

1-1995

The May 4 Memorial at Kent State University: Legitimate Tribute or Monument to Insensitivity?

Alan Canfora

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/vietnamgeneration>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Canfora, Alan (1995) "The May 4 Memorial at Kent State University: Legitimate Tribute or Monument to Insensitivity?," *Vietnam Generation*: Vol. 2 : No. 2 , Article 18.

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/vietnamgeneration/vol2/iss2/18>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by La Salle University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Vietnam Generation by an authorized editor of La Salle University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact careyc@lasalle.edu.

The May 4 Memorial at Kent State University: Legitimate Tribute or Monument to Insensitivity?

Alan Canfora

Soon after November 15, 1988, when Kent State University leaders announced their scheme to reduce the long-awaited May 4 memorial from \$1,300,000 to \$100,000—a controversial reduction of over ninety per cent—a local citizen wrote to the Kent newspaper: “Hip, hip, hooray, three cheers, halleluja... this May 4 Memorial situation is disgusting. Those students got just what they asked for, let’s forget it...”¹

The May 4 Memorial, as advocated by the families of the Kent State massacre victims and Kent State University (KSU) student activists since 1980, was always intended as a “permanent and proper memorial tribute” dedicated to those four Kent State students who were brutally gunned down on a sunny spring afternoon on their campus by the sixty-seven bullets fired by the Ohio National Guard during an antiwar confrontation on May 4, 1970.

Unfortunately, however, since the May 4 Memorial design was announced in 1986, conservative anti-memorial pressures were apparent both publicly and privately.

In July of 1986, the Ohio Convention of the American Legion publicly condemned the May 4 Memorial as “a memorial to terrorists” and “an insult to patriotic veterans who served their country honorably and well.”² The Fraternal Order of Police and other organizations and individuals added their voices to the anti-memorial chorus.

Privately, conservatives among the KSU administration soon became convinced to pursue only a half-hearted May 4 Memorial fund-raising campaign in response to the howls of their conservative friends. Despite repeated inquiries and complaints from memorial supporters, KSU officials never mounted an effective public campaign to publicize the memorial design or solicit construction funds.

Instead of a national fund-raising drive promoted by a comprehensive fund-raising committee guided by professional fund-raisers, KSU’s May 4 Memorial fund-raising campaign was meager indeed. A few KSU bureaucrats worked part-time with no committee or professional fund-raisers. Only a select few foundations and a portion of the KSU alumni were approached for May 4 Memorial funds. The general public was not ad-

equately informed concerning the design, the importance of the memorial, or the need for funds. Under \$50,000 was raised for memorial construction during two years.³

Only a few years earlier, KSU leaders successfully raised over \$6,000,000 for a KSU Fashion Museum and Fashion Design School. For the sake of "fashion," KSU leaders hired professional fund-raisers, assembled over 170 prominent Americans from coast-to-coast as a fund-raising committee, promoted a national advertising campaign and easily raised the six million for their fashionable cause.⁴

As the twentieth anniversary of the Kent State murders occurs on May 4, 1990, the eyes of the nation will focus on Kent State University and seek to learn valuable historical lessons. Officials in the arch-conservative administration of KSU President Michael Schwartz will vainly attempt to promote a false historical judgement—a fraud—when the "mini-memorial" is dedicated.

In defense of the ongoing attempt to minimize the historical significance of the lives and deaths of the four slain KSU students, President Schwartz seeks to continue to blame the American people for a "lack of interest" and "lack of support" for the May 4 Memorial. Instead of admitting that KSU consciously failed to promote the memorial or raise the construction funds, KSU provocatively continues their long-standing contribution to the cover-up of murder by minimizing the historic significance of these lives and deaths.

On May 4, 1990, the dedication of a small fraction of the entire memorial design will invite an inevitable expression of protest and disharmony on a day which should stand for a national message of hope, healing and reconciliation. In the absence of legitimate, principled leadership at KSU, a great university risks its future image and reputation as a result of strident conservatism and the arrogant abuse of power.

Perhaps a historical review is in order for those who remain unfamiliar with KSU's sad record of insensitivity.

In 1970, after days of militant student demonstrations in response to the U.S. invasion of Cambodia, the President of KSU was literally out to lunch when approximately seventy Ohio National Guardsmen attacked a peaceful student rally on campus under the noonday sun. KSU President White's lunch was interrupted by a university functionary who informed him that KSU students were shot to death in a KSU parking lot.

Parents of the slaughtered KSU students only learned of the deaths of their children from news reports or phone calls from friends or relatives who heard the tragic news. KSU leaders who had thoughtlessly turned campus authority over to armed troops could only shut down the bloody university—too late for some students.

KSU insensitivity toward the victims was apparent again when the dormitory-fee refund check was mailed to the parents of slain student

The May 4 Memorial

Allison Krause. The KSU check was mailed to her grieving parents “payable to Allison Krause.”⁵

While outraged parents of the students killed joined with the nine wounded students and others who demanded justice, KSU officials failed to raise their voices. A cover-up of murder was initiated by National Guard officials, politicians, and the courts. KSU leaders remained silent for many months until a national petition drive demanding a federal investigation forced a new KSU President, Glenn Olds, to join that ultimately failed effort.

Parents of the KSU victims filed a costly lawsuit against the KSU President, National Guard members and Ohio’s Governor which was finally settled out of court in 1979. Meanwhile, KSU’s “official” annual May 4 commemoration activities ceased after 1975. KSU leaders felt that five years was long enough to pay tribute to the memory of its murdered students.⁶

In response to the callousness of KSU administrators, KSU student government leaders formed a student organization to continue the commemorative programs without the participation of a KSU administration that did not want to be bothered with the inconvenience of May 4 any longer.⁷ The student group, the May 4 Task Force, began a comprehensive education campaign and agitated in support of the families of the KSU victims by seeking to re-name four buildings and cancel classes on May 4 in memory of the dead students. KSU leaders refused, and in late 1976 announced a plan to build a massive gymnasium on part of the May 4 confrontation site.

A six-month protest began on May 4, 1977, after the annual commemoration program when thousands of KSU students marched against the gym construction. Hundreds of students then occupied the KSU administration building and began a protracted protest which included a 62-day “Tent City” occupation of the May 4 site and over 300 arrests. The parents of slain student Sandra Scheuer were among those arrested in protests against the gym’s desecration of a historic area. A *Cleveland Press* columnist wrote at that time: “Well, I call it obscene. And I weep for those poor, sorry, stiff-necked Establishment flacks who run Kent State. They are wrong. They are wrong. They are indeed obscene.”⁸

After the fiasco of the gym construction controversy, KSU “flacks” added insult to injury when they arrogantly refused the offer of a donation of a \$150,000 memorial sculpture by renowned sculptor George Segal, commissioned by the Mildred Andrews Foundation of Cleveland. The sculpture, “Abraham and Isaac,” symbolized a biblical theme of intervention and reconciliation. KSU leaders condemned it as “too violent” and refused the generous offer.

A KSU leader suggested that sculptor Segal make another version including a “nude or semi-nude coed” enticing a soldier with her “charms.” This sexist, insensitive remark was condemned as yet another blot upon the

sorry record of KSU administrators.⁹ Princeton University soon eagerly accepted the valuable Segal sculpture, and it remains there today.

The absence of an appropriate May 4 Memorial lingered as a controversy when a new KSU President, Brage Golding, promised a “memorial arch” (symbolic of military victory) near the killing ground prior to the tenth anniversary of the May 4 shootings. This plan was withdrawn amidst criticisms and contrasted sharply with a thoughtful call for an appropriate May 4 Memorial by the students of the May 4 Task Force and the families of the KSU victims during the tenth annual commemoration events.¹⁰

The May 4 Task Force student memorial proposal was ignored by the KSU administration for years until a broad-based movement pressured KSU leaders to convene a committee to study the memorial question and approve a “permanent, proper, lasting memorial.”¹¹ Finally, in January of 1985, the KSU Board of Trustees approved the May 4 Memorial proposal. At that time, I publicly praised the “wisdom and foresight” of the favorable memorial decision by the KSU trustees and administration. I also noted my hope that the decision to build a May 4 Memorial “will bring an end to any controversy in the future about May 4.”¹²

A few months later, on May 4, 1985, the fifteenth anniversary of the 1970 events featured U.S. Senator Howard Metzenbaum and the families of the victims who joined university officials on the KSU Commons during a day of unity and peaceful common purpose due to the anticipated memorial.

A feeling of unity among all concerned continued into early 1986, as demonstrated by my written comments in the *Daily Kent Stater*, when I praised “the enlightened administration of KSU President Schwartz” and added: “President Schwartz has acted as a guiding force as KSU addresses a brighter future.” However, almost prophetically, I also observed, “This will probably be the last great opportunity for KSU to properly pay a lasting tribute to these four slain KSU students. And it may well be the final opportunity for KSU to provoke another May 4 controversy which isn’t necessary.”¹³

In fact, after 1985, KSU President Schwartz began to boycott the annual May 4 commemoration events due to his growing arrogance and abuse of power apparent by 1986.

Unfortunately, KSU failed to include the students, the families of the victims or other May 4 Memorial supporters in the process of choosing a memorial design, promoting the memorial, or seeking memorial construction funds. Consequently, after a national design competition which yielded 698 memorial designs, the KSU administration of President Michael Schwartz was able to fire the original May 4 Memorial designer supposedly due to a discriminatory rule requiring U.S. citizenship.

Although Ian Taberner—the original designer—was a Canadian citizen, it is clear that he and his design were rejected due to artistic differences with autocratic KSU President Schwartz nearly one hundred days after his

The May 4 Memorial

Canadian citizenship was promptly admitted by Taberner.¹⁴ The second-place design, a seventy-foot square granite plaza surrounded by thirteen pillars, designed by Bruna Ast of Chicago, became the new May 4 Memorial design.

Simultaneously, in the summer of 1986, Schwartz rejected a second offer of a donated "Abraham and Isaac" sculpture by George Segal. Ivan Boesky was willing to purchase copies of the sculpture for KSU and his own private collection months before he was arrested on Wall Street. Negotiations broke down when KSU's Schwartz rejected the request of the victims' families to locate the sculpture near the site of the 1970 killings. Schwartz' petulant decision to again refuse the Segal sculpture prompted the father of slain student Allison Krause to comment: "As far as we're concerned, the university doesn't exist.... That is a worthless organization. We're really disappointed that the university has been so heartless." Mr. Krause's wife, Doris, added, "Why should we make any of our wishes known if they wouldn't care? As far as Kent State is concerned, they can do as they please. They have always done as they pleased."¹⁵

Additionally, in 1986, Schwartz isolated May 4 Memorial advocates from the fund-raising process so that the conservative anti-memorial criticism was able to effectively stifle memorial fund-raising from 1986 until the memorial was reduced by over 90 percent in late 1988.

Not surprisingly, during this period, relations deteriorated between Schwartz and the students of the May 4 Task Force. The Taberner citizenship controversy and the failed fund-raising controversy combined to ensure openly hostile relations between Schwartz and the May 4 Task Force students and most of the KSU victims' families. Students blasted Schwartz's "abuse of power"¹⁶ and made other public complaints, including statements such as: "There are people in the administration, higher-ups, who want the memory of May 4 erased...they're more interested in tuition than the truth."¹⁷

Coincidentally, a May, 1988, survey by the KSU Faculty Senate revealed that among the 383 KSU faculty members surveyed, "75 percent said they felt the university administration was very autocratic or somewhat autocratic."¹⁸

Meanwhile, the failed KSU fund-raising campaign invited headlines locally and nationally, including, "Lack of Progress on Memorial at Kent State Stirs Controversy,"¹⁹ and "KSU Memorial: Little Money, a Lot of Blame."²⁰ KSU functionaries began to recite a litany of lame excuses in response to criticisms of their invisible memorial fund-raising campaign.

KSU Vice-President William Shelton (now President of Eastern Michigan University) and KSU attorney Robert Beck emerged as the chief defenders of KSU's failed campaign. These two testily responded to the criticisms because they were in charge of KSU's pitiful memorial fund-raising efforts.

Repeatedly, Beck would claim that the public and wealthy contributors

“are not interested in the bricks and mortar process.”²¹ Beck and Shelton refused to assemble a national fund-raising committee, attain a professional fund-raiser to spearhead a campaign, promote national advertising, or solicit donations nationally and publicly.

Martin Scheuer, father of slain KSU student Sandra Scheuer, complained to the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in early 1988 that KSU wants “to bury the past.... I can’t do anything about it, so we are just sad about the whole case. People should know what happened so it won’t happen again.” Mr. Scheuer, nearly eighty years old, expressed a wish to see the memorial built before his death. He was pessimistic.²²

Soon after, KSU President Schwartz dishonestly wrote in his own hand to the Scheuers: “I want to assure you that we are doing everything we can to raise enough money to build the memorial.”²³

Everything we can?

A national fund-raising committee, professional fund-raisers, national advertising and national fund-solicitation were all crucial factors utilized by Schwartz, Shelton, Beck and other KSU leaders to raise over six million dollars for the KSU Fashion Museum and Fashion Design School just prior to their lackadaisical May 4 Memorial fund-drive.²⁴ Only the anti-memorial conservatives were happy that KSU failed to promote a serious memorial fund-raising campaign.

After years of blaming the victims at Kent State, KSU apologists Schwartz, Shelton, and Beck began to consistently attempt to “blame the slow fund-raising on lack of public interest in the effort.” If the public could be blamed for a “lack of support,” KSU leaders hoped to escape the criticisms of memorial supporters, satisfy conservative memorial critics and make a final grand contribution to the long-standing campaign to cover up murder and deny the significance of the lives and deaths of KSU students in 1970.

On November 15, 1988, the situation came to a crucial, climactic turning point. Tipped-off by a *Kent Record-Courier* news story, the May 4 Task Force became aware that KSU leaders were considering a reduction or elimination of the long-delayed memorial.²⁵ On the morning of November 15, I was quoted on the front page of the *Daily Kent Stater*: “The Schwartz administration reneged on a promise to aggressively promote the necessary fund-raising for this crucial memorial project. Any decision to reduce or reject the long-awaited May 4 Memorial will be highly controversial and will invite protracted disharmony for the University prior to the 20th anniversary of the KSU shootings.”²⁶

The May 4 Task Force called an outdoor news conference in the KSU Student Center Plaza at noon prior to the announced KSU trustees’ meeting where the fate of the May 4 Memorial was at stake.

Our news conference turned into a spontaneous pro-memorial rally. I attacked the dismal KSU “purposely-failed fund-raising campaign” and complained that the May 4 Memorial languished as “the best kept secret in

The May 4 Memorial

America.” Mentioning the failures of Schwartz, Shelton and Beck by name in front of several TV cameras and other media representatives earned me a retaliatory personal attack from Shelton during the KSU trustees’ meeting which followed.

Just prior to the trustees’ vote to reduce the May 4 Memorial by over 90 percent—from \$1,300,000 down to only \$100,000—Shelton screamed, “Alan Canfora is not the conscience of Kent State University...the siege is over—this administration will not be held hostage under the guise of pseudo-morality!”²⁷

Seeking to shift the blame from himself for the memorial crisis, Shelton smokescreened and created various transparent illusions before he again blamed “the cost of the project, the type of project, the perception of the [conservative] public as to the intent of the memorial,” and, Shelton concluded, “there is a lack of a substantial constituency for this project.” Again, Shelton blamed the public for a lack of interest and support for the memorial.²⁸

The KSU Board of Trustees, content as usual to approve almost anything suggested by a full-time KSU bureaucrat, voted unanimously to reduce the long-awaited May 4 Memorial from \$1,300,000 down to a \$100,000 “mini-memorial.” Memorial architect Bruno Ast, in from Chicago for the day, valiantly and vainly argued to convince the trustees to agree to build part of the original design with the hope that “an angel” would generate future funds to complete the original design. However, Ast was ordered to create “a new and totally different design” for only \$100,000.²⁹

The students of the May 4 Task Force remained determined to oppose KSU’s attempt to minimize life and death and the historical importance of May 4, 1970. At a news conference, on December 8, 1988, the May 4 Task force and my own educational group announced our intention to proceed and raise funds to complete the May 4 Memorial construction at KSU.³⁰

Within one hour, KSU issued a news release from ultra-conservative KSU trustees’ chairman William Risman which prevented and condemned any further May 4 Memorial fund-raising to complete the construction on the KSU campus as “unauthorized and unethical.” KSU had purposely failed to raise construction funds for the memorial and now KSU sought to prevent others who would expose their conscious ineptitude.³¹

However, pressure against KSU continued to increase. Soon after a national *New York Times* article in early December of 1988,³² Senator Howard Metzenbaum of Ohio announced his support for full construction of the May 4 Memorial³³.

Wounded KSU student Robert Stamps’ article published in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* urged complete memorial construction.³⁴ Parents of the slain students and nearly all other wounded students also voiced support for full construction of the memorial. Wounded student Jim Russell condemned the reduced memorial as a “bargain-basement memorial.”

Wounded student Tom Grace wrote: "Those of us who suffered gunshot wounds on May 4 are backing the original memorial design. We are opposed to university schemes for a scaled-down version of this important memorial." The mother of slain student Jeff Miller wrote: "Please be assured of my deep commitment to the construction of the complete May 4 Memorial as originally designed by Bruno Ast." Sandy Scheuer's parents similarly agreed.³⁵

When the KSU trustees and administration announced that they would sponsor a "memorial ground-breaking ceremony" on January 25, 1989, after the KSU trustees meeting, the May 4 Task Force students announced that they would sponsor a protest.

Surprisingly, although the parents of slain student Bill Schroeder had written in early January, 1989: "...we agree to let you add our names to the campaign for a \$100,000 (plus) memorial to May 4, 1970," when the university trustees held their next meeting on January 25, 1989, only the Schroeders were on hand with KSU leaders and mysteriously offered their approval of the smaller memorial.

The pro-memorial voices had obviously been heard since November 15. At their meeting on January 25, 1989, just prior to their "ground-breaking ceremony," KSU trustees shockingly reversed themselves and approved not a new memorial design, but a fraction of the original Bruno Ast design. The May 4 Memorial was no longer totally aborted. This announcement, which may ultimately lead to complete memorial construction, did not prevent a silent May 4 Task Force protest demonstration during the ground-breaking ceremony which stole headlines across America.³⁶

During the spring of 1989, noted author Harlan Ellison came to KSU and raised over \$2,000 for the "alternative" May 4 Memorial campaign.³⁷ The nineteenth annual May 4 commemoration program featured a variety of speakers who criticized KSU's insensitivity and urged full memorial construction.³⁸

A May 5-6, 1989, reunion of Kent State Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) veterans also generated a barrage of anti-administration, pro-memorial statements. A desperate attempt by the frantic KSU administration to block the SDS reunion failed.³⁹

In response to the increasing shrill anti-May 4 Memorial maneuvering by the KSU administration, a group of long-time May 4 activists formed a non-profit educational corporation to promote a memorial and raise awareness nationally. The May 4 Center filed for tax-exempt status with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). They attained that tax-exempt status in November, 1989, and have embarked upon a national campaign to create a May 4 Memorial. Our "parallel plan" seeks tax-exempt donations to build a memorial either in the city of Kent, Ohio, or to complete the May 4 Memorial on the KSU campus. They also seek to create an educational center in Kent

The May 4 Memorial

to broadly promote May 4-related education and to encourage continued student activism.⁴⁰

As the twentieth anniversary of the May 4 massacre approaches, it is significant to note that the May 4 Task Force students stand opposed to KSU administration plans to dedicate their tiny portion of the May 4 Memorial on May 4, 1990, without a commitment to complete memorial construction in the future. A major demonstration for full memorial construction is inevitable.⁴¹

A *Daily Kent Stater* student newspaper writer expressed the frustration of many KSU students recently when she wrote, "...the [reduced] May 4 Memorial is really a joke.... It is unfair to memorialize something that captured national attention and national horror the way the May 4 shootings did in such a cheap manner."⁴²

Arrogant KSU President Schwartz insulted the families of the KSU slain students recently when he invited these parents "out to lunch" at noon on May 4, 1990, after the 11:00 AM student demonstration against the dedication of his "mini-memorial." The parents of slain student Sandy Scheuer criticized this as "insensitive and inappropriate" especially since their daughter was executed during a noon hour 20 years earlier while another KSU President was "out to lunch."⁴³

An additional concern among the families of the May 4 victims, the students of the May 4 Task Force and other May 4 activists involves the curious scheme by the crude KSU administration of President Schwartz to insist that the May 4 Memorial is simply a memorial to "the events" and not the slain students. A related peculiar question concerns Schwartz's adamant refusal to allow the names of the four murdered students to be placed prominently upon his little memorial "to the events." As Schwartz stated callously to a *Newsday* reporter in 1986, in opposition to placing four names on the memorial: "...the martyr issue is one that we were not interested in, to be very honest with you."⁴⁴

Former KSU Vice-President Shelton, responsible for the failed memorial fund-raising campaign and the "abortion" of the memorial has said, "the public perceives it as a memorial to the students only, but it's a memorial to the event."⁴⁵

So how about this "event" and this "memorial"? The Kent State "tragedy" of May 4, 1970, produced the greatest campus massacre in American history—four students slaughtered—the only incident where American women students were executed on their campus, and the single, outstanding factor which triggered the only national student strike in U.S. history.⁴⁶

In May of 1970, nearly 500 American campuses shut down when nearly five million American students joined the national student strike of May, 1970. President Richard Nixon was pushed to the point of emotional and

physical collapse. American foreign policy was directly affected and the U.S. war in Southeast Asia was hastened to an early end.

Twenty years later, conservative Kent State University President Michael Schwartz gambles recklessly when he arrogantly attempts to force a false historical judgement upon Kent State students, American students, and the American people. Was the May 4 Memorial at Kent State University really reduced because of a “lack of support” and “lack of interest” among the American people? Does KSU seek to impose a false historical judgement by minimizing the significance of the lives and deaths of students?

Less than two hundred days after the November, 1988, decision to reduce the May 4 Memorial at Kent State, Chinese students were gunned-down at Tiananmen Square at Beijing. Since then, other students have been brutally shot down in Romania, South Africa, El Salvador, in the Middle East and elsewhere. Will American students also be shot down again? Clearly, since the scheme to reduce the May 4 Memorial was announced, the monumental importance of a national or international May 4 Memorial has become greatly enhanced.

In memory of Allison Krause, Jeff Miller, Sandy Scheuer and Bill Schroeder—and in memory of other American students killed at Jackson State University, Orangeburg College, Southern University, the University of Kansas, North Carolina A&T, the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, and elsewhere—a May 4 Memorial must serve as a lasting reminder that it is never proper to fire weapons into crowds of unarmed student protesters.

For those students shot down and killed from Kent State and Jackson State to Beijing and South Africa—and for those future students who will risk their lives—this May 4 Memorial will stand forever as a symbol of freedom and hope as well as a tribute to those already fallen.

The current portion of KSU’s “May 4 Mini-Memorial” begs for completion. Even the 555-foot Washington Monument took 38 years to build because construction was halted in 1854 for nearly 25 years by the arch-conservative “Know-Nothing” political party. The intentional failure of “Know-Nothing” KSU officials to secure support for a significant May 4 Memorial simply reflects KSU’s long-standing record of blatant insensitivity.

In memory of Allison, Sandy, Jeff and Bill, and in memory of all other students killed unjustly elsewhere in our nation and our world, the Kent May 4 Memorial must stand as a legitimate tribute and not as a monument to insensitivity. Especially for student activists of the 1990s, and the uncertain future, a proper Kent May 4 Memorial is not an important symbol of our “intent to prevent the use of excessive force against future campus protests.”⁴⁷

The May 4 Memorial

Clearly, the American people remember. The American people care about freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom to dissent. We will prove the American people remember and care. We will attain a proper Kent May 4 Memorial.

Notes

- ¹ Eunice Standsbury, letter to the *Kent Record-Courier* (hereafter KRC), 5 December 1988: 4.
- ² "Legionnaires Try to Block KSU 'Terrorist' Memorial," *Cleveland Plain Dealer* (hereafter CPD), 11 July 1986: 1.
- ³ "Canfora Condemns Administration for Memorial Cop-Out," *Daily Kent Stater* (hereafter DKS), 9 December 1988: 4.
- ⁴ "Modified Memorial Lacks Original Meaning, Sincerity," editorial, *DKS*, 18 November 1988: 4.
- ⁵ KSU treasurer voucher #363909, 21 May 1970.
- ⁶ *DKS*, various articles, April-May 1975.
- ⁷ "Caucus Backs KSU Appeal," *Akron Beacon Journal* (hereafter ABJ), 7 October 1975.
- ⁸ Don Robertson, "An Obscenity at KSU," *Cleveland Press*, 1 August 1977.
- ⁹ "McCoy Comments on Segal Sculpture," *DKS*, 14 November 1978: 3.
- ¹⁰ "KSU Group Asks Memorial for Four Slain in 1970," *CPD*, 17 April 1980: 4D; also *ABJ*, 17 April 1980.
- ¹¹ Alan Canfora, "May 4 Memorial Needed," letter to editor, *DKS*, 9 December 1982: 4; Christine Wright, "Victims of May 4 Incident Deserve Lasting Memorial," *DKS*, 26 April 1984: 4.
- ¹² "Decision on Memorial Gets Mixed Response," *KRC*, 24 January 1985: 1; "Trustees OK Kent State Memorial," *Chicago Tribune*, 25 January 1985.
- ¹³ Alan Canfora. "Memorial Need Not Be a Controversial Issue," *DKS*, 13 February 1986: 5.
- ¹⁴ "KSU Memorial Design Change OK'd," *KRC*, 2 July 1986: 1.
- ¹⁵ "May 4 Kind Ponder Memorial Issue," *KRC*, 10 July 1986: 9.
- ¹⁶ "Memorial Still Subject of Controversy," *DKS*, 10 April 1987: 1.
- ¹⁷ "KSU Memorial: Little Money, a Lot of Blame," *CPD*, 27 November 1987: 2B.
- ¹⁸ "KSU Faculty Assesses Morale," *KRC*, 3 May 1988: 3.
- ¹⁹ *Chronicle of Higher Education* (hereafter CHE), 2 March 1988: A3.
- ²⁰ "KSU Memorial: Little Money, a Lot of Blame."
- ²¹ "May 4 Memorial Fund Raises \$22,000," *DKS*, 1 July 1987: 4; "Task Force Hopes to Speed-Up May 4 Memorial Fund-Raising," *DKS*, 5 November 1987: 4; "May 4 Memorial Low on Funds," *KRC*, 8 April 1988: 2; "Financial Bind Tarnishing KSU Memorial," *ABJ*, 7 June 1988: 1.
- ²² *CHE*, 2 March 1988: A3.
- ²³ Michael Schwartz, letter to Martin and Sarah Scheuer, 26 April 1988.
- ²⁴ KSU Foundation files, KSU archives.
- ²⁵ "Memorial Decision Looms at Kent State," *KRC*, 11 November 1988: 1.
- ²⁶ "A Dilemma: Save or Scrap Memorial," *DKS*, 15 November 1988: 1.
- ²⁷ "KSU To Cut Memorial Cost," *KRC*, 16 November 1988: 1.
- ²⁸ KSU trustee meeting tape, property of Kent May 4 Center, 15 November 1988.
- ²⁹ "KSU To Cut Memorial Cost."
- ³⁰ "Activists to Launch Drive for KSU Memorial Funds," *CPD*, 9 December 1988: 2B.
- ³¹ News release, KSU board chairperson, 8 December 1988.
- ³² "Terrible Event Echoes in Dispute on How to Remember It," *New York Times* (hereafter NYT), 14 December 1988.

Canfora

- ³³ "Metzenbaum Backs Initial Plan for KSU Memorial," *CPD*, 17 December 1988: 1B; "Don't Skimp on Memorial: Metzenbaum Calls for Initial May 4 Plan," *KRC*, 18 December 1988: A-1.
- ³⁴ Robert Stamps, "Vietnam is an Echo Still Heard at Kent State," *CPD*, 13 January 1989.
- ³⁵ Correspondence addressed to Alan Canfora.
- ³⁶ "Smaller Kent State Memorial Draws a Protest," *NYT*, 26 January 1989; see also *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, *Los Angeles Times*, etc. on the same date.
- ³⁷ "Ellison Raises \$2,000," *KRC*, 7 April 1989: 1.
- ³⁸ "May 4 Remembered at KSU," *CPD*, 5 May 1989: 1B; see also *KRC* and *DKS*.
- ³⁹ *ABJ*, *CPD*, *KRC*, *DKS*, various articles, April-May 1989.
- ⁴⁰ "May 4 Center Announces New Fund Drive," *KRC*, 29 November 1989: 1B.
- ⁴¹ May 4 Task Force Resolution, 12 October 1989.
- ⁴² Laura Tressler, "Veterans Day Observation," *DKS*, 15 November 1989: 4.
- ⁴³ "May 4 Invitation Receives Mixed Reactions," *DKS*, 7 Feb 1990.
- ⁴⁴ "Memorial Opens Painful Wounds at Kent State," *Newsday*, 24 July 1986.
- ⁴⁵ "Persistence Pays Off for KSU Victim: Memorial Gets OK," *CPD*, 20 November 1988: 1B.
- ⁴⁶ *On Strike... Shut It Down!* (Chicago: Urban Research Corporation) 1970.
- ⁴⁷ Alan Canfora, "Kent State Memorial Fuels Student Activism," *Guardian*, 8 April 1989: 7.