**THE FIRST ~5 MINUTES OF THE INTERVIEW WERE NOT RECORDED DUE TO TECHNICAL ISSUES. THE OPENING OF THE RECORDED TRANSCRIPT IS MR. ROGER CHARLES’ RESPONSE TO THE THIRD FOLLOW-UP QUESTION OF THE FIRST MAIN QUESTION: (***Ottawa was a bilingual institution. How linguistically integrated was it during the 1970s; did francophones and anglophones enroll in the same university courses and participate in the same clubs?*)

Roger Charles: Many of the francophones that went to Ottawa U were actually franco-ontariens. If Quebec had separated [from Canada] they would have been a much smaller minority.

Roger Charles: I think the French community versus the English community, they were two dynamics. One, I would say was the appeal or attractiveness of an independent Quebec. And I would probably say that for the bulk of the French speaking group (who were not conservative) would have supported the parti Quebecois and independence at the time.

Roger Charles: Which of course never led to any physical conflict that I ever saw between English and French in Ottawa U, but it did make for a very difficult dynamic and experience compared to Carleton, which was very English.

Matthew Bhamjee: Anglo-saxon almost?

Roger Charles: Yeah, very white. because the international, the international students at that time were a tiny, tiny, tiny, tiny minority. So it [Carleton] really was at that time an English university.

Roger Charles: So it really was at that time an English university.

Roger Charles: A lot of the professors were from the US.

Roger Charles: And that was because, in the 60s, the universities exploded. You know, up until the 60s there was one university for BC and a University of Toronto and a University of Manitoba. Kind of like state, state universities in the states. And you know, all of the smaller universities like Brock and Concordia and uh and Carleton all exploded and there weren't enough professors in Canada to fill the spots. So there was a great deal of recruitment.

Roger Charles: So, in my particular faculty, Yeah, I would say, yeah, certainly feel half the staff may have been American.

Roger Charles: They all spoke French. That was a prerequisite, of course, in our course, you couldn't teach unless you spoke French and the French is very good if the accents were at a bit odd, but the French was very good. So in in our sector there, there were a lot of Americans, but bilingual American.

Roger Charles: So, as far as a place to be in the 70s at all you, it was kind of interesting and in the sense that uh, Canada was going through much, much, much more, more severe stresses politically. Uh, resonated in the French and English Canada at that time. And that was reflected to considerable extent, In the challenges, I think both at the administrative level and in the student body level.

Roger Charles: So you have you had essentially 3 universities all in all. So there was Carlton, which was the English university, the University of Quebec, all which is the French University and Ottawa U, which was the bilingual university, but with more biased towards French.

Matthew Bhamjee: Ok, so what that everything you have to say on that? On to the next question. We use the term party culture to refer to social activities outside of the classroom, can you describe the party culture on campus during the 70s?

Roger Charles: well again I was a graduate student. I did not live on campus. I had a bunch of roommates and we shared a house, you know, uh, downtown Ottawa at the time. So my party culture was limited. When I left campus, other than the occasional, I have a couple of friends who I remain friends with today from my University of Ottawa days.

Roger Charles: but my social activities on campus were we're fairly minimal, but the big, big, big, big differences between today and yet and then was smoking was still common. It was still seen as sophisticated. Getting drunk was seen as something manly, uh, and to have sex with a girl you had to get the girl drunk, from a man’s perspective obviously.

Roger Charles: but so the notion that drinking was bad for you, that smoking was bad for you, that and all that sort of stuff and getting drunk and then getting in a car and driving uh, all those things that are seen as either illegal uh or socially unacceptable today were not then.

Roger Charles: So in one sense I suppose, when you talk about party culture, it wasn’t just uO, it was [all] universities in general that do it.

Roger Charles: going out and drinking and smoking and having sex and all those things that that are, you know, Hollywood staple of universities, none of it was seen as bad, from a moral or health perspective at the time. So people didn’t think very much about the particular impacts

Roger Charles: getting into a car and getting now all of the things, you know, the drinking and driving the anti smoking campaigns, the women's liberation movement, all of these things had started and all of these things were starting to have an impact on behaviors on campus but they hadn't got to the stage where they become either (as in the case of drinking and driving)g the laws were getting tighter and tighter but they weren't such that it was seen as a real criminal offense to get into car and be drunk.

Roger Charles: Most people still smoked. The irony today is that, cigarette smoking is the worst offence, worse than dope. It was of course the reverse case back then.

Roger Charles: So no, I think the constraint I mean I don't know what the university party culture, I teach at the University Vancouver now, but I don't socialize with my students where whereas in, in those days a university professors having sex with their students was not wasn't forbidden either.

Matthew Bhamjee: Really? Would you say that it was, I don’t want to say common but, more prevalent then compared to how it is now?

Roger Charles: Yes, because now, you sleep with one of your students you get fired. Whereas before it was more of a wink, wink say no more thing. So we certainly, I certainly knew professors, who always check the first year students and I'm talking about male professors and females. I’m talking first year, second year students. So it was not uncommon.

Roger Charles: all of these things that that are now seen as bad, you know on campuses and smoking cigarettes, getting drunk, chasing women were seen as normal back then. So you could argue that that. If you define party culture as all of those things, then yes, there was a party culture, but it wasn't. thye were just the social norms of the day in terms of your behavior.

Matthew: Wow. Ok. Alright so, we'll move on to the second section now I think you spoke about this very briefly, but this is about sort of the female experience and you know, gender norms. In your words, what would you say feminism signified in Canada in the 70s?

Roger Charles: Certainly if you watch movies in the 60s, of Hollywood. But just, just generally the sexism, you know, watch the James Bond movies of the 60s and you watch the ones that have been made in the 2010s. The social norms are dramatically different. It’s normal if you look at a movie in the 60s, women are either mothers or sex objects.

Roger Charles: As women went to university and became educated, and as society transitioned from rural society to an urban society, they started demanding, quite rightly in hindsight, greater respect and so there were quite a number of times where the feminist movement was perceived as a women who don't wear bras, and don’t shave their legs and don't shave their armpits and wear army boots.

Roger Charles: And so that transition was certainly, very much an awareness of this shift in in attitudes towards women at the university and that, you know, included people, men like me. you know, you were still attracted to women and you still lusted after women, but women were because certainly becoming far more aware and conscious of their own rights as individuals rather than the old joke was, you know, a woman went to university to get a bachelor the bachelor. and that attitude of finding a husband who would provide was definitely shifting.

Roger Charles: So the women I knew at the graduate level, you know we're pretty independent minded women. Who had saw their lives in terms of a career and not in terms of a husband or family.

Roger Charles: I would say that the 70s Were the period when the feminist movement really started to embed its consciousness into the university.

Roger Charles: Having said that, I think socially, most, most women and men still expected to get married are still expected to have children. But it was no longer automatic default to do so, and that nuanced shift was an outcome and a reflection of the feminist movement, which really got rolling in the late 60s and became even more pronounced in the following years.

Matthew Bhamjee: so a lot of changes?

Roger Charles: Yes but, you see that in hindsight, you know in 50 years time someone probably gonna contact you and say what the hell does auto you like then and when you're there you know you live within the experience that you experience and the social norms that you accept as the norms today and you know what I was there you didn't even have computers you know the only computers remain friends and you had. So things in that sense have changed dramatically have compared to today, but you're not when you know you're not, you don't wake up with a sort of Eureka moment. Life and social norms all change, don’t you just live with them?

Roger Charles: And it's only in hindsight and where we are today and you look back at where you were 50 years ago and realized that there was a transition going on, but you weren't, you weren't completely complex.

Roger Charles: Most men were very dismissive of the feminist movement and they kind of dismiss ed them as all ugly lesbian. But in actual fact, the work that most feminists did to change the mindset of men and society generally was being absorbed and the way that more than more women than men go to universities these days is the outcome of that, that transition.

Matthew: Ok, so for the next question, would you say there were any programs at the university or departments or clubs where women were less present or accepted or represented?

Roger Charles: Every Sports Club, I would think, certainly football, hockey, you know, and they were still male dominated sports. Women, were We're in sports, I think at that point time, we're still very umm kind of amateurish for the most part.

Roger Charles: So, I think the Ottawa U GGs at the time were actually a powerhouse football team. And so they were quite successful, much better than Carleton at the time. And the ice hockey team. So, I think in sports teams most of the time, were still seen as you know, it was very much a male. I mean, I think that there were intercollegiate female sports, but I don’t think that played it anywhere near the role that the major sports teams did.

Roger Charles: And again, at that time, , and even today, to a certain extent, I think you know they're trying to change the mindset that the women went into the softer sciences, so women were still expected to go into nursing. I had friends who were female and who were going into medicine. And so the number of women that were going into the medical professions, right across the board was growing very rapidly.

Roger Charles: There was very little crossover, I think in both in terms of clubs and so I don't think there was a huge merger of those value systems at that time.

Matthew Bhamjee: Ok. Just to assure you, we’re still much better then Carleton at football.

Roger Charles: Ok, well I’m glad to hear that.

Matthew Bhamjee: I think were at 5 panda games in a row or something.

Roger Charles: You know, I know the guy that owns the Ottawa Red blacks, John Ruddy. He and I went to school together and he played [football] at Carleton. So I got to know the football teams a little bit because I knew him and he's gone on to be very successful developer. That's why I think he brought the football team at Carlton back because of his links back in the 70s to playing football there so.

Roger Charles: one other thing that I should add. I was very good friends with Maureen McTeer who was Joe Clark’s wife, who became prime minister in 1980. And I remember this quite vividly, she was a very good example of how women were changing in the 70s. , she and I went to high school together at Saint Pat's, and then I did undergrad at UBC. But she and I linked back up at the University of Ottawa and by this time she was quite a determined and independent woman and She went to law school at Ottawa U.

Roger Charles: And so she was a very good illustration of the new woman, the woman of my generation of boomer generation, during she was very determined. She had great have political ambitions. And she knew that she wanted to be a lawyer and she wasn't going to be a mother just because she was a woman.

Roger Charles: And the last time I really remember sitting on campus with her chatting. And by this time, this was the late 70s, she had married Joe Clark. And she told me how they're that she he was going to become leader of the opposition to Justin Trudeau's father, at this point in time was still Prime Minister and he was running, they got it and she became the wife of the Prime Minister, Joe Clark. And a lot of people hated her precisely because she inserted her independence. she wasn't the back sitting in the back being quiet and humble, she went out and asserted her rights. Both books and all the rest of this stuff. So she was a very good illustration of how women we're taking charge of their lives and becoming professionals.

Roger Charles: Instead of just marrying men and having children, but quite determined to have independent lives of their own. And so she and the women I knew who became medical doctors were the first wave, the big wave of women asserting an independent professional life was becoming much, much more widespread.

Matthew Bhamjee: alright we’ll move onto the third section. historians have written a lot about what they call counterculture revolution, and that your generation rebelled against the values of your parents generation. To what extent in your social circle, did people see themselves as needing to mobilize for a more just society and better world, which you say?

Roger Charles: I’m not sure, you know. I think every generation thinks itself is as a revolutionary and defiant. But you know the big thing about our generation, the boomers, is that we're at university was we were the first generation to really be lucky. And in the sense that, you know, my parents went to war, they grew up during the depression and then after the war, Was considered the glorious years from the 50s to the 70s.

Roger Charles: Western economies, including Canadian economy, which at the time of the you know the in the late 60s and 70s, was still in the second richest country in the world. Now we're down about 15th or 20th. And so, we were blessed with a health system and all these sorts of things that made our lives actually pretty cool.

Roger Charles: Now they, you know, the Vietnam War was going on in the United States, and there were Americans certainly going off to the to the war. But Canadians were not faced with that sort of trauma. And we didn’t have conscription.

Roger Charles: If you were to ask me what was the biggest change in in or that made much of the sort of value system that were change happening, it's the pill. You know when women could have sex and not have to worry about getting pregnant. And then firstly, there was a sexual liberation and all the rest of it that made a huge, huge mental change, both for women and men. And so the default that you know if you had sex with a woman, you had to marry her because you might get pregnant no longer existed.

Roger Charles: And then of course the drugs became fairly popular. So, but this is all premised on unemployment at 2 or 3% and the economy growing at two or three or 4% etcetera. But by the 70s, things were starting to change. You know, we had stagflation, You're the there wasn't any automatic right that you would get a job when you graduated from university. And so, when you were talking in your preamble about the 70s being a dull age to most people, , I think that's because of the excesses of the 60s and the revolutionary or the OR the reaction to the conservativism or and traditionalism of our parents had to consider with them expired because the economic models that had resulted in the growth of Western Economic Society for the previous 25 years were failing. And therefore, by definition, people became more reserved and more conservative.

Roger Charles: And of course, in ultimately resulted in in a great disaster, in a sense, that starting in the 80s we have the conservative pushback. And what we see when the chaos done in the United States today and Pierre Poilievre of and the people’s party today is a reflection of all the things, umm, that we started as a reaction to the economic situation that was taking place in the 70s.

Roger Charles: so I am not so sure that you could call our generation really that revolutionary, the Boomers governments are a embarrassment to you from your generation. I look at Trump and many of the people that are empowered, they, Xi Jinping in China and Modi in in India and Erdogan. They're all part of my generation and I think are awful people.

Roger Charles: So yeah, I’m sure it’s a cultural reaction, not a revolution.

Matthew Bhamjee: I mean I on that point, I think it's just people can sometimes get a little more conservative as they grow older. I’m sure it’ll happen to me, and on top of that, maybe these people in power were from more privileged standing when they were younger and so they didn’t get the same perspective. I mean, Donald Trump wouldn't have been necessarily affected by the effects of the Vietnam War because his dad made sure he got out of the draft or whatever.

Roger Charles: Bill Clinton, for that matter, dodged the draft. So you went all American presidents and George W Bush, they all dodged the draft because they could. Anyway, that’s another story.

Matthew Bhamjee: Ok. I think we have time for one more question. All give you the would you like to do the question about sexuality and harassment, or would you prefer to keep on the track of Sort of like protests and counterculture?

Roger Charles: I think sexuality and harassment, I don’t know

Matthew Bhamjee: It’s up to you, you don’t have to speak on anything you’re not comfortable with.

Roger Charles: Well I’ll just say, it's a very fashionable subject today about sexual harassment and always, of course, you know, with the cases of Harvey Weinstein and all that sort of stuff. And yeah, all that stuff went on back then, and the professors were just as bad as everybody else will know. Not a lot, but some of the professors certainly chased the girls. So and you would be far better off talking to some of the females of my age about sexual harassment because I'm sure they got a lot of it.

Roger Charles: Or not a lot of it, but certainly it was obvious and nobody though anything of it. The feminist movement was precisely targeted to that sort of thing as a pushback that women are not just sex objects and sex toys for forbidden pleasure.

Roger Charles: So no doubt that stuff existed. But as a man, hey, did you think it was particularly bad? You know you went to see a James Bond movie and they were terribly sexist. In fact most movies were terribly sexist. If you look at the movies of the day, the idea of having sex with a 16 year-old was normal. Not today. But you weren’t a pariah for doing those sorts of things. So it's very difficult for me to talk about that stuff because it was an accepted norm that is no longer acceptable.

Roger Charles: The other thing was you know what? (And I come back to it) The big dynamic in Ottawa, was whether Quebec was going to separate or not.

Roger Charles: And the French to be fair you know, I had a lot to do with Quebec in throughout the 60s and 70s and no society in Canada changed more than Quebec did. So it used to be in Quebec the power of the Catholic church, but today you know, nobody goes to church in Quebec anymore. And then so the social revolution. and so that brought on partly by the desire for Quebec independence.

Roger Charles: And the and the combination of the pill and urbanization and all these things had a far, far, far greater impact on uh, Quebec society and French society Than it did on English Canadian society, which was the dominant society and the conflict was primarily an in the French conflict. And the conflict is never over.

Roger Charles: And so it was, I think a much more sensitive issue at all where you precisely because it was a bilingual university. , I certainly went out and I'm having a good relationship with French people that I knew girls and boys, uh, there, there, there was considerable, um, these two solitudes between the English and French.

Roger Charles: Well, it’s still pretty substantive. In my view I'm certainly very glad I went to Ottawa U at the time, Ottawa U and Carlton were seeing roughly equal. Even Carlton seen a bit better. Now, It's clear that Ottawa is much, much, much, much better. I think great value added propositions precisely because it has been or is the biggest bilingual university in Canada, if not the world.

Roger Charles: and it was a triumph of the administration that Ottawa U assume to keep that, that that dynamism and that, that intercultural engagement under some fairly tough times politically in Canada. So I think if there was, if there's a schematic underline or at Ottawa you during those that period it was the management of a university that had its feet in both camps, both French and English Canada, and where there was times Potential for a real physical conflict, you know?

Roger Charles: But the FLQ, where we're blowing up post boxes and in 1970 of course there was the War Measures Act because a bunch of people got killed. And so U Ottawa would have in the thickness of the political dynamic, so I think its to the credit of the administration of the day I think, to manage the two, the dynamics at the university, again in hindsight, very well. And the university, I think is blessed and that said, benefited tremendously by being a bilingual university.

Matthew Bhamjee: Alright. Thank you. I think that’s all I need.

--END OF FORMAL INTERVIEW--