

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Anti-War Movement

Personal Experience

O.H. 1367

MARK SHUTES

Interviewed

by

Matthew Butts

on

October 3, 1990

MARK T. SHUTES

Mark T. Shutes was born on February 6, 1947 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the son of Emmett and Irene Shutes. He attended Saint Anselm's High School at Swissvale, Pennsylvania, graduating in 1965. He immediately moved to Youngstown, Ohio, where he planned to work his way through college at Youngstown State University.

While attending Youngstown State, Shutes became concerned about United States military involvement in Southeast Asia. As editor of the *Jambar*, Shutes attempted to increase student awareness of the events occurring in Vietnam. In conjunction with this, he helped to organize a number of student protests on campus against the war. Shutes was also instrumental in helping to organize Youngstown State's biggest demonstration against United States involvement in the war, the Peace Moratorium of 1969.

Following his graduation from Youngstown State in 1970, Shutes remained active in the anti-war movement, until the war's end in 1975. He later became involved in the labor movement in Youngstown, during the crucial days prior to the death of the steel industry in the late 1970's.

Shutes returned to Youngstown State in September of 1979 as a member of the Anthropology Department, while completing his Master of Arts degree at the University of Pittsburgh. He continued his graduate education at Pitt, while teaching at Youngstown State, achieving his PhD in 1987. Dr. Shutes remains an integral part of the Anthropology department at Youngstown State. He is also an active member of a number of organizations, including the American Anthropology Association, and the

American Conference for Irish Studies. Dr. Shutes is married to the former Mary Ellen McDonagh. They reside with their daughter, Megan, at 1988 Hastings Drive, Kent, Ohio.

B: This is an interview with Mark Shutes for the Youngstown State University Oral History Program on the Anti-War Movement at YSU during the 1960's, by Matthew Butts, at Youngstown State University, at DeBartolo Hall on October 3, 1990, at approximately 10:00 a.m.

Tell me a little bit about where you are from.

S: I was born in a suburb right outside of Pittsburgh Pennsylvania, a place called Aspinwall. I spent all my life growing up in a suburb of Pittsburgh called Monroeville but, actually, it was a little place called Wilkins Township. Pennsylvania has lots of strange township divisions. It was near mostly Westinghouse Town. Westinghouse had a research center near by, but there was also air brakes. All the towns that I grew up in were all these mill towns. They were Westinghouse Towns. Turtlecreek, East Pittsburgh, Braddock, all those places. My mother was a devout Catholic so I went to school at Catholic Schools. I usually went to high school at Swissvale, which was a ways from where I lived. I was not much of a Catholic until ninth grade. Mostly, I spent my life in those kinds of towns. Some suburban influence, but mostly those small, very kind of ethnic, small Pittsburgh towns. They were not steel towns, but they were mill towns, mostly run by Westinghouse, who made air brakes. It was kind of a mixture of both small industrial town life and suburban life.

B: Tell me something about your family background.

S: My father was an engineer. He served in World War II. He was an engineer for Health Research and Development for most of his life. He designed sensing machines that helped them find oil, including a portable seismograph, things like that. He was an alcoholic and, although it never bothered his job, it eventually bothered him. So when early retirement had come and when they left this area, he went into alcoholic treatment for about a year. Started to go from a few beers on the weekend to a fifth of gin or vodka every couple of days. That rehabilitated him. He never touched it again and got another job, fortunately, with Salvouche Engineering, in Pittsburgh, where he spent most of his last ten years. He just retired two years ago. He is doing pretty well.

My mother was a remarkable woman. She was a school teacher in a Catholic School. [She was] A fifth grade teacher for almost twenty years while I was growing up and then she changed positions, retired for a while, stopped teaching. [She] Got tired of it, went back, working part time at night for a bank, a Union Bank in Pittsburgh, just as somebody who would record checks as they came in. She ended up, in two years, being Purchasing Manager for that bank. [She] Spent most of her life being a Purchasing Manager. She retired two years ago, herself.

I have a brother who is a professional bowler. He won the PBA championship in 1980 and 1979. He does not bowl on tour anymore. He runs a pro-shop. He has a family with two kids in Eastern Pennsylvania. I have a sister who is very much younger, kind of a late child. She is currently working on a PhD in Lester. She lives in England. She married somebody from England and lives her life there. And then there is me. That is about all. Not a bad home life. Some interesting details. I think that in some ways, having been familiar with alcoholism, later on, that all of us were kind of like children of alcoholics. Although my father was a decent person, he was not around much. I think he was a World War II- Vietnam-Veteran Syndrome person. He lost a lot of good friends there and came home and just sort of went to work. So I recognize that stuff. I get along pretty well now. But otherwise, [it was a] fairly normal kind of childhood -- normal, suburban stuff.

B: Could you tell me something about your educational background through your PhD?

S: Yes. I went to undergraduate school here. I was the editor of the newspaper. It is funny how I came here to begin with. I was in a massive fight with my father. He wanted me to be an Engineer, at the time. I did not want to go into Engineering mostly because he wanted me to. So I ended up working for a year after I got out of high school. [I had] A variety of jobs, including the steel mills, and so on. I got enough money to come to school and this place was some place that friends of mine, in high school, used to come up to drink, because they had three-two beer, then. A friend of mine was going to school here and he said it was inexpensive to go to school. Then it was not a state school. It was like \$18 a credit hour, something absurd like that. Well, it seemed good to me because that is what I could afford. I could afford a year and a half of that. I could go to school on my own. So, I came to school here. It went state pretty soon after that.

I got attached to people that were running the newspaper at that time and now are all editors for the Cleveland Plain Dealer. Jack Murphy, his name was. I ended up being the editor of this paper for three years and getting a tremendous interest in Anthropology from a man who is now at PITCOM, James Adovasio. Dr. Adovasio got me turned on to Anthropology. So during the war years, I was leaving for Canada. We are going to talk about it, I suppose later on. I turned in my draft card when I was editor of the newspaper as part of a campaign against the war. A hundred editors and student government leaders turned in their draft cards and published it in the New York Times, that it was an unjust war and refused to serve in it. So we all got reclassified 1A and harassed a lot after that, by a man named Hershey. He got on the draft board. I do not know why they never did draft us. I went to get a physical.

I simply assumed that life would be impossible here, so I had applied for,

and received, an Ontario Fellowship to go to school at the University of Toronto. I had also applied because of a good person here, Jim Kriazas, who was the chairman of my department. I applied to Pitt, because he was a professor at Pitt. He encouraged me to apply just in case there were some alternatives, although, a lot of things happened the summer before I was supposed to go away to Toronto. I was going to get married. My wife was going to go with me. Her parents were not real happy about that. I would not be able to return.

Well, on that July, they ran the first lottery. They opened up a lottery system for the draft. Two days before the lottery, I had received a notification from the University of Pittsburgh that I had been granted a full fellowship to go to graduate school in Pittsburgh, but I was not going to take it. Two days later, the draft came up with my number. My birthday number was something like 347. Unless there was going to be a national nuclear disaster, I would not ever be drafted. So my status was no longer questionable. I would have gone, we were planning on going, but I would have felt bad about leaving the United States. Then I did not have to. And since the Ontario Fellowship did not have any money attached to it for six months, and I was getting married that year, we decided to take the fellowship to the University of Pittsburgh.

I spent four or five years there, in graduate school. In Anthropology, I ended up doing field work at Hiram, where I still work. I have only just recently, in the last three years, finished a degree. I procrastinated terribly. I took a full time job when I first came back in the field here. That is a mistake because you get involved in all kinds of things, you get involved in your own work, preparing courses. So it has taken me about seven or eight years extra to get out. I have just now finished up with my dissertation, well after I have published all kinds of things. But, that is about it. Now I am an Assistant Professor here, and working away, teaching Anthropology.

B: Let us go back to YSU. What was YSU like as a college and a state university in the 1960's? What was the campus like?

S: Well, there were places that are not even around anymore, where the new library is and Butler. Well, Butler Institute was there, but where the new library is, was a series of buildings. Jones Hall was there. The library was where the administration building is. Tod Hall was changed from the library to an Administration Building. There was only Kilcawley Dorms. There was no Kilcawley Center. There was no CAST Building, no Cushwa Building. This building was not here. There was only Ward Beecher. The new science complex, the new science end of it was not added. It was a very small place. Most of the classes I had were held in places that are gone, where the new library is now located. Places called East, West, and Central Hall. They were all left-over Army buildings. Central Hall was, principally, a cafeteria. The university was almost confined to the Wick-Arlington kind of area, that first block. Central

Hall, West, and East Hall, were the places where there were a lot of classes. Just old houses, essentially.

You had to be very careful who you picked to go to school. There were a lot of people then who were not probably considered very applicable, apt teachers, today. But there were also some very good teachers, that you got first hand experience. One of which, was Jim Adovasio, I think he was an archeologist. He happened to be a local person who came back between degrees to teach here. Jim Kriazas, obviously, was a tremendously good anthropologist, too. Arlene Body was the chairman of Sociology for a long time and was a brilliant woman. She is recently deceased but she was a friend of mine and she received service awards at the end. So you ran into some very, very good people who were just starting to make hires of the people that are now the bull-work of this place.

It was kind of the boom for buying professors and they were just starting to get into that before they went state. So that sometimes, you would get really rank courses, if you were not careful, you would get some bad things. But if you were careful, there was this selection of really good people. There were not that many of them around so you got a really good face to face relationship with a lot of bright new kinds of people from all different areas. So, in some ways, it was kind of backwards, but in other ways, it was really exciting. If you were interested in intellectual things, as I always have been, I suppose, you had access. To me, for the first time, I had access to really good people from outside, who were really interested in what they were doing and really interested in sharing it. The network was small. I think it prepared me pretty well for graduate school because you got to think for yourself.

You got good feedback from bright people. Hence, there was a group of people here, not that large, they all ended up, most of them, in the anti-war movement. I got to know, through the paper and elsewhere, really bright people. All of whom had this network of professors, and it was kind of a liberal community that was very nice. Something you do not get anywhere now, I suppose, not even here. You could go to somebody's house in the evening and we would all be hanging out at some professor's house for dinner or whatever. You would get all this good feedback, what was positive and negative about you and what you were thinking about the world.

It was kind of, like, it was not just here, but everywhere. People who were going to school were somehow more excited about intellectual activity. You get those kinds of phases. Mostly, America is anti-intellectual. You get a job, you get out. There was a really strong interest in Philosophy and History and Literature, Social Sciences, what the world was like. The generation had that enthusiasm. There was a core of those kind of people here, maybe fifteen or twenty people. We took a lot of classes together, ended up with a number of different majors. I had a major in Anthropology and Biology, and a minor in Journalism, because we ended up taking lots of different things. Did a lot of

reading. People used to sit around and talk about Literature when we were at parties and so on. [It was] An interesting time to be around.

The school, itself, was somewhat backward. I suppose. There was a lot of provincialism in the place. There still is a little of that kind of a sense that you do not want it to get out of hand, you want there to be in local control. When it went state, there was a lot of elimination of that. Before that, it was just totally managed by the Youngstown elite of some sort or another. Youngstown State was a place where you sent your third cousin if they were not doing too well and they ended up being a teacher somewhere. But it grew up rapidly.

After that, when it became state, they got lots of money to build things and they hired a lot of faculty because they were deficient in a number of areas. By the time I went away to graduate school in 1971, it was already a fairly substantially changed place. I came back to teach here in 1979. It was remarkably different then, than it is now. This place now is comparable to any of the other state schools. Better than some, because you still get a lot of real high quality people in classrooms. As we grow further into graduate education and so on, that probably will not be the case. In terms of an undergraduate education, there is more contact hours with good, strong and working PhD's here than there is in most places, because they are hiring people who are good. I think that right now, people's exposure to professors and good ideas here is probably common place. You do not have to pick your courses as carefully as we used to have to.

B: What was the general composition of the student body? What was it like at that period?

S: Oh, that is interesting. It was predominantly local people. When I got here and I got involved in the paper, the newspaper had just been taken over by a kid named Jack Murphy, who was then working for the Vindicator, a fascinating guy, he is now an editor for the Plain Dealer. Always wanted to be involved in a newspaper. He took over the paper and he was an independent. At that time, almost everything that was on campus was controlled by fraternities and sororities. We essentially went on a campaign, I became editor the following year, to eliminate that kind of grip on the campus. I do not think they were bad people, but they were very narrowly focused. They were kind of a local partying group. Things on campus were things they did and they shared, and the newspaper was more of a "PA" rag for the college and for the fraternity and sorority stuff because it was their newspaper. It was not growing. It was not responding.

We were very negative to fraternities. I still am in some ways. I am not negative to people who join fraternities, but the notion of fraternities is in some ways, foreign to me. It is kind of a bastardization. I look at it on campus now and they are a source of a lot of crap. A source of a lot of anti-Semitism, a lot of racism. They are just party places, that get out of hand in terms of their

proportion of their interest to people. I did not like them then, at all. I am fairly moderate about them now. Because of the kinds of things they were doing, the place was there for a lot of serious people who went to school, and went home, and the people who had sort of some kind of investment in the place, and in its running, who were students, were predominantly those people who were sorority and fraternity types. It was kind of a nice, small, little place. They were not all irresponsible, far from it, but they were, the way we saw them, they did not have much vision. They were not thinking outside of the framework of their own little lives. They were not thinking about the place in terms of the rest of the world. They seemed to be very provincial to people that were independent but interested in campus stuff, the way I was.

A lot of the people that went there, then, are very much like people that go here now. There were people who were local, but did not get actively involved in a lot of things. They were very serious about their education. A lot of them worked, a lot of the friends that I had, also had either part-time or full-time jobs then. A lot more of them were first generation college people. There was a lot of pressure on them to work hard. There were jobs available locally, so some of them saw themselves as having futures here, unlike now, where lots of people do not. But, I guess, in terms of when I came to college and got involved with the affairs of campus through the newspaper, I think that, predominately, we saw our job as one of enlightening these provincial clods. I am not saying they really were, I am trying to give you a background of the way we felt. We were arrogant people. We were really confident in our intellectual knowledge because we were young. In comparison to other people, other people that we met as we moved down to other campuses, we knew that there was a much broader way of looking at the world than what is going on here.

We were very adamant about fraternities. In fact, we tried to systematically eliminate their control over campus activities and encourage independents to run for Student Government. We would talk about how student government did nothing more than just reaffirm and fund Greek parties. They had a news column in our paper for years called Greek News. When we got out a campaign to eliminate their control over items, we stopped publishing anything about their events, including their ads. Outrageous, right? They complained about that, and I said I would run the Greek News Column again, and I did.

A friend of mine, who was a Cipriate, now teaches at the University of Hawaii, Papa Costas, Greek, Greek Cipriate. We ran a column for international students, Greek students, in Greek. Even the head was in Greek. He used to come out to the printers and correct the copy. Although they had Greek type flaws, they had no idea what it meant. That kind of stuff. So in those days, it was a battle of very strong, local provincialism versus people who were merging with kind of broader idea of what the university was. I am not saying that I was a major leader of that. I think I was one person that was aware of that. There was a core of people that felt that this place was too narrowly conceived. Very

conservative, very volative, toe-the-line kind of place. Do not make any waves. We did not want to deal with that.

B: As far as then, with the Peace Movement, would you say the majority of students then, had no interest in it?

S: Well, that is hard to say, because I can remember thousands of students down on Wick Avenue, on the square there for the Anti-war Demonstration in 1969. A thousand students in one place at YSU then, for that kind of purpose, was amazing. I would say that they were far more committed, when people finally started to become aware of the war, they were far more committed then, in terms of their personal interest, than in terms of their campus activities. I think the Anti-war Movement here was fairly strong, given the fact that this was the kind of place that I just defined. Probably, a thousand people then, out of maybe ten-thousand enrollments. Ten percent were sufficiently vocal. You could get them energized to get them to do something like that, if you could organize it well enough.

So that was not small numbers or anything like that but for Youngstown, I would say most people, if they had an opinion about the war, and we have talked to a lot of people when we were doing things like that, predominately in the early years, like 1967 through 1969, most people would have told you that it was a good thing that we were there, we were fighting for Democracy. There was one professor here, in English, part-time, named Keller, that was fired. They bugged his classroom because he was talking about the war, and most people thought that was alright. But by 1969, 1970, when the war was being covered everyday, there did not seem to be any end to it. There did not seem to be any intention to win it. More and more people on this campus, although they did not show up for rallies, and so on, began to believe that there was something wrong with what we were doing there. Lots of people were dying, there did not seem to be any objectives. We did not seem to be concerned about winning it. There was a lot of political corruption surrounding it.

So in 1969, and 1970, particularly after Kent State, there was a lot more concern about it. We used to get four or five thousand students at a rally. Around the area, you could not mobilize that many people, as has always been with YSU. People have very practical concerns about universities. But more and more, people would become moved toward that position, kind of a mirror image of the nation, I guess. There was not any highly radicalized core, just a small group of people. But as the war droned on, more and more people became convinced that this was a drain on everybody's time, resources and energy. It was a dangerous thing.

I belonged to Ohio Peace Coalition as a student. I was an organizer across all the campuses in Ohio. So I visited every campus. In comparison to other places, maybe a little smaller percentage, maybe fifteen or twenty percent

of campuses in other places were actively involved, at the heights of places. Whereas here, maybe it was only eight to ten. They would actually show up with their bodies and do something. The lines were much more rigid here, when we were marching downtown, people in the office buildings were throwing garbage out their windows. The business community and the local community was really not prepared for that at all. Even though they were a democratic town, they were very, very conservative. I think that that is pretty fairly typical for a place like this. I was very harried in those years that so many people would, in fact, come out, for the most part, willing to do it until the end. It seemed so unfair. I had lost many friends in the war, very close friends, before I even came here.

It was not that I was frightened of serving in the war. My brother was a Marine. I probably would have. It was just that it came to the point where a lot of us felt that the government was out of control. They had no control over what they were doing. It was being maintained for political reasons. People's lives were being lost needlessly. There was no intention of winning it. They were just going to waste lives and then lie about it. They regularly lie, as everybody knows now, people who died, we had soldiers in other countries, outside of Vietnam, the entire length of the war. My friend was killed in Laos where he spent the entire war, fighting. But none of his records are available to his parents because he's not allowed to be Laos. He got no medals. He got nothing. They just notified them that he was dead. There were whole battalions that fought that war outside of Vietnam. It was a very secretive, very nasty, little, ugly war. I was losing a lot a friends. It was just the time. I do not know what to say, it was the time that people began to feel that the government was not being responsive to anything. People genuinely felt that it was time for change, that something could happen. We were all very naive about that. We thought that the mass student movements, that we were only a small part of it and so on, were indications of really powerful positive changes about racism, about sexism, about all kinds of government controls over people's lives.

So, yes, here, I was mightily encouraged, actually, by the kind of people that did show up for rallies. There was always very strong faculty support. Not everybody, administration certainly did not, but there was a core of faculty and Richmond, he lost his job. There was a Professor in Philosophy named Blackmon, who is no longer here, there was Claudia and Chaplain Morrison, one in History, one in English, a PhD, that were droned out because of their anti-war activity. Alice Budge could tell you more about them. They were good friends with her. I knew Chaplain very well.

There was this sense in which was this stronger identification with these points, that they were significant, not just in terms of our fears about going to war. They were significant in terms of shared fears, fears of people that we respected had about the way the United States was going. Why these secret little wars were dangerous for our survival. So that encouraged everybody, I think, I would say, probably sixty percent of the campus never went to any rally

and their opinions are their own. In the surveys and in the things that we did, towards the end we were probably maybe forty percent of those were strongly supportive but did not do anything or believed it was wrong. The rest were people that either were opposed to it or could not be concerned with it. It was not a radical place. Like I said, in 1969, 1970, it got very radicalized, amazingly so.

B: Outside of the campus, what was the outside community's feelings? You said something about the business district throwing garbage on you during one of the marches. Was there any support from the community?

S: Yes. We had a number of jobs. I guess the people that were able to speak in public were in limited supply. I had fairly good skills that way. I was an Omnibusman for the local peace council. One of the jobs we had was to go to, particularly, labor unions and get these people to see that this war was dangerous to the labor movement, in the fact that it was creating an artificial economy, that it was a class war, very few people with the upper ranks ever went. Particularly those who went to college never went, did not have to go. It was being fought by the lower ranks, working class, and underclass because they could not afford exemptions. We tried to get them to see that. At that time, there was only one other union that was supporting it. That was the Meat Cutter's Union in Cleveland, saying that war was bad. It was creating an artificial economy. It was bloating the economy. There were going to be major layoffs and major problems for union organizations after such an effort. They were absolutely right. The whole country went conservative right after that war. They burnt the heart out of the labor movement in the process. We were trying to say the same things.

We began to get some support. I was granted a seat on the Trumbull County Labor Federation, a student seat that they had created. There was a great deal of hostility among the rank and file. Older members of the unions and the union leadership were strongly supportive, after a while, of the anti-war effort. They began to see that there were bad economic consequences, as was the case. That was probably one of the reasons why labor unions went down. All throughout that time frame, there was a really conservative core of rank and file membership. It was like hardhats, they used to call them in those days. They used to wear flags on their construction helmets. That clung to these kinds of physicians that defied their own union leadership and opposed anti-war stuff and so on.

It was that difference, I think, that broke up the unions. They did not have any support. The laborers got coerced by these conservative and chauvinistic kinds of ideas. Eventually, they got coerced out of their jobs. Steelworkers, for example, I talked to a number of leaders in rank and file. Rank and file hated the whole notion of not supporting the country. So, in general, I would say that the

town probably shared that. The very strong labor history of the town, a portion of those people involved in labor activities of the 1930's and 1940's were very conscious of that and very supportive of it. The vast majority of the people of the town were either ambivalent or radical or just simply opposed to it. Not in any kind of philosophic way, just because it was not right.

B: Do you remember any of the names of the labor leaders you talked to?

S: Tom Shipka's father was the guy, Al Shipka. He was active on getting us onto the labor council. I am trying to think, there were some of these people, there was an auto workers leader in Lordstown, very strongly supportive in the late 1960's early 1970's. Al Shipka was our major labor contact. Through him, we met a number of different trade union officials at that level. The federations, which did not have much power, but which were sort of the bastions of liberal unionism, they would meet every Sunday for breakfast and try to meet on these issues. Those people, and their leaders, were very strongly supportive. The local level leaders, steelworker leaders, rank and file, were not. I think that they moved towards that towards the end, they began to see the handwriting on the wall as the war geared down. See, they ended up being blamed for it. Essentially, who took the heat for the war was the unions and the liberal congress. Nixon used his club and beat them to death with it. It was not us, it was not the students who ended up taking the heat for the war, it was the labor-liberal government coalition. They all went down with it.

B: Did you have any dealings with Edward Mann?

S: Yes, but I dealt with Ed Mann later on. When I came back from Ireland, my first field work, I got a job. I was working on my dissertation. I was not working at the university at the time. I got a job with the Ohio Public Interest Campaign. I do not know if they are still around, they were a grass-roots Ohio organization. June Lucas took my job. She used that, eventually, as a way into politics. I took it from a guy named John Greenman, who was the first director here. He was my assistant editor of the paper when I was editor of the Jambar. He eventually went on. He is Alice Budge's husband. He went on to be an editor of the Akron Beacon Journal. He took it for a while and then he left, I believe, to go to graduate school. I took it from him.

Two days after I took the job, there was a job layoff at Sheet & Tube. So we got actively involved in supporting the effort to buy out the mill. We were on a committee. That was where I met Ed Mann. I gave a lot of talks to steelworkers then. We were information gathering out and about strongly supportive of union labor and we were involved continuously in an attempt to buy out the mill and finding the right strategy to do that. My first publication was on it. That was this thing here from years ago. It was an attempt to identify the real reasons for the

shutdown. Ed Kelly was also a member of the Ohio Public Interest Campaign. That was in Business Week, or Business Review.

B: Business Insider Review.

S: Yes, a very well known publication. We tried to show that Lykes, in fact, fired these people because of total mismanagement. Over-investment, mismanagement, attempt to strip the assets of the company. So we were kind of like the intellectual arm of these people. They trusted us to direct the criticisms in the right way. I met Ed Mann through that. He may not remember me, I do not know, he might remember the Ohio Public Interest Campaign. I did that for about nine or ten months. I left, got a teaching job and left. June Lucas, who is now one of the state representatives, took over. So I met those people after the fact, not during the anti-war days. Although they were the people out there, we did run across them because there was a Youngstown Peace Coalition -- Ed Mann and his wife, Rebecca. I do not know if she is still married or actively involved. We all were.

There used to be a dog house on Wick Avenue. It was a small seventh building, further up, we used to have an office in one of those buildings, a store front. It was a coalition of local people and students. We ran it for about a year and a half. I think those people still stayed with it. As the students went down, and kept the peace thing going, actually, it turned into more radical types of labor and social issues the last few years, the solidarity movement, pensions and so forth. So we probably ran across each other in those days.

When I first was exposed to Ed Mann, it was during these steelworkers things, when Lykes closed down. We were very active in OPEC, providing adequate information to people about what happened. The fact that it wasn't the result of Japanese competition, that it was a terribly mismanaged company that ended up obliterating the history of this town because they mismanaged it. All the while that they were running steel mills, they were importing Japanese steel into New Orleans on their own ships, their container ships, and selling it. Those are the kinds of things that nobody saw. So we won that day. We, essentially, won the local media and it was mostly this kind of grit, study work, research work that kind of helped out. They sat on our boards, local coalition members for that, were on our board, essentially, our grass roots campaign supported labor, supported environmental health issues, encouraged independent people to run for local office, that kind of stuff.

B: Why did you decide to come back to the Anti-War Movement?

S: Oh, when I was a senior in high school, I was spending a lot of time outside of high school. I missed ninety days the last year. I graduated in August as a punishment for missing so much school. When I would go down to Oakland, we

used to go to school by streetcar and the streetcar would go past our school in Swissvale and then go on to Pittsburgh. I would just stay on it. Both my parents worked and so call offs to home did not work too well. I had a friend whose girlfriend ran the office in the afternoon and she did not call my house. So, for literally weeks at a time, in my senior year, I would be down in Oakland, predominately. Funny enough, because that is where I ended up going to graduate school.

In the libraries and stuff like that, sitting around in Whitetowers and other places where there were lots of college students, and I got aware of it because there were a lot of people then, not many, but then, they were at the big universities or out in the streets handing out literature. There were talks being given by professors and other people about the dangers of this war. This was like in 1965. Because I was particularly influenced by outside things, I was really, quite bored stiff and worried what I was going to do. It became perfectly clear to me, after hearing a number of such topics- illegally, I was supposed to be in school- that maybe this was not such a great thing. So when I got back to school, I was usually caught when I got back. They would give me tons of makeup work to do. I ended up doing a paper on Vietnam and the history of it for one of the makeup projects for history.

It was not a matter that I was some kind of dissatisfied individual who wanted to revolt against my parents' generation. I did not feel that. What was very clear was that if you looked at the history of Vietnam, it was a bloody place. It was exploited. The French exploited it first, exploited the population, ripped it off for its resources then passed it on to us, after we bailed them out of a war under Eisenhower. In that there was no sense in which it was a just war, there was not really any reason to be there. The communists were highly localized people. They hated the Russians, they did not cooperate with the Chinese. They were not a movement of people that was some kind of part of an international communist conspiracy. In fact, they were just trying to get their country back. It seemed to me in all my naivete then, that that was a perfectly legitimate reason, that we had the same problem, that was what my paper talked about.

The United States was formed out of the same kind of problem. There were people there that felt just effected from the colonial administrators who were trying desperately to organize their own country. That they were choosing, at that time, what was the most radical philosophy to obliterate the oppressors. At the time, the Vietnamese were doing it, it was because Marxist-Leninism, the time we were doing it was Russo and company, some violent radical philosophy then. Had there been a McCarthy in the 17th and 18th century, he would have certainly banned everybody who read Russo and all the people that were the heroes of the American Revolution. That was the paper that I wrote, very similar grass-roots, to protect, to control your own life over a series of multiple, dominations that had little or no investments in the place at all, just controlled it

for resources. Ripping it off for resources as an export place.

So it seemed to me unjust that Americans should take over what originally was a French rip-off, to bail them out of it and then get more and more involved in it for all the wrong reasons. They were essentially lying to us. In my mind, that really struck home. I was really naive as most people of that age were about our government. It became really clear that what we were hearing from our national leaders were lies. They were not even accurate facts about the history of the place. So I became very skeptical, to begin with, about what they were saying to me about Vietnam because I had become very interested in it. They were lying to us. What they were telling us things about the country and its history that were lies.

So, when I came here, I was already prepared to be, at least, personally opposed to the war. But as most people came, I did not know anybody here. I was living in the Tod Hotel. I used to earn my rent by shooting pool in the basement. We played a lot of pool at Turtlecreek. I was also embroiled in this war with my father. I was really determined to make it. I really did not want to be bothered by anything. More and more, as I would hear these positions, I would end up speaking out more and more. There was a paper in English, in one of the English-Communication classes, on why we should leave Vietnam. It just became a personal issue to me that got focused when I began to meet more people who got attached to the Jambar and more and more people that were around, I found that my views fit with theirs, because they had also done some reading. There were also some crazies out there, who had no knowledge of Vietnam and just really wanted to rip into the system.

So that was how I came to it. I came to it very rationally, very logically. I was never crazy about it. Never crazy about violence, never really particularly attracted to by the doctrine of Marxist-Leninism. It just seemed wrong, on the face of it, on the history of it. It seemed like a place we should not be in. We should not be killing people and if we were, we ought to be telling people the truth about why we are doing it.

B: What events stand out, as major and significant during the period of the Anti-war Movement?

S: The Kent State killings were devastating. I can remember those days. I had promised a group of Palestinian Students that I would stand with them in a silent protest about their position. I remember because that was where I was. I was sort of holding one of these banners as a statement of solidarity, when all of this come "over the line." See, I had been to Kent State. I was on this group of people, they were called SDS then, but that whole gang fell apart very quickly. I was part of an Ohio group that went around, we were a peace settling group. In other words, we tried to keep demonstrations peaceful. Wherever there was going to be a major rally, we would meet two or three days before and identify

the people that were going to be there and screen people. There were people that were running around the country that were just crazy. We would have frisbee bombs. [They] Put plastic explosives under the rim of the frisbee with plastic caps. I mean there were real crazies. There were also a lot of plants. People that were FBI people that would produce violence, believe it or not. It is easier to believe now, I suppose, but then it was not. There were people who were plants for the FBI that would come around and initiate violent acts so as to discredit the demonstration. Our job was to screen those people out.

So we were at Kent the day before that because there was supposed to be a major mass-rally the next day. Somebody had burnt down the little ROTC building the day before, so we all went up there. There was an emergency meeting and we looked at the scene of the ROTC building and we tried to identify what groups were around, who was doing it, who was at the scene, who was responsible for that. Everybody thought that they had pretty much controlled that. The process was really naive, by the way. All you did was just to get them out if they took drugs and alcohol and put them on a bus somewhere. I mean, it was not really sophisticated, but you got them out of there. There were people that traveled all over Ohio, people that were crazy. Some of them were also plants. I felt really comfortable about that and I was supposed to be in Kent the next day, when the big demonstration took place. We all were.

I ended up going for half that evening and half the next day to Washington with somebody else. We lobbied for the American Friends Service Committee, an act to end the war. The governed Cronie Hatch Act to end our involvement there. There was a really important vote coming up so we went down there and we lobbied half the night. I came back up to Youngstown the next day. I went to help these people hold signs and we heard about the shootings at Kent State. Jackson state happened right around the 10th. It was devastating. Everybody could not believe it. That was one of the most memorable instances because it brought everything home about what could really happen. The other one had to be, I suppose, the rally, itself. Being able to get a thousand people to go to downtown Youngstown to protest the war.

B: Was that the Peace Moratorium of 1969?

S: Yes. After the deaths at Kent State, we held a moratorium, which the university ended up supporting. A day of discussions and learning about what happened and why. That was fairly wise of people. The early stuff was a lot of confrontations, people with shotguns in the offices. There were a lot of coalitions of different movements then when they developed the strike. Black student leaders and anti-racism, anti-sexism and the war effort sort of combined. There were a lot of group activities and group petitionings of the university to change the university's structure, some of which led to it, some of which did not. You know, the two most striking events were probably the peace march downtown,

and the day that people got shot at Kent State and the moratorium that followed that.

B: What was your role in the Peace Moratorium of 1969?

S: Essentially, what we did was, we were omnibusman. We were people who were linked with the community. Mostly my role in that job was to get other people to support it. [I would] Make sure there were other groups there, and to organize the effort of going downtown. [I would] Make certain everybody had signs, make sure everybody knew where they were going, everybody was briefed. It was more bureaucratic than inspiration. It was not well organized. We were not like super well-organized. Most of the people that were the leaders knew each other and we knew faculty and we could get things together. It was kind of like a spur of the moment thing. That was probably the most systematic of the efforts. There were a lot of other people involved. Alice Budge and John Lynder were dominantly responsible for that happening. We did our part. We brought people to support it, make sure it was cleared by downtown with the Mayor and all that stuff. A lot of things were done by committee. I would say that Lynder and Alice were the prime movers in that event. Not myself.

B: How did the YSU Administration act towards students involved in the Peace Movement?

S: As the editor of the Jambar, I had developed a rather interesting relationship with President Pugsley. I do not want to say it was a "father/son", but it was very close. It was a very interesting personal relationship I had, well before the anti-war stuff. I used to go over and talk with him about the problems we were having. I had lots of access to him and he was very fatherly to me, in a real sense, in the genuine sense. Even though he and I became an enemy of everybody. Indeed, when we decided to form a chapter of SDS on campus, I went to him and told him what we were going to do. He let us all meet. But the reaction of him, as an individual, and the way he treated me and people that I knew, as an individual and the way he managed the university response, was entirely different. I do not think he had much control over that. There was a lot of rigidity. A lot of people lost their jobs. It involved the peace movement. A lot of contracts were not being renewed. When we had at least a demand to present to the university that racism was still on the campus, they brought shotguns and local police in, to what was then, Jones Hall. I mean, the Jones House was where the president had his office. Jones' old house was where the library yard is now.

They had an absolute crazy person as people's security. An old -- I do not want to say he was totally mad -- completely devious, right winged conservative, by the name of Krept. He kept files of student leaders. We broke

into his office and reported all the files in the Jambar. He was working with the FBI to identify and photograph radicals on campus. So their initial response to anything that involved large numbers of people on campus, was absolute paranoia. "Button it up, make sure nothing gets hurt, receive the demand, but do not do much." Later on, particularly after Kent State, the reaction of most of the university administrators changed dramatically. It was like, "My God, we are responsible for having these students killed. We over- reacted to the situation." There are dead people on university campuses, shot by soldiers.

After that, the next few years were a little more reasonable, although the kinds of bureaucratic imagination to get rid of left wingers still went on. Chaplain Morrison was eliminated, Blackmon was eliminated. They would not stay. There was a lot of pressure put on them. So, I do not want to say it was totally right wing, in reaction, because I knew Pugsley, as a person, was a pretty nice person. But their response to the bureaucrats throughout 1969 and 1970 was like, "Button it up and if they do too much, kick their butts." I think it was only because people like myself had some kind of personal contact, and he was a little more or less nervous about students than he would have been otherwise, particularly about SDS, Students for a Democratic Society. I do not know that for a fact, but their bureaucratic response was pretty frightening, until after Kent State. Then I would say it was a whole new ball game. There tended to be a lot more willingness to let the university respond to this, a most frightening thing. In the early years, "Button it up, keep it tight, get the troops in, just in case." That kind of thing. Surprising, shocking, I think, then, not so much now, but then it was shocking to see the university be unwillingly entertaining notions of free debate. It was scary.

B: Looking back, was there anything that you would have like to have done differently as a member of the anti-war movement on this campus?

S: Differently. I was always very happy with what I did, mostly because it seemed to me that I had arrived at the position rationally, and not inmotively. I knew a lot of people that arrived at it inmotively. In other words, that were dissatisfied with their home life, tired of having their parents distract them and liked to get into having drugs and having power, eventually were bureaucratic-- having power in the system. All the Yuppies came from that period. They got to be pretty good at manipulating power. There was a lot of problems like that, but I was always secure in the fact that I was doing it for the right reasons.

Essentially, I do not think I would do anything differently, except maybe try to get more people to try to see the rational side, than of the attractive motive side. Often times, what we did, not to our credit, was to appeal to emotions, about the outrageousness of this position. I always thought that maybe we should have done a little bit more by appealing to the history of the event although nobody listened to that. To show what America was about was

essentially the same things that we were repressing in Vietnam. It was about local control over your own life. It was about resistance to colonial oppression. It was about those things. And yet, at the same time, that we were saying this was right, we were sending our people over there to die to repress the same kind of stuff they believed in.

I was really very happy about the fact that I was non-violent, that I was completely comfortable with going to jail, or going to Canada, for that position. I would have done it. That I was happy with myself that I had the courage to stand up for what I believed in. What I would have done differently was maybe not manipulate emotions so much. There were only a very few ways to get people out. Sometimes we did tend to manipulate people's emotions rather than appeal to their intellect. So I suppose I would have done that differently if there had been the chance. Often times, events were dictating us, not the other way around. It was a very interesting time to be alive. There were lots of things that were happening that sort of rearranged people. We were, often times, responding to things that we thought we were in control over.

Otherwise, no, I was very happy and still am happy with the philosophy that I generated and developed during that time. I think I would have taken it a lot further, but I am no less radical today than I was then, just more knowledgeable, I guess, and more concerned with the intellectual end of it. Many people see the truth about international relationships and what happens to people's cultures. So I do not have any regrets about that at all, except with that motive stuff. I think it was the motive stuff that probably got people killed, because it made the universities frightened. People got out of hand, there were funerals, you know. Across the country it was that in motive stuff that had lots of people out in the streets and led to a lot of trouble. It could have been a bit less emotional about the issue. It was hard, but everything sort of coalesced at once. Young people were really dissatisfied with the sterility of immaterialism. They were bored. A lot of them felt manipulated. They did not know why they were in school. All these issues coalesced around that. It was hard to avoid the emotionalism.

- B: Do you remember any other students that were mentioned around here that were very active?
- S: A whole group of people that I know. The friends of mine, Sandy VanSuch, who now directs a local theater company, Oakland Theater Company, Roy Welch, Bob Marshall, Jeffrey Alshultz, Ed Brackfeld, almost all the people that I was with. A lovely young man, David Beacon, he was gay, an absolute pacifist. Long hair. He was a lovely person, and made very strong commitments to pacifism. There were all kinds of students. Then there were Arab students, Palestinian Students that also supported the war effort, International students. My wife, Mary Ellen, almost all of our friends were involved in that community.

Nearly everybody that I hung out with was involved with the anti-war effort in one way or another. Any of them still local? Not a lot of them. A lot of people left. [They are] All over the country, went to different schools, went to graduate schools, whatever. It was only by accident that I ended up coming back here, actually. There was a job here. I knew the people that were around.

B: Is there anything that you would like to add?

S: No, only that I am glad somebody is doing this. It seems to me that with all the change that takes place in the United States, the 1960's and the 1970's are becoming time warp dimensions. People distort time and space pretty easily. We have trouble with geography in the United States, you know, where things are, what they look like, spatial relationships. We have a lot of trouble with time relationships. There is a lot of similarities to the things that are going on in the world today. I am glad somebody is collecting these people's feelings or ideas about what happened then, because these same kinds of tactics that worked were transformed, and when they transformed the government in the Philippines and this notion of nonviolence and organizing mass protests is only one part of it. We also have to follow it up, politically. But that was the United States' real first taste of that, back to the civil rights thing. [It was] The first taste of people being out somewhere and expressing their discontent. We did not do it very well, but I think it had an impact on the final solution.

We are not there anymore. Democrats got thrown out of office. I do not know if that is good or bad, but it is true. People ought to understand that there are a whole lot of Americans out there from this generation, thirty five and forty year old Americans who are hiding, who are either embodied in gross materialism or essentially have no place to take their excitement about new commitments, anti-racism and a new potential for America. The whole thing just clamped down on it. It mostly happens with those kinds of radical whites. In the process, this stuff about how many good Americans were involved in this, how many good, true issues came out of it, get lost. I am glad somebody is recording this. A lot of good feelings about America and being an American comes out of this period for me. It gives me a lot of hope. I am not negative anymore. I was, when I went to it as a kid. As it turned out, Americans, we are really the people.

B: Thank you very much.

End of Interview