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On November 11, 1968, a letter was sent to the faculty of Kent State University from a student group called the Students for a Democratic Society also known as SDS. The letter was sent to the faculty of Kent State University to ask for help with meetings and events. The letter was written by then-treasurer of the Kent chapter of Students for a Democratic Society, Richard Skirvin (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 4). At the time the letter was written, the group had already formed, and was active in campus politics and programs. According to records from the Kent State University archives, hand written notes from members named Critzer Rudd, Howard Emmer, Edward Erickson, and one unidentified member outlined the plans and overall ideals for the SDS. It is important to note that the first member named on the notes Critzer Rudd is not listed in an inter-departmental correspondence from Kent State of the active members in the SDS chapter of Kent (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 7).

The notes have overtones of communist beliefs and fighting against a repressive culture. Critzer Rudd says "We will create a mass democratic socialist movement which will govern the country." He also is quoted as saying "we feel we cannot accept change through peaceful means." Howard Emmer, who was to be a vocal member of the group in 1969 when the group held marches wrote, "we don’t know really what we’re fighting for, but we’ll find out!" Edward Erickson, another member as listed on the inter-departmental correspondence stated, "...that the ultimate goal is for the workers and students to rise up and
take over the factorys causing a general strike, out of this strike the students would build a socialist country” (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 4).

The group, Students for a Democratic Society has been called the "largest radical student organization in the United States today” (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 1). In June of 1968, the group had on record as claiming over thirty thousand members and three hundred chapters around the country. The group wanted to be referred to as “communists” after changes in membership and bans on exclusions of certain members took place. The meaning behind being called “communist” was they wanted to stand out from the other organizations that were more disciplined in the Communist belief.

The SDS was involved in the planning of the 1968 Democratic Convention held in Chicago, and mobilized students to attend, and told the attendees to have their blood type on a form of ID in case of rioting in the streets (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 1).

An application for University recognition by a student organization was submitted to the University on February 20, 1968, the constitution was tabled by the University on November 14, 1968, and finally passed in December of 1968 (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 5, Edgar L. McCormick, papers, box 2, folder 11). According to the constitution of the Kent SDS, which was written in April of 1968, the purpose of the organization was to be “an educational and social action organization dedicated to increasing
democracy in all phases of our common life. It seeks to promote the active participation of young people in the formulation of a movement to build a society free from poverty, ignorance, war, exploitation, and man's inhumanity to man” (Edgar L. McCormick, papers, box 2, folder 11). According to the Kent State inter-departmental correspondence regarding the active members of SDS, there are thirty-two members listed, and most of the names on the memo had been named in other documents citing the activism of the group (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 7). The events that were to occur in the next few weeks were to determine the demise of the group, the rise of a liberal group in support of due process, and the demise of that group after the campus-wide referendum.

Structural Conduciveness-

The condition in which the group was able to become a student organization, protest, and be suspended is conducive to the events that unfolded in April of 1969. Kent State University allowed student organizations to form through applications that were filled out by soon to be student leaders upon approval. The application for the Kent SDS was filled out in February of 1968. The form included the name, purpose, national affiliation, and requirements for membership, officers, and advisors. The form also required a time and meeting place to be placed on the form.

The group was then approved, and drafted a constitution for the day to day running. Other conditions in which the events in April were able to occur
were the many protests that the group held against the University. Not only the
time period, but also the mere existence of the ability to protest created the
conditions that was to be later when arrests and suspensions took place.

Structural Strain-

    The Kent chapter of the SDS had been active in dorm programs, and with
other campus programs, but the group did not become seen as a threat to the
campus until April of 1969. On April 8, 1969, the group had organized and
decided on four demands of the University. The demands were abolition of
the ROTC on campus, the abolishment of the Northeast Ohio crime lab, the
banning of the Liquid Crystals, and banning of the Law Enforcement School. —
cite this! The Kent SDS distributed a flyer on campus with the demands and the
reasons why they wanted the changes made to the University. The flyer was not
only to advertise a noon rally at the Union, but also to advertise their feelings
about the administration. The four demands are given on the flyer, and the
reason to go with them.

"...And we've got the goods on the weapons they produce here at Kent to
maintain that Empire: ROTC, to train second lieutenants to lead in the
genocide of the Vietnamese; the Northeast Ohio Crime Lab, to make
repressions of oppressed people in America—and particularly blacks—more efficient and quiet; the Liquid Crystals Institute, to further counter-
insurgency techniques against the just wars of national liberation
throughout the world; and the Law Enforcement School, to train the
'liberal' occupying army for the 'liberal' war against black people at home"—
Maybe next they'll try to suspend the NLF, May 4th Collection, Kent State
Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 3.
When the students of the Kent SDS decided they wanted to be heard by the administration, they marched over to the administration building on April 8, 1969 to post the four demands on the administration building, then Bowman Hall. Upon arriving at the building, they were met by campus police and barred from entering. Fights broke out between the group and campus police, and at the end of the confrontation five people were arrested, and seven were suspended. This was also instrumental in the suspension of the SDS charter as a recognized student organization by the University.

The arrests and suspensions were reported the next day in The Daily Kent Stater on April 9, 1969. According to the front-page article written by then-students Mary Chastain and Saul Daniels, the students were charged with the following violations of the Student Conduct Code.

"Battery of University police officers in the performance of their duty, assault of University police officers in the performance of their duties, disruption of the teaching function of the university by interruption of an English class in Satterfield Hall, violent and forceful attempted entry into the Administration Building, disruption of the administrative functions of the University, and breach of the peace, including indecent language" (Daily Kent Stater, April 8, 1969, p.1, vol. LIV, No. 85).

A letter sent to the Kent SDS from the Office of student conduct programs said the following of the suspensions

"1) You are prohibited from entering upon University property during the course of your suspension except for attendance at your individual hearing or for just cause as approved by the Office of Student Conduct Programs in the accompaniment of University security officer."
2) A violation of the above provision shall be considered a violation of the appropriate provisions of the Ohio Revised Code and as such will subject you to civil arrest and prosecution." - Formal Notification of University Suspension, May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 5.

On April 15, the Daily Kent Stater reported that the University had set a hearing on April 16 for the suspended SDS members. After the University announced the hearings, the Kent SDS had acted quickly to plan a rally to "reassert their demands issued last week." The hearings that were to be held the next day were only for four of the six students. The vice president for student affairs issued a statement saying "as a matter of policy, hearings growing out of actions taken by the university have never been held publicly because of the nature of the college" (Daily Kent Stater, April 15, 1969, p. 16, Vol. LIV, No. 88). The DKS article had detailed information about how the hearing would be composed. "This board is composed of two students and two faculty members, plus one faculty member named by the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled" (Daily Kent Stater, April 15, 1969, p. 16, Vol. LIV, No. 88).

The suspended students also had to attend a hearing in the local court. The same day of the hearings, the Kent SDS had plans for a rally to petition for an open hearing of the attendees that evening. The hearings ended up being held in the Music and Speech building on front campus, and not all of the arrested students had their hearing that day. In order to keep the hearings closed, the administration arranged for campus police to chain the doors and
keep protesters out. Through a back stairway and elevator that was unguarded, the members of the Kent SDS broke in through a side door that was unprotected by campus police and protested the hearing outside of the doors. The noise became so loud that the hearings had to be stopped and continued on another day. After another confrontation with campus police, the Ohio State patrol was called in due to lack of support from the local police force as campus police were already burdened. In the end, fifty-eight people were arrested, suspended, and banned from campus. After the incident, the Kent SDS released a memo to the campus the next day explaining what went on in the hearings from their point of view. The memo was entitled “Kent Thugs” and explained the numbers of people who were arrested and involved in the confrontation.

"60 people ARRESTED. 60 people SUSPENDED. 60 more folks NOT ALLOWED ON CAMPUS. What's all this bullshit about? --58 people were arrested for trespassing and given $1000 bail and a night in jail, and that's clearly BULLSHIT—5 girls are still in- booked on those same trespassing charges. --5 people- those who were escorted to the hearing last night by armed pigs have not yet been booked... The judge is deciding whether they are in contempt of court. That's the craziest bullshit of all”- Kent Thugs, May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 3.

The Kent SDS described the series of events that took place. The time of the hearings was set for 4:30 pm, and around 4:35 the University moved the defendants to the place that the hearing was to take place. They were moved to the Music and Speech building by armed guards. When the group gathered in the hall to protest, the hearings were immediately cancelled. The group told the police, Oates, and the crowd that had gathered outside that they had
"intended to leave", but the charges that were brought against arrested people state "...asked to leave and refused." The group was held at the building until arrests were made later in the evening. The end of the memo states that the group won, and will win again "because we dare to struggle"- Kent Thugs, May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 3. The group planned a rally at Fred Fuller Park in Kent the next day at 2:00 to gather support not only to those arrested and suspended, but the four demands which had started the arrests.

Another incident occurred with the leaders of the SDS on Friday, April 18, 1969. The Kent SDS released a flyer to the campus explaining why their leaders were arrested for the events that took place on Wednesday at the Music and Speech building. The flyer said of the arrests

"...Four highway patrolman, two Kent city pigs, and three plainclothesmen arrested Ric Erickson and Howie Emmer at their home. Warrants were also issued for the arrests of George, Jeff, Colin, and Kurt. All have been identified by the University as S.D.S. 'leaders'. All have been charged with inciting to riot, a felony. It should be noted that this was a re-arrest" (Kent SDS, May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, SDS, papers, box 107, folder 3).

The flyer also told of the calling of the leaders to campus, then arrest for trespassing and contempt of court. Since the hearings were cancelled, contempt of court was an issue that was never mentioned for the students on trial at Kent State.
The night of the hearings, on April 16, students that had gathered outside of the Music and Speech building to witness the confrontation between the officers and the Kent SDS. Many heard by word of mouth “persons concerned about the Administrations handling of that night’s situation should meet in the Commuters Cafeteria at 4:00 the following afternoon” (The Aftermath: The Formation and Dissolution of the CCC, May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 44). The next day, many people attended, and a result was the Concerned Citizens of the Kent Community. A narrative about the 3-C in the May 4th archives explains the formation of the group. A quote from the Daily Kent Stater on April 21, 1969 says of the group “We are a broadly based coalition of leaders of recognized student organizations, faculty members, and independent students. We are not SDS or YSA. We neither support nor reject SDS’ demands—we are concerned only with procedural due process” (The Aftermath: The Formation and Dissolution of the CCC, p. 34, May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 44). The meeting held at 4:00 also formed the steering committee of the 3-C, and the number of people on the steering committee was to fluctuate in the following days.

The main concern with the 3-C was the due process, and the University’s actions toward the SDS. Due to the actions of the University, the group laid out three resolutions that would represent their purpose and goals. The resolutions were
1. All charges and suspensions be dropped since they were not in accordance with the Student Conduct Code.
2. The Student Code as of November 1968 is followed.
3. The SDS charter be reinstated since the revocation did not follow the stipulations of the Student Conduct Code

(The Aftermath: The Formation and Dissolution of the CCC, p. 34, May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 44)

The Thursday after the 3-C had formed, a rally was planned on the commons on campus. The group had debated on a march to President White’s home, but only a few members went in the end. The members that marched to the house were only the steering committee. When only three members of the steering committee were able to enter President White’s home, he had decided to comment the next morning on what his decision would be.

The next day, the activities of the 3-C continued on the campus with a meeting at Student Body President Bill VanderWyden. VanderWyden had invited not only the 3-C, but student senators, though none showed. After the meeting, there was a rally planned in the Commuters Cafeteria, but was moved to the Portage room. The events that were occurring on the campus affected the group, and the informal group was moving very fast with many people wanting to speak and take action. After the small rally in the Portage room, there was large one held in the Wills Gymnasium. This rally was in response to “...the Administrations refusal to accede to the three demands. Steve Shafoff, who had emerged as one of the principal leaders of CCC, presented three options to the crowd: (1) do nothing; (2) boycott classes immediately; (3) hold another rally Monday to decide what action to take” (Formation and Dissolution of the CCC:
Narrative, p. 35 Kent State May 4th Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, Box 19, folder 44). After the group chose to wait until Monday, students in numbers from three thousand to five thousand “...marched around the campus in silent protest against the Administrations actions with respect to due process. There were no violent incidents during this march or at the earlier rallies” (Formation and Dissolution of the CCC: Narrative, p. 35 Kent State May 4th Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, Box 19, folder 44).

The group brought out not only supporters of the SDS, but student leaders as well. VanderWyden, Student Body President was supportive of the group, but only marched to President White’s house because the events were affecting the student body. A backlash of the group was forming, and a secretive meeting took place on the campus “...with Miss Tate, Bill VanderWyden, Frank Frisina, Robert Ross, David Zona, and Tom Hyde” (Formation and Dissolution of the CCC: Narrative, p. 35 Kent State May 4th Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, Box 19, folder 44). A result of this meeting, three leaflets that were unsigned were distributed around the campus warning the students of radicals that had arrived, and would cause problems at the 3-C rally. The following days would evolve to show that the student-government leaders feared an influence of SDS on the 3-C, and possible violence on campus similar to the incidents with the SDS in the days past. This fear in students leads to a special edition of the Daily Kent Stater, and an article that tied the 3-C to the SDS. The author of the article was Bill Armstrong and said of the evidence
linking the two groups that the 3-C follows the manual of the SDS, and the steps it has taken is directly correlated with that manual. The tying link was "the frustration should be centered around a set of specific demands that have been unresolved through the established channels of liberal action. If this type of solution exists, then a strike is both possible and desirable" (The Daily Kent Stater, Monday, April 21, 1969, p. 1). Armstrong mentions a flyer that was distributed by the 3-C on April 18, 1969, and it stated

"if the university does not act immediately on these demands (the demands of the 3-C group), the students and faculty representatives," (of several departments listed on the flyer) "are prepared to support a general student-faculty strike" (The Daily Kent Stater, Monday, April 21, 1969, p. 1).

The 3-C group had three demands that were advertised similarly to the SDS demands earlier in the month. The group kept pushing their demands on the campus, and wanted to act on them if not followed by the university. The actions or planned actions were very similar, and those events prompted the article in the Stater.

In the following couple of days, the 3-C released a flyer around campus responding to the article in the Stater, the flyers sent around campus about the radicals, and the sudden fear of the university of the group's existence. The flyer stated the following:

"Why were not faculty and student committees consulted before the immediate suspension policy was adopted by the administration? Does not the university policy regarding immediate suspension exceed the stipulation of state law? Why was the SDS so quickly ostracized from the university and their appeals for an open hearing on April 16 denied by the administration? Was the administrations reaction to the Music and Speech
incident justified by the events which actually took place? Were the administrations method's of gathering support for its position consistent with the ideals of a free and Open University in its search for truth and justice? Why and by whom were unsigned leaflets containing gross distortion of fact permitted to be printed on university presses? Who was responsible for the April 21st special edition of Kent Stater? What is the administrations response toward the referendum? What role has the University played in the arrests? What role is the university currently playing in the arrests? For example, in supplying evidence? What role will the university play in the future? Will the administration cooperate with the law enforcement agencies? Will the administration ask law enforcement agencies to cease activities of harassment; example- arrests and rearrests? These questions demand immediate I. You as students can not settle for lies, distortions, or ambiguities” (Have you been in front of the administration bldg? Kent State May 4th Collection, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 44).

The main concern of the students was that the Kent SDS was having a strong influence on the 3-C, and wanted to distribute more of the anonymous flyers from the secret meeting. The 3-C had plans to speak to the students in the dorms, but questions arose as to how they were able to being uninvited by the dorms. The fear that was rampant of the 3-C on the Kent State campus was also that Steering committee chairman Steve Sharoff attended a SDS meeting. This re-enforced the idea of the SDS’ influence on the 3-C. Even though the campus was rampant with anti-sentiment toward the 3-C, the group surged ahead to prepare for the referendum that was to take place on April 21, 1969.

Mobilization of Action

The 3-C had decided on a referendum for the students of Kent State to vote on for the resolutions that the group had formed. The referendum was to occur on April 23, 1969, and was in conjunction with the Student Government elections held on campus. Before the referendum, a rally was held that was
initially seen as a possibility for more violence on campus. The rally went on without any violence, and a vote was taken “to hold a University-wide referendum Wednesday on the question of a four-day class boycott” (Formation and Dissolution of the CCC: Narrative, 42). The 3-C then released a flyer to the campus for students and faculty of Kent State to encourage turnout for the vote.

A flyer distributed by the 3-C for the referendum states:

“Has this University reached the stage where all dissent will be stopped by the treat of violence? Our protest will not be muffled, for we are united in the purpose of restoring civil liberties to all citizens of this campus through legal and peaceful protest!! Vote today on action!!! Referendum today 8:00 am- 5:00 pm
Bowman Hall, Kent Hall, Union, Education Build. Eastway Center. Restore civil liberties! The choice is yours!!! Vote! Vote! Vote! Vote! C.C.C” (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 46).

Other flyers were distributed around campus diverting students attention from the alleged connection between the 3-C and the SDS (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 46). The group pushed ahead for the referendum and prepared to act after the results had been made official.

The day of the referendum, the Daily Kent Stater featured an article about how the results of the referendum impacted the groups existence. Steve Sharoff spoke with a Stater reporter telling that the students ultimately decide what their future will hold. The referendum featured the three demands thought of by the 3-C to help ensure that the members of the Kent SDS were granted due process rights. According to the Stater article, “the committee hopes that students will realize that something has gone wrong here...we want students to be aware of
what is happening in the United States and on other campuses, and that they should have a voice in college government” (The Daily Kent Stater, April 23, 1969, p. 1). After coming under fire by the University and the anonymous flyers distributed around campus, the group applied for recognition as a campus group, and was given probationary status before the referendum. The hope was that the referendum would pass and the group could have a strong presence on the campus.

After voting took place results were of mixed reviews by students, faculty, and “other”. The Daily Kent Stater reported on April 24, 1969 that “...showed a desire by students to take some kind of action against the university, but not necessarily to boycott” (The Daily Kent Stater, April 24, 1969, p. 1). It was also estimated that at the time of the deadline for the newspaper, nine thousand ballots had been cast by the students, faculty, and staff. When the final totals came in, the results were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Sociology and Anthropology</th>
<th>Kent State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 24, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: All Staff, Graduate Assistants, Etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: Gene Wenninger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: Yesterday’s Referendum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results- 8,615 ballots cast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Issue #1 | Students 2,892 (Yes) | 4671 (No) | 112 (Invalid) |
|          | Faculty 102 (Yes)    | 283 (No)  | 7 (Invalid)   |
|          | Other 105 (Yes)      | 97 (No)   | 5 (Invalid)   |
| Issue #2 | Students 2874 (Yes)  | 5096 (No) | 166           |
|          | Faculty 116 (Yes)    | 377 (No)  | 11 (Invalid)  |
|          | Other 105 (Yes)      | 104 (No)  | 7 (Invalid)   |
After the election was finalized, it was totaled that 45.7% of the Kent State student body, faculty, and other turned out to vote for the referendum. The large percentage of student turnout was the largest the university had ever seen, and showed that the students, faculty, and other were paying attention to the developing situations. The four issues plus the actions were voted on, and except for the last issue, disapproved. A large majority of the voters showed an anti-SDS sentiment, as the issues with the SDS were voted down by large percentages.

The first issue on the referendum was that “the administration should drop the suspensions of the students involved in the incident at the Music and Speech building, April 16” (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 46). The final count was three thousand one hundred approved, and five thousand five hundred and fifty one disapproved (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 46).
occurred after the disrupted hearings. "The administration should utilize its influences to attempt to have criminal charges against these students involved in the incident at the Music and Speech building dropped" (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 46). The final count for the second issue was an overwhelming five thousand five hundred and seventy-seven disapproved while three thousand and ninety-four approved (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 46).

The third issue was voted down by five thousand two hundred and ten to reinstate the charter for the Kent SDS, while three thousand two hundred and thirty-two approved the measure. The last issue, the only issue that was to pass called for the university to use the Student Conduct Code of November, 1968, and that it "be applied in all cases" (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 46). This measure was voted on by five thousand three hundred and forty while two thousand eight hundred and thirty-three disagreed.

For the actions to be taken by faculty and students, the only recommendation that was taken was to do nothing. A large majority voted this on over the four day, non-violent boycott of classes with the teach-ins, the teach-ins only, and the write in (May 4th Collection, Kent State Archives, Jerry Lewis, papers, box 19, folder 46). The voting members in the referendum wanted the Student Conduct Code to be used that was in effect in 1968, but decided on doing nothing for further action against the university and their
handling of the SDS throughout the month of April. While the referendum was a great success for the 3-C in bringing awareness to the student body and faculty of the mistakes made by the university, the decision by the students to not take action hindered the further success. The 3-C brought attention to the lack of due process granted to the Kent SDS, and brought all types of students together for a common cause. While the success of the referendum was limited to only the amount of people voting, the organization became successful in the awareness that was brought to the students.
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