YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Anti-War Movement at YSU During the 1960's

Personal Experience

O. H. 1302

STAUGHTON LYND

Interviewed

by

Matthew Butts

on

October 23, 1990

ATTORNEY STAUGHTON LYND

Attorney Staughton Lynd was born on November 22, 1929 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the son of Robert and Helen Lynd. He attended Harvard College following high school, receiving a B.A. in History. He continued his graduate education at Columbia University achieving his Ph.D in American History in 1962. Following this, Dr. Lynd taught American History at Spelman College (1961-1964), and Yale University (1964-1967).

While engaged in teaching, Attorney Lynd became active in both the Civil Rights and Anti-War movements. Dr. Lynd served as Director of Freedom Schools during the key Mississippi Summer Project of 1964. After having helped the Civil Rights Movement gain strength, Dr. Lynd switched his focus of attention to United States involvement in Southeast Asia. He was chairperson of the first march on Washington in protest to the Vietnam War in 1965. He was also one of the first people to picket the Pentagon because of U.S. involvement. He later became one of the first United States citizens to visit North Vietnam during the Vietnam conflict.

In 1968, Dr. Lynd's attention was again refocused on the labor movement in the United States. Soon after, Dr. Lynd's interest in law began to blossom. He attended the University of Chicago Law School achieving his J.D. degree in 1976. His first job as an attorney was in Youngstown, Ohio as an Associate at the practice of Green, and Schiavoni, where he served from 1976 to 1978. In 1978, Attorney Lynd took his present position with Northeast Ohio Legal Services in Youngstown.

Attorney Lynd has been the recipient of many distinguished awards because of the concern he has exhibited for his fellow human beings. He has also written over twenty books including such noted ones as Nonviolence in America: A Documentary History, and Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism.

Attorney Lynd is married to the former Alice Niles. They reside at 1694 Timber Court, Niles, Ohio. They have three children, Barbara, Lee, and Martha. Presently, the Lynds remain active in the labor movement in the Youngstown area defending the rights of retired steelworkers, and other workers.

-Matthew Butts

O. H. 1362

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

INTERVIEWEE: STAUGHTON LYND

INTERVIEWER: Matthew T. Butts

SUBJECT: Peace Movement, Labor, SDS, People involved in the anti-war movement.

DATE: October 23, 1990

B: This is an interview with Staughton Lynd for the Youngstown State University Oral History Program, on the Anti-War Movement at YSU During the 1960's, by Matthew Butts, on October 23, 1990, at Metropolitan Towers, Youngstown, Ohio, at approximately 12:00 p.m.

B: Could you tell me a little bit about where you are from, a little bit about your family?

L: I was born in Philadelphia but only spent a few days there. I grew up in New York City. My parents were both college teachers, fairly well known because during the 1920's and 1930's they jointly wrote a book called Middletown, about Muncie, Indiana and a follow up book called Middletown In Transition. I went through a private school system from pre-kindergarten through high school run by an organization called the Ethical Culture Society, which is a kind of reform Judaism, which is to say, it embodied the ethical idealism of the Jewish tradition but very little in the way of Jewish ritual or religious practice. I, in fact, am not Jewish, but that is the exposure that I had as a young person. Then, I met my wife. She came from a Quaker background which was actually very similar. That, I think, fairly well describes my value orientation.

There used to be a statement over the platform of the auditorium at our school, which said, "The place where men meet to seek the highest is holy ground." If I had to edit that today, I would do something about the word "men". I would say, "men and women". But apart from that, that pretty much describes my approach to things. It's not that I believe in a God or know what people find when they make that search, but I feel very much in accord with people who really try to build their lives around certain values. I've tried to do that myself.

B: Tell me a little bit about your educational and employment experiences, past.

L: From high school (the name of the high school in New York City is Fieldston) I went to Harvard and after dropping out of college for awhile, I finally managed to graduate from Harvard in 1951. The first graduate study I took up was in City and Regional Planning. I think what it expressed was a desire, somehow, to combine the life of the mind and social action. I pursued that first at the Harvard School of Design, where I found for my taste, too much emphasis on architecture and not enough on social planning. Then, at a program at the University of Chicago, where I had the opportunity to study with Rex Tugwell, the former New Deal Administrator. But I did not, in the end, decide to go on and become a professional planner. I was drafted, I did other things, and when I finally came back to graduate school at the end of the 1950's, it was in the field of History. Then I had various experiences as an Historian and now I'm a Lawyer. But you may have other questions about all that.

B: Did you ever teach History at any universities?

L: Yes. I taught History for three years at a college called Spelman College in Atlanta, which was the sister college to Morehouse College where Dr. King got his bachelor's. The student body was entirely made up of black young women. My department head was a Historian named Howard Zinn, who has since written A People's History of the United States and various other things. Then in 1964, I left Spelman and went to Yale, where again I taught for three years as an assistant professor. Thereafter I taught episodically or part-time, one course at a time, for a few years at various universities in the Chicago area. Basically, by that time, I had become very active in the anti-war movement and I was not able to get a full time job teaching History.

B: In reference to the anti-war movement, when did you begin to question U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia?

L: Well, I was not especially aware of Southeast Asia. I remember in the Spring of 1954 when the French Army surrendered at Dien Bien Phu. I was aware of the event. I happened to be in a singing group at the time, whose conductor was very affected by what he called the destruction of the flower of the upcoming group of young military officers in France. My sympathies were more with the Vietnamese. But I didn't maintain any continuing interest in Vietnam. The thing that I will never forget that brought it very vividly to my attention was that in the Summer of 1964, which was my Summer between teaching at Spelman and teaching at Yale, I was a part of the so-called Mississippi Summer Project of that year. Indeed, I was the director of the Freedom School component of the project, which meant that a couple of hundred young men and women were acting as Freedom School teachers, ultimately, under my direction. That was the year when three young men were killed, Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner and James Chaney. It came about that in August of 1964, there was a funeral for those three young men near Philadelphia, Mississippi, which is where they were killed, at the site of the church which they had been going to visit on the day that they were apprehended by the police and then murdered. This was about two months after the murders and it was still a very....A great deal of precaution was taken about traveling out into that particular part of the Mississippi countryside so that when people went to the funeral they went in convoys of cars. At the funeral, the leader of the overall Summer Project, a SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) organizer named Bob Moses, spoke. And what should he speak about but not just racism in the United States, but about the Tonkin-Bay Resolution that the Congress had just passed. He said, "We're going to have to deal with the fact that just as dark skinned people are being killed in this country, so they are being killed by bombs and the like overseas." I'm not sure any of us at that time knew anything about Napalm, but Bob, very specifically drew the connection between Vietnam and Mississippi. Then approximately six months later, the United States began to bomb North Vietnam and little by little, I was drawn away from the Civil Rights Movement, which was, at that time, taking up the idea of black power and wasn't an easy place for whites to work. I was drawn into the movement against the war in Vietnam, so that by April of 1965 I was in fact, the chairperson of the first march on Washington against the war.

B: Describe to me the first march on Washington. What was it like?

L: Well, it was called by the Students for a Democratic Society. If I'm not mistaken, there were about 20,000 people there, sitting in the semi-circular area near the Washington Monument. Of course 20,000 people by the standards of later marches, would have been called a colossal failure. But at that time, April 1965, we were excited out of our minds that 20,000 people had come. It was a memorable day in many ways. The president of SDS at the time was named Paul Potter. He had written a speech. The speech had been typed and mimeographed at the office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in Washington, and somehow when everybody left to go to the march they locked the office, but forgot to take the speech. So, in my capacity as chairperson of the march, one of the first things I did upon arrival in Washington was somehow shimmy open the window of the SNCC office and climb through it with a couple of other people to get these mimeographed copies of Paul's speech. With the result that by the time we arrived at the meeting, it had, in fact, begun. The speakers included Senator Gruening, who was one of the two senators who voted against the Tonkin-Bay Resolution, the independent journalist, I. F. Stone, who died only this past year, Bob Moses, Paul Potter, and myself. After the speeches and the singing, we all marched down from the area of the Washington Monument to the area of Congress, which is maybe two thirds of a mile away. I think it was...I know that for me personally, it was doing that which I had never done before, which gave me and I think gave others the idea that, "We should come back sometime and not just walk down to Congress as an afterthought after we meet at the Monument, but we should walk down to Congress with the idea of assembling on the steps of Congress and declaring peace with the people of Vietnam." -Which in fact, many of us, including Bob Moses of SNCC and Dave Dellinger attempted to do the following August. I just add one more thing for the future historian who may be studying all this. It's very important to understand that SDS organized that April march, but felt that it was almost a diversion from its main work, which was to try to do organizing in the inner city, to form coalitions of black poor people and white poor people to try to change the social system as a whole.

Now there was a meeting after the April march at the Institute for Policy Studies where the leadership of SDS, over my objections and the objections of some others, decided that, while of course they were very sympathetic to a movement against the war in Vietnam, they were not going to turn their organization into an organization the main task of which was leading and coordinating the anti-war movement. Which meant that there was a tremendous vacuum created. It was a very disturbing vacuum because now we know that an anti-war

movement continued through out the next ten years and grew stronger and stronger with each passing year. But then we didn't know that, and we were indeed afraid that during the summer of 1965, as American Troops were sent to Southeast Asia, an atmosphere of support for the war effort would be generated in the United States such that by the time students came back to the campus in the fall, it would be difficult to protest. That is why an action was planned for August, 1965. I can remember in June of 1965 after a meeting in Washington to plan the August action, one other fellow and I went out to the Pentagon and started picketing there. We were immediately surrounded by dozens of military policemen who politely inquired what mental institution we had been admitted to. What did we think we were doing? I drew myself up and I said, "You don't understand. We are just the first of thousands." It turned out to be true. But it was very touch and go that summer whether the government would take the attitude "this is subversive stuff and we're going to stamp it out", and that's why we felt a particular obligation to pursue it during a period when students were away from campus.

B: Who were the protesters, cross section, sex, age, positions, education?

L: Well, there have been a lot of studies done by now. The big change was that at the beginning the protesters were overwhelmingly students. It seemed that on every campus there was an ad hoc committee to end the war in Vietnam. This was at a time when nationwide public opinion still supported the war. But according to the poll data I've seen, surprisingly early, maybe 1967, 1968, the polls were starting to show that even working-class people had a lot of questions. By the late 1960's and early 1970's, it was, in my opinion, the working-class people who were, after all, the people who were in the military for the most part, that were carrying the ball on the anti-war movement. The students, by that time, were almost in the role of supporters, or auxiliaries of a movement that had really shifted to Vietnam itself. There were certain incidents that kind of symbolized that transition. For example, in the Fall of 1967, there was a big demonstration at the Pentagon. The students came charging up the steps and they were met by soldiers with drawn bayonets. The question was, how were the students going to portray themselves to these soldiers? It was on that occasion that, not all the protesters by any means, but some of them influenced by David Dellinger, who has been a life-long pacifist, by Gregory Calvert, the then national chairman of SDS and others... I wasn't there, but I talked to a lot of people and I have read a lot of things. It was this group within

the tens of thousands of people who were at the Pentagon in the Fall of 1967 who put out the idea, "join us." It was this group who put flowers on the bayonets, who did not express hatred, fear, derogation, who did not attempt to put the soldiers down but rather to say, "Look, we're all in the same boat. You've got it worse than we do. We have no ill-will towards you. We ask you to think about all this." I think that was very important. I had a little personal experience along the same lines which I think must have occurred the next Spring. I did a lot of speaking in those days. I was invited to speak at a community college on the south side of Chicago about the war in Vietnam. This was a white ethnic working class college. I walked into the room and I saw that everybody had their copy of Time magazine with the sentences underlined in red about the radical Yale professor who had been to Hanoi. I thought, this is going to be an interesting situation. Just in the moment, I improvised the following, I said to them, "Look, we all know that we can't believe what we read in the media. So for purposes of this class, the only things that we're going to believe are things that you personally have experienced if you've been in Vietnam, or things that have been experienced by friends whom you trust, who are there or have been there and have written to you about it and told you about it." I said, "You tell me what you think you know on the basis of those sources. I'm going to write it on the board." So I spent an hour writing, "The people don't want us there." "The soldiers on the other side are more motivated than the soldiers who support the Saigon government." All of the propositions of the anti-war movement. Which if I had advanced them as things that I believed in, I feel quite sure that they would have rejected as Communist and unpatriotic. In fact, it was the very same observations that they were telling me on the basis of their experience and the experience of their friends. So we got all the things written up on the board and I said, "Well, that's what I believe too," and took off. I always felt very good about that afternoon. I think it was indicative of the change that was going on in the late 1960's. So to go back to your question, overall, the change was from a student movement to a much broader movement.

B: When did you travel to Hanoi, North Vietnam?

L: In December 1965, and in January 1966.

B: What were your reasons for going there?

L: Well, I was asked to go by a man named Herbert Aptheker, who was an American Historian. He had written his dissertation on American Slave Revolts, and was a

member of the Communist party. I had known him as a historian. He told me that he had been invited by the government of North Vietnam to come there with two non-communists who were active in the peace movement. So he asked me and asked me to find one other. I asked a number of people who, for different reasons, couldn't go, or didn't want to go. Then one day, when it was almost time to go, Tom Hayden happened to be in New Haven. He and I and my two children at the time were out sledding and I can just remember standing in the snow and saying to Tom, "Hey, Tom, how would you like to go to Vietnam?" Being an adventurous spirit, he said, "Yeah, good idea!" Needless to say, he did a lot of thinking about it, checking around with his friends about it and what would be the effect on his work as a community organizer, but in the end, he also decided to go. So there were the three of us. I think our motivations were not identical, they were overlapping, but not identical. My motivation was that I was a Quaker, I am a Quaker and I knew that in the late 1790's there was a Quaker physician named Benjamin Logan who was asked by Jefferson, who was then out of power, to go to revolutionary France and talk with them about what might settle the diplomatic controversies between France and the United States. So Dr. Logan went to France, talked with leaders of the revolutionary French government, came back, talked to President John Adams and apparently made some contribution to the fact that war was averted-- that the United States did not go to war with France. Now a law, called the Logan Act was passed, telling people never to do that again. Moreover, passports at the time, were restricted for travel to North Vietnam, North Korea, China, Albania, and Cuba so that it was an undertaking not without some risks but I thought that what Benjamin Logan had done was splendid and that I would try to do something similar and that was really my notion in going there.

B: What did the anti-war movement gain from your experiences and your visit to North Vietnam?

L: Well that is a very interesting question and I probably am not the right person to answer it. Like so many things in life, there were different levels of success and failure, I think. On my own terms, discovering some diplomatic key that could be put in the lock and bring peace, it was a complete failure. Not, I think, because of anything I did or didn't do but just because that was a situation where the United States still assumed that they could beat the stuffing out of these little brown people and it didn't even take them seriously. But underneath that, there was something else that I would like to think historians would take note of, and that was this: The situation then, was not so different from the situation now with respect to Iraq,

with the difference that the United States was in combat in Vietnam. But every day there would be a rumor that the war was going to be escalated or on the other hand, a rumor of some peace development exactly as with Iraq and from time to time, President Lyndon Johnson felt obliged or felt compelled, I don't know why he did it, really, but he did it. He would declare a bombing pause for a period of time and in, if I'm not mistaken, December, possibly late November of 1965, after I had decided to go to North Vietnam, the President of the United States declared a bombing pause. He dispatched envoys all over the face of the earth to explore possibilities of peace. But there was one place that he didn't send them. He didn't send them to the country that the United States was at war with, to North Vietnam. He almost set the stage for us because here was George Bundy going there, Averill Harriman going here and Aptheker, Lynd, and Hayden going to North Vietnam. It came out in a very funny way because a reporter from the New York Times had come up to New Haven. I told him I was going and he swore in blood that he wouldn't break the story until we got back. However, he did break the story. He broke the story while we were in China and in Vietnam. It was a front page story. I think that apart from the results of the mission, which were meager, the fact of making a trip in war time to talk face to face to one's enemies caught people's imagination and there were many other such trips in one form or another as the war went on. In saying that, I don't mean to endorse everything that Jane Fonda or anyone else did while they were in Vietnam because these were things that one really struggled with. But I do mean to say that I think there was something significant and positive in this impulse to make human contact with the enemy. That, I think, was the main thing that our trip accomplished. Bear in mind that this was also a time- it was just before the time- 1966 was the year when draft calls just went through the roof. So there was a great deal of soul searching throughout the anti-war movement about personal commitment and am I willing to go to jail, and all of this. I think at that level, the fact that we were willing to make the trip despite the Logan Act and so on, was part of the process that in the end, led to a very wide spread attitude of "Not only do I think this war is wrong, but I personally am not going to go along with it." "Hell No! We Won't Go!" That's what I would say. It failed as a diplomatic mission, but as a kind of personal action that contributed to what was then called resistance to the war, I think it was quite effective.

B: What was the State Department's and the United States Government's response to your trip?

L: It was a response at two levels. First of all, they sent someone from the State Department on a small plane to New Haven to find out anything that I might have found out, which I think they felt probably correctly was not too much. What we really found out was that the people we were talking to thought they were going to win the war which was kind of a mind blowing idea. Very slight human beings saying, "Look, you don't have a chance. Either you escalate your involvement in my country (this is the Vietnamese talking) in which case more and more people are going to come to the National Liberation Front in the effort to drive you out, or you withdraw. And in either case, we win." That was their attitude. They were right. But it wasn't something you could tell someone from the State Department that would be useful to him in his diplomatic work. So that was one level of response. The other level was that they took away my passport and the ACLU sued and two or three years later, got it back.

B: Was there a specific court case that returned that to you?

L: Yes. And it's a case in the circuit court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the caption is Lynd (that's me) vs. Rusk, the Secretary of State.

B: What people were most important to the anti-war movement?

L: You're going to have to add a little to that.

B: Who initiated the actions that were most responsible for the growing of the national anti-war movement?

L: Well, my own feeling, and I'm sure this will be the judgment of future historians, if it is not already the judgment of historians, is that there were many kinds of people and many kinds of actions. At the time, everybody felt that whatever action they were into was the most important one. That is to say, the people who were into draft resistance said that the people who were interested in running peace candidates for Congress were wimps and the people who were running peace candidates for Congress said that the draft resisters were crazy, and would alienate potential support. But in retrospect, it seems to be perfectly obvious that both made significant contributions. I do think that it is the clearest example in the history of the United States of an anti-war movement growing throughout the course of a war. Not that that hasn't happened in other situations: Richard Barnet's book, <u>The Rocket's Red Glare</u> shows that it's really the typical pattern that at first... We're seeing this already in the Iraq crises. At first there was almost 100% support for

whatever it is that the National Government has done and very quickly that begins to erode particularly as there are casualties. I think the Vietnam situation was perhaps the strongest anti-war movement developing in the very midst of a war. I think there is no doubt, whatsoever, that although it was a subsidiary, a secondary force, it was a force in preventing the war from escalating. There is a great deal of evidence that in the Spring of 1968, when there were about a half a million American soldiers in Vietnam, President Johnson would have liked to have sent two or three hundred thousand more but decided not to, because his closest advisors told him it would create a level of domestic unrest that the government couldn't handle and then instead, decided not to run for reelection. I think that the peace movement along with the Tet Offensive had a lot to do with that.

B: Were you associated with the anti-war group, People for Peace?

L: Doesn't ring a bell. I really wasn't a member. I may have joined some things but basically I was just an independent person.

B: Describe to me what events and memories stand out most in your mind from the period of the anti-war movement?

L: Well, I've told you a number of them, such as picketing at the Pentagon with one other person in June 1965 or that class at a community college in the Spring of 1968. There were experiences in Vietnam that were quite moving and that I haven't forgotten. I remember, for example, talking through an interpreter to a man who ran a factory in Hanoi. He was receiving us in some little room adjacent to the factory. There was a white tablecloth and little candies in glass dishes and we had heard quite a few speeches by this time and I was sort of doodling with the candies in front of me and then I sort of began to pay attention. He said, "You know, we have great admiration for Abraham Lincoln who wrote your Declaration of Independence." I started to feel very patronizing at his historical error and then realized that I wouldn't have known enough names and facts about the history of his country even to make a mistake. I just didn't know anything about it. So he said, "We have great admiration for Abraham Lincoln who wrote your Declaration of Independence but," he went on, "just now, the name American has become difficult for us to say." I was sitting there fooling with my candies and had my head down and there was this tremendous pause. What was going on? I looked up and here, this man was weeping. I figured well, so much for oriental inscrutability. That's one thing I learned on this trip. People in Vietnam cry just the

same way people any place else do. I wasn't in the anti-war movement that long because by around 1968, I felt clearly that it was growing, it was going to take care of itself and I had other things to do.

B: Do you remember your response to the Kent State shootings?

L: Well, I was in Chicago by then and I remember I was a teacher at a school for community organizers run by Saul Alinsky and I remember a student at the school saying something like, "There is a very volatile situation out there and it would just take one spark to set it off." It seemed that it was the next day that we heard of the killings at Kent State and I then participated as a speaker in the national student strike which swept the country. Later on, of course, after moving to Youngstown, I came to know Alan Canfora, who was one of the Kent State students that was wounded, and in fact, represented a group of teachers who opposed the action of Kent State University when it was seeking to build a gymnasium on the site where people had been killed. So I came to have a much richer appreciation for the event after I moved to Ohio.

B: What do you feel the impact of the anti-war movement was on the war itself? Was it a primary mover in its ending?

L: Well, it clearly was a mover in limiting its escalation. That's the thing I'm sure of. Particularly in the Spring of 1968. I was not nearly so involved in the years when the war was dragging to an end. And of course, President Nixon's strategy for fighting the war, his strategy of Vietnamization, was a strategy for fighting the war without involving the American people and therefore, not having to deal with draft resisters and servicemen fragging their officers and so on and so on. I guess I would say that the phase of the anti-war movement in which I was involved, say 1965 to 1968 was responsible for setting limits on the number of servicemen that could be sent to Vietnam consistent with domestic security. It seems to me that what you might call, the working class resistance to the war that then developed among soldiers themselves had a lot to do with Vietnamization because both from what one read at the time, and what one has heard since in films that we've all seen, it appears that by the early 1970's the United States' Armed Forces in Vietnam had reached a point where they were no longer a reliable fighting force, at least for the war that they were being asked to fight. If those two things are true, and I believe they are, that is quite a contribution. Because it limited the escalation of the war and it then further limited it by creating a situation in

which if the war were going to be continued it had to be by Vietnamese ground soldiers and bombing. In the end, the Army that was left on the ground, the National Liberation Front proved the stronger army. So yes, in those ways, provided you're prepared to make a somewhat detailed and complex analysis, and not just try to say it in a sentence or two, I do think that the anti-war movement made a major contribution.

B: When you moved into the labor movement, did you see any linkage between the two movements, the anti-war movement and the labor movement?

L: Yes, in that during the anti-war movement, the American working class was generally portrayed in the media as pro-war and anti-student demonstrators. These were the years when the term "hard hat" was used a good deal, the term "middle American" was used a good deal. So one of the reasons that I wanted to become involved in the labor movement was that I, along with a lot of other people, I saw this. I saw that working class parents whose kids might be going to college for the first time that anyone in the family had gone to college, were looking at the "goings on" on campus and thinking, where did these people come from who feel they could throw away the opportunity for a college education just to burn things and tear things up and chant slogans and write things on walls? So I felt in the late 1960's that the student movement for social change and the American working class were missing each other. They hadn't connected with each other. I wanted to find out about that and to explore it in depth. I now feel that first of all, in terms of the general goals of the movement of the 1960's that people should participate in the decisions that affect their lives, that that's just as much a working class goal as a student goal. The workers might use a somewhat different language, but when they tell you how they feel their union hasn't listened to their demands, or they can't get through to the union lawyer to talk about how their pensions or medical benefits are being taken away, they are saying exactly what students said about the war or southern blacks said about the institutions with which they were dealing. "They're not listening, they're not paying any attention to us, they're making decisions for me and they're not giving me a chance to be heard." More specifically about the war, one of the reasons we moved to Youngstown was that we ran into a couple of Youngstown steelworkers who not only opposed the Vietnam War but had opposed the Korean War. And we're talking about Ed Mann and John Barbero, who worked at the Brier Hill Works. Not that they were life-long pacifists or came from a pacifist background, they had both been Marines. But on the basis of their experience, they had come to certain views that were

very similar to the views that my wife and I had come to on the basis of quite different experiences. We said to ourselves, "Boy, that is interesting. It would be interesting to live in this place and work with those people." So those were some of the connections I felt between the work I had been doing and the work that I began to do in labor law.

B: Was there anything else that you would like to add at this time?

L: I think that the anti-war movement of the 1960's and early 1970's has a continuing influence on American foreign policy. I think Congressman James Traficant might, in another period of American history, have been beating the drums for war. But I think he is dealing with a very wide spread experience which is still being expressed and digested as you see in all these movies, of people who felt abused in that they themselves went to war or relatives were sent to war for a war that they never really could figure out. That just didn't seem worth the price that was being paid both by American citizens and of course, by others. I think that's still there and at the heart of the so called "Vietnam Syndrome" which some people lament, something I am extremely proud of because I think it means that before throwing themselves into another conflict that they don't really understand very well, like the conflict in the Near East at the present moment, Americans are going to be more inclined to pause and think and you saw the other day on television, Congress is going to break for the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays and come back in January. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and not just its chairperson, Senator Pell, a democrat, but its ranking Republican member, Senator Luger of Indiana, summoned the Secretary of State and said to him, "Listen, we're concerned that when we leave you guys may go to war without consulting the Congress and without consulting the people." And they're thinking about the Tonkin-Bay Resolution. They are thinking about the way it happened in 1964, 1965 and I think that's great. I was extremely moved by Luger, who played quite a role in the Philippines and who I, somewhat rather to my surprise, have come to respect. I was extremely moved that he would ask that question about that possible conduct of the president of his own party. So I mean it was a terribly painful, irrevocably destructive experience for many persons and many families and yet, like a lot of other bad and painful experiences, I guess it's an experience that something was learned from and I feel very good to have been a part of that.

B: Thank you very much for your time.

L: You're welcome.

END OF INTERVIEW

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSTIY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

1. Topic The anti-war movement in the United States during the Vietnam War.
2. Key word descriptors (10 or less) President Johnson, Vietnam, Peace Movement, Labor, SDS, Civil Rights, Kent State
3. Subjects discussed The start of the anti-war movement in the U.S. during the Vietnam War. The people who were involved in the anti-war movement in th 1960's.
4. Interviewer (name and age) Matthew T. Butts 22
5. Interviewee Staughton Lynd 60 History professor, attorney. (name, age, and areas of expertise)
6. Description of interview, giving interview number (if more than one with the same interviewee), time, date, place, mailing address, any other person present, approximate length, any special explanation, any false endings, etc.
7. Tape: Feet _____ Minutes 54.35
8. Transcription (Transcriber's name, date) Susan M. Zawacki 11-13-91
9. Audit-Edit Clerk (Collator's name, date) Susan M. Zawacki
10. Interviewee editing: Date Sent 11-27-91 (1992) Date Returned 12-16-91 4/1/92
11. Final editing (Editor's name, date) SH 4-6-92
12. Final Copy typed (Typist's name, date) SH 4-6-92
13. Proofreading (Proofreader's name, date) Melina M. ~~Susan Smith~~ 4-9-92
14. Indexed (name, date) J'Orien Smith 4-10-92
15. Final corrections and index typing (name, date) J.S. 4-10-92
16. Copies made of transcript: Library 1 Interviewee 1 Others _____
17. Copies made of tape and for whom: Ø
18. Other information pertinent to this interview (documents included, final copy cited in published works, etc.):

Sent letter 1 1/30/91 / Sent w/ J'Orien letter - 1-9-92 SZ

Sent letter 2 WS 11-27-91 / Sent Ltr 3 WS 4-13-92 SZ