

Kent State in Context: The National Guard in Campus Disorders, 1965-70

Thomas M. Guterbock

University of Virginia

May 2020

Accepted for presentation at the Annual Meetings of the
American Sociological Association, San Francisco, August 2020

ABSTRACT

The year 2020 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the May 4th tragedy at Kent State University. Much has since been written about the events of that day, including the actions of the troops involved in the shooting, but little attention has been paid to the varying role and varying success of the National Guard across the dozens of times in which they were involved in the campus disorders in that period. The purpose of this paper is to review the use of the National Guard in campus disorders from 1965 through June 1970 in order to identify the factors that contributed to its successes and failures, and indicate in particular factors that affected the likelihood that the Guard's actions on campus would contribute to violence.

The first part of this paper develops categories to describe different types of campus disorders, and the various enforcement codes that authorities developed to fit different categories of disorder as they had occurred in large cities. Next, the paper outlines the unique structure and role of the National Guard. The history of the use of the National Guard on campuses is then reviewed, including over 40 campus incidents in the five years under study; a history that is divisible into three distinct periods. The final portion of the paper attempts to categorize these incidents in terms of the type of protest activity and the enforcement code which authorities applied. This leads to the conclusion that the Guard was most successful in dealing with disorders that most resembled the ghetto riots earlier in the Sixties, and that the Guard was successful in controlling more complex situations only when the official enforcement code was altered to suit the unique situation of the campus.

Kent State in Context: The National Guard in Campus Disorders, 1965-70

The year 2020 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the May 4th tragedy at Kent State University, when four college students demonstrating against the Vietnam War were shot and killed by members of the Ohio National Guard. Much has since been written about the events of that day (see Lewis 1971, 1978 for a review), including the actions of the troops involved in the shooting, but little attention has been paid to the varying role and varying success of the National Guard across the dozens of times in which they were involved in the campus disorders in that period. The purpose of this paper is to review the use of the National Guard in campus disorders from 1965 through June 1970 in order to identify the factors that contributed to its successes and failures, and indicate in particular factors that affected the likelihood that the Guard's actions on campus would contribute to violence.

The first part of this paper develops categories to describe different types of campus disorders, and the various operational postures or enforcement codes that authorities developed to fit different categories of disorder as they had occurred in large cities. Next, the paper outlines the unique structure and role of the National Guard. The history of the use of the National Guard on campuses is then reviewed, including over 40 campus incidents in the five years under study; a history that is divisible into three distinct periods. The final portion of the paper attempts to categorize these incidents in terms of the type of protest activity and the enforcement code which authorities applied. This leads to the conclusion that the Guard was most successful in dealing with disorders that most resembled the ghetto riots earlier in the Sixties, and that the Guard was successful in controlling more complex situations only when the official enforcement code was altered to suit the unique situation of the campus. The Kent State events are unique in some respects, but when seen in context of similar and dissimilar events the larger circumstances that gave rise to that tragedy become much clearer.

Methods. The bulk of the research on which this paper is based was carried out during the summer of 1970, immediately after the May 4th tragedy. The author was then an entering sociology graduate student at the University of Chicago, who had just completed four months of initial active-duty training in the DC National Guard. Supported by a stipend from the Center for Social Organization Studies, the research group led by the department chair, the late Morris Janowitz, the author traveled to Washington to use the resources in the library of the National Guard Association. Here were filed the annual reports of each state's National Guard, including after-action reports on all activations of Guard units. Much of the detail on specific incidents was gathered from coverage in the *New York Times*, available on microfilm, from other news indexes and from a wide range of news clippings available at the National Guard Association library. The original result of this work was an 80-page white paper completed in December of that year (Guterbock 1970). I have recently updated some details by revisiting my notes from 50 years ago and by consulting contemporary literature, sources and accounts written after 1970.

Types of protest and disorder. For the purposes of this study, it will be assumed that the natural history of any serious campus disorder is determined by two sets of causes. First, the disorder germinates and persists because of the social tensions and political issues that exist within the campus community. Second, the seriousness and length of a campus disorder is to a great extent determined by the actions of control agencies, including administrative, police and military forces. These assumptions are similar to those applied to the study of urban riots by Morris Janowitz in his *Social Control of Escalated Riots* (1967). Implicit in these assumptions is the recognition that stronger measures of control are not a solution to "campus unrest," since it derives from the serious problems of the university and society. But it is also recognized that the misapplication of force by control agencies can exacerbate tensions and provoke violent responses. When confronted with a situation of civil disorder, it is therefore essential that

control agencies accurately perceive the nature of the disturbance, and apply only those measures of control appropriate to it. The term "misapplication of force" is not merely a euphemism for manifestations of brutality; it refers to the official use of measures inappropriate to the given situation. Misapplication of force usually results in the escalation of disorder.

Thus, the first step in determining appropriate uses of the National Guard on campus is the application of a set of categories to collective behavior as it appears on campus. The fundamental distinction to be used here in categorizing collective action is between spontaneous and organized action. This applies not only to an escalated situation but to all three levels of collective behavior, peaceful, disruptive and violent (see Table 1). Thus, a group of citizens gathered peacefully by chance or circumstance is a Casual Crowd, which is different from the similar group that has gathered specifically for a political purpose, the Peaceful Demonstration. The Casual Crowd becomes an unruly crowd when it becomes undecorous, threatening, or obstructive. It is no longer peaceful, not yet violent, but because of its spontaneous nature is not the same as a Disruptive Demonstration, which deliberately goes beyond peaceful tactics to attain specific goals. And at the violent level of action, Mob Violence is to be distinguished from a Planned Violent Demonstration. Looting of a store by a casual crowd of people acting on impulse after some provocation is not to be equated with the ransacking of a campus building by a militant student group that has met and discussed the action previously. The distinction between spontaneous and organized action on each level is crucial because it recognizes the extent of social structure among the participants.

Table 1. Types of crowd and protest action

	<i>Spontaneous</i>	<i>Organized</i>
<i>Peaceful</i>	Casual Crowd	Peaceful Demonstration
<i>Disruptive</i>	Unruly crowd	Disruptive Demonstration
<i>Violent</i>	Mob Violence	Planned Violent Demonstration

The extent of social structure which exists in organized protests is reflected in the large amount of preparation which is usually necessary for their success. The participants in such events are in a social relationship to their leaders, marshals, and other participants, and will respond to sanctions from the group. In dealing with such a group, authorities can best maintain control of the situation by dealing with the leadership and thus making use of the already existing social controls on participants.

By definition, structure is lacking in crowds and mobs. The essential step in halting the processes of mob behavior is the dispersal of the crowd; once this has been accomplished the ordinary controls on individual behavior can be applied to the scattered participants, many of whom will refrain from violence when removed from the crowd situation.

Because collective behavior is subject to rapid change, especially when official agencies attempt to apply measures of control, and because campus communities in the late Sixties usually contained a wide variety of political action groups, it will be seen that the majority of incidents of campus disorder in this time period were a mixture of spontaneous and organized actions spread over time and space. Under these circumstances the task of law enforcement becomes exceedingly complex, and control agencies can only be effective if a variety of measures are available to them that matches the variety of elements in the disturbance.

Enforcement codes. In reviewing the history of “protest policing strategies” over the last half century, Patrick Gillham (2011: 636) observes: “During the 1970s, the predominant strategy of protest policing shifted from ‘escalated force’ and repression of protesters to one of ‘negotiated management’ and mutual cooperation with protesters.” (See also McPhail, Schweingruber and McCarthy 1998.) In the period 1965 – 1970, these two strategies were in tension with one another. While police and military manuals still generally treated crowd control as one complex problem, an examination of actual police practice indicates that two differing practical codes of control were developed, one appropriate for the control of casual crowds and spontaneous violence, and one appropriate for the control of large demonstrations.

The first of these enforcement codes came out of the cumulative experiences of control agencies in the urban riots of the 1960s. The Miami Study Team of the Eisenhower Commission concisely stated the best thinking on the effective control of urban riots. This strategy calls for “the use of a force of well-armed and trained police and soldiers equipped with full anti-riot equipment, proceeding, according to a clearly defined and understood plan, to completely clear the area of disturbance with the use only of that force necessary to accomplish the objective” (NCPV 1968: 27).

The new thinking on the control of organized demonstrations came in response to the actions of the anti-war movement in its later phases. In reporting on the handling of the 1969 "Counter-inaugural" demonstrations in Washington, the Washington Study Team of the Eisenhower Commission demonstrated how official actions before and during the demonstration effectively kept the peace. Their conclusions (NCPV, Washington Study Team: xi-xii, 119-120) can be paraphrased as follows: "Police must act with restraint and professionalism, refusing to be goaded by the actions of the few and retaining the good will of the majority. They must control troublemakers in the crowd without antagonizing the bulk of the demonstrators. The conduct of officials other than the police can make the policeman's job possible or impossible. Officials must deal in good faith with dissenting groups, with determination to

grant full expression to freedom of speech and peaceable assembly.”

Both of these enlightened enforcement codes (written by staff members of the same Presidential Commission) emphasize the need for planning, discipline, training, and effective communications through all phases of control operations. Both urge the minimum necessary use of force. But, while dispersion is recommended for the spontaneous riot, the large demonstration must be allowed to function, must be "dealt with," its "good will must be retained." The difference is not one of "hard line" versus "dovish" thinking; it is a recognition of the real differences between spontaneous and organized group action as already outlined above.

Both of these guidelines were developed in the setting of the city, and it did not necessarily follow that they would be equally effective in the setting of the campus, which is socially and physically different. It will be seen that the National Guard was deployed under both types of enforcement codes in different incidents of campus unrest, with differing degrees of success.

The U. S. National Guard in the late 1960s. The National Guard is a military organization, not a police force. It was established by Congress in 1916 and assigned a dual mission under the National Defense Act: the Federal Mission of acting as part of the Organized Reserve system, and the State Mission of acting as a militia serving the military needs of the state governments. As a consequence, neither the Army National Guard nor the smaller Air National Guard is entirely under the control of either Federal or State government, and the division of authority between the two governments is complex and subject to change. The National Guard can be called to State Active Duty by the Governor, who serves as commander-in-chief of his state's forces. However, ninety percent of funding for the Guard comes from the Federal government; Federal funds pay for training and equipment, and training is based on regular forces' training and activity. Guard members serve four months of Federal active duty training to start, then fulfill the six years of reserve duty (which was required under the Selective Service system for men to discharge their military obligation in lieu of 2 years in the regular military) with a two week Federal

training camp each summer, and a minimum of 48 unit training assemblies each year (usually on weekends). In the 1960s very few National Guard units were called up for Federal duty overseas, yet most of their training was for wartime activities. At that time, most Guard units had obsolete equipment and lacked access to more expensive equipment such as Armored Personnel Carriers. Because of the pressures of the Vietnam war and the demands of the draft, National Guard units in this period typically had waiting lists for enlistment of three to four years. In addition, National Guard enlistees were generally more educated and older than regular Army draftees and enlistees (National Guard Association 1970). One contemporary account (Todd 1969) dubbed them (and Army reservists) as “conscientious acceptors,” pragmatic and generally apathetic about the surrounding contention about the war and the social changes underway in the larger society.

Although the Army National Guard opened its force to female officers in 1960 and women could enlist after 1967 (Citizen-Soldier 2018), during the period under study here nearly all Guard soldiers were male. Although there existed a few Guard units (in large cities) with African-American majorities, the vast majority of Guard soldiers were non-Hispanic whites. The Kerner Commission in 1967 urged the government to increase the recruitment of blacks into the Guard (National Advisory Commission 1968: 496-7), but, despite the success of an early affirmative-action program in New Jersey, a nation-wide black recruitment initiative proposed by the Johnson administration was not funded by Congress (*Facts on File* 1970: 149). So, at the end of 1969 Negroes still comprised only 1.15 per cent of the National Guard as compared to 1.3 per cent at the end of 1965 (*New York Times* 4/1/66: 23; 3/31/68: 1).

Riot training for the Guard was conducted according to Federal guidelines, but execution of riot control operations was under state control. Planning for riot control was done locally, and rules of engagement varied by state, as did the legal powers of Guard members (such as the power to arrest a citizen). In the period from 1967 to 1970, the National Guard took significant measures to improve its riot control capacity and prevent misapplication of force (after the Guard’s grossly deficient performance in

the urban riots of 1967 in Detroit and in Newark). In August 1967, mandatory riot-control training for the Army National Guard was raised to 33 hours of unit training, 16 hours of command and staff training, and an eight-hour Command Post Exercise designed to test out riot plans. All state forces completed this training by October, 1967. The Army's riot control manual was revised in 1968, new offices focused on civil disturbances were created, and every state was directed to develop riot control plans. In 1968, new training facilities were constructed at Fort Gordon to simulate the setting of an urban riot (*Army Digest* 1968).

All these changes came out of the Guard's involvement in large urban riots. When compared to the record of police in the riot control operations of the late 1960s, the Guard's record in the post-Detroit period is quite good. In defending the Guard's performance shortly after the Kent State tragedy, the President of the National Guard Association pointed out that the Guard was called out 191 times for civil disturbances between January 1, 1968 and April 30, 1970 (that is, after Detroit and before Kent State), involving 224,00 troops, with only a few fatalities attributed to the enforcement actions of Guardsmen (Cantwell 1970). (That summary covers civil disorder generally, not just campus unrest.)

It did not necessarily follow, however, that a control force developed and proved in urban riots expressing racial unrest was necessarily the best for controlling campus disorders. The civil disturbance training which National Guard Troops received concentrated on control techniques appropriate to large urban riots. These included training in anti-looting, anti-sniping, and anti-arson measures, the protection of fire-fighters, and operations in a built-up area. The more general portions of training, including most of the practical exercises, concentrated on the techniques of dispersion: riot control formations, agents such as pepper gas, and munitions. Flexibility and discipline were stressed, but the enlisted soldier was primarily trained for two alternatives: doing nothing, or using measures of force to disperse a crowd. Except for members of Military Police units, Guardsmen were not trained in such police fields as apprehension and search, unarmed defense, use of the police club, foot and motorized patrols, marking of

evidence, records and forms, traffic control, law and law enforcement, or identification and description of persons. Even after the full course of required riot training, the Guardsman had neither the tools, the knowledge or the confidence of a professional police officer. (This is as true today as it was then; compare Cancian 2020.) With his uniform, rifle, bayonet and gas grenades the Guard soldier could be useful where the application of overwhelming force was useful; but that soldier's utility was limited in a more complex crowd control situation such as that of a large organized demonstration.

On August 26, 1969, the Military Support to Civil Authority (MSCA) office of the National Guard Bureau sent to each state MSCA office a letter suggesting that existing civil disturbance plans be amended as necessary to include any university, college, or high school campuses which the states felt might become disorderly. As a result, many campuses were physically inspected, maps were obtained, billeting sites selected and vital installations pin-pointed so that existing plans could be extended to campuses. To all appearances, there was little or no coordination with campus administrators. As has been seen, the Guard had been primarily trained and equipped for the Federal (wartime) mission, and then was re-trained and re-equipped somewhat to better cope with spontaneous urban violence. Although the Guard had been involved in some large, organized demonstrations, the active control of crowds was handled by the police in each case, who were present in large numbers because such demonstrations were usually in towns of substantial size. With the spread of serious disturbances to campuses outside the city, the National Guard was for the first time coming into direct confrontation with organized demonstrations, and this, it will be seen, is a partial explanation of its sometimes deficient performance.

As a military organization, the National Guard can only support, not replace the police. The Guard is used only when the State's other law enforcement resources have been exhausted. In dealing with campus unrest, the National Guard was used primarily on small town and rural campuses. In large municipalities, police forces are large, sometimes disproportionately large in relation to the population. When disturbances occur, large numbers of police can be made available by shifting personnel from

quieter areas of the city, cancelling vacations and lengthening the working shift. Thus, outside forces including the National Guard are called into cities only for the most serious disorders. Smaller towns with smaller forces have less extra manpower and, while the addition of county and state forces means a greater percentage increase in available strength, it is still far more likely that Guard assistance will be needed if disorder breaks out. In the small college town this situation is aggravated by the presence of the student population, which normally is adequately policed by campus security forces, leaving the local police the day-to-day burden only of policing the townspeople. Since campus police usually have no formal power of arrest, they are of little help when serious problems of control develop. So in small towns with large campuses, the local police are totally unprepared to handle campus lawlessness when the control system of the educational institution breaks down. With the spread of "campus unrest" to institutions outside the large cities, starting in 1965, the deployment of National Guard troops became unavoidable.

Defining campus disorder. Before beginning a description of the history of National Guard involvement on campuses, it is necessary to clarify what the term "campus disorder" is meant to include. As used here, "campus disorder" refers to political events which established authority defines as illegal, and which involve an interaction between members of the campus community, campus administration, and civil authority. Although students can demonstrate illegally in many settings, it is only when they do so as students, within their own school, that they are part of "campus disorder."

The National Guard was involved in many such events, but it was also involved in several events which fall outside the definition, yet in the press and public opinion were often considered incidents of campus disorder. Such incidents include those in which violence of the larger society was brought onto or close to the campus. Such incidents could be serious enough to involve the National Guard, as did the demonstration in Harvard Square on April 15, 1970, or the 1970 May Day Rally near the Yale campus. Although neither of these schools remained detached from events so near them, the parties most

fundamentally involved in both cases were large groups of non-campus demonstrators and law enforcement officers on city property. These were not incidents of campus unrest, but rather large political demonstrations of the type of the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention and the Washington "Counter-Inaugural" demonstration.

Also excluded from the strict definition of campus disorder are incidents in which collective student violence is taken out of the campus onto town property. These incidents bring students and civil authority into direct confrontation, with the school administration unable to take a substantive role. The National Guard was alerted in Athens, Ohio to protect the town from students of Ohio University in May, 1968; riots by Duke University and North Carolina College students following a downtown rally in March 1969 brought in the Guard to enforce a curfew on the streets of Durham; similarly, the Guard was alerted and patrolled in Isla Vista in the Spring 1970 disorders among the large student population near the Santa Barbara campus of the University of California. These incidents are more accurately classed with urban riots or large demonstrations than with campus disorder.

Levels of Guard involvement. In speaking of National Guard "involvement" in various incidents, it must be recognized that the commitment of Guardsmen is a process involving several successive steps. The process begins with the involvement of full-time personnel, located at each local unit, at the state capitals, and in Washington. If trouble is anticipated at a certain location, high officials of the State Guard will travel to the scene to evaluate the situation and coordinate operations. Usually municipal, county and state police officials will be in touch with the Guard officials; sometimes when these officials notify the Guard that trouble is impending a newspaper account will state that "the National Guard was alerted" even though no troops have been assembled. Such early communication and planning were largely lacking before 1968, but became the rule rather than the exception from then on. State law varies on who can make an official request to the Governor for Guard troops, but in a case where communications are well developed such a request is merely a formality; usually it was the city mayor or county sheriff who

made it. Troops may in fact have already been assembled nearby for a unit drill, or a "training alert" may have been called (each unit is allowed one annually) so that the Federal Government would cover the cost. If a State Active Duty call was made, Guardsmen were alerted by phone by full-time personnel on duty according to a pre-established "alert plan." Sometimes only a handful of Guardsmen were called, to man gas dispersal or other special equipment which is not otherwise available to local police. Often more Guardsmen were needed than the local unit can offer, so Guardsmen would be assembled at armories in adjacent areas as well. The next step was moving these extra units by motor to the nearest armory, or to a site better equipped to handle them or more favorably located. Public schools and state fair grounds were favorite billeting areas.

It is noteworthy that the choice of units was based almost exclusively on proximity to the scene of action. This means that actual civil disturbance experience is confined to those units in or near areas which have had disorders. When an outlying area was hit for the first time with disorder, the Guard soldiers who assembled at the local armory were likely to have had no prior experience in riot control, even if the Guard had been used in many disorders elsewhere in the state. This fact is especially significant for small college towns, far from a big city, which were hit by campus disorders.

The process of commitment of National Guard troops has been traced as far as the actual assembly of troops on State Active Duty. This stage is usually referred to by the press as "standby alert." In fact, the troops may be at any of a number of stages of alert, ranging from training as usual to "ten-minute alert" (soldiers in full gear, vehicles and radios on, ready to move out on shortest notice). The alerted troops may be at the armory or billeting area, or at a staging area close to the action, from which they may withdraw while off duty. When troops are actually committed ("National Guard troops were sent into the area") it is not necessarily to a direct confrontation with the disorder. They may assume traffic control or patrol duties in quiet areas, so that local police can be concentrated in the area of trouble. They may set up patrols just outside the area of trouble, guard critical buildings and installations, or cordon off a wide

area to prevent trouble from spreading. Finally, they will if necessary move from these nearby positions to help police in controlling or dispersing crowds, dispensing gas, and making arrests.

It would, of course, be rare for a unit to go through each of these stages in orderly succession in a real situation; but more often than not when the Guard is "called out" or "sent in" the final stage of involvement is never reached. For the purposes of this study, it will be usually sufficient to use two terms to describe the level of Guard involvement: *alert*, meaning that troops other than full-time personnel were assembled at an armory, billeting site, or staging area, and *commitment*, meaning that troops were sent to the general area of the disorders and assisted the police in some way.

Three periods of Guard involvement in campus unrest. Tables 2a and 2b list, in chronological order, the 44 distinct incidents of campus unrest in which the National Guard was involved between 1965 and June of 1970. As noted above, the listing is based on official reports by various state National Guard as well as news indexes and newspaper accounts; I believe it is a complete list of campus unrest incidents, as defined above, that involved activated Guard troops. The tables include reported counts of the number of Guard troops involved in each incident, but as indicated in the notes to Tables 2a and 2b the basis of these numbers is variable. Three historical periods can be distinguished among these incidents. One distinct type of incident seems characteristic of each period, although older types continue to occur on less radical campuses after newer types of disturbance have become more common elsewhere.

Table 2a. Chronology of National Guard Involvement in Campus Disorders, 1965 – Spring 1969

Academic Year	Date	Institution and Location	No. of Guardsmen (** indicates standby only)	Notes
1965-66	April 4-6	Alcorn A&M College, Lorman MS	588	1
1966-67	May 11-13	Jackson State College, Jackson MS	750	1
1967-68	Oct. 28-Nov. 1	Grambling College, Grambling LA	646	1
	Nov. 13-15	Central State University, Wilberforce OR	1,020	2
	Feb. 6-Mar. 6	South Carolina State College, Orangeburg SC	750	2
	April 6-8	Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee AL	594	2
	April 6	Florida A&M University, Tallahassee FL	333	2,3

Academic Year	Date	Institution and Location	No. of Guardsmen (** indicates standby only)	Notes
	April 6	North Carolina A&T University, Greensboro NC	1,168	2,3
	May 15-20	Delaware State College, Dover DE	124	2,4
1968-69	Feb. 12-21	Univ. of Wisc., Madison WI	2,249	2
	Feb. 13-16	Duke Univ., Durham NC	965**	5
	Apr. 28-30	Voorhees College, Denmark SC	256	2
	May 8-9	Howard Univ., Washington DC	835**	5
	May 12-15	Southern Univ., Baton Rouge LA	1,488	5
	May 15-June 3	Univ. of Calif., Berkeley CA	5,600	2
	May 21-25	North Carolina A&T University, Greensboro NC	735	2

1. "Number of troops" as shown on NGB list. Probably indicates total number of Guardsmen called to duty.
2. "Number of troops committed" as shown on NGB list. Often lower than "number called" but greater than the force in action at any one time.
3. Shows troop strength in city disturbance of which campus incident was only a part.
4. Smaller numbers of troops remained on duty until June 8.
5. "Number of troops called" as shown on NGB list. Greater than the number of troops on standby at any one time.

Table 2b. Chronology of National Guard Involvement in Campus Disorders, Fall 1969- Spring 1970

Academic Year	Date	Institution and Location	No. of Guardsmen (** indicates standby only)	Notes
1969-70	Dec. 10-11	University of Akron, Akron OH	595**	6
	Feb. 20-28	Voorhees College, Denmark SC	256	6
	Feb. 21-22	Southern Illinois Univ., Carbondale IL	169	6
	Mar. 3-6	Univ. of Illinois, Champaign/Urbana IL	825	6
	Apr. 15	University of Oregon, Eugene OR	200**	6
	Apr. 16	Miami University, Oxford OH	504	6
	Apr. 21	University of Kansas, Lawrence KS	340	6
	Apr. 23	University of Oregon, Eugene OR	200	6
	Apr. 29-May 9	Ohio State University, Columbus OH	1,508	6
	May 1-6	University of Maryland, College Park MD	1,073	6,7
	May 2-8	Kent State University, Kent OH	1,395	6
	May 4	Case Western Reserve, Cleveland OH	---**	8
	May 4-9	Univ. of New Mexico, Albuquerque NM	618	6
	May 5-11	(Statewide Tension) Stillwater OK	756**	6
	May 6-8	University of Kentucky, Lexington KY	200	6
	May 6-9	Northern Illinois University, Dekalb IL	1,484**	6
	May 6-10	Univ. of Ill., Champaign/Urbana IL	1,123	6
	May 6-17	Southern Ill. Univ., Carbondale IL	1,132	6,9
	May 7-9	Western Ill. Univ., Macomb IL	443**	6
	May 7-20	Univ. of Wisc., Madison WI	2,243	6
	May 8-June 6	Univ. of South Carolina, Columbia SC	2,132	6
	May 8-13	University of Iowa, Iowa City IA	754**	6
	May 8-9	Northwestern University, Evanston IL	879**	6
	May 13-14	University of Denver, Denver CO	1,555	6
	May 13-16	University of Georgia, Athens GA	289**	6
	May 14-24	Jackson State College, Jackson MS	1,546	6
May 15-19	Ohio University, Athens OH	1,592	6	
May 21-28	Ohio State University, Columbus OH	3,738	6,10	

6. "Number of troops (average)" as shown on NGB list. Shows the average number of troops on duty each day of operation.
7. Technically, two separate call-ups are involved; with an average strength of 403 for May 1-2, and 1,073 for May 4-6.
8. Several thousand Cleveland troops were already on duty at this time for a Teamsters' strike.
9. Technically, two separate call-ups are involved, with an average strength of 1,087 for May 6-12, and 1,132 for May 13-17.
10. For purposes of analysis, this call-up and the one of April 29 will be considered part of one continuous incident.

The years 1965-1968 comprise the first period, the period of *black student unrest*. National Guardsmen entered the campuses of nine Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) between April, 1966 (Alcorn A and M College) and May, 1968 (Delaware State College), before setting foot on a mostly white campus for the first time in February, 1969 (University of Wisconsin). (In May, 1968 Guardsmen were alerted after students at mostly white Ohio University had "trashed" the town of Athens, but this is not strictly speaking an incident of campus unrest.) Guardsmen were involved in incidents of black campus unrest four more times in the Spring of 1969, and twice in Spring of 1970 (the second Voorhees College incident and the second Jackson State College incident). These incidents include several tragedies: the deaths at both Jackson State incidents, the shotgun shooting of students at Southern University's Baton Rouge campus, and the killings by state police at South Carolina State College in Orangeburg. (Guard troops were present when that shooting occurred, but investigations attributed all the shooting injuries to Highway Patrol officers, who had loaded their shotguns with buckshot.) Guardsmen returned sniper fire from dormitories in three of these incidents: during the nationwide uproar over the Martin Luther King assassination of April, 1968 at Tallahassee's Florida A and M University and Greensboro's North Carolina A and T State University, and again at N.C.A. and T. in May, 1969. Some incidents in 1967-70 involved the generalized tensions between white and black society, with the black students spontaneously exploding into collective violence after some relatively minor triggering incident. Other incidents involved the organized effort of a student minority to produce a change in the political orientation of the black campus. In the earliest incident, at Alcorn A and M College in Lorman, Mississippi, the issue was alleged discrimination against civil rights activists; at Grambling College in Grambling, Louisiana (October, 1967) a non-violent minority protested the heavy emphasis on athletics at the school; and by 1968 as the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee became ascendant, militant student minorities began using confrontation tactics to press their demands for Black Studies, Black Culture, and Black Power at their colleges.

It is a sad fact that none of these incidents, even those involving student deaths, received nearly the attention from the public or reaction from white college students that was generated by the May 1970 killings at Kent State. In considering this disparity in attention, I originally wrote (Guterbock 1970: 44): “If many of the earlier incidents have faded from public memory, it is because they were perceived at the time as a part of general black unrest, and the public impact of Guard troops patrolling black campuses was not so great in a time when they were often patrolling black neighborhoods.” Others have attempted to attribute the lack of media attention to the 1968 Orangeburg Massacre at SCSU to the competition from other big news stories at the time, such as the Tet Offensive (History.com 2019; see Boissoneault 2018 for a more insightful analysis). But these attempts at explanation fail to state the broader and clearer explanations: institutional racism and racial bias in our perception of news. As the Black Lives Matter movement has continued to remind us, it is still—regrettably—the case that in the mind of the (white) American public and in our news media: black protest was and is still seen as more threatening than white protest; black victimization—even death—at the hands of law enforcement is too often viewed as routine and ignorable; and harm to whites is far more newsworthy than harm to blacks.

When 2500 Guardsmen were sent to Madison in February, 1969 to quell the student strike at the University of Wisconsin, a new phase of Guard involvement was begun. This was the period of *articulate white student protest*. Following the lead of the militant blacks, but focusing on new issues, white students had begun taking over buildings, capturing administrators, boycotting classes, and sometimes turning to destruction and violence to press their lists of "non-negotiable" demands. The new direction of white student dissent was clearly discernible during the fall of 1967, in the prelude to the rebellion at Columbia in April, 1968 (NCCPV--Skolnick 1969: 98f, 105f.) When the National Guard became involved in this kind of protest activity, it was a "first" in many ways: Wisconsin had a student body ten times the size of any school the Guard had previously entered; the number of Guardsmen used was roughly double to any previous campus operation; the Guardsmen stayed on duty for nine full days; and

for the first time the troops were expected to protect campus buildings and disperse protesting groups while the university continued all its normal functions. Yet although the students were mostly white, the strike was led by militant black students and centered around racial issues. The Guard was alerted for troubles at Duke University the day after starting duty in Madison, and the issues and leadership there were also African-American. But at the University of California's Berkeley campus that spring, where a man was killed when Sheriff's Deputies fired buckshot at a crowd and 5,600 Guardsmen were called out, the issues and leadership were those of white student protest. With the exception of a three-hour take-over of the administration building at the University of Akron by black students in December, 1969, for which Governor Rhodes alerted 600 troops, articulate dissent involving the Guard and white campuses was centered after Berkeley on university involvement with the military and the war. Spontaneous violence in this period, when it occurred at all, took the form of resistance to police actions. Even after articulate dissent had given way on many campuses to disorganized group action, some examples of planned, specific confrontation could be found: like the building take-over at the University of New Mexico in the second week of May, 1970, or the construction at the same time of "Woodstock West" on the University of Denver campus. But by May, 1970 the Guard was becoming involved in a new kind of campus disorder.

The third phase was that of *violent white student protest*. Warrelated issues precipitated this kind of activity, but its main function seems to have been to challenge the legitimacy of university and civil authority. Some white campuses had grown so tense by spring 1970 that, like some black neighborhoods or colleges, they were liable to explode under the stimulus of events to which they were sensitive. The arson and violence which occurred in Isla Vista, the "student ghetto" near Santa Barbara, in February, 1970 were not strictly speaking part of campus disorder, but they signaled the new flammability of the nation's students. At the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana, student unrest in March, 1970 was first expressed in organized demonstrations against oncampus military recruiters, but repeatedly escalated

into huge window-breaking and rock-throwing sprees through the campus and the town, which as in Santa Barbara caused authorities to impose a curfew and call out the Guard. The changing pattern of disorder was reflected in events at Ohio State University in Columbus, where seventeen were wounded by shotgun pellets in April when local, county, and state police along with a thousand Guardsmen moved against students striking over ROTC and minority issues. The school closed for ten days after the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State incident. When Ohio State reopened, organized student activity was almost extinct; instead hundreds of students swarmed off the campus and looted the nearby stores along High Street on May 21; almost 4,000 Guardsmen were on duty for a week as a result.

The announcement of the U.S. entrance into Cambodia touched off spontaneous disorders on many campuses, including Kent State, where student mobs "trashed the town", set fire to the ROTC building and prevented firemen from saving it, and burned down an equipment shed as well. When National Guardsmen on May 4 fired their rifles into a crowd of students there, killing four undergraduates (and wounding nine) after an attempt to disperse an organized rally, the turmoil on campuses around the country intensified. Organized protest turned increasingly from confrontation to real violence, in a wave of arson and firebombings. And groups of students were prone to unleash unpremeditated violence on hated symbols, including buildings and all types of law officers.

Escalation. As seen in Tables 2a and 2b, alerts and commitments of National Guard troops increased sharply over the five academic years from 1965 to 1970. There were no such incidents in calendar year 1965; one (Alcorn A and M College) in the spring of 1966; one in the spring of 1967 (the first Jackson State College incident); seven incidents 1967-68; seven incidents in 1968-69; and at least 27 incidents in 1969-70, the bulk of which occurred in the last months of the spring term. Major General Winston P. Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, testified before the President's Commission on Campus Unrest that "during the height of campus unrest last May (1970), National Guardsmen were used on 24 occasions at 21 universities in 16 states" (Wilson 1970: 2). His statistics are higher than those just

given, probably because they are based on a wider definition of "campus unrest" and "use" of Guardsmen, and a narrower definition of separate "occasions." Despite differing definitions, however, it is clear that there was an upward trend in the frequency of National Guard involvement on campus, with an explosive increase during the turmoil over Kent and Cambodia.

This rise in the frequency of Guard involvement was a product of several factors. Most important of these was the contemporaneous increase in the frequency of campus disorders nationwide, as campus tensions intensified and spread to include white campuses. A second factor was the relatively late appearance of disorder on white campuses outside large cities. While 1968 saw serious disturbances at Columbia and San Francisco State, the National Guard did not become involved because large numbers of local police were available. In the spring of 1969 disturbances occurred on white campuses in smaller cities (Madison, Durham, Berkeley) with smaller police forces that required Guard support. Not until spring of 1970 were there any disturbances on white campuses in towns of population less than 80,000 that were serious enough to involve the Guard. (In contrast, looking at the first period of Guard involvement, many HBCUs are located in rural area and activism started as early in those locations as in the big-city HBCUs.)

A third factor in the increasing frequency of Guard involvement was the increased planning and preparedness on the part of the Guard itself. An important function of the inter-agency planning conferences and command-post exercises of 1968 was to involve the Guard in the earliest stages of any control operation, to ensure the readiness of adequate resources when the need arose. By mid-1969 planning offices of the Guard were planning specifically for campus disturbances. So a campus disturbance was more likely in the later years to be met with an immediate and massive Guard alert. Thus in Spring 1970 units in Oklahoma, Georgia, Oregon, and parts of Illinois were alerted merely because campus disturbances seemed likely.

A fourth factor, the significance of which is difficult to gauge, was the increasing polarization between students and government. Concomitant with the increased acceptance by the white student of radical ideas and militant activism, there was an increased willingness on the part of established authority to use strict regulation and repressive force to contain student protest. In the later years, a campus or state administration faced with white campus protest was more likely to employ military force, especially since, after Wisconsin and Berkeley, the precedent had been set. Thus, the policing strategy of escalated force continued to be favored by some in authority. Again, we must not leave unremarked that authorities had shown little hesitation about unleashing escalated force against black students in the earlier phase of Guard involvement.

In addition to the rise in the frequency of incidents, a rise in the number of troops involved in each incident is also discernible. Statistics are not uniform over the entire period; newspaper accounts are approximate and can usually only estimate the number of troops actually on the campus; while the National Guard Bureau listed only the number of troops called up, sometimes showing the total number activated for the entire operation, and sometimes showing an average daily count of active troops. Even so, the NGB-reported troop counts (National Guard Bureau, 1970), shown in Tables 2a and 2b, reflect the escalation. Before April 29, 1970 (when Guardsmen moved into Ohio State University in Columbus) only five incidents out of twenty-four occasioned call-ups of over 1,000 men. From Ohio State on, 11 out of 19 incidents saw more than 1,000 active troops. If incidents which saw no actual commitment of troops are eliminated from the list, the count becomes five of twenty in the first period, and ten of twelve in the

Table 3. Location of Incidents.

University or College ¹ **NGs never entered campus	Enrollment, ² HBCU ³ Status	Affiliation	Town	Population ⁴	Police ⁵ (estimates in quotes)
Alcorn A&M	1,928 HBCU	State	Lorman MS	300	"1"
Jackson State	3,686 HBCU	State	Jackson MS	144,422	335
Grambling	3,718 HBCU	State	Grambling LA	3,144	"5"
Central State	2,626 HBCU	State	Wilberforce OH	785	"1"
S.C.S.C.	2,010 HBCU	State	Orangeburg SC	13,852	38
Tuskegee	3,183 HBCU	Private	Tuskegee AL	1,750	"3"
Florida A&M	3,956 HBCU	State	Tallahassee FL	48,174	115
N.C.A.&T.	3,844 HBCU	State	Greensboro NC	152,337	280
Delaware State	1,008 HBCU	State	Dover DE	7,250	38
Wisconsin	34,670	State	Madison WI	126,706	285
**Duke	7,249	Private	Durham NC	83,370	162
Voorhees	725 HBCU	Episcopal	Denmark SC	221	"1"
**Howard	7,852 HBCU	Private	Washington DC	800,000	3,680
Southern	6,814 HBCU	State	Baton Rouge LA	175,714	354
Berkeley	28,107	State	Berkeley CA	120,300	"205"
**Akron	14,432	State	Akron OH	300,247	418
S.I.U.	21,576	State	Carbondale IL	18,700	31
Illinois	31,850	State	Champaign/Urbana IL	83,330	100
Oregon	14,762	State	Eugene OR	50,977	115
Miami	14,672	State	Oxford OH	7,828	10
Kansas	14,790	State	Lawrence KS	40,500	39
Ohio State	41,207	State	Columbus OH	534,509	945
Maryland	56,943	State	College Park MD	28,482	"48"
Kent State	20,115	State	Kent OH	25,000	21
Case Western	9,726	Private	Cleveland OH	845,686	2,438
New Mexico	14,440	State	Albuquerque NM	201,189	394
Kentucky	13,815	State	Lexington KY	69,210	227
**Northern Ill.	20,719	State	Dekalb IL	18,486	38
**Western Ill.	8,819	State	Macomb IL	12,135	19
South Carolina	14,314	State	Columbia SC	101,500	201
**Iowa	19,506	State	Iowa City IA	33,443	50
**Northwestern	9,421	Private	Evanston IL	79,283	157
Denver	8,819	Methodist	Denver CO	493,887	1,079
**Georgia	17,652	State	Athens GA	31,355	"53"
Ohio	16,040	State	Athens OH	25,000	"35"

1. Listed in order of appearance on Table 1. Oklahoma alert not listed.
2. Enrollments shown are for 1968-69, except Alcorn A & M which shows 1966 enrollment. *College Blue Book*, 1969.
3. HBCU = Historically Black College or University.
4. 1960 census as quoted in various standard sources. Champaign/Urbana shows sum of the two cities.
5. Number of full time Police Department employees as of December 31, 1968, from *Uniform Crime Reports of the United States, 1968*, Tables 54, 55. Figures in quotes are estimates derived from population figures and rate per 1,000 inhabitants of full-time police department employees, by geographic division and population group, *Ibid.* Table 48.

second. This rise is another reflection of the escalation in the conflict between students and established authority.

Political factors affecting authorities. National Guard involvement has primarily been connected with disturbances at State-run schools as Table 3 shows. Only four times did Guard troops actually enter private campuses, and there was no Guard violence at all in any of these incidents. Out of 35 campuses which saw Guard involvement, only seven (20 per cent) were private; out of 26 campuses which Guardsmen actually entered, only three (12 percent) were private. This is evidence of the importance of politics in determining when the National Guard was used, assuming that disorders are as frequent and as serious on private campuses as on State campuses. Apparently, administrators of private schools were far less quick to use troops for the protection of their institution's property and functions, than were Governors and State educational administrators.

In the period under study, the National Guard was involved in campus disorders in twenty states and the District of Columbia; troops were actually committed in seventeen states. Eight states called out the Guard more than once: California, Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, and Wisconsin. The use of the Guard on campus was thus concentrated to some extent in a few states. This may be a reflection of a similar local concentration of campus unrest generally, which this study cannot attempt to measure. However, these states may have seen more frequent Guard involvement because their governors were more willing to use military force against students. If the governor's use of Guardsmen on a campus is seen as overtly repressive by students in the state, it can in turn further generate tension and disorder at that campus or others. The Governor's use of rhetoric can also play a role in generating conflict; but although most states have had campus disorders, and a great many governors had a tendency to sound "tough on student protesters," militant rhetoric and widespread disorder do not universally coincide, as the examples of Governor Bartlett's Oklahoma and Governor Rockefeller's New York demonstrated. It does seem, however, that a few states saw heavy Guard involvement partly because

of the "hard line" stance taken by their governors in word and deed: Ohio, Illinois, California, and South Carolina. These are not simply the states that have sent the most Guardsmen onto campuses; they are the states in which one incident involving massive involvement of troops seemed to generate new incidents requiring Guard presence.

Ohio's Governor James A. Rhodes was the clearest culprit, calling out troops at Central State University in Wilberforce, the University of Akron, Ohio State in Columbus, Case Western Reserve, Miami University in Oxford, Kent State, and Ohio University at Athens. Rhodes accompanied each call-up with statements that while he was governor no one would be allowed to damage state property, and he charged his opponent in the Senate race with a "soft attitude on campus violence" for criticizing the speed with which the Guard was dispatched to Oxford (*New York Times* 1970). (Rhodes was defeated in an election a few days after the Kent State killings.) California's Governor Ronald Reagan was renowned by the time of the massive Berkeley "People's Park" disorders for extensive use of police and Guardsmen, and in his state, too, "campus violence" became a political football. Governor Otto Kerner of Illinois actually activated more Guardsmen at more campuses than Reagan, who sent almost all of his troops to one school, Berkeley. In May 1970 Kerner called out 5,000 Guardsmen statewide while Reagan simply shut down the state university and college system, an indication that governors do change their policies. Governor Robert McNair of South Carolina was not quite as aggressive as the other three, but the disorders at Voorhees College were related to the killings that had occurred at South Carolina State College in Orangeburg, and his illiberal handling of May 1970 disorders at the University of South Carolina in Columbia may merely have protracted trouble.

The significance of political factors such as these is suggested by examination of the data in Table 3 on the size of the local police force. The assistance of the National Guard ought not to be necessary for control of campus disturbances in towns where there are large numbers of police available. In each incident then, the strength of the local police gives a rough indication of whether Guard involvement was

justified on practical grounds or was perhaps politically motivated. Among the 26 population centers in which Guard troops were actually committed, the median number of full-time police employees was 100. Solely on the basis of local police strength, the use of Guardsmen in Denver and Columbus seems hard to understand, as is the readying of Guardsmen for potential campus duty in Cleveland, which had 2,438 police employees. (That Guardsmen were alerted for disturbances at Howard, when Washington has a police force of 3,680, makes more sense since a wider disturbance in the city itself seemed possible at the time.) The Guard involvement in Columbus and Cleveland represents additional evidence that the Governor of Ohio was over-reacting.

In summary, from 1965 to 1970 Guardsmen were most likely to be sent onto the campuses of state-run schools where the local government had less than 400 employees on the police force. Occasionally they were sent to private or big city campuses, but their involvement on such campuses was generally minor. (Ohio State University in Columbus is an exception.) Early use of the Guard was almost exclusively in incidents at HBCUs. In the later years, the use of Guardsmen on campus increased both in frequency and in number of troops involved. This increase was the result of the use of troops on mostly-white campuses, which increased as the conflict between white students and established authority escalated and spread to outlying campuses. The governors of a few states adopted a militant attitude toward student unrest, which made for more extensive use of the Guard in their states.

Table 4a. Typology of 44 incidents (Part 1).

Protest type	NG posture	College/University of incident	HBCU ?	Campus closure	NG violence	Other agency violence
Organized, non-violent	Active control	Tuskegee	HBCU	Closed		
		Delaware State	HBCU	Closed		
		Voorhees 1969	HBCU	Closed		
		Voorhees 1970	HBCU	Closed		
		U. New Mexico		Closed	10 bayonet wounds	
		U. Denver				
	Cordon	Grambling	HBCU			
		Miami of Ohio				Dog bites
		Oregon 4/15/70				
Spontaneous, violent		Jackson State 1967	HBCU			1 killed by police
		N.C.A.&T. 1968	HBCU	Closed	**	
		Florida A.&M.	HBCU	Closed	**	
		Southern—Baton Rouge	HBCU			Police shotgun fire
		N.C.A.&T. 1969	HBCU	Closed	**	
		Jackson State 1970	HBCU	Open 1 day		2 killed, 12 wounded by police
Mixed, Demonstrations permitted		Central State U.	HBCU	Open 1 day		
		South Carolina State	HBCU	Open 2 days	++	Highway patrol kills 3
		U. Wisconsin 1969				
		Southern Illinois 2/70				
		U. Kansas				
		U. Maryland				
		U. of Illinois 5/70				
		U. Wisconsin 1970				
		Ohio U.			Closed	

** Sniper fire returned by NG, no casualties

++ NG troops charged crowd with troopers; implicated in shooting by some eyewitnesses, but not corroborated.

Table 4b. Typology of 44 incidents (Part 2).

Protest type	NG posture	College/University of incident	HBCU ?	Campus closure	NG violence	Other agency violence	
Mixed, Demonstrations prevented	Demonstrations Banned	Alcorn A & M	HBCU			Troopers violent	
		Berkeley				Sherrif's deputies shoot, killing one	
		Ohio State U. April 1970		Open 10 days		Sheriff deputies' shotgun fire injures about 20	
		Kent State		Open 3 days	4 killed, 9 wounded		
	Curfews	Ohio State U. May 1970					
		U. of Illinois 3/70					
		Southern Illinois 3/70			Open 4 days		
		Kentucky					
		U. South Carolina					
	No commitment of troops		Duke				
Howard			HBCU				
U. Akron							
U. Oregon 4/23/70							
Case Western Reserve							
U. Oklahoma							
Northern Illinois							
Western Illinois							
U. Iowa							
Northwestern U.							
U. Georgia							

Guard performance in relation to type of campus incident. Having described the historical pattern of Guard involvement in campus disturbances, it is now possible to attempt an evaluation of Guard performance under various circumstances. Among the forty-four incidents that involved the Guard on campus in the period studied are some in which Guardsmen killed or injured innocent people, some in which prolonged violent conflict continued for several days after the Guardsmen arrived, and some in which the Guard performed its mission safely and with relative ease. In the several incidents, Guardsmen confronted a variety of different kinds of disorder, and were used to enforce a variety of different enforcement codes or policing strategies. The attempt to evaluate Guard performance will in effect be an attempt to relate the various levels of violence that occurred with the varying circumstances under which the Guard undertook its mission. Three variables will be considered in these terms: (1) Did the school stay open or close down when Guardsmen entered? (2) Was the disturbance spontaneous, organized, or composed of both spontaneous and organized elements? (3) Did administrative policy permit non-violent demonstrations, or was all assembly in effect proscribed? In Tables 4a and 4b, the 44 incidents are arranged in a typology according to the type of protest, and serious incidents of violence by law enforcement are noted. The tables note HBCUs and whether (or when) the campus was closed.

Closing the campus seems to be the surest way to end disorder. If the disturbances are spontaneous, closing the campus and sending everybody home is effective because it means widely dispersing the students, unless they live together in a "student ghetto." Where disturbances stem from organized dissent, the closing will provide a considerable impetus for meaningful negotiation, since everyone wants the school to open up again. So, irrespective of the type of disorder that exists, there are on almost any campus two options for the use of Guardsmen: either to control disorder while the school remains open, or to clear, close and cordon off the campus, Understandably, administrators have usually been reluctant to make use of the second option.

The campus has closed in fifteen incidents in which National Guardsmen were involved. Nine of these schools were closed at the time that Guardsmen became involved (Florida A and M, Tuskegee, Delaware State, Voorhees 1969, Howard, North Carolina A and T, Voorhees 1970, New Mexico, and Ohio University). Of these, Guard violence occurred only at New Mexico. Six other schools stayed open for at least one day after Guardsmen arrived on campus, but then closed when violence seemed to be getting out of hand. Violence ended at these schools once they had closed. It is noteworthy that all these closings were either of black schools, or of white schools after the killings at Kent State. Thus, one feature of the second historical phase of Guard involvement on campus was that campuses were invariably kept open. It might seem that the shift from closing schools in the first phase to keeping them open in the second phase represented a shift in policing strategy from escalated force to negotiated management (McPhail et al. 1998), but at the same time governors and university presidents who pledged to keep the campus open were seen as hard-liners representing law and order against misbehaving or criminal student protesters. And as will be seen below, it was often the case that when schools were kept open, authorities and law enforcement used force to prevent or break up demonstrations, peaceful or not.

The distinction between spontaneous and organized disturbances was discussed near the beginning of this paper. In practice, the majority of the campus incidents the Guard has confronted were mixed situations in which students engaged in both kinds of behavior. A smaller number of incidents, however, has consisted either entirely of highly organized and non-violent (although disruptive) protest, or entirely of spontaneous protest. These latter types will be considered first.

The Guard has actively aided in the control of organized, non-violent protest in six incidents. Four were at HBCUs which closed as the Guardsmen entered (Tuskegee Institute, where the trustees were held captive in 1968; Delaware State and Voorhees 1969, where students had occupied buildings; and Voorhees 1970, where students were boycotting classes). The other two incidents were at mostly white schools in May 1970 (sit-ins were cleared by Guardsmen from the administration building of the University of New

Mexico, which had been closed for three days, and ten persons suffered bayonet wounds; at the University of Denver Guardsmen cordoned off "Woodstock West" while police demolished the shacks). In addition, a small number of Guardsmen briefly provided security at the edges of three campuses on which there was no spontaneous violence: Grambling College, where students held rallies for academic excellence in 1967; Miami of Ohio, where police cleared student sit-ins from the ROTC building on April 15, 1970; and the University of Oregon in Eugene, during protest activity on May 23, 1970.

When actively used to control organized disruption, the Guard was generally used in closing the campus, or in clearing the last holdouts from a campus already closed. Only once did this result in Guard violence (New Mexico), although there was violence by police at Miami. The general peacefulness of these incidents is partly due to the fact that in most cases the students did not defy the police, once the authorities had called them in. So the operations remained fairly simple, involving security of a perimeter and sometimes the active apprehension of trespassers. With one exception the Guard performed its mission well.

The Guard was involved exclusively in the control of spontaneous violence on six occasions. All these incidents were on HBCU campuses: twice at Jackson State College, twice at North Carolina A and T, once at Florida A and M, and once at Southern University in Baton Rouge. Three of these incidents involved sniping activity by the students in connection with disturbances among blacks elsewhere in town (Florida A and M and both NCA and T incidents). Both Jackson State incidents involved bands of students throwing stones at passing cars and police over-reaction resulting in deaths. At Southern, students threw up barricades, set fire to a truck, and threw rocks at Sheriff's deputies, who responded with shotgun fire and tear gas. Thus, all the incidents involved police gunfire, and three involved Guard gunfire, but the Guardsmen inflicted no casualties.

An indication that the Guard performed well against spontaneous violence is the fact that within three days of the police shootings the students in both the first Jackson State incident and at Southern had turned to organized, peaceful marches and rallies. In the other four incidents, the schools closed. This is the kind of situation which the Guard is best equipped to handle, and it does seem to have done a better job than the police, although it received some criticism for its anti-sniping operations in the second NCA and T incident (North Carolina State Advisory Committee 1970). No one was shot in that operation, however, even though the students had been shooting from their dormitory for three days. It is likely that fewer would have been hurt at Southern and Jackson State if the institutions had closed immediately and let the Guard clear the campuses.

The variable of administrative policy toward peaceful demonstrations does not enter into the discussion of these "un-mixed" types of incidents. Clearly, every school that called in the Guard to put down non-violent demonstrations was exercising an illiberal policy toward organized dissent. On the other hand, in schools where no organized demonstrations occurred, the administrative policy toward peaceable assembly is immaterial. But as we move on to consider the many incidents of "mixed" disorder (that is, both spontaneous and organized disruption), it is important to distinguish differing policies toward organized action. On any campus, violence cannot go uncontrolled, but the attitude toward "disruption" can vary greatly. In some incidents, authorities took a liberal stance, hoping violence could be avoided if students were permitted rallies, marches, and the barricading of streets and buildings. On other campuses, such activities were repressed; included in this case are those incidents in which curfews, martial law, or emergency decrees banned all free assembly for any purpose, and those in which no extraordinary ban on protest activity was issued, but effective protest was prevented by strict enforcement of existing regulations against blocking traffic, parading without a permit, disorderly conduct, trespassing, etc.

In nine incidents on eight campuses, the Guard was used to control violence, but was to allow disruptive organized protest. The incidents are placed in this category because they include some rallies or marches which went unmolested, and other more violent activities which were suppressed. By this vague standard, the following incidents are included: Central State University, South Carolina State College, University of Kansas, University of Maryland, Southern Illinois University (February 1970), University of Illinois (May, 1970), University of Wisconsin (1970), and Ohio University in Athens. The National Guard lived up to its enlightened mission in all these cases, although there were eyewitness allegations that Guardsmen might have been responsible along with Highway Patrolmen for the three student deaths at SCSU in Orangeburg. (However, the dead and wounded there were all struck by buckshot, and the Guard troops did not carry shotguns, the weapon used by Highway Patrol in that incident.) In terms of the amount of violence and turmoil on these campuses, it is hard to distinguish them from campuses where a less liberal policy was pursued; in neither case was university life anywhere near normal. Except perhaps in the case of Orangeburg, Guard performance here cannot be faulted; rather it can be pointed out that the most peaceful of these campuses were those which closed. C.S.U. closed after one day; SCSC found peace once it closed.

Most significant was the case of Ohio University in Athens, where in mid-May, 1970, students marched into town and stoned the single bookstore, and then confronted local police at the campus edge for several hours, exchanging rocks for tear gas. Although windows were broken on campus, a fire was set and racial conflicts broke out among the students, police did not move onto the campus, and the only arrests were of those turned over to police by student marshals. Governor Rhodes, in a reversal of his usual policy, turned down three times in 48 hours the university president's request for State Highway Patrolmen. Finally at 3:10 A.M., May 15, it was decided to close the school, and at dawn three 1,500 man National Guard battalions moved in, clearing the campus without further incident (New York Times, May 16, 1970: 10). The tolerant attitude assumed toward disruptive and violent behavior at Athens prevented

any needless police violence. This was a case where an early version of negotiated management was apparently put into effect; a notable change immediately after the Kent State killings had taken place. But it was the closing of the school which actually brought peace to the campus, and the Guard performed its mission flawlessly (even though weapons were loaded as at Kent State).

The list of incidents in which effective protest was proscribed and spontaneous violence occurred as well (Table 4b) includes the least peaceful incidents of Guard involvement. The four incidents in which assembly was explicitly banned by emergency decree were each record breakers in their time: Alcorn A and M, Berkeley, Ohio State and Kent State. At the University of Illinois (March, 1970), Southern Illinois University (May, 1970), University of Kentucky, and University of South Carolina there were nightly curfews which involved Guardsmen in the dispersal of angry crowds of students. At the University of Wisconsin (1969) Guardsmen prevented students from picketing for their strike, and dispersed any group of students that blocked traffic. Ohio State, Kent State, and S.I. U. closed, but only after ugly violence. These are the incidents in which administration policies were the most repressive: the Guard was expected to maintain "law and order" without allowing students to express their grievances in any kind of mass action. The shootings at Ohio State and Kent State both occurred when law officers moved against students who had done little more than assert their rights of free assembly in the face of an emergency ban. At Berkeley and Alcorn the bulk of the action consisted of people trying to demonstrate peacefully and law officers using force to prevent them. Again, the Guard's record in these incidents is better than that of the police; Guardsmen killed the Kent State four, but the violence at Alcorn was the work of Mississippi State Troopers, and the shotguns at Ohio State and Berkeley were fired by county officers. If the events at Kent State were not so hideous, one might almost congratulate the Guard on its restrained performance in support of policies so inviting to violence.

Evaluating and explaining Guard performance. Reviewing these various types of incidents, it can be seen that the National Guard was consistently successful in one group of incidents: those which

consisted entirely of spontaneous violence. These incidents, all of which took place on HBCU campuses, bear the closest resemblance to the urban disorders for which the Guard was equipped and trained. The Guard performed relatively well in incidents with no spontaneous violence, partly because most of the schools involved closed immediately, and partly because these disorders were in no case extremely serious. When the Guard was confronted with a complex situation of mixed student activity, it seemed to make little difference whether a liberal or repressive enforcement code was followed; conflict between students and troops tended to be prolonged and repeated, and the potential for violence was high. Such dangerous conflict could best have been avoided by closing the campus.

As has been seen, administrators were willing to close their schools only in two of the three historical phases of Guard involvement. It can be surmised from the pattern of closings that administrators of HBCUs, especially after Orangeburg, were usually realistically pessimistic about the possibility of a black school functioning under the occupation of white Guardsmen. When organized white student protest reached a level of escalation the police could not handle, white college administrators were not similarly realistic. Guardsmen were called in to help police control undesirable student behavior, and the normal functions of the university were expected to continue. Usually, serious confrontations occurred for days in succession, with student dissatisfaction rising and the level of force used by law enforcement units rising with it. Even non-political members of the university found it difficult to carry on "normal functions" in the presence of bayonets, carbines, and drifting clouds of riot gas. As student force was met with official force, and finally at Kent State student violence was met with disproportionate, deadly National Guard violence, it became apparent even to the most aggressive governors that calling out the Guard for extended confrontation with protesters was an invitation to tragedy. The latest phase of campus unrest saw many school closings.

This analysis suggests that the violence that accompanied National Guard attempts to control campus disorder during the phase of "articulate white student protest" was not primarily a function of the

Guard being "trigger-happy" or poorly trained. On the contrary, it has been seen that in every kind of college incident the Guard record is superior to that of the police. Rather, the violence stemmed from official policies which required that force be fundamentally misapplied. Officials seemed to feel that campus disorders could be handled like urban commodity riots, by the imposition of curfews, the show of force, vigilant patrolling, arresting of leaders, and the unrelenting dispersal of crowds. This is clearly an inappropriate enforcement code for the control of organized demonstrations. It is precisely the kind of administrative policy which, according to the Eisenhower Commission's Counter-Inaugural Study Team, makes the policeman's job of keeping the peace impossible. It was just such an official attitude which set the stage for the Kent State killings. Ironically, the hard-line enforcement policies of authorities at Kent State apparently arose informally and organically over several days, without any clear decisions on enforcement policy ever being made at the top, according to the penetrating and balanced account provided by James Best (2000).

Yet this enforcement code, patterned after the techniques developed to control spontaneous violence in the ghettos, is also inappropriate for the control of spontaneous violence on campus. Physically and socially, the campus differs from the urban neighborhood. Riot formations and riot gas are far less effective means of dispersal on the wide lawns of a campus than on city streets, as the cases of Ohio State, Kent State, and others demonstrate. More importantly, the campus community consists of a relatively homogeneous population whose members have extensive knowledge of each other and live and work in a comparatively small space. The "normal functions" of these people are to meet in organized groups for discussion and action; usually in classes and extra-curricular activities. Students live in dormitories or apartment buildings in which close communication and interchange can continue after "business hours." Such a community cannot be treated like an urban neighborhood. On a campus, a ban on assembly is incompatible with "business as usual," and a curfew merely packs restless students together in their dormitories, as ready as ever for collective action. The military control procedures

developed for disorders on city streets cannot be successfully applied on campus unless they are modified to suit the special nature of the university environment.

The policy lesson that this author drew from these data, fifty years ago, reads as follows (Guterbock 1970: 72):

As campus disorder has moved through different phases in the last five years, with students engaged in various kinds of collective behavior and administrators working on various definitions of what behavior is legitimate, the National Guard has been asked to perform various different roles. Of these, it has clearly worked most efficiently and least dangerously in the role of an overpowering, extraordinary military force, to be used only when the university has officially abandoned its "normal functions." If the National Guard is to prevent campus violence effectively, it should not be asked to fill any other role.

Much has changed since that time. Protest has moved to new issues, new locations and new techniques. The police have become much more heavily armed. New technologies and practices of surveillance have been put into place, along with an overall posture of 'strategic incapacitation' practiced by law enforcement, government and private sector authorities (Gillham 2011). Still, I would stand by the claim that forces trained and equipped for military duty should not be thrust into a role that requires the skills, tools, and experience of professional police. If major campus unrest were to recur in the United States, as it often has in other countries since 1970, authorities would do well to heed the lessons of the turbulent period considered here.

There is also a lesson here, perhaps, for those who study collective behavior and the ways in which protest activity is controlled or repressed by authorities. Looking at the sweep of change over many incidents and many years, we tend to abridge the issues of police strategies and tactics into simplified, overarching schemas. "Escalated force" and "negotiated management" are useful as

ideal types. But in the late 1960s, when the transition from one police strategy to another was under way, the incidents reviewed here show a wide variety of law enforcement approaches, approaches that changed day-to-day as events unfolded. Student protest took many forms and presented itself in many combinations. As I have argued, an enforcement code that is appropriate for the campus is different from that which is effective in an urban setting. Effectiveness depends as well on whether protest is spontaneous or organized, violent or merely disruptive, and whether the campus is kept open or is closed. A crucial variable is the official posture toward disruptive collective action: is it tolerated, banned, or allowed only outside of curfew hours? It is clear, as well, that black student protest was dealt with differently than protests at mostly white campuses (some of which was on behalf of black grievances and led by black students). And decisions by key actors such as governors, university officials, police and Guard commanders, and individual officers and soldiers were often determinative of the action, just as were decisions by protest leaders, individual protesters, and crowds of students acting collectively. This paper has used these contingencies to explain why the Guard succeeded and failed in campus disorders. Hopefully, the discussion has also helped to set a framework that makes the tragic May 4th killings at Kent State more understandable.

REFERENCES

Books and Articles

- Adler, Renata. 1970. "The Guard: But Ohio. Well, I guess That's one state where they elect to lock and load." *The New Yorker*, October 3, p.40.
- American Council on Education, Special Committee on Campus Tensions, Sol M. Linowitz (chairman). 1969. *Campus Tensions*. New York: American Council on Education.
- Bayer, Alan E. and Alexander W. Aston. 1969. "Campus Disruption During 1968-69." *A C E Research Reports*, American Council on Education Office of Research, IV, No.3.
- Best, James J. 1978 [2000]. "The Tragic Weekend of May 1 to 4, 1970." Pp. 3-34 in *Kent State and May 4th: A Social Science Perspective*, Second Edition, edited by Thomas R. Hensley and Jerry M. Lewis. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall-Hunt Publishing.
- Boissoneault, Lorraine. 2018. "In 1968, Three Students Were Killed by Police. Today, Few Remember the Orangeburg Massacre." *Smithsonian Magazine*, February 7. Retrieved 1/29/2020 (<https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/1968-three-students-were-killed-police-today-few-remember-orangeburg-massacre-180968092/>).
- Cancian, Mark F. 2020. "Use of Military Forces in the COVID-19 Emergency." *Critical Questions*, March 17. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Retrieved 4/19/2020 (<https://www.csis.org/analysis/use-military-forces-covid-19-emergency>).
- Cantwell, MG James F. 1970. "Aftermath of Campus Violence." *The National Guardsman*. June, inside front cover.
- Citizen-Soldier Magazine*. 2018. "A History of Women in the Army National Guard." March 13. Retrieved 1/29/2020 (<https://citizen-soldiermagazine.com/history-women-army-national-guard/>).
- Gillham, Patrick F. 2011. "Securitizing America: Strategic Incapacitation and the Policing of Protest Since the 11 September 2001 Terrorist Attacks.: *Sociology Compass* 5/7: 636-652.
- Guterbock, Thomas M. 1970. "The Role of the National Guard in Campus Disorders, 1965 – June 1970." Working paper #170. Center for Social Organization Studies, University of Chicago, December.
- History.com editors. 2019. "Orangeburg Massacre." *History.com*. February 8, 2019, original April 6, 2018 . Retrieved 1/29/2020 (https://www.history.com/topics/1960s/orangeburg-massacre#section_5).
- House of Representatives. 1967. *Hearings before the Special Subcommittee to Inquire into the Capability of the National Guard to Cope with Civil Disturbances*. Committee on Armed Service, 90th Congress, 1st Session, August 10-25 and October 3.
- Janowitz, Morris. 1967. *Social Control of Escalated Riots*. Chicago: University of Chicago Center for Policy Study.
- Janowitz, Morris. 1969. "Patterns of Collective Racial Violence." Pp. 317-337 in *Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr.

- Report of the Task Force on Historical and Comparative Perspectives to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Lewis, Jerry M. 1978. "The Telling of Kent State: An Update." Pp. 45-50 in *Kent State and May 4th: A Social Science Perspective*, Second Edition, edited by Thomas R. Hensley and Jerry M. Lewis. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall-Hunt Publishing.
- Lowinger, Paul and Frida Huige. 1969. *The National Guard in the 1967 Detroit Uprising*. Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University, Department of Psychiatry and the Lafayette Clinic, unpublished.
- McPhail, Clark, David Schweingruber and John D. McCarthy. 1998. "Policing Protest in the United States: 1960 – 1995." Pp. 49-69 in *Policing Protest: The Control of Mass Demonstrations in Western Democracies*, edited by Donatella della Porta and Herbert Reiter. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Otto Kerner (chairman). 1968. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. New York: Bantam Books.
- National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence [NCCPV], Milton Eisenhower (chairman). 1969. *Interim Statement on Campus Disorder*. Washington, D.C., June 9.
- NCCPV. 1969. *To Establish Justice, to Insure Domestic Tranquility*. New York: Universal Publishing.
- NCCPV, Chicago Study Team, Daniel Walker (chairman). 1968. *Rights in Conflict: the Violent Confrontation of Demonstrators and Police in the Parks and Streets of Chicago During the Week of the Democratic Convention of 1968*. New York: Bantam.
- NCCPV, Miami Study Team, Louis J. Hector and Paul Helliwell (co-directors). 1969. *Miami Report: Civil Disturbances in Miami, Florida, during the Week of August 5, 1968*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- NCCPV, Washington Study Team, Joseph R. Sahid (Director). 1969. *Rights in Concord: The Response to the Counter-Inaugural Protest Activities in Washington, D.C., January 18-20, 1968*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- NCCPV, Special Staff Report, William H. Orrick, Jr. 1969. *Shut it Down! A College in Crisis: San Francisco State College, October, 1968-April, 1969*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- NCCPV, Task Force on Group Violence, Jerome II. Skolnick (director). 1969. *The Politics of Protest: Violent Aspects of Protest and Confrontation*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- National Guard Association. 1970. "Who is the Guardsman?" *The National Guardsman*, June, p. 13.
- New York Times*. 1970. "Rhodes urges law and order, says Taft soft on violence." May 5, p. 21.
- North Carolina Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, King Virgil Cheek (chairman). 1970. *Trouble in Greensboro: A Report of an Open Meeting Concerning the Disturbances at Dudley High School and North Carolina A and T University*. Washington, D.C.
- Todd, R. 1969. "The Conscientious Acceptors." *New York Times* (October 12), Section VI, p.27.

Vasquez, Juan M. 1970. "The Guard is Poorly Trained for Riot Duty," *New York Times*, May 10, Section IV, p.2, column 1.

Periodicals, Serials, and Reports

After Action Reports from various states concerning the May 1970 Disturbances, on file with the National Guard Association Library, Washington.

Army Digest. 1968. Articles on "Riotville" and Special Orders on Conduct during Civil Disturbance Operations. August.

Chief, National Guard Bureau, *Annual Report*, Fiscal Years 1966, 1969.

College Blue Book, 1969.

Facts on File, accounts of Guard actions, 1968-70.

National Guard Bureau. 1970. *National Guard in Domestic Emergencies since World War II*. Photocopied, June 30. 35 pages.

National Guardsman, June 1970.

New York Times, 1965-1970. Numerous news stories on civil disturbances and the National Guard.

Numerous press clippings from around the country on file at the National Guard Association Library, Washington, D.C.

Offices of the Adjutant Generals of various states, *Annual Report* or *Biennial Report* to the Governor.

Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, 1968. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Washington Post, May 1969. News accounts of Howard University incident.

Wilson, Major General Winston P., *Presentation to the President's Commission on Campus Unrest*. Washington, D.C., July 17, 1970, mimeographed.