these elements of “gender,” for example, by changing the meaning of
pregnancy and restructuring the gendered aspects of university institutions.

13 For more about the history of sex education (and lack thereof) in America, see Janice E. Irvine, Talk
About Sex: The Battles over Sex Education in the United States, Paperback ed. (Berkeley: University of
California Press, 2002); and Jeffrey P. Moran, Teaching Sex: The Shaping of Adolescence in the 20th Century

14 For a study of sexually active students at UNC, see Karl E. Bauman, "Selected Aspects of the
The sexual liberation movement at UNC began in the early 1970s with a few male faculty and graduate students, but within a year, female and male undergraduates became key participants, and the movement soon involved people from all segments of the university. By the time the students graduated in 1973, men and women in the sexual liberation movement in Chapel Hill had created a contraceptive clinic, provided a question-and-answer sex column in the student newspaper, offered a class on human sexuality, founded “America’s first Love Boutique,” and established a sexuality counseling service. The programs and ideas put forth by UNC’s sexual liberation movement would capture the attention of the nation and offered young people across the country a new model for understanding their own sexuality and their relationships to others.
By the mid-1960s, southern college students, like their counterparts across the country, were participating in a self-conscious and lively public discussion about sex. Students and the public alike agreed sexual permissiveness was on the rise, and surveys suggested that a larger proportion of young people — especially women — had intercourse before marriage than in previous decades. Although this was a moment of excitement for youth who felt free to experiment with and express their sexuality, this perceived sexual freedom brought with it confusion and uncertainties for young women, men, and their sexual relationships. Yet, instead of focusing on the practicalities of coping with these changes in the sexual atmosphere, the University of North Carolina’s administration and Student Health Services condemned and attempted to reverse sexual trends by equating responsibility and morality with abstinence before marriage. The university cemented old rules and created new ones that attempted to limit female students’ autonomy and prevented them from obtaining the devices and services they needed to protect themselves against unwanted pregnancy. In short, the university refused to help students navigate “sexual wilderness” of the 1960s.¹⁵

In 1964, cover stories in *Time* and *Newsweek* announced that America was in the midst of a “sexual revolution.” These popular magazines told parents that their children had embraced a “new morality” and organized around the motto: “sex will save you and libido

makes you free.”16 While some Americans feared that the example of the “free-love”
movement in California would lead to orgies on campuses around the country, some
sociologists, psychiatrists, and journalists pointed to what they saw as the newest trend in
young peoples’ sexual relationships: “promiscuity with affection.”17 As one Newsweek
reporter explained, “the key to the new morality is the widespread belief that a boy and girl
who have established what the campus calls a ‘meaningful relationship’ have the moral right
to sleep together.”18

Perhaps the biggest concern of the public was that young women went along with these
new relationship and morality paradigms. Generally, the public accepted the idea that “boys
will be boys” and would seek sexual outlets, but reports that “in the new campus code of
sexual conduct, girls are supposed to be as free as boys in seeking sexual pleasure” was cause
for alarm; the old axiom that “nice girls don’t” did not seem applicable anymore.19 Statistics
pertaining to the actual sexual behaviors of young women remained shaky at best during the
middle of the decade. The very claim that a “sexual revolution” in behavior had occurred
was based only on anecdotal evidence. By the decade’s end, however, multiple studies,
including one of UNC undergraduates, suggested that a dramatic change in women’s sexual
experiences had occurred. Just under half of girls across the nation had premarital sex before


the U.S. Campus,” Newsweek, 6 April 1964, 52-56, 58; and Cam West, “Sex Attitudes Liberal, Panel Says,”
Daily Tar Heel, 18 September 1969, 1. Also, see Filene, Him/Her/Self: Gender Identities in Modern America,
197-8.


March 1966, 69, 74; and Memorandum by Crist, 12 August 1970, box 6, Crist Papers. Also, see Bailey, Sex in
the Heartland, 11.
their twentieth birthday, and more than half of the unmarried women at UNC had intercourse by the time they graduated.\textsuperscript{20} When compared to Kinsey’s findings in the early fifties, this was about a twenty percent increase in sexual activity among unmarried women in just over twenty years.\textsuperscript{21}

When the media attempted to explain the cause of these changes, the birth control pill often took center stage. During the mid-1960s, the media latched on to the idea that the “Pill” promoted promiscuity among young, unmarried women (even if it was \textit{with} affection). The Pill soon became the emblem of a “sexual revolution” defined by female sexual license in the popular mindset.\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Time} reported that in the midst of the “sexual revolution” a “considerate boy asks a girl politely, ‘Are you on pills?’”\textsuperscript{23} In trying to make sense of the perceived sexual changes on the UNC campus, the Dean of Women, Katherine Kennedy Carmichael, agreed with the media: “A sexual revolution has occurred, especially since the pill became popular in 1964; for sex is a power that cannot wait in the now generation.”\textsuperscript{24}


\textsuperscript{21}In Kinsey’s study of 8,000 women, about fifty percent of the women interviewed had premarital coitus, but only twenty percent first had intercourse between the ages of sixteen and twenty, and thirty-five percent had premarital coitus between ages twenty and twenty-five. Alfred C. Kinsey et al., \textit{Sexual Behavior in the Human Female} (Philadelphia and London: W.B. Saunders Company, 1953), 286-8. It should be noted that Allan Petigny points out that statistics from surveys concerning sexuality are not always reliable due to the intimate questioning about one’s personal life. Moreover, he argues that perhaps people were more open about sexuality during and after the sexual revolution than before it. Alan Petigny, "Illegitimacy, Postwar Psychology, and the Reperiodization of the Sexual Revolution," \textit{Journal of Social History} 38, no. 1 (2004): 63-79.


\textsuperscript{24}Katherine Kennedy Carmichael, “Notes Concerning the Activist Student Life at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,” 8 July 1970, box 2, Series 2, Katherine Kennedy Carmichael Series, Records of the Office of the Dean of Women, University Archives and Record Service, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (hereafter cited as RDW). Emphasis in the original.
In fact, by 1969, 8.5 million American women took the Pill, making it the most popular form of birth control in the nation. Nevertheless, this trend did not necessarily extend to the college-age population.\textsuperscript{25} One 1968 study at UNC found that only a small minority of women at the university actually used the oral contraceptives. Sixty percent of students surveyed either did not use any contraceptives at all or depended on unreliable methods, such as withdrawal, rhythm, or douching the first time they had intercourse, and forty percent of the students used either nothing or unreliable contraceptives each time they had sex.\textsuperscript{26} Despite the public panic, it seemed that the Pill — or any other reliable contraceptive device for that matter — had little effect on unmarried college students’ sexual behavior.

One major explanation of why college women did not use birth control devices was that most universities’ health services would not prescribe them.\textsuperscript{27} In 1970, seventy -two percent of all American university health care services refused to prescribe contraceptive devices to unmarried female students. UNC’s Student Health Services fell into this category. The head of UNC’s Health Services explained to the Dean of Student Affairs in 1970, “It is still my belief that the time is not yet present for the dispensing of contraceptive devices to unmarried students in the university solely for the purpose of contraception.”\textsuperscript{28}


\textsuperscript{27} Universities had no legal obligation to prescribe contraceptives before the 1972 Supreme Court case \textit{Eisenstadt v. Baird}. This case barred doctors from denying contraceptives to adults based on their marriage status. Eisenstadt v. Baird, 405 U.S. 438 (S. Ct. 1029 1972). The right to contraceptives would not extend to minors until the 1977 Supreme Court case, \textit{Carey v. Population Services International et al}, 41 U.S. (S. Ct. 2010 1977). This case affirmed that it was illegal for anyone to deny the sale of contraceptive to persons under the age of 16. It also made the public display and advertisements of contraceptive legal. See Allyn, \textit{Make Love, Not War}, 266; and Bailey, \textit{Sex in the Heartland}, 129 30.

\textsuperscript{28} Hedgpeth to Cathey, 14 May 1970, Series 9, box 1, Records of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, University Archives and Record Service, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (hereafter cited as RVC).
UNC’s Health Services not only denied female students access to birth control; they also punished them for asking for it. When a woman student showed up at Health Services and asked for contraceptive devices or advice, she often received a guilt-producing morality lecture. Some doctors told women that their behavior was not “lady like” or advised them that “sex, like wine, should not be guzzled.” In addition to these sermons, many doctors sent letters to students’ parents telling them of their child’s request for birth control. When it came to sex, all doctor-patient confidentiality rules went out the window. Moreover, if a student became pregnant, the university did not offer her many options. Policy in the late sixties mandated that she would have to “present herself as soon as possible to the Student Health Service,” where they would aid her in dealing with the “problem in an ethical and confidential manner.” This “confidential manner” usually consisted of notifying her parents and suspending her from the university until she gave birth. If, however, a woman decided to circumvent the university and solve the problem on her own by obtaining an illegal abortion, she could face “disciplinary action . . . not because of the pregnancy per se but because of the illegal fashion in which the student [had] attempted to resolve the problem.” In the years before *Roe v. Wade*, it was extremely difficult to obtain a legal abortion in North Carolina, so if a woman chose to terminate a pregnancy, it would almost certainly be illegal and, more often than not, unsafe. Doctors often saw young women at


30 James A. Taylor to Cathey, 10 March 1967, series 1, box 12, RVC.

31 Cathey to Carmichael, Cansler, Hedgpeth, and Taylor, 8 September 1976, series 1, box 12, RVC. Emphasis in the original.

32 For more on illegal abortions in America throughout the twentieth century, see, David P. Cline, *Creating Choice: A Community Responds to the Need for Abortion and Birth Control, 1961-1973* (New York: Pelgrave
neighboring Memorial Hospital in Chapel Hill with infections so severe that they had to have their reproductive organs removed.  

UNC Health Services justified its actions concerning birth control and abortion by arguing that the availability of these devices and services would cause “sexual irresponsibility” among female students.  

UNC’s administrators agreed and preferred to address student’s sexual behavior by lamenting the loss of “traditional” morality.  

Throughout the sixties, administrators structured their discussions of students’ sexuality around promoting abstinence and reversing new sexual trends they saw. They did not provide practical knowledge and services to help students cope with sexual decisions or their consequences. Instead, they attempted to control female students’ sexual behavior by limiting their personal autonomy and their opportunities for sexual expression and experimentation. 

In part, the administrators’ concern over female students’ sexual activities during the sixties was due to the fact that there were more of women on the UNC campus than ever before. UNC had admitted a few female students since 1897, but all were juniors, seniors, or graduate students. The few freshman allowed to enter the university in the early sixties had to be permanent residents of Chapel Hill and major in “feminine” subjects of either fine arts, medical technology, pharmacy, physical therapy, nursing, or dental hygiene. It was not until


34 Katherine Carmichael to C.O. Cathey, 9 May 1967, box 12, series 1, Unwanted Pregnant Student Policy, 1967, RVC.
the fall of 1964 that the university accepted female freshman regardless of residency or major, but even then, women had to “meet stricter academic requirements than men” due to a “housing shortage.” Women finally gained equal admission with men in the fall semester of 1972, but the number of women on campus fluctuated between only twenty-two and thirty-one percent from 1964 to 1975.

The sexual consequences of admitting increasing numbers of women were never far from administrators’ minds. To curb the anticipated explosion of sexual activity between male and female students, the administration increased the policing of a number of rules for women only, in loco parentis fini. Men were largely exempt from these rules. Throughout the early and mid-sixties, women under twenty-five had to live in university housing, were locked in their dorms after certain hours of the night, had to sign-out and have permission to leave campus, and could not have men in their dorm rooms. These rules gradually gave way between 1967 and 1972 as the Association of Women’s Students, the female branch of student government, demanded full equality with their male classmates. By 1968, dorm curfews were lifted for junior and senior women, and they could leave campus without parental permission. Women could have male visitors in their rooms with the door open by 1969, and in 1972, the passage of Title IX erased any vestiges of special rules for women.

---


37 The one rule that applied to men was that they also could not have women in their rooms. For the history of women at UNC, see Dean, Women on the Hill.

38 Ibid.

38 Ibid. As far as I can tell, UNC does not seem to be either behind or ahead of universities around the country in dismantling women’s rules but rather, seems to be representative of many universities in its timing. See Bailey, Sex in the Heartland, 95-104.
The Office of the Dean of Women continuously resisted the breakdown of *in loco parentis*, and in 1969, asked, “Do we inculcate sexual morality by protecting the sanctity of our residence halls?” The answer for them and the majority of administrators who fought for women’s rules was “yes.” As each rule slipped away, many believed that the ideal of sexual chastity for women students slipped away as well.

A young doctor at UNC watched the events surrounding the increase of the female population on campus, women’s rules, and Health Services carefully throughout the late sixties. Takey Crist, a former UNC football star and son of Greek Cyprian immigrants, quickly learned about the problems unmarried female students faced when a student with a red catheter lodged in her uterus from a fifty-dollar abortion arrived at Chapel Hill’s North Carolina Memorial Hospital in 1966 during the first year of his residency. She recovered after treatment, but the university expelled her. Appalled by this event, the thirty-year-old resident made it his goal to help as many students with their sexual problems as he could. Crist took up this effort on a one-on-one basis by prescribing contraception, performing abortions, teaching women and men basic facts about their sexual bodies, and counseling them about the psychological effects of sex. As the years went by and Crist became an assistant professor of obstetrics and gynecology at UNC and a practitioner at Memorial Hospital, the numbers of desperate and sexually ignorant students coming through his doors did not dwindle. Much of the time, young women came to him when it was too late; they

---

39 Carmichael to The Dean of Student Affairs at the University of North Carolina, 10 1969, box 2; and Heather Humphreys Nees, “Report of the Assistant Dean of Women, 1968-1969,” 1969, box 2, RDW. Emphasis in the original.

were already pregnant or, like the woman he saw during his residency, had suffered from botched “back alley” abortions that had endangered their health and lives.\(^{41}\)

There was no doubt in Crist’s mind that the university administration and Health Services were largely to blame for student’s sexual ignorance and problems. Besides the young doctor and a few of his colleagues, students had nowhere to turn for information about sex and how to protect themselves from its unwanted consequences. Health Services and the university did not reward or even promote responsibility for sexually active students; to them, all premarital sex was immoral, and the only morality they endorsed was abstinence. This mindset virtually shut out the possibility of any type of sex education. Crist ranted in the *North Carolina Medical Journal*, “It is as though pregnancy were being forced on a girl for stating that she was sexually active when in truth she was acting responsibly to herself, her boy friend, and society.”\(^{42}\)

Crist decided that since the university refused to educate these women about sex, he would have to assume the responsibility. In 1970, he began making rounds to dormitories and sororities on the UNC campus in order to assess and teach female students basic sexual and reproductive knowledge.\(^{43}\) One of his stops was Kappa Delta Sorority where he talked to a crowd of seventy-two female students for four hours. Crist began by passing out a sheet of paper in order to evaluate their sexual knowledge. On the front, he asked the sorority sisters to label pictures of the female and male pelvis; on the back, he told them to put a “star” over


the date of ovulation and an “x” over the “safe” days on a menstrual cycle chart. The results
did not differ drastically from those in the many other dorms and sororities he had visited
over the past six weeks. A few women could label the menstrual cycle correctly, but the vast
majority could barely label any parts on either of the anatomy drawings.44 When they
watched a video about birth and delivery, many stared with a look of shock on their faces.
They asked whether they would ever feel sexual pleasure again after giving birth or whether
their vaginas would return to “normal.” As the girls filtered out of the room, two stayed
behind. The doctor had a good idea of what they wanted, since at many of his lectures, a few
nervous-looking female students usually lingered. They told him what he expected to hear:
they were both pregnant and had decided to terminate their pregnancies but had no clue
where to find a safe abortion practitioner. Crist then sent them through the “proper
channels,” which mostly likely entailed giving them the names of his colleagues or
sympathetic clergy in the area that ran an abortion referral service.45

Crist marveled, “We can get men on the moon but we can’t get young people to
understand some very elementary facts concerning human reproduction.”46 How could this
be the age of the great “sexual revolution” if America’s youth seemed just as ignorant of their
sexual bodies and consequences as they ever had? In speeches he gave at UNC and around

44 Crist gave this informal questionnaire to 600 female students. Of those who were sexually active, over
twenty-five percent did not answer a single question correctly, none of these girls answered all the questions
correctly, and only fifty-nine percent answered half the questions correctly. Of the “girls less sexually active”
almost eighty percent answered half the questions correctly and nine percent scored one hundred percent. Crist
concluded, “The more you knew about physiology the more responsible you were.” Andrew H. Malcolm,

45 Crist, “Sex Education-Coed,” n.d. [1970], box 10, Folder Grant, Crist Papers. For more on illegal
abortions before Roe v. Wade, see Reagan, When Abortion Was a Crime. For more on abortion in North
Carolina before Roe, see Schoen, Choice and Coercion. David Cline provides an insightful account the Clergy
Consultation Service in his work. Cline, Creating Choice, 113-123.

46 Crist, “The College Student and Sexuality-What it is all about,” Speech given at the University of South
the country, Crist suggested, “Maybe we are not in the midst of a ‘Sexual Revolution.’ For what in fact is occurring seems too chaotic and varied to describe yet as a revolution. A revolution implies a clear movement in an understood and generally supported direction.” Crist preferred to use Vance Packard’s idea of a “sexual wilderness” to describe the sexual changes and dilemmas that young people faced.47

Crist believed that society unfairly targeted women who were “told all their lives that their period is ‘the curse’ and that sex is wrong and bad,” and at the same time, “encourag[ed] young men to get as much sexual experience as possible.”48 UNC administrative and Health Services’ policies reinforced this gendered assumption by targeting only women students. The Dean of Women believed “women must be the standard bearers” and that “every society must have a function for women, which is somewhat different from that for men; and education should reveal this concept.”49 When it came to sexuality, this standard was the double standard; a standard the university taught and promoted. Cornelius Oliver (C.O.) Cathey, the Dean of Student affairs, often joked, “I have repeatedly told the women that we will treat the men in the same light when they get pregnant,” and “men are by nature promiscuous, however, women have to be kept in their proper place.”50 Thus, in loco parentis restricted women’s activities but not men’s. The fact that medical contraception consisted of methods used and obtained only by women allowed Health Services to limit


48 Pat Broden, “‘I Really Think We’re in Sexual Wilderness,’” The Charlotte Observer, 30 September 1971.

49 “Dean Carmichael Stays ‘Consistent’ As Coeds Change,” 23 March 1973, News and Observer; and Carmichael to The Dean of Student Affairs at the University of North Carolina, 10 June 1969, box 2, RDW.

50 Memorandum by Crist, 12 August 1970, box 6, Crist Papers.
women’s options and their attempts to be sexually responsible. The university punished pregnant women, not their male lovers. Repeatedly, Crist came across young women who felt the emotional reality of this double standard. One women’s boyfriend “after finding out that she was pregnant, told her that he would pay for everything . . . . [S]he was deeply in love with this guy but she realized that they couldn’t get married as they both had to finish school.” She described herself as “the loneliest person in the world when I was in the hotel room after I had had an abortion.” As many stories went, the boyfriend gave his pregnant girlfriend some cash and abandoned her. These young men listened to what their university taught them: pregnancy was a woman’s problem and preventing it was a woman’s responsibility.

51 Crist, “Sex Education,” n.d. [1970], box 10, Crist Papers. This is consistent with Barbara Ehrenreich’s argument that in beginning in the 1950s, conventional masculinity began to undergo changes as men shirked responsibility of the “breadwinner” role and formed a new morality of self-indulgence, including sexual indulgences with women. Barbara Ehrenreich, The Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight from Commitment (New York: Anchor Books, 1983). For somewhat of a different argument, see Filene, Him/Her/Self: Gender Identities in Modern America, 197.
As students at the University of North Carolina wandered in a “sexual wilderness,” a few male faculty members and graduate students attempted to navigate them towards a new definition and practice of sexual responsibility and morality. They also laid the ideological and practical foundations of the sexual liberation movement. Instead of trying to force or persuade students not to have sex and equating responsibility with abstinence, they accepted the fact that many unmarried students would be sexually active and articulated a definition of responsibility based on preventing the unwanted consequences of sex. As Crist stated, it was time “not to decide what is good or bad, but to decide what is necessary.”

Furthermore, in the actions of these men, we begin to see an attempt to undermine the sexual double standard by construing sexual responsibility as both a male and female obligation. These men took the first steps in the sexual liberation movement at UNC by creating institutions outside the university where students could obtain contraceptive devices. They trusted that students would become sexually responsible if they had products and services available to them, and based on the student response to these new institutions, they were largely right.

In the fall of 1969, two graduate students entered one-year master’s degree programs in the School of Public Health at UNC. Philip Harvey returned to America from India to attend UNC with a generous grant from the Ford Foundation. For five years, he had worked for Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE) — an international non-profit

---

organization with the mission of aiding poor families in developing countries. As the supervisor of food imports, he came to believe that “shipping food half way around the world and feeding the rapidly growing numbers of children was not the most effective way of helping India and helping Indians.” He “got very interested in family planning” as a means of alleviating poverty. When Harvey arrived in Chapel Hill, he met a young doctor who also believed that family planning would rescue the world from poverty. Tim Black grew up and went to medical school in London, half way across the globe from Harvey’s boyhood home in Illinois. But, like Harvey, he found his way to developing nations where he served as a physician in New Guinea and Nigeria. He had witnessed mass poverty and the lack of a viable medical infrastructure while living in rural villages. As he helplessly watched mothers suffering in order to provide for their children, he became convinced “that preventing a birth could be as important as saving a life.” Deep inside the jungles of New Guinea, Black decided he would devote his life to promoting women’s reproductive freedom.

Harvey and Black shared a belief that “it is a fundamental human right for all people to be able to learn about their bodies and to have the means to regulate the size of their families.” Although the two men first thought of the problems of population and medical infrastructure in global terms, upon arriving in Chapel Hill, both began to realize that similar predicaments existed within this nation’s borders, especially on college campuses. As

---

53 Philip Harvey interview by author, Tape Recording, Hillsborough, North Carolina, 10 March 2005.

54 Black quoted in Philip D. Harvey, Let Every Child Be Wanted: How Social Marketing Is Revolutionizing Contraceptive Use around the World (Westport, CT: Auburn House, 1999), 17.

Harvey remembered, they wanted to do “something big, [by] changing habits and changing
the ideas of very large numbers of people.”

To these two graduate students, providing condoms to students seemed like an excellent
solution for bypassing the medical establishment epitomized by UNC’s Student Health
Services, but this form of birth control had its own problems. Condoms remained an “under-
the-counter item” at pharmacies; one had to ask the pharmacist for them rather than just
picking a package off the shelf. This procedure caused a considerable amount of
embarrassment for young, unmarried people, who, in the process of buying contraceptives,
had to make their private sexual lives public. Furthermore, pharmacists, like doctors, denied
unmarried people contraceptives whenever they saw fit.

To circumvent the pharmacists and put power into the hands of young consumers, Harvey
and Black planned to distribute condoms through the mail as part of Harvey’s master’s
thesis. But here they faced another barrier. The mailing of contraceptive devices had been
illegal since the enactment of national and state Comstock Laws in 1873. The two graduate
students consulted Planned Parenthood Federation lawyers, who told them that they could
face felony charges if they followed through with their plans. They then conferred with
“some people at the post office who told [them] that they couldn’t say that they would not

56 Harvey interview.

57 Crist, “Lecture for Pharmacology,” 2 October 1971, box 24, Crist Papers. For more about the barriers to
obtaining condoms in the early 1970s, see M. Joyce Rumel et al., "The Pharmacist’s Neglected Role," Family

58 Andrea Tone gives a fascinating account of the enactment of the Comstock Laws and its legacy in her
book and even reveals that a thriving condom mail-order industry existed before these laws. Andrea Tone,
Devices and Desires: A History of Contraceptives in America (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001), 4-85. For
more information about Comstock and the legal history of birth control in the nineteenth century, see Helen
Lefkowitz Horowitz, Rereading Sex: Battles over Sexual Knowledge and Suppression in Nineteenth-Century
enforce the law.” 59 Apparently, the School of Public Health did not object to their project. Black, however, had his two children to consider, and neither he nor Harvey wanted to end up behind bars. Despite these concerns, their passion for family planning and the inspiration of a few previous female contraceptive crusaders who had served jail time — America’s Margaret Sanger and England’s Marie Stopes — provided them with the courage to go forth with their plan. 60 These men risked fines and prison time to make condoms available to anyone “regardless of marital status, without any questions at all.” 61 In the end, their audacity paid off; the two never faced felony charges for selling condoms through the mail. 62

Harvey and Black formed their non-profit organization, Population Service, Inc (PSI), in January of 1970 with grant money from the Ford Foundation. Immediately, they began hunting for publications that would print advertisements for their new service. Mainstream publications such as Time, Newsweek, and the New York Times denied them advertising space due to their fear of prosecution in states that prohibited contraceptive advertisements, but PSI finally found a niche in such men’s pulp magazines as True and Saga as well as in over 400 college newspapers, including UNC’s own Daily Tar Heel. 63 Comstock laws had

---


60 Harvey interview. For more information on Margaret Sanger, see Ellen Chesler, Woman of Valor: Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Movement in America (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996); Linda Gordon, The Moral Property of Women: A History of Birth Control Politics in America (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002); and Tone, Devices and Desires, 117-49.


62 By the mid-1980s, however, Harvey and Black expanded their inventory to include a number of adult products such as vibrators and pornographic videos, which entangled them in a number of legal battles revolving around their sending “obscene” material through the mail. See Harvey, The Government Vs. Erotica.

63 Mail-order condoms were even too risky for Playboy and Penthouse (Penthouse eventually allowed PSI to place advertisements in a brochure they published, but continued to bar them from their magazine). Harvey, Interview; and Population Planning Associates, “Private Placement Memorandum,” December 1972, Harvey Papers.
frightened away the competition, and the two students soon found themselves overwhelmed with orders. As Harvey stated, “It worked so well the first few years that even a complete idiot couldn’t have made it fail.”64 In the first year, they received well over 2,000 orders, and in the following year, PSI had 50,000 customers, with the largest number of requests coming from students in “smaller communities, where the Pill [was] rare and drugstore anonymity impossible.”65 Harvey and Black did not intend to make a fortune; they insisted that their social consciousnesses and belief that young, unmarried people deserved the same services available to married people guided them. In fact, PSI lost money in the first two years of operation despite the large number of orders and failed to enjoy large profit margins until the late 1970s. “[I]n the early days everybody [involved with PSI] was broke.”66 Nonetheless, the sheer quantity of customers suggested that many college students wanted to and would be sexually responsible if given the opportunity.

Harvey and Black not only advocated equal access to products for unmarried and married people; they also promoted gender equality. Since the 1920s, feminists such as Margaret Sanger had argued that condoms gave men too much power by enabling them to decide whether to wear them and promoted female contraceptive forms such as the diaphragm instead.67 Fifty years later, Harvey and Black saw this issue in a different light. The “male

64 Harvey Quoted in Mark Pruett, “Adam and Eve Case,” (Chapel Hill: Graduate School of Business at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1989), 2, Harvey Papers.


66 In approximately the first five years of operation, Black and Harvey used what profits they received to maintain the company and help it grow. Population Services, Inc split into separate for-profit and non-profit corporate entities in 1971. Harvey, interview; and Population Planning Associates, “Private Placement Memorandum,” December 1972, Harvey Papers.

assumption that women on the Pill will take care of everything” encouraged men to construe pregnancy prevention as solely a women’s issue and responsibility. 68 PSI refuted this notion in their advertisements. The headline of one asked, “Who causes pregnancy?” The answer: “It takes two to tango. Men must share the responsibility for preventing unwanted pregnancy.” 69 Harvey and Black believed unwanted pregnancy affected men as well as women. As Black explained to one newspaper reporter: “We’re interested in the individual. Each unwanted birth is a personal tragedy for the father as well as the mother.” 70 Pregnancy should not be just a woman’s problem; Black and Harvey maintained it should be a couple’s problem. Another advertisement demanded, “If you really give a damn about both your lives . . . you’ll want to protect her.” 71 Barbara Ehrenreich argues that starting in the 1950s, men went through their own “male liberation” movement by shirking sexual responsibility and avoiding long-term, monogamous relationships. PSI advertisements condemned this trend and called for male accountability. 72

In the following years, Harvey and Black incorporated and expanded their business. In August 1970, they began to include mail-order pregnancy tests in their product line. 73 A


72 Ehrenreich, The Hearts of Men. Interestingly, PSI, and later Population Planning Associates (the for-profit version of PSI founded in 1971, see f.n. 73) did not advertise their condoms as a precaution against venereal disease during the early seventies. This was probably due to Black and Harvey’s interest in population control and the curability of venereal diseases in the era before the advent of Chlamydia and AIDS.

73 The incorporated part of the business became Population Planning Associates. Black and Harvey also retained Population Services, Inc., which served as an international non-profit organization that distributed condoms to developing nations around the globe. Harvey Interview.
woman could urinate into a jar, send the sample to a laboratory, and receive the results over the telephone. Detection of a pregnancy hormone in urine was a new technological innovation in the early 1970s, and the home pregnancy test kit, the “Error Proof Test” (e.p.t.), did not become available in stores until 1978. This mail-order pregnancy test, therefore, became the only reliable method to detect pregnancy for women outside their doctors’ offices. Harvey and Black had the same rationale for this service as for the mail-order condoms: they wanted to ensure privacy and take control away from the medical establishment — a rational that mirrored that of the women’s health movement. Women could keep their sexual status private, and if they did not want a child, they could find an abortion practitioner without having to reveal their pregnancy status to a family doctor or Health Services.

On November 17, 1971, Harvey and Black further expanded their enterprise by opening a small store on a busy intersection in the heart of downtown Chapel Hill. Newspapers from Alaska to New York covered the opening of “America’s first love boutique.” According to publicity reports, this was the first store in America to display non-medical contraceptives in “a relaxed, natural and dignified” manner and to provide a “response to the intimate needs of

---


75 Previously, doctors could only diagnose pregnancy by searching for signs on women’s bodies such as the softening of the uterus and the bluing of the cervix. These symptoms only became detectable around the sixteenth week of pregnancy. If a woman wanted to know whether she was pregnant before the fourth month, a doctor had to resort to the expensive technique of injecting her urine into a rabbit and looking for certain reactions. In the 1960s, some college students began to perform similar tests with frogs in their dorm rooms. Schoen, Choice and Coercion: Birth Control, Sterilization, and Abortion in Public Health and Welfare, 154; “Pregnancy Tests ‘Damn Good Indication,’” Daily Tar Heel, 7 December 1971, 1; and The Office of the NIH History, "A Thin Blue Line: The History of the Pregnancy Test Kit,” 2003, <Http://Www.History.Nih.Gov/Exhibits/Thinblueline/> (accessed 23 April 2005).
men and women.”  

The store, Adam & Eve, offered cosmetics, leisurewear, “sex enhancing products such as oils [and] organic dusts,” female contraceptive jelly and foam, books on population control and ecology, pregnancy tests, and of course, condoms. Harvey repeatedly defended his business to the press and community members: “Anyone tempted to liken it sight unseen to the pornography shops of Demark or Manhattan is sadly mistaken. Adam & Eve was created to fill a void left by those who would either display the sex act in the gutter or hide it altogether in a Victorian shroud.” John Quinn, the store’s marketing director, used rhetoric similar to Crist’s: “We are not here to start a sexual revolution. . . . We’re here to provide a tasteful response to a revolution already in progress.” In other words, they defined themselves as part of the burgeoning sexual liberation movement in that they promoted not only sexual frankness and pleasure, but also sexual responsibility by making products and services available to young unmarried people.

Providing condoms and pregnancy tests to young people was an important practical step in trying to prevent unwanted pregnancies, but it was not a panacea for the contraceptive problem. Harvey and Black realized that many young people avoided the condom because,

---


among other reasons, it interrupted foreplay and lessened sexual sensations.\textsuperscript{80} The demand for medical forms of birth control still existed, and Takey Crist too was well aware of this demand. Even after the advent of PSI and Adam & Eve, college women continued to flood him with requests for alternatives to condoms such birth control pills, intrauterine devices (IUDs), and diaphragms.

Crist had attempted to educate students on his own by lecturing at dormitories, sororities, and fraternities but felt the futility of his efforts. He lamented:

Who cares for these women with regard to their medical, obstetrical, and gynecological problems? Supposedly, the UNC Infirmary, but after four years of dealing with this institution, I can only conclude that with regard to the personal problems of our women at UNC concerning abortion, contraception, sexual problems and sex education, the Infirmary and most of its staff has flunked the course.\textsuperscript{81}

Crist believed he had no choice but to set up an alternative institution: a “contraceptive clinic” for UNC’s female students.\textsuperscript{82} He had heard about a husband and wife team who had set up such a clinic at Yale in 1969, which offered birth control products and sexuality counseling, and he sought to replicate their efforts at UNC.\textsuperscript{83}

Crist began to build a coalition of people and institutions he believed would support his initiative; eventually, this group would form the faculty base of the sexual liberation movement at UNC. He first turned to the chair of the Department of Obstetrics and


\textsuperscript{81} Crist, “Sex Education-Infirmary,” n.d. [1970], box 10, Grant, Crist Papers.

\textsuperscript{82} According to Doug McAdam and David Snow, a defining element of social movements consists of working for change outside of institutional channels. Although Crist and his allies did work with the “institution” of the North Carolina Memorial hospital and the Carolina Population Center, they explicitly attempted to circumvent Student Health Services. McAdam and Snow, \textit{Social Movements}, xxi.

Gynecology, Charles Hendricks, and a doctor associated with the Carolina Population Center, Dr. Jerry Hulka. The three men had worked together in expanding women’s access to abortions at North Carolina Memorial Hospital since 1967, and Crist knew they would help him with his newest endeavor to aid female students. Hendricks had consistently lent departmental support and prestige to Crist’s attempts to expand women’s reproductive rights, and Hulka’s links to the Population Center would provide Crist with institutional support and capital. Established in 1966 with the mission of combating the world’s “population explosion” through family planning programs, the Carolina Population Center worked with many departments at the university and by 1969 was the largest, and probably best-funded, population control center at any university in the country, if not the world. The head of the Center, Dr. Moye Freymann, characterized himself as a staunch supporter of legalized abortion as well as sex education for high school and college students. Many of those who worked with him, such as Dr. Jerry Hulka, shared a similar ideology. Members of the Population Center dealt with both the statistics and real life situations of unwanted pregnancy and believed that society could no longer rely on counseling abstinence and sidestepping the practical problem of putting contraceptives into the hands of sexually active people.

---

84 For more about Crist’s, Hulka’s, and Hendrick’s efforts to expand abortion access in the late sixties, see Schoen, *Choice and Coercion*, 184-7.


With financial and personal support from the Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics and the Population Center, the contraceptive clinic opened on May 5, 1970. It became known officially as the “Health Education Clinic” because the founders thought that calling it a “contraceptive clinic” would be too controversial at this time. They set up the clinic in the Ambulatory Patient Care Facility in North Carolina Memorial Hospital. Although the new clinic would be only a stone’s throw from Health Services, Crist and his supporters believed that even a minimal physical distance would be enough for the students to distinguish this facility psychologically from the well-known reality and reputation of Health Services.

All the doctors at the clinic, with the exception of one female fourth-year medical student, were men, and almost all the patients were women. In one sense, this mimicked a gendered power dynamic in other health facilities that the women’s health movement was beginning to fight. Yet, these male doctors were clearly interested in young women’s reproductive freedom and were willing to risk both money and reputations to assist them. Moreover, even if the clinic had tried to hire female doctors, it would have been extremely difficult to find them, since in 1970, only about six percent of obstetricians and gynecologists

---

89 Hendricks to Donald (Ed) E. Hedgepath, 24 February 1970, box 11, Crist Papers.
92 For more about the Women’s Health Movement, see Morgen, Into Our Own Hands: The Women’s Health Movement in the United States, 1969-1990.
were women. The clinic, however, did mirror the women’s health movement in that it
attempted to restructure how women received gynecological care by forming an alternative
institution to cater to women’s needs, and it had the goal not only of prescribing
contraceptives but also of empowering women by educating them about their reproductive
bodies.

The founders of the clinic hoped to fill a void in contraceptive services and promote
sexual responsibility, and that they did. In the first year and a half of its operation,
approximately 800 women utilized the service. The doctors at the clinic prescribed birth
control devices to ninety-seven percent of these women, and Crist even hypothesized that
“since implementation of the clinic, there is an impression that abortions have decreased and
that the students are more knowledgeable with regard to contraceptive practices.” Yet, it
soon became clear to the young doctor that these women needed much more than tangible
products. On the contrary, he believed “contraception and sex education [went] hand in
hand” and that “one cannot give out contraception without touching on such vital areas as
education, venereal disease, pregnancy counseling, and without talking about human
sexuality.” Many women did in fact come to the clinic just to talk about their sexual
problems, so that they “could make important decisions later on.” Crist believed that
women needed contraception education before they made the decision to have sex. Coming

---

93 “Patient’s Prejudice,” Time 20 March 1972, 88; and Erica Frank, John Rock, and Sara Danielle,

94 “Demonstration Projects to be considered by the Committee Members for State Wide Family Planning
Programs,” 7 December 1971, box 10, Crist papers. Crist had gathered some data about the clinic decreasing
abortions, but he had not fully calculated it at the time he made this statement. He also stated that it was near
impossible to estimate how many female students actually had abortions, since those who obtained them
illegally and had no complications almost never reported the procedure. Takey Crist, "Something Is Happening

95 Crist to Hendricks, 20 December 1970, box 11, Crist Papers.
to the clinic after one had already been sexually active seemed risky and counterproductive.

Crist also realized that despite their invitation for men to join their sexual partners at the clinic, the service catered almost exclusively to female students, thus bolstering the idea that women had to carry the entire burden of sexual responsibility. In order to combat some of these problems, Crist began to implement a new plan to reach all the students at the University of North Carolina in the summer of 1970.
CHAPTER 4
ELEPHANTS, BUTTERFLIES, AND “SEX MEN” INSTIGATE A MOVEMENT

With funding from his allies, the Carolina Population Center and Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Crist embarked on a new project in the summer of 1970. This endeavor set in motion a grassroots activism among students at UNC and instigated a social movement. The spring of 1970 had laid the groundwork with the mail-order condom business and the contraceptive clinic, and in the fall, the sexual liberation movement began. It quickly gained a large number of adherents, a practical goal of educating students about their bodies and the ways to protect themselves against unwanted pregnancy, and the ideological underpinnings of responsibility and gender equality.

As in PSI and the Health Education Clinic, men set this newest phase of the movement in motion. Crist had recruited three medical students from around the country to work with him on his endeavor: Richard Mier from the University of Chicago, Donald Rollins from the University of South Dakota, and Tom Blush from the University of California at Irvine. As Rollins explained, “I don’t want to become a doctor just to push pills . . . I want to be in there helping with the real problems of society.” The students agreed with Crist that one of the most pressing “real problems” was the lack of sex education for college students. Calling themselves the “Sex Men,” Mier, Rollins, and Blush, under Crist’s supervision, created a

booklet for UNC students, “Elephants and Butterflies . . . and Contraceptives.” 97 The Sex
Men had heard about a few similar booklets produced on other campuses and believed that
an easily accessible booklet students could read privately would be an ideal way to educate
them about their bodies, contraception, venereal disease, and abortion. Sexual liberation
movement members at McGill University in Canada were credited with the first booklet of
this kind in 1968, and in 1970, similar booklets appeared at the University of Colorado, Yale,
and Duke. 98 Many more would materialize in the following years, but “Elephants and
Butterflies” was one of the American forerunners in its timing, tone, comprehensiveness, and
content.

When presenting the booklet to the Population Center for the first time, the three medical
students explained: “The sexual revolution we have heard so much about may be only a
minor insurrection as far as the contraceptive habits of college students are concerned.” 99 It
was time for a new direction and ideology, which they summarized eloquently and succinctly
on the booklet’s opening page:

We have made only one value judgment: unwanted pregnancies and
venereal disease should and can be avoided. True lovers or true friends or true
human beings must want to spare the person they love the pain and anguish
brought by an unwanted pregnancy. We’re not implying in this booklet that
contraceptives will solve all your problems. We are saying, and emphatically so,

97 Richard Mier, Donald Rollins, and Thomas Blush, “Elephants and Butterflies . . . and Contraceptives,”
1st ed. (Chapel Hill: ECOS, 1970). There is a copy in box 6, Crist Papers.

98 The “Sex Men” listed the booklets from Duke, McGill, and Boston and gave credit to their authors in the
For a contemporary discussion of these booklets see, Andrew H. Malcolm, “College Ferment ’71,” Today’s
Health 49, no. 4 (April, 1971): 27-33. For examples, see David Schoen, “The Boulder Birth Control
Handbook.” 1970 ed. (Boulder, Co.: Birth Control Information Commission and Students of the University of
Colorado, 1970); and Student Committee on Human Sexuality, “Sex and the Yale Student,” (New Haven, CT.,
Dr. Philip Sarrel, 1970). It is not clear if the Yale booklet appeared before or after “Elephants and Butterflies.”

99 Richard Mier, Donald Rollins, and Tom Blush “Elephants and Butterflies: A Report for the Carolina
Population Center’s Summer Research Program,” 17 August 1970, box 7, Crist Papers.
that unwanted conception creates tragedy and that this tragedy can be prevented by the use of contraceptives. The following pages tell you how.\textsuperscript{100}

The Sex Men presented people who suffer from unwanted pregnancies as lovers, friends, and human beings. They never use the word “women,” even though unwanted pregnancy obviously affected only their bodies. This gender-neutral language attempted to level the hierarchical relationship between men and women in regards to unwanted pregnancy.

Procuring and using contraceptives was \textit{not} just a women’s issue; men needed to take responsibility as well. Furthermore, like Harvey and Black’s advertisements, this statement depicted unwanted pregnancy as an emotional “tragedy” for both men and women. A man and a woman who created an unwanted pregnancy together did (or should) suffer the emotional consequences together.

The Sex Men pursued the theme of gender equality throughout the booklet. The first section addressed female and male anatomy: “elephants” and “butterflies.” It even had a section on the female orgasm, a central rallying point for some segments of the second-wave feminist movement who had begun drawing links between sexual pleasure and women’s emancipation.\textsuperscript{101} Although this booklet did not dwell on how women could best obtain sexual pleasure by focusing on the clitoris, as many feminists did, the male authors echoed feminist language and ideology by asserting that women’s “traditional role as passive, submissive weaklings who have no active interest in sex is changing with our new generation of maturing students.”\textsuperscript{102} The second section of the booklet focused on contraceptives. It

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{100} Richard Mier, et. al., “Elephants and Butterflies…and Contraceptives,” title page, box 6, Crist Papers. Emphasis in the original.
\item \textsuperscript{101} For an excellent study of the connections between Women’s Liberation and sexual pleasure, see Gerhard, \textit{Desiring Revolution, 1920 to 1982}.
\item \textsuperscript{102} Richard Mier, et. al., “Elephants and Butterflies . . . and Contraceptives,” 6.
\end{itemize}
explained not only each method’s effectiveness but also how to overcome the psychological barriers preventing its use: “we must be willing to come to grips with the guilt, fear, embarrassment and frustration which too often plague our sexual relationships.” They called on students to “realize that honest, frank, and loving communication is the key to contraceptive effectiveness as well as sexual happiness in general. A man and a woman who make their needs and wants known to each other will have no trouble discussing contraception, but the couple who never really talks to each other will end up parents sooner than they expect.” This statement called for students to strive for relationships cemented in communication, equality, and maturity and endorsed monogamy, not the “you are free to do whatever pleases you” mentality so often associated with the sexual revolution.

“Elephants and Butterflies”’ third section explained how to obtain an abortion safely. Despite its name, the booklet had a radical bent; it not only provided facts about sexuality, it named specific people and places in Chapel Hill that would provide abortions, contraceptives, and pregnancy tests. The booklet stated that these people and organizations allied themselves with young, sexual active people and would help them obtain products and services without judgmental “morality” lectures. By displaying their names in print, these local doctors, clergymen, and business owners made a public statement that they believed in

103 Ibid.


the ideology and goals of the sexual liberation movement and would risk their reputations to supporting it. 106

As soon as "Elephants and Butterflies" appeared in the fall of 1970, the sexual liberation movement morphed into a full-fledged grassroots movement by involving male and female undergraduates. After the completion of the booklet in August, the three medical students had to return to their respective schools, leaving Crist as the only Sex Man to deal with distribution of the booklet. Crist wanted to make sure that every student had a copy and hoped that the release would provoke a dialogue on campus about sexual responsibility. He realized, however, that distribution would not be an easy task. The administration was steeped in the ideology of the double standard and preferred to control students’ sexuality rather than to educate them about it. Anticipating a fight with the administration, Crist immediately began to build a coalition of faculty and students — anyone he could find in the university community — who would support the booklet and donate funds for printing and distribution.

Crist first attempted to tap into existing foci of student activism. Tommy Bello, the student body president, fully supported the booklet and its messages, and his actions represented two sides of the sexual liberation movement’s agenda. In stating his philosophy about student government, he told the students, “we must stand together and we must be willing to work outside of the normal administrative channels” in order to “assure the

106 Although “Elephants and Butterflies” devoted one page to venereal disease (VD), the remaining twenty-three pages dealt primarily with reproduction. It is important to note that while many of the members of the sexual liberation movement talked about VD and spread information about the signs of infection and treatment methods, it usually did not appear at the center of their discussion. These were, of course, the days before AIDS and chlamydia, and doctors could cure gonorrhea and syphilis in the early stages. As Crist remembers, “People could be sexually active then and the only thing they had to worry about [was] pregnancy.” Margaret Scales and Taky Crist, interviewed by Johanna Schoen, Figure 8 Island, 25 May 2002.
protection of student rights.”107 Despite administrative objections to sex education and dispensing contraceptive, students would find the information they needed through a different “channel”: “Elephants and Butterflies.” On the other hand, Bello planned to use the expected momentum of “Elephants and Butterflies” to form a committee charged with composing a petition stating the “grievances from students that have been to the infirmary and have been given morality lectures and not treated as patients, but in an unprofessional manner.”108 Instead of sidestepping the institutional structure of the university in the manner of PSI and the Health Education Clinic, Bello called upon the university to play an active, positive role in students’ sex lives. Neither form of activism was new to the UNC campus. Students had been protesting for a decade about civil rights, women’s rights, the Vietnam War, and other issues, but this was the first time they had explicitly fought for sexual freedom and demanded that the university support this freedom.109

Crist next contacted Mary Vallier, President of the Association of Women Students (AWS). This senior nursing student could not contain her excitement about “Elephants and Butterflies” and wanted to publicize the book as much as possible and distribute it to every woman on campus. The AWS’s fight against in loco parentis had taken over almost its entire agenda during the previous two years, and its new president wanted to expand the AWS from “rules and rules alone.”110 Since the fight against in loco parentis circuitously

108 Memorandum by Crist, August 1970, box 6, Crist Papers.
110 Mary Vallier to New Students, August 1970, box 2, RDW.
advocated student’s sexual freedom, Vallier believed a new goal of educating students about sex would be a logical next step. Vallier represented a burgeoning feminist consciousness on the UNC campus of which women’s sexuality was very much a part. A UNC female liberation group recently had demanded that the Health Services provide access to birth control and abortion because “unmarried women are as entitled to this as married women, the university should make no distinction between the two.” Vallier and other feminists on campus envisioned sex education as a women’s issue and thought of “Elephants and Butterflies” as a vehicle for raising sexual awareness for women students. To coincide with the release of “Elephants and Butterflies,” Vallier planned a series of symposiums dedicated to sex education along with discussion groups on the topic in each dorm and sorority. She recognized the importance of this budding movement and wanted to make sure that the AWS played a central role.

Another student who would soon become a leader of the sexual liberation movement also stepped forward at this time. A sophomore from Charlotte, North Carolina, Robert Wilson wrote to Crist about the Sexual Revolution Month he independently had been planning for Morrison Dormitory, one of UNC’s first co-ed dorms. Wilson, who had heard Crist lecture about sex education, asked him to “be the number one speaker” and to help him gather information in the form of pamphlets, films, and samples of contraceptive devices. Crist


112 Memorandum by Crist, 14 August 1970, box 6, Crist Papers.


agreed and then told him about "Elephants and Butterflies." Their goals of sexual liberation coincided, and they decided that the “Sexual Revolution Month” could serve as a platform for promoting the booklet and the ideology embedded within it.\footnote{Crist to Robert Wilson, 25 August 1970, box 6, Crist Papers.}

The sexual liberation movement would soon become Wilson’s passion, taking up almost all of his free time. But why would a young man feel so strongly about bringing sexual knowledge to his fellow students? The answer lay in Wilson’s recent past. When he was sixteen and in high school, Wilson’s girlfriend became pregnant. They were certain that they wanted to abort the pregnancy but did not know where to turn. Finally, Wilson got up “enough hudspah” and asked his Catholic priest to help him. To his astonishment, the priest “just kept a straight face and didn’t judge” him. Instead, he listened and then referred him to a Protestant pastor in Charlotte who, most likely, was part of the Clergy Consultation Service that aided women across the country in finding safe abortion practitioners.\footnote{Robert Reid Wilson interviewed by author, Tape Recording, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 27 September 2005. It should be noted that it was unusual for Catholic priests to refer parishioners to the Clergy Consultation Service. See Cline, \textit{Creating Choice: A Community Responds to the Need for Abortion and Birth Control, 1961-1973}, 113-15.} Wilson’s girlfriend and her father flew to London where she safely terminated the pregnancy. When it was over, Wilson could not forget his anxiety or the relief of “how lucky [he felt] to have gotten the answer that [he] needed.” His experience proved to him “how little information was around anywhere,” and he “didn’t want anybody to go through that again.”\footnote{Wilson interview.} Providing students with knowledge and services so they would never have to endure this sort of ordeal became his “drive” throughout his college days and after. Wilson’s experience is one example of how unwanted pregnancy affects men. This event had such an impact on his life
that he made a career out of aiding others in similar situations by becoming a psychiatrist specializing in anxiety. In many cases, personal experiences with unwanted pregnancies compelled students to join the sexual liberation movement. Unwanted pregnancies were not an extraordinary part of high school and college life in the early seventies; they were actually quite common. In 1973, an estimated 12 percent of sexually active female students at UNC became pregnant by their sophomore year.\textsuperscript{118} It is no wonder that “Elephants and Butterflies” had such powerful impact on the student body.

Students such as Bello, Vallier, and Wilson believed that "Elephants and Butterflies" would launch a new awareness of the need for sex education on a widespread scale, but first they would have to deal with some prominent members of the administration. The last thing most administrators wanted on campus was a social movement centered on sex. They had begrudgingly dealt with student disruptions related to civil rights and Vietnam War protests in the past few years, and they saw this burgeoning movement as another step in the wrong direction.\textsuperscript{119} The Dean of Women claimed she recognized the need for sex education, contraception information, abortion, and the booklet in general but still believed that the administration should deal with students’ sexuality by restricting their actions.\textsuperscript{120} Crist characterized male Dean of Student Affairs C. O. Cathey as “an old timer here at the University. . . [who] is well aware of the problems of abortion and contraception for young


\textsuperscript{119} Perhaps one of the most famous examples of student activism at UNC was the foodworkers protest of 1969. See Williams, "It Wasn't Slavery Anymore': Foodworkers' Strike at Chapel Hill, Spring 1969”.

\textsuperscript{120} Memorandum by Crist, “Report on Conference with Dean of Women,” 11 August 1970; Crist to Dean Katherine Carmichael, 21 August 1970; and Charles H. Hendricks, MD to Isaac M. Taylor, MD, Dean, 21 September 1970, box 6, Crist Papers. Also, see Katherine Kennedy Carmichael, “Notes Concerning the Activist Student Life at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,” 8 July 1970, box 2, RDW.
people, but at times you get the opinion that he wants to continue with old ideas and traditions [rather than] change with the times.”121 The administration ultimately decided that the publication of the booklet would outrage taxpayers, alumni, the press, and not least, Jesse Helms, North Carolina’s rising political star.122 The university refused to allocate funds for the printing and distribution of “Elephants and Butterflies” in the fall of 1970 or at any other time.123

Originally, UNC’s Duplicate Service agreed to print the booklet with funds from the Rockefeller Foundation and various student organizations, such as the AWS. It printed 10,000 copies in the first week of September but had to destroy all of them due to the administration’s objections to referencing UNC affiliates, the Population Center, and Dr. Crist.124 Crist lamented the struggle with the administration in a letter he wrote to Tom Blush, a fellow Sex Man: “Putting it very mildly this book has caused an uproar on this campus.”125 Crist shot off letter after letter defending “Elephants and Butterflies.” Using both rational and emotional persuasion, Crist argued, “I am not sure I have adequately justified in my mind the price the university wants to place on the young 21 year old female who might die from an illegal abortion or from unwanted pregnancy.”126 This was not just a political issue for him; it was life or death, and he would not relent until he got his way.

121 Memorandum by Crist, 12 August 1970, box 6, Crist Papers.

122 Ethel Nash to Moye [Freymann], 14 September 1970; Memo by Crist, 15 September 1970, box 6, Crist Papers.

123 Frederic Schroeder (Dean of Men) to Bill Griffin, 23 June 1972, box 12, Crist Papers.

124 Dr. J Hulka and Robert Blake to Dr. Moye Freymann, 11 September 1970, box 6, Crist Papers.

125 Crist to Tom Blush, 24 September 1970, box 7, Crist Papers.

126 Crist to Dr. Arden C. Miller, 11 September 1970, box 7, Crist Papers.
Finally, ECOS, a non-profit, student-run printing service, printed and distributed "Elephants and Butterflies" on September 18, 1970. Ten thousand copies hit the stands of the student store, and within five days, all were gone; there were only about 18,000 undergraduate and graduate students at the time. Congratulatory letters and requests for copies of the booklet poured into Crist’s offices from across the country. Within six months, "Elephants and Butterflies" had its third printing and had found its way to universities all over the country from Harvard to the University of North Dakota, all custom-made to list local contraceptive and abortion providers. The Boston Women’s Health Collective would not publish *Our Bodies, Our Selves* for another two years, and according to many in 1971, “Elephants and Butterflies” was the most comprehensive sex education booklet ever published for college students. This booklet crystallized the sexual liberation movement and rendered it visible to UNC students and other college around the country.

---


The distribution of “Elephants and Butterflies” sparked a conversation about sexual responsibility that would continue for years. It also unleashed a tidal wave of activity among UNC students. Within a few months, the student newspaper initiated a weekly question-and-answer column about sex; a course in human sexuality began; Health Services changed its policy on distributing contraceptives; and a student-run sex counseling service was formed. Most importantly, undergraduates began to create an equal role for themselves in the sexual liberation movement and more women took on prominent positions.

The release of "Elephants and Butterflies" solidified Crist’s celebrity status on campus as an oracle of sexual information. Students considered him their closest ally against what they perceived as the sexually repressive and oppressive adult establishment. Crist undoubtedly relished this newfound fame and welcomed the opportunity to promote a new movement on campus. Nonetheless, he also believed that for significant change to occur the students needed to become more involved in the sexual liberation movement by taking on leadership positions. The policies of Health Services and the administration’s refusal to support "Elephants and Butterflies" proved to Crist that students could not rely exclusively on existing institutions to change to meet their needs. The students (with his help, of course) would have to build their own institutions, and if they could, fundamentally restructure the existing ones. Crist continually invoked the attitude of “us versus them” in a similar fashion
to the New Left student activists. Crist wrote in the original conclusion in “Elephants and Butterflies:” “Many of your problems have been handed down from the older generation.” His hopes lay with the new generation of political activists. At an orientation seminar in the fall of 1971, he told students: “The frankness with which today’s young people discuss sexual problems is more natural, refreshing and appropriate to man’s basic nature than the tenseness, over-restraint, and shame expressed by older generations.” It was time for the students to create change themselves.

Robert Wilson, Mary Vallier, and Tommy Bello had taken important steps in launching a sexual liberation movement by publicizing the sexual problems students faced, placing movement objectives at the top of the priority list of the institutions they led, and organizing events aimed at educating the students. Another student also closely watched the events surrounding "Elephants and Butterflies" and the budding sexual liberation movement unfold. In the fall of 1969, Lana Starnes, a freshman from Charlotte, North Carolina, did not quite know what to expect when Crist arrived at her dorm to speak about sex. She and the other girls sat listening — mouths agape — as Crist talked about birth control devices, venereal disease, and the dangers of illegal abortion. Crist fascinated Starnes as he stood in front of the room answering questions “matter-of-factly, without embarrassing” her and the other students. Starnes not only learned about the consequences of sex that day; she also learned of her own and her peers’ ignorance about the subject. Listening to Crist, this “sweet, soft-

130 Wilson interview. For more about the New Left and its ideology, see especially Miller, Democracy in the Streets; and Rossinow, The Politics of Authenticity.


spoken” southern woman began a metamorphosis that would eventually cause her fellow students to endow her with the title of “Sex Goddess.” ¹³³

A year later, Starnes was chronicling the burgeoning women’s and sexual liberation movements in the student newspaper, the Daily Tar Heel. In November, she wrote an editorial about her observations of the sexual liberation movement at UNC. She recognized this as a moment when radical change was possible: “The questions are now out in the open and are being discussed freely. . . . It’s time we came out of the dark ages and talked about our problems truthfully and openly.” She gave credit to Crist, whose contagious enthusiasm caused students in Chapel Hill and neighboring colleges to “open up to him.” Yet, remembering her own ignorance and invoking her newfound feminist consciousness, Starnes warned students that she often witnessed “very intelligent women who were almost totally ignorant of their bodies.” “I have come to see the vastness of the problem,” she concluded. “The problem that exists is to educate the youth of today about sex.” ¹³⁴

Beginning with her editorial, Starnes began to participate in and shape the sexual liberation movement with her pen. As she chronicled Crist’s visits to dorms, symposiums, and lecture halls across the state, she and the doctor became friends and allies. The nineteen-year-old experienced another life-changing moment when she accompanied Crist to Peace College in Raleigh. A few girls approached her after Crist’s lecture to ask her some questions about sex. Starnes remembered, “That was the turning point! I found that because of my talks with Takey and writing about Elephants and Butterflies I had learned enough that


I could answer questions myself.” Crist also realized the breadth and depth of Starnes’s knowledge and pitched an idea to her: together they could write a column in the *Daily Tar Heel* answering students’ questions about sex.

At the University of Pennsylvania, physician Elaine C. Pierson had written what was probably the first sex column in a student paper, but Crist and Starnes believed that students should be involved in this kind of endeavor and made it their goal to share responsibility for the column. Starnes’ equal involvement in the column and accumulation of knowledge represented a new chapter in the sexual liberation movement, which in many ways mirrored the women’s health movement’s self-help mentality. Although she cooperated with Crist in writing the column, she became a sort of lay practitioner and educator just as many in the women’s health movement had. Thus, Starnes was one of many feminists around the country reclaiming medical knowledge of sexuality and the body for “ordinary” people. Moreover, like women’s health activists, she believed that women’s sexual ignorance directly related to their oppression and that this column would aid in their struggle for both sexual and gender liberation.

Although the sex column seemed to be an excellent way to advertise and contribute to the sexual liberation movement, Crist and Starnes were unsure as to the reception it would receive. They believed the students would support it, but wondered how the *Daily Tar Heel*

---


136 Pierson’s column is the only reference of a sex column in a major student newspaper that I have found, and there is no evidence that Crist and Starnes knew about this column when starting their own in 1970. However, further research is needed to find out how prevalent sex columns in student newspapers were. See Andrew H. Malcolm, "College Ferment ’71," *Today's Health* 49, no. 4 (April, 1971): 27-33.


138 For more on the links between feminism and sexuality, see Jane Gerhard, *Desiring Revolution*.  

and the university administration would react to the unprecedented request. To their delight, Tom Gooding, the student editor of the *Daily Tar Heel* was “all for it,” but as Starnes explained, she and Crist “caught flak from the administration, faculty, and the public.” Dean of Student Affairs C. O. Cathey, who had objected to the "Elephants and Butterflies” booklet, told her, “I have heard all the dirty words but I never expected to see them printed in the Student Newspaper.” He defined any reference to sexuality as obscenity. Not surprisingly, those like Cathey who fought against the column thought that it would lead to promiscuity, but Crist and Starnes retorted by arguing that their “purpose was to promote not promiscuity, but the awareness of sexuality and a better understanding of attitudes, behaviors, and the needs of others. Understanding and caring are a curb to promiscuity.” They wanted the column to provide scientific and practical knowledge to the students at UNC and believed it would help liberate them from their sexual ignorance. Moreover, it would make all the activities of the sexual liberation movement visible to the students each week; here the columnists could promote the services of PSI, the Health Education Clinic, and various other events and institutions created by the movement.

Ignoring criticism from the administration, Crist and Starnes published their first column in December 1970 by asking, “is this [“Elephants and Butterflies,” the booklet] enough?” They argued that the booklet’s true success came from placing the “question of sex education out into the open . . . [and that it] stimulated people to ask other questions, questions that have for so long been repressed.” For the next three years, the column, also entitled

---


140 Lana Starnes and Dr. Takey Crist, “Column to Answer Sex Questions,” *Daily Tar Heel*, 7 December 1970, Editorial Page. This is an example of what Foucault names the “repressive hypothesis,” but it also reveals how important this term was for contemporaries to understand problems and invoke change. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*. 49
“Elephants and Butterflies,” employed a question and answer format where students wrote to Starnes and Crist about their sexual problems and curiosities. Students asked a wide array of questions ranging from the history of tampons and the probability of catching VD in a swimming pool to why women fake orgasms and how to compare abortion prices in different states. A virtually nothing was taboo; the sexual liberation movement had opened all aspects of sexuality to public discussion on campus.

Starnes, Wilson, Vallier, Bello, and Crist embarked on independent yet intertwined activities throughout the fall of 1970, but by the end of the semester, they felt that it was time to pull their efforts together. In November, Crist began writing letters to his student allies, “A lot has taken place on this campus in the last 14 months with regards to the health and care of students. Advances have been made in the areas of sex education, abortion and contraceptives.” “Everything we are doing may not be the best,” he added, “but I think it is better than nothing.” The student leaders and Crist then formed a Committee for Human Sexuality with the purpose of placing all their activities under one umbrella organization so that they could effectively organize and pull resources together. Starnes, Wilson, Crist, and a graduate student from Maternal and Child Health, Bill Griffins, served as the committee chairpersons. The Board of Directors included sympathetic faculty members in the Department of Maternal and Child Health, the Carolina Population Center, the Department of Health Education, and the School of Social Work. Even a few doctors from Health Services and members of the administration, who realized that sexual liberation would occur with or


142 Crist to Tommy Bello, 6 November 1970; and William B. Griffin to Sir, n.d. [1970], box 6, Crist Papers.
without them, joined the board.\textsuperscript{143} This would be a collaborative project where male and female students, faculty, and administrators could organize and discuss sexual issues on equal footing. In addition to supporting “Elephants and Butterflies,” the column and booklet, the Committee planned to make speakers available to student groups free-of-charge; establish an “abortion loan fund;” produce a film about UNC’s “attempts at solving the Health Education problem;” funnel “student interest and manpower to related programs concerning Human Sexuality; promote student action with “letter writing [and] campaign work to help influence the establishment of a realistic legislation on the state and local levels;” and finally, to create a class on human sexuality.\textsuperscript{144} This was no small undertaking and represents an unprecedented expansion in the sexual liberation movement’s goals and activities on the UNC campus.

The Committee’s first goal was to create a class for undergraduates, “Topics in Human Sexuality.” In the late months of 1970, memos began circulating between committee members discussing how to make this idea into a reality. Since at least the 1920s, some colleges had courses with sexuality as a theme, but most had titles such as “Hygiene” or “Marriage and Family Living,” which assumed and/or promoted the notion that students’ sexual relations would and should take place within the institution of marriage. Even into the 1960s, most of these courses attempted to promote conventional gender roles. In many ways, these classes attempted to return to a “traditional” sexual sensibility rather than helping

\textsuperscript{143} “Board of Directors, Human Sexuality Committee,” n.d. [1971], box 12 Crist Papers. Other members included Joseph DeWalt (Student Health Services), William Eastman (Marriage Counselor for Student Health Services), Mrs. Phil Ellis (North Carolina Association of Educators), Paula Goldsmid (School of Social Work), Kathleen G. Goldstein (Co-director, Switchboard Counseling Service), Dr. Geraldine Gourley, (Maternal and Child Health), Peter W. Hall, (Assistant Dean of Men), Jerry Hulka (Maternal and Child Health), Arthur H. Jones, (Carolina Population Center), Joseph Stallings (Student Government), and Guy Steuart (Chairman Dept. Health Education).

\textsuperscript{144} “Human Sexuality Committee,” n.d. [1971], box 12, Crist Papers.
students adjust to the sexual changes of the sixties and seventies. As Crist observed, "The marriage or family courses offered do little more than explain parental roles and how to budget a family income."

During the early seventies, sex education at the college level gradually began to change at some universities. Four universities in the Northeast had courses titled “Human Sexuality” by 1970, and Crist began corresponding with their faculty coordinators at Yale, Oberlin, Dartmouth, and the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Although these courses differed drastically from their predecessors in that they prepared undergraduates for sexual experience before and after marriage and explicitly discussed the full range of sexuality’s physical and emotional consequences, many of these courses did not offer credit hours to enrolled students. Crist and the Human Sexuality Committee felt that this was counterproductive because such information should not be considered any less important than that conveyed in other classes.

Fearing political repercussions, the university refused to fund the course, and the Sexuality Committee had trouble finding a department willing to associate itself with this controversial undertaking. After months of searching for a home for the class, Guy Steuart

---

145 For excellent studies of sex education, see Irvine, Talk About Sex; and Moran, Teaching Sex. One interesting exception to emphasis on marriage and gender roles was Alfred C. Kinsey’s course at the Indiana University. Although entitled a “marriage course,” Kinsey’s course seemed to mirror the late 1960s courses such as the one taught by Crist and others more than either its immediate predecessors or successors. See James H. Jones, Alfred C. Kinsey: A Life (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997), 313-36.


of the Public Health Department agreed to offer the course for credit hours under the Health Education curriculum. Even though this was a graduate school department and offered no other undergraduate classes, Wilson remembers that they were “more or less . . . glad to have us there.”

But Steuart did have one condition. He made sure that the course coordinators “would NOT advertise…in the Daily Tar Heel or any other newspaper. Students [would have] to find out about it through word of mouth.”

Steuart warned that opposition to the course might spring up at any time and that “the course should be a sober and scientific reflection on the issues of sexuality . . . and not to look as if we are the initiators of the sexual revolution which has occurred quite without the benefit of our sponsorship.”

Crist assured him that the “students would not be given any ‘how’ information,” and the emphasis would be on “responsible sex.” Some did not think these precautions went far enough. One faculty member who promised to give a guest lecture dropped out at the last minute because he feared his participation would endanger his academic and public reputation.

Nonetheless, the Sexual Committee managed to raise funds and secure guest speakers in time for the Spring semester. On February 1, 1971, 200 students filled a lecture hall for a momentous event on the UNC campus. Crist began “Topics in Human Sexuality” by telling the students the purpose of the course:

The intent of the organizers of the Course, ‘Topics in Human Sexuality’ is to challenge students with concepts and issues of human sexuality and to provide

---

149 Wilson Interview.

150 Crist to Dr. Steuart, 23 November 1970, box 10, Crist Papers. Emphasis in original.

151 Guy Steuart to Crist, 11 January 1971, box 10, Crist Papers.


students with the opportunity to creatively integrate these concepts and issues into their total perspective of self and society. We anticipate that a basic result of making this challenge and providing this opportunity will be that students will have an increased capacity to make better informed value choices.\textsuperscript{154}

The founders of “Topics in Human Sexuality” intended to change how students viewed sexuality and experienced sex. They would not teach them “morality” but would give them enough information to create their own “values.” Every Monday night students majoring in such departments as Dramatic Arts, Sociology, History, and French sat through lectures by Crist or a guest speaker and then dispersed to smaller discussion groups where they talked about their personal sexual experiences and worked on various collaborative projects.\textsuperscript{155} The lecture topics included: venereal disease, abortion, the religious aspects of sex, sexual expression in marriage, the population problem, “the college student and sex,” and sex and the law.\textsuperscript{156} The course coordinators tried to present a balanced view of sexuality by seeking “participation from people whose viewpoints on contraception and related matters are not quite as militant as those held by many of us on this faculty.”\textsuperscript{157} Dr. Jerry Hulka from the Population Center and who had helped with the contraceptive clinic even gave a lecture on “Chastity in the Sex Game,” although he admitted his “fumbling efforts to be an ‘angel’s advocate’” turned out to be a “surprisingly difficult task.”\textsuperscript{158}


\textsuperscript{156} Interestingly, a lecture was not devoted to homosexuality, but many students did take up this topic in individual or group papers. See p. 55. Crist, “Outlines for lectures: Topics in Human Sexuality,” 1971, box 10, HEED Correspondence, Crist Papers.

\textsuperscript{157} Hendricks to Isaac M. Taylor, 29 January 1971, box 10, HEED 33, Crist Papers.

\textsuperscript{158} Hulka to Crist, DeWalt, Hellegers, Vincent, and Schaffer, 31 August 1972, box 11, HEED 33, Fall 1972, Crist Papers.
Students reacted to the course more enthusiastically than anyone could have hoped. As one remembers, it “was the place to be.” Student letters praising the course poured into the offices of administrators and department heads. One student wrote, “[T]his course is more relevant to my every day problems and needs than any other course I have taken this semester.” She explained that the most important aspect of the course for her was “that it has broadened my perspective concerning homosexuality, abortion, masturbation, and how to cope with my own needs.” It seems that the sexual liberation movement succeeded not only in educating the students about their own sexual desires, lives, and responsibilities but also in encouraging them to accept the various lifestyles and sexual practices of others. The future president of the student body, a heterosexual male, reported on the gay male subculture at Chapel Hill for his final project in the class. In the paper, he admitted that he was apprehensive “about going to the local gay bar [because his] provincial Eastern North Carolina upbringing had never brought me in contact with homosexuals. Sure, I’d read all the accounts about them in Time and had even seen a couple but had never been in an environment dominated by gay people.” He left a Chapel Hill gay bar “with a different attitude towards homosexuality. I realized that homosexuals were a rejected minority of human beings with most of the same ambitions, faults, and feelings as the rest of society.” “Topics in Human Sexuality” proved to be a consciousness raising and changing event for many of its participants.

159 Margaret Scales and Takey Crist, interview.

160 Janelle Urnay to Dr. Steuart, 19 May 1971; and Richard Manning to Steuart, 11 May 1971, box 10, Crist Papers.

161 ibid.

The course also received national acclaim. *Today's Health* featured the course in its April 1971 issue, and letters poured into Crist from around the country. 163 A mass media consultant asked Crist for copies of "Elephants and Butterflies" and other information he used in class in order “to educate media executives about the need for human reproduction information.” He wanted to use Crist’s ideas in a national radio show devoted to sex education.164 Dozens of college professors from Wichita to neighboring Durham wrote Crist asking for syllabi.165 Even a few high school teachers wanted information about how to start sex education courses.166 The sexual liberation movement emanating from Chapel Hill seemed to gain more followers around the country with every initiative it took.

By the next fall, the course had an enrollment of about 250 students and a waiting list of over 400. The students, however, did not know how long they would have to wait.167 During the course’s first semester, Crist taught it free of charge, and the members of the sexual liberation movement managed to raise seven hundred dollars from private donors and schools, but the next fall, Crist announced that there was not enough money for the class even if he taught the course again for free. They had only received $200 from the School of Nursing, which would not be enough for guest lectures and course materials. Although Crist had acquiesced to the administration’s requests the previous semester to keep the course out of the press, he went public with the issue of funding and potential threat of cancellation. He

---


164 Jon H. Pfaff to Crist, 12 April 1971, box 10, HEED 33, Crist Papers.

165 For example, see Harmon L. Smith to Dr. Stuart, 31 May 1971; Shirley M. Mainwaring to Gentlemen, 1 July 1971; and Rowland New (Montgomery College, MD) to Crist, 14 May 1971, box 10, HEED 33, Crist Papers.

166 Lena C. Mathis to Crist, 3 May 1971, box 10, HEED 33, Crist Papers.

had built a rapport with many students while teaching the course and knew they would support him. Crist blasted the administration and all the departments on campus in the *Daily Tar Heel*: “Somebody better come up with the money to run this course. We’re talking about peanuts. . . . We are turning away from 400 to 500 students each semester who can’t get into the course because of limited space, time, money and instruction. Why?”¹⁶⁸ Crist and his student followers contacted multiple departments and even resorted to asking pharmaceutical companies for money on the condition that Crist would talk about their contraceptive products.¹⁶⁹ They were desperate. It seemed that the continuation of the course would either make or break the sexual liberation movement.

The members of the sexual liberation movement had the support from a large number of students whose anger about the funding issues reached a boiling point over the next few days. The administration and various departments attempted to assuage the tension. The Chairman of the Health Department, Guy Steuart, defended himself, arguing that he had no knowledge of funding issues, which might have been true since he had supported the course from its inception. The director of Health Services offered funds, probably to keep Crist from going on a rampage and further damaging its reputation. These men knew the students would side with Crist and feared the impact of the negative publicity. Eight days after Crist’s media tirades, various departments finally came up with the necessary funding.¹⁷⁰ It must have seemed to many faculty and administrators at the university that this doctor had obtained the upper hand in all sexual matters on campus and had gained a vociferous student following.

---

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

Building on the success of the course, Wilson and Starnes went to the Human Sexuality Committee with an idea for a peer counseling service. They knew that members of the sexual liberation movement had tested similar services at the University of Colorado at Boulder and at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst with great success.\(^{171}\) They wanted UNC to be on the cutting edge of the movement and believed a counseling service would be the practical next step. Furthermore, Starnes and Wilson felt students “needed as many educational outlets as possible” when it came to sexual issues in order to “help combat the sex education void of students prior to college life, to help assist them with questions and problems about their sexuality while they are in college, and to prepare them for their future life.”\(^{172}\) Although “Topics in Humans Sexuality” and “Elephants and Butterflies” taught students about sex, Wilson thought UNC still lacked “campus resources to aid students in integrating sexual expression into the context of interpersonal relationships,” and a “adequate formal loci” for students to obtain “the necessary information in this very significant area.”\(^{173}\)

Additionally, “Topics in Human Sexuality’s” formality and the inherent hierarchy of the classroom dissuaded many students from seeking individual help. Moreover, only two hundred and fifty students per semester could take the class, leaving the other 18,856 students with information unavailable and questions unanswered. Starnes and Wilson wanted the new counseling service’s staff, planning committee, and organizers to be students. They knew, however, the students were not professionals in the field of human

\(^{171}\) Wilson interview; and Peer Sex Education Program, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, n.d., box 12, Human Sexuality, Crist Papers.


sexuality, despite the knowledge they had gained in the last two years. They would need help from experts as well.

Crist, of course, was on board, but with the contraceptive clinic, speaking engagements around the country, and “Topics in Human Sexuality,” he was already over-extended. Wilson and Stares first went to the student government, which agreed to lend them space and funds to set up the counseling service. They then found help in an unexpected place. Student Health Services had been revising its policies related to students’ sexual activities — no doubt in response to the sexual liberation movement’s demands. In the fall of 1970, it finally buckled under pressure and began prescribing contraceptive devices, and in the fall of 1971, Health Services created a position of “Coordinator of Human Sexuality,” filled by Dr. Caroline Dixon. She had been an active participant in the sexual liberation movement during her previous job at the University of Massachusetts, and she eagerly joined UNC’s movement. It seemed that Health Services personnel had heard the movement’s message; they did not want to risk further alienation and isolation from the students and the movement. The students and the physicians at Health Services came to an agreement that “a peer-orientated service [would serve an] intermediary function between the student and the professional.” Thus, instead of isolation, the counseling service would attempt to promote an ethic of cooperation between Health Services and the students of UNC.

174 Wilson interview.


176 Carolyn S. Dixon to Bill Griffin, 28 September 1971, box 12, Human Sexuality-Committee for Human Sexuality, 1971, Crist Papers. For more about the Sexual liberation movement in Massachusetts, see Cline, Creating Choice.

177 Baldwin and Wilson, "A Campus Peer Counseling Program in Human Sexuality."
In early October, Wilson began placing advertisements in the *Daily Tar Heel* for student volunteers for a new sexuality counseling team. Thirty-seven students responded. Wilson and Dixon ran three three-hour training sessions. The female physician “presented probably the quickest and most precise explanation of physiology, anatomy, contraception and pregnancy in the history of college education—a record two hours.”178 They also heard a problem-pregnancy counselor speak about abortion. Finally, Wilson and William Eastman, a psychologist and marriage counselor at Health Services, led role-playing exercises to ascertain whether volunteers had the “openness and sensitivity” to become counselors.179 Wilson tried to detect what he called the “Kama Sutra extremist,” who he believed “could prematurely and unjustly influence decisions” of the student who used the service.180 The sexual liberation movement did not promote hedonism but rather frankness, responsibility, and rational choices.

The Human Sexuality Information and Counseling Service officially opened on October 18, 1971, by offering in-person counseling as well as a telephone hotline for students who wished to remain anonymous. Because all of the space in the Student Union had been reserved until the following May, the student government, one of the closest allies of the sexual liberation movement at this time, lent the counseling service part of its lobby. With limited funds, the counselors bought a table, chairs, and bookshelves, which they filled with “free pamphlets, books to be checked out, and various displays of anatomy and contraceptive devices.” The makeshift space came together when Wilson hung his “trusty Indian-print

---


179 Ibid.

180 Ibid.
“bedspread” as a partition (students would be able to request private rooms for counseling if they wished).

The counseling service also set up an extensive advertising campaign to let the students know they were available to help them. The sexual liberation movement’s media ally, the *Daily Tar Heel*, ran many stories and announcements promoting the service. The counselors also placed posters in “almost every classroom on campus and in all dormitories, as well as other public locations.”181 Most of these posters had catchy and amusing slogans, which the service hoped would capture students’ attention. One featured a cartoon of a young man giving the “OK” sign with his fingers and had bold letters asking, “‘hey Charlie…did you score last night?’” The poster went on to pose a series of questions to the male student: “Was she on the Pill? Does she have an IUD? Did you remember your condom?” The final statement of the poster read, “Hey Charlie, birth control is your responsibility too!!”182 As with the other ventures of the sexual liberation movement, this service sought to promote male responsibility and communication between couples.

In the first year of its existence, the counseling service handled 1,091 cases, averaging fifty-two per week.183 Indeed, the sheer number of cases suggests that students still had many unanswered questions about sex and its consequences, and they actively responded to the activities of the sexual liberation movement. Students inquired about a variety of matters such as increasing penis size and female orgasms; which doctors in the Chapel Hill area would prescribe birth control pills; where male students could meet girls; if blood poisoning
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183 “Counseling Service Reports 1,091 cases,” *Daily Tar Heel*, 4 September 1971, 1.
could cause a woman to miss her period; abortion prices and availability; and the signs of pregnancy. Surprisingly, a number of students still did not know how pregnancy occurred. One male student, for example, worried that “he had gotten his girl pregnant . . . even though she had on underpants, pantyhose, and slacks.” Other calls suggested that students still did not know what to make of the “sexual revolution.” Many felt that there was something wrong with them if they were not sexually active. This pressure was especially stressful for male students. One student revealed to a counselor that “his roommates and friends have been giving him a lot of hassle” for not having intercourse, and he “was feeling inadequate.” The counselors listened and assured these students that there was nothing wrong with them. They even suggested that “the idea [of] the sexual revolution in some quarters is believed to be mainly an ideological revolution.” This counselor envisioned the sexual revolution less as a change in behavior than in the atmosphere in which “people felt freer to talk about aspects of sexuality, especially people of the opposite sexes talking together.” When counselors received questions they could not answer about such things as the causes of abdominal pain after masturbation, whether vitamin E increased sexual

184 These documents were written by the counselors after they talked to students. S. Tager took a call from a female, 27 October 1971; Margaret Scales talked to a male age 21 on October 28 1971; Cam Kay took a call from a male college age, 18 October 1971; Kathie Gantt took a call from a male, 17 October 1971; Judi took a call from a female, 27 October 27 1971; Cam Kay took a call from college age male, 25 October 1971; D. Brantly took a call from a male, 26 October 1971; Marc Gilfillan advised an 18 year-old male, 25 October 1971; and Kathy Smock advised a female, 22 October 1971, box 12, Human Sexuality Committee, Questions from Coeds, Crist Papers.

185 Cam Kay took a call from college age male, 25 October 1971, box 12, Human Sexuality Committee, Questions from Coeds, Crist Papers.

186 Marc Gilfillan advised an 18 male, 25 October 1971, box 12, Human Sexuality Committee, Questions from Coeds, Crist Papers.

187 Jim Hackman talked to an estimated 18-year-old male walk-in, 26 October 1971, box 12, Human Sexuality Committee, Questions from Coeds, Crist Papers.
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potency, or how to increase body hair, they called doctors at Health Services who had agreed to be on call during certain hours to respond to the service.\textsuperscript{189}

Although the Human Sexuality Information and Counseling Service relied on doctors at Health Services for information and referrals, a tension between the two institutions always existed under its surface of conviviality. Before the fall semester of 1972, Dr. Dixon reminded Wilson that Health Services is “your prime supportive and endorsing agency.” She also conveyed to him, “We do not feel that we can continue in this supportive role without having some input into the quality of the end results.” She suggested that the Counseling Service have a faculty advisor from Health Services who would play “a very active role” in training counselors and reviewing the program.\textsuperscript{190} Crist also demanded that the students keep the faculty members of the Human Sexuality Committee informed of their plans, so that the service would not jeopardize the sexual liberation movement or faculty reputations and credibility.\textsuperscript{191} The student counselors took some of the suggestions to heart, but they also tended to ignore many of the faculty’s requests, which simultaneously led to increasing tensions with adults and positive feelings of independence for the youth.

Most of the students involved in this peer-counseling group had taken “Topics in Human Sexuality” or had met Crist during his speaking tours and volunteered for personal or ideological reasons. Many counselors, like Wilson, had personal experiences with unwanted pregnancies and felt that the sexual liberation movement would prevent others from going

\textsuperscript{189} HSICS, Questions referred to doctors, 29 November 1971 and 10 April 1972, 22 November 1973, box 12, Human Sexuality Committee, Questions from Coeds, Crist Papers.

\textsuperscript{190} Caroline Dixon to Robert Wilson, 15 June 1972, box 12, Human Sexuality Committee, 1972, Crist Papers.

\textsuperscript{191} Crist to Wilson, 27 June 1972, box 12, Human Sexuality Committee, 1972, Crist Papers.
through the pain they or someone close to them had gone through. Others participated because they saw the goals of the sexual liberation movement as central to second-wave feminism. Student counselor Margaret Scales, recalls, “I was not sexually active. I was not a lesbian. I was not in need of an abortion and all that. But, I was very interested in women’s health and as a feminist. . . . I was very interested in the information and the counseling — well, the information sharing part of it.” The counseling service had many features of and can even be considered part of the women’s health movement that took off in 1969 — the year the Boston Women’s Health Collective began to formulate the ideas for Our Bodies, Our Selves, the underground abortion service, JANE, was founded, and Carol Dower started to develop techniques for women to view their cervixes. Like members of the women’s health movement, the student counselors believed that they could liberate themselves by gaining knowledge about their bodies and passing their knowledge on to others. Both the counseling service and the women’s health movement employed self-help ideology that simultaneously drew upon and undermined physicians’ traditional roles as authorities on health and sexuality. Nonetheless, the counseling service differed in a crucial aspect: men still largely controlled it. It may have had an equal number of male and female counselors, but Wilson often took charge, and most of the physicians they relied upon were men. In one sense, this appears to be paternalistic and to reinforce the power dynamic that the women’s health movement fought. Yet, it can also be interpreted as men attaining a feminist consciousness. Female and male counselors learned not only about their own anatomy and
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gender-specific problems but about those of the opposite sex. Wilson firmly believed in a woman’s right to choose whether to carry a pregnancy to term and sought to empower women by making information available to individuals so that they could “make the very best decision for her future.”

Both male and female counselors believed that their involvement in the sexual liberation movement would create real personal, institutional, and individual changes. These students informed and aided their classmates, but they also taught themselves lessons of tolerance, patience, and understanding. As Wilson reported to the Human Sexuality Committee, “Even if our Counselors were the only people who the Service helped this year, our existence is justified.” These sexual liberation movement members had preached an ethic of acceptance toward different sexual identities and acts, especially when it came to homosexuality, but many had never had to practice what they preached until they joined the service. Wilson made it a goal to recruit members of the gay community to the counseling service, but he also felt some trepidation. When entering a recruitment meeting made up of all gay men, Wilson thought he was “so liberal that I’m vulnerable to the idea of being gay, and I’m going to go in and be tapped with a magic wand and suddenly have interest in
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197 These events took place before students had a formal organization for gay and lesbian activism on campus. The Carolina Gay Association would not form until 1974. There was, however, a growing gay liberation movement in the Chapel Hill and neighboring areas. When the Triangle Gay Alliance formed in 1972, it became the only organization for gay and lesbians in Eastern North Carolina at that time, and about half its membership consisted of college students from UNC and various other universities in the area. Mary Day Mordecai, “Homosexuals Seek Understanding through Organization,” The News and Observer, 22 February 1972; “Where the Money Goes,” Lambda: The Newsletter of the Carolina Gay Association 1, no. 1 (1974); and “Carolina Gay Association,” [1975], pp. 962-3, University of North Carolina Clippings Files through 1975, North Carolina Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
men. . . . It took a lot of courage.” He remembered, “It was like about six seconds [before] I was totally fine, and that was behind me and then we went on to our business.” Margaret Scales gave a fellow female counselor a ride home one night. The woman was bisexual and Scales remembers, “All of a sudden I got this sweat—I thought she was going to reach over and grab my crotch, and at that point, I realized that I was so unsophisticated. . . . So that was a great wake-up call for me.” Participation in the sexual liberation movement changed the consciousness of many of the participants, and it also offered an accepting and self-affirming experience to lesbian, gay, and bisexual people. As one counselor reflected, “Most meaningful to me has been the group spirit and interaction; also the counselors response to me, as a person with homosexual feelings, has helped me to feel that I can stand tall, be proud and count myself as an equal member of the human race.”

Like the other events of the sexual liberation movement at UNC, the Human Sexuality Information and Counseling Service caught the attention of the national press. Journalists from *Esquire*, *Today’s Health*, and *Time* journeyed to Chapel Hill to document the service. Wilson claimed that this “sensationalism has helped spread the word that one’s sexuality can be talked about, not just in whispers, but in general conversation.” Furthermore, Wilson claimed that he received hundreds of letters from colleges and universities around the country asking for information about how to start their own sexuality services. UNC’s
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sexual liberation movement had not only captured the attention of its own student body, it had captured the attention and imagination of the country by offering a new paradigm for sexual freedom, gender equality, and a new sexual ideology for America’s youth.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

By 1973, the sexual liberation movement had accomplished an astounding number of projects at the University of North Carolina. Students now had a mail order service and store from which to buy condoms, a clinic offering medical forms of contraception, a booklet listing the places and people they could contact for help with problem pregnancies, a class devoted to helping them understand their sexual bodies and lives, and a newspaper column and a peer counseling service to answer their personal questions about sex. Ironically, students even began complaining in 1973 about “all the sex information that has been crammed down [their] throat[s] since [they] got to Carolina.”202 This was quite a change from when the class of 1969 entered the university. By 1973, the novelty of the information seemed to have worn away. In addition, leadership is crucial to every social movement, and the sexual liberation movement at UNC proved to be no exception. Student leaders such as Starnes and Wilson graduated, and Crist left the university in 1973 to open a private practice in Jacksonville, North Carolina.203 The sexual liberation movement seemed to lose some of its intensity in the following years on this campus.

Yet we cannot underestimate the importance of what this movement achieved in such a short time and how its participants managed to invoke change. The sexual liberation
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movement was an important, but seemingly forgotten part of what the public and historians consider as the sexual revolution, New Left, and second-wave feminism. Although the American public often remembers the sexual revolution as a time of sexual chaos, it becomes apparent that when we separate the different strands of this social and cultural phenomenon, a major element of it, the sexual liberation movement, attempted to bring order to what its participants perceived as sexual chaos by promoting a morality of responsibility. As part of the New Left, this movement drew upon the energy and idealism of youth in attempting to level hierarchies such as those between the married and unmarried, faculty and students, and men and women. Finally, the sexual liberation movement represents an important aspect of the history of feminism. Men and women came together as allies. They believed progress and empowerment for one gender involved changing the social and ideological position of the other. Given the amount of change they actually achieved, they offered a model of feminist action that largely is forgotten and that too few would follow in the proceeding years.

The battles over birth control availability, legal abortion, and sexual education have continued to rage after the sexual liberation movement’s peak between 1969 and 1973.\textsuperscript{204} Recently, there has been a rising trend in pharmacists around the country denying birth control and “morning after” pills to women, and right-wing legislation and judges have continually chipped away at the reproductive freedoms granted to women in \textit{Roe v. Wade}.\textsuperscript{205} In 2005, the Bush administration proposed to spend 167 million dollars on abstinence-only

\textsuperscript{204} For more about how the New Right fought the gains of the Sexual liberation movement throughout the 1970s and to the present, see Irvine, \textit{Talk About Sex}.

sex education programs, more than twice the budget of 2001. Democratic Senator Henry Waxman headed a study of these programs and found that they present America’s youth with “false, misleading or distorted information” about contraception, abortion, sexually transmitted diseases and sexual stereotypes.” Some of these programs present information suggesting that condoms do not prevent HIV, that touching a person’s genitals might result in pregnancy, and even that women need “financial support” and men crave “admiration.”

Today, over 100 of the 117 of school systems in North Carolina teach abstinence-only sex education, despite the fact that over half of the teenagers in the state are sexually active.

Jacquelyn Hall argues that both historical memory and historical amnesia are “powerful political weapon[s].” It is of critical importance that historians weigh in on the contests of how society remembers the “sexual revolution” by recovering what has been oversimplified, caricatured, and distorted in order to influence contemporary political battles. In many ways, the “sexual wilderness” of the 1960s shares many characteristics with contemporary America. As many in our society attempt to persuade us to inch backwards towards curbing women’s reproductive rights and limiting sex education, it becomes all the more urgent to remember how the illegality of abortion and lack of sex education affected women during the sixties and in turn, how one movement managed to better the lives of these women by fighting against ignorance, hierarchies, and oppression. By remembering what was, we can come closer to imagining what could be.
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