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INTRODUCTION

During the 1960s the daughters and sons of America’s “greatest generation” formed pockets of resistance to the established cultural, political, and social structures of the United States by way of a culture and identity that subverted official socio-ideological discourse. These individuals, many of them students, challenged the power structures of the nation through radical alternatives that ranged from the militant mobilization and organization of largely marginalized and traditionally apolitical groups within American society, to a commitment to participatory democracy and revolutionary violence. The challenges revealed that the base of the nation’s superstructure countered the legitimacy of U.S. power not only through issues of class, gender, and race but also through issues of age, as an unprecedented number of America’s youth first realized their political consciousness and later actualized their political power. The most famous and largest radical student organization during the 1960s was the New Left group, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

“We are people of this generation…looking uncomfortably to the world we inherit.”¹: The Cultural Elements of SDS

Robert Haber and other student activists from the University of Michigan founded SDS in January 1960.² SDS started as an extension of the Student League for Industrial


Democracy (SLID), which was a leftist student activist group founded during the 1930s. SLID’s parent organization was the League for Industrial Democracy (LID). Although SDS was at first an extension of this labor-oriented and social-democratic leftist collective, Haber intended to create a distinct and new left organization that would disconnect from the Old Left’s top-down emphasis on labor. Haber was not the first to call for a New Left though, as several prominent intellectuals during the 1940s and 1950s, such as C. Wright Mills, Paul Goodman, and William Appleman Williams, provided critiques of the ineffective Old Left and inspired a new left movement through writings that exposed the inequalities of American society, and just as important, how these inequalities could be rectified. Haber was one of the individuals whom these intellectuals inspired and he used their writings to help guide the early days of SDS.

SDS, and the New Left movement it helped sustain, departed from America’s Old Left tradition by adopting a new form of leftist ideology with two distinct components. The first ideological component related to a new conceptualization of how democracy could function within American society. SDS placed a substantial amount of faith in participatory democracy. It “aspired to create a democratic order that would involve a deep commitment to citizen participation” that would create a truly democratic society.

The second ideological component that SDS offered to leftist thinking was a

---


consideration of an individual’s role within the struggle for democracy. Unlike the Old Left, SDS wanted to change the lives of those involved in its movement by causing an individual to reevaluate the agency they possessed within the fight for a new democratic order. Thus, SDS was the first true “homegrown” leftist movement, and these two components influenced how the organization attempted to accomplish its goals.

SDS sought to bring change to America’s communities through the use of education, demonstration, and mobilization in an alliance of university students and the general U.S. populace. SDSers upheld the broader leftist ideology that the United States was an oppressive and imperialist nation ruled by the Establishment. SDS believed the Establishment dominated the masses through its control of the United States’ economic and social structures, and believed it was the job of the youth to challenge them.

According to SDS, the presence of the Establishment prohibited the operation of America’s democratic mechanisms. The organization therefore put itself at forefront of

---

8 Ibid.


8 The Establishment: politicians, businessmen, and members of the military industrial complex. For a thorough breakdown of the Establishment, and what SDS believed it stood for, please refer to the group’s manifesto, “The Port Huron Statement” which is housed online at, http://www.h-net.org/~hst306/documents/huron.html. The manifesto does not explicitly label those who controlled the economic and social structures of the nation as an all-encompassing “establishment.” However, later SDS writings often referred to those in power as part of the Establishment and used it as a proper noun. As such, this thesis also uses the Establishment as a proper noun.
events that defined the turbulent 1960s. Unlike the contemporary youth counterculture, which manifested itself in music, clothing, and other symbolic displays of youth unity, SDS wanted through political activism, to carve out or destroy the preexisting political and economic structures of the nation to eliminate the deficiencies of what they regarded as a failed system.

According to SDS’s leadership, the masses needed to be mobilized and organized so that the deficiencies of the nation could be rectified. SDS first solidified these ideas in the group’s 1962 manifesto, *The Port Huron Statement* (PHS). Written largely by Tom Hayden, a former University of Michigan student, PHS embraced the ideologies presented by Mills in the 1950s and in its critique of American society, functioned as “a call to arms, meant to rouse youth from complacency…to provoke people out of defeatism, to replace apathy with hope, to search for truly democratic alternatives.”

This call to arms quickly spread to universities across the nation, making SDS the largest

---

9 SDS quickly aligned itself with the Black Liberation Movement by working closely with Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in the early 1960s. In fact, SDS used many of its early resources for civil rights demonstrations in the American South by sending SDS activists to the region. Simon Hall’s *Peace and Freedom: The Civil Rights and Antiwar Movements in the 1960s* and Jennifer Frost’s *An Interracial Movement of the Poor: Community Organizing and the New Left of the 1960s* both explore the connections between SDS and the civil rights mobilizers and organizers during the 1960s.

10 The social makeup of both SDS and the counterculture closely resembled each other. Both groups were largely characterized by young, white males, typically from middle-class suburban households. Kirkpatrick Sale’s *SDS* and Rebecca Klatch’s *A Generation Divided* both offer thorough explanations of the social classes students in SDS often came from. Theodore Roszak’s *The Making of a Counter Culture; Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969) and Gretechen Lemke-Santangelo’s, *Daughters of Aquarius: Women of the Sixties Counterculture* (Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 2009), discuss the social classes and gender aspects within the hippie movement.

New Left group by the mid-1960s with roughly 15,000 officially registered members and 172 recognized chapters.¹²

During the height of student led anti-war activism, from 1966 to 1970, SDS became the most noticeable student movement in the United States.¹³ The National Office (NO) of SDS recognized its growing numbers and decentralized its role in the governing of regional and local chapters in the summer of 1966.¹⁴ This decentralization allowed for local SDS chapters to operate with some autonomy, while the NO kept watchful eyes on their activities through its regional SDS supervisors’ visits to chapters across the nation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation also recognized the growing numbers in SDS, launching a full-scale investigation of the group in 1966. The growth of SDS during the mid-1960s coincided with the intensification of the war in Vietnam, and opposition to the war in Vietnam became the NO’s unifying guideline, with the issues of economic equality and participatory democracy playing a secondary role in the organization. The organization continued to radicalize, and from 1968 to 1970 SDS experienced its “Revolution” phase, which was a sharp departure from SDS’s founding

---


¹³ The student movement during the 1960s was part of the broader term, “The Movement.” The Movement began during the early days of the black freedom struggle, growing in strength and numbers as more citizens became active in social and political protests. By the early 1970s, the Movement lost momentum due to the war in Vietnam winding down and also due to the fact that many students became disillusioned with the Movement’s ability to bring true change to the political and social structures of the United States. This thesis uses the Movement as a proper noun.

ideologies. This phase of SDS’s history (1968-1970) saw the most radical attacks against the Establishment, which is the main timeframe of this thesis.

The revolution phase of SDS’s history did not arise in a vacuum. It was instead a reaction to four important developments that defined the chaos of the late 1960s. Although the developments existed outside of the SDS context, the organization used the developments to legitimize its increasing radicalism and to recruit a larger amount of students into the Movement.

The first important development was the height of the nation’s critical population mass. For the first time in U.S. history the youth “occupied a distinct and powerful position in society.” With roughly 40 million people under the age of twenty five by the late 1960s, the youth were a noticeable thread in the fabric of American society. This large demographic—roughly 7.9 million college students—resulted in more students than ever before attending college, and provided SDS organizers with a large pool of educated people to recruit into the Movement.

The U.S. government also used the large youth demographic to sustain its escalation of the Vietnam War. This second development, the height of the Vietnam War, increased the amount of males drafted into service, which translated into higher numbers of American causalities. From 1968 to 1970, 28,679 U.S. soldiers perished in Vietnam, or

---


16 Ibid, 20.

17 Ibid.
almost half of America’s total 58,220 war casualties.\textsuperscript{18} In other words, more individuals than ever before knew someone directly affected by the war, which allowed SDS to gain momentum in its anti-war stance and recruitment activities. The youth also realized that enrolling in college briefly shielded them from the draft.

The third development that showed the chaos of the late 1960s and fed the revolution phase of SDS was the spike in urban unrest and race riots. In many major American cities, citizens who were angered by America’s economic and racial inequality rose up against the power-structure. As the U.S. media broadcasted the burning of American cities, average citizens became aware of the growing tension within American society. These riots were also connected to the fourth development. Indeed, the late 1960s saw the assassinations of prominent Civil Rights leaders and American politicians. When a gunman assassinated Martin Luther King, Jr. on April 4\textsuperscript{th}, 1968, in Memphis, Tennessee the effects were widespread, as “American cities erupted in bitter violence—twenty blocks of Chicago burned, while more than 5,000 troops were needed to restore order in the nation’s capital”\textsuperscript{19} The nation had burst at the seams. SDSers realized it was the perfect opportunity to capitalize on the chaos and they initiated their revolution phase.

Two watershed moments during the revolution phase characterized the increasing radical nature of the Movement. The first was the SDS takeover of Columbia University in April 1968. Columbia’s SDS aligned itself with Columbia’s Students Afro-American


\textsuperscript{19} Hall, Peace and Freedom, 141.
Society (SAS) and occupied five University buildings, including the Administration building. The U.S. media widely publicized the takeover, allowing the message of SDS to be disseminated to those who were not directly connected to the student movement. The takeover also reinforced the attitudes held by conservative members of American society who viewed SDS as a dangerous organization.

The revolution phase of SDS continued to grow throughout the spring and summer of 1968, culminating in the eruption of violence at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. During the 1968 Democratic National Convention (August 26-29, 1968), protestors from a variety of youth organizations, with a large number of SDSers, clashed with Chicago police officers to voice their disapproval with the political system of the United States. The protest of the convention is gauged as “one of the most propelling and influential events of the sixties,” making it a symbolic watershed moment in “revolution” phases of SDS. The violence that the police employed against the protestors had a profound impact on those involved in the Movement. Hundreds were injured and one man was killed when Chicago police officers fired upon a crowd of protestors. With the chaos broadcasted on national television, “many young activists began to believe that the U.S. government was no longer a democracy; instead, they claimed, it had become illegitimate, an outlaw institution led by war criminals.” SDS used the violence at the Convention as a rhetorical justification for its increasing

---


21 Sale, SDS, 473-75.

radicalism, often calling upon SDS members to “remember” Chicago. These two watershed events, linked to the assassinations of Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert Kennedy, the 1968 Election, the Tet Offensive, and the continued drafting of U.S. male citizens encouraged SDS’s radical faction, “The Weathermen,” to launch its “Days of Rage” (October 8-11, 1969), where SDSers sought to “bring the war home” to Chicago.  

SDS as a national organization had divided into various factions by the late 1960s due to differing interpretations as to what method was best for bringing revolutionary change to the United States. During SDS’s 1969 National Convention, these factions battled for control resulting in an SDS that ceased to function as a unified national organization. Although the NO lost its ability to maintain control over SDS as a national organization, local SDS chapters continued to operate autonomously. When the Vietnam War ended in 1973, however, the remaining SDS chapters faded away due the student movement no longer having a large enough cause to rally students.

In essence, SDS constructed its culture on the premise that through collective action true change was possible; a culture that believed idealism was not unrealistic and indeed possible if they exposed the masses to the Establishment’s perceived oppression. SDS’s culture came to accept that the progressive cultural attitudes that a minority of American youths not directly associated with political and social movements had, namely drug experimentation, sexual freedom, psychedelic artistic expression, rock music, and other forms of cultural identities, were also part of the mindset that countered the

---


structures of mainstream American values. SDS learned to combine political radicalism with the apolitical cultural elements of the 1960s through the process of cultural syncretism, or the combination of various youth identities. It is this combination of the late 1960s that arrived at Kent State University (KSU), Case Western Reserve University (CWRU), and John Carroll University (JCU)—all Northeast Ohio institutions of higher learning.

*The Campus as Carnival* explores how SDS operated at these three universities using the semiotic theories of the Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin, especially as they relate to how the SDS chapters at KSU, CWRU, and JCU decentralized unitary language authority via a carnivalesque culture and identity that inverted the socio-ideological discourses generated by the centripetal functions of unitary language dominance. Each of the campuses examined in this thesis was inherently unique: KSU was a large, state-funded university, CWRU was a medium-sized, elite research university, and JCU was a small Jesuit institution, making the commonalities between the campus carnivals interesting for SDS studies. Although each campus was inherently unique, each institution experienced the chaos of the 1960s, which connected these carnivals not only to each other but also to the revolution phase of SDS. Before these

---

25 This thesis uses culture as understood by Mikhail Bakhtin. Bakhtin argued that culture is best understood through language, and his theories are discussed in greater detail below. In regards to identity, this thesis relies on Simon Gunn’s definition presented in his book, *History and Cultural Theory*. Gunn explains that “to speak of a person’s identity is thus to indicate what distinguishes them and makes them different from others. At the same time, identity also denotes what is common to a group the individuals who compose it.” (Gunn, 133). He also explains that “identities are thus seen as akin to roles that individuals play on a variety of sites or stages.”(Gunn, 146) This thesis, therefore, uses both culture and identity as the lens to explore the SDS chapters listed above.
cultural attitudes can be explored, however, it is important to outline Bakhtin’s theory of
semiotics to properly understand how his theories align with what *The Campus as
Carnival* argues. Also, a definition of the terms: “unitary language,” “heteroglossia
language,” “campus carnival,” and “carnivalesque culture,” which are used throughout
the thesis, is necessary.

The Historiography of SDS

It was not until SDS disbanded in the early 1970s that scholars began to study the
organization. The group had captured the minds of American citizens who participated in
social movements during the 1960s and those who watched from the sidelines. The
seminal work on SDS is Kirkpatrick Sale’s *SDS: The rise and development of the
Students for a Democratic Society*.26 Sale’s book is continually referenced by historians
who study the topic due to the thorough examination of the group and remains relevant in
contemporary SDS historiography. Published three years after the fall of SDS in 1970,
Sale’s institutional history employs a Marxist analytical approach of why SDS formed
and also established the narrative for SDS. The book continues to prove useful if one
intends to understand the various inside functions that caused the group to form and fall.
Another well-known work, *SDS* (1972), by Alan Adelson relies on strictly journalistic
methods to posit that SDS was less radical than mainstream America believed, while also
focusing mainly on the Columbia University chapter of SDS.27 *The Movement: A
History of the American New Left, 1959-1972* (1974), by Irwin and Debi Unger, is

---


another seminal work on the New Left and SDS. Although less concise in the
examination of SDS when compared to Sale’s work, The Movement offers an interesting
analysis of the motives and reasons SDS organized in the way it did, along with a
thorough explanation of the changing political motivations of SDS throughout the 1960s.
Also, the book provides an intellectual history of SDS, which assists in the understanding
of the shifting political attitudes of student activists. In particular, the Ungers’ analysis
contends that “The Movement” is synonymous with the New Left, and that other cultural,
political, and social movements of the time, despite influencing SDS members, existed
independently with distinct goals.\(^28\) Both Sale and the Ungers reveal that the New Left
emerged from the ruins of the Old Left, which presents arguments that explain how
activists of the New Left were initially influenced by those of the Old Left but later
challenged the old guard in order to create a culturally distinct movement. A more recent
study, “If I Had a Hammer”:\(\text{\textit{The Death of the Old Left and the Birth of the New Left}}\)
(1987), by Maurice Isserman also examines the connection between the Old Left and the
New Left to argue that the ideologies of anti-war and “radical” demonstrations were not
something exclusive to SDS, but rather a negotiated understanding of older leftist
thought.\(^29\) His work deals primarily with the early days of SDS and does not contain a
thorough discussion of the later years of the group. Nevertheless, it is an excellent

\(^{28}\) The argument that SDS was unable to unite with other demographic groups is present in many of the
studies that followed the arguments presented by the Ungers.

\(^{29}\) Maurice Isserman’s, “\textit{If I Had a Hammer}”: \textit{The Death of the Old Left and the Birth of the New Left} (New
resource to learn about the long tradition of leftist attitudes of American university students.

Following the guidelines of these scholars, modern scholarship has focused on broader historical themes. Rebecca Klatch’s *A Generation Divided: The New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s* (1999), explores SDS and the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) through themes of identity, gender, and convergence to present the connections between the activism of the New Left and the New Right. The strength of Klatch’s investigation comes from the study of the socio-economic background of student activists to assist in the explanation of how and why students of the 1960s joined political organizations. Jennifer Frost’s *An Interracial Movement of the Poor: Community Organizing and the New Left in the 1960s* (2002), like Klatch’s study, provides insight into the theme of gender, along with race, in relation to the New Left and student activism during the 1960s. By examining the early days of SDS and its Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP), Frost agrees with the Ungers that SDS failed to negotiate common economic and political goals that would have united “The Movement” in terms of race. Offering a “global” approach to New Left historiography, Martin Klimke’s *The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties* (2010), examines the relationship between student activists in the United States with those in West Germany, and thus reveals the transnational exchange of

---

30 “Modern” in the sense of being during or after the cultural turn.

31 Rebecca E. Klatch, *A Generation Divided*.

“radical” ideas. Klimke argues that the exchange was mainly one-sided as German students were more influenced by the actions of American students rather than the other way around. For a comprehensive overview of all the cultural, political, and social movements during the 1960s, Terry Anderson’s, *The Movement and the Sixties* (1996) is another excellent resource.

In all, each of these works gifts SDS historiography with insight into the organization and its role in American society during the 1960s. Although the historiography of SDS is significant, and continues to grow, there is a gap in relation to studies that investigate the cultural aspects of SDS and how local SDS chapters used language to challenge dominant discourses. Also, the historiography of SDS does not contain thorough studies of the three universities listed above; however, *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement At American State Universities in the Vietnam Era* (1994), by Kenneth Heineman, does pay particular attention to KSU’s SDS.

*The Campus as Carnival* seeks to fill the gap in SDS historiography by utilizing the linguistic and semiotic theories of Mikhail Bakhtin to provide a semiotic analysis of SDS. In particular, the thesis employs Bakhtin’s theories to scan and analyze historical texts to discover signs of a carnivalesque atmosphere, culture, and identity in Northeast Ohio. The driving argument of this thesis is that the demonstrations and protests that occurred on these campuses exhibited a classic case of carnival and carnivalesque culture. To assist in the explanation of this atmosphere, the thesis provides a new term to

---


describe such demonstrations and protests: “campus carnival.” Campus carnival, in the strictest sense, is highly similar to the medieval marketplace during carnival, and will be defined in more detail below. In order to show how a campus carnival existed on these Ohio campuses, *The Campus as Carnival* examines how the language communities of SDS utilized heteroglossic language to decentralize the official unitary language of the universities, and also presents how these universities responded to such subversion. The thesis also compares the language communities of the three SDS outfits in order to explore possible thematic commonalities in the way they conducted campus carnival. To help drive such an argument the thesis is guided by several key historical questions.

**Key Historical Questions, Methodology, and Sources**

Each chapter seeks to answer several historical questions. First, how did KSU’s, CWRU’s, and JCU’s SDS chapters perceive their campus culture? Answering how each chapter perceived itself culturally allows for the question: What language did these SDS outfits use to present culturally subversive language communities? Understanding how each chapter presented itself as a unique language community opens the door to view how SDS displayed its culture through actions of carnival. Also important is the examination of how the events that occurred outside of the SDS context permitted these local SDS chapters to align with the revolution phase of SDS’s history. The last historical question is directly inspired by Bakhtin’s dialogism: How was SDS’s relationship with each university formed by its actions, and how did each university respond to SDS’s goals and ideologies?
Using these key questions, *The Campus as Carnival* relies on the documents created by each SDS outfit which they distributed throughout each campus. When available, internal university documents are also used to contextualize how each university perceived SDS and the campus carnivals created by SDSers. A close reading of these documents allows for the extraction of distinct linguistic properties that illuminate how SDS created and reinforced the heteroglossia language standard that will be defined below. The campus newspapers of each university are also used in this thesis. Although SDS did not own the words within media reports, campus newspapers do prove as a useful source. Indeed, the newspaper of each campus closely monitored and reported SDS activities to the campus communities, which showcased how the greater campus communities perceived the actions of SDS. Each source is scanned through the employment of Bakhtin’s theories to compare and contrast the varied degrees of campus carnivals at each university. Documents that contain a combination of both unitary and heteroglossia aspects are deconstructed to extract the dialogic properties of each historical text.

**A Brief Introduction to Semiotics and the Theories of Mikhail Bakhtin**

Renee Descartes’ descriptions and theories of how the mind experiences and perceives reality in his treatise, *Meditations on First Philosophy* (1641), allowed for new
explorations of the human experience within the mind, space, and time. The Western philosophers who followed Descartes continually sought to explain the human experience, along with a conception of reality based upon new metaphysical theories. Empiricism—in direct opposition to Cartesian rationalism—gained prominence through the philosophical work of John Locke and George Berkley and furthered the discussion of the duality of mind and body. For this discussion, Berkley’s theories prove useful. Although rooted in a strictly philosophical realm, Berkley’s empiricist attitudes presented in his *Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge* (1710) provide the beginnings of any semiotic study. Berkley discussed how words and ideas attempt to demonstrate perceived reality, and how words and ideas are often accepted through a negotiation of various language forces. In other words, “chair” is an understood symbol within the metaphysical realm (the mind) that is also understood in a perceived physical realm. This theory implies that a person understands within the mind that “chair” is the device in a perceived physical world with the function of providing an area for one to sit on, stand on, etc. One’s mind, therefore, is capable of creating mental pictorial representations of “chair” without having a particular “chair” in mind. Or, one can create

---

35 Rationalism has long been an integral part of Western Philosophy. Indeed, rationalism concludes that knowledge is gained through the rational functions of the human mind. For Descartes, his employment of rationalism was used to explain and justify his existence. His famous rationalist phrase “I am, I exist, is necessarily true each time it is expressed by me, or conceived in my mind,” typically translated into as: “I think, therefore I am,” from his second meditation is regarded as one of the most important developments in rationalist thinking. Essentially, rationalists conclude knowledge exists independently within the human mind or a priori knowledge; knowledge independent of sense experience. Cartesian philosophy is based directly on the employment of a priori knowledge to determine the human experience.

36 Empiricism is a philosophical method of deduction that differs greatly from rationalism. In the place of using only the rational functions of the human mind to gain knowledge, empiricists conclude knowledge is derived through the human senses and experience or: a posteriori knowledge. In Locke’s, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), one of the first uses of the term “semiotics” is presented.
a mental pictorial representation of “chair” based off a specific “chair” experienced in the perceived physical world, such as the “chair” one has in their office. According to Berkley, there is no “chair.” Rather, there is only the device for sitting but through language we understand precisely what “chair” is intended to signify.

Berkley ultimately concluded words are arbitrary symbols that only help us gather information in relation to how we perceive reality. Words do not truly authorize us to perceive a physical world, because words hold no true meaning and such meaning can shift with little consequence. One can disagree with such a conclusion as it is obvious that language will always accept the device for sitting represents the idea “chair” in the strictest sense. It is unlikely one thinks “chair” and then produces a mental pictorial representation of a tree; our language, and how we symbolize it is a force with constant control over our minds and rarely permits new interpretations of linguistic properties. It is possible that words used for ideological and not practical explanations of the world can change due to the fluidity of ideologies, but that assertion will be visited later in this introduction. Regardless of what the true function of language is, one can agree that language determines definitions of reality, and attempts to explain and represent the meanings of reality. SDSers used a distinct language to define and represent the reality they inhabited, while also challenging the previous language definitions of the realities that they and others inhabited.

37Berkley’s theories depart here, for he believed words are unable to truly define physical reality, because physical reality does not exist, and thus a material reality cannot be physically experienced. Therefore, his theories mean it is possible that one can hypothetically determine “chair” means “tree”, but for the sake of length, and with this introduction not being a philosophical study, there is no need to discuss his theories in more detail. For more information regarding his theory of immaterialism, please refer to his treatise that is housed online at: http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/academic/digitexts/berkeley/knowledge/knowledge.txt
Departing from strictly philosophical descriptions of language, linguists and semioticians of the twentieth century theorized the “true” function of language in the human experience. The Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure asserted that language was best understood by the use of signs that signify a meaning. The meaning of words is determined through fixed linguistic structures. This structuralist approach to the study of language is presented in his book, *Course in General Linguistics* (1916). Saussure explained two different styles of a linguistic experience: the first labeled *langue* or language as a system, and the second, *parole* or language through speech.\(^{38}\) Historian Simon Gunn suggests how Saussure grounded his conceptualization of language:

First, meaning was seen not to inhere in words themselves, but was generated by the structural systems of relations which underscored language and which he sought to analyse. Consequently, there was no necessary relation between signs (e.g. words) and their referents—objects and people in the “real” world. Meaning was established within the linguistic systems, not in relation to a domain of reality or experience beyond it.\(^ {39}\)

Indeed, *Course in General Linguistics* laid the groundwork for future semoiticians. The rise of post-structuralism and postmodernism challenged the structuralist attitudes conveyed by Saussure. Although influenced by theories of Saussure, the postmodernist and post-structuralist, Jacques Derrida, concluded that meaning is not constructed through a predetermined set of symbols, because “language resembles a kaleidoscope rather than a stable structure.”\(^ {40}\) The theories of Saussure and Derrida represent opposite


\(^{39}\) Ibid, 10-11.

\(^{40}\) Ibid, 17.
ends of a long spectrum of semiotic works. If there is a middle point to this spectrum, Bakhtin occupies it.

Bakhtin provided stimulating discussions of topics that ranged from how time and space are constructed in fictional and nonfictional writings, influenced by Albert Einstein’s theory of relativity (chronotopes=time spaces), to philosophical theories on how best to understand language in the human experience. For the purpose of this thesis, Bakhtin’s conceptualization of language is the most important. Indeed, his theories can be used to illuminate how SDS’s protest culture and identity was a form of carnival. Although Bakhtin's theories are not specifically intended to be used for the historical analysis presented in this thesis, his ideas prove useful when altered to complement this style of analysis.

Bakhtin concluded that language is a social experience that reveals insight into the cultural functions of societies.\textsuperscript{41} Therefore, by examining the language used by SDS and the authority it challenged, the cultural functions of the group are realized. Departing from the structuralist approach to language, Bakhtin explained that language never exists in a vacuum, and that preexisting structures do not always determine meaning. Meaning is instead placed on those who employ language, but meaning is also generated through its connection to preexisting structures due to language existing simultaneously in the past and present. In other words, when an SDSer demanded university law enforcement officers to disarm, there is a historical meaning that generated ill feelings towards armed guards on campus, while also a contemporary meaning shaped by possible police

brutality on or off a campus. Furthermore, Bakhtin disagreed with the notion that utterance must be divorced from written language and concluded that it is always possible to understand the context of any language if one comprehends how language represents past and present culture. Also important is the realization that a reader’s understanding of language is represented by their own current culture. Of course, such a theory stands in direct opposition to Saussure, because Bakhtin refused to separate different linguistic modes as Saussure did with langue and parole. Building on this, Bakhtin explained that language is dialogic and is always uttered with an anticipation of what a response will be and preexisting structures do not always determine how responses are formed. When SDSers shouted insults at law enforcement officers or political figures, for example, they anticipated certain responses. However, they could not predict if the officer or politician would challenge their shouts or join forces with them. In other words, Bakhtin put the speaker and the listener on the same level; one is not more unprejudiced than the other. Both use previous and current experiences to determine their understandings of how responses are formed both in utterance and outside it.

Bakhtin also explained that language contains an infinite set of symbols that provide explanations of how thought is aligned in terms of the ideological and social functions within societies. This revelation meant that “freedom” to an SDSer generated different meanings when compared to “freedom” as understood to a university administrator, but both individuals had a mutual understanding of freedom in the sense
that it reflected certain aspects of their ideologies and culture. Bakhtin explained this conceptualization of language in his essay “Discourse in the Novel”:

> What we have in mind here is not an abstract linguistic minimum of a common language, in the sense of a system of elementary forms (linguistic symbols) guaranteeing a *minimum* level of comprehension in practical communication. We are taking language not as a system of abstract grammatical categories, but rather language conceived as ideologically saturated, language as a world view, even as a concrete opinion, insuring a *maximum* mutual understanding in all spheres of ideological life.\(^{42}\)

Realizing that language is ideologically saturated allows one to gather how meaning functions between the listener and the speaker, the reader and the writer, etc., because language resembles descriptions of who one is, what one believes in, and how one perceives reality; however, individuals are not part of only one language category. Instead, every individual is part of various language communities, or “socio-ideological” languages.\(^{43}\) These language communities are often defined by status, profession, generation, etc.\(^{44}\)

The socio-ideological functions of any language community are determined through the negotiation (or conflict) between two larger language forces: unitary language and the heteroglossia. These language forces—unitary and heteroglossia—are home to all language communities. Essentially, an individual’s language community exists in both the unitary and heteroglossia language spheres.\(^{45}\) Bakhtin describes that the unitary language “gives expression to forces working toward concrete verbal and

---

42Ibid. 271.

43Ibid. 271- 272.


45 The heteroglossia language is considered to create the stratification that results in language communities.
ideological unification and centralization, which develop in vital connection with the processes of sociopolitical and cultural centralization.\footnote{Bakhtin, \textit{The Dialogic Imagination}, 271.} Unitary language, through attempts of unification and centralization, is considered a centripetal language force. The centripetal force resembles official discourse or official languages. For SDS, the unitary language sphere was that of the state, the Establishment, and the university.

To assist in the illumination of such a theory, imagine two individuals, one a capitalist and the other a socialist, participate in a dialogic experience.\footnote{Socialist is used to designate modern state socialism, not historical socialism.} The individuals are discussing the economic functions of a chair factory in their local community. The capitalist individual believes that the chair factory creates economic stability in the community by providing gainful employment to individuals. The socialist individual, conversely, believes the factory does not provide adequate wages, and therefore does not provide economic stability to the community and advocates for the nationalization of the factory. Although these individuals have different ideological understandings of the positives and the negatives of the factory, the unitary language centralizes their understanding of what ideas such as “factory”, “wages”, and “stability” means in the strictest sense but has difficulty centralizing the ideologies of the two very different language communities. The argument of the two individuals, therefore, is not based on the elementary definitions of particular words that represent the physical world or basic abstract ideas. Rather, the individuals argue what the actual function of the factory is due to the language communities they represent. The fact the individuals’ language
communities define how they understand reality, along with the fact that the individuals participate in a dialogic argument, reveals the presence of the second language force: the heteroglossia.

The heteroglossia is a language energy that does not seek to centralize but to decentralize. Such a language force is centrifugal in nature as it does not operate only through the standards of unitary language; a heteroglossia operates in reaction to unitary language. By standing in direct opposition to unitary language forces, the heteroglossia force imprints itself in utterance through an unofficial manner by pulling away from official ideological discourse. As we saw above, unitary language is typically that of the state. As such, a protest staged by SDS must employ hetroglossic language in order to offer alternatives to official unitary discourse. Taking this into account, unitary language is defined as “high” language. The heteroglossia, conversely, is defined as “low” language. Bakhtin explains:

This stratification and heteroglossia, once realized, is not only a static invariant of linguistic life, but also what insures its dynamics: stratification and heteroglossia widen and deepen as long as language is alive and developing. Alongside the centripetal forces, the centrifugal forces of language carry on their uninterrupted works; alongside verbal-ideological centralization and unification, the uninterrupted process of decentralization and disunification go forward.48

The conflict between these two language forces presents the culture of carnival as understood by Bakhtin. He used the medieval carnival—described in the writings of Rabelais—as a way to investigate how the “low” language of the people challenged the “high” language of the state and the Catholic Church in his book, *Rabelais and His World.*

(1965). The atmosphere of carnival destroyed the normative functions of the unitary language and allowed for the heteroglossia to operate in full form:

The suspension of all hierarchical precedence during carnival time was of particular significance. Rank was especially evident during official feasts: everyone was expected to appear in the full regalia of his calling, rank, and merits and to take the place corresponding to his position. It was a consecration of inequality. On the contrary, all were considered equal during carnival…This temporary suspension, both ideal and real, of hierarchical rank created during carnival time a special type of communication impossible in everyday life. This led to the creation of special forms of marketplace speech and gesture, frank and free, permitting no distance between those who came in contact with each other and liberating from norms of etiquette and decency imposed at other times. A special carnivalesque, marketplace style of expression was formed.49

Essentially, “Carnival embodied the spirit of unofficial against official culture, of dialogic imagination against monologic truth.”50 It is important to remember that the unitary language permitted the carnival, even though the heteroglossia attempted to pull away from it. For the purpose of this thesis, carnival as an idea and an event exists at the center of the competition between the two language forces. Figure 1 provides a diagram of the theoretical framework.51

50Gunn, History and Cultural Theory, 67.
51Michael D. Goodnough, “Figure 1,” chart, in Bakhtin Diagram (Kent, 2012).
Revisiting the two individuals engaged in the dialogic argument, now consider that the state determined the chair factory was hurtful to the local community. The state nationalized the factory in an attempt to provide better wages for the workers, and thus controls all functions of the factory. The socialist individual now, in his particular world view, exists within the unitary language’s grasp: his ideas in relation to the chair factory are fully centralized. For the capitalist individual, her ideas exist within the heteroglossia: her world views stratify the linguistic order. As the unitary language attempts to centralize the verbal and ideological thought process of the capitalist, her language community attempts to pull away from the centralizing force in order to maintain her views. If the capitalist individual begins to boycott the factory, whether mentally or physically, the conflict creates the idea of carnival in the sense that official culture is
directly challenged by unofficial culture. Or, for the purposes of this thesis, when SDSers staged protests against unitary language agents they created a campus carnival.

Campus carnival, therefore, is defined as the act of deriding official university culture through campus protests, the distribution of pamphlets/leaflets, guerilla theatre, the occupation of university buildings, and other activities of the heteroglossia. All these acts utilize heteroglossia language in order to present a direct challenge to the functions of the unitary language force that is represented by a university, and serve as a unifying language for SDS and its generational cohort. A campus carnival is divided into three stages, with each stage possessing a unique form of a campus carnival. Stage one campus carnival is labeled as “mild campus carnival” and is designated to mean carnival in its most tamed form. During stage one of campus carnival, there is a lack of violence and intensive demonstration, which results in the heteroglossia being unable to fully decentralize various campus language communities. Stage two of campus carnival is labeled as “aggressive campus carnival.” Here, there are attempts by the heteroglossia to completely pull language communities into its grasp, but it is unable to achieve complete stratification and decentralization. Also, this stage may have minor instances of violence against unitary language forces. Stage three is considered “complete carnival,” which represents campus carnival in its highest form and displays heteroglossia language in its rawest practice. Typically, stage three of campus carnival utilizes actions of radical violence against the unitary language forces in order to completely stratify the linguistic order. In other words, language communities are understood as briefly existing completely outside the grasp of unitary language, which attempts to centralize the
functions of this carnival by removing the carnival's ability to continue. These three stages do not need to occur in congruence with their numerical value. Although “three” is placed with more value than “one” in terms of numerical context and physical experience, a university does not always experience such stages in order. In other words, Campus X may experience stage two of campus carnival before ever experiencing stage one. Conversely, Campus Y may only ever reach stage one, and never experience campus carnival in a higher form. A campus carnival is continual in some respects, but various sites of campus carnival in time and space are considered unique and one part of the mechanism that constructs “the whole” of a carnivalesque culture and identity.

As stated above, the purpose of this thesis is to employ Bakhtin’s theories on language and carnivalesque cultures to investigate the conflicts between official and unofficial culture and discourse, and show how these carnivals helped define identity. Employing these theories allow for the above key historical questions to be addressed. The first chapter explores the campus carnival created by KSU’s SDS, arguing that KSU’s SDS created extreme cases of campus carnival culminating in the events of May 4, 1970. KSU’s SDS aligned with the violent aspects of SDS’s revolution phase, meaning it was not reluctant to employ physical force to challenge unitary language authority. The use of violence is what ultimately signaled the end of KSU’s SDS as the campus carnival became too large to contain through normative centralization. Chapter two focuses on the campus carnival of CWRU. The chapter argues that CWRU’s SDS had the ability to create a considerable cranivalesque culture, but was a largely unable to, due to its unwillingness to challenge unitary language authority in the same manner of KSU’s SDS.
The lack of violence, however, is central to the argument that CWRU’s carnival was able to last longer than the carnival at KSU. Also, chapter two argues that CWRU’s SDS viewed itself as lagging behind Kent’s carnival. Chapter three investigates the campus carnival of JCU. The chapter explores why JCU’s campus carnival was far tamer than the other two universities studied. Ultimately, chapter three argues that JCU’s language communities felt it largely unnecessary for a revolutionary movement on its campus as a result of its religious culture. Furthermore, JCU’s SDSers tended to reflect the earlier stages of SDS, meaning the group placed a great deal of emphasis on social justice and participatory democracy, and avoided the revolution phase of SDS’s history.

With KSU’s SDS providing the most “radical” and profound instances of campus carnival, this thesis will compare CWRU and JCU in relation to KSU in both practice and ideology. This comparison allow for common themes between the protests of each campus to be extracted and discussed in the conclusion of this thesis. In particular, each SDS outfit was united in its opposition to ROTC programs, outside recruitment organizations, defense research, the Vietnam War, bigotry, racism, and sexism. These themes reveal that during the late 1960s, a new and unified carnivalesque student identity emerged in Northeast Ohio. Although rarely connected directly, the carnivalesque identity sought to make collective action a possibility as progressive ideologies were fused with “radical” elements of political mobilization.
CHAPTER I

“KENT THUGS”52: THE CAMPUS CARNIVAL
AT KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

During the late 1960s the campus of Kent State University (KSU) reflected the atmosphere of many university campuses in America and the world as its students often demonstrated using powerful carnivalesque displays of ironic contempt. KSU activists began conducting protests at KSU demanding University administrators to allow the formation of campus political organizations and free speech activities roughly a year before students at the University of California, Berkeley began the famous Free Speech Movement (1964), a common marker signifying the rise in student awareness.53 KSU’s activist history and use of the carnivalesque continued with the formation of an unnamed antiwar group in 1964, which organized peace protests before the founding of Vietnam Day Committee in 1965.54 From that point, KSU’s student protestors were at the forefront of antiwar activities and orchestrated minor incidents of campus carnival. Student dissent and activism exploded in the late 1960s as the University (and nation) became more polarized over the intensification of the Vietnam War, Civil Rights, the 1968 Election, and changes in many of the cultural attitudes of the nation's youth. As

52 Kent State SDS, Kent Thugs (Kent: Kent State SDS, 1969)
54 Ibid.
KSU students from various economic, political, and social backgrounds voiced their opinions through protest, a new carnivalesque identity emerged. The identity sought to challenge unitary dominance through the centrifugal capabilities of a powerful heteroglossia language. Much like other campuses, Kent’s student identity never united in its ideologies, but did find common ground in the principle that youth could facilitate change by directly challenging the superstructure.

One of the few active student forces on Kent’s campus that did possess a distinct identity of activism was SDS. Formed during the 1968 academic year, Kent’s SDS made its campus presence known through frequent acts of campus carnival that challenged the University’s unitary authority, resulting in Kent’s chapter becoming one the larger chapters in the nation. By the spring of 1969, the University challenged SDS’s ability to maintain its campus presences as it sought to centralize the verbal and socio-ideological thought of Kent’s SDS by arresting members and suspending the chapter from campus.

Before SDS’s campus carnival at KSU can be examined, however, it is necessary to review how the University utilized unitary language to legitimize its 1969 decision to suspend Kent’s SDS from campus. Robert E. Matson, Kent State University’s Vice-President for Student Affairs sent an official two-page letter to the officers and members of Kent’s SDS on April 8, 1969. The letter came in response to a campus demonstration conducted by Kent’s SDS that had turned violent when members of the organization attempted to enter the Administration Building. The letter outlined six violations involving Kent’s SDS that warranted suspension from campus. According to Matson,

---

55The reason SDS attempted to enter the Administration Building is investigated later in the chapter.
Kent’s SDS engaged not only in “disruptive” behavior but also in violent behavior against University officials. For that reason, Matson explained, “Each of the above violations constitutes an act which within itself justifies the suspension of your organization,” and there was ample evidence to support the University’s decision to suspend the organization from campus. The University’s decision to suspend the SDS charter was not created as an act of unwarranted punishment; rather, it was justified through preexisting University bureaucratic protocols created by the centripetal functions of its unitary language. In other words, the University justified the suspension through the employment of procedures created by the State of Ohio, or as Matson described, through the use of “appropriate provisions of the Ohio Revised Code.” Not only did the letter effectively suspend the organization from campus, it also stated members of Kent’s SDS were prohibited from registering for future courses and were not permitted to enter Kent’s campus except “in the accompaniment of a University Security Officer.”

Matson’s letter outlines the tension that often accompanies the conflict between the unitary and heteroglossia language forces, as the University employed the state’s official ideological discourse to justify its decision. More important than the tension—both literal and figurative—created by the actions of the hetroglossic nature of SDS’s carnivalesque culture, the centripetal forces of the unitary language failed to properly

56 “1. Battery of University police officers in the performance of their duty. 2. Assault of University police officers in the performance of their duty. 3. Disruption of the teaching function of the University by interruption of an English Class in Satterfield Hall. 4. Violent and forceful attempted entry into the Administration Building. 5. Disruption of the administrative function of the University. 6. Breach of the peace, including indecent language.” “Students for a Democratic Society.” Robert E. Matson to Officers and Members, April 8, 1969, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, May 4th Collection.
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centralize the verbal and ideological language of the group prior to April 1969. Unable to properly centralize the language communities of SDS for it to function within the preexisting language structures of the University, the unitary language removed the language community to end the decentralization capabilities of the heteroglossia. The unitary language of the University ensured, at least hypothetically, that the tension between the two language forces would cease and the normative functions of University language communities would be restored.

Matson’s explanations of the violations that warranted SDS’s suspension also reveal that during April 1969, KSU experienced stage three of campus carnival, or “complete carnival.” Maston’s letter provides instances where SDS damned the sacred nature of the University through “indecent language,” derided the official nature of the University through the “disruption of the teaching function of the University,” and how the profane expressions of SDS haunted the unitary functions of the University’s language authority through the “battery of University police officers.” Although this was the first time the University suspended Kent’s SDS from the campus, the disruptive atmosphere was not an exclusive April 1969 development. It was instead part of a long

58 If the University had properly centralized the verbal and ideological discourse of Kent’s SDS through the use of its centripetal language forces prior to April 1969, the group would not have continued its heteroglossic activities that warranted suspension.

59 As stated in the introduction to this thesis, stage three of campus carnival is defined as “complete carnival,” campus carnival in highest form. The level of campus carnival during this stage, displays heteroglossia language in its rawest practice. Typically, stage three utilizes actions of violence against the unitary language forces in order to completely stratify the linguistic order. In other words, language communities are understood as briefly existing completely outside the grasp of unitary language, and thus, the unitary language attempts to centralize the functions of this carnival by removing the carnival’s ability to continue.

60 Matson, letter.
tradition of political activism on Kent’s campus. Matson’s letter suggests that the
demonstrations by Kent’s SDS simply grew too large for the University to properly
contain through normative verbal and ideological centralization.

This chapter argues that the various campus demonstrations of Kent’s SDS were
not senseless acts of disruptive behavior employed by a rabble-rousing youth culture, but
were guided by more complex socio-ideological motivations. The demonstrations
exhibited a classic case of campus carnival at all stages due to the varying levels of
tension between the unitary language of the University and the heteroglossia language of
Kent’s SDS. The chapter also argues that Kent’s campus carnival was far more “radical”
in its operations when compared to the forms of protest exhibited by the other SDS
outfits studied in this thesis. Further, this chapter argues that the carnivalesque culture of
Kent’s SDS was not initially(or always) opposed to operating in a unitary language
experience, and that the full development of a heteroglossia language only came as the
tensions between the University and SDS grew too large for the University to contain.

“I'm on the pavement, thinking about the government:”

The Culture of Kent State University’s Students for a Democratic Society

The culture of Kent’s SDS showed many of the same cultural attitudes of SDS
chapters across the nation, but the students of Kent were far different in nature than those
at Berkeley, Columbia, and the University of Michigan. Contrary to sociologist Cyril
Levitt’s argument that SDS was a “revolt of privilege against privilege,” Kent students

---

were products of Middle America. They came from working-class backgrounds and did not view the harsh reality of America’s inequalities from above, but from within. Social inequality was a real experience for them—a day to day existence that made the Movement all the more important. When SDS as a national organization initiated a mobilizing and organizing push in 1968, Kent students who wanted to challenge these inequalities viewed SDS as the legitimate organization to vent their concerns.

Kent’s SDS did not officially organize until February 20, 1968 when the group filed for University recognition as a campus group. By the time Kent's SDS sought official University recognition roughly 300 official SDS chapters, with between 80,000 and 100,000 members, existed in the United States. The application for campus recognition suggests the group conformed to the centralizing forces of the University’s unitary language functions, as SDS realized that through official recognition it would have “the privileges of using the name and facilities of the University.” Initially, at least, University recognition permitted SDS to spread its cultural messages through “education and social action,” all the while abiding “by the rules and regulations of the

---

62 Cyril Levitt, *Children of Privilege: Student Revolt in the Sixties: A Study of Student Movements in Canada, the United States, and West Germany* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 4.

63 The formation of Kent’s SDS came at a time when the National Office of SDS became increasingly decentralized, and less active in the daily workings of the various chapters across the nation. Such decentralization was the result of the National office of SDS breaking into various ideological groups, coupled in with the fact that the organization became too large for direct oversight. Membership statistics: Sale, 664.

64 Sale, SDS, note, 416.

65 George Hoffman, *Form A*, February 20, 1968, Application for University recognition by a student organization, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, May 4th Collection.
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University and to support its program and objectives. The group surrendered such control to the unitary language even as it sought to represent the ideals listed in the “Port Huron Statement,” because the centripetal forces of the unitary language are difficult to avoid and often results in tribute being paid to official discourse—only the carnival can break such a pattern. It is possible that Kent’s SDS participated in the unitary functions of the University’s language protocols to evade potential problems that would result from the group operating on campus without official recognition. If so, the clever ruse the heteroglossia language utilized can be appreciated, but such a minor subversion does not yet reveal campus carnival.

Regardless of what the true intentions of the group were in relation to the application for official recognition, it is apparent that unitary language forces are at times impossible to avoid due to the centripetal nature of its unifying abilities. As Bakhtin explains, “Every utterance participates in the “unitary language” (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces).” Therefore, it is important to examine how the group also used its heteroglossia language within the official University document. Essentially, the group sought to educate and bring social action to campus, which reveals that the group had pre-conceived goals. The use of the words “education” and “social action” meant the group presumed the University had failed to properly educate the campus community about the problems the group saw within the Kent community and that it was

67 Ibid.

68 Bakhtin, The Dialogic Imagination, 272.
best equipped to provide such education. These aspects meant the group sought to challenge official discourse through its ideological attitudes, which created the presence of the heteroglossia. Understanding both the heteroglossia and unitary aspects of SDS’s culture also allows for the realization that campus carnival had not yet arrived to Kent’s campus, resulting from the absence of an open air display of mockery. SDS’s application was not distributed for all on campus to read. It was instead created for the eyes of those directly involved in Student Affairs. Soon, however, the situation—through the emergence of a campus carnival—would change.

Once the University granted official recognition in February, 1968, Kent’s SDS started an intensive education campaign that relied on the distribution of pamphlets across campus. In one of the earliest distributed pamphlets, one sees the beginnings of SDS’s carnival.69 Titled “20 Years of Schooling and They Put You on the Day Shift,” the pamphlet illuminated heteroglossia language in practice.70 The purpose of the pamphlet was to introduce the campus community to the ideologies and practices of Kent’s SDS, serving as campus carnival at stage one.71 Unlike the application for University recognition, the pamphlet was not part of an official unitary discourse. Instead, SDS

---

69 There is not an official date on the pamphlet. However, there is a way to determine approximately when SDS created the pamphlet. The pamphlet has a stamp on the lower right corner that gives credence to SDS being an official University group. Therefore, SDS wrote the pamphlet after February 1968. More indicative of the date is a note on the back of the pamphlet that states an upcoming organizational meeting slated for “Sat. Sept. 28.” Using these clues, the pamphlet was likely distributed before or during the fourth week of September 1968.

70 The title is in reference to the Bob Dylan song “Subterranean Homesick Blues.” In later years, the song was also the inspiration for an SDS splinter group that operated under the name “The Weathermen.”

71 As stated in the introduction, stage one campus carnival is labeled as “mild campus carnival,” and is designated to mean: Carnival in its most tamed form. During stage one, there is a lack of violence and intensive demonstration, which results in the heteroglossia being unable to fully decentralize various campus language communities.
owned the words within the pamphlet; it created the socio-ideological discourse and did not depend on preexisting unitary language protocols to present its heteroglossic culture. The only unitary symbol on the pamphlet is Kent State University’s rising sun symbol, which was given facial features with a word bubble containing the title. (figure 2) The alteration meant the sun symbol no longer uttered the unitary’s centralized and official language through dour utterance. In its place, it contained the language of the heteroglossia. It spoke to students in a new language which represented fresh ideals. This symbolic act reveals how the heteroglossia’s centrifugal forces often pull away and disrupt the sacredness of unitary discourse in order to disrupt and stratify the linguistic protocols of a unitary language.

Figure 2: Symbolic alteration of KSU’s sun logo, Kent’s SDS, September 1968
Referring back to the application for University recognition, which granted the privileges of using the name of the University, Kent’s SDS did indeed use the University’s name (through the sun symbol), but distorted the official name of University for its own purposes. In essence, the use of the symbol was to bring awareness to the campus community in a way that conflicted with the overall ideological message of the University. Right from the start Kent’s SDS restructured the structuring structures of University language. Although the message presented in the pamphlet conflicted with the pledge Kent’s SDS made in its application, the University was not yet prepared to attempt full centralization, and the carnival remained unchallenged. The symbolic alteration gifted any campus reader of the pamphlet with an understanding that Kent’s SDS did not oppose conveying its message freely, which further hints of campus carnival at stage one. In addition, the lyrical reference to the Bob Dylan song welcomed its generation, as the pamphlet’s sun symbol emitted rays of a “hip” message that aligned with the broader cultural elements of 1960s youth culture. On the inside of the pamphlet, further signs of the heteroglossic and carnivalesque culture of Kent’s SDS are revealed:

We live in a world that is becoming increasingly restrictive—a world where we have less and less control over those things that most directly affect our lives. As young people living in America today and more specifically as students attending Kent State University there are certain realities that to a greater or lesser degree we must face every day.  

If the reader of the pamphlet did not already feel connected through the cover presentation, the use of the rhetorical device “As young people living in America”
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72 Kent State SDS, *Kent SDS-Twenty Years of Schooling and They Put You on the Day Shift*, May 4th Collection.
demonstrated the connection that Kent’s SDS attempted to create with other language communities on campus. Language communities are defined through “status” and “generation,” and the basic “status” of many individuals on the Kent campus was that of a student, which placed these individuals within the language community of students. The “generation” of the individuals was also related, which created a connection of language communities through age. Connecting the language communities active on Kent’s campus permitted the heteroglossia language to explain the realities that they all had to “face every day.” The realities included an education system considered “inadequate” and “depersonalized,” excessive textbooks prices, University prejudice and racism, the draft, the Vietnam War, and the “increasing intrusion of an artificial ‘plastic’ culture.”

By combining the various issues that plagued the United States—bigotry, racism, and the Vietnam War—with local communal and cultural deficiencies—excessive textbook prices and inadequate parking—SDS ended its search for the sacred through the fusion of cultural attitudes. Through the centrifugal force of its heteroglossia language and carnivalesque culture, Kent’s SDS offered a language community that stood in binary opposition to the language community of the University. This binary tension produced a strain on the centralized language communities within the University, as the pamphlet was not only intended for those who followed the ideological thought processes of Kent’s SDS but also for those who did not in hopes that more would participate in the campus carnival. The pamphlet served as an open air mockery of the official functions of the

---

Ibid. The group actually labeled the Vietnam War, the “Vietnamese War”. The term was likely used to convey the message that the United States should not be illegally involved in the civil war between the North and South Vietnamese armies. Such a statement relates to the overall ideological guidelines of SDS that perceived the United States as an imperialist nation.
University, and challenged official University culture. Any individual who read the pamphlet participated in a dialogic experience by reading the attacks of the heteroglossia. This experience pulled away the individual, at least temporarily, from the unitary language’s grasp.

The pamphlet ended with examples of the cultural elements of SDS which provided the ultimate hope of the campus carnival:

In the past several months Kent SDS has initiated a variety of programs which are in various stages of development. These include a draft counseling service, a speakers bureau, the Free University, a radically oriented newspaper, a book co-op, a radical arts project, and a number of alternatives to the downtown Kent social scene such as the Yellow Unicorn coffee house and the free appearances of groups such as the James Gang.  

By identifying these cultural elements, Kent’s SDS detailed how quickly they had mobilized and organized since its official University recognition. The rapid emergence of a culturally distinct language community meant the heteroglossia’s centrifugal force had successfully started stage one of campus carnival. Thus, with the campus carnival begun, the festivities would grow larger in scope and magnitude when the heteroglossia attempted to dislocate more language communities from the dominion of the unitary language.

**November 1968: The Carnival Asserts its Dominance**

By the end of October 1968, Kent’s SDS solidified its position as a campus force through its demonstrations that illustrated it was not afraid to display its cultural elements
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74 Kent State SDS, *Kent SDS-Twenty Years of Schooling and They Put You on the Day Shift*, May 4th Collection.
in the face of centralizing unitary forces. The confidence of Kent’s SDS made their actions during November 1968 one of the most sensational periods of Kent’s campus carnival as it fluctuated between all stages of campus carnival. Indeed, the November 1, 1968 *Daily Kent Stater* article revealed to the campus community that the carnival was in full swing, describing how on October 31, Kent’s SDS interrupted a Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC) drill on campus. Kent’s SDS targeted the ROTC program for a number of reasons, with the most obvious being the direct connection to the U.S. Armed Forces. Kent’s SDS considered the military as the agent that enforced the oppressive and imperialistic functions of the Establishment and its presence on Kent’s campus, as a homeland, was viewed as tantamount occupation by imperialist forces:

Approximately 20 members of SDS marched across the commons yesterday at noon to illustrate their dissatisfaction with the militaristic system that trains young men to go out and kill. They marched in Army fashion chanting, “Kill, Kill, Kill.” The ROTC classes, drilling on the commons at that time, made no move to disrupt the demonstration.

This type of demonstration presented campus carnival at stage two. SDS challenged both the unitary language of the University and the unitary language of the U.S. Federal Government. They illustrated their dissatisfaction in an open air environment which allowed them to comprehend the centrifugal forces of heteroglossia as it worked against centralizing functions of the unitary language. For the unitary

---

75 SDS outfits across the national typically protested against ROTC programs, so Kent’s SDS is not unique in its opposition to the program.


77 Stage two of campus carnival is labeled as “aggressive campus carnival.” Here, there are attempts by the heteroglossia and carnivalesque culture to completely pull language communities into its grasp, but the carnival rarely accomplishes complete stratification and decentralization. Also, this stage may have minor instances of violence against unitary language forces. Either way, the unitary language suffers an intensive blow as stage two is widely advertised.
language forces, nothing was safe from being derided by the campus carnival. Everything sacred was challenged; everything high became low. The fact that Kent’s SDS marched in a military fashion meant the group not only mocked the socio-ideological functions of ROTC’s language community but also the most basic elements that defined its language authority: uniformity and order. SDS’s centrifugal language forces tore the ROTC’s culture from the unitary language’s grasp, feasted on it in a jovial manner, and digested the culture through the heteroglossia sphere. Invigorated by their display, the carnivalesque culture began to grow through the boisterous ideological fervor of the heteroglossia language force as it spun faster than the unitary language’s ability to maintain control. The implications of the language feast were widespread. With the campus carnival publicized through the Stater, the heteroglossia pulled more language communities away from the centralizing forces of unitary discourse. In effect, through the dialogic experience of reading the article campus language communities became aware of the growing strength of the carnivalesque culture and the social struggle it unfolded.

On November 1, 1968, the carnival spread throughout Kent’s campus as the Presidential election neared and Kent’s SDS capitalized on the opportunity to display its disillusionment with the American electoral process. Indeed, SDS felt the election would not bring true change to the structures of the country and that the perceived oppression employed by the Establishment would continue. Kent’s SDS members now were not only concerned with deriding the official functions of unitary discourse through protests of those directly involved, such as ROTC, but to venues where the unitary forces of the University had the strongest and most sacred control: the classroom. University
classrooms provide an outlet for the unitary language to express its socio-ideological functions and to centralize the opposing functions of the heteroglossia—especially at state funded universities.\(^7\) Students, whether aware of it or not, received the discourse that the University wanted to present through its service of education. If the structure that houses the administration of the University is the brain, the classroom is the heart that pumps the unitary message into the arteries, capillaries, and veins of the campus community in order for all other organs of the campus to operate effectively. In the classroom ultimate centralization occurs, and Kent’s SDS realized one of the most manageable ways to disable the brain was to attack the heart. Invading a political science class held in Bowman Hall, the *Stater* reported SDS activists carried a black coffin to display their dissatisfaction with the electoral process.\(^7\) The use of a coffin had multiple meanings: first, it signified that for SDS members democracy was dead; second, SDS showcased that it was the pallbearer of the dead democracy; and third, SDS offered hope that once laid to a proper rest, democracy might rise again in fulfillment of the Port Huron Statement’s scripture to bring political agency to the masses.

The demonstration also presented a new development in the ideological functions of Kent’s SDS. Previously, the carnival of Kent’s SDS remained outside the classroom, which meant the carnivalesque operated in the safety of an open air environment, similar

\(^{7}\) Heineman notes that KSU’s professors were traditionally quiet on issues that SDS sought to advertise. It is probable that some university professor decided that voicing disapproval of the Establishment might result in termination, and thus supported dissent privately. Also, members of Kent’s faculty did voice disapproval of various national events, but they were a minority. For an overview of KSU professors and their ideologies, along with professors at other state universities, please refer to chapter 2 (pp. 42-75) of Heineman’s, *Campus Wars*.

\(^{79}\) *The Daily Kent Stater* (Kent), November 2, 1968, Volume: LIV. No. 25.
to the carnival of the medieval marketplace. As space SDS designated the “outside” for the site of carnival, not the “inside.” Such spatial transformation meant the carnival grew ever more ambitious in its campus operations. The carnivalesque culture left its marketplace safety net, and attempted a new site of campus carnival. Such an aggressive demonstration aligns with stage two of campus carnival. Although Kent’s SDS attacked the heart, it continued to pump as the centralizing forces of the unitary language proved too powerful for the heteroglossia to consume. Students within the classroom shouted their disapproval of the demonstration, and booed Kent’s SDS out of the classroom. It appears within the classroom the official functions of the unitary language centralized in a manner stronger than the heteroglossia’s ability to decentralize. Otherwise the students within the classroom, regardless of their political ideologies, would not have voiced disapproval with the demonstration and would have joined the deriding of official culture. Not defeated, SDS left the classroom and continued its funeral march across campus. Despite the failure of the demonstration, the carnivalesque culture ensured all language communities would continue to be aware of its ever-expanding campus presence.

Four Days after the black coffin march, on Election Day 1968, Kent’s SDS suspended its attempts to assign the “inside” as a site to display its heteroglossic culture.

80 Although pamphlets were distributed both inside and outside University buildings, it is necessary to take campus carnival mainly as an “outside” event during stage 2.

81 The Daily Kent Stater (Kent), November 2, 1968, Volume: LIV. No. 25.
in an aggressive manner by sponsoring a dance at KSU’s Student Union. Shortly after 9:15 pm, Patrolman D. Boll arrived at the Union to respond to a noise complaint called in by students not involved with the dance. In his report to Security Officer Donald Swartzmiller, Boll explained his encounter with SDS members. He explained that:

This officer responded to the Union at his earliest convenience and asked the SDS leaders to close the doors leading to the commons in order to keep the noise down. The group had a live band and their permit was in order, so they really were in the right. But, the group complied with my request and closed the doors so as to be as least disturbing as possible.

Boll’s encounter with SDS was an interesting one. It is clear from the report that both Boll and SDS did not actively seek out a confrontation with each other. The report stated the complaints came from students within the Union, revealing that those within similar language communities of SDS were the ones dissatisfied with the actions of SDS, not the unitary language of the University. Also interesting is that the group had a permit from the University to hold the dance, only days after deriding official University culture in various forms of campus carnival. By holding the dance on campus, SDS contradicted its previous message stated in “20 Years of Schooling and They Put You on the Day Shift” that University facilities were “inadequate and depersonalized.” It can be argued that with a noise complaint the facilities were inadequate as SDS was not able to freely enjoy its concert; however, the same pamphlet explained the group held free concerts at the

---

82 Complaints on Noise at Union; ref. SDS Dance, "D. Boll to Mr. Swartzmiller, November 5, 1968, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio." The reason for the dance is unknown, but it is interesting it was held on a Tuesday. Therefore, it is possible the dance was held on that date due to it being Election Day. The only document discovered that discusses the dance is a KSU Police report.

83 Kent State SDS, *Kent SDS-Twenty Years of Schooling and They Put You on the Day Shift*, May 4th Collection.
Yellow Unicorn coffee house. Kent’s SDS did have access to facilities outside of campus, but chose not to utilize them, showing that SDS was not always opposed to operating through the bureaucratic protocols of University’s unitary language.

But that was not the end of the set. Boll’s report continued with more interesting developments:

At about 10:45pm, more complaints came in and the janitors complained for they wanted to clean the room and they said the group was to leave at 10:30pm. This office[r] did not have a copy of the permit, SDS claimed their permit was good until 11pm. This officer then told them that they would have to leave then, which was about 10:48pm. The group completely complied and told their members to leave. Some of the janitors complained about it taking so long for the group to leave, but as previously stated, the band was a live band and had to take down their equipment. Sgt. Rine felt I should make this report on the basis there was many complaints, I feel the group acted very co-operatively and even when they really didn’t have to.

In Boll’s second visit to the dance SDS was again compliant, which illuminated SDS’s unwillingness to perpetually carry out forms of campus carnival even when vis-à-vis with one its most hated enemies: law enforcement officers (LEOs). SDS viewed LEOs with the same disdain as the military; however, “pigs”, as SDS referred to them, were not overseas maintaining American imperialism but at home, maintaining the oppressive hold of the Establishment and all that it stood for in America. Even worse, unlike many members of the military, LEOs chose to participate in the oppression, because they were not drafted against their will.

---

84 Located in the basement of the Universalist-Unitarian Church of Kent, the Yellow Unicorn Coffee House was the location for frequent SDS meetings, but was not considered an exclusive SDS locale. Indeed, the coffee house was open to all members of the Kent community, and held draft resistance counseling to students. Sally Burnell, Unitarian Universalist Church of Kent, accessed November 21, 2011, http://www.kentuu.org/about-us/history/
Without a strong display of mockery for official University culture, it is difficult to label the dance as an act of campus carnival, but it is still possible. That Kent’s SDS sponsored a dance in the Union made it likely that students who were not associated with the group could experience the carnivalesque culture in a less hostile environment. It was easier for a student to approach a member of Kent’s SDS while listening to a band than it was approaching that same SDS member during a campus march. Moreover, the band likely played rock music, which once again showed how SDS attempted to link the generational language community. The free social environment of the concert also allowed for SDS to educate individuals from other language communities not normally interested in their ideologies and goals. If such education did take place, labeling the dance as stage one of a campus carnival becomes easier. As time progressed, however, such tame forms of campus carnival became almost nonexistent.

After the 1968 Election, Kent’s SDS aligned itself with the language community of Kent’s Black Union of Students (BUS) to protest the Oakland Police Department’s recruitment campaign on campus. Kent’s SDS believed, as did various national leaders of SDS, that a true revolutionary movement required a fusion of black and white radical members.\textsuperscript{85} The BUS-SDS alliance created a stronger and more powerful carnivalesque message. BUS had its own problems with the University concerning the racial issues that plagued the Kent community and the nation. Combined, the heteroglossic nature of both

\textsuperscript{85}The fusion of an interracial movement was mainly one-sided, though. With Stokely Carmichael’s rise to prominence in SNCC, he called for “black power” which meant a “radical” interracial movement was unlikely.

Indeed, SNCC excluded white activists from assisting in its movement in 1966. During SDS’s early days, however, it aligned with the black liberation movement, and sent activists to sit-ins in the south.
BUS and SDS stood in solidarity on November 13, 1968 to voice their disapproval of a police department with a long history of bigotry and racism. Kent’s SDS released a pamphlet titled “Why we are confronting the Oakland Police,” explaining to campus language communities that:

The members of the Oakland Police Department who are on campus today are acting as representatives of a powerful repressive institution in our society. They are not here to discuss in our society. We are confronting the power of destructive institutions, in which an elite few make the major decisions. It is not a matter of individual free speech as guaranteed by our American Constitution. We are against unrestricted destructive power—not unrestricted speech. The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) asks everyone to confront themselves and to choose a role in the context of this reality.  

In typical fashion, Kent’s SDS continued its attempt to “pull away” various campus language communities from the control of University. The pull away was in a more ambitious manner than previous cases of campus carnival, as SDS called upon not only students but also all other members of the campus to support the demonstration. Such a call to arms provided a direct challenge to the unitary functions of the University, because the campus carnival was open to all who were willing to participate in it. The pamphlet also listed the demands of Kent’s SDS:

1. That Kent State University deny its facilities to the Oakland Police Department
2. That Kent State University sign a pledge of good faith agreeing not to infiltrate or otherwise intimidate recognized, legitimate campus organizations
3. That the Kent State University Police Department disarm.

---

86SDS, WHY WE ARE CONFRONTING THE OAKLAND POLICE (Kent: SDS, 1968), May 4th Collection.
87Ibid.
The demands provide insight into the larger ideological views of Kent’s SDS as they demanded that the centralizing functions of the University’s unitary language end immediately, and challenged the broader aspects of the University, such as armed law enforcement officers on campus. This carnivalesque message broadcasted that once language communities combined their heteroglossic nature to challenge official discourse, the result would startle the unitary forces. 88

Locking arms, BUS and SDS formed a blockade around the entrance of the Student Activities Center at approximately 2pm and explained they would not break the blockade until the recruiters were expelled from campus. The blockade put the culture of the carnivalesque vis-à-vis the culture of the University. 89 Now, however, the carnivalesque culture employed a tactic it had not yet used: direct utterance of official unitary discourse. The members stated that proper notice for the recruitment had not been distributed across campus. As a consequence, the carnivalesque culture concluded the University breached its own protocols. The symbolism behind such a statement was powerful. Undoubtedly, the carnivalesque culture had grown through its binary opposition to unitary discourse. Such growth permitted the heteroglossia to claim it understood the functions of official discourse better than the forces that were supposed to

88 “Demand 3” showcases that SDS was not only concerned with the presence of the Oakland Police, but it also called for an end to (and exposed) University infiltration and surveillance. Throughout the history of Kent’s SDS, there were continual attempts by campus and other local police departments to infiltrate the group through constant surveillance and paid student informants. Heineman, in Campus Wars, overviews the monitoring of SDS from local police outfits on p. 36. As will be discussed later, local police were not the only unitary agents monitoring the Kent outfit. As Kent’s SDS became more “radicalized” in its carnivalesque activities, it caught the eye of the Federal Government, which sent an undercover agent to investigate the group.

89 The Daily Kent Stater (Kent), ”BUS-SDS Blockade SAC; Dr. White: ’Action Intolerable’” November 14, 1968, Volume: LIV No. 31.
uphold it. In effect, Kent’s SDS and BUS regurgitated the language of the University in a centrifugal nature, which meant they used the University’s own language against it. This wild display of carnival publicized that the heteroglossia language recognized its place within the unitary language’s functions and by using those functions, proved even the basic protocols that defined the structures of the University’s language community were not safe from the heteroglossia’s centrifugal forces. Furthermore, due to the blockade, individuals wanting to enter the building were unable to, which allowed SDS and BUS to interrupt the daily functions of any language community that normally used the building. This interruption further weakened the unitary language’s ability to maintain the daily routines of campus operations. SDS and BUS ensured their mockery of the University was available for all to see and loosened the grip the University’s unitary language had on other campus language communities. The SDS-BUS carnival provided the dialogic imagination against monologic truth. What force were language communities of the University expected to side with? If the University had indeed broken its own protocols by not providing proper notice for the recruitment, was it to be trusted? Had it lost authority over all language communities? The centralizing forces of the unitary language needed to respond quickly, countering with a statement that explained the blockade also broke University protocols due to the entrance of a public building being obstructed. The weak retort failed to dislodge SDS and BUS members, who continued the stage two campus carnival until 7pm.90

---

90 Ibid.
The University did not send police to break up the blockade. The University’s unwillingness to end the demonstration provided another example of how the carnival had grown stronger since its initial arrival to campus. With the use of University police, the unitary language could have centralized the decentralizing forces of the demonstration by removing it from the public eye. The fact that it did not illustrated how the carnival operated with relative freedom in the campus “marketplace,” and that the unitary language was unable to properly control the growing carnivalesque culture of Kent’s SDS. It is likely the University also realized that ending the demonstration through police force would have allowed for the carnival to grow stronger, because more language communities would be made aware of the supposed oppressive nature of the University. The carnival did not go unharassed though, as the Stater reported that counter protestors armed with motorcycle chains attacked SDS and BUS members. The counter protestors were not arrested for their violence against the protestors. With the counter protestors allowed to use violence with immunity showed the campus language communities that the University would side with any group that attempted to end the campus carnival. The Oakland recruiters, perhaps realizing the power of the carnival, left the campus. Many SDSers claimed victory as their carnival derided authority in a manner that resulted in such authority leaving in defeat.

The University’s administration, however, did not let this mockery go unanswered. While they did not authorize a police response, they did have investigators identify the various members who participated in the carnival. The identification of members involved in the blockade empowered the Dean of Students to plan hearings to
prosecute the members for their unrestrained violation of official discourse. The possibility of hearings roused further disillusionment from BUS and SDS, which resulted in both groups confronting the University’s administration. BUS announced that a walkout would occur if the University did not grant amnesty to the carnival’s participants. The University refused to back down and BUS students departed Kent’s campus en masse. Kent’s SDS remained behind, which suggests that the group was unwilling to offer full support to the language community of BUS. In the end, however, the University dropped all charges against the activists after the Ohio Civil Rights Commission raised the possibility of an investigation.91

With the charges against the activists dropped, Kent’s SDS once again claimed victory over the perceived oppressive nature of the University and the Establishment. The claims of victory needed to be quelled and on November 18 1968, Robert Matson released a statement that summarized the reactions of the University’s unitary language sphere:

The events of the last few days on the Kent campus have caused considerable anxiety and concern for all. We have all been involved in some way or other as the polarization of feeling has developed. As time progresses, it becomes more and more imperative for each of us to accept the responsibility attendant upon us as members of the University community. It is necessary that order prevail on the campus and that the rights and freedom of all be protected. There exist built-in safeguards within the University community through the Student Conduct Code to protect individual and group rights.92

91 Heineman, The Campus Wars, 225.
92 Dean of Students Office, ”letter from Robert E. Matson, November 18, 1968, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, May 4th Collection.
The unitary language of the University now attempted concrete verbal and ideological centralization through the use of the Student Conduct Code. The letter spoke to members of all campus language communities. It asserted the carnival harmed the campus as a whole. The University was cognizant that the campus carnival had power over its centralizing functions, and that it needed to address the issue through the “built-in safeguards” to strip the carnival of any legitimacy.

“Dig It”⁹³: The Spring Offensive of 1969

Kent’s campus carnival continued throughout the Fall Semester of 1968. In the Spring Semester of 1969, Kent’s SDS organized in a manner that challenged the limits of what the heteroglossia was capable of in the form of what the group labeled the “Spring Offensive.” Indeed, the offensive came in response to the continual arrest of SDS members, who had become more violent in their carnivalesque tactics. It was during the offensive that Kent’s SDS achieved stage three of campus carnival.

Kent’s SDS drafted a list of four demands to guide the offensive.⁹⁴ The first called for the University to abolish ROTC, which Kent’s SDS had a history of opposing. The second demand concerned the Project Themis grant to the Liquid Crystals Institute. Project Themis was a research grant enacted by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara in 1967. The project aimed at creating innovative and arguably “futuristic” military technology. KSU’s Liquid Crystals Institute received a Project Themis grant in 1968.

---


⁹⁴ The demands were presented on many of the pamphlets Kent’s SDS distributed on campus and in the *Stater*.
One of the more interesting aspects of the research at Kent State regarded the use of thermal technology to detect heat signatures. The technology provided the possibility of finding objects that emitted heat signatures, even if hidden underground. Detectors equipped with the liquid crystals could be placed along roads to track the movement of heat signatures. The information gathered by the technology would be transmitted to satellites, then, back to Earth in reception centers. This innovative technology would allow for American military personnel to locate possible hiding spots and underground tunnels of the Vietcong. Researchers also hoped the project would allow for revolutions in the detection of cancer. Kent’s SDS ardently opposed the technology, which it considered a sign of the imperialistic methods of the Establishment. 95 The third demand called for the abolishment of the law enforcement school, especially that the Northeast Ohio Crime Lab be abolished. These demands were similar to those presented in November 1968 in the sense that they were a heteroglossia attack on the unitary’s ability to centralize discourse; however, the demands of 1969 were larger in scope, and escalated Kent’s SDS attack on the University in a more ambitious manner. This pinpoint attack on the University told members of Kent’s campus that Kent’s SDS had done its “homework,” and that it was willing to expose the larger and more bureaucratic functions of the University. Overall, these new demands, and the events that unfolded during the spring, eclipsed the “polarization” Matson described in his November 1968 letter.

95 Chapter 1 of Kenneth Heineman’s Campus Wars provides a strong overview of the Project Themis grants awarded to various American universities—especially Kent State. Roger Geigers article, "Science, Universities, and National Defense, 1945-1970," Osiris 7, no. 1 (1992), offers strong background information on the relationship between defense research and American universities. Also, Dr. J.W. Doane of Kent State University has a history of his research at the Liquid Crystal Institute, which describes Project Themis. The memoir is housed online at: http://www.lci.kent.edu/researchhistory.html
On April 8, 1969, Kent’s SDS determined the most efficient way for the University’s administration to be made aware of the demands was to march directly to KSU’s Administration Building and present the demands to members of the administration. In terms of carnival, Kent’s SDS again left the safety net of the “campus marketplace” to present its ultimate ideals in a more direct manner. In other words, the carnivalesque culture targeted the domain where the sacred and centralizing functions of University occurred. The Stater reported how the march quickly spiraled out of control when University police prohibited SDS from entering the building. Undeterred by the police blockade, Kent’s SDS attempted to push through the armed barrier, which sparked a physical confrontation between them and University police. This conflict presented a new development in the relationship between the University, Kent’s SDS, and the campus carnival. No longer were the officials of the University going to sit idly by while SDS mocked the University’s unitary functions, as it countered the physicality of heteroglossia’s language expression with its own, more violent, response. The conflict presents an example of what occurs when an unofficial carnivalesque culture fails to fully consume official culture; the failure to fully consume the culture meant the centripetal forces gained momentum through the violence, because the unitary forces did not lay down in submission. This planned demonstration revealed that Kent’s SDS reflected the revolution phase of SDS’s history, once again showing how the organization aligned with

---

96 The University’s President, Robert E. White, declined to meet with SDS in relation to the demands of the offensive. His refusal to conduct dialogue with SDS is what caused the group to march on the Administration Building.

97 Bill Armstrong, "SDS Bumps Heads with Campus Police," The Daily Kent Stater(Kent), April 9, 1969, Volume: LIV No. 85.
broader SDS trends. The violent confrontation ended with the arrest of five SDS members and the heteroglossia’s centrifugal force felt the full power of the unitary’s centralizing abilities.

With members of Kent’s SDS properly centralized in jail, Matson drafted his April 8, 1969 letter that explained the suspension of Kent’s SDS from the campus. The University’s administration scheduled hearings for April 16, 1969, which meant Kent’s SDS would have to answer for its wild displays of carnivalesque culture. The suspension of Kent’s SDS hypothetically ended the campus carnival. As we will see; however, the suspension and the subsequent hearings only inspired the carnival to continue and grow in power, which greatly radicalized the operations Kent’s heteroglossia language.

“Open it up or shut it down”: The Fall of Kent State University’s Students for a Democratic Society

The Stater reported on April 16, 1969 that the members of Kent’s SDS, who were not required to participate in the hearings, arrived at the Music and Speech Building with the goal of opening up the hearings for all to see. The University, in anticipation of a potential protest, positioned University law enforcement officers around the building. Like the earlier confrontation that caused the hearings, Kent’s SDS found the University unwilling to let the campus carnival go unanswered. SDS entered the building through an unprotected and unlocked door and marched towards the room where the hearings were to take place. University police quickly confirmed the presence of SDS members inside.

98Kent State SDS, Kent Thugs (Kent: Kent State SDS, 1969).

the Music and Speech Building, and, according to University officials, the presence of these SDS members was an act of criminal trespassing. Consequently, the University’s police arrested sixty SDS members. The demonstration had a wide range of support (and opposition) from members of various language communities. In an interesting development, *The Stater* reported that during the demonstration

Father Rob Begin, one of the “Protest Priests,” on campus yesterday took the SDS megaphone to address the crowd. He stated, “The United States is becoming the new Nazi nation. We have no right to inflict our views on other nations of the world. That’s Hitler folks…Begin continued, “The young people must change the values of the world; the young people today are involved in a struggle.”

This wide range of support meant Kent’s SDS was no longer alone in its struggle. Indeed, with the support of an individual who represented an official institution—the Catholic Church—SDS’s struggle received sympathy from unlikely supporters due to SDS’s opposition to the war in Vietnam. Although the priest did not speak for the Catholic Church as whole, it does show the power of the heteroglossia’s grasp. Chapter three of this thesis discusses the importance of clergy members to Northeast Ohio’s carnivalesque culture and identity in greater detail, especially Father Begin’s presence at John Carroll University.

The next day, SDS distributed a pamphlet titled “Kent Thugs,” which described the events that occurred at the Music and Speech Building. The pamphlet mocked the unitary functions of the University through strong use of heteroglossia language,

---

100 Ibid.
101 Ibid.
explaining that

The slogan for the day was “Open it up or shut it down.” Since they wouldn’t do the former, we did the latter…So we had a little hassle. First moving over jocks and then through chained doors. Then over pigs. We made it into the building in full view of the administration and the trustees. Dig it. We were able to win because they were scared. They knew they couldn’t keep the truth from the people without lies and force. After all, that’s what’s been going down in the ghetto and Vietnam all along.102

The pamphlet continued with a description of the spring offensive’s four demands and ended with “Dare to struggle, dare to win”—a statement often used by SDS to showcase its connection with the revolutionary movement of Mao Tse-tung. Again, their pamphlet exemplified how the heteroglossia language of Kent’s SDS sought to bring more language communities into its sphere, because it openly broadcasted what occurred during the confrontation with no reservations, and mocked the University for its actions. The pamphlet showed that Kent’s SDS did not consider their arrests as a defeat. It had won, and the carnivalesque culture would continue until the four demands were met. Additionally, the pamphlet connected the localized problems of the Kent community to the larger issues of the nation—racism and the Vietnam War. Kent’s SDS viewed the campus carnival as part of the larger national and international struggles of the 1960s.

The suspension and arrests of SDS members did not deter the group from continuing its campus carnival, and the spring offensive continued. Countless SDS pamphlets released throughout April 1969 kept to the heteroglossia’s tactic of mocking the University in every way possible. Often the pamphlets challenged the suspension of the organization and called on campus members to contemplate why the group was

102 Kent State SDS, Kent Thugs (Kent: Kent State SDS, 1969), May 4th Collection.
unable to formally appeal its suspension. The pamphlets that Kent’s SDS distributed proudly kept the name “Kent SDS,”[103] which suggested to campus language communities that the group was not fearful of possible unitary responses—Kent’s SDS would not compromise its goals. The flame ignited by the carnivalesque culture continued to burn and by failing to properly extinguish the flame, the University failed to centralize SDS’s verbal and ideological language. Even with the use of preexisting University protocols, it was impossible for the University to end the campus carnival even as the campus carnival began to lose its momentum.

It was apparent through the various instances of campus carnival that the language community of Kent’s SDS could withstand complete centralization from the University’s unitary language force. However, by the Spring and Fall of 1969, the group’s ability to maintain campus carnival began to wane. Similar to the national SDS, Kent’s SDS experienced an intensive crisis caused not by the arrest or the suspension of group members, but by the internal rifts that emerged. Many SDS activists—both in Kent and elsewhere—had not brought an end to the Establishment and members of various SDS outfits began to consider the use of violence and domestic terrorism to accomplish their goals. The idea of terrorism did not result only from the failure to dethrone the Establishment in a peaceful way but was also because many concluded the only way to answer the violence SDS members faced at their demonstrations was to respond with

---

[103] When SDS members wanted to hold meetings on campus, they used the name “Yippies” (a recognized campus organization), so they would not be arrested.
their own violence. As the debate between a revolution of love and a revolution of violence emerged, the strain disillusioned many within the SDS movement. Kent’s SDS experienced the debates firsthand.

On April 28, 1969, Niel Wetterman, an investigator from the Federal Government’s Internal Security Division, attended a teach-in sponsored by members of Kent’s SDS. The reason for Wetterman’s presence on the Kent campus is not clear, but it appears he was involved in an ongoing investigation of SDS from a national standpoint. After the events that unfolded earlier in the month, it is likely he received order to begin an investigation of Kent’s campus, along with the fact that members from the NO operated in Northeast Ohio. The most famous member to attend this teach-in was Bernadine Dohrn. A University of Chicago Law School graduate, Dohrn joined the left wing National Lawyers Guild in 1967, which provided legal support to members of the New Left. Due to her radical beliefs, statements, and dedication to the Movement, SDS elected her as the organization’s Inter-organizational Secretary in 1968. Dohrn espoused the belief that violence was necessary to destroy the Establishment and became

---

104 The transition into forms of violent methods of resistance was not an exclusive development for SDS members. SNCC also made the transition into an organization that did not exclude the possibility of using violence to accomplish its goals.

105 Kirkpatrick Sale notes the investigators from the Internal Security Division were scattered across the country on at least sixteen campuses nationwide during 1969-70. One of these campuses was Kent State University. The fact the Federal Government felt it necessary to investigate the Kent campus, reflects that the heteroglossia language of Kent’s SDS had gained the attention of those in ultimate power over the Establishment. Please refer to pages 643-646 in Sale’s book, *SDS*, for a thorough discussion of the undercover investigation teams.
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one of the founding members of the radical SDS faction, “The Weathermen.” The notes Wetterman took during the teach-in revealed that some members of SDS aligned with the belief that violence was a necessary means to bring change.\textsuperscript{108} When Dohrn took the stage, Wetterman noted that she:

Stated the need of radical change through revolutionary action and noted the ultimate need of carrying weapons for the purpose of defense and revenge. Dohrn cited as an example a group of blacks in New York who were accused of intended fire-bombing target areas with Molotov cocktails, state a number of targets were selected, including Macy’s while in her opinion some stupid ambitions and then commented that however other targets the police department, made sense.\textsuperscript{109}

Dohrn’s statements were not well received by all of those present at the meeting. Wetterman noted that as the discussion ensued regarding better apparatii for bringing radical change, an unidentified member in the audience voiced opposition to Dohrn’s statements.\textsuperscript{110} The question the person asked was why a revolution that would use murder was better than a revolution that would rely on love. The debate illustrated the division within Kent’s SDS concerning the idea of using violence. Corky Benedict, from the Ohio Regional Office of SDS, took the podium and continued Dohrn’s call for violence. When Rick Skirvin of Kent’s SDS took the stage he “defended Benedict’s position that revenge is justifiable, citing his position while incarcerated in Portage County Jail, at same time

\textsuperscript{108}Please note that Wetterman’s notes from the meeting were not written with consideration for grammar or complete sentence clarity.

\textsuperscript{109}Wetterman, Niel E. \textit{This Investigator Attended a Teach-in at Kent State University on April 28, 1969.} Report no. 1. May 1, 1969, May 4th Collection.

\textsuperscript{110}Ibid.
Wetterman’s notes detail how Kent’s SDS experienced its own challenges in regards to its language community. In some respects, the heteroglossia language community of Kent’s SDS broke into two sub communities, with each group vying for control over the ideological functions of the community as a whole. However, with the very nature of the heteroglossia being a centrifugal force, the opposing ideologies were unable to be centralized. Thus, Kent’s SDS remained divided on whether violence was an acceptable form of protest.

The debate in Kent replicated on other campuses across the nation. SDS members from various outfits failed resolve this division, which added to the growing disillusionment of its members. The organization broke into various splinter groups, the most famous being The Weathermen. The Weathermen concluded that violent revolutionary action was the only means to begin true change, and started various efforts to conduct terrorist attacks throughout the nation. The splintering of SDS did not end the campus carnival in Kent. Although the group was never reinstated as an official University group, its campus demonstrations continued. Many members kept their carnivalesque culture alive, which showed that hope was not lost and that the end of an organization did not signal the end of their activism.
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As spring 1970 arrived and President Richard Nixon announced the U.S. invasion of Cambodia, students across the campus assembled and voiced their disapproval through acts of campus carnival. As is widely known, a demonstration against the invasion of Cambodia at KSU ended with the death of four students. The May 4th Shooting at KSU shocked the nation even as black students at Jackson State College in Mississippi experienced their own shooting by members of the unitary language. The shooting at KSU revealed to white America the dangers that resulted from the radical tension between the heteroglossia and unitary language. The shooting also played into SDS’s ideas that “if radicals are really posing an effective threat, the powers they are threatening are bound to attack them.” That story, however, is not SDS’s. But the events in early May 1970 culminate at least three years of oppositional carnival at KSU and perhaps that the division between the unitary language of the KSU Administration, the National Guard, and Ohio’s governor James Rhodes could no longer negotiate with the heteroglossia of the generational language group. Not all SDS outfits in Northeast Ohio experienced such strong divisions though. How the heteroglossia of the generational language community at Case Western Reserve University negotiated with the unitary language is the story of the next chapter.

113 Alan Adelson, SDS, 49.
CHAPTER II

“THE UNIVERSITY, INC.”\textsuperscript{114}: THE CAMPUS CARNIVAL
AT CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

During the morning of March 24, 1970, members of the radical SDS faction, “The Weathermen,” declared war against the established unitary language authority of Cleveland. Armed with sticks of dynamite the Weathermen snuck onto the grounds of the Cleveland Museum of Art with the intention to destroy Auguste Rodin’s famous sculpture, \textit{The Thinker}.\textsuperscript{115} With the dynamite placed between the bronze statue and the stone base it rested on, the Weathermen detonated the explosives. The explosion catapulted the sculpture from its stone base, gnarled the bronze on the sculpture’s lower half, and left it face down on the ground (Figure 3).\textsuperscript{116} The upper portion of the sculpture remained undamaged and the Museum remounted the sculpture without conducting restorations (Figure 4). Although this act of terrorism failed to destroy the sculpture, the message was clear: the Weathermen had access to weapons of war and planned to use them to bring revolutionary change to the United States.

\textsuperscript{114} CWRU SDS, \textit{The University, Inc.} (Cleveland, 1968)

\textsuperscript{115} \textit{The Thinker} at the Cleveland Museum of Art (CMA) is not the original version of the sculpture. Instead, it is a copy of the original sculpture. The original version of the sculpture was first exhibited in 1888 in Copenhagen. Although CMA’s version of the sculpture is not the original, it is still a highly valued piece of art. "Rodin's The Thinker," The Cleveland Museum of Art, accessed August 8, 2012, http://www.clevelandart.org/collection-focus-article/rodins-thinker

Figure 3: The Thinker after the explosion, March 24, 1970

Figure 4: The Thinker remounted


The Weathermen utilized violent action and violent rhetoric to distance their group from the earlier New Left. According to the Weathermen, the best method for bringing revolutionary change to the structures of the United States was to combat the perceived violent oppression of the Establishment with further violence. The Weatherman legitimized their use of violent action by contextualizing their struggle as one component of the larger revolutionary struggle of oppressed peoples throughout the Third World. In early 1968, the Weathermen formed a cell in Cleveland to influence local SDS chapters. With Cleveland as home to a number of universities and a ribbon of highway systems that linked east, south, and west, it was the ideal location to build a pan-Weatherman identity. The Weathermen’s radical identity, however, failed to fully materialize. The various SDS factions in Cleveland, despite the Weathermen’s calls, remained largely ambivalent to its violent call for action and rhetoric. This ambivalence towards the use of violence was often the case for the SDS chapter at Case Western Reserve University (CWRU). Case’s SDS also attempted link other SDS chapters in the Northeast Ohio region through displays of carnivalesque behavior, but the chapter avoided the tactics of using bombs to convey its message. The chapter’s lack of violent revolutionary action prevented it from creating a carnivalesque identity defined by a strong heteroglossia. Although Case’s SDS failed to actualize a robust carnivalesque identity—through a radical heteroglossia—in Cleveland, it did at one point challenge unitary language authority through the utilization of violent protest methods. With the
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lack of direct physical confrontations against unitary language authority the campus
carnival of Case’s SDS remained secondary when compared to the radical and violent
cases of campus carnival experienced at KSU. Nevertheless, both SDS factions displayed
their connected carnivalesque identity via a heteroglossia that challenged unitary
language authority.

This chapter argues that CWRU’s SDS failed to generate a significant
carnivalesque identity due to its unwillingness to challenge—both symbolically and
physically—unitary language authority in the same manner of Kent’s SDS. The lack of
violence also helps in the understanding of why CWRU’s campus carnival outlasted the
campus carnival of KSU. Case’s SDS was tame in its use of heteroglossia language to
challenge unitary authority. When the heteroglossia challenged unitary language
authority it seldom disrupted or stratified the normative functions of the University’s
linguistic order. The tamer forms of campus carnival contrasted with Kent’s SDS as the
unitary language forces of the University were not required to remove Case’s SDS from
the campus to end the carnival. In other words, the heteroglossia of Case’s SDS never
grew large enough to pose a true threat to the normative functions of the University.
Furthermore, the heteroglossia of Case’s SDS rarely suspended the unitary language’s
concrete verbal and socio-ideological centralization of campus language communities,
which resulted in it being unable to sustain the carnivalesque atmosphere it sought to
create. Unable to sustain itself the heteroglossia faded away as the broader student
movement lost momentum in the early 1970s. The reason why Case’s SDS avoided
radical and violent forms of campus carnival was due to the cultural composition of CWRU’s student body and SDS’s ineffective methods of organization and mobilization.

“Where the Action Ain’t”\textsuperscript{121}: The Culture of Case Western Reserve University’s Students for a Democratic Society

The culture of CWRU’s student body was far different than that of KSU, originating from the institutional dissimilarities of each university. Unlike KSU, CWRU was not a state funded liberal arts institution providing a variety of vocational undergraduate degrees; it was a well-endowed research university focusing on science, medicine, and technology professionals. The student body of CWRU during the 1960s received an education that permitted them to obtain employment positions that kept the Establishment functioning.\textsuperscript{122} Case students tended to come from more exclusive backgrounds. Unlike the parents of KSU students, the parents of CWRU students were often not the working-class individuals of Middle America. Instead, they tended to locate in the upper-middle class.

Tuition rates for CWRU during the 1960s and 1970s reflected the University’s exclusive position, amounting to almost $2,100.00 a year compared to KSU’s tuition rate of $510.00 a year.\textsuperscript{123} The University’s culture that resulted from its emphasis on science, medicine, and technology, forced Case’s SDS to form its carnivalesque identity in ways

\textsuperscript{121} CWRU SDS, "Where The Action Ain’t" (Cleveland, 1968).

\textsuperscript{122} Also hinting at the culture of CWRU is the fact that the Universities student newspaper, The Reserve Tribune, and later, The Observer, often had advertisements for large corporations. For example, Dow Chemical and General Electric often attempted to recruit Case students into the Establishment. At KSU, conversely, such recruitment rarely took place.

different than Kent’s SDS, as the socio-ideological centralization of Case’s language communities was more concrete. CWRU’s centralized environment had a profound effect on how Case’s SDS tackled the issues that plagued the local Cleveland community and the nation at large. The CWRU students who formed their SDS, however, held the same cultural attitudes of SDS minded individuals. Those who gravitated toward leftist ideologies recognized the inequalities of American society and understood if no action was taken the inequalities would continue to grow. Formed in the fall of 1968, Case’s SDS first challenged the conservative culture and identity of Case’s language communities before it challenged broader national issues.\footnote{Kirkpatrick Sale notes that in the fall of 1960 there was an SDS chapter at Western Reserve University. The chapter did not last long though. Sale explains that during the early days of SDS, chapters fizzled out before building a strong radical identity. The fact that a chapter formed at Western Reserve University reveals the more elite aspects of the University. Western Reserve University’s SDS chapter was founded at the same time chapters sprouted up at Syracuse, Yale, Chicago, and Harvard, years before SDS made its way into universities considered less prestigious. Kirkpatrick Sale, \textit{SDS}. (New York: Random House, 1973), 29.}

In a survey of fifteen schools conducted during the spring of 1968, \textit{Esquire} magazine labeled CWRU as a defender of conservative ideologies.\footnote{"Esquire Survey Finds Reserve ‘conservative’" \textit{The Reserve Tribune} (Cleveland), September 17, 1968, Volume: 65 ed., No. 1 sec.} On September 17, 1968, CWRU’s student newspaper, \textit{The Reserve Tribune}, reprinted the \textit{Esquire} survey to the campus community, noting the survey relied on individuals such as Robert M. Shelton, the Imperial Wizard of the United Klans of America. The article opened with a series of rhetorical, and perhaps, sarcastic questions: “Is there a university left where you can still get a good conservative education? A place where deans are loved and respected? Where kids go to all the football games and even know the alma mater?
Certainly—Western Reserve University.” At the same time, Esquire readers learned about CWRU being a conservative institution of higher learning, Case’s newly formed SDS began its heteroglossic attack on the conservative culture of Case’s language communities.

In its first pamphlet, “Where the Action Ain’t,” Case’s SDS responded to the Esquire survey and provides insight into how it perceived the cultural functions of CWRU. The pamphlet opened with a fictional letter written by a concerned father:

Dear Sirs:

I am the father of a bright, healthy young man who will be entering college next year, and to tell you the truth I’m worried. I do want him to get a good education, but I don’t want him to turn into a bearded, pot smoking, draft dodging leftist.

David is a straight A student, so I imagine he would not have too much difficulty getting into a good school, and fortunately I can afford to send him anywhere, whatever the tuition.

I know that it is not your regular function to counsel worried parents in the choice of colleges, and that of course you do not guarantee anything. But would you be good enough to suggest about ten or fifteen good schools to look into where American traditions are steadfastly supported?...

Case’s SDS conveyed CWRU was an institution with the emphasis of supporting and protecting traditional American values. The pamphlet pointed out that CWRU was an institution where conservative parents could be assured that their children would receive the best possible education without having to face the alarming realities of some public universities. As a result, the pamphlet communicated the perceived cultural aspects of
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126 The Esquire article incorrectly refers to Case Western Reserve University as Western Reserve University, so the Tribune pokes fun at the labeling. It is true that Western Reserve University and the Case Institute of Technology were initially separate institutions of higher learning. However, the universities were combined through a federation in 1967. “Esquire Survey Finds Reserve ‘conservative’” The Reserve Tribune (Cleveland), September 17, 1968, Volume: 65, No. 1.

127 CWRU SDS, Where The Action Ain’t (Cleveland, 1968).
the Case campus. For example, Case’s SDS made class an important part of defining the University’s culture. The father explained he had the financial capabilities to send his student “anywhere, whatever the tuition.” His main reservation was the possibility of his son becoming a “bearded, pot smoking, draft dodging leftist.” By sending his son to a private university that reflected the dominant American traditions, the father’s worries were calmed, and his son would remain the healthy and bright individual he was at home. According to the pamphlet, CWRU was such a university, an island “where the action ain’t,” surrounded by the sea of urban decay in Cleveland. If action was to arrive at CWRU, Case’s SDS needed to create it.

This initial pamphlet not only illuminated the perceived cultural compositions of CWRU’s campus language communities, but also the cultural compositions of Case’s SDS. In many ways it reveals the inherent differences in the culture, language identity, and heterglossic tactics of Case’s SDS as compared to Kent’s SDS. Kent’s SDS also released its first pamphlet in late September 1968, titled “20 Years of Schooling and They Put You on the Day Shift”; it was a scathing critique of the Establishment and the power structure of Kent State University. The first pamphlet of Case’s SDS, however, avoided any attack on the power structure of the University, made no mention of the gender, racial, and social inequalities of American society, the 1968 Election, or the war in Vietnam. In fact, the critique of the University—through the concerned father—simply chastised parents who held conservative viewpoints; it did not chastise the Establishment
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129 Kent State SDS, Kent SDS-Twenty Years of Schooling and They Put You on the Day Shift, May 4th Collection.
and provided no explanation of how action could be brought to CWRU. Unlike the first pamphlet of Kent’s SDS, it was not a call to arms that confronted the various local and national deficiencies through a carnivalesque identity. Furthermore, it offered no location where SDS minded individuals could meet to discuss and express their concerns. In effect, the pamphlet lacked action, not the University. The release of a pamphlet without revolutionary rhetoric defined by a strong heteroglossia made Case’s SDS incompetent in regards to building a carnivalesque identity. Of course, the pamphlet did arouse interest in students with leftist ideologies, but the heteroglossia had marginal centrifugal capabilities. However, this conservative approach to building a carnivalesque identity changed when chapter held its first official meeting.

“Oh, I get by with a little help from my friends”\textsuperscript{130}: Case’s Carnival Begins

Bill Ayers and Terry Robbins, regional field supervisors for SDS’s National Office (NO), recognized the need to mobilize and organize CWRU’s campus community and attended the first official meeting of Case’s SDS on September 21, 1968.\textsuperscript{131} Throughout the fall of 1968 Ayers and Robbins had traveled across the Ohio-Michigan region to help newly formed SDS chapters understand the growing student movement. Robbins noted that the fall of 1968 was an exciting time for SDS: “There’s a whole new


\textsuperscript{131} Larry Levneer, "SDS Excites Enthusiastic Response for New Programs," \textit{The Reserve Tribune} (Cleveland), September 24, 1968, Volume: 65, No. 2.
set on campus. The Movement is opening up all over the place.” Their work as regional field supervisors came out of the SDS’s national convention in the summer of 1966, where the NO concluded that a decentralized national organization was best for the mobilization and organization of campus communities as it prevented SDS from becoming overly bureaucratic. By the fall 1968 semester, the NO wanted to play an even smaller role in SDS activities across the nation, advising its regional supervisors to excite students into joining SDS chapters, then allow the SDS chapters to function with autonomy. As Kirkpatrick Sale notes, during the fall of 1968 “SDS wanted to develop what was called an ‘organizing thrust’ towards the campuses, operating not with a national program but by energizing local people in local chapters around local grievances.” Ayers and Robbins wanted to energize the young Case chapter by helping them understand what methods were best for challenging unitary language authority.

Ayers and Robbins opened the meeting with a discussion of SDS’s goals and ideologies and critiqued the first pamphlet released by CWRU’s SDS. First, they exposed the Establishment as the enemy of the American populace, with Ayers pointing to the violence at the 1968 Democratic National Convention as an example of not only the brutality of the Establishment but also how to confront it. Ayers and Robbins called upon members of Case’s SDS to attack the Establishment in order to bring revolutionary change to the Cleveland community. They also cited the student takeover of
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132 Terry Robbins, quoted in *SDS*. Sale, 478.
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134 Larry Levneer, "SDS Excites Enthusiastic Response for New Programs," *The Reserve Tribune* (Cleveland), September 24, 1968, Volume: 65, No. 2
Columbia—a private elite school like Case—during the previous spring as an example of the student power SDS wielded, which provided Case’s SDS with the hope that student power could be exercised in Cleveland. *The Tribune* noted that the meeting “closed with planning groups for various SDS activities. Draft resistance, [women’s] liberation on campus, the university in general, an SDS newsletter and the poor feather campaign, a charity run in opposition to United Fund whose money many see as misdirected, were discussed.”

The meeting’s goals were tame compared to Kent’s SDS, as the heteroglossia of Case’s SDS did not directly challenge unitary language authority. The heteroglossia of Case’s SDS was in an embryonic state during September 1968. It required feeding through the umbilical cord of the NO before it was ready to function on its own. Nevertheless, through the lessons of Ayers and Robbins, the heteroglossia was cognizant of what language was needed for bringing revolutionary change to CWRU and the Cleveland community.

The day following the first official meeting of Case’s SDS, the chapter along with other student activists, gathered outside the Sheraton Cleveland Hotel to protest the arrival of Vice President Hubert Humphrey. Humphrey, a former Minnesota senator, was often criticized by student radicals for his unwavering support of President Lyndon Johnson’s foreign policy actions. He announced his presidential candidacy in April 1968, and campaigned on the promise to end America’s occupation of Vietnam. When he
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received the Democratic Party’s presidential nomination in August 1968, many student activists doubted his sincerity. *The Tribune* reported an estimated four hundred students attended the demonstration to protest Humphrey’s arrival. Case’s SDS used its new understanding of heteroglossic language to display its distaste for the presence of the prominent unitary language figure. Case’s SDS started the protest by chanting “Hell no we won’t go,” “Money for cities, not for Vietnam,” “End the war against Black America,” and recalling their lesson from the previous night’s meeting chanted, “Remember Chicago.” The heteroglossia spoke in a manner that conflicted with the unitary language’s centralizing functions and no longer required feeding from the NO’s umbilical cord. Instead, it received feeding through the boisterous ideological fever created by the open-air mockery of an official unitary language agent. The protest was an interesting development in the carnivalesque identity of Northeast Ohio. Unlike Kent’s SDS, Case’s SDS had the opportunity to challenge more well-known unitary figures due to its location in Cleveland, and thus had the potential to create a stronger carnivalesque identity. As the heteroglossia ridiculed Humphrey, the campus carnival of CWRU began at stage one. Invigorated by its challenge of unitary language authority, Case’s SDS prepared to continue its campus carnival.

137 Larry Leveneer, “CWRU Antiwar Groups Jeer Humphrey Downtown,” *The Reserve Tribune* (Cleveland), September 24, 1968, Volume: 65, No. 2
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139 Stage one of a campus carnival is labeled as “mild campus carnival,” and is designated to mean: Carnival in its most tamed form. During stage one, there is a lack of violence and intensive demonstration, which results in the heteroglossia being unable to fully decentralize various campus language communities.
October 1968: Case’s Carnival Grows

In the beginning of October, Case’s SDS held its second meeting, which was far different than the first. The chapter no longer required the motivation of outside individuals like Ayers and Robbins. During the second meeting, Case’s SDS defined its ultimate goals and how best to accomplish revolutionary change. The Tribune publicized to the campus language communities that SDS was formulating a number of programs to challenge unitary language authority. The heteroglossia grew in strength and readied for ways to decentralize the verbal and socio-ideological functions of the University’s unitary structures.

One of the interesting aspects of the second meeting is how the carnivalesque culture of Case’s SDS defined itself in relation to the campus community. Unlike Kent’s SDS, Case’s SDS made women’s liberation one of its main goals for the campus community. The Tribune reported that Case’s SDS felt “SDS girls should seek ‘women’s liberation in the dorms.’ Goals would be student control over hours, dress in dining halls, and improving student-administration communication.”140 With women’s liberation constructed as one of its goals, Case’s SDS attempted to connect its carnivalesque identity to the broader ideologies of the New Left. But although the organization started to realize the potential power of the heteroglossia, it was still unprepared to utilize such power. Case’s SDS did not directly challenge University’s power structure. The chapter instead sought to improve relations with the University’s administration, explaining that
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practical dialogue could end the restrictions placed on women students in campus dormitories. The fact that Case’s SDS believed improvements could be made between the two language forces again illuminates the inherent tameness of Case’s campus carnival. For example, at the same time Case’s SDS attempted to improve relations with University’s administration, Kent’s SDS had already defined the unitary language as an oppressive force unworthy of communication. Also, the meeting made no mention of the problems that plagued women on a nation level. In essence, Case’s SDS inability to connect the problems of the local community with the problems of the national community gives credence to the argument that Case’s SDS had difficulty in understanding its revolutionary identity as part of a larger student movement.

The meeting also attempted to grapple with the difficulties of building a campus carnival on Case’s campus that resulted from the cultural compositions of the students who attended the University. As a research university, CWRU had a number of engineering students on its campus. These students pursued degrees that would allow them to gain employment in corporations with direct connections to the defense industry, so Case’s SDS had trouble “finding engineering students willing to sign SDS membership rolls.”141 The Tribune explained that “sympathizing SDS engineering students know that the U.S. government frowns upon SDS members for employees.”142 The hesitance of certain members of the student body to associate themselves with SDS, even if they agreed with its ideologies, further hints at the inherent disconnection Case
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students had with the Movement. The reservation of these students also suggests the general lack of confidence Case students had in SDS’s ability to change the unitary structures of the University and the nation. According to the Tribune, many engineering students avoided SDS because of the potential problems that might arise in securing employment after graduating from the University.\textsuperscript{143} These students felt their leftist leanings were just a phase that would fade away later in life, for life’s goal was to attain a high paying career. If they joined the Movement, the prospect of being unable to secure employment after graduation was real. Their hesitation gave credence to the centralizing functions of the unitary language and the difficulties the heteroglossia had in disrupting the dominant worldviews generated and sustained by a powerful unitary language force. Through the functions of concrete verbal and socio-ideological centralization the unitary language imprinted in the mental realms of many Case students that it was undesirable to be associated with a decentralizing organization. Therefore, the carnivalesque culture created by heteroglossia’s centrifugal decentralization remained distant to many of the language communities at CWRU.

The difficulty of dislocating language communities from the grasp of the unitary language force did not stop the heteroglossia’s attempts to stratify the linguistic order though. The dedicated members of Case’s SDS initiated more profound instances of campus carnival when they linked their carnivalesque culture to Kent’s SDS and the broader student struggle of Northeast Ohio. The centrifugal nature of the heteroglossia grew more powerful and its attacks started a radical “pull-away” from the centralizing

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid.
functions of the University’s unitary language authority. If the pull-away was to be successful, Case’s SDS had to clearly define the University as part of the Establishment. The opportunity arrived on Election Day 1968.

On Election Day 1968, Case’s SDS released a pamphlet titled “The University, Inc.” Contrary to their first pamphlet released, it showcased the growing strength of the heteroglossia as it attempted to decentralize campus language communities through a campus carnival. The heteroglossia of Case’s SDS spoke in a language more radical than before and even called for a student strike. Although Case’s SDS functioned with autonomy, the call for a student strike was the outcome of a plan concocted by the NO during its fall National Council meeting. The pamphlet derided unitary language authority through radical heteroglossic language and exposed the University as:

an instrument which makes people into passive bodies which stuff the bureaucracies of death, controlling, manipulating our lives. We strike out against this oppression and death. We strike out for life and liberation […]

We indict the universities—at the courts of human justice not the courts that have indicted our brothers and sisters in many other cities. We indict them first because they directly participate in research and training for the military—the Military which is used against [the] movement of exploited peoples throughout this world and here in the ghettos of this country […]

We don’t want to work on Maggie’s Farm no more!

We strike against mock democracy and death-voting of today’s election, against U.S. suppression throughout the world, against university participation in these crimes through research and corporate control and the manipulation and channeling of students’ lives.

ARE YOU WITH US—OR WITH THEM?145
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The lines were drawn. The heteroglossia prepared for a linguistic sparring match against unitary language authority. Case’s SDS ended it objectives to facilitate improved communication with the University’s administration, as it indicted the University (and other universities) as complicit to the perceived crimes of the Establishment. According to Case’s SDS, the University did not “restrict” Case students; it “oppressed” them. The pamphlet connected University’s administration to the Establishment, and argued that students must hold the University’s administration accountable for the connection.\textsuperscript{146}

The heteroglossia possessed stronger centrifugal power. It attempted to pull more language communities away from the centripetal functions of the University. Case’s SDS noted that the University was not its only target though. The pamphlet presented a Robespierreian ultimatum to CWRU’s language communities: if students were not with SDS they were with the Establishment. If students did not join in the carnivalesque activities, they would become passive bodies through the unitary language’s “control” and “manipulation.” Case’s SDS contextualized the problems of CWRU with larger national issues and linked its carnivalesque culture to campuses across the nation. The chapter became confident that its strike against “mock democracy” could bring change to CWRU.

The “University, Inc.” was not an empty threat, but the ability of the heteroglossia to generate wild displays of carnivalesque behavior was weak. Case’s SDS carried a black coffin across the campus to demonstrate its carnivalesque culture and its

\textsuperscript{146} Ibid.
dissatisfaction with the election. As the fifty SDS members marched across the campus, they hoped more would join the campus carnival, but few did so and it remained at stage one. Despite the ambitious goal to create a campus wide strike, the black coffin funeral march again revealed the weakness of Case’s SDS. Unlike the black coffin march of Kent’s SDS, Case’s SDS failed to disrupt the normative functions of the University. The Tribune reported that Case’s SDS conducted the march “quietly,” which made it unable to “build up impetus.” The march’s inability to awaken students from the “manipulation” and “control” of the Establishment meant Case’s SDS was again unsuccessful in its display of revolutionary ideologies.

The feeble attempt of the heteroglossia to dislocate students from the grasp of the unitary language during the black coffin funeral march was also noted by members of Case’s SDS. Case’s SDS equated the lack of support for the protest and strike in a shallow manner. It blamed “too many midterms” and “lousy publicity” as explanations for why more students did not join the strike. Such explanations for the march’s failure exposed the insecurity of Case’s SDS as it grappled with its role in the Movement. The black coffin funeral march illustrated that democracy or education was not moribund on Case’s campus as SDS claimed, but rather the carnivalesque identity it intended to sustain. The organization needed to retreat and reorganize if it was to activate the power
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of the heteroglossia and attack the unitary language authority. Case’ SDS did not have to wait long for an opportunity to grow the campus carnival through a thriving heteroglossia when the Dow Chemical Company held a job recruitment event the following week. Case’s SDS saw this as the perfect reason to stage another protest.

The Dow Chemical Company often sent recruiters to university campuses across America. The company wanted to find the best and brightest students to maintain its position as a powerful multinational corporation. When Dow received a contract from the U.S. government to produce napalm in 1966, SDS chapters across the nation protested the company. In the 1967-68 academic year alone, SDS chapters conducted over one hundred protests against Dow recruiters. According to a task force report submitted to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, protests against companies that supported the war effort became a central purpose for the hundreds of SDS chapters across the nation.151 SDS protests against Dow marked a “growing sophistication among many students of the role of corporations in propagating the war and is a solid indication that at least a rudimentary understanding of imperialism was catching hold.”152 With CWRU home to an engineering school, Dow planned to hold open interviews for engineering students on November 11, 1968.153 Case’s SDS used the recruitment as an opportunity to atone for the failure of the black coffin funeral march.

152 Sale, *SDS*, 382.
When the Dow recruiters arrived to the campus, Case’s SDS picketed their arrival and released literature doused with heteroglossia language.

The anti-Dow pamphlet opened with SDS’s reaction to the recruitment: “We feel the concept of recruitment is symbolic of what is wrong with education.” 154 Titled “Why Are We Here?,” the pamphlet was far different from “The University, Inc.” Instead of calling on students to strike against the University, the pamphlet asked, “Will you stay and rap with us?” Less a call to arms and more a call for reflection the pamphlet connected CWRU’s administration and private corporations to U.S. imperialist ventures. Case’s SDS connected circumstances occurring on the campus to larger national struggles and demonstrated the increased power of the heteroglossia’s centrifugal forces. The pamphlet explained to students who sought employment with Dow that “there should be nothing shocking about children seared and mutilated because of one of many products of Dow Chemical—not if what you’re after is a good job. Not if you’ve been trained to make first the grades and then the $15, 000 a year.” The heteroglossia asked students to consider the moral implications of being employed by a corporation that supported the war effort. According to Case’s SDS, if a student’s life goal was to make a reasonable salary, then the sight of seared and mutilated children would not be “shocking.” However, like the funeral march, the SDS had difficulty suspending the normative functions of the University and the picket failed to get more students to join in the campus carnival. Case’s carnival remained at stage one.

154 CWRU SDS, Why Are We Here? (Cleveland, 1968).
Things changed quickly. When Kent’s SDS aligned with Kent’s Black United Students (BUS), and seized KSU’s administration building on November 13, it marked a watershed moment in the carnivalesque culture and identity of Northeast Ohio. Case’s SDS realized its time-space relationship with Kent’s SDS and attempted to grow the power of its heteroglossia through stronger forms of campus carnival. A week after Kent’s SDS seized the University’s administration building, Case’s SDS released a pamphlet outlining the chapter’s hope for an increased radical posture. Gaining inspiration from the power of the heteroglossia at KSU, the two language energies amalgamated by way of the heteroglossia’s centrifugal linguistic capabilities. Case’s SDS abandoned its interest in the facilitation of practical discourse with the power structures of the Establishment and sought to utilize the revolutionary tactics of Kent’s SDS. “SDS has been showing this film in Kent since Wednesday…CWRU-SDS has it for a day,” an untitled pamphlet distributed on campus announced, inviting all those interested to view a film with Case’s SDS. Titles **Huey**, the documentary followed the efforts of the Black Panthers, specifically tracing the radical ideologies of prominent Black Panther leaders Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown, and Huey P. Newton. A deconstruction of the pamphlet’s language reveals that the NO likely loaned the documentary to, or at least encouraged, local SDS chapters to show it to SDS members to sustain radical ideologies. The phrase “CWRU-SDS has it for a day,” hinted that the documentary had circulated around Northeast Ohio. Case’s SDS recognized the failure of its restrained heteroglossic attacks against the University to that point and sought to dislocate and dislodge
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substantial numbers of students from the clutches of the unitary language. This pamphlet connected its language identity to the radical elements of the broader movement unfolding in America and tacitly aligned Case’s SDS with the Black Panthers and Kent’s SDS. The connection resulted in a pinpoint attack on the unitary language structures of the University. The heteroglossia revealed to the University’s administration that it viewed the struggles of the Black Panthers as legitimate and worthy of recognition. Case’s SDS accepted the need to position itself as an organization which offered militant and radical alternatives to the socio-ideological functions of unitary language.

If readers failed to recognize the growing radicalism of the heteroglossia, there were further indications that Case’s SDS repositioned itself as standing in binary opposition to the unitary powers of the University. Case’s SDS not only intended to show a film about the Black Panthers but also “a newsreel film about riot-control weapons,” and offer “a rap about what’s happening at Kent—the seizure of the administration building and the subsequent walkout of Black Students from the university.” These statements alarmed University officials. Prior to November 1968, despite the increased centrifugal aspects of its heteroglossia language, Case’s SDS gave little indication that it aspired to mirror the radical instances of campus carnival at Kent. Couple this with the fact that the failed instances of campus carnival created by Case’s SDS and it was apparent to University officials Case’s SDS was nothing more than a rabblerousing organization that held little sway with various student language communities. When Case’s SDS released this new pamphlet, however, the unitary language had something to
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fear. The statement, “a newsreel film about riot-control weapons,” gave the impression to the campus language communities, and the University’s administration, that Case’s SDS expected eventual physical clashes with unitary figures and sought to train students on how to combat potential police responses. Also, the desire to “rap” about the situation at Kent hinted that Case’s SDS might attempt to create such a situation at CWRU. The administration had little to immediately fear, however, for the willingness of Case’s SDS to begin higher levels of campus carnival did not occur until nearly a year later.

“War/Game”: The Spectacle of Revolution and the End of Case’s Carnival

During the remaining months of the 1968-69 academic year Case’s SDS failed to actualize radical instances of campus carnival despite its link to the broader student movement. There were several instances of campus carnival at stage one, but the revolutionary rhetoric espoused by Case’s SDS near the end of November 1968 never culminated into physical clashes with unitary figures. Instead, the organization continued its attempts to decentralize language communities through ideological organization and mobilization—talking. This allowed the heteroglossia to gain strength without having to fear unitary retaliation. The lack of violent actions and rhetoric also calmed University fears that Case’s SDS sought to recreate the campus carnival of Kent’s SDS. When the 1969-70 academic year began, however, Case’s SDS became more open to the employment of violence as the heteroglossia could no longer contain itself; it needed to demonstrate its power of decentralization and stratification.

CWRU’s newly named student newspaper, The Observer, reported on the tensions present at CWRU during the beginning of the 1969-70 academic year. On
September 13, 1969, for example, CWRU hosted an anti-war conference in the University’s auditorium. A variety of student groups organized the conferences and they discussed the various implications of the war in Vietnam. The conference was not designed to be a protest of the war; rather it was designed to allow students, professors, and guests to comment on America’s occupation of the Southeast Asian nation through civil discourse. Case’s SDS entered the auditorium to reveal its invigorated carnivalesque culture through a radicalized heteroglossia. Dressed in Viet Cong flags members of Case’s SDS stormed the stage. The Observer noted that once on stage, “[SDS] members issued militant calls for action against the power structure, for material support of the Viet Cong, and to ‘bring the war here, to bring death here’ in the revolutionary struggle to free blacks.” It was clear that Case’s SDS had ended its tame forms of dissent as the heteroglossia now called for violence and even death. The call spoke in a manner that demanded attention from the campus language communities and mirrored the radical tactics of Kent’s SDS. The demonstration was the first instance Case’s SDS succeeded in suspending the normative functions of the University, and thus created a campus carnival at stage two. Case’s SDS informed the student body that it would not sit idly by and wait for revolution to arrive at CWRU. If revolution was to happen, SDS would be the force to start it. The opportunity arrived six days after the conference interruption when

157 “Anti-war Conference Interrupted by SDS Demands for Actions,” The Observer (Cleveland), September 16, 1969, Volume: 1, No. 3.
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159 Stage two of campus carnival is labeled as “aggressive campus carnival.” Here, there are attempts by the heteroglossia and carnivalesque culture to completely pull language communities into its grasp, but the carnival rarely accomplishes complete stratification and decentralization. Also, this stage may have minor instances of violence against unitary language forces. Either way, the unitary language suffers an intensive blow.
the Davis Cup tennis championship began on September 19, 1969 in Cleveland Heights, a suburb of Cleveland. 160

The Davis Cup was an international tennis competition that brought together tennis players from around the globe. In 1964, Cleveland became the first Midwestern city to hold the championship. 161 The 1969 championship was to be a popular event in Cleveland due to the prominent unitary figures who attended. The match’s final featured U.S.A. versus Romania. Two days before the Davis Cup was scheduled to open, Case’s SDS released a pamphlet that called for a protest against the games. Titled “War/Game,” the pamphlet reiterated the revolutionary rhetoric revealed during the anti-war conference. The pamphlet’s heteroglossic attacks against unitary language authority were far more profane than previously experienced:

Once more the fat-ass corporation executives and lying politicians are getting together for a ruling class festival—The World Davis Cup Tournament in Cleveland Heights. They’ll sit back watching this game the same way they oversee the people of the world. Tricky Dick pig Nixon is even supposed to show up.

But those dudes just can’t indulge in this bullshit game anymore. There’s a war going on in the world—Peoples’ War! […]

We’re getting together and fighting the rich businessmen and their pigs in the streets, the schools and anywhere they appear. We see that struggle as the only way to revolution…The Sides are drawn. Which side are you on?

A Revolution is not a spectacle! There are no spectators! Everyone participates whether they know it or not. 162
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The pamphlet’s derision of unitary language authority represented the heteroglossia’s attempt to once again suspend the unitary language’s normative functions. Case’s SDS attacked the highest levels of unitary language authority. With the Davis Cup being broadcast worldwide, Case’s SDS realized the potential to reveal its carnivalesque culture for all to see. It called for those interested to join in the struggle. The Davis Cup stood for all that was wrong with the Establishment and was part of a larger war—a peoples’ war. Once the Davis Cup began, unitary language authority became cognizant that Case’s SDS was not interested in issuing empty threats. Indeed, what occurred during the protest of the Davis Cup became the most extreme form of carnival ever exhibited by Case’s SDS.

At noon on Saturday, September 20, members of Case’s SDS (and a cohort of John Carroll University SDSers) gathered at Roxboro Elementary to plan their protest of the tournament. Case’s SDS determined that the best way to display their carnivalesque culture, and to disrupt the tennis match, was to march to the main gate of the stadium. Trouble began almost from the start, as the heteroglossia put its revolutionary rhetoric into practice. At roughly 2p.m., Case’s SDS positioned itself about 100 yards from the main gate. The heterglossic attack began with the typical methods of deriding unitary language through chants. The protestors shouted, “Ho-Ho-Ho Chi Minh” and other similar chants which caught the eye of the Cleveland Heights law enforcement officers stationed outside the main gate. The chants created a carnival at stage one, but the attempts to destabilize unitary language authority were largely ineffective. In previous
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instances of campus carnival, Case’s SDS would stop at this point; yet this time they chose not to retreat. Invigorated from the boisterous ideological fervor created during the anti-war conference Case’s SDS moved to stage two. The heteroglossia spun with more intensity and power. It realized a “revolution is not a spectacle” and simple chants were not enough. If Case’s SDS was to be taken seriously by unitary language forces, and pose a true threat to the power structures of the Establishment, it needed to suspend the normative functions of the tournament.

Case’s SDS lined up in preparation for an assault on the main gate of the stadium. The carnival intensified as law enforcement officers became uneasy with the increased tension of the demonstration. As some members of the demonstration were armed with copper pipes, the law enforcement officers recognized the potential danger that Case’s SDS posed to the normative functions of the tennis tournament. Concrete centralization needed to occur if the carnival was to end. When Case’s SDS marched across the street to bulldoze through the main gate, the law enforcement officers moved in.

The law enforcement officers positioned themselves between the gate and the demonstrators. Case’s SDS, undeterred by the police presence, continued the march. Violence erupted when the officers made the first move and surrounded the demonstrators. One SDS member attacked an officer by striking him on the head with
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a copper pipe. The officers responded to this violence with more violence. They used batons to beat back the protestors. Now, the carnival entered stage three.168 As the battle continued, SDS members who carried Viet Cong flags used the flagstaffs as weapons and hammered the police officers. One protestors fashioned a razor blade and slashed an officer’s hand before the officers subdued him. Although the protestors displayed their carnivalesque culture through the raw practice of revolutionary violence, the heteroglossia was not strong enough to continue its centrifugal tactics. The superiorly armed and better organized officers ended the protest and arrested twenty of the individuals involved in the carnival.169 *The Observer* noted that Bernadine Dohrn was one of the individuals arrested during the protest. Dohrn’s involvement with CWRU’s SDS was not surprising. The previous spring she attempted to recruit members of Kent’s SDS into the realm of violent protest. Her presence in Northeast Ohio during the late 1960s reveals how members of the radical national SDS factions sought to pull members into their version of carnivalesque culture, and also showed their desire to build a pan-Weathermen identity in Northeast Ohio. The Davis Cup continued with no further interruptions. To the disdain of the heteroglossia, the tournament’s only interruption
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168 Stage three of campus carnival displays heteroglossia language in its rawest practice. Typically, stage three utilizes actions of violence against the unitary language forces in order to completely stratify the linguistic order. In other words, language communities are understood as briefly existing outside the grasp of unitary language, and thus the unitary language attempts to centralize the functions of this carnival by removing the carnival’s ability to continue.
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came when a rainstorm caused the match to be delayed for a few hours. The American team defeated the Romanian team five to zero.

The carnival experienced at the Davis Cup presented a dramatic shift in the tactics of Case’s SDS, and showcased that the organization was briefly swept up the revolution phase of SDS’s history. Prior to this violent demonstration, the calls for action against unitary language authority remained mostly empty threats. The evolution into violent action revealed to campus language communities that the organization was not reluctant to challenge unitary authority in a physical manner. As the heteroglossia achieved stage three of carnival it briefly suspended unitary language authority. Indeed, Case’s SDS had come a long way since its first demonstrations. The ability to continue these radical heteroglossic attacks against the centripetal functions of the unitary language, however, was short-lived.

For the remainder of the 1969-70 academic year, Case’s SDS abandoned its efforts to bring revolution to Cleveland through violent means. The organization reverted to its earlier methods of campus carnival by holding regular meetings in an attempt to educate the campus community. Since SDS posed no true threat to the normative functions of the University, it was unnecessary for the unitary language to remove the heteroglossia from CWRU. This reversal to previous levels of campus carnival showed the true power of the University’s unitary language, because it centralized Case’s SDS within the sphere of unitary dominance. The Weathermen continued the radical forms of carnival, and used violent actions against unitary language authority in the Cleveland community. However, with the Weathermen being forced to go underground, their
attempts to influence SDS chapters across the nation diminished. Moreover, with the NO splitting up by the summer of 1970, SDS as a national organization ceased to exist.\textsuperscript{170}

In 1971, an active SDS chapter still operated at CWRU. The organization continued its calls for reform, focusing mainly on the economic issues plaguing the Cleveland community.\textsuperscript{171} As the Vietnam War came to a close in 1973 many students no longer believed that true change was possible.\textsuperscript{172} The ability of Case’s SDS to continue the centrifugal functions of the heteroglossia dwindled, and the language energy it generated lost momentum. Like the Movement itself, Case’s SDS simply faded away.

The importance of Case’s SDS to the overall Movement is questionable, but the organization does present an interesting example of how students can unite with the hope of bringing change to the dominant structures of the status quo. The history of Case’s SDS demonstrates that the creation of a carnivalesque identity is not always an easy task. For many members of CWRU’s student body, Case’s SDS did not speak to them in a manner that resonated with their conceptions of reality. Moreover, the often restrained tactics of the organization resulted in it being unable to create a carnivalesque identity that spoke to the broader student movement. At times, SDS presented a carnivalesque identity that did have the potential to organize and mobilize large numbers of students through wild displays of campus carnival but the identity was difficult to sustain. With the cultural makeup of CWRU, revolutionary action was an idea that seemed doomed.

\textsuperscript{170} Sale, \textit{SDS}, 651-57.

\textsuperscript{171} CWRU SDS, \textit{Fight Unemployment at CWRU} (Cleveland, 1971).

\textsuperscript{172} Anderson, \textit{The Movement and the Sixties}, 417.
from the start. What can be gathered from the actions of Case’s SDS, however, was that CWRU was not a campus “where the action ain’t,” when compared to the minuscule campus carnival at John Carroll University investigated in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III

‘PEACE BE WITH YOU’: THE CAMPUS CARNIVAL AT JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY

By the late 1960s opposition to the war in Vietnam became the main focus of the SDS. With more young individuals drafted into service to fight in a war that had lost the support of many language communities across the nation, SDS recognized that its anti-war stance was the perfect recruitment tool. SDS also recognized that the use of its anti-war stance to recruit students into its carnivalesque culture offered the potential to educate students on its other radical ideologies which could sway even more students into the New Left. The SDS factions at KSU and CWRU helped generate a carnivalesque identity that presented scathing critiques of the war in Vietnam and also the Establishment. Northeast Ohio’s carnivalesque culture and identity seeped into many university campuses when the power of heteroglossia languages increased during the late 1960s through unified opposition to unitary language dominance. Although much of the carnivalesque activities occurred at the larger universities of Northeast Ohio like KSU and CWRU, smaller colleges also experienced radicalized student language communities defined by carnivalesque methods of protest. One of these institutions was the small Catholic university, John Carroll University (JCU). The presence of a heteroglossia at JCU was an interesting development in Northeast Ohio’s carnivalesque culture and identity due to its size and religious affiliation. How the carnivalesque culture operated at
JCU provides an excellent example of the manner in which SDS functioned at smaller institutions of higher learning and why smaller universities were less willing to sustain displays of carnivalesque contempt.

This chapter argues that JCU’s language communities felt it largely unnecessary for a revolutionary movement to occur on their campus. Many of language communities at JCU were united in opposition to the war in Vietnam and the desire to end poverty in America through social justice. This unified atmosphere differed from the polarized campuses of KSU and CWRU, but JCU did experience instances of polarization. This chapter also argues that the radical identity that emerged at JCU was miniscule when compared to the carnivalesque culture at KSU and CWRU. Minuscule is not designated in terms of physical numbers; instead, it is intended to reflect the heteroglossia language’s lack of power, and its failure to decentralize campus language communities. JCU’s SDSers sought to organize an identity that stood in binary opposition to unitary language authority but they lacked the desire to participate and adopt the more radical aspects of other SDS chapters due to the cultural composition of their language communities. In other words, the SDSers at JCU reflected the early actions of SDS in the sense that challenges to unitary language authority occurred in the metaphysical realm of intellectual debates with physical demonstrations and confrontations against unitary language authority considered for the most part counterproductive to achieving their goals.

Furthermore, this chapter argues that although a carnivalesque identity at JCU remained miniscule when compared to the other universities examined in this thesis, the
fact that JCU had an SDS group showed the apparent strength of Northeast Ohio’s carnivalesque culture during the late 1960s. More important and interesting is the manner in which JCU’s SDSers used heteroglossic language to convey their carnivalesque identity. Although JCU’s SDSers used their weak heterolgossia to generate instances of campus carnival through centrifugal acts of decentralization, the language did not chastise unitary language authority via vulgarities. Instead, JCU’s SDSers used the religious composition of its language communities as justification for their radical identities. They claimed that those who were opposed to Leftist ideologies rejected the moral principles they needed to uphold as JCU students and Catholics.

This form of rhetorical justification complicates the history of Northeast Ohio’s carnivalesque culture and identity for a variety of reasons. One of the complications, as this chapter demonstrates, is that opposition to unitary language authority in Northeast Ohio was not always secular in nature, and religion played a role in the way some students identified with the student movement of the 1960s. Another important complication, and one of the most important, is that JCU’s SDSers had difficulty in defining the Catholic Church as connected to the Establishment. Indeed, the Catholic Church functioned as a unitary language force due to its centralization of ideologies and linguistic expressions; however, its vague opposition to the war in Vietnam and other American imperialist endeavors, support for social justice, and its reluctance to support America’s capitalist institutions meant it was not always allied with all functions of the Establishment. It is important to understand, then, how the culture of JCU affected the
SDSers on campus and how those outside the carnivalesque culture grappled with its presence on the JCU campus.

**Spring 1968: The Catholic Left, the Culture of JCU, and the Creation of a Carnivalesque Identity**

JCU operated like many other Catholic institutions of higher learning. Although the Jesuits who ran JCU were more progressive in nature when compared to the church’s mainstream culture, they still upheld the conservative guidelines of the Vatican. The guidelines placed emphasis on accepting church dogma and upholding the Catholic tradition. Moreover, the University did not operate as a coeducational university until 1968. Prior to 1968 women students were only permitted to attend the University part-time, and the University prohibited women students from living on the campus. These guidelines conflicted with many of the ideologies that defined the New Left and America’s countercultures during the 1960s. As the 1960s progressed, however, many church officials realized the commonalities between the Movement and their religious teachings. The connection between church officials and the student movement was especially the case at JCU.

JCU’s student newspaper, *The Carroll News*, often commented on America’s involvement in Vietnam and America’s social inequalities. The paper used JCU’s position as a religious institution to legitimize opposition to the war in Vietnam and by 1967 University students had participated in several anti-war protests. *The Carroll News* reported on April 4, 1967 that JCU’s Non-Committee Opposing War (NOW) sent
students and clergy members to an anti-war protest in New York. The presence of an anti-war organization at JCU connected many students to the radical ideologies that defined the broader student movement. The members of JCU’s NOW made it different than the radical organizations at KSU and CWRU, however, due to fusion of very different language communities. *The Carroll News* explained it was not only University students who participated in the organization but also clergy members. Since the Jesuit brothers who taught at the University represented the Catholic Church, they can be considered agents of the unitary language. But although these clergy members were unitary language agents, they did not centralize the socio-ideological thought of JCU’s students in the same manner that university officials did at KSU and CWRU. Instead, they challenged the Establishment by protesting the war in Vietnam, and thus existed within the heteroglossia’s language sphere. KSU and CWRU rarely had University officials who participated alongside students during protests. JCU students who gravitated toward leftist ideologies, therefore, had little to fear from University officials and recognized that support for their radical ideologies could come from unitary agents. The relationship between students and faculty members had a profound impact in the formation of a carnivalesque culture at JCU.

Clergy activists or “protest priests” were not exclusive to JCU or even Northeast Ohio. Younger Catholic priests found themselves swept up in the turbulent 1960s as they discussed radical theology, or “the idea that priests should behave more like Jesus and act
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on behalf of the alienated, poor, or outcast.”

Like many within the New Left, these priests recognized the economic and racial inequalities that plagued the United States and felt that “being ‘committed’ was being ‘religious,’ and being a religious person often meant direct action based on conscience, often without regard to the church hierarchy or American law.”

The belief in upholding radical theology resulted in many priests participating in protests alongside student radicals at a number of Catholic universities. This fact was an important development in the relationship between the heteroglossia and unitary language as “Catholic colleges, which could have banned protests, did not,” and even though older members of the clergy “tried to maintain tradition against countercultural threats” on their campuses, “they were not draconian.” In other words, Catholic universities accepted the similarities between the New Left and certain aspects of church dogma, and did not prohibit students from exploring those commonalities. The Catholic priests who marched alongside SDS activists during the civil rights struggle and openly opposed the war in Vietnam refused to embrace all aspects of 1960s youth culture, which continued their connection to unitary language authority. They avoided expressions of free love and open drug experimentation but their connection to the Movement showed how a carnivalesque culture can consume those in the higher ranks of unitary language through the heteroglossia’s centrifugal process of decentralization of accepted socio-ideological thought.
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The best example of the relationship between religious individuals and Leftist radicalism was “The Catonsville Nine.” In May 1968 two Catholic priests with seven laymen broke into a government draft board building in Catonsville, Maryland. The group took hundreds of selective service cards from the building and used homemade napalm to burn the cards. The media publicized the trial of the Catonsville Nine, and mainstream America became aware of the growing Catholic Left. JCU never experienced radical clergy members using dangerous weapons to display their carnivalesque ideals, but the presence of anti-war clergy members at JCU influenced the culture of the campus. At the same time SDS chapters formed at KSU and CWRU during the spring semester of 1968, JCU also experienced radical students who used heteroglossic tactics to challenge unitary language authority.

On February 27, 1968 a number of JCU students participated in a draft card burning protest outside of the University’s administration building. The Carroll News reported that the demonstration aroused anti-war fervor on the campus, as the protest exposed JCU’s language communities to protest methods that often occurred outside of the campus. Prior to the draft card protest radical JCU students challenged unitary language authority off of the campus, such as NOW’s visit to New York. The draft card protest informed JCU’s language communities that their campus was no longer immune to instances of campus carnival. But the carnivalesque act of burning draft cards to defy the Selective Service System was not a new tactic by the time it arrived to JCU. The


symbolic act gained prominence amongst anti-war activists in 1967 when “The Resistance,” an organization composed of West Coast student radicals, publically burned their draft cards in New York and the San Francisco Bay Area.\(^\text{179}\) When JCU students imitated anti-war activists across the nation by burning their draft cards, they showcased the birth of a heteroglossia language at JCU and the start of a campus carnival.

The initial campus carnival remained within stage one.\(^\text{180}\) Although the carnival did not decentralize the language communities of JCU from the grasp of the unitary language, it exposed the campus to the radicalized nature of a carnivalesque culture. Furthermore, the draft card protestors used the demonstration as an opportunity to call for the formation of a SDS chapter when A. Tymonski, a JCU student who would later become a prominent member in JCU’s carnivalesque culture, explained JCU’s need for a SDS chapter.\(^\text{181}\) *The Carroll News* reported that Tymonski “based the legality of such an organization on the Declaration of Student Rights,” which the University’s President, Father Joseph O. Schnell, supported.\(^\text{182}\) Tymonski’s justification for the creation of a radical organization was typical of most students who sought to create SDS chapters at the universities they attended. Similar to SDSers at KSU and CWRU, Tymonsky used official unitary language to support the creation of a SDS chapter. With the University’s Declaration of Student Rights cited to justify the legality of a SDS chapter, Tymonski
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\(^{180}\)Stage one of a campus carnival is labeled as “mild campus carnival,” and is designated to mean: Carnival in its most tamed form. During stage one there is a lack of violence and intensive demonstration, which results in the heteroglossia being unable to fully decentralize various campus language communities.
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showed the power structure of the University that the University protected and technically supported the right to hold Leftist ideologies. This style of justification showcased that JCU’s carnivalesque culture and identity was cognizant of the need for approval by the University’s unitary language authority before it could develop a heteroglossia language capable of decentralizing the socio-ideological thought of JCU’s language communities. Moreover, the need to publically justify the legality of an SDS chapter at JCU revealed that Tymonski expected some form of resistance from members of various campus language communities, and that by going on the offensive, he hoped to forestall other students from challenging the creation of a JCU SDS chapter. As March 1968 continued, the concept of an official SDS chapter at JCU became a site of controversy when SDSers, anti-SDS students, and University faculty members voiced their approval or disapproval of an official SDS chapter.

On March 22, 1968 Tymonski published an article in The Carroll News titled “Is Carroll ‘SDS’ Entirely Feasible?”\textsuperscript{183} After Tymonski’s remarks at the draft card protest about the need for an SDS chapter at JCU, it appeared he felt it necessary to discuss how a SDS chapter at JCU would function. The development of a heteroglossia at JCU took an interesting turn when compared to the heteroglossias of KSU and CWRU. At KSU and CWRU there was never a public discussion about the feasibility of a potential SDS chapter. SDSers at those universities simply created their chapters without seeking approval from the campus language communities. It was after the establishment of an official SDS chapter that discussions about the feasibility and functions of SDS occurred.

In other words, SDSers and KSU and CWRU created their chapters behind closed doors through a bureaucratic process so that they would be allowed to hold official meetings and have access to university facilities. The heteroglossia at JCU, conversely, found it necessary to inform language communities how an SDS chapter would affect the campus culture and other heteroglossic groups at JCU.

Tymonski first explained that a JCU SDS chapter would not affect or destroy other campus groups, like NOW.184 His need to explain that other groups would not be absorbed by JCU’s SDS illuminated that other campus groups feared SDS would steal their members or overshadow their activities. Tymonski also commented on the possibility that a JCU SDS would be required to answer to larger SDS chapters, by writing “The only thing absolute about the character of local SDS chapters is their relativity,” as local SDS chapters operated with “total autonomy, based on the needs, resources, and orientation of their various constituencies.”185 According to Tymonski, JCU’s campus language communities needed focus on what a JCU SDS chapter could add to Northeast Ohio’s already growing carnivalesque culture and identity. His article continued with discussion of the power structures of the University and Northeast Ohio and reviewed the main points of SDS from a national standpoint. The article, unlike the literature released by the SDS chapters at KSU and CWRU, did not label the power structures as enemies. JCU’s SDS chapter would attempt to initiate action to promote a

184 Ibid.
185 Ibid.
constructive relationship between the power structures of Northeast Ohio and JCU’s SDS to allow for “participatory democracy.””\textsuperscript{186}

The reference to participatory democracy as a goal of SDS was first explained in the organization’s manifesto, \textit{The Port Huron Statement} (PHS). The manifesto emphasized the “interconnections between social ills like militarism, racism, and poverty, American capitalism, and the need for a comprehensive solution,”\textsuperscript{187} and with JCU’s religious culture, Tymonski revealed a JCU SDS chapter could help accomplish social justice, and thus made a potential SDS chapter feasible for the campus. With his reference to PHS Tymonski connected the potential JCU SDS chapter to the older guard of SDS. By the time he published his article in \textit{The Carroll News} SDS chapters throughout the nation avoided direct references to PHS. For many SDSers the statement’s intellectual nature did not resonate with their language communities; it was not a document that spoke to the youth’s need for direct challenges to unitary language authority in a “hip” manner. This disconnection from the earlier days of SDS made many SDSers “terribly ignorant of their intellectual predecessors. Pete Seeger’s and Bob Dylan’s folk music…probably had more influence on many New Left activists than the sometimes complex books and articles” that informed and inspired the founders of SDS.\textsuperscript{188} Recalling the pamphlets released by the SDS chapters at KSU and CWRU, such a point becomes further illuminated due to those chapters use of Bob Dylan lyrics to
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recruit campus language communities. At JCU, however, PHS complimented the social Catholicism of JCU. Tymonski navigated and negotiated the moral connections between the original culture of SDS and JCU’s religious culture, while downplaying the popular culture connections between SDS and JCU’s language communities.

The article ended by stating there would be an open meeting the next day for students to learn about SDS and that an unnamed SDS representative would be in attendance. CWRU also had SDS regional officers visit the University during the early stages of its chapter, so despite the fact that local SDS chapters operated with autonomy, the National Office (NO) still recognized that its representatives could help jumpstart new chapters. The presence of an unnamed SDS regional representative at JCU also provides insight into the functions of Northeast Ohio’s carnivalesque culture and identity. The NO acknowledged that smaller institutions of higher learning were as important as larger intuitions in challenging unitary language authority and bringing change to the structures of the nation. But although it seemed a JCU SDS chapter was close to formation, anti-SDS students voiced their disapproval in an attempt to discredit SDS and its members.

Miles McKearney, a JCU student, countered Tymonski’s calls for a JCU SDS chapter and attempted to expose SDS as an organization dangerous to JCU’s religious culture. McKearney’s April 5, 1968 article in The Carroll News traced the history of SDS to argue that it was a “Communist front.”
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history was obvious. The article began with a brief history of the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID) and its parent organization, the League for Industrial Democracy (LID). Both organizations were social-democratic in nature but McKearney’s label that they were Communist organizations was a stretch. McKearney then summarized how SDS formed as an extension of SLID. Although he was correct that SDS started out as an extension of SLID, McKearney failed to recognize (or simply chose not to recognize) that SDS broke away from the dogma of SLID and LID in the early 1960s. This breakaway identified one key moment in the development of the New Left and made SDS a distinct and autonomous student organization. His reference to SDS as a Communist organization was also questionable. SDS did have members who espoused Communist ideologies, but SDS did not function as a Communist organization and it often chastised the bureaucratic structures of Communist nations and Communist parties across the globe. McKerney’s method of analysis followed many on the right side of America’s political spectrum during the late 1960s. Conservative journalist Gary Allen in his 1969 article “The Students and the Establishment,” also traced the history of SDS to argue its only objective was to create a “domestic Vietcong” aimed at the violent overthrow of the U.S. government. It seemed McKerney, and others who connected SDS to Communism, used the same Cold War rhetoric popularized by Senator Joseph
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McCarthy during the 1950s. McCarthy used his position in politics to publicize potential Communist infiltration, which later became known as McCarthyism. McCarthyism was the perfect tool for the unitary language to centralize ideologies that countered and subverted the accepted discourses of mainstream American culture. It played on the fears of Americans and made them “hesitant to take a stand, especially ones which could be considered controversial.” McKerney, then, acted on the behalf of the unitary language when he attempted to expose the heterglossic ideologies of many SDSers, particularly given that 1968 was a pivotal election year.

Even though McKerney attacked SDS in an attempt to centralize JCU’s language communities into the realm of unitary language authority, he failed to disconnect the moral relationship between SDS and JCU’s religious culture. He explained that SDS’s initial desire to help the poor through social justice was a noble goal that all language communities needed to recognize. He was quick to point out, however, that social justice “has become passé” for SDS as it had lost its founding values and was only interested in rabble rousing for the sake of publicity. His assumptions that SDS’s main interest was radicalism for the sake of radicalism might have been true for some SDS members in America, but McKearney’s claims conflicted with Tymonski’s promise that a JCU SDS chapter would operate with total autonomy from the NO to accomplish social justice.
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Tymonski responded to McKearney’s arguments in an article published by *The Carroll News* on April 26, 1968. Titled “How to Talk to Communists,” Tymonski attempted to disprove that SDS was a “Communist front,” and the article summarized that Communists should not be considered enemies.\(^{196}\) He argued that, although Communist ideologies conflicted with many aspects of the Catholic Church’s teachings, students should not be opposed to engaging in constructive dialogue to explore the commonalities between Communism and Catholicism. He justified this argument through an explanation that Catholic students should combat anti-Catholic ideologies in a loving, “Christian” manner.\(^{197}\)

A deconstruction of Tymonski’s article reveals it had two motives. The first sought to counter claims that he, as an individual who sought the formation of a JCU SDS chapter, was a Communist. Tymonski showed that he was not a Communist by presenting to JCU’s campus language communities the proper language to utilize when speaking to those who opposed church dogma. The second motive was the use of religious rhetoric to quell attacks on those who aligned with heteroglossic organizations like SDS. Although Tymonski did not directly attack McKearney, he hinted that those who did not approach opposing viewpoints in a loving manner, even if the viewpoints conflicted with church dogma, failed to be good Catholics. Tymonski’s article, therefore, utilized non-vulgar heteroglossia language to decentralize and disrupt McKearney’s employment of unitary language. As Americans and Catholics, JCU students received
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unitary centralization via arguments on two fronts. The first that stated Communism was a dangerous force to be avoided at all costs due to its opposition to America’s capitalist and democratic functions. The second was Communism’s promotion of atheist societies and challenges of church authority. Tymonski decentralized JCU’s language communities from this socio-ideological thought by arguing that students had nothing to fear from engaging in constructive discourse with those who the power structures declared as enemies. Tymonski ensured his protection from potential attacks by using church teachings to legitimize JCU’s carnivalesque culture, and he exposed McKerney as someone who did not approach individuals in a “Christian” manner.

The articles written by Tymonski and McKearney provide insight into the cultural functions of JCU. Despite the differences in approach, Tymonski and McKearney both agreed that helping the poor was a goal that all JCU language communities should seek to accomplish. This style of dialogue rarely occurred on the polarized campuses of KSU and CWRU but the arguments presented by Tymonski and McKearney showed JCU had instances of polarization that resulted from different interpretations of church dogma. The dialogue also illuminated that many of the JCU’s language communities were united in the belief of achieving social justice but differed in how a SDS chapter could contribute to such a program. The fact that the dialogue occurred through articles published in The Carroll News hints that the University’s power structure did not seek prohibit students from engaging in dialogue that helped publicize the Catholic Church’s teachings on assisting the poor and opposing war. McKearney’s article implied that the potential SDS chapter at JCU alarmed certain members of the campus community who feared the
organization would harm the religious integrity of the campus. Tymonski attempted to negotiate a relationship between Leftism and Catholicism to argue that SDS would help uphold JCU’s religious integrity by supporting Catholic values. It seemed by spring 1968, however, a robust carnivalesque culture and identity defined by a strong heteroglossia would remain dormant in physical space until JCU’s SDSers resurrected the boisterous ideological fervor generated by the draft card protest.

Fall 1968: The Resurrection and Final Death of JCU’s Campus Carnival

For the remainder of the 1967-68 academic year The Carroll News published no further discussions about a potential JCU SDS chapter. Although discussions about SDS ceased, it is important that SDSers sought the creation of a chapter at JCU during this time. Indeed, KSU experienced the creation of a SDS chapter during the spring of 1968, so the connection in time between the formation of distinct heteroglossia languages in Northeast Ohio revealed the increasing power of the Movement, and how the Movement influenced students from various language communities. The resurrection of JCU’s campus carnival occurred during the fall of 1968.

JCU’s SDSers held a meeting in the University’s Administration Building on Thursday, September 12, 1968 to discuss official recognition from the University’s administration. The Carroll News reported that members of the University’s “Student Union,” JCU’s organization that handled student affairs, attended the meeting, along with
one unnamed faculty member.\textsuperscript{198} The secretary of the Student Union, James Laures, described the University’s bureaucratic process of chartering official recognition. After an intensive discussion broke out between JCU’s SDSers they decided to postpone Union recognition and “expressed a desire to have no specific leadership or recognition, so that in acting as individuals, the Union or the Administration couldn’t investigate or persecute the group.”\textsuperscript{199} The decision to postpone official University recognition revealed that JCU’s SDSers recognized the potential problems that could result from being an official University student organization. The fact that JCU’s SDSers feared potential “investigation” and “persecution” from the University’s administration was an interesting development in the carnivalesque culture they sought to create and sustain through heteroglossic attacks on unitary language authority for a number of reasons. First, it showed that JCU’s SDSers, by the fall of 1968, had little trust in the University and its administration. As Tymonski stated in February 1968, the University had to support the creation of a SDS chapter at JCU due to the Declaration of Student Rights. By the fall of 1968, however, SDSers felt that even though the University would support the creation of a SDS chapter, it opened up the possibility for the University to investigate the organization and prohibit heteroglossic displays of carnivalesque behavior. Second, the fear that the University could investigate the organization hinted that JCU’s SDSers planned to conduct protests radical enough to warrant University persecution. In many ways these fears were not unfounded. As seen at KSU and other universities across
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America, university police forces often conducted investigations of SDS chapters. Furthermore, the more radical SDS chapters in America, such as one at KSU, also received investigations from the American Federal Government. JCU’s SDSers, then, felt the potential risks of a SDS chapter outweighed the potential profit. This realization also downplayed the initial arguments made by Tymonski that stated the need for a SDS chapter at JCU, and helped prove McKearney’s argument that JCU’s SDSers had more sinister intentions. If the SDS chapter that Tymonski originally called for would seek social justice and did not want to participate in revolutionary violence, SDSers had little to fear from potential investigations. Although the meeting solidified the fact that there would be official JCU SDS chapter, JCU’s SDSers still desired to align themselves with the greater carnivalesque identity of Northeast Ohio. Thus, they announced that they would use the next day as opportunity to challenge unitary language authority in what became JCU’s most radical and last campus carnival.

On Friday, September 13, 1968 JCU’s SDSers sponsored a campus protest that they labeled as a “picnic.” The Carroll News reported that, even though JCU had no official SDS chapter, thirty JCU’s SDSers who called themselves “The Students for a Free Society” was “Carroll’s local affiliation with the national SDS movement.” The thirty protestors gathered in front of JCU’s Administration Building stating that they would march to the University’s athletic field to protest a scheduled ROTC drill. A university administrator asked the SDSers to “make sure everybody’s rights are adhered
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to and I’ll assume your rights are also respected.” This proclamation again affirms that the University’s unitary language forces sought to protect JCU’s SDSers if they “adhered” to certain protocols. But the unitary language was uncertain if the heteroglossia would harm its normative functions of centralization and felt it necessary to explain the protection of the SDSers was conditional on the guidelines administered by the unitary language. In other words, if JCU’s SDSers wanted to protest they had to do so in a manner deemed acceptable by the unitary language. JCU’s SDSers, however, had no intention to uphold the rights of other campus language communities.

The protestors arrived to the field and positioned themselves in a way that prohibited ROTC members from beginning their drill, which created a campus carnival at stage two. Prior to this demonstration, JCU’s SDSers made no attempt to suspend the normative functions of the University. With the ROTC cadets unable to conduct their drill, JCU’s SDSers succeeded at displaying their canivalesque identity in a way that demanded University attention. Indeed, it appears JCU’s SDSers were correct in their fears that the University would become interested in their activities, and showed that since they were not an official University organization, they could not be persecuted as a collective but as “individuals.” The protestors utilized methods typical of SDSers by chanting and deriding official unitary language authority through heterglossic language.


203 Stage two of campus carnival is labeled as “aggressive campus carnival.” Here, there are attempts by the heteroglossia and carnivalesque culture to completely pull language communities into its grasp, but the carnival rarely accomplishes complete stratification and decentralization. Also, this stage may have minor instances of violence against unitary language forces. Either way, the unitary language suffers an intensive blow as stage two is widely advertised.
Once the SDSers ended their protest and returned to their initial gathering place, the ROTC cadets resumed their drill without further interruption.204

The ROTC protest at JCU was important to the carnivalesque identity of Northeast Ohio for a variety of reasons. First, although JCU had no official SDS chapter, SDSers created heteroglossic tension on the campus. The protest also showed that official recognition was not important for challenging unitary language authority, and that a heteroglossia can decentralize campus language communities even when the heteroglossia is not at its greatest strength. The only thing important for JCU’s SDSers was for them to display their carnivalesque identity as a collective force regardless of whether or not the collective was officially recognized. Second, the protest was important for the carnivalesque identity of Northeast Ohio due to its timing. JCU’s SDSers, despite the fact that it had no official SDS chapter to call their own, preceded the ROTC protests of KSU’s SDS. The heteroglossia of JCU’s SDSers had the ability to educate other Northeast Ohio SDS chapters on what protest methods worked best at suspending the normative functions of the unitary language. JCU’s SDSers also presented to other Northeast Ohio SDS chapters that campus carnivals could occur at unlikely locations, such as small religious institutions. With JCU’s SDSers giving hope to radical students at other universities about the potential power of heteroglossic challenges of unitary language authority, it became largely unnecessary for JCU’s SDSers to continue their carnival. Not all members of JCU’s language communities abandoned the calls for an
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official SDS chapter, and support for the creation of an official SDS chapter came from unlikely members of the campus community.

Ulf Goebel, a professor of political science at JCU picked up Tymonski’s original arguments about the feasibility of an official SDS chapter. In his October 1968 editorial published in *The Carroll News*, Goebel used the original rhetorical tactics crafted by Tymonski. His editorial began with an explanation that JCU’s SDSers had nothing to fear from the University if the organization operated with religious intentions. He also commented on McKearney’s arguments that SDS chapters only sought publicity, such as the chapter at Columbia University. He agreed with McKearney that these chapters tarnished the name of SDS by being radical for the sake of being radical, while also commenting that the “ill-informed accusations that would associate anyone even thinking about the Students for a Democratic Society with a dark and sinister international Communist conspiracy,” made him compelled to write the editorial. Goebel’s attacks on Columbria’s SDS protected him from possible claims that he supported university takeovers and violent SDS chapters, but noted that connecting SDS to Communism was absurd. Goebel argued that a SDS chapter would be important for JCU, which resulted from its positions on fighting racism, helping the poor, and ending the war in Vietnam. 

Goebel drenched his editorial with Catholicism’s motifs of agony, death, resurrection, and redemption, while also attempting to comment on the polarization of
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JCU’s campus language communities as a reflection of the divides in American society due to the 1968 election being a month away:

A university at its best is a microcosmic manifestation of its society on the level of reflexive humanization and thus redemption by way of a memory that frees and makes possible the engagement of future possibilities with compression. To affirm the future in full view of our responsibility as free men it is imperative that make the experience of this nation in agony ours. To rise above from the barbaric death of hippies and yippies it is necessary for us to live that death ourselves. ²⁰⁷

He ended his editorial with similar religious justifications that Tymonski used in his March 1968 article but expanded the connection between the life of Christ and SDS activists:

I have always been attracted to Christian mythology and particularly now it speaks to me. I am reminded of the man Jesus...who lived the only life possible for God, engaged in the project of redeeming humanity. A carpenter first and outcast for the remaining two years of his life, he chose the company of whores, pimps, embezzlers, thieves, and generally the wretched of the earth. His was a life of rebellion with the alienated for the purpose of raising all of humanity to a higher level. We might well benefit from his example. ²⁰⁸

Reading between the lines, it appears Geobel believed SDS was the modern force that could raise humanity to a “higher level.” JCU’s SDSers did not respond to Goebel’s calls though. JCU’s “Students for a Free Society” made no further protests for the remainder of the academic year.

Although JCU’s SDSers made no further protests, the University allowed for open-air displays of carnivalesque contempt by sponsoring a talk for two protest priests in April 1969.

²⁰⁷ Ibid.
²⁰⁸ Ibid.
On April 22, 1969 four JCU professors sponsored a dialogue “concerning Dow Chemical, the producer of napalm for the Vietnam War,” with Fathers Robert Begin and Bernard Meyer who broke into a Dow building in Washington, D.C. and destroyed a number of company’s files on April 15, 1969. In many ways these priests were similar to the “Catonsville Nine” who also used illegal actions to display their carnivalesque behavior. The Carroll News commented on the radical ideologies expressed during the meeting while also reporting the moral and religious connections the priests had to carnivalesque behavior. Once again, the meeting showed the University’s support for radical ideologies as long as the ideology sought to end oppression through social justice. When Professor Boland took the stage, he “maintained the morality of the priest’s action.” He then attempted to continue Geobels earlier arguments about the connections of Christ to radicalism by stressing “that Frs. Meyer and Begin were faced with two evils, the napalming of children and the burning of offices. A true prophet will challenge evils, accepting the retribution of society, he said.” The other three professor who attended the dialogue continued Boland’s arguments. This open air challenge of official unitary language authority by professors rarely occurred at KSU and CWRU.

The meeting took a more radical turn when the protest priests began their talk on Dow Chemical and the war in Vietnam. They outlined America’s corporate imperialism
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of Latin America and argued that Communism was not the enemy of the U.S. or even Catholicism:

Turning to Viet Nam, the priests pointed out the immorality of war itself, and as Fr. Beigin said to one of the students, “If you consider war immoral, but go to the aid of your country, you are in a sense becoming a ‘Christian murderer.’” The priests also mentioned the Cuban revolution, and stated that the U.S. should have rendered assistance, militarily and economically to the rebels. On Viet Nam again, they advocated self-determination by the people of that country even if they chose to elect Communism. “Freedom is obtained by choice,” said Fr. Begin, “even if Communism is the type of freedom they want.”

The protest priests who attended this dialogue revealed to JCU’s language communities that unitary language agents supported radical ideologies. Furthermore, the priests showed they were willing to initiate revolutionary change to the unitary structures of the U.S. through radical protest methods. Recalling the Dow Chemical protest of CWRU’s SDS, these priests exhibited far more radical behavior in the sense that they represented official unitary language. The priests, as members of the Catholic Church, had influence on members of JCU’s language communities. These were not individuals who represented political ideals, but rather religious ideals. But although the priests offered JCU students lessons on how to legitimize radical ideologies through religious motives, JCU’s SDSers remained dormant and conducted no further protests on the campus. CWRU’s SDS realized the absence of a strong carnivalesque culture at JCU and attempted to recruit JCU’s SDSers into its radical identity the following fall.
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On Thursday, September 18, 1969, CWRU’s SDS chapter distributed a pamphlet on JCU’s campus titled “War/Game.” The pamphlet called for a protest against the Davis Cup tennis championship and explained CWRU’s SDS would protest the cup that Saturday. As explained in the previous chapter, the protest of the Davis Cup was the most profound instance of campus carnival for CWRU’s SDS. SDSers used violent protest methods to clash with local law enforcement officers.

The distribution of a pamphlet at JCU written by CWRU’s SDS was an interesting development in the story of JCU’s campus carnival and Northeast Ohio’s carnivalesque culture. The pamphlet showed that CWRU’s SDS attempted to build a unified carnivalesque culture in the Cleveland area, as it sought to recruit not only to members of CWRU’s language communities but also the language communities of JCU into its heterologssia language sphere. The pamphlet also revealed the absence of a strong carnivalesque identity at JCU because JCU had no official SDS chapter to generate and sustain acts of campus carnival. Although JCU had no official SDS chapter, SDSers still attended the University in the fall of 1969. JCU sophomore Jim Fraley answered CWRU’s SDS call and attended the Davis Cup protest as a reporter for The Carroll News. He noted a small “cohort” of JCU students participated in the protest, and his account of the protest gives an “on the ground” overview of what occurred:

“Hey, man...good to see ‘ya, good to see ‘ya,” said one guy that I recognized from JCU (whom I’ll call Bill). “Do you plan on getting arrested”? I told him I hadn’t. “Then you better get out now,” as he headed east down North Park... Then it happened. I stood there alone and watched, yet it was still hard to believe. To say that the SDS got everything they expected would be fairly accurate. To say that some police officer vented person frustrations couldn’t be closer to the
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truth. A short, stout you man later identified as a math instructor at Cleveland Heights High by a fellow teacher, made sure that the demonstrator’s first swing would be her last. I walked over and stood about four feet away with hands in pockets and watched. Squirming and swinging on the ground with her breast exposed and screaming. “fascist pig…fascist pig,” he dropped his knee on her neck and took on her hair with his other foot. “Here get her with these,” as one policeman tossed him a pair of cuffs.”

The participation of JCU students in a protest organized by CWRU’s SDS demonstrated that if a university did not fulfill a student’s carnivalesque desires, they would seek fulfillment by integrating themselves with language communities not directly connected to their own. This fact also illuminated how, even if a student attended a university without an established SDS chapter, Cleveland still offered the opportunity for the student to display their carnivalesque tendencies.

The Davis Cup protest served as the last campus carnival for CWRU’s SDS, and thus its ability to recruit more members into its heteroglossic sphere dwindled during the late 1960s. The inability for CWRU’s SDS to continue the recruitment of SDSers from other locations lowered the probability that JCU’s SDSers would have outlets to display their dissatisfaction with the Establishment, and the lack of support for a JCU SDS chapter continued throughout the fall of 1969.

The significance of JCU’s SDSers to Northeast Ohio’s carnivalesque identity was smaller in scope when compared to the SDS chapters at KSU and CWRU. The lack of significance resulted not from the small number of JCU students who aligned with the SDS movement but from the lack of a strong heteroglossia language. The heteroglossic language used by radical JCU students often failed to establish strong definitions of how
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unitary language authority harmed their campus culture and remained ambivalent to whether the Catholic Church was a pillar of the Establishment. Thus, the SDSers at JCU found themselves existing in a campus culture that did not feel a SDS chapter was necessary for the campus. The lack of support for a SDS chapter stemmed from the University’s unified religious culture which furthered the notions that a SDS chapter at JCU was unnecessary. Indeed, whether pro or anti SDS, students and University officials often cited the importance of social justice, and with many SDS chapters across the nation becoming more interested in a violent overthrow of the Establishment, JCU’s SDS had difficulty in negotiating and common relationship between the University’s religious culture and SDS’s radical secular culture. Either way, the brief emergence of a carnivalesque identity at JCU offers an interesting example of how the Movement occurred at unlikely locations.
CONCLUSION

The Students for a Democratic Society were one component of the larger student movement of the 1960s. Although *The Campus as Carnival* did not explore all of the student movements or all of the SDS chapters in Ohio during the 1960s, it does reveal how a protest culture translated into a protest identity via languages that subverted official socio-ideological discourse. The culture and identity of the SDSers at Kent State University, Case Western Reserve University, and John Carroll University continued the American tradition of questioning official power structures through attempts to demonstrate cultural, political, and social power. This thesis also illuminated how the SDSers at each university were united in opposition to official unitary language authority by employing various levels of heteroglossic language. Each campus community experienced the challenges to unitary language authority to varying degrees, but the carnivalesque identity at each university reflected the broader desires of dissenting students and citizens across the nation during the 1960s. Most important, *The Campus as Carnival* showcased that Northeast Ohio was a hotbed of SDS activity, which is a topic rarely explored in SDS historiography.

Chapter one explored SDS’s campus carnival at Kent State University to argue that KSU’s SDS demonstrated classic cases of campus carnival at all stages. This strong carnivalesque identity made Kent’s campus carnival the most “radical” when compared
to the other universities studied in this thesis. KSU’s SDSers continued the traditions started by earlier KSU activists during the mid-1960s, eventually making KSU’s SDS one of the largest chapters in the nation. The campus carnival created by KSU’s SDS generated the most radical and profound instances of heteroglossic critiques of unitary language authority by utilizing violent protest methods.

At first, KSU’s SDS operated through the preexisting bureaucratic linguistic protocols of the University to ensure the organization would be permitted to organize freely on campus. KSU’s SDSers then attempted to negotiate common cultural connections between other campus language communities through pamphlets that used vulgarities to chastise both the University’s and America’s official culture. According to KSU’s SDSers, the members of the Kent community, whether pro-SDS or anti-SDS, all had to face the same alarming realities, arguing that their SDS chapter could help bring change to both the local and national community. KSU’s SDS published many more statements and pamphlets than the other SDS chapters explored in this thesis, revealing their desire to dislocate campus language communities from the grasp of the unitary language. KSU’s SDS at times complied with the unitary language’s centralizing functions—especially during its November 1968 rock concert in the University’s Student Union. The exchange with Officer Boll illuminated that the University was not fearful of SDS during its early stages; Officer Boll noted SDS’s compliance throughout his police report, while also explaining that SDS had done nothing wrong. However, KSU’s SDS stopped its compliance with unitary language authority after its encounter with Officer Boll.
As the radicalism of KSU’s SDS increased during its short history, the chapter attempted to mirror the violent actions of other SDS chapters by clashing with University law enforcement officers and attempting to occupy and shut down University buildings. When the Oakland Police Department started a recruitment campaign at KSU, SDS aligned with BUS to shut down the recruitment by blockading the Student Activities Center on November 13, 1968. The blockade increased the University’s surveillance of the group and exposed KSU’s language communities to the growing power of SDS’s heteroglossia language. The radicalization of the chapter continued into the spring of 1969.

Famous members of SDS’s NO, such as Bernadine Dohrn, also recognized the growing strength of KSU’s SDS and attempted to use it to help achieve the violent overthrow of the Establishment. Although KSU’s SDS remained divided on the whether violence was the best method for practicing campus carnivals, the chapter’s radicalism and size attracted surveillance efforts by the U.S. government. The presence of U.S. government officials revealed the danger many unitary officials felt KSU’s SDS posed to the unitary functions of the Kent community by the spring of 1969.

With the “Spring Offensive” KSU’s SDS offered the most organized and pinpointed attack on a university when compared to the other SDS outfits investigated in this thesis. During the Spring Offensive, KSU’s SDS increased its employment of violent heteroglossic language, marching directly to the University’s Administration Building to present its four demands on April 8, 1969. After the protestors clashed with University law enforcement officers, the University required them to answer for their actions by
scheduling a hearing for those involved in the violent campus carnival. On April 16, 1969, the members not required to participate in hearings broke into Music and Speech Building to shut down the hearings. The actions of KSU’s SDS gave the unitary language structures no other alternative but to suspend the chapter in an attempt end the practice of campus carnival. KSU’s campus activism did not die with the suspension of its SDS chapter, though. The war in Vietnam continued, and many Kent students still attempted to challenge to unitary language authority. When four KSU students died from the actions of Ohio’s National Guard on May 4, 1970, it appeared KSU’s SDS was correct in its assessment of the perceived violent oppression of the Establishment.

Chapter two investigated the campus carnival at Case Western Reverse University. The chapter argued that CWRU’s SDS failed to initiate strong displays of a carnivalesque culture and identity, resulting from its reluctance to challenge unitary language authority in the same manner of KSU’s SDS. Cleveland was the ideal location to build a strong carnivalesque identity, but CWRU’s SDS was often incapable of providing developed heteroglossic critiques of unitary language authority. But although the organization failed to develop along the same lines of KSU’s SDS, the chapter’s lack of violence allowed to it outlast the larger SDS chapter at KSU.

CWRU’s SDSers attempted to fill the lack of “action” they perceived at their campus after an Esquire survey deemed the campus “conservative.” Initially, CWRU’s SDS received lessons from the NO on what language was best for challenging unitary language authority. Their first protest, which occurred at the Cleveland Sheraton Hotel on September 22, 1968 against Vice President Hubert Humphrey, provided the opportunity
for CWRU’s SDS to demonstrate their carnivalesque ideologies in front of well-known unitary figures. For the remainder of the fall of 1968, however, CWRU’s SDS often had difficulty in defining its motives and never organized its members in a way that made the unitary language authority fearful of its actions. This difficulty was often the result of the campus’s culture. Indeed, CWRU’s SDS failed to recruit a large number of students into its carnivalesque identity due to the fear some students had about aligning with SDS.

Case’s SDSers did at times generate instances of campus carnival, adopting the rhetoric of other SDS chapters in the area by issuing pamphlets drenched with heteroglossia language. The Reserve Tribune continually noted, however, that CWRU’s SDS failed to recruit large numbers of the student populace into its radical identity. CWRU’s SDS eventually defined the University as complicit to the perceived crimes of the Establishment, and scheduled a campus wide strike against the 1968 Election through a black coffin funeral march. Both CWRU’s SDS and the larger campus community labeled the strike a failure, unlike the black coffin march at KSU.

This failure resulted in CWRU’s SDS viewing itself as lagging behind KSU’s SDS. The chapter understood that Cleveland was the perfect location to link and influence other local SDS chapters and hinted that it might mirror the radical campus carnival at KSU. In the fall of 1969, CWRU’s SDS attempted to take a radical turn. It released literature on JCU’s campus in September, calling for SDSers at JCU to participate in a protest of the Davis Cup. A small JCU cohort did participate in the protest, which offered an example of the possibility SDSers had in the area to unite their carnivalesque identity. The Davis Cup protest proved to be the last and most radical
campus carnival of CWRU’s SDS. With Beradine Dohrn present at the protest, however, CWRU’s SDS still needed members from the outside to initiate strong displays of carnivalesque behavior. The failure of CWRU’s SDS to disrupt the normative functions of the University through a powerful heteroglossia allowed the chapter to outlast KSU’s SDS, offering it the potential to continue critiques of the Establishment long after SDS ceased to exist as a national organization. Although the organization sought to link other SDS chapters in Northeast Ohio, CWRU’s heteroglossia was incapable to decentralizing large numbers of campus language communities, and the task was eventually taken up by Cleveland’s Weatherman who adopted more revolutionary acts of violence through a series of bombing campaigns.

Chapter three examined the campus carnival at John Carroll University to argue that JCU’s language communities felt a revolutionary movement on their campus was superfluous. Furthermore, chapter three illuminated that JCU’s heteroglossia was miniscule when compared to the other SDS outfits explored in this thesis. The chapter attempted to capture the cultural workings of the campus community to explore how JCU’s SDSers viewed themselves within the broader student movement.

JCU showed signs of a carnivalesque identity with SDSers attending the University in the late 1960s. However, the University’s religious culture restricted the ability of JCU’s SDSers to include the Catholic Church as one pillar of the Establishment, which complicated the relationship between the heteroglossia and the unitary language. The University showed support for JCU’s SDSers due to an emphasis on social justice, and therefore JCU’s language communities felt an official SDS chapter
was not needed to display radical ideologies. JCU’s SDSers also received open support from the University’s faculty members, which was rarely the case at KSU and CWRU. Debates on the feasibility of SDS and the possible sinister motives occurred through the campus newspaper. These debates were another rarity when compared to KSU and CWRU. The debates revealed the intellectual lens JCU students used to examine SDS and its connection to social justice; JCU’s SDSers were not interested in transmitting a “hip” message as was the case at KSU and CWRU. At one point, JCU’s SDSers did sponsor a campus carnival by protesting the University’s ROTC program, but the protest remained miniscule when compared to the campus carnivals at KSU and CWRU.

By the fall of 1969, a small cohort of JCU’s SDSers did answer the calls of CWRU’s SDS to protest the Davis Cup protest. However, these individuals did not act on the behalf of JCU, and instead were pulled into CWRU’s heteroglossia. The Davis Cup protest did provide the opportunity for JCU students to fulfill their carnivalesque desires, but JCU’s SDSers did not continue their carnivalesque activities after the Davis Cup protest. Although an official SDS chapter never formed at JCU, the SDSers at JCU illuminated that the Movement occurred at unlikely locations.

It is important to note, not only for the narrative of this thesis, but also for the broader narrative of SDS, that the campus carnivals explored in this thesis developed during the late 1960s. As noted in the introduction, the late 1960s was a time of change for the United States and SDS, as the nation experienced a surge in the collective consciousness of students and average citizens who were dissatisfied with the structures of the nation. Prior to the late 1960s, SDS chapters did not organize at Northeast Ohio
universities in a way that demonstrated strong displays of carnivalesque behavior. As the Movement swelled during the late 1960s, Northeast Ohio university students recognized the actions of other students and attempted to actualize their student power. The three campuses explored in this thesis offer a prime example of how university students grappled with their role in the Movement in an attempt to voice their concerns about a system they regarded was in need to change. By understanding that Northeast Ohio was a hotbed of SDS activities, this thesis allows future historians to view SDS from a bottom-up and cultural perspective.

The alteration and then application of Bakhtin’s theories are not only useful for studies on SDS. Indeed, the theoretical apparatus used in this thesis can be applied to a number of cultural, political, and social movements throughout history. Baktin’s theories are useful for studies on protest in general. However, there are specific movements that warrant the application of the theoretical and methodological model used in the thesis. The Tea Party Movement that gained national popularity after its march on Washington, D.C. in September 2009 demonstrated a contemporary example of a carnivalesque culture and identity. The protestors, similar to the SDSers of the 1960s in terms of their distrust of the federal government, sought to expose the apparent corruption of Washington’s political elite, and used a number of heteroglossic symbols to display their dissatisfaction with America’s political power structures. The Tea Party carnival failed to decentralize the masses away from the grasp of the unitary language, though. Washington’s unitary language centralized their heteroglossia language when rightwing politicians consumed and adopted the Tea Party Movement’s ideologies, using it as a
platform to gain political power. An application of Bakhtin’s theories to the Tea Party Movement could prove useful for future historians to gauge how language united individuals in attacks against America’s political structures.

The Occupy Movement, which gained international acclaim after its September 2011 occupation of Zocatti Park in New York, New York, is another example of a carnivalesque culture and identity. The Occupy Protestors, like the SDSers of the 1960s, chastised the apparent economic inequalities of American society to call for reforms in America’s economic system. They revealed the unitary language’s exploitation of the masses and used heterglossic language to display and perform their carnivalesque desires, with the “1%” serving as the unitary language and the “99%” as the heteroglossia. As the Occupy Movement spread across the globe, the unitary language once again sought to centralize the socio-ideological thought process of those who utilized carnivalesque protest methods. Indeed, the politicians on America’s left sought to centralize the demands of the Occupy Movement, and promised to institute a series of reforms for America’s economic structures.

There are also opportunities for studies on carnivalesque cultures and identities beyond America’s shores. The Tunisian protests against President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali in 2010 that quickly spread to Arab nations throughout the Maghreb and Middle East, labeled “The Arab Spring,” showed instances of violent heteroglossic attacks against official unitary culture. The unitary culture of this location was far more sacred than the unitary authority in America, and thus the Arab Spring provided a prime example of carnivalesque behavior. Many of these protestor’s ideologies were later centralized by
America’s unitary language, and America offered support to many of the protestors, funding the overthrow of regimes typically disliked by America’s Establishment.

As protest cultures and identities continue to be important components of today’s cultural and political discourses, the actions of Northeast Ohio’s SDSers provide a riveting example of how the desire to display dissatisfaction with established structures created environments of carnival as understood by Bakhtin. What can be gathered from the SDSers of Northeast Ohio is that students actualized political power by calling on all members of a society to contemplate whether change of the status quo was a viable option. Although the unitary language often succeeded in its centralization of socio-ideological thought, the heteroglossia continued its job of stratification and decentralization. As long as individuals question official sociocultural and sociopolitical features of the unitary language, the heteroglossia will continue to flourish.
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