American Aggression over National Apathy and Ambivalence

Martin Spitzbergen
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Martin Spitzbergen

American Aggression over National Apathy and Ambivalence

Introduction

> Students are restless because they have a feeling of 'powerlessness' in communicating with educational and governmental officials.[1]

> The authorities are inhuman. They show so much force when dealing with this kind of thing that they end up provoking what they're trying to avoid.[2]

> The 6:00 news one night had a report on one of the killings at Kent State. As the reporter mentioned the fact that some of the dead students were just going to class one of the men [guardsmen] referred to the dead girl as a 'fucking whore who deserved to be killed.[3]

The aforementioned quotes published in a 1970's issue of the *Southern Illinoisan* newspaper captured the voices of Southern Illinois University (henceforth SIU) students during a hearing that brought together the university's administration and officials in the Illinois House of Representatives. The first couple of statements illustrate the level of hopelessness and fear felt by student activists in the 1960s and 1970s, fear that possibly fueled the revolts on campus. The last statement, part of the archival records of the Illinois chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union, illuminates the egregious amount of contempt held by some in the 1970s National Guard. While emphasizing the hate against the murdered young woman in the tragedy at Kent State, the statement provides a picture of the deep divide in American society during the Vietnam War era.

---

1   Morris Library Special Collections. Southern Illinois University Carbondale; Carbondale, IL. "C. Thomas Busch Papers" [herein, MLSC-SIUC-CTBP]: Box 3, Student Activism Folder, 1970.

2   Ibid.

3   MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 3, National Guardsmen Statements, May,1970.

These accounts form the basis of the argument made throughout this paper. The bedlam that reigned across multiple American universities in the United States in the 60s and 70s, including on the SIU campus in Carbondale, Illinois, led Americans into contentious anti-establishment or establishment conservative factions. Although some were caught in the middle, most Americans were driven into introspection and the political arena between ambivalence and apathy. First time and seasoned participants found themselves at an ambiguous moral crossroads between a rock (American youth) and a hard place (status quo). Multiple accounts of overreaching by American institutions of authority created a 'vacuum' for influential groups of Americans to fall into the subaltern class (voiceless or powerless people), made up of the college-aged American population in the context of constitutional and human rights. Paradoxically, it was the same subaltern class that held power to grant authority to those institutions.

In the 60s and 70s, rapid social change created an opportunity for the United States (henceforth U.S.) government's dominant authoritarian institutions to divide the subaltern class by utilizing the already established conservative and progressives leaning groups. American conservatism at this time was harsh and morally absolutist in its politics, yet their resolve was driven by their insecurity and resentment out of fear of losing their privileged status among Americans.[4] Unknown to conservatives, this fear provided the hierarchy of government and social authority (the dominant class) with a means to exploit them. Contrarily, progressives promoted socialistic ideals such as the exclusion of privilege among social classes, the expansion of democracy through government intervention such as economic subsidies of welfare, in-turn benefiting the economically weak and disenfranchised in society.[5] The American Vietnam War events set the stage for a revolt of, and susceptibility to, the status quo set by the American dominant class.

Italian theoretician and politician Antonio Gramsci developed an idea he coined hegemony (one class controlling the another) while imprisoned by the fascist dictator Benito Mussolini in 1926.[6] He explained this term by first describing its structure. The leadership of the dominant class of society utilizes cultural, moral, and ideological means to coincide with the economic determination of their historical materialism.[7] Gramsci added that ironically, in order for a dominant power to become hegemonic, they first necessitated

---

4   Kim Phillips-Fein, "Conservatism: A State of the Field," (Oxford, Journal of American History, 2011), 725.

5   Peter G. Filene, "An Obituary for The Progressive Movement," (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), 27.

6   James Lull, Hegemony (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 34.

7   Ibid, 33.

academic intellectuals such as himself to construct their complex status quo. Intellectuals constructed these systems in such a way as to benefit the dominant class. Additionally, intellectuals forced the subaltern class to believe that the status quo was constructed for their benefit.[8] In layman's terms, a wealthy dominant class rules by using its economic means to force specific cultural factors, morals, and ideologies onto an entire society through society's available, ideological- producing mediums (tv, newspaper, magazines, religion, political party, schools).

In the turbulent period between the late 1960s and early 70s, American pro-war conservative politicians and their intermediary agencies employed populist language to de-emphasize the differences between themselves and the American conservative. The divide between pro-war conservatives and the anti-Vietnam war, anti-establishment progressives, was cemented. Unfortunately for progressives, the ruling American conservative leadership subjugated their voters into obedient submission, making American democracy a theocratic, authoritarian, hegemonic power.

In the 60s and 70s, SIU students recognized their local society's plot and enthusiastically resisted. Regrettably, those students who did not receive the right to vote until later in 1971 once the Twenty-sixth Amendment passed, their concerns regarding the war and society never materialized. Forced, often violently, into a subaltern position, SIUC students fought against an overwhelming system that left them no real control over their constitutional rights of liberty, freedom, and the pursuit of happiness. When American leadership chose not to heed the incensed student pleas, Salukis used radically anarchistic means to make their voices heard.

Where is the line?

During the 1960s and early 1970s in America, college campuses erupted in protest against the war in Indochina, and SIU student activists sought ways to maintain their resolve. Saluki students were not only concerned with the illegal invasion of Cambodia and Vietnam, but their peers' lives, police brutality, inequality of race and gender, military conscription, College administrators, and national and local government administrations also played a central role in their protests.[9] Among a large and growing student population, the U.S. government in the 60s and 70s mirrored an oligarchy rather than a democracy, as they dismissed any anti-war grievances as youthful angst. In turn, university students stood steadfastly in bearing the brunt of oppressive tactics from the oligarchic system. Provided with the

---

8   Ibid.
9   Robbie Liberman, Prairie Power: Voices of the 1960s Midwestern Student Protest (Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, INC, 2010), 5-25

before-mentioned social ills, SIU students rightly considered themselves oppressed. The dominant American conservative rule chose to silence the loud and incensed pleas of the student movements by instead opting to increase troops sent to Vietnam and instituted an increase in the U.S. military draft lottery.[10]

Scholars have primarily only focused on arson accounts, intense demonstrations, and the non-adherence of the locally mandated curfew on the SIU campus in the late 1960s and early 70s.[11] They mention taking over campus buildings and the destructive demonstrations in university and city streets. However, those scholars failed to consider the validity of students' motives for adhering to such actions or what they hoped to achieve. A malicious light has been cast overwriting in favor of SIUC students' tactics, as destructive methods are discouraged.

Fortunately for this paper, the student movement at SIU during this period served as a particular writer's and researcher's material, as it was derived from American student movements and social protesting.[12] Others chronologized the SIUC student movement through the lens of peaceful and legal methods employed by many in the movement.[13] In the field of Peace and Conflict studies, examples of failing peaceful methods and how, and at what level did they turn violent should be added to the chronology of events. Combining these specific research fields and writings allows the historian to further expand the American student movements' historiography of the 60s and 70s. Additionally, the strengthening resolve amongst the SIU students, made possible by their deep-seated-anger dissatisfaction, and distrust with the status quo, disturbed America's conservative population. Conservatives made this evident by their destructive name-calling of the demonstrating youth, with terms such as hippie, yippie, trouble-makers, and protesters. Yet, students collectively adorned those musings and used them as fuel for their self-determination and motivation behind their struggle.

David P. Barash and Charles Webel argued that root causes of the clash between American conservativism and the progressive student movement could be summarized by examining and proposing theoretical models explaining violent and nonviolent individual and collective behaviors, both

---

10   Andrew West, Rolling Thunder in a Gentle Land: The Vietnam War Revisited (London: Bloomsbury Publishing,2013), 17-21.

11   Allan Keith, Turbulent Times (Illinois: Allan H. Keith, 2002), 1-11.

12   Robbie Lieberman, David Cochran, We Closed Down The Damn School: The Party Culture and Student Protest at Southern Illinois University During the Vietnam War Era (Illinois, Peace & Change), 316-331.

13   Allan Keith, "Turbulent Times" (Illinois: Allan H. Keith, 2002), 1-9.

historically and cross-culturally.[14] Barash and Webel asserted that the idea of social injustice and political autocracy were the main forces influencing structural violence. These scholars noted that although the United States began with a war of independence from a monarchy (with human rights being a central focal point), yet during the 20th and 21st century it became an antirevolutionary force and status quo power, reinforcing the argument drawn out by this paper.

The clash at SIUC, between conservatism and the progressive student movement, can be understood by looking at it through a Thoreau/ Marxist style lens. The introduction of this essay illustrated the fears and hopeless feelings felt by the students at SIU. Hopeless and scared, students reverted to what Thoreau coined as *Civil Disobedience*.[15] Written during the period of American slavery, Thoreau makes the case that when the law of man and government are at odds with one another, the individual must follow his or her conscience and, if necessary, disregard human law.[16] Rioting certainly fits this narrative. The cultural contradictions of capitalism noted in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels's *Communist Manifesto*, and Antonio Gramsci's theories regarding immeasurable power held in society's social structure helped form a visual of the real inequality and helplessness represented in the struggle behind the student movement. Conscription emerged as the antithesis of this theory. Angry, scared, and hopeless, students were imposed upon by the American government's immeasurable power and the general status quo formed by the dominant class. Gramsci's theories coincided with the SIU student demonstration conflicts and his ideas regarding dominating social factors. In a split from traditional Marxist theory, Gramsci contended that economic factors were no longer the determining factors in constructing social class in the twentieth century. Indeed, "ideological influence is crucial now in the exercise of social power," pushing Marx and Engels's theories further into ideology.[17]

Gramsci's theories also stressed society's "ideology-producing institutions, in struggles over meaning and power."[18] Adhering to Gramsci's notions of mass amounts of power held by ideological-producing institutions and their immense influence on culture quotes from a young Guardsman disparaging his recently deceased peer serve better to understand the status's weight quo of the era. With the far-reaching ability of the dominant, conservative administration, and its influence on culture through the medium

14 David P. Barash, Charles P. Webel, Structural and Cultural Violence in *Peace and Conflict Studies* 4th Edition, (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing, 2014).

15 Henry David Thoreau, *Civil Disobedience*. (New York: Signet Classics, 1980).

16 Ibid.

17 James Lull, *Hegemony*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 33.

18 Ibid.

of mass media, hateful rhetoric like that became prevalent throughout society, pervading schools, religious organization, politics, and pop culture. Disparaging this Guardsman solely on his disgusting language neglects the root cause as to why he felt that way, to begin with, or why he was so comfortable using that language. Lull interprets critical theorist Stuart Hall's definition of hegemony by first making it clear that hegemony:

> is not a *direct* stimulation of thought or action, but, according to Stuart Hall, is a 'framing [of] all competing definitions of reality within [the dominant class's] range bringing all alternatives within their horizons of thought. [The dominant class] sets the limits-mental and structural-within which subordinate classes 'live' and make sense of their subordination in such a way as to sustain the dominance of those ruling over them.[19]

Lull adds hegemony "implies a willing agreement by people to be governed by principles, rules, and laws they believe operate in their best interest, even though in actual practice, they may not."[20] Making clear the real connection between the status quo, conscription, and student activism at SIU.

In SIUC's Days of Dissent: A Memoir of Student Protest, Allan H. Keith explained the student movement at SIUC in 1970 through the multitudes of peaceful tactics used by the students who were attempting to avoid violent conflict while voicing their concerns.[21] Amid the explosive movement that was occurring, students under the age of twenty-one did not have the right to vote. Therefore, voting their way out of the war was impossible until President Nixon signed a bill mandating voting rights down to eighteen, later in June 1970.[22] Illustrated in their book, *"We Closed Down The Damn School": The Party Culture and Student Protest at Southern Illinois university During the Vietnam War Era*, Robbie Lieberman and David Cochran collaborated, Keith, Barash, and Weber's argument that suggests righteousness in the SIU student movement noting that lawfully abiding students continued to pursue peaceful means through the legislature to reconcile the American dichotomy. The student's protests and subsequent riots stemmed from a mixture of groups like the student party culture, student rights movement, and the student New Left.[23]

---

19 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
21 Allan Keith, Turbulent Times, (Illinois: Allan H. Keith, 2002), 5-7.
22 David E. Engdahl, Constitutionality of the Voting Age Statute, (George Washington Law Review, 1970), http://heinonline.org.
23 Robbie Lieberman, David Cochran, We Closed Down The Damn School: The Party Culture and Student Protest at Southern Illinois university During the Vietnam War Era. (Illinois, Peace and Change), 316-331.

of mass media, hateful rhetoric like that became prevalent throughout society, pervading schools, religious organization, politics, and pop culture. Disparaging this Guardsman solely on his disgusting language neglects the root cause as to why he felt that way, to begin with, or why he was so comfortable using that language. Lull interprets critical theorist Stuart Hall's definition of hegemony by first making it clear that hegemony:

> is not a *direct* stimulation of thought or action, but, according to Stuart Hall, is a 'framing [of] all competing definitions of reality within [the dominant class's] range bringing all alternatives within their horizons of thought. [The dominant class] sets the limits-mental and structural-within which subordinate classes 'live' and make sense of their subordination in such a way as to sustain the dominance of those ruling over them.[19]

Lull adds hegemony "implies a willing agreement by people to be governed by principles, rules, and laws they believe operate in their best interest, even though in actual practice, they may not."[20] Making clear the real connection between the status quo, conscription, and student activism at SIU.

In SIUC's Days of Dissent: A Memoir of Student Protest, Allan H. Keith explained the student movement at SIUC in 1970 through the multitudes of peaceful tactics used by the students who were attempting to avoid violent conflict while voicing their concerns.[21] Amid the explosive movement that was occurring, students under the age of twenty-one did not have the right to vote. Therefore, voting their way out of the war was impossible until President Nixon signed a bill mandating voting rights down to eighteen, later in June 1970.[22] Illustrated in their book, *"We Closed Down The Damn School": The Party Culture and Student Protest at Southern Illinois university During the Vietnam War Era*, Robbie Lieberman and David Cochran collaborated, Keith, Barash, and Weber's argument that suggests righteousness in the SIU student movement noting that lawfully abiding students continued to pursue peaceful means through the legislature to reconcile the American dichotomy. The student's protests and subsequent riots stemmed from a mixture of groups like the student party culture, student rights movement, and the student New Left.[23]

---

19   Ibid.

20   Ibid.

21   Allan Keith, Turbulent Times, (Illinois: Allan H. Keith, 2002), 5-7.

22   David E. Engdahl, Constitutionality of the Voting Age Statute, (George Washington Law Review, 1970), http://heinonline.org.

23   Robbie Lieberman, David Cochran, We Closed Down The Damn School: The Party Culture and Student Protest at Southern Illinois university During the Vietnam War Era. (Illinois, Peace and Change), 316-331.

Those three groups converged into one when SIU announced the construction of a controversial Vietnamese Studies Center in July of 1969.[24] Students understood the center's construction by the University administration to follow a path of complicity with the war and the conservative status quo of their country.[25] In her book, *Prairie Power*, Robbie Lieberman analyzed the 1960's and 1970's midwestern student movements as a reaction to an amalgam of war, civil rights, and the disease of affluence suggested by the lifestyles of their parents. She noted that the student movements for social change began with a nonviolent methodology and a deep belief in young people's potential to change the world. Conversely, Lieberman argued that from 1965 on, the movement took a turn towards more expressive anarchistic tactical demonstrating methods.[26] 1965 was a turning point in the Vietnam War when President Lyndon B. Johnson escalated the conflict with operation Rolling Thunder, increasing the number of combat troops (82,000) sent to Vietnam.[27] The increase in deployed combat troops and the demonstrating students at SIU suggests a link between the anarchistic means of demonstrating described by Lieberman and the institution of Operation Rolling Thunder. It served to support Barash and Webel's argument that political autocracy operates as a force influencing structural violence.

When the autocratic system of governments, police, local merchants, and university administrators saw these student movements, they viewed only the damage caused by the movement, neglecting the reasons or the damage to the youth. American leadership's reaction was to end student demonstration by using the National Guard, disparaging remarks against anti-war demonstrations, and pockets of heavy police presence. To match the verbosity of the government's and university administrator's reactions, students grew more violent and more reactive. Numerous accounts of promoting vigilante justice, condescending rhetoric from those in leadership, and horrid police brutality, culminated in the largest and most destructive demonstrations at SIU in May of 1970 coined, "Seven Days in May."[28] H.B. Koplowitz, a former resident of Carbondale during the 1960s and 70s, explained the chronology of events during those chaotic seven days that resulted in over $100,000 in damages to the campus and the city of Carbondale[29]. Reactive violence from

---

24 H.B. Koplowitz, "Seven Days in May," in Carbondale After Dark, (Carbondale: Dome Publications, 1982), 52-63.

25 Robbie Liberman, Prairie Power: Voices of the 1960s Midwestern Student Protest (Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, INC., 2010) 5-23.

26 Ibid, 3-11.

27 Andrew West, Rolling Thunder in a Gentle Land: The Vietnam War Revisited (London: Bloomsbury Publishing.2013), 17.

28 H.B. Koplowitz, "Seven Days in May," in Carbondale After Dark, (Carbondale: Dome Publications, 1982), 52.

29 Ibid, 58.

local merchants, police/ national guard brutality, and dismissive rhetoric from university administrators and local/national government sparked the violent and destructive tactics associated with the Carbondale riot. Unified SIU students from several social groups concluded that the government's laws were antithetical to the laws of men, and rioting became their voice.

There Must Be Some Kind of Way Outta Here, Said the Joker to the Thief[30]

Before 1972, the military draft (henceforth the draft) was a requirement for all males between 18-25.[31] The draft enlisted college-age young men under a law created by lawmakers who self-excluded themselves from those requirements.[32] Although the draft has waned over the years, all young men's requirement to register in the U.S. remains today as they must register for selective service when they reach the age of eighteen. The fear students felt in the 1960s and 70s of getting killed in war before their late twenties was real. Given that enlistment into the draft is still a requirement, the possibility of a reinstated draft is still a viable possibility.

The *True Republican*, a daily from Sycamore, IL, published an article profiling a young male senior at Northern Illinois University. The article detailed his experience with the draft, upon conscription, to fight in a war that he did not understand.[33] The article described the young man as not afraid of weapons, nor was he afraid to fight if someone were to "call his bluff."[34] His response was to convey that he did not subscribe to the "hippie" ideology encompassing many universities of this period. He even suggested that he probably would have enlisted into service during the two World Wars had he been old enough, thus furthering himself from the hippie stereotype.[35] However, one reason for his disdain against the draft was because he did not want to waste the degree he had worked hard for, nor did he believe in the war's cause. He saw the draft as a waste of the $14,000 of tuition he already paid, a wasted education, and a possibility of dying at a young age.[36] He did his best to legally avoid the draft by writing letters to the draft board, pleading his case. He sought draft advice counseling from his university draft advisory team.[37] Finally, he noted that after the next two semesters, he was to be employed by a state hospital using

30   Bob Dylan, "All Along the Watchtower," track 4, (side 1) on John Wesley Harding, Columbia, 1967, vinyl.

31   Martin Anderson and Barbara Honegger, The Military Draft: Selected Readings on Conscription. (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1982), 6-18.

32   Ibid.

33   MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 1, Student Activism and the draft, 1970.

34   Ibid.

35   Ibid.

36   Ibid.

37   Ibid.

local merchants, police/ national guard brutality, and dismissive rhetoric from university administrators and local/national government sparked the violent and destructive tactics associated with the Carbondale riot. Unified SIU students from several social groups concluded that the government's laws were antithetical to the laws of men, and rioting became their voice.

There Must Be Some Kind of Way Outta Here, Said the Joker to the Thief[30]

Before 1972, the military draft (henceforth the draft) was a requirement for all males between 18-25.[31] The draft enlisted college-age young men under a law created by lawmakers who self-excluded themselves from those requirements.[32] Although the draft has waned over the years, all young men's requirement to register in the U.S. remains today as they must register for selective service when they reach the age of eighteen. The fear students felt in the 1960s and 70s of getting killed in war before their late twenties was real. Given that enlistment into the draft is still a requirement, the possibility of a reinstated draft is still a viable possibility.

The *True Republican*, a daily from Sycamore, IL, published an article profiling a young male senior at Northern Illinois University. The article detailed his experience with the draft, upon conscription, to fight in a war that he did not understand.[33] The article described the young man as not afraid of weapons, nor was he afraid to fight if someone were to "call his bluff."[34] His response was to convey that he did not subscribe to the "hippie" ideology encompassing many universities of this period. He even suggested that he probably would have enlisted into service during the two World Wars had he been old enough, thus furthering himself from the hippie stereotype.[35] However, one reason for his disdain against the draft was because he did not want to waste the degree he had worked hard for, nor did he believe in the war's cause. He saw the draft as a waste of the $14,000 of tuition he already paid, a wasted education, and a possibility of dying at a young age.[36] He did his best to legally avoid the draft by writing letters to the draft board, pleading his case. He sought draft advice counseling from his university draft advisory team.[37] Finally, he noted that after the next two semesters, he was to be employed by a state hospital using

---

30 Bob Dylan, "All Along the Watchtower," track 4, (side 1) on John Wesley Harding, Columbia, 1967, vinyl.

31 Martin Anderson and Barbara Honegger, The Military Draft: Selected Readings on Conscription. (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1982), 6-18.

32 Ibid.

33 MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 1, Student Activism and the draft, 1970.

34 Ibid.

35 Ibid.

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.

his psychology degree. As a result of such employment, he could receive the benefit of being exempt from the draft by law.[38]

To distance himself further from the "hippie" stereotype, the senior proclaimed that he was "not a hippie who thinks everything is wrong and everything should be changed."[39] When asked about evading the draft by leaving the country, he answered by saying if "someone isn't satisfied with the federal administration or social system, they should act to change it rather than leaving it.[40] This quote highlights this young man's contrasting ideas about those battling the system that instituted the draft and his desire to avoid the draft. The amalgam of theories provided in this paper's literature review suggests that this young man's morals and ideals were influenced by the hegemonic class's superstructure stimulus on the status quo. The irony in this young man's situation is a powerful example of those theories. Unfortunately, the overwhelming cowardly stigma imposed on those who did not wish to go to Vietnam was inevitable. This carefully constructed status quo prevented the senior from joining the demonstrating students.

Following President Kennedy's assassination in 1963, Lyndon Johnson soon took office and passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1964.[41] The resolution authorized the U.S. military to take action in Southeast Asia to bolster the global fight the United States waged against communism. After President Johnson left office, President Nixon came into office and escalated U.S. military presence in Vietnam. By citing the 2nd amendment of the United States Constitution, President Nixon gained the legal authority to head all military actions in Vietnam, bypassing a formal declaration of war from congress.[42] Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon's involvement in the Southeast Asian conflict justified their circumvention of international law that forbidding the invasion of a foreign land as a means to combat communism. The conservative faction of American society in the 1970s embraced the presidential administration's actions in the fight against communism in Indochina. The mass media subsequently fed into the conservative population's deep-seated "save the world from communism" attitude.[43]

In 1970, during President Nixon's first term in office, the SIU campus mirrored larger national patterns regarding anti-war demonstrations,

---

38   Ibid.

39   Ibid.

40   Ibid.

41   Andrew West, Rolling Thunder in a Gentle Land: The Vietnam War Revisited (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013), 137-203.

42   David Alan Bloom. The Closing of the American Mind. (New York: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks, 1987), 1-22.

43   Nicole Hemmer, Messengers of the Right: Conservative Media and the Transformation of American Politics. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), x-xvi.

his psychology degree. As a result of such employment, he could receive the benefit of being exempt from the draft by law.[38]

To distance himself further from the "hippie" stereotype, the senior proclaimed that he was "not a hippie who thinks everything is wrong and everything should be changed."[39] When asked about evading the draft by leaving the country, he answered by saying if "someone isn't satisfied with the federal administration or social system, they should act to change it rather than leaving it.[40] This quote highlights this young man's contrasting ideas about those battling the system that instituted the draft and his desire to avoid the draft. The amalgam of theories provided in this paper's literature review suggests that this young man's morals and ideals were influenced by the hegemonic class's superstructure stimulus on the status quo. The irony in this young man's situation is a powerful example of those theories. Unfortunately, the overwhelming cowardly stigma imposed on those who did not wish to go to Vietnam was inevitable. This carefully constructed status quo prevented the senior from joining the demonstrating students.

Following President Kennedy's assassination in 1963, Lyndon Johnson soon took office and passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1964.[41] The resolution authorized the U.S. military to take action in Southeast Asia to bolster the global fight the United States waged against communism. After President Johnson left office, President Nixon came into office and escalated U.S. military presence in Vietnam. By citing the 2nd amendment of the United States Constitution, President Nixon gained the legal authority to head all military actions in Vietnam, bypassing a formal declaration of war from congress.[42] Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon's involvement in the Southeast Asian conflict justified their circumvention of international law that forbidding the invasion of a foreign land as a means to combat communism. The conservative faction of American society in the 1970s embraced the presidential administration's actions in the fight against communism in Indochina. The mass media subsequently fed into the conservative population's deep-seated "save the world from communism" attitude.[43]

In 1970, during President Nixon's first term in office, the SIU campus mirrored larger national patterns regarding anti-war demonstrations,

---

38 Ibid.

39 Ibid.

40 Ibid.

41 Andrew West, Rolling Thunder in a Gentle Land: The Vietnam War Revisited (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013), 137-203.

42 David Alan Bloom. The Closing of the American Mind. (New York: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks, 1987), 1-22.

43 Nicole Hemmer, Messengers of the Right: Conservative Media and the Transformation of American Politics. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), x-xvi.

struggles for racial and gender equality, and struggles of oppression brought on by autocracy.[44] Adding to their feelings of oppression, SIU's system of *in loco parentis* put the student's parents' role into university administrators' hands.[45]Adding to the local growing student unrest on campus was the construction of the Vietnamese Studies Center. Students viewed its construction as a symbol of university administrators' complicity in the Vietnam War.[46] On May 6, 1970, in a Chicago Daily News issue, one SIU student stated that "student violence stems from those that represent the ills of the nation."[47] Adding, "campus unrest will not cease until the issues of expansion into the Vietnam War into Cambodia, racism, and the urban crisis of water and air pollution is resolved."[48] These quotes clarify that the student activists were no longer content playing a minor role in society and intended to change it using whatever means necessary to accomplish the goals noted in the quotes.

Nationally, the clash between conservatism and the "radical" youth, particularly in American universities, climaxed at Kent State University in 1970. The Mayor of Kent called upon the Ohio National Guard to stifle the anti-war demonstrations occurring on campus.[49] First, guardsmen hurled tear gas canisters at demonstrating students and onlookers alike, injuring several of them. When the confusion in the Guardsmen ranks rattled their defensive nerves, shots were fired, killing four university students. It was only after this tragedy that Americans began noticing what young people were up against. Rhoten A. Smith, President of Northern Illinois University Student Association, recalled this tragedy in an interview in the *Chicago Daily News*. He noted that "When [he] took over as President, the student body opposed participation in antiwar demonstrations."[50] Also, he mentioned that "immediately following both the Cambodian adventure and the tragedy at Kent State, the student senate voted to abolish the ROTC on campus."[51] He concluded his interview with a call to lower the voting age from 21 to 18 to give the voiceless students a means to control their lives.

Through the conventional political route, SIUC students appealed to the Illinois House of Representatives, pleading that the $25,000 destruction to university and local storefronts came from "a small minority of radicals, many

---

44   MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 1, Student Activism Folder, 1970.

45   Lieberman, Prairie Power ,(Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 2004), 1.

46   MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 1, Vietnamese Studies folder, 1969.

47   MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 1, Student Activism: Campus Unrest, 1970.

48   Ibid.

49   MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 1, Kent State, 1970.

50   MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 1, Student Activism News Clippings: Campus Unrest, 1970.

51   Ibid.

non-students."[52] Overshadowing that destruction were multiple accounts of police brutality that encompassed an alarming amount of times, gassing agents were used on students, assaults on students by officers refusing to provide any I.D., and a plethora of recorded arrests for unlawful assembly. All of these were provided to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) Illinois chapter and produced an image closely resembling that of George Orwell's novel, *1984*.[53] In response to those violently oppressive measures, SIUC students took over university buildings, started fires, knocked over trash cans, gathered *en masse* to demonstrate, and local storefronts were vandalized. It is not to generalize or play down the destructive nature of the SIUC student unrest, but it is undoubtedly read as the lesser of the two evils.

Dr. Donald S. Detwiler, an SIU professor and a voice of reason during this period, authored an article in the *Southern Illinoisan,* titled "What is the Meaning of the Mounting Tide of Civic Disobedience and Disorder,"[54] describing the level of disharmony in America as "growing pains," adding:

> Our nation has entered an agonizing period of testing in which we face the unprecedented challenge of institutionalizing the human dignity of a racial caste of former slaves. There is an extraordinary commitment, both public and private, to saving America by realizing its ideals. There is no other way. How can he (Nixon) expect the young people of America to obey the law and respect the existing order when he himself disregards international law and ignores the Constitution by ordering United States armed forces to invade a foreign country without a congressional declaration of war or even consultation of the Senate.[55]

In an attempt to persuade the student movement on campus, Dr. Detwiler concluded his article by writing that, "no matter how lustily the youth of America cry 'power to the people,' they are the minority who cannot succeed with violent confrontational tactics."[56] However, as the student's peers were being gunned down in anti-war demonstrations, drafted into an unlawful and unpopular war, and with every peaceful means to stop it exhausted, a violent confrontation was their last resort.

The SIU Vietnam riots' story cannot be told entirely without explaining the controversies surrounding one of the catalysts that sparked those seven days in May. The new Center for Vietnamese Studies planned at SIU drove

---

52 Ibid.
53 MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 2, ACLU Records Folder, 1969-70.
54 MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 1, Town of Carbondale Reactions to Riots, 1970.
55 Ibid.
56 Ibid.

students to question the administration, residents, and government's morals and complicity. They also began to question the center's purpose; those questions turned into conspiracy theories.[57] Indeed, the grant proposal awarded to SIU in 1969 for planning and constructing the Center for Vietnamese Studies was available for public scrutiny. At first glance, it was easy to comprehend why students questioned the center's purpose. The grant was to be spread out over five years to expound on and provide new research on Vietnamese social, economic, and educational issues in that underdeveloped country. Irregularities throughout the contract required further investigation. For instance, the grant required consultation with "other U.S. universities, AID (Agency of International Development), other U.S. federal agencies, and international and regional agencies."[58] To avoid foul play, questions on the university's consultations items appeared in the grant summary only as "for the purpose of providing for post-war development of the country." Nevertheless, there was no end date for the war, and the U.S. federal government typically demands a return on $1,000,000 investments. Another example of irregularities in the grant's language were the copies of the grant's documents labeled with the warnings of "Secret", "Confidential", and "Top Secret."[59] Traditional federal grants did not require these kinds of labels.

Conclusion

By acknowledging the destruction caused by the student anti-war movement at SIUC, an acknowledgment of social theories and catalysts to the student movement's destruction of property must study. The period between 1965 and 1975 marked a death toll rate of U.S. combat troops in Vietnam at 1,000 casualties a month, totaling 58,220 by wars end.[60] Not by coincidence, this enraged most social groups in the American youth. Despite the staggering death toll, the pro-war superstructure in society had little room for student complaints, noting that the young Americans were too naïve to understand or that they should perform their American duty and complain afterward. The construction of the Center for Vietnamese Studies served to heighten the level of distrust students had for authority while providing students with a stage to enthusiastically force national acknowledgment of their dissatisfaction with the constructed status quo. These events at SIUC demonstrated a need for further research regarding the attitudes that drive student movements on college campuses. Currently,

---

57   MLSC-SIUC-CTBP: Box 1, Vietnamese Studies, 1969.

58   Ibid.

59   Ibid.

60   Andrew West, Rolling Thunder in a Gentle Land: The Vietnam War Revisited (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013), 137-203.

research on student anti-war protests is narrow because it focuses on the extensiveness of the events leading up to, during that period, and their outcomes. Future research should concentrate on motives for destructive student demonstrations rather than focusing on the demonstrations themselves' chronological events.

Work Cited:

Ahlstrom, S. E. (1980). The Traumatic Years: American Religion and Culture in the '60s and '70s. *Theology Today*, 504-522.

Anderson, M. (1982). *The Military Draft.* Ann Arbor: Hoover Inst Press.

B, G. W. (1974, November). The Carbondale Disease. *Change*, pp. 11-14.

Beresford, B. (Director). (1991). *Black Robe* [Motion Picture].

Bloom, A. (1987). *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students.* New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.

Busch, T. (1970). *Biographical sketch of Robert MacVicar.* personal, Carbondale.

Carlson, C. (1968, November 8). Profile of a young man, worrying about the draft. *True Republican*, p. 4.

Clardy, B. K. (2002). *The Management of Dissent: Response to the Post Kent State Protest at Seven Public Universities in Illinois.* Lanham: University Press of America.

Cochran, R. L. (2001, July 26). "We Closed Down the Damn School": The Party Culture and Student Protest at Southern Illinois University During the Vietnam War Era. *Peace & Change*, pp. 316-331.

David P. Barash, C. P. (2014). *Peace & Conflict Studies: 4th Edition.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Detwiler, D. S. (1970, May 12). "If I Flunk Out, Its All Over". *Southern Illinoisan*, pp. 1-2.

Dunn, T. A. (2010). The movement and the Sixties: Protest in America from Greensboro to Wounded Knee. *History Journal*, 15.

Dylan, Bob, "All Along the Watchtower." Recorded on November 6, 1967. Track 4, (side 1) on *John Wesley Harding*, Columbia Records, 1967, vinyl.

Edgar F. Raines, J. (n.d.). The Klu Klux Klan in Illinois, 1867-1875. *Illinois Historical Journal*, Vol. 78, No. 1, 17-44.

Emery, E. (1972). The Press and America: An Interpretative History of the Mass Media. *ERIC*, 1-788.

Engdahl, D. E. (1970). *Constitutionality of the Voting Age Statute.* DC: George Washington Law Review.

Gray, C. K. (1970). *Gray Calls for Fact-Finding Tour of Southeast Asia.* D.C.: House of Representatives of US Congress.

Harper, R. A. (1998). *The University That Shouldn't Have Happened But Did!: Southern Illinois University During the Morris Years, 1948-1970.* Carbondale : Devil's Kitchen Press.

Hemmer, N. (2016). *Messengers of the Right: Conservative media and the Transformation of American Politics.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jensen, D. H. (2009). Social Movement Criticism and the Renaissance of Public Address. *Taylor & Francis*, 83-93.

Keith, A. (2002). *Turbulent Times.* Illinois: Allan H. Keith.

Koplowitz, H. (1982). *Carbondale After Dark.* Carbondale: Dome Publications.

Liberman, R. (2010). *Prairie Power: Voices of the 1960 Midwestern Student Protest.* Charlotte: Information Age Puplishing, INC.

Lucaites, R. H. (2001). Dissent and Emotional Management in a Liberal-Democratic Society: The Kent State Iconic Photograph . *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 4-31.

Lull, J. (1995). *Hegemony.* New York: Columbia Press.

Lull, J. (1995). *Hegemony.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Margo, W. J. (2007). The Economic Aftermath of the 1960s Riots in American Cities: Evidence from Property Values. *Cambridge University Press*, 849-843.

Martin Anderson, C. b. (1976). *Conscription: A Select and Annotated Bibliography.* Stanford: The Hoover Institution Press.

Morris, D. (1970). President of university to Shutdown Campus. *Chicago Daily News Newspaper*, p. 1st page.

Pinto, E. (1970). Society to Blame for Student Unrest. *Chicago Daily News Newspaper*, p. 2nd page.

Poats, R. M. (1969). *Final Proposal for AID Institutional Grant Support.* Washington D.C.: Department of State Agencyfor International Development.

Robbie Lieberman, D. C. (2001). "We Closed Down The Damn School": The Party Culture and Student Protest at Southern Illinois University During the Vietnam War Era. *Peace and Change, Vol. 26, No. 3*, 11.

Robert W Strayer, E. W. (2016). *Ways of the World: A brief global History.* Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Smith, R. A. (1970). Society to Blame Fro Student Unrest. *Southern Illinoisan*, p. 3.

Thoreau, H. D. (1980). *Civil Disobedience.* New York: Signet Classics.

Tragesser, C. (1970). Society is to Blame for Student Unrest. *Chicago Daily News Newspaper*, p. 2nd page.

Webel, D. P. (2014). *Structural and Cultural Violence.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing.

West, A. (2013). *Rolling Thunder in a Gentle Land: The Vietnam War Revisited.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

William L. Barney, w. T. (2001). *Blackwell Compassions To American History: A Companion To 19th-Century America.* Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Williams, R. H. (1983). *Cultural Wars In American Politics.* New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Zimmer, C. (2016, Oct. 17). *The New York Times* . Retrieved 06 11, 2018, from https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/18/science/ancient-farmers-archaeology-dna.html?mcubz=1&_r=0.