

Form 2083

# STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

112 East 19th Street, New York 3, N.Y.

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY  
OF WISCONSIN  
816 State Street  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

## S.D.S. BULLETIN

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY  
OF WISCONSIN  
816 State Street  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

NO. 4 1962-63

MARCH - APRIL

### CONVENTION

### A TEST BAN?

When June comes and you are looking for a nice place to relax from exams before beginning the summer job--why not consider the SDS Convention? Four relaxing days in the comfortable environs of New York City, with plenty of sun and summer attractions--it should be great. Just ask those who were at last year's,

Seriously, if that is what you expect an SDS Convention to be, you might as well stay home. Because although we shall try to move at a relaxed pace, we may not succeed (last year's had an all-night plenary); and the level of discussion and conversation is more likely to be stimulating than relaxing. But if you are seriously concerned with the process of social change in America and how to help direct/reflect it, if you wish to engage in substantive political debate and discussion, and if you feel the need to talk concretely--if tentatively about your own personal vocation in the light of the need to change society--in short, if you feel that SDS and the people in SDS can be significant in understanding and effecting social change, then come to the Convention. Dates are June 14-17, location in the NYC area. Keep in touch with the National Office for further details and for possible help with transportation.

The suggested foci of the Convention include: Port Huron Statement revision; debate on and adoption of positions on specific issues; electoral action; assessment of where SDS is and where we ought to go; constitutional revisions; elections. But these are only sugges-

(cont. p. 3, col. 2)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* **DUES ARE DUE!!!** \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

"The [Joint Congressional] Committee [on Atomic Energy's] prime interest was in digging up material to cast doubt on a test ban, not to prove its feasibility. The Committee wasn't interested in figures to prove it improbable that old women could fly on broomsticks. It prefers Rand Corporation studies showing that if miniaturized jet engines were put on the rear end of the broom and operated by transistors, then..."

--I.F.Stone, in his Bi-Weekly, 3-18-63

As Dick Flacks points out so well (see DB section), the realization of a test ban treaty would have tremendous consequences, both for the arms race and for all of American politics. Therefore, we strongly urge that all SDS members send a stamped, self-addressed envelope to I.F.Stone's Bi-Weekly (5618 Nebraska Ave., NW, Washington 15, DC) and request a copy of the 3-1-63 issue of the Bi-Weekly, which in eight pages does a good job of demolishing most of the arguments of those who oppose a test ban. What follows here is mostly a summary of that issue--but readers should be sure to obtain a copy for themselves.

These data are a result of I.F.Stone's sitting in on the Joint Committee's four-day hearings on the problem of detecting secret tests, and on a highly important speech given by Sen. Hubert Humphrey to "an almost empty Senate and an indifferent press gallery" on March 7.

Many of the portions of Humphrey's speech quoted in the Bi-Weekly were devoted to countering the arguments of opponents of a test ban treaty. Namely:

1. The U.S. must continue to test in order to develop a neutron bomb. But the neutron bomb would help the Soviets
- (cont. p.16)

Pam  
DB 10/25/64

1. Travel, speaking: March 23, to Michigan State Young Democratic Issues Conference, "Trends in the South"; April 1, to sociology classes at Delta College, Midland, Mich., "The Importance of Karl Marx to the Contemporary American Society" (see p. 9 for a report on this); April 5, to USNSA Conference at University of Chicago, "Student's Rights".

2. Studies: The "peace strategy" paper, made possible by a grant from Julian Griggs of the Canadian Peace Research Institute, is in the final stages of drafting and should be available by the Convention (see story on PREP activity). Two other studies will be finished by June, the first on the attitude of the Kennedy Administration toward the press, the second on American involvement in guerilla warfare.

3. Fund-raising: The United Auto Workers are discussing a proposal for two SDS staff persons to stimulate student consideration on labor and economic issues. Ann Arbor national officers are responsible for continuing negotiations.

4. Impressions: Behind a facade of continued harassment of the civil rights movement by Southern Democrats, I am convinced that political realignment--towards liberalism--is now taking place. We must face the possibility that both parties will see the rise of "cold war liberals" to positions of highest power and that the leftward progression will cease there.

Evidence of this trend is most easily available in the magnificent speeches of Senator Clark (D-Pa) against the Senate "Establishment" on February 19-21.

Clark's complaint is that the Dixiecrats, through control of the Democratic Steering Committee, prevented committee privileges from going to a number of liberal Senators who need such privileges to bolster their 1964 candidacies. To Clark, the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition is worried about the 1958 election of 15 liberal Democrats and three "modern Republicans". This trend, coupled with the decrease in Republican Senators from 47 in 1956 to 33 this year, points to the end of right-wing domination of committee structures. Other relentless factors working against the Establishment are its own agedness and the ab-

sence of second-level reactionaries in the tenure structure (see "Disestablishmentarianism" in New Republic, 3-16).

Clark's own feelings: "Let me point out that since 1958 the establishment has lost control of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Commerce Committee, the Committee on Government Operations, the Interior Committee, and...the Judiciary Committee. They never had control of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They have lost control of the Public Works Committee.

"Therefore time is on our side. Unless catastrophe overtakes the liberals of both parties in the election of 1964, I predict that we are within striking distance of obtaining control of the committee system of the Senate for the liberal and forward-looking elements on both sides of the aisle". Congressional Record, 2-20-62, p. 2529.)

The questions we must begin to debate at once seem to be:

1. How will this change alter military policy? A test-ban? Substantial arms control agreements? Even disarmament?
2. How will this change affect other foreign policy efforts? American investments? Foreign aid programs? Will we continue to be at constant (limited or guerilla) war with communists or other peasant-based revolutionaries?
3. How will this affect the "mix" of the private economy? More civilian public spending?
4. Will these changes satisfy the civil rights movement? What does the explicit Powell-Black Muslim alliance against the NAACP suggest for the white liberal/labor community which previously was outraged at the NAACP's "militance"? If the civil rights movement continues in the direction of radical insurgence, what economic problems will it aggravate and demand solutions for? Will the Negro movement pick up some momentum as the last forms of legalized segregation go down in the South these next few years?
5. How "successful" will liberalism be in meeting the cumulative and inter-related economic problems of under-

## LID/SDS DISCUSSIONS START

The first of, hopefully, a series of constructive informal discussions between members of the LID and the SDS took place a few weeks ago here in New York, around the subject of the relations between the civil rights movement and the labor movement. Beginning with introductory presentations by SDS National Executive Committee members Tom Kahn and Timothy Jenkins, there was a general discussion of the directions for the civil rights movement, discrimination within the unions, political strategy, etc. There were disagreements; but participants seemed to feel positively about it, and there are beginning plans to discuss some other topics. This is a welcome addition to our sometimes tense and sometimes too formal relations with each other.

## BURDEN, cont.

development, poverty, structural unemployment, labor-management stalemate, and threatened Latin markets? Can we expect the industrial union leaders to openly attack Neany and Kennedy on economic policy? Is it possible that the labor movement itself will be shaken by its inability to handle routinely the demands placed on it by the unorganized and the rank-and-file?

6. Is it likely that principled liberalism will re-marry the New Frontiersmen because of this realignment?

What then will happen to the non-pacifist sections of the peace movement?

7. Where should students and young radicals be in all of this? In the cities like NSM and SNCC, working on concrete problems that build politically effective constituencies? Publishing well-documented critiques of domestic and foreign policy in liberal journals? Speeding up educational work in towns as well as on campuses? Anticipating the wave of economic dissatisfaction that is well on its way, and developing effective explanations and programs? Developing institutions, such as voter registration, which the adult liberal community must support but which are pointed ultimately away from the continuation of the White Man's Burden, the Cold War?

## CONVENTION, cont.

mb/3

tions; SDS members are strongly urged to participate both in the preparation for the Convention--by sending ideas for agenda, Convention priorities, etc. and by writing substantive pieces on the PHS, particular issues, SDS itself, or any thing else, all to be included in the next Bulletins--and in the Convention itself by attending. Without such participation by the membership, SDS cannot build the politically and socially conscious base on campuses which it must build in order to attain even the most modest successes.

\*\*\*\*\*  
Preparatory to the Convention, the SDS National Executive Committee will meet on April 19-21 in New York City. The question of the Convention agenda will be the most important one the NEC will take up--both what items should be considered and how much time should be allocated to each. Prospective constitutional changes will undoubtedly be discussed also; and it is highly unlikely, to say the least, that issues which will be important and contentious at the Convention will not be discussed at the NEC.

Also on the agenda is the question of general SDS functioning until the Fall and staff changes in the Fall, when the present office staff will be resigning. This brings up another question, which is tentatively planned (at least informally) for the NEC agenda--viz., broadly, post-school vocational possibilities for SDS-type radicals (subtitled: How to Function Effectively in the Real World) and, more specifically, what SDS people who are getting too old to validly consider themselves in the "student world" can, should, and plan to do. (This is a question, no doubt, which occurs to many SDS members, whether still in school or not--and it is one which, perhaps, we should deal with more formally.)

Of course, all SDS members are welcome and urged to attend the NEC meeting (provided this reaches you by then); it will be held at 218 E. 18 St. Be in touch with the national office for further details, including housing for out-of-towners. And do let us hear from you with ideas and views to be included with the pre-Convention Bulletin.

VOICE --by Barbara Steinberg, U. of Mich. VASSAR C.

VOICE is continuing its program of educating the campus and itself. The most recent of the VOICE forums on American Society have included Brendan Sexton of the United Auto Workers, who spoke on The Labor Unions as a Force for Social Change, and Bob Ross, on Towards a New Politics. Future forums will include open air discussions on various issues of interest to the student body. Tom Hayden and Dick Flacks will speak on peace at the first forum, on April 19.

Earlier in the semester, Herbert Aptheker, editor of Political Affairs and Negro historian, spoke on the Emancipation Proclamation and its history during the past 100 years. Our next program will be a partial attempt to test the University speaker ban. Carl Winter, formerly director of education for various states' CPs and currently Midwest correspondent for the Worker, will discuss the theory and practice of peaceful coexistence.

On March 30, VOICE, in conjunction with Ann Arbor Friends of SNCC and Detroit CORE, arranged a demonstration to protest the harassment of voter registration workers in Greenwood, Miss., and to request Federal intervention. Over 90 people, mostly from the University, participated in a silent one-hour picket line in front of the Federal Building in Detroit. After the demonstration, many people stayed to pass out literature and fact sheets in downtown Detroit.

The VOICE Peace Committee has been very active. Its current program includes sending speakers, mostly graduate students and teaching fellows, to fraternities and men's dormitories, to discuss the draft. The draft is being used as a jumping off point in order to raise the issues of peace and the cold war. So far there has been an excellent response and a great deal of interest among the students in the dormitories. The sister program to this is run with the co-operation of Women Strike for Peace, whose members are speaking in the girls' dorms and sororities. The Committee is also investigating and listing peace-oriented courses at the University and, with the USMEA Committee of Student Government Council, working to develop interdis-

Barbara Gerson reports: We've been the jumping-off place for two important new developments this semester--(1) an NSH project--55 students signed up..negotiations with Poughkeepsie going well. Project launched by, but independent of, SDS. (2) an informal study group dealing with Marxist and other Socialist theory--about 9 regular participants, and one regular faculty member (sometimes others sit in). Talk of organizing more than one group, on various topics, for next year. The present group is unofficial, not sponsored by anyone, purposely limited to its present size, 3/4 SDS members, and has not sought publicity on campus...Speakers have been: Jim Monsonis, Peter Countryman/Cliff Henry, Otto Nathan (who once taught here).

plinary peace courses to be added to the University curriculum. A position paper, which will be an abstract of the parts of the Port Huron Statement which deal with peace and the cold war, is being prepared and will be distributed as a summary of VOICE's stand on these issues. There is, also, an ongoing distribution of literature, and communication with other campuses--as is true of VOICE in general.

The Student Government Council election on March 13 was probably the most important VOICE project for several weeks. We ran five candidates and elected 3, one of whom is now Executive Vice-President of SGC. The Michigan Daily and everyone else on campus, publicly predicted a "liberal" victory at the polls --which is, we feel, the very reason we didn't win. (Of the 18 SGC members, of which 11 are elected and 7 ex-officio, 8 are liberal and 5 of these VOICE members.) The prediction seemed to have frightened the "conservative" leaders on campus into getting out the vote while lulling the liberals into complacency. The attempt to remove ex-officio members (such as the Daily Editor and the President of the Interfraternity Council) from SGC also failed, probably for the same reason. The ex-officios have traditionally been conservative.

BOSTON U.

From Hannah Frank comes the following report:

"The B.U. chapter is now meeting twice a month, although lately we have been meeting every week. Because of the complications of becoming legally recognized at the school, we have decided to postpone that until next year so that we can immediately begin on some of the problems at B.U. One of the things we are working on is housing problems for the students. There should be a fuller report on this soon.

"We have begun a study group on university reform, which will be part of the regular meetings until the end of the year. The reading so far planned is: the Port Huron Statement, the working papers used at the Brandeis University Reform Conference, and Paul Goodman's Community of Scholars. I hope that this will give us more of a sense of direction than we now have, and that the study group can become more intensive next year. Of course, this will lead directly into the problems of Boston U. and what should be done. There is a proposal for a revamping of the Student Faculty Assembly now before the president of the University, and there is a possibility that he will turn it down. If this happens then the mood of the University will be perfect for campus political parties; and our members are very interested in this kind of activity.

"A summer project on political activity in Roxbury is now in the thinking stage, with the details yet to be worked out. At the moment, there are two campaignees in the area we are interested in--Mel King for school committee and Tom Sullivan for city council. This will be an all-Boston SDS project that the majority of the people in the B.U. club will work with over the summer. This is the type of thing that really has to be done in Boston. A real political base has to be built up and this can be the start of it.

"Besides that, there will be a more intensive study group in the Boston area set up this summer as an outgrowth of the Cambridge group (an all-Boston bi-weekly/weekly seminar group studying various social revolutions). This is

BERLIN: A BACKGROUND REPORT mb/5

by Ted Reed

The past, though dim with an inactive year, has the prospect of brightening throughout the next couple of months. The liberal/radical community at Oberlin is in a state of transition with much of the older leadership making a last desperate attempt at study. A new freshman class, however, promises to revive some of the enthusiasm of the college.

Activity, with its center off the campus, has been dampened by the repression of an administration which is very subtly making it harder to organize new groups or to hold meetings in college buildings. Under some active new freshman leadership, there was an active anti-HUAC committee established in the 13th Congressional district. Unity with a local group has added to its strength and through an excellent mailing program, they are continuing their efforts with some excellent educational material. A local Hazard committee served not only to raise several hundred dollars, but also provided an opportunity for some new unity with the small

(cont. p. 6, col. 1)

an excellent idea for several reasons: it bridges students from the various colleges together who wouldn't ordinarily meet; for me at least it has been a great learning experience that has stimulated a great deal of thinking and reading; and it gives a perspective on organization that is very useful for those of us who have not organized before. There are some drawbacks to the study group. There are some people who have just gotten interested in politics and don't have the background that the majority of the people do. When they first come the level of discussion frightens them away or they are afraid to express their ideas. This is dangerous because it is these very people that we wish to attract at the same time we do not wish to discourage the politically sophisticated. I've told some of the new students just to read the material and come and listen and that eventually they will feel confident enough to express themselves. Generally it's working out very well. People are beginning to think. If this alone happens, the study group is worth it. I hope the group is continued next year. It is certainly worthwhile.

NORTH TEXAS STATE C.

Bill Jamison reports: "NTSU chapter set up two meetings on campus on March 6 for SFU field secretary Peter Allen...few "uncommitted" came to Pete's speeches; however, a group of YAF-nicks was brought out into the open...beginning research on Niki missile in general and Denton (site of WASC) Niki base in particular in preparation for possible pickets...starting work with a Southern Methodist U. group to find a radical candidate--or even a liberal one--for Congress in '64 from Dallas."

GERALD, cont.  
left at the college.

Most of the effort of the past year has been directed at local issues such as housing, social rules, and the like. Progress has been minimal. The in loco parentis position of the administration has, if anything, been enhanced; as the administrative bureaucracy has managed to stifle all except the programs which they approve. Two elections to the student council have been disappointing for the liberal wing of the campus. Very few of the new leaders protest the pressure from the conservative party which stresses services for the students. The student government has for the first time in several years completely left the scene as an active participant in international and national affairs.

The hope for reactivation of liberal/radical concern is for a new group of organizations to spring up and take the leadership. With the Student Peace Union degenerated into an arms control discussion group, the Young Democrats have attempted to assume the role of the "new left". Hope for new interest lies, however, in a reactivated SDS chapter under the leadership of the new group of students working on the Anti-HUAC committee, an aid to education conference which is scheduled for next fall, and in the coming SNCC drive. If these single issue groups can unite, the left has new hope for a revival.

BALTIMORE CHAPTER

From Kim Moody comes the following report: "We participated in the Northwood stand-in demonstration here in Baltimore (this included mostly students from Negro Morgan State C.; 400 were arrested), the most exciting civil rights action in Baltimore to date. [This involved the right of Negroes to unrestricted access to certain movie theatres and precipitated major demonstrations for a number of days, as well as the considerable number of arrests already mentioned, before the goal of integrated theatres was won.] Our involvement in this demonstration, especially the fact that a number of us were among those arrested, has helped spread our name on campus and looks as if it will bring us a couple of new people. Also on the civil rights scene, some of the chapter members will be participating in a tutorial program along NSM lines that will soon be formed in Baltimore. There will be a SNCC support demonstration in Washington on March 18, in which we shall participate.

"Also planned are participation in the nation-wide series of Easter Walks (either co-sponsoring with the SFU or simply in co-operation with them) and, in response to the appeal of visitor Frank Wilkinson, an attempt to set up a student anti-HUAC group in the area, possible actions being participation in a Washington anti-HUAC demonstration (if HUAC holds hearings there) and showings of the new anti-HUAC film.

"Our main activity is our 'New Left Seminar'." The brochure for the seminar lists five session topics: Values for the Student Movement; Civil Rights and Liberties; The Labor Movement; Peace and Foreign Policy, and Summary and Conclusions. The seminar is an attempt to make participants out of the "audience" who previously listened to ideological discussions. Each session will be led by a panel of "specialists" and students, on the basis of suggested readings.

A last comment by Kim is relevant to  
(cont. p. 8, col. 1)

Paul Booth writes:

"INTELLECTUAL SLUM CLEARANCE" AT  
WISCONSIN

"1. A group of individuals who have been participating in the Problems of Peace in the Nuclear Age Discussion Group are laying plans for a permanent peace research group on campus.

"2. Various inquiries into the possibility of peace politics in the area are being carried out, as yet with no concrete results.

"3. Both the peace and American Society discussion groups are continuing with around a half-dozen regulars each. The American Society discussion has evolved into readings in Liberalism--Schlesinger, Bell, Galbraith, etc.

"4. Plans to hold next year's Intercollegiate Conference on Poverty in the United States are being pursued; it is hoped that the chapter will be able to contribute to the conference its major energies next fall, and will be able to co-sponsor the event.

"5. The Swarthmore Political Action Club with which the chapter has friendly relations, is organizing direct action and voter registration on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, following sit-ins held in several towns there last year.

"6. An idea that originated in the chapter along with the Peace and American Society discussion groups has borne fruit. Student Council adopted the idea of running an introductory Sociology course due to the continual absence of Sociology from the curriculum. Starting next fall, Council will hire members of the Pennsylvania University Department of Sociology to give a non-credit course to interested Swarthmore students. It is hoped that the administration will grant credit to the course, after one semester demonstrates that students are interested in the study. Similar treatment may also be accorded to the as yet unrecognized discipline of cultural anthropology. Faculty are fairly evenly split over the program.

"7. Anyone interested in receiving a copy of a speech on peace politics given by Paul Booth to a joint meeting of

"The seminar...is an attempt at intellectual slum clearance within Academia", whose "hub" of undergraduate education "is suffering from a chronic dismemberment of knowledge, a condition which is exacerbated by the administrative exigency of compartmentalizing knowledge into arbitrary sub-divisions. Whereas the quality of the fragments may individually improve, the sum of the parts is not in fact an integrated whole. We do not take issue with those who contend that the piecing together of the puzzle of education is the task of the student; we do, however, submit that the means to do so are never supplied." The Seminar on Contemporary American Society is an attempt to supply some of the means on the part of 19 University of Wisconsin students, all but one of whom live in a particular section of the University Residence Halls. SDS NEC member Gary Weissman is Co-ordinator of the Seminar; Associate Co-ordinator is Rhoda Feigenbaum. These two are graduate students; all the rest are undergraduates, representing all four classes and an admirably wide range of academic concentration areas. The nine-course seminar's individual sessions range from "The Effect of Philosophical Ideas and Literature in Contemporary America" to "Problems of Economic Growth and Democracy" to "Aesthetics and the Arts in American Society", with the final session being devoted to an evaluation of the series, which is running throughout the current semester. "We are not so presumptuous," say the co-ordinators, "as to be unaware that the realization of all of the seminar's goals would be a mere scratch on the surface of the pool of resources from which students might draw to improve the quality of their own education. If the seminar can serve as a springboard for ideas of tapping those resources to students with more fertile imaginations than ours, the effort will not have been wasted."

peace groups in the county should write him at Swarthmore C., Swarthmore, Pa."

The FDR Four Freedoms Club has been raising money, food, and clothing for the people in the Delta Area of Mississippi, via word of mouth, leafleting and door-to-door collections. They are holding a forum on April 12 on "The Future of the Democratic Reform Movement in New York City". The forum is a prelude to the process of making a selection of the areas in which the club will be working during the next primary election campaign in New York, which will be held in early Sept., 1963.

The club will be distributing the SDS/ADA statement on the McCarran Act as soon as it is published. The members will try to use the piece as a center for discussion of the McCarran Act with other high school students. Some of the members will be engaged in tutoring high school and junior high school students in conjunction with the Harlem Education Project of the Northern Student Movement.

---

#### SSACC STAND-INS

The Southwest Student Action Co-ordinating Committee (SSACC) has been conducting stand-ins at Interstate Theatres throughout Texas (Denton, Austin, Houston, Ft. Worth, etc.) and in Little Rock, in an effort to assure Negroes equal access to those theatres. We have no final word yet on the outcome of these actions; National Secretary Jim Monsonis visited Paramount Theatre's office in charge of Interstate (Paramount's Texas subsidiary) and carried SSACC's demands to a high officer, but received a polite rebuff. More action is planned.

From the U. of Illinois, Rennie Davis reports: "...key people from the YDs to YPSL now meet on a regular basis for lunch and discussion. We have developed a sense that the combined organizational resources can throw this University into something of a tailspin."...a 100-person silent vigil against HUAC's harassment of WSP got good coverage and attention and "had an important, stimulating impact on our group"...plans being made to sit-in at the Student Services Bldg. against discrimination in University-approved and -advertised housing; the University has declared that any student sittin-in will be expelled; among those planning to participate are: the Student Body President, YIGA President, officers of the YDs, inter-fraternity council, NAACP, SPU, etc. ...later, Cliff Steward reports plans for the development of a peace research center "headed by the likes of Dallas Smyth and Osgood" and a peace seminar to start on an experimental basis.

---

#### U. OF OKLAHOMA: A "CLEAN BREATH OF AIR"

Bill Perry writes that "if there has been a time to start a(n SDS group) in the past two years, this is the time. For the first time in three years there was a little argument about academic freedom, and most took its side. The air here is still infested but a clean breath of air was a welcome relief"... Bill is also Southwest Student Action Coordinating Committee area representative from Oklahoma.

---

#### ACTIVITY BEGINS AT WAYNE STATE U.

The beginnings of a discussion group are reported by Greg Nigosian from Wayne State U. (Detroit). First meeting of this as yet undirected group was scheduled for April 3; hopefully, this will set the stage for a functioning chapter for next year. Also, Greg has been instrumental in having candidates for the University Board of Governors speak before the student body on questions submitted by students and faculty.

---

#### BALTIMORE, cont.

more schools than just Hopkins: "When Steve Max was down here, he pointed out that the existence of graduate students in the chapter was a deterrent to undergraduate growth. This is probably true. Soon we will discuss the possibility of reorganization--probably creating two chapters, one for grads, the other for undergrads."

## ORGANIZING STARTS AT TWO MICHIGAN SCHOOLS

From forays into the Michigan wilderness by two SDS NEC members come accounts of efforts to start SDS groups at Delta and Kalamazoo Colleges.

Bob Ross was invited by a student government person whom he's met through NSA regional activity to speak at (compulsory) chapel at KALAMAZOO C. in Kalamazoo, Mich., in mid-February. The short speech (perhaps, Bob says, its brevity accounted for its good reception) was followed by a discussion with about 15 students, where interest centered on the role of labor in the Michigan Democratic Party and of the unions generally. "...There is interest in a student left-liberal group which identified with labor", Bob reports, "...enough interest to start an 8-15 man chapter with a mailing list of much more... "

But the campus is "horribly unorganized; nothing exists besides student government and the NSA committee--no speeches, no demonstrations, leaflets, pickets..." Hopefully, Bob's trip and subsequent organizing efforts by local contacts will change at least some of that.

Tom Hayden journeyed to DELTA C. (Midlands, Mich.) at the end of March to speak to some sociology classes and a public affairs seminar, and to talk with SDS friends there about organizing left/liberal concerns. A main problem seems to be that Delta is a two-year school--though aspiring to four-year status, an aspiration supported by the Administration, nearly all the faculty, and (at least) the liberal students. If four-year status is not achieved, the school may not be able to hold its now very good faculty. Two-year status also makes continuing organization more of a problem than is usually true.

The liberal students are organized in a group called the Delta Association of American Liberals; DAAL has worked quite hard for four-year status. One problem is the conservatism of the surrounding community, which was expressed recently when an excellent young instructor was fired (i.e. his contract was not renewed) for criticizing the Kennedy administration during the Cuban crisis--this despite support for his rehiring by

"NEVER HAVE SO FEW DONE SO LITTLE  
FOR SO MANY" --Jim Williams .mb/2

Thus is headed a draft of thoughts about The UNPARTY: "The UNPARTY is a DISorganization of students who completely refuse to assume their civic responsibilities.

"Because it believes campus politics are a farce, it feels that only a farcical solution can best solve--or, rather, attempt to solve, the problem of apathetic students and apathetic governments.

"Thus, the UNPARTY militantly withdraws from any participation in campus politics and elections.

"By NOT running candidates--urging that people 'Don't vote' for these 'non-candidates' we hope to call attention to the paradox of 'student government' which has no real student participation."

Jim writes that the UNPARTY (the name is most unofficial) is not formalized at all but is simply an idea in the heads of some U. of Louisville students. But the UNPARTY is receiving considerable sympathetic reaction from the conservative Southern city school (which combines the worst features of being Southern with those of being a city school): "UNPARTY is strangely growing in popularity. In the last week, we've covered the campus with posters (elections not for a month yet) with all manner of inscriptions: 'Look, Ma: No Candidates!'; 'Look Marge, it's the INACTION Giants!'; etc. Some posters with 'famous losers' on them like Vercingetorix, Dewey, Al Smith, Norma, Louis XVI, etc."

---

the faculty and even the administration.

One hope for continuity at Delta (aside from four-year status) is the tentatively proposed Michigan-wide effort to co-ordinate liberal student action in the State legislature on civil rights, education, civil liberties, and peace issues. Hopefully, more on all this later.

ACTIVITIES OF THE PREP OFFICE

In a recent Report to Advisors and Co-operating Organizations, Peace Research and Education Project (PREP) Director Richard Flacks summarized PREP's activities for the six weeks following its formal initiation on Feb. 1, 1963.

The basic PREP program, "Toward An Effective Campus Peace Program", has been mailed to all SDS members and also to 300 students and faculty whose names came from participants in the Swarthmore Conference on Disarmament of Feb. '62. Also, "Peace, Power, and the University", by Dick Flacks and Al Haber, has been mailed to a somewhat smaller list of SDS contacts and to some periodicals and is available to SDS members and friends upon request to the PREP Office (715 Arch, Ann Arbor, Mich.). The result of this and other publicity has been orders for over 1200 copies of "Peace, Power, and the University" and other literature. Any chapters or other groups on campus which have not ordered bulk copies of the Haber/Flacks paper should do so as soon as possible.

Peace seminars and study groups have been initiated at a number of schools, as have "American Society" seminars. We will have to wait for any report of qualitative or quantitative success in these seminars.

PREP has "contracted" to undertake the following research projects: (1) "Minimum Program to Prevent War", by Tom Hayden primarily (to be completed soon); (2) "Peace and the 1962 Congressional Campaigns", by Paul Booth (probable completion date: summer); (3) "The Selective Service System", by Todd Gitlin, former chairman of TOCSIN at Harvard.

The following research projects need students to do them: (1) a study of the military budget, requested by Harold Taylor; (2) bibliographic classification of peace literature, requested by Turn Toward Peace; (3) participant observation of the QNVA peace walk from Canada to Cuba, requested by the Conflict Resolution Center at the U. of Michigan for Bradford Lyttle. Anyone interested in these should contact PREP.

PREP plans to publish a regular newsletter, the first issue of which is expected quite soon. It is to contain

LOCAL CATHOLIC WORKER GROUP STARTED

Bob Wilhelm of Seton Hall U. (South Orange, N.J.) writes of the formation of a Catholic Worker group at that Catholic school. They are, he says, in complete sympathy with the Chrystie St., NYC D.W. Their first project is to get the fraternities on campus to sponsor a dance whose proceeds would go to Operation Freedom in Mississippi. (Bob was president of the S.H. International Relations Club until the Club balked at SDS affiliation on grounds of not co-operating with the "extreme left"; Bob then resigned in order, he says, to devote his energies to the "extreme left".) CW has requested affiliate status.

YCS PLANS NATIONAL STUDY WEEK

The College Young Christian Students movement is planning a National Study Week in Lake Forest (near Chicago), Ill. from June 4-9. The topic will be "The Student in Political Life". The Week is an annual event held by the liberal Catholic student organization, and will concentrate on the role of the socially and politically concerned student. Some of the areas to be considered will include: the Christian vision of man, politics and democratic government; directions for the future of American politics and government; working in community political activity; the individual in a complex society; and others. Those interested in further information should contact National Study Week, College YCS, 1655 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago 12, Ill.

curricula and bibliographies for peace seminars, reports of campus programs, listings of student peace research possibilities, etc. PREP is extremely interested in receiving copies of syllabi and evaluative reports of any peace seminars established. Being discussed are plans for a Student Conference on the Cold War and Higher Education.

For further information on any aspect of the PREP Office and its activities, write the PREP Office.

The Boston organizing conference of Nov. 30-Dec. 2, 1962, has produced (to this point) two mimeographed papers available from the SDS National Office for 10¢ each.

Paul Potter, former National Affairs Vice-President of NSA, spoke on "Higher Education and the Cold War": "American higher education--through institutional inertia and bureaucratic agglutination, through political pressure and educational ideology--is deeply, and, under the pressures of the current world crisis, ultimately committed to the nourishment of a national and international system in which the Cold War is inextricably rooted. The model for changing that system cannot be an adjustment model. Our problem is not that the system is nor working well enough; it is rather that the current system is working entirely too well--that it is working us all into a final catastrophe...We must forsake the current adjustment model and begin to search for a revolutionary model which is dynamic enough to extricate us from the continually narrowing concentric circles which define the limits of change within the established political power structure...In order to develop a revolutionary model, concerned faculty and students will for the most part have to move outside the University-defined spectrum of lectures, seminars, and officially sanctioned research. And more importantly, they will have to move outside the societally-defined spectrum of what is relevant since relevance is definted today as that which is directed at adjusting the current power structure.

Noel Day's speech, entitled "A White American in a Non-white World (a general concept he rejected, as it used whiteness as a criterion), was taken verbatim from his talk at the Boston Conference (Paul had an opportunity to edit his). The talk was magnificently given, entirely extemporaneously, and dealt with (as was promised) "man. I'm just going to comment and jump around, and probably hit on a lot of things, including semantics, the world of nations, the United States, this thing we call the Negro problem, the individual,

Most Bulletin readers know that each year SDS and Campus AFA have run jointly the Liberal Study Group at the NSA Congress. in co-ordination with several other liberal student organizations. The LSG is three things: a daily Liberal Bulletin, a series of seminars during the Congress, and a series of papers which (hopefully) we can distribute free of charge to Congress delegates presenting a liberal point of view on matters of interest to students. It's time to get papers for this year written; preliminary meetings of the LSG sponsors have been held, adequate financing looks like a real possibility, and we should begin to move. Papers should be 10-20 pages long, double-spaced; we want to hand out around 20 on various topics. Some suggestions: the Domestic Peace Corps; various issues in university reform; the McCarran Act (someone is already working on this); youth employment and automation; unionization on campus, both of students and non-students; issues relating to peace, civil rights, civil liberties. You can suggest more. There will be a steering committee to select the best papers for mass distribution. Why not write one for a course this Spring.

peace, growing up in Harlem, what James Baldwin called 'the blues', what I call the blues of everybody, mental health and mental illness, opinion-making, Cuba, feelings and fears with regard to the student movement, and lots of other things." The talk dealt as much with the man of color in a colorless world as vice versa: "as a Negro I suffer from certain forms of paranoia, which I feel most Negroes suffer from in this country. But I (don't) have to suffer from the severe personality conflict that most whites suffer from: the adherence to the American creed on the one hand, and the way in which we live on the other, and the constant strain that we're in between these in trying to pull things together in our lives. And the impossibility of doing so for most white Americans--actually, for most whites in this world." But enough; the speech must be read (and must have been heard and seen) to be appreciated.

What happens when a group of students, faculty, and liberal administrators sit down for a weekend and talk about what's wrong with the university? This was the scene recently at the Conference on University Reform sponsored by the Brandeis U. Chapter of the Students for a Democratic Society on March 1-3 at Brandeis. Trying to steer carefully between the twin dangers of generalities on the one hand and minutiae on the other, there were moments of confusion and over-direction. But for many of the 80 or more participants there was a good deal of clarification about the often-spoken but little understood concept of university reform.

The conference opened Friday night with a speech by Paul Goodman, anarchist and author of Growing Up Absurd, Community of Scholars, and other works. He began by counting coup on the government view of the University as a place for research in military, medical, and commercial matters rather than as a center for training in the ability to think clearly and creatively. Because of this concept of the university a series of restraints are put upon the student community in order to enhance research in the "practical" areas of life. Pressures become more evident in research situations, where money is required, but they operate on all levels to bring students to conform. By Goodman's thesis, a conforming student is no longer a student since he ceases to question that which he is told. Goodman sees the university now as a training center for the professions. He would have it "become a new center of initiative for our society". Students must learn to "grasp the reality of the institutions of our society". The student must aim at the integration of all the data he receives from physics, sociology, literature, psychology; and by using the image that emerges he can then effect meaningful changes.

Although substantial in its critique, Goodman's comment did not provide much of a guideline for change. Unfortunately, that marked much of the best of the conference, also. On several different occasions effective critiques were made of various aspects of the uni-

versity experience by both students and faculty, but responses to the "what can we do?" question left much to be desired. Is it the case that the problem is simply so enormous that we cannot even find a lever by which to effect change? Is it the case that we simply don't know what thorough-going, radically oriented university reform would look like, or how we would achieve it? Or was it simply a matter of weakness in conference organization and integration? Probably all of these are to some extent involved.

For instance: Tom Hayden, SDS President, spoke Saturday morning on the role of students as decision-makers within the university, on in loco parentis, and did a critique of some of the "models" of the ideal university which educators and others have constructed. But after finding fault—justifiably—with models ranging from the Goodmansque a-few-students-and-a-few-scholars-living-together-in-a-house to the modern corporate educational factories typified by most state universities, he concluded by saying that the university cannot be really reformed without a total social revolution. Probably most students present agreed with him to a great extent; yet the conference dealt only peripherally with the question of the way students can relate their concern for social change with their relation to the university.

For instance: two administrators from Brandeis addressed the conference, one rather polemically and one in a very open and friendly manner. Both drew essentially the same conclusion, though, viz., that change will come from liberally minded administrators who know what is best in education, rather than from the generally narrow-minded and conservative faculties or from the uneducated and inexperienced student bodies. It was an educational experience to see educators in benign and not so benign ways deny the validity of the purpose of the conference—how can students bring about university reform—but what to do about this crippling problem was not dealt with adequately.

(cont. p. 13, col. 1)

The over-balance on analysis without reconstructing, though, was somewhat corrected by the end of the Conference. A presentation on the SDS Peace Research and Education Project, in which an attempt is being made to counter-balance the capture of university research by Defense Department Projects by stimulating research on problems of peace, was followed by an address by Herbert Marcuse of the Brandeis faculty on the university and the Cold War. (His summation: "in the first place, the university should have nothing to do with the Cold War. In the second place, insofar as it does have to do with the Cold War, its purpose ought to be to end it.") And the following morning informal discussion sessions got into the problem of "vocation"--what is it that we want to do when we get out of school--and related this to the problems of university curriculum and university reform itself. While personally useful, such discussions did not get even then to the question of what it is that we ought to be doing within the university today to create the kind of educational experience which is what we are led to expect from the liberal rhetoric regarding education.

The conference was most useful to a great many of those present but for very different reasons. In a sense there were two levels of persons--those who had not ever really thought through what is entailed in the concept of university reform and a radical critique of the university; and those who had done that for quite some time now and were looking for creative breakthroughs in their own thinking. For the first group, the analysis was crucial, definitive, excellent; it will take some time for this much to be absorbed before university reform can be taken seriously in a programmatic way. For the latter group, it became clearer than a most previous discussions of university reform that we really don't know just what it is that we are trying to construct and how we think it can be done. So much more must be done on the constructive as well as the critical level.

The emergent "idea"--perhaps "standard" in its militaristic sense would be better--of the conference, though, was not pessimism or agnosticism about methodol-

## A FOLLOW-UP ON COLORADO U.

(CPS): In last month's Bulletin, we recounted the story of the effects of high-pressure state politics on the U. of Colorado--the firing, by a fundamentally civil libertarian college president, of the campus paper editor, followed, a couple of months later, by the resignation of the President himself. In a clearly related series of developments, the resignation of Provost Oswald Tippeo highlighted the virtually mass exodus of high administrators from the University. Student Body president Tom Cesten said that professors estimate that at least ten high level administrators will leave this spring. In an editorial comment on Tippeo's resignation, the Colorado Daily said it "provides a painful example of what can happen when a university lets itself become the bone of contention in political dogfights. It is also a black omen of what is going to happen to this university if the State of Colorado doesn't do everything in its power to prevent similar involvements in the future."

Meanwhile, the former managing editor of the Colorado Daily, Terry Marshall, was placed on probation for writing to recently elected (on a platform of ridding the University of "subversives") right-wing U. Regent Dale Atkins that he, Marshall would "continue to subvert your dirty Americanism". After being originally placed on probation, Marshall gained a special hearing before a three-dean panel; but he was found to have been "intemperate and insulting"; "students at the university", the board held, "do not have the privilege, as a matter of right, to write scurrilous and insulting letters to other students, teachers, or to members of the Board of Regents. It is ...conduct unbecoming a student."

ogy or anarchistic rejection of the system. It was perhaps best stated by the response of Bob Ross, University of Michigan undergraduate, to Tom Hayden's speech on Saturday. It is very simply that there may not be easy answers to the myriad of problems that face the modern university, ranging from parking space to what to do about grades. But that if answers are to come, we in the student community are the logical ones to supply them. And we intend to achieve the power to do so.

By the time this Bulletin reaches you, we expect to have had printed up in considerable quantity copies of the McCarran Act statement which appeared in the last Bulletin. Each member will receive a copy, and we will be sending bulk amounts to chapters, associated groups, and clusters wherever they exist. Let us know how many you want; if we haven't sent them, or haven't sent enough, we'll make sure you receive them. (And if you could manage to send us \$7/1000 ordered, that would help greatly in defraying printing costs.)

This statement should be used in the overall fight against the Act, HUAC, SISS, and all other manifestations of Cold War neurosis in civil liberties; it should be used as an educational tool--not as something for people to read and nod their heads at, but as a beginning statement from which to help people develop their own thinking on the whole question of civil liberties.

And if this results in action also--from letter-writing to sit-ins--we won't be displeased. In any case, let us know what happens on your campus--and make sure something does!

# d u e s #

SDS is among the 17 national organizations sponsoring a National Student Federal Aid to Education (FATE) Conference to be held in Washington, D.C. on April 25 and 26. The conference will be open to all undergraduate and graduate college students, and it is hoped that a cross-section of student opinion on the issue of federal aid to education, especially in relation to the National Education Improvement Act now before Congress.

Inasmuch as all SDS members and friends on the mailing list will have received a direct mailing about the FATE Conference, only the outlines of the program need be given here (more information can be obtained from FATE, Box 1646, Washington, D.C.). The meeting will take place from Thursday night through Friday night. Highlighting the conference will be participants' visits to their Congressmen in order to express their views on aid to education as well as on other subjects of concern to students. (The visits will occur Friday morning; participants should make these arrangements independently and well in advance). The balance of the time will be taken up by workshops and an evaluation of the Congressional visits.

### "STUDENT COMPLAINT COMMITTEE" LEADS TO STUDENT EXPULSION

(CPS): At small (410 students) co-ed Findlay C. (in western Ohio), the abrupt dismissal of a student protest leader from school in early March brought a student-administration controversy to new heights. The expelled student, John Krouse, 26, was head of the recently-formed "Student Complaint Committee", which voiced student grievances on censorship, compulsory cafeteria food, and several other aspects of student life; The Committee had produced a newsletter in order to publicize grievances. Krouse refused to appear before Findlay's student court on grounds of being refused the right of counsel. He was charged with failure to support college regulations, conduct unbecoming a student, unauthorized posting of materials on campus bulletin boards, unauthorized presence in college buildings, and attaching material to

plaster walls. The protest group also was charged with failure to work through the established channels of the Student Government Association; Krouse called it "no more than a dummy organization". The Administration said Krouse's dismissal was due to "open defiance and expressed disregard for the rules and regulations of Findlay College and its Student Government Association." Krouse in ends to file suit to remain in school.

Earlier in the year the editors of the student newspaper and the student year-book both resigned, charging heavy-handed censorship by the administration. The paper editor claimed that every piece of copy had to be initialed by the college's public relations director before being printed.

A combination of an unpopular Cuba demonstration, a right-wing County Prosecutor, an avowedly revolutionary Marxist student organization, and a virtually certainly unconstitutional state law provides the setting for a tale of mid-western withhhunting. The place is Indiana U. (Bloomington), the time October 24. The demonstration, of course, was part of the nation-wide series of protests against the Administration's "quarantine" of Cuba. It almost was called off (the demonstration, not the quarantine) because of a combination of no police protection and an angrily opposing mob; as it turned out, there was some violence (later played down by the local press, the campus press, and the "liberal" student body president); in addition to the usual tactics encountered throughout the midwest and elsewhere, or rock- and egg-throwing, sign-tearing, etc. This demonstration was rapidly dispersed by the hostile crowd. It had been called by an ad hoc committee including, among others, members of the Young Socialist Alliance, which proclaims itself to be a revolutionary Marxist socialist organization.

Newly elected Republican Monroe County Prosecutor Thomas A. Hoadley felt that it was very possible that the YSA violated the State Anti-Subversive Act of 1951, which is virtually identical to a Pennsylvania law which has been struck down by the Supreme Court as unconstitutional but which has yet to be tested in court. Hoadley then proceeded to pillory the YSA through the mass media, while lodging no formal legal charge against them. Support for the YSA was expressed by the I.U. Young People's Socialist League (the only other leftist student group on campus), and a Bloomington Defense Committee (Box 625, Bloomington, Ind.) was set up to help defend the YSA. The ACLU promised legal help if necessary. While, at the time of writing, the University has not given in to attempted pressure aimed at withdrawal of official University recognition from the YSA, thereby isolating them (the YSA had had trouble being recognized originally, but had finally achieved official campus status last

(CPS): Ten Arkansas Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal (located in Pine Bluff) students who decided to celebrate the third anniversary of the sit-in movement by sitting in at a local Woolworth's were expelled by the school administration two weeks later. The students had been warned by the Administration not to participate. SNCC chairman Charles McDew commemorated Lincoln's birthday anniversary by wiring President Kennedy to aid the Pine Bluff students. It doesn't seem to have worked.

fall), I. U. Professor of the History and Logic of Science Norwood Hanson wrote in the Feb. 22 Bloomington Daily Herald-Telephone of "collective spinelessness" on the part of the faculty of the University: "And what does our faculty do? As usual they are more worried about.../other things/ than the fact that a genuine issue of academic freedom is likely to be lost by default ...Every member of this University, faculty and student body, ought to wake up to what is happening."

It seems that any disasters that occur will be of omission rather than commission. Most politicians consider Prosecutor Hoadley's charges against YSA to be absurd; prosecution (persecution?) seems highly unlikely. Even if Hoadley is successful in winning a conviction, there is little doubt that the Indiana Anti-Subversive Act is unconstitutional (even Hoadley practically admitted it); it only needs court testing. But it is the omission highlighted by Professor Hanson that indicates the erosion of what is left of real, functional participatory democracy--which must include an exchange of views and a willingness to hear other views--in fact, to encourage their expression. Successful prosecution is unlikely; persecution and further mind-closing (by those on both sides of the controversy) might well be all too successful, and might go essentially unprotested.

--from reports by SDS member Mike McNaughton and Bloomington Defense Committee information

TEST BAN, cont.

(and other nations poorer than the U.S.) more than it would the U.S.; the U.S.'s stockpile is so tremendous now that a neutron bomb need not be added. Continued testing, however, would give the Soviets an opportunity to develop it.

- 2. The U.S. must develop an anti-missile missile. But such missiles depend primarily not upon bomb testing but upon guidance systems and detector systems.
- 3. The Soviets have already developed an anti-missile missile. Aside from this's not being true, Humphrey argued that it would be impossible to know if an anti-missile missile functioned under conditions of stress (i.e. surprise attack) from having seen a couple of set-up-in-advance successes.
- 4. Testing must be done in order to develop such things as tactical weapons, weapons to overcome hardened Soviet missiles, and, in general, more explosive capacity per pound of bomb weight. "...Our objective," said Humphrey, "is to limit the Soviets and to slow them down, not merely to keep adding to our stockpiles." I.e., the stopping of the arms race is more important than the further sophistication of our hyper-overkill capacity.
- 5. The Soviets could cheat and, through

some breakthrough, force the U.S. to surrender. Quite aside from the fact that tests would be rapidly detected (see below in this article), "...our Defense Department believes that no amount of cheating under the kind of verification system being proposed by the U.S. could alter the strategic military balance.

- 6. The verification system being proposed by the U.S. is less effective than previous ones. But advances in technology have more than made up for any easing of verification demands (e.g. fewer on-site inspections).
- 7. Lack of verification stations on Soviet territory makes the verification system weaker than previously. But the "black box" scheme--agreed to by both countries--is just as good.
- 8. The U.S. is proposing an inadequate number of on-site inspections (seven--the Soviets, three). But compared to the total number of "suspicious events" likely to occur during the year, the number, though absolutely lower by a large number, is relatively higher because of better detection of earthquakes as earthquakes rather than possible tests. Previously the number of natural suspicious events thought likely to occur in the Soviet Union was 70 to 100 (19 kilotons or more; originally the U.S. agreed to a three-

\*\*\*\*\*  
SCIENTIST DOUBTS IMPORTANCE OF SMALL TESTS; HOLIFIELD TRIES TO OVERAWE HIM

Rep. Holifield (D-Cal): You are eliminating, in effect, any concern as to the improvements of weapons which could obtain under a 2 or 3 kiloton test in alluvium.

Dr. Press (Pres. Seismological Society of America; Caltech): That is right. Now, speaking as a private citizen and not as an expert I would say that when I think of the possibilities he has for weapons development under the circumstances, I do not think it a risk to our security.

Holifield: May I ask you, have you been thoroughly briefed in the degree to which advancements can be made with an average of 3 kiloton power of test explosions or less?

Press: I have had discussions with people who know.

Holifield: With weapons development people?

Press: With weapons development people.

But I would like to add that I am not an expert in this field. However, I have framed an opinion on the basis of the discussions that I have had.

Comm. Chairman Pastore (D-RI): You mean you ave based an opinion as to what weapons development might take place?

Press: As to the threat to our security by a weapons development program which has to be undertaken in deep cavities, in large cavities, or in small yields under alluvium coupling.

Holifield: And you are aware of the improvements that have been made in the Nevada test series with that level of testing?

Press: Not as a specialist, but as a listener in discussions that have taken place.

Holifield: Unclassified discussions, or classified?

Press: Some of these were classified.

--from the Committee hearings, March 7.

year moratorium on inspecting sub-19 kiloton explosions); for that number the U.S. suggested 12 to 20 inspections. Now, the moratorium is off; all seismic events are inspectable; in any case, over-19 kiloton suspicious events are now estimated to total only about a dozen annually (this due to improved systems of external detection).

9. The U.S. draft gives the Soviets a veto on the control body. This is not true; the U.S. would pay for its own detection stations and for its participation in on-site inspections. It would have complete control over its inspection and detection procedure and personnel.

Both the U.S. and the Soviet Union have proposed an agreement which would outlaw all save underground tests, with a provision that negotiations on underground testing would continue. Neither foresees any need for inspection guarantees for atmospheric, underwater, or outer space tests--these could be easily detected without having to inspect the site of the alleged test. Thus, the only issue

is underground tests. Stone proves pretty conclusively that (a) even underground tests of any size cannot be hidden for sure; (b) even if they could, they are of extremely limited military value; (c) besides, they would be much too expensive for the Soviets, in relation to whatever military advances could be gained therefrom. Let us take these contentions individually, in reverse order.

The Soviets, to the best of our knowledge, have never conducted a series of underground explosions--in fact, we know of only one Soviet underground test, on Feb. 2, 1962, and that one was detected immediately and easily by the Atomic Energy Commission. (No-one seems to have seen fit to question this further; how many other stations around the world detected it? What were estimates of size? Etc.) But underground tests are tremendously expensive and (aside from being very possibly non-extrapolatable to above-ground conditions, as we shall see later) have a technology all their own, which requires considerable experience before it is possible to interpret cor-

\*\*\*\*\*  
CLOSER TO THE TRUTH ON DETECTION--but truth is "classified"  
\*\*\*\*\*

Today I have in my office, for my personal use, document after document which is labelled "secret". I am told, "Do not use it; just look at it." But when I want to engage in debate with those who hold a different point of view on the issue of nuclear tests, and when I need the evidence--such as evidence on the VELA Project or data on research by the Dept. of Defense and particularly by the Air Force--I am told, "You cannot do that; it is secret." Mr. President [of the Senate], I do not know how one can possibly come to an understanding regarding the issue if all the evidence is labelled "secret". Mr. President, the people of the United States are getting sick and tired of this so-called secrecy.

My colleagues...should...read the material from which I draw [my] conclusions. I wish especially to bring to my colleagues' attention what I have just stated so I repeat the sentence: "Moreover, the U.S. system is capable of detecting some seismic events below the presumed 'threshold', so that no nation could be sure that its clandestine tests would go undetected." [emphasis added, here and in next sentence]

That is a masterpiece of understatement. The fact is that our detection capability is much greater than the press has led us to believe on the basis of the information it has received from the U.S. Government...

...This study [on all events detected for the 5-year period 1958-62] shows clearly why the number of inspections and the number of detection stations can be reduced without in any way diminishing the effectiveness of verification...

...When it comes to the issue of advances in seismology, we are handcuffed. I will abide by the law but I do not like it. I have said to the President and to those responsible for our position on nuclear tests that the American people need to know the facts. Tell the American people of our detection system. Tell them what we have. We are always telling them what a big bomb we have. Tell them what a good detection system we have. I do not say it is foolproof or perfect. I merely say the results in 3 years of research are phenomenal, and I challenge anyone to prove the contrary.

--Humphrey, in the Senate, March 7

rectly the various data obtained. Thus the Soviets would have to conduct an entire series of clandestine underground tests, a most unlikely possibility.

When President Kennedy announced a little over a year ago that the U.S. would resume atmospheric testing, one of the main reasons he gave for doing so was that underground tests could not give sufficiently significant military information. Now, strategically speaking, the Soviets' main need is to reduce the weight of their warheads so as to permit more mobile and more hardened missiles, in the light of U.S. knowledge of the whereabouts of many of the Soviets' missile sites. This need cannot be met with underground testing, because (a) sufficiently large bombs cannot be tested underground and (b) small underground tests (the only ones which might be hidden; don't forget the 20-kiloton level at which tests can definitely be detected) are not reliable in terms of extrapolating from small to large tests. This last fact is to be found buried twice over in the AEC's 1962 report--first, on p. 233; second, underneath some euphemistic language: "...certain hypotests such as effects tests [i.e. those testing the effects of the weapon] and many high yield detonations can only be carried out in the atmosphere and in the environment to which they pertain and at their particular design yield [i.e. non-extrapolatability]."

But the most startling revelations come when we turn to detection of underground tests and the scientific advances made in this field over the past few years. Senator Humphrey's own remarks, necessarily somewhat oblique because based on "classified" material, reproduced on page 18, seem to this writer clearly to indicate that in fact the Soviets are quite right in saying that there is no need whatsoever for inspection, that all nuclear explosions can be detected from outside any country. Thus, the Soviets' contention that they accepted three on-site inspections as a token in order to help the treaty pass the Senate seems very plausible. (This does not mean that it is no longer relevant that the Senate is very unlikely to accept less than seven--if that many--on-site inspections; but it does mean that the President must be willing to do for a test-ban treaty what he has been unwilling to do for practically anything else

mb/18

\* "Actually it would have been more in the  
\* US interest if a nuclear test ban treaty  
\* could have been achieved in 1958 and  
\* 1959. The arms race, including nuclear  
\* testing, is buying the US less security  
\* than we would have with effective arms  
\* control and disarmament agreements."  
\* --Senator Hubert Humphrey

\*\*\*\*\*  
during his Administration--fight hard for something, including taking it to the people. But that's a different question--and it is still relevant if the Soviets have a position at Geneva which is much closer to scientific truth than does the U.S.) And, as I.F. Stone points out, during the hearing no questions were asked and no information offered on the secret tests during the recent series; undoubtedly these were monitored to test existing detection devices. If these detection devices had failed, there would undoubtedly have been a leak to the press; the lack of same leads one to believe that the detection devices worked very well indeed.

Still around is the Teller theory of the "big hole", whereby an explosion in certain types of material could be muffled 200-300 times if exploded in the middle of a big hole underground. Dr. Teller--who, incidentally, has come out against a test ban agreement on political rather than scientific grounds--however, discovered that in fact the big hole only magnified, not diminished, the shock from an explosion. Nonetheless, the theory has turned up again. However, for a test of a 100 ton (not kiloton) bomb, a cavity of 95 feet diameter (the height of a nine-story building) would have to be created; imagine the size for a large bomb. The problem of just hiding the excavation arrangements from spy satellites and U-2s seems considerable (by I.F. Stone's calculations, this would require 5,000 truckloads of 8 tons each for the excavation). Furthermore, there are some cavities that just can't be dug, because the hold won't support itself. Much has been made by anti-test ban-ers of the extraordinary muffling powers of alluvium, a soft soil--and indeed it has such powers. But: (1) it's not possible to build a "big hole" in alluvium; it's too soft; (2) "most shots in alluvium were followed by the formation of surface collapse craters" (according to an Air Force expert, Carl

(cont. p. 19, col. 2)

## MIDWEST YOUNG DEMS TO HOLD CONFERENCE

On April 26-28, the University of Illinois Young Democrats will sponsor the Midwest Conference on the Potential of College Young Democrats. Among the major speakers will be Cary McWilliams of the Oberlin Government Dept.; Bob Wilson, Publisher and Editor of The Liberal Democrat and 1962 Congressional candidate; and SDS member Rennie Davis, a graduate student at the U. of Illinois.

The conference is to deal primarily with four areas of discussion: political realignment; the role of the College Young Democrats in the D.P.; the liberal in the D.P.; and the structural relationship between College Young Democrats and the Party and among the College Young Democratic Clubs themselves.

According to the Statement of Purpose of the Conference, the participants will ask themselves: "What is the place of College Young Democrats in the D.P.? What is our potential as a political force, working within the Party? And, of great importance, is the socially conscious student, the student activist, able to find a place in the Young Democrats?"

Registration is \$6. Those interested in more information should contact Y.D. Conference, Room 7a, University YMCA, Champaign, Ill.

\*\*\*\*\*  
"You [Americans] killed women and children in Playa Giron [The Bay of Pigs]. You bombed the first decent houses, the first schools, the first hospitals of Cubans who never before, during the long American protectorate over Cuba, had a roof, and alphabet, or their health. And you did it in the name of liberty, democracy, and free enterprise. What do you want us to think of these nice words when in their names a population is murdered and the first proofs of concrete welfare destroyed? 'The U.S.A. seems destined by Providence to plague us with all kinds of evils in the name of Liberty.' [Simon Bolivar]"

—Carlos Fuentes, In the January 1963 issue of Monthly Review

## PEACE/CIVIL RIGHTS SEMINAR PLANNED

mb/ -2.

SDS member Tom Rodd of Pittsburgh writes of a Peace-Civil Rights seminar to be held on April 26-28 in Pittsburgh, sponsored by the Pittsburgh Campus Co-ordinating Committee on Peace, of which he is Treasurer. SDS members in the general area should have received information directly from PCCCP soon; others interested should contact Tom at 214 S. Dallas, Pittsburgh 8, Pa. "Definite local action may well be the result", it is hoped.

## QUIET DESEGREGATION

(CPS): Trustees of Rice University, in Houston, Texas, have asked a federal district court to set aside certain provisions in the will that funded the school, so as to remove the "whites only" clause and to allow the charging of tuition. The will of William Marsh Rice created, in 1891, the institution for "the instruction and improvement of white inhabitants", such instruction to be free.

## TEST BAN, cont.

entire Soviet Union with sufficiently deep alluvium deposits to be considered for use in underground tests are within 400 miles of the Iranian border (one is right on the border), much too close to be used clandestinely; (4) during the recent U.S. test series, a Northern Canadian seismic station, with ordinary equipment, detected a 2-kiloton shot in alluvium from 2,000 miles away. Nonetheless, says Stone, "I predict that references to alluvium will form a deep geologic strata on the floor of the Senate during the coming debate on a test ban."

These are amazing data; they must not go unpublicized. We will leave the reader to draw his own conclusions about the basis for the U.S. position at Geneva (and, incidentally, why the Soviets are unwilling to accede to the seven-inspection limit). In any case, we again strongly urge that you get a copy of the March 18 issue of I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly—and use it.



FOR, cont.

2. The Fellowship's objective--world peace--can be secured only by the passage of legislation; hence, the FOR falls into a recently created category of "action organizations", excluded by IRA regulations from the right to tax-deductability.

**THE IMPLICATIONS:** These arguments by the IRS pose a serious threat to all kinds of religious and humanitarian efforts in this country. The decision raises, in particular, two questions. First, can the religious community of America permit an administrative agency of the government to declare that work for peace is not part of its role? Must the American church accept the dictum that it is to stick to its worship and sacraments, taking no part in voicing its opinions in the political community? This question is very important at this time, when the church is in many cases becoming less of a force for social change and when religiously oriented socially concerned students and adults often despair at the possibility of bringing the church into the thick of the fight for social justice. Second, who maintains that world peace will come only through the passage of legislation? To be sure, legislation may be important, but if such a ruling is permitted to stand, any work with social implications which requires incidental legislation may be subject to similar rulings.

**INCONSISTENCY?:** At the same time that the tax exempt status of the FOR has been overturned by the IRS, organizations on the right continue to enjoy exemption. The IRS's claim to be interested only in "tax loopholes" is certainly inconsistent with bypassing numerous superpatriotic and extreme right wing organizations which have substantially larger budgets and are not religious in character--quite apart from the loopholes which save much huger sums for large corporations.

**CHALLENGE:** The FOR plans to challenge the IRS ruling which has ended their 37-year period of tax exempt status. The challenge is limited by the lack of appeal procedures for IRS rulings and by lack of defense funds with which to carry their pleas through the courts. The FOR suggests the following 3 avenues of support for this effort, which will undoubtedly be long and arduous:

1. Contribute to the legal defense fund. (send to FOR, Box 271, Nyack, N.Y.).
2. Bring the matter to the attention of church and other groups concerned with civil liberties and peace; their help will be needed at various points.
3. Express your feelings to the Commissioner of the IRS, Mortimer Caplin; the Secretary of the Treasury, E. Douglas Dillon; and other concerned government officials including your Congressmen.
4. We would add a fourth point--drop a brief note to the FOR expressing moral support; this can be very encouraging in such a struggle.

This challenge to the status of the FOR represents a challenge to the activities of other religious and non-religious organizations engaged in similar programs of education on the issue of peace.

#### BREAKTHROUGHS ON CO'S?

From the Jan/Feb issue of "News Notes", the organ of the Central Comm. for Conscientious Objectors, come two potentially very significant stories. In one, an admitted atheist was given a 1-O (alternative service) classification by his local board--which apparently considered "natural law" an acceptable "Supreme Being" (to qualify as a CO, one must declare his belief in a "Supreme Being"). In the second case, however, the registrant answered "No" to the Supreme Being question, and was therefore denied his request for CO classification. When ordered to report for induction, he reported but refused to submit to induction. His trial before a judge ended in the registrant's being declared not guilty; the judge demurred from any statement until he had submitted a formal opinion (not yet available). The registrant's lawyer had argued, among other defenses, the constitutional point that the addition of the so-called "Supreme Being Clause" to the law was an act forbidden to Congress in that it constituted a preference to some religious groups over others (e.g. Orthodox Buddhists, according to Selective Service, have no religion). He argued an additional constitutional point, namely that the proscription of "a purely personal moral code" in the law (as a basis for CO classification) was ambiguous and therefore void. We hope to be able to report more on this case in the future.

CONSISTENCY ON THE NEW FRONTIER

--by the U.S. Government

From President Kennedy's press conference of March 21, 1963:

Q; Mr. President, the Civil Rights Commission for months has been trying to hold a hearing in Mississippi. Do you feel that this hearing should be delayed any longer?

A: No, that is a judgment the Civil Rights Commission should--any time, any hearing that they feel advances the cause or meets their responsibility which has been trusted to them by the law, then they should go ahead and hold it.

\*\*\*\*\*

The following letter was written over the signature of Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr., General Counsel of the Civil Rights Commission, over date of March 6:

Dear Mr. Monsonis:

This will reply to your telegram dated March 6 addressed to the Commission expressing disappointment in the postponement of the scheduled hearing in Mississippi. I can well understand your position. It goes without saying that the decision to postpone the hearing was probably the most difficult and tortuous one made by the Commission since it came into existence in 1957.

We recognize the fact that a Mississippi hearing is long overdue. This conclusion is supported by our preliminary investigations and reports which seem to indicate evidence of serious and uncorrected deprivations of constitutional rights in the State.

We are not unmindful of the continuing need to bring to the attention of the American people, including surprisingly large numbers of otherwise informed Mississippians, the facts and circumstances surrounding complaints and allegations of civil rights denials in Mississippi, which, for various reasons, either have not had adequate public exposure or have gone undetected. In this regard, the Commission also recognizes the possible contradiction between its decision and the fulfillment of its statutory authorization from Congress to hold hearings

(cont. p. 23, col.1)

SOME BACKGROUND ON THE GREENWOOD STORY

--by Jim Monsonis

During the past month a great deal has been happening in the civil rights movement in Mississippi. Some of it has been covered by the papers--much still has not gotten out to the public. It seems pretty clear that the violence of Mississippi will continue for some time as the movement deals more and more deeply with the real issues involved in the intense level of discrimination practiced in that area: jobs, employment, and political pressure through the vote.

The following is a re-cap of the major events of the last few weeks. Some of the information comes from personal visits with us of Sam Block and Jim Travis, SNCC field secretaries in Mississippi who have been the target of the most extreme of the violence; the rest is gleaned from a mass-distribution leaflet titled "Mississippi Violence Vs. Human Rights", an excellent summary of the facts of the situation. The pamphlet is available for mass distribution at 7¢ per copy (16 pp.). Get some for your campus now--write to the ad hoc Committee for the Distribution of the Mississippi Story, PO Box 564, Atlanta, Ga.

The work in the Mississippi Delta area--an area where Negroes are in the large majority, though unemployed due to automation of the cotton plantations in addition to the ills felt by the Negro community all over the South--dates back to 1961. At the time, a few beginning efforts were made to register voters and to develop a movement--some violence (more than the "ordinary" violence constantly committed) occurred, there was a mass movement in McComb, but nothing resulted from it. (Some of you may have read of this period in Tom Hayden's Revolution in Mississippi.) Work has continued in the area, however, and recently seems to be attracting the attention of the white power structure.

First came retaliation by burning. On Feb. 20, four buildings in the same block as the SNCC office in Greenwood, Miss., were burned to the ground--since a burning had been threatened, it appears that a mistake in the location of

(cont. p. 23, col.2)

necessary for carrying out its statutory functions, which include factfinding and formulating appropriate reports to the President and Congress. Our previous experience with the hearing process in other States has indicated that it is particularly well suited for scrutinizing civil rights complaints and for collecting information upon which our studies and recommendations can be grounded. Needless to say, in view of these considerations in favor of a hearing, the decision to again postpone the hearing was not an easy one.

As you may know, the postponement of our scheduled hearing was at the request of Attorney General Kennedy. He felt that the work of the Department of Justice might be severely hampered if the Commission held hearings in Mississippi during the period when the Department was involved in far-reaching civil rights litigation, including the contempt trial of Governor Ross Barnett. Although the Attorney General recognized our desire to hold public hearings in Mississippi, he felt that at the present time it might be claimed "that the Civil Rights Commission is working with the Department publicly to prejudice the State of Mississippi and its officials in the minds of the jury" and the court, and possibly even bring embarrassment upon the court and the Department of Justice. Acknowledging that this charge of prejudice would be groundless, he still urged the Commission to reconsider its decision. Against our firm conviction that a Mississippi hearing would be extremely beneficial, we had to weigh the monumental and long-range possibilities inherent in the current litigation for the advancement of civil rights and, in addition, the advantages stemming from the mutual cooperation and assistance of those Federal agencies that are actively involved with civil rights problems. The Commission decided that, under the circumstances, it would be improper not to cooperate with the Attorney General and therefore agreed to postpone "for the time being" its scheduled public hearing in Mississippi.

I would like to emphasize, however, that we will continue our current investigation in Mississippi so that our reports and recommendations to the President

(cont. p.23, col.1)

the office was made. When Sam Block suggested this connection a few days later he was arrested for trying to create a breach of the peace.

Then came the first shooting. On Feb. 28, while driving home late at night, 3 SNCC workers were fired upon by a passing 1962 Buick without plates. Jim Travis, SNCC staff member, was hit twice with .45 caliber slugs, and was in serious condition for a long while. Sam Block told me the other day that there were 17 bullet holes in the car they were driving. FBI agents have arrested three persons in connection with the shooting, but the cases are still undecided.

On March 6, another shooting occurred when a passing car shot out the windows of the SNCC car as it was parked in front of the Greenwood office--shotgun shells were found. Although there were several people in the car, fortunately the only injuries were from flying glass and not serious.

On March 20, the third shooting occurred when the car belonging to Mrs. Dave Dennis, wife of the CORE field secretary in Mississippi, was shot into in Jackson.

Another burning occurred--this time successfully--on March 24, when the SNCC office was burned out in Greenwood. SNCC workers are accused of setting it themselves.

On March 26, a shotgun blast hit the home of Dewey Greene, Sr., father of an applicant to Old Miss who has other children active in the voter registration drive. This too happened in Greenwood.

On the next day, when a mass protest march was organized by SNCC Executive Secretary Jim Forman, Bob Moses, and others, it was dispersed with dogs; and a dozen or so were arrested, including the leaders.

Finally the government has begun to act a little, and Justice Department personnel have filed for injunctions and other matters. To date, though, they have had no success; the Kennedy-appointed judges do not feel the Kennedy-run Justice De-

(cont. pl23, col. 1)

I attended a meeting at the end of January of peace candidates and peace politics organizations held in Washington, D.C., to discuss everything from campaign tactics to 1964 strategy, to a general reevaluation of the 1962 experience.

As is known, candidates for Congress in the '62 election included three dozen individuals supporting unilateral tension-reducing initiatives. Fourteen of these were at the meeting. Also represented in some way were about a dozen organizations concerned with peace politics. Two of the "peace congressmen" --George Brown, Jr., of California, and Robert Kastenmeier, of Wisconsin--gave informal talks to the group. Brown, as you may know, was elected in '62 on a fairly strong peace platform; he has subsequently voted against the extension of the draft and for reductions in the authorization for defense procurement.

#### CONSISTENCY, cont.

and the Congress will fairly and adequately deal with civil rights problems existing in the State.

/s/ Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr.

#### GREENWOOD, cont.

partment should be involved in the case. What will happen remains to be seen.

The violence, coupled with the removal from the Federal relief rolls of the Negro community when it started to become active in trying to register to vote, has worsened the situation of the Negro in Mississippi; and our help in the way of food, clothing, and finances is desperately needed. In addition, of course, a great deal of pressure must be put on the Federal Government in every way possible. There is so much more that the government could do which for a variety of political reasons it seems unwilling to do. As Wiley Branton, Arkansas-born lawyer who heads the overall coordinating body for the efforts, the Voter Education Project, said recently, "The Federal Government has done little to protect the peace in LeFlore, or elsewhere in Mississippi...The peace of the United States is broken and shattered by the lawlessness in Mississippi. The Federal Government has an obligation, which it is not fulfilling, to resotry it."

Discussion focused around political strategy, especially around the question of whether peace people should support sympathetic party professionals in general election campaigns despite the de-emphasis of the peace position on the part of the candidate which that usually involves. In addition, a great deal of information was exchanged about the 1962 experience in terms that will be quite useful for 1964.

The group decided to form a Peace Politics Clearing House which will publish a discussion bulletin for circulation among the individuals and organizations represented at the conference. In addition, another meeting was projected for the fall, at which time concretization of program for the '64 elections may take place.

My personal observations were that the meeting held together remarkably well, considering the great diversity among the candidates themselves--professional liberal Democrats, ideological third-party types, Republicans, etc. The most instructive discussion came from the professionals, like ex-Congressman William Meyer of Vermont, stressing the need for peace people to help their friends in Congress. Missing from the discussion was any analysis of the attitude of the Kennedy Administration toward peace politics, despite the otherwise thorough discussion of the independent, educational campaign vs. the win-oriented campaign strategy.

#### AUTHORITATIVE JOURNAL APPEARS

Recently there appeared a journal which we would like to recommend--though with political reservations--to SDS Bulletin readers. Often important documents will appear therein, and there is frequently quite good--albeit ideologically limited (this is a classic exemplification of the respectable Establishment)--reporting of current events. 10¢ daily. For information write N.Y. Times, 229 W. 43, NYC 36

Two Wheaton C. (Ill.) students and three editors of a student magazine at the University of Notre Dame have joined the ranks of student journalists to fall before in loco parentis-wielding administrators this year.

At Wheaton, the editor of the campus newspaper was removed from his post by a 17-1 vote of the College Publications Board, while his partner in publishing an "off-campus" magazine was given a one-year enforced leave of absence from the college by the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs for "disregard for the spirit of the college". (The former editor's academic status is still pending.)

The two had been advised by students, faculty and administration against publication of Critique, a literary magazine, but went ahead anyway, using private financing and mail circulation. Subsequent to the faculty/administration decision on the two, the Student Council voted 7-4 to uphold the decisions.

Though the college claimed that the content of the magazine--which had been denied official recognition--was not a factor in the action, the expelled co-publisher charged that the evangelical protestant college has been sensitive to student publication, hoping to avoid adverse publicity.

At Notre Dame, the editor and associate and managing editors resigned from a student magazine, charging censorship, while a faculty advisor withdrew from his advisory position in sympathy.

Though the specific issue at stake was the content of the March 29 issue (three articles were expurgated), a Feb. 22 editorial probably was most influential in the pressure brought to bear on the editors. At that time the editors suggested that Notre Dame's president, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, should be replaced by allayman and installed as chancellor. Rev. Hesburgh was criticized for spending too much time away from the campus.

The three articles censored included: a "declaration of rights and grievances" by the Student Senate, asking for more liberal dormitory rules; a satire on

The following is reprinted in its entirety from Peace News (a British weekly on peace and other social concerns) of 2-8-63

"The More You Laugh", by Virginia Naeve

Recently I came across a rather vulgar statement against Civil Defense drills that a travelling salesman made up and gave to a friend. I had some printed--it looked just like the Government CD stuff--and passed it around. It said:

To all employees: IN CASE OF A NUCLEAR ATTACK, AT FIRST WARNING:

1. Stay clear of all windows.
2. Stand in clear area at least four feet from machinery or furniture.
3. Loosen necktie, belt, brassiere, or any other restricting clothing.
4. Remove glasses, empty pockets of any sharp objects such as pens, pencils, etc.
5. Immediately--yes, immediately--upon sighting brilliant flash from atomic explosions, bend over and place your head firmly between your legs.
6. And kiss your ass goodbye.

One newspaper is going to print this in its next issue, and a lawyer in Cleveland said it was the first thing he had come across that would have effect on the workers, and another man read it before a whole group of businessmen and brought the meeting to a halt, they were all laughing so, and all at the expense of the US CD programme. Intellect is great, but Chaucer and a few other of the old boys did pretty well in getting over their points with smut, and I'm not one to ignore this if it is effective. It took a salesman to do such as this. All the intellectual stuff just doesn't hit the common guy. The more a thing is laughed at the harder it is to put it over effectively.

liberal dormitory rules; a satire on spring campus riots--"an incitement to student riots", according to a campus spokesman--; and what that spokesman termed "an uncomplimentary presentation of a faculty member whose name was changed but still recognizable".

UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES: "The Third World", by Keith Buchanan, is the lead article in the Spring issue of New Left Review (British New Left publication; for copies contact B. DeBoer, 188 High St., Nutley, N.J.). This is an analysis of what is going on in the present development of the underdeveloped nations, in a few brief pages covering everything from the class structure of these nations (four classes basically, of which he sees real hope for social revolution coming from the peasantry) to economic imperialism by the western powers. An objective view of the possibilities of the achievement of higher standards of life for all men, it is much worth reading. jm

"GAULLO-GERMAN MONSTER": Claude Bourdet paints a chilling picture of tomorrow's possible Europe in "The Wrong Europe" in The Nation (333 6 Ave., NYC 14; 25¢) of March 9.

The U.S., the Soviet Union, and Britain have all sat back and allowed to develop a most dangerous situation. DeGaulle, being unable to get the Common Market during the Algerian war, has instead shaped it to his own ends. Based on a Paris-Bonn axis, which includes or will soon include a functional if not a real military alliance (including nuclear weapons) with fiercely anti-Communist (because peace with the Soviets would be political death for many Germans) and still-Nazified Germany, deGaulle sees himself as top man on the European totem pole. (It was for this reason that he wanted to exclude Britain, who would be on a parity.) The Germans, on the other hand, are quite willing to allow de Gaulle to have at least nominal power -- for now -- while knowing that they have the economic power to take over more or less at will. Now that the U.S. has awoken to this danger, she tried to do something about -- viz., get Britain in according to Bourdet, the British had already made large concessions on agricultural questions, but deGaulle gutted them anyway, not wanting them under any conditions). Here there is support from some sectors in Germany (their apparent Ertard and "a large segment of Germany's industry and finance"), who are more interested in British (and American) markets than in the "military-political

dreams of the two old men."

The U.S. would like to dilute both British neutralism and Franco-German militarism by pushing them together; also, a larger market would be to her liking. Already the U.S. has had to offer (essentially to Germany, also France) multinational crews of missile-bearing ships to counter independent forces (but this writer doesn't see Germany--or France--taken in by that ingenious scheme.

For Bourdet, the only hope is to get muddling yet democratic Britain (and Scandinavia) into the Common Market.

dm

A report on ANGOLA giving a long, solid summary of the facts in a pamphlet for mass distribution has come out, in the form of a report of the Mission to Angola sent by the World Assembly of Youth. A five-person team (3 Africans, 1 European, 1 American) went to Angola last May as an official delegation; this is their report. 54 pages long; well done and documented. Available from the Young Adult Council, 345 E. 46 St., NYC.

jm

IMAGE DISCRIMINATION: "Of all the advertisements appearing in these magazines [four national magazines with a combined circulation of 20 million] during the year, only two depicted Negroes, and these appeared in but one of the four magazines." This is one of the facts uncovered in a study on discrimination in advertising published by the Mayor's Committee on Job Advancement (NYC). Feeling that one of the blocks to Negro applicants for good jobs is the fact that there is little stimulation for these jobs from advertising, the committee did an unsystematic but interesting study on advertising models and the image of a pure white America which they project. Write for a copy to City Hall in New York City. jm

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Staff for the Bulletin include National  
\* Secretary Jim Monsonis and Ass't National  
\* Secretary Don McKelvey; unsigned articles  
\* are their work. Synopses of articles are  
\* by one of the other of them, as indicated  
\* by initials.

INDIA/CHINA CONFLICT: I am most unhappy at having to condense greatly the Review of the Month in Monthly Review of January 1963 entitled "A Fool's Game". It is the best and most comprehensive discussion of the border war which this reviewer has read anywhere, and is well-documented with material from speeches by Nehru and articles in the New York Times. There are two parts to the editorial (this section of MR is written monthly by Editors Leo Liberman and Paul Sweezy)--one dealing with the background and analysis of the conflict itself, the second with a discussion of why the conflict was/is in the interests of (and in the case of India, precipitated by) the ruling classes of India and the U.S.

It has been India which has consistently refused to negotiate on the basis of the status quo, as China has been calling for since the question became an issue (and as China did, successfully, with Nepal and Burma), and which has instead insisted that the basis for negotiations be India's claims of what the border should be. The status quo being discussed included: (a) In the East, the McMahon Line (itself a source of dispute as to its exact location), which delineated the actual areas of respective control at the time of the Oct. 1942 eruption of fighting. (b) In the West, rival claims that the Aksai Chin area of Ladakh (in Kashmir), through which the Chinese had built a modern road between Szechuan and Tibet and which the Chinese effectively controlled, was "traditionally" part of each country: until 1950, neither country had ever controlled the area, while since then the Chinese had. It should be noted that in 1950 the Indian Government published a map showing this area as "disputed", while after China had entered Tibet the Indian Government, seeing the border become alive again rather than dead as before, unilaterally decided what the border in the area should be. China was never consulted and never agreed to that border.

Then in 1956-57 the Chinese transformed what had been a caravan route between Szechuan and Tibet into the modern road mentioned above. The Indians didn't discover this for a year, and then only through a Chinese publication. But they made no public protest for a year after that, because at the time relations be-

tween the two countries were good. But following the suppression by the Chinese of the Tibetan revolt of March 1959, which "both offended and frightened the Indian ruling class,...the problem of the Sino-Indian border took on a new aspect."

of 159

In the spring and summer the issue of the road through Aksai Chin was raised publicly by the Indians for the first time, and that fall skirmishes started in the area. China then suggested that all forces withdraw from the border and that negotiations take place, but India insisted that such negotiations be on the basis of Indian border claims.

Thus, if anyone, the Chinese and not the Indians would be humiliated by accepting the status quo as a negotiating basis, for it would include the McMahon Line, a clear remnant of British Imperialism (and having no legal basis, according to the Chinese--and the Soviets). The willingness of the Chinese to do this indicated (1) the importance of the Aksai Chin area to them and (2) "a sense of sober realism and a desire for peace".

Clashes continued: the Indians started pushing harder in the East end, finding relatively little Chinese resistance, in the West and Middle border areas, too.

In October, 1962, the Indians initiated large-scale fighting (this view is supported by a clipping of the N.Y. Times for the period, and confirmed by L.F. Stone's Weekly of December 20, 1962, which had similar clippings from the British press). Why? (1) The Indians were badly informed and/or believed that the Chinese would continue to fall back indefinitely. (2) The extreme reactionaries in the Congress Party (hereafter called the CP, not to be confused) were willing to accept defeat in order to "get rid of Krishna Menon, to undermine Nehru's position, to whip up war hysteria, to force India to seek military aid from the West."

The Chinese response--an offensive--was obviously planned in advance--but "it is hard to see what alternative the Chinese had". They would give major concessions on the McMahon Line but could not give up their investment in Aksai Chin or have the border in perpetual turmoil. "What else could they do but slap the

mb/28

Indians down and then offer to re-establish the status quo ante as a basis for negotiation?"

\*\*\*\*

The Indian ruling class is the big bourgeoisie--big industrialists, big merchants, big bankers, upper echelons of the state apparatus (including the army). Through their political organ, the CP, they mouth "socialist" slogans but continue to extract the profits of development. There is no chance for economic development without modernization of agriculture, which is impossible given the present vested interests. The ruling class fears the masses' rising up--and China, "having only recently overthrown its own ruling class, is in a heroic period of stormy and spectacular development." The unity of the people behind the popular (but aging) Nehru after a long struggle for independence, and skillful CP propaganda about "socialism" keep the masses in line. But "the transformation of Congress [Party] from an independence movement to a corrupt, bureaucratic, reactionary instrument of capitalist rule is becoming increasingly obvious (the parallel with the Kuomintang in China a generation earlier is painfully exact: why shouldn't history also repeat itself in the sequel?); and finally, the propaganda force of Red China's success may lag behind their achievement, but lagging is different from non-existing."

Thus, the ruling class must: assure economic growth, be sure that Nehru's successor is to the Right of him, and generally stop social revolution--which is the only way promising the people a better life. War with China could help solve these problems--the move to the Right is a typical reaction to a war situation; American aid could help the economy; and an India-China war would make the Indian people less likely to see China as a country to emulate while the war--any war--would tend to reunify the people (behind the ruling classes, of course). The decision to have a border war with China was only somewhat a conscious one: "a ruling class always knows, instinctively as it were, the kind of actions and policies that are calculated to promote what it regards as its interests." Nehru and Krishna Menon--though "socialists at heart" and "men of good will"--can get the power and fame they undoubtedly desire only from the big bourgeoisie--besides, they believe they can reform the CP by staying in it--which they cannot.

The U.S.'s interests are obvious: trouble for China, and drawing India closer to the West and away from neutralism.

About the only possibility for solving the problem is an international peace conference much like the Geneva Conference on Indochina. dm

In "CUBA AND THE COLD WAR", in the March 1962 issue of Liberation magazine (4 Beekman St., NYC 38; 154), Leslie Dewar talks mostly about the Cold War. She says, "he says, don't start to worry about Soviet expansionism until the early '50--but with the Sputnik and other triumphs in space, Americans were suddenly jolted out of their feelings of invulnerability and the fear of Soviet expansionism became nearly universal (and panicked)."

Both the US and the Soviets have foreign policies based on determinism--Soviet as Marxist determinism being more florid than American ideologic determinism, the latter being rendered unnecessarily rigid by its belief not merely that the Soviets wish to expand their influence and power but that they must, because of their ideology. There can be no compromise--either total victory or permanently postponed war (through superior strength (there can be no consideration of losing to the Devil).

Soviet policy toward Cuba has been determined largely by the ups and downs of Soviet-American relations. During the first period of the Castro regime, feelings were warming and leading to the disastrous June 1960 summit, which didn't leave too good a taste in Khrushchev's mouth. But the accession to power of Kennedy boded new possibilities ("never fear to negotiate"), but the Cuban invasion of April '61--just as bad as the U-2 a year earlier--gutted those hopes (Castro defended himself with seven planes--none Soviet). A third time a detente was arranged--this time quietly and involving the functional partition of Germany at the Oder-Neisse--and agreed upon, but Kennedy reneged because Adenauer refused to accept it. This third example of American perfidy (as perceived by the Soviets) caused a re-evaluation of Soviet policy--a re-evaluation which is still going on. Clearly Kennedy could not keep his allies inline, and he was unable or unwilling to control domestic forces.

The Cuban crisis--in which the U.S. went it alone, except for the likes of Haiti--resulted in a diminution of U.S. leadership and a tendency toward isolationism which was quite to the U.S.'s liking. Another important result is that the U.S.

mb/29

accepts Cuban neutralism, and Cuba has the power (in the form of Soviet arms) to repel all save the fullest attack. It seems, concludes the author, that the Cuban crisis has started the U.S. on the way to really think about whether Soviet expansionism is negotiable. dm

C. WRIGHT MILLS: A HUMAN PORTRAIT: In issue #2 of Root and Branch (PO Box 906, Berkeley 1, Cal; 90¢) is an extraordinarily human portrait of Wright Mills, the virtual deity of the New Left, entitled "C. Wright Mills--The Last Six Months". I have been told by someone who knew Mills that this is also a quite accurate portrait.

The author, Saul Landau, met Mills in Havana and became his research assistant, traveling around the world with him and his family. He combines with the human portrait, a fine delineation of Mills's political views. The effect is such that one gets a feel for Mills as a total man which is extremely rare, even in personal contact.

All this reviewer can do is to urge the reader to send 90¢ to Root and Branch (or \$3½ for a year's subscription) and get issue #2; it's excellent virtually throughout. dm

NOTES ON THE NEW LEFT: "For too long radicals have been concerned only with problems of unemployment, physical hunger, economic crises, and imperialism. In other matters, they have been the puritans and the unfeeling. These are the radicals who don't want bohemians on their picket lines, as if it is only political dissent which is important. But it is important that the political radical be, in a sense, 'bohemian', for this means that his radicalism is concerned with the terrible things we do to each other as men, with the violence and cheapness of our lives, to the shoniness of relations, and to the frustrations of our finer instincts. These are the things that are terribly wrong with our society, and it is for radicals to project a social solution to them."

"We cannot simply brush aside [the] arguments [of a Toure, a Castro, or a Kruma] that, in this particular stage of their countries' development, man is made freer by a strong revolutionary government which has the power to pursue programs of economic reform, break the hold of the old ruling class, and with-

stand the aggression of foreign powers. The question is not how to construct the ideally free man under ideal conditions. The question is how to extend the freedom of the masses of Cubans in the face of the fantastic obstacles to their freedom which exist. I do not now want to argue that elections are always a hindrance to revolution and economic development, but I do want to suggest that they often are--and in the case of China, with its incredible problems of overpopulation and poor resources, or of Cuba, with its powerful adversaries, such is a very real possibility."

These are two quotes from an excellent article entitled "Notes on the New Left", by Robert Scheer, from issue #2 of Root and Branch (see above). It ranges from good comments about ivory tower-ish intellectuals (and their magazine products) on the left to even better comments about sectarians on the left. His sensitivity to issues about which we should be most sensitive, personally and politically, should be evident from the quotes. The article, though less flashy than the one on Mills, is even more of a lust. dm

Also in that issue of ROOT AND BRANCH are half a dozen more fine articles: two on Yugoslavia, a critique of the Soviet Draft Program, critical comments on West Side Story (the movie version) and Judgment at Nuremberg, The Early Marx and the Late Fromm, and more. An excellent issue. dm

A COLLECTION OF PEACE ARTICLES: The other day we received a review copy of a book called Changeover: the Drive for Peace, edited by Virginia Maeve (paperback; Allan Swallow, Denver, \$1.85). I haven't read the whole thing--it's a collection of articles from various publications of a temporary nature not readily available. As such it is uneven, but contains a lot of good stuff. Would especially recommend W. H. Ferry's "Caught on the Horn of Plenty". jm

"WE WANT TO BE": In the Monthly Review of January 1963 (333 6 Ave, NYC 14; 50¢) is the prepared text of a speech to be given by Mexican novelist Carlos Fuentes as part of a debate with U.S. Ass't Secretary of State Richard Goodwin. Unfortunately, the U.S. Embassy in Mexico didn't see fit to grant Fuentes a visa, and none of the U.S. mass circulation magazines were willing to print the speech. In parts it is extraordinary in its eloquence, and it is written as if spoken to an American by the Latin American masses. It must be read to be appreciated.

Latins, unlike nordeamericanos, have a background of feudalism overlaid by capitalism to contend with. Classical liberal laissez-faire capitalism resulted in single-crop countries relegated to that status by the international division of labor. Capitalism has not and cannot destroy the feudalism of the countryside.

Neither will the Alliance for Progress result in real land reform--how is one to expect a ruling class to give up the

\* \* \* \* \*

\$100

For SDS, financial crises involve such situations as not having \$5 to buy a roll of stamps. Thus, members and friends will understand something of what it means when we say that we have had to borrow over \$100 in order to pay for this Bulletin. Where that \$100+ will come from, we don't know; where the next such amount will come from for the next Bulletin is even more difficult to say.

Perhaps what we need more than anything else is communication from the people to whom the Bulletin goes--perhaps we need more than anything else to be told why they are not doing anything we suggest below, and how the National Staff and National Officers can function so as better to help other SDS members to manifest their concerns effectively. For without such activity on the part of SDS members, the organization cannot consider itself even the beginning of a "new left" movement in this country. As we mentioned in the last Bulletin, financial woes are usually as much or more the result of organizational problems as the cause of them. So our plea

basis for its class rule? Rather, the Alliance will be : by the governments. And the Alliance says nothing about foreign domination of Latin American economies. At Punta del Este V., the Alliance for Progress looked like the soft loincloth of naked intervention in favor of the concrete political and economic interests of the United States in Latin America."

As for the democracy and liberty that Americans seek for Latins and whose loss they bewail: The U.S., during its own revolution and first few years, did much of what it complains about in Cuba--without the hindrance of being "an exploited, illiterate hungry mass of people... A democracy cannot exist with empty stomachs, empty minds, and empty shacks. Democracy is not a cause; it is a result... [true revolution] means starting from the bottom and creating conditions that, at least will permit the exercise of democracy." Elections, democracy, free press, human rights are not being sacrificed; they never existed. The masses want concrete democracy, the destruction of old structures of ex-

\* \* \* \* \*

is for SDS members and friends to be in touch with the national office, not just with ideas but with news (this presupposes activity, which is what we're looking for), thoughts--but with money, too.

Now, about money:

1. If all members were to bring themselves up to date on their dues payments, a total of around \$750 would flow into (and, no doubt, rapidly out of) the office: of SDS's 600 members, about half have paid no dues this school year and over half of the rest owe for this semester.
2. Those who can afford it might dig down about \$5 worth more; a few members have done this, and though we haven't been acknowledging these "overpayments of dues" those members can be sure the contributions are greatly appreciated.
3. Chapters which are established can help doubly by making sure their members are paid and by finding ways of raising money locally.

ploitation--and they shall have them--  
"it no longer matters what you Americans do or do not do."

Misery among the Latin American masses is so horrible--and so clearly supported by the U.S. and, often, the trappings of democracy and liberty--that those masses could scarcely fear the Communists ("Ask those masses if they are afraid of help from the Soviet Union. Ask them if there is a single Soviet company in Cuba that exploits the Cuban economy for its own gain."): they fear "only their present oppressors...they prefer anything that might mean a change."

The underdeveloped countries might dissolve the bipolarization of the world, and they might be aided by the amazing force of science, which offers to all, without discrimination or distinction, the possibility to achieve "a truly human life".

What do we (Latin Americans) want? "... We want progress that is real, not the unjust lie of today. We want to be... We want to be free of slavery,, and we want to save you from a destiny worse than that of the slave: that of the lord, the master. dm

A CALL TO THOUGHT: "Our best minds on the left have turned from the labor movement to the areas where they have

prospects of emotional and intellectual<sup>mb/31</sup> integration. Many have joined the peace and civil rights movements because they are at least appreciated in these fields and because they are convinced that these struggles have superceded the old ones in importance. They have been persuaded that the major agencies of social change in America lies not within the working class and its organizations. On the weight of the evidence, they see labor as unsympathetic to the aims of the peace and civil rights movements, and at times even antagonistic."

Starting with this divorce, Stanley Aronowitz, in an article printed both in the Village Voice (Feb. 28) and New America (March 12), calls for radical intellectuals to consider the way in which economic factors play such a crucial role in the whole society, the impending catastrophe implied in automation, and to deal once again with the questions of concern with the labor movement. National representative for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, he is aware of the labor movement's reluctance to consider radical alternatives today and suggests that it is the role of the intellectual to identify with labor and help it find its vision. jm

Clip and send to: Students for a Democratic Society, 112 E. 19 St., NYC 3, NY  
Name .....School & Yr. ....  
Mailing Address .....  
Permanent Address .....

- \_\_\_ I wish to join (see below) and enclose ( ) \$1 initiation + ( ) \$1/semester dues.
- \_\_\_ I am a member. Enclosed are ( ) \$1 last semester's dues; ( ) \$1 this semester's dues
- \_\_\_ I wish to contribute to SDS: \$ enclosed; \$ pledged on \_\_\_\_\_ (date).
- \_\_\_ Send me information on SDS and mailings for two months.
- \_\_\_ Send me a Port Huron Statement. (25¢ to cover costs is appreciated.)
- \_\_\_ Send me a literature list.
- \_\_\_ I am a member and need a membership card ( ) and/or a constitution ( ).
- \_\_\_ I would like to do volunteer work in the office. My phone \_\_\_\_\_

\* \* \* \* \*  
"Membership In the SDS is open to students, faculty and others who share the commitment of the organization to democracy as a means and as a social goal.

"SDS is an organization of democrats. It is civil libertarian in its treatment of those with whom it disagrees, but clear in its opposition to any totalitarian principle as a basis for government or social organization. Advocates or apologists for such a principle are not eligible for membership.

CORRESPONDENCE SECTION

The following correspondence originated in response to Lynn Pful's article in the last Discussion Bulletin, entitled "the least dishonorable failure."

Dear Lynn,

I think you have some imperfectly articulated and perhaps unrealized but quite valid criticisms of the Port Huron Statement. However, the way you criticize the document makes your criticisms less likely to be treated seriously. I think that in taking the statements of what should be as statements of believed-soon-possible-national-policy, you are making a grave error; they were certainly not meant to be soon realizable goals but rather almost utopian statements of distant goals. Treated as such puts them in more proper perspective than you do. However, I think you have pointed toward a problem in the content and tone of those who wrote the document (as well as those who approved it)--viz., a tendency to want to be in the power elite and to wield the power rather than to create an entirely new society and structure. Perhaps the clearest example of this is the bit you point out about the corporations--it never came over clearly to me before in reading the PHS a couple of times that we don't want democratic corporations--that's idiotic to expect--we want no corporations at all. (At least I do.) But again I must say that you confuse an at-this-time unattainable value or goal (such as a "good" American policy toward underdeveloped countries) with a belief (which SDSers do not hold, I don't think) that such a value or goal can be immediately accepted. Saying that we're for something doesn't mean that we think everyone else will be for it soon, too.

A few specifics: (1) I don't think that it is "proven" that majority participation cannot ever work by showing that the American public is easily swayed by its Government. It's sort of like saying in 1500 that capitalism could never work, because it had never existed. To be sure, the reaction of the American public to the Berlin and Cuban crises has some very sobering things to say about democracy; but it is no absolute and concrete proof of democracy's absolute ineffectiveness. (2) Your assertion that "repression and violence increase in direct proportion to the amount of dedication and courage shown by the few actual activists" may well be true for a quite small number--but will it be true as that number grows considerably? The psychological question of how a dominant caste or class reacts to upsurges from the dominated is more moot, I suspect, than you imply. After all, increased strength of militancy may, in some situations, bring the support of the so-called "moderates". (3) The NAA may be bourgeoisified, but it has not been totally ineffective. (4) The problem of whether voter registration is wasted because it means incorporation of the Negro into the System is not answered by your polemic. It is, of course, an extremely serious question; Tom Kahn wrote a paper for the Chapel Hill conference last May which eventually became an LSG paper--"The Political Significance of the Freedom Riders" dealing with this and saying that the Kennedy Administration was trying to "take over" the radical civil rights movement by incorporating the Negroes into the DP--undoubtedly this is true. But the voter registration campaign seems to me an opportunity to radicalize the Negro rather than incorporate him into the System; much depends, I suspect, on the ideology behind action rather than the form of action. The only alternative, it seems, to eventually voting people in and/or out of office is (armed?)

rev 1961 --i can real revolution--taking over the city halls and post offices and private businesses, etc.--not just sitting in. What alternative did you have in mind? (5) I doubt very much that the peace movement's war-mongering enemies (e.g. the Administration) are engendering internal factionalism; it happens all by itself, and the forces (aside from the more basic societal forces which shape individuals' psychologies, which aren't at all conscious) causing it are not externally manipulated.

You must admit yours is a fundamentally extremely negative statement--and, in a sense, i quite agree both with your negativeness and with your apparent lack of ability to suggest an alternative and/or a means of being effective in the face of tremendous power in the hands of our enemies.

Don McKelvey

Dear Don,

First the general point you made. Perhaps I did not make it clear in my article, but I believe that these goals are not only now unattainable but always will be for the reasons I mentioned. Now the specifics. (1) 99% of the American public is unbelievably stupid and thus will believe whatever drivel is presented to them. Since the conservative power structure controls what is laughingly called "education" plus all means of communications, it is their brand of insanity which will prevail. Majority participation is thus unattainable, and any program to which the majority gave assent would thus be suspect. Because of this massive stupidity, control of a new left must rest in the hands of an intelligent and really educated elite, chosen for their demonstrated competence. (2) It is clearly and simply irrational to expect any significant increase in the amount of those who are actually activists. This contention is substantiated by history. Those with courage and conviction have always stood alone against the witch burners. It is also substantiated by biology which demonstrates the rarity of the exceptionally intelligent. Even supposing that militancy will increase in strength provides however no support for your contention that such a militancy will bring the support of the so-called moderates. An illustration indicative of the fallacy of this reasoning is the fact that when the Negroes decided that they didn't need the white moderates who had previously decided for him when and how he should be free, these moderates either became segregationists or crawled back into the woodwork and were never heard from again. The next specific. (3) The NAACP is Hopeless! Just try to work with them. (4) Your contention that whether the Negro is incorporated into the System or radicalized depends on the ideology of action is true. There is still however the question of what ideologies are being advocated to the Negro. SCLC, the major voter registration organization, accepts the system unquestioningly, as do the NAACP, CORE, SCEF, and most of the others. Even SNCC still presents no alternative to the system to the Negro voter. You are right in saying that the only alternative is armed revolution. This is not quite my thinking however, because the crackers have full control of the military, and such a revolution would be over before it started. Rather my thoughts were directed to an armed guerilla type of attack a la Robert Williams and his statement advocating retaliatory lynching where necessary. Really I didn't have too much of an alternative in mind because there isn't any. (5) I admit that there is much to do it yourself factionalism in the peace movement also elsewhere. Also I think that there are few

corr/3

(though some) System finks sent in to destroy the peace movement. The opposition is much more clever than that. They simply and purposely and consciously engender a mass psychosis about Communism, and the individuals in the peace movement respond to it in varying degrees. Thus redbaiting and witch hunting (evidence: SDS Constitution. Also the SAHE episode). The purposes of the opposition are thus accomplished as the peace movement haggles over who to admit, and whether to attend such and such a conference while the bombs pile higher and higher.

I admit quite readily that my statement is negative. There isn't any other orientation which takes reality into account. The reason that I don't suggest an alternative or a means of being effective is that there isn't any.

Lynn

Dear Lynn,

I'm afraid i must repeat myself when i say that to note (correctly) that the present American public can be easily manipulated by the forces of the status quo is not equivalent to saying that all people everywhere will always be incapable of (a) having much more control over what happens to their lives (to the extent that they can, psychologically speaking, actually "control" things) and (b) making decisions which you and/or i consider to be correct ones. My feeling, very roughly, is that men as individuals have the capability of much individual development if only society is organized so as to promote that development. That they are now manipulated only indicates a certain organization of society. Now, i must agree with your pessimism about being able to overthrow that mode of organizing society and replace it with a more human one--but this is because of our weakness and the System's fundamental effectiveness in the socialization process, not because men are inherently stupid. Secondly, while it is true that control of the New Left does lie in the hands of a few (more precisely, the New Left is a few), the function of the New Left is to help individuals to develop their ability level and to raise their level of social and political consciousness so that constantly more individuals are capable of being part of the "elite."

I would use the same line of argument to counter your statement that only a few are biologically capable of being activists (i assume you mean "activist" in a pretty broad sense). If only we could free just a fraction of the abilities in each individual, we'd have plenty of capable revolutionaries. Again, the problem is in the level of social/political consciousness and the System's efficacy in socializing.

There's a difference between saying that the NAA has never done anything worth while (rather, "is totally ineffective")--which you do in your article--and saying that you can't work with them. For instance, the NAA was, i understand, very important in the 1954 Brown case in the Supreme Court; certainly you can't say that that decision has had no effect on anything.

In general--and i do not mean to repeat myself--i too fear that in general too many good potential revolutionaries (not necessarily violent) will be drawn into the System, and with them (or without them, probably) the masses. I'm not sure what to do about this, for as soon as the most blatant injustices disappear--whether they be segregation or economic depravity--the vast majority of men will want more of the good material things of life--and that's one thing that America has to offer.

So...what's to be done?

Don

Dear Don,

My statement about Americans being manipulatable was intended to apply only to Americans, but I believe that, doubling the IQ to speak in terms of the rest of the world, the results are still pitiful. Even in ideal conditions how much control can an individual exercise, emprisoned by his environment and heredity. It is debatable, but I believe that no individual has any choice about anything, and that the phenomenon considered to be choice is really only indicative of the fact that the individual is acting in response to conscious rather than unconscious desires caused by his past and surroundings. Then too, there is the question of whether the common low grade and insensitive moron should have any control of anything beyond the simplest elements of his own life in areas where others are not affected. Because the greatest possible development for the average human is low, as little impediment as possible and as much inducement as possible ought to be exercised to attain as much of this potential as possible, but even under the best of conditions this development will never be very great. (2) Why are we so weak? Because we are an intelligent but powerless few. Why is the System strong? Because they are a shrewd and powerful but insensitive few able to control millions of beings with only sub normal intelligence and a lust for agression. That these people are manipulated indicates a social organization and the fact that they are manipulatable - because they are stupid. The goal you set for the New Left is perhaps unrealistic, because there are not enough more people capable of joining the elite to make such a project worthwhile. You mention freeing the revolutionary potential. I contend that there is no such potential. It is a curious and often unhappy minority which does possess such potential, and the combination of intelligence, idiotic perserverence, dedication, and sheer insanity is much too rare to justify a recruitment project. The really competent, intelligent and dedicated do not need to be sought out and begged. They manage to find their way, sometimes with much unhappiness which eliminates those who would fail under pressure to what must be done and to those who are doing it. (3) I agree that the NAACP has produced a few results accidently along the way. But the nature of the organization renders it incapable of the mandatory change necessary to achieve any kind of at least 3/4 assed society. The Brown case declared segregated schools unconstitutional, and the Negroes of Prince Edward County have had no public schools for three years. The NAACP is an organization with bourgeoise goals and bourgeoise means to attain these goals. It is also a means of asserting himself for the Negro in place of the assertion with society denies him, and because of this it is much more important to the NAACP Negro to obtain the chairmanship of a committee than to accomplish anything with the committee other than giving dinners, raising funds, and giving himself plaques. The NAA gives him a means of having his cake and eating it too, of being the great black father while keeping his long black cadillac. They are too terrified of losing their bourgeoise standing to do anything that would accomplish anything. (4) What's to be done? What can be done that would be effective? Nothing.

Lynn

Dear Lynn,

We seem to be getting down to basic issues. How do you know--especially since you, like me, are an environmental determinist--that what you perceive

corr/5

to be man's worthlessness is due to some inherent quality rather than to the incredibly awful material and social conditions under which men have always lived? The question is not rhetorical--you may well be right that most (all?) men just aren't worth it. But, then, why continue to fight for Negroes' rights if not because, lurking way down deep someplace, you don't really believe (not intellectually but viscerally) that it must be worth it.

It seems to me that a case could be made for the notion that, given the awful material/social conditions i mention above, the occasional flashes of humanity and ability that individuals show indicates much, not little, hope--that there are great untapped reserves of potential which have never had a chance to be made manifest. Our scientific knowledge is really so limited that the whole thing is a matter of faith--but how continue if not on faith?

Again: i don't see why you--i mean you as an individual--continue to struggle if you feel it's absolutely certain that it is worthless to the common man, who is now and forever a low grade and insensitive moron. You must feel otherwise (the "must" is a point of intellectual, not psychological, logic). But it seems to me that the best way to bring out whatever potential individuals and mankind have--while recognizing the considerable evil in men, or rather in their actions, and degradation, and moronicness--is to seek out and cultivate that potential--to treat them like human beings as much as is psychologically possible.

Don

Dear Don,

I quite concede that mans' generally uninspiring nature is not a product of inherent evil but of his environment. This is largely an irrelevant distinction, however, because change in these conditions can only be in the direction of further deterioration. Cuba and the developing nations are indications to the contrary, but even there the individuals directing the new society have been produced by the old and are subject to all its degrading possibilities. As for the great untapped reserves or potential you mention one might say that such characteristics are the vestige of a finer individual who has been corroded, thus indicating that this is all that is left, rather than that there are further reserves. One might also say that there may exist this potential. Potential, however, is meaningless without development, and the conditions of society are not now and will not be conducive to such development. As for continuing, there is really no good reason. There is only the feeling of guilt which would result from acquiescing to evil without fighting it.

Sometimes I don't see why I continue to struggle either. But when I do, I think that I continue for two reasons. The first is that when someone else is getting screwed, I may be next on the list, and I have a distinct aversion to getting screwed, either sociologically, economically, or politically. The second is that continuing to struggle satisfies certain psychological needs I have, so that it would be harder not to continue. I have to do something with each day, and continuing the struggle both occupies the time, and might possibly lessen the first condition. In the specific instance a psychologist might surmise that it inflates my ego to be the only white female in an otherwise all Negro organization, that I derive a certain satisfaction from my activities. And while these satisfactions are not detestable neither are they especially admirable. So my activities are oriented primarily toward myself than toward others, and I do what I do for myself rather than for them.

Lynn

Dear Lynn,

As you know, I tend to agree with your pessimistic estimates of what is likely (not) to happen, but I am intellectually unsatisfied with the categorical and assertive nature of your arguments. Why is change likely to be in the direction of further deterioration? Is that something you just feel in your gut, or do you have some sort of social/political analysis which results in that belief?

You seem to be being Rousseauian--noble savage corrupted and all that; is so? I rather disagree, and would be more Frommian than Freudian about the effects of civilization on man; it does indeed hold out hopes.

Don

Dear Don,

Change is likely to be in the direction of further deterioration because, in America, the nature of the warfare state leaves no other alternative. As long as this country retains its position of dominance over Western Europe, suppresses Latin America, "supports democracy" in Asia, and attempts to implement its policy of neo-colonialism in Africa, having already reduced Liberia to an American colony, perspectives for the rest of the world are apt to be equally encouraging. The nature of the warfare state is destruction, and destruction is its ultimate result.

When I spoke of the effects of civilization on man, I was speaking of the effects of present civilization, not that civilization which would be desirable, and was in no way stating that civilization per se was responsible for man's present condition. I do not contend that the basic nature of man is either good or evil, but that, the influence of heredity granted, man is rendered either good or bad by the nature of his environment. The fact that 99 and 44/100% of mankind are finks is due not to the presence of evil in his inherent nature, but to the evil inherent in his present social, political, and economic systems.

Lynn

\*\*\*\*\*

#### DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

The following is an excerpt from a letter by National Secretary Jim Monson to Jed Johnson, National Chairman of the Young Adult Council:

"...we are in favor of the principle of large numbers of volunteers working to alleviate some of the major social ills of our society. The government ought to support these efforts and finance them. However, in reading over the study documents (prepared by the government) and judging from the way that the Peace Corps has been used, we have two reservations. The first is that it will be used politically as a support for the Democratic Party, much as the Peace Corps has been used as an instrument of American Foreign Policy rather than for its own sake. And the second is that the document as presented shows total avoidance of facing the real problem, i.e. the conditions that create these major social problems. Attack on the roots of the problem as well as the symptoms is absolutely necessary. Insofar as the National Service Corps treats symptoms in such a way as to avoid treating root problems, we would be opposed to it; insofar as it is supplemental to genuine attempts at other levels, we would support it."

The balance of the DPC correspondence is between Marcia Kirkpatrick of/NSA staff and Don McKelvey:

Dear Marcia: What do you people down there think of this Domestic Peace Corps idea? I'm a little skeptical, I must say; first, from a practical point of view, since people who want to become social workers can simply become social workers,

though admittedly it's nice to have Federal backing on something like that; second, from a radical point of view, since this may serve to take the edge off concern for radical social change in this country, which I feel is necessary in order adequately to deal with the problems which assumedly a DPC would deal with. Just thoughts....it may turn out (if it becomes) to be a good thing.

Don

Dear Don: Most people here are pretty enthused about the DPC. I have many doubts, myself, though on slightly different basis than yours. Although I'm still working for it, I think that radical social change in this country is practically an impossibility as long as the laborer would rather cling to the (mistaken) dream that he or his son might someday be president of U.S. Steel. I think that the DPC, with the right approach, might introduce some revolutionary social ideas to people who simply don't connect social reform with government action. My main grip against the present plans for the DPC is the ("local autonomy" proposal. It seems to me that entrenched castes will not invite the corps because of fear that the education, awareness, etc., it might bring would upset the social apple cart. Areas which are in the most desperate need might well refuse the DPC because they are too egotistic to admit that they are a depressed area. I think that there is a lot to be said for nabbing people who are young to work actively in some sort of social work--especially people who do not plan to make a career of it.

Marcia

Dear Marcia: You seem to be saying that radical social change can come about through government action (assumedly not consciously on the government's part). I doubt it, certainly with this Administration, since JFK is smart enough to incorporate enough of the "Left" into the Establishment to take the edge off radical appeals (e.g. Stevenson, Bowles, the DPC). Now I won't allow myself to paint myself into a corner by saying that the DPC is a Bad Thing. But to the extent that it does what you say--introduce ideas and experiences to individuals which may very well be sure to radicalize them--it's a Good Thing. But to the extent that it only goes so far and no farther--and says that it's gone as far as is necessary--and thereby fails to radicalize potential revolutionaries, it has a bad effect. And it's tough as hell to attack something like the Foreign Peace Corps (or the DPC) (or the Alliance for Progress, though that's easier; see Monthly Review of Jan. '63), which looks pretty "far out" (and is, in relation to what's been done previously) and good and is, in a limited sense. Lenin said (back in the 1880's or so, when he was in his early twenties) that particular circumstances determined whether a particular relief of workers' conditions (e.g. shorter hours) or a particular heightening of their misery was likely to lead to a raising of the proletariat's consciousness. It's the same thing here, I suspect; two kids could go into the DPC, and one comes out an Establishment, and the other an ardent revolutionary.

Your point about "local autonomy"; I don't share your fears on this. It's to the advantage of the local politician to provide more services for his constituents (and that's how this is likely to be perceived by the constituents--at least the politicians and JFK will do their best to make it look that way); I rather suspect that his power is, in general, sufficiently well-entrenched to withstand quite minor tendencies to upset the apple cart. And I rather doubt that egotism has much to do with it; there's too much political gain involved in Federal handouts.

Perhaps you're right that I'm too concerned about people's selling out to the System--but so many have done it.

Don

The following correspondence is from Ronnie Somerlott, a baker's apprentice in Colville, Wash.--it consists of answers to questions in letters to him.

Q--"I've been told by Washingtonians that at least some parts of the State tend to be quite conservative because of the influence of heavy defense spending; is this true where you are?"

A--This section of the state is conservative--period, not because of defense spending (that section would probably lie over on the coast). Sometimes I believe that this is widely over-played, Sure, it might affect the local political climate a little; but you will also find the most liberal sections of the DP in Seattle, where the Boeings Co. is located.

Q--"I'd be very interested to know just what sort of things--political, economic, social--interest and concern young people just starting out to work at what are usually called blue collar jobs--that sort of perspective we rarely get in SDS, and we need more of it."

A--This is a very hard question for me to answer, I suppose they would be more interested in bread and butter issues, and only the things that would affect them. It would be rather difficult for them to take any interest in a theoretical study, as they neither have the time nor the opportunity to put it to use if they would. As parents and employees they can't take too strong a stand for fear of losing their jobs or displeasing one of their friends. In my discussions with people in this area, outside of students or liberals, I've found they look at foreign affairs only as it affects the United States. For example, the recent election of a Democratic socialist in <sup>the</sup> Dominican Republic only means one thing to them--another Castro, or Communist. They don't see any differences between Communism and Socialism, and they will not because they rely on the press, radio and TV for their information. Even when someone like Howard K. Smith comes along, it's simple--he's a Communist or Radical. You may laugh, but it's true! Anyone who stands against War, unemployment, extreme anti-Communism, civil liberties for Communists and other left wingers or right wingers, or dares to stand against the establishment in any way, well..you know the answer--he's a big mouth, worry wart, radical etc. etc.

I've written so much already I hate to write more but have you heard about the breakaway from the Democratic Party here in the State House of Representatives? Seven Democrats joined with the minority 48 Republicans to elect the conservative Democrat Day as speaker, and they control the House completely. Day appointed the chairmen for the various committees and the loyal Democrats would not accept the appointments, so we had a stand still for quite some time. The only bill they passed was their pay checks. The Dixiecrat-Republican combo is beginning to ram their policy through the House now. The loyalists are fighting mad. Day, from Spokane, the leader of the Dixiecrats, led a walkout at the 1962 state convention over the platform, which was too liberal for him and his friends. The main issue in this fight at present is not the platform, but private vs. public power. In the last session of the House the private power forces attempted to pass a bill that would have weakened the public power system, in various parts of the state. O'Brien, then the speaker, was chairman of the Committee in which it came up; and by using his powers, it never reached the floor. Thus when he ran for speaker again this year they nailed him to the mat. Day gave the Republicans good representation on the redistricting committee and the very important Ways and Means committee; also, by putting enough Anti Labor Democrats on the Labor Committee, he assured domination by a coalition of Anti-Labor Democrats and Republicans. One of Day's supporters, McCormack--also of Spokane--is a member and official of the Steelworkers Union. I'm surprised he would back Day on this, Also, Day himself isn't really anti-labor, but maybe McCormack's stand can be explained by this: the Steelworkers are attempting to take over the bargaining rights of the miners in this area from the United Mine Mill and Smelter Workers Union, using Anti-Communism as its main reason. McCormack also walked out of the

State Convention, and was the leader of the group of legislators who demanded that Communist leader Gus Hall not be allowed to speak at any of the State-supported schools on school property or buildings. This was done! Of course, this goes on and on.

Ronnie Somerlott

Q--"You say the unions are weak around where you are." (1) How come? (2) Have there been any attempts to unionize? (3) If so, what happened? (4) Or is it just that there aren't that many unionizable people around? (5) Do you think there's a need for unions there?

A--I'll skip (1) for the moment and deal with the others, which should answer it. If after dealing with the others I feel my answers on the others haven't, I'll come back to it. (2) Yes, there have been attempts and just last summer there were two. The first was a strike which ended up by the company's selling the mill to an Alaska JuneCo. for scrap metal; the mill was torn down. The second was a vote to see if the workers at another mill wanted to join a union; it lost. Have thought of two more cases; while in school, during the summer months I worked at a sawmill. It seems two of the men working there wanted to form a Union and were talking to the others about this. Well, someone told the boss and that was the last we saw them. The other case concerns our neighbor, and good friend, who has invented some type of dry cleaning device and has opened two shops for its manufacture. Well, somehow an election had to be held for or against a union. The union lost, and he tried to find out who caused the election to be held--he didn't. I know for a fact that if the election had gone pro-union, he was planning to move the whole thing to Oregon.

(3) is answered above. (4) This is partly true; there are not too many. The lumber industry is in bad trouble financially, and this would be the main source of union members. Farming is still number one up here, with Government work second. (5) Yes, sir, I do! First, we have one of the lowest per capita incomes in the state; unions, I feel, would up the income not only of its members but in areas of our entire economy. Small business would be better, which is very important to an area such as this. Also, it might give us a new lease on life by destroying (partly) our dependence on farming. Mining has a good future here, but there is NO market price to make it worthwhile. And I like the things that seem to follow strong unionization--namely, unionization, mainly political action, which I would hope would be liberal and thus a great help in turning this from a Conservative backward area into a progressive liberal area. And they are badly needed here in Eastern Washington.

Ronnie S.

On the turning down of the unions hereabouts, I would not say for sure--but as a guess and only a guess, I would say (1) the general conservatism of the workers in this area; (2) fear of losing their jobs; (3) the state of the localities economy is very bad, with unemployment 24.9% at present, which is very good for up here--at times it gets to 50% and over. Lumber, the mainstay as far as workers go, is in bad shape--Canadian imports, you know.

Ronnie

\*\*\*\*\*

The following letter is from Dave Russell of Harpur C. (NY) to PREP Director Dick Flacks.

3-17-63

Dear Dick,

Your criticism of the Peace Seminar is a good one and as the seminar progresses I am feeling the effects of little material on foreign policy more and more. We tend to get into these issues very quickly and because there was no reading on them discussion is rather naive. Some information for future seminars: don't try to get undergrads to read so much. My syllabus includes only about 60 pages a

week but even that is too long and the readings too dry. There should be some way to integrate detail with the emotion that unsophisticates like to see in peace issues. The best idea for the future that I have been able to come up with is

this. Make the assignments just one hefty article a week and plan on two people to start the show, one arguing for and the other against. This introduces conflict and satisfies the emotion. Then there should be at least two other people in the group to do either or both of the following: prepare a list of supplementary readings in books, magazines and journals and get ahold of one or two of the millions of pamphlets that are around which deals with the subject under discussion and provide them at cost. In addition, whenever possible, bring speakers to the seminar to participate in discussion. For example, Mulford Sibley visited the campus and sat in on our seminar as did Charles Walker from the AFSC, and maintain a continual flow of faculty members attending by invitation only. Another thing that I did which could work at other places, too, is to invite two local ministers, who are sympathetic to sit in as permanent members (this gives the group a lot of respectability).

Now, to what is going on. The Peace Seminar is in its fourth week and ranging in attendance between 12 and 16. The pace is too slow and it is becoming somewhat boring. The people change from week to week, with four or five regular members. I am presently trying to get someone committed to continuing the thing next year. If I have time, I will draw up a request to the faculty that a course be established integrating the social sciences in attacking the problems of peace.

The establishment of the peace seminar stimulated a number of students to start a peace action group. That will formally be accomplished within the next two weeks. As a suggestion for projects that need action, I drew up a list of ideas that I knew of. (See DB section) The action on my part gave me an idea for PREP. It would be great if you could stimulate a circular list of ideas for action (both action and research) amongst SDS members and groups. It could be continually added to and criticized and might grow into a very useful item.

The attitude study that I mentioned to you is well under way. The questionnaire is presently being mimeoed. It appears to be very satisfactory. It is an extension of a survey done by Putney and Middleton and reported in the American Soc. Review of Oct. '62. We are getting people's attitudes toward war and correlating them with geographical and family background, feelings of conformity and alienation, effects of media, religion and a few others.

The beginnings of a political party are starting around campus. There are five or six students who are interested and yesterday began working to construct a smaller version of SDS. They may even affiliate sometime. But they are depending for leadership upon me and I neither have the time nor will I be around in the future. Any material they might use would be appreciated. I donated the SDS paper on political parties as well as everything else I had (PHS). They want to develop a philosophy, a program, and a plan of action to make it into a permanent party both outside and in the student government. That is what is happening on campus. But just in the area of peace. The Civil Rights Club just finished a fund drive for NSM and SNCC, netting \$800. They also had John H. Griffin speaking here last week. They are beginning a program of community involvement centered around the tutorial program. They are soliciting a group of sponsors involving big people in the area and working on a pledge campaign for the housing bill before the New York State Legislature. Four or five students are going to be working on NSM projects this summer....

Dave.

corr/ll

Some more comments (but undoubtedly not the last) on the newspaper strike:

From Jim Williams, of the U. of Louisville--

Dear Jim,

I have a few comments to make re: the discussion about the NY newspaper strike and the "Divine Right of Labor."

Firstly, I miss the NY TIMES. I wish that I could still pick it up at the library and get "The Word" on what's happening. From a selfish point of view--I wish there wasn't a strike and that I could enjoy the pleasures of James Reston again.

BUT, and this is an important "but", I am also union. I still pay my dues regularly. I've been a member of the AFGE, AFL-CIO, and was on the staff of IUE #761 here and edited their paper. Likewise, I'm involved in this strike at Hazard, where I'm helping the "wildcatters" against the UMWA.

So, my immediate and automatic response is for labor. Yet, as in the case of Hazard, I don't let labels or tags deter me from doing what I think is right. The local AFL-CIO here won't help the strikers in Hazard because they don't want to damage their relations with the UMWA. I can't accept that position--I am on the side of the strikers and thus opposed to the UMWA and the AFL-CIO in this instance. I think we have to judge these things pragmatically--although, like you, Jim, I wouldn't publicly denounce the ITU if I didn't agree with their demands, out of respect and Brotherhood. (I would criticise the ILGWU for discrimination, however.)

Here in the south, we have an especially bad situation. Often, local TUs are blatantly anti-Negro, etc., especially in the building trades. One reason why I don't use union printers for what New South Review jobs we have, is that the local printer's union won't admit Negro printers. So, I use a non-union Negro printer for my work. If I have to choose between the Negroes and the Union, I stand with the Negroes.

I am disgusted by much that goes on in many unions. I hate the graft and corruptness and downright pettyness of some of their leaders. (The AFL-CIO certainly has nothing on Hoffa!) Yet, most of all, I'm disappointed with the rank-and-file. They, conceivably, can change things--yet, they don't.

But, I think the labor movement holds the key to the future of democratic reform in this country.

I think the labor movement is society for the most part. I believe that whatever benefits labor benefits the nation as a whole. The majority of people are workers, not middle-class intellectuals--and any attempt by us to impose middle-class ideas etc. upon them is certainly undemocratic. I would take issue with Brewster Kreen on this subject. Brewster would seem to imply that we could do quite well without the working class, etc., and for labor to advance itself "leads inevitably to a totalitarian conclusion". I wouldn't expect this from Brewster, or a representative of the FOR.

I would think any trend to shut the SDS off from the labor movement would be tragic/indeed. The role of the SDS, as I see it, is to play a leading part in the labor movement and the various social movements. We are the representatives of the labor movement on the campus. We can play no continuing role in society unless we make this clear distinction. As college students who will probably end up in the "professions" I think we must be doubly aware of this. It is in the white-collar fields where the labor movement needs friends so badly. We can break down some of the barriers between labor and the white-collar worker if we keep

As for the NY strike in particular, I would support it. (Still grumbling because I miss the TIMES), but, I doubt if I'd be out picketing, etc., since they seem to be doing o.k. by themselves. The Hospital Workers needed help badly and were glad to get it. The ITU doesn't and we'd just be in the way. I would issue a statement supporting the ITU, however.

I can cry no tears about the POST. If it were so "liberal" it wouldn't participate in a lock-out, the greasiest tool in the bosses' box. Besides, Mrs. FDR is gone anyway, you can read Rempton in the New Republic. Besides, the Village Voice is a lot better than the POST--who has time to read a daily paper anyway?

Anyway, we should get this straight. SUSis pro-labor, period. Sure, we'll criticize and raise hell generally, but, when the chips are down--we know what side we're on.

Jim

From Todd Gitlin, former chairman of TOCSIN at Harvard:

Dear Jim,

It would seem to be gilding the lily--or the goldenrod?--for me to try to add to the rather fruitful exchange on the NY newspaper strike/lockout in Bulletin #3; those issues not explicitly touched upon in the correspondence are, I think, fairly evident and easily deduced from the written words. Moreover, since I am (or should be) working beaver-like on my thesis, I wouldn't in any case have time to attempt substantive comments. All this is by way of introduction to some questions, sparked by the discussion, that I think we ought to ponder and write about.

1. Does it make sense to talk about a "Commonweal" (Mary Varela) unless the objective relationships among groups in society is perceived by them--more than perceived, understood (Verstehen--Max Weber's usage), integrated into the personal or class Gestalt? That is, Is there a community of men if men don't think there is?

2. How much community is community? That is, if six of us are cohesive, loving, humane, etc., and the rest of society is fractionated, anomic, bitchy, etc., is the community we live adequate for the preservation of those values without which we would rather live elsewhere? If so, is it possible "to have a society organize and progress without community" where that society (or a segment of it) has obtained its community by killing or exiling or expropriating others (or another segment)? (The quote is from Mary's letter.) Is the Cuban situation a case of the latter hypothesized situation?

3. (This is not, appearance, contrary, offered facetiously.) Might not the newspaper strike contribute to some real community by leaving subway travelers nothing to do but relate to each other? by depriving them of malevolent editorials, misleading "news", and other obstacles to genuine human feeling? If we think that the newspapers don't tell ~~xxx~~ people "what's what", why don't we leap into the vacuum by distributing material we think is relevant to their lives?

4. Is the IT Local 6 as democratic as Lipset et al give us to believe? If so, and if local democracy is crucial to community, is the strike--in the long run--a "bad" thing? If local union community does exist to some extent, does my question 2 apply?

5. Is it possible for us to apply our full knowledge and understanding to the de-

fense or criticism of the strike before we see what comes out of it (how many and which, if any, papers fold; what the ITU comes out with and how it bears on taming automation and putting it to human purposes; etc.)?

6. In the end, should criticism of, say, the union demand that members be allowed to set dummy type, be focused on a system which permits of no more fruitful labor, rather than on the union that seeks, perhaps shortsightedly, to keep men at work? (This may seem to be a leading question. It is.)

7. How is this system changed, and to what? By asking this question, in which both halves are essential, I am asking us to be utopian in the best sense: to ask what is essential, and what merely transitory; to think not only of "who's friends and who's enemies" but of who is doing what, and whether that leads us toward, or away from, our vision; to look at long-term as well as short-term outcomes of social phenomena; to draw our own conclusions about the nature of the motives of the actors making up those phenomena (good? evil? misguided but reparable?), and to consider how important motives--and community--are in the light of our utopian vision.

Despite the vagueness of these formulations, I think it is incumbent upon us as people who call ourselves radicals to think about these questions, among many others, for if I am not mistaken they cut to the very guts of what we are all about.

S. J.

Cheers, Todd

The following letter is from the Assistant National Secretary Don McKelvey

Dear Editor,

Just a few undoubtedly disjointed notes in response to the many letters on the New York strike.

To be sure, we should all identify with people who (a) are economically exploited in the sense of not receiving what they have due to them and, more important (b) are humanly exploited and dehumanized by being forced to sell themselves for money. It is in this sense that I would identify with labor--regardless of the issue. But we must recognize--as I'm sure we do--that labor leaders do not necessarily act in the (either subjective or objective) interests of the masses they're leading; though I suspect that during a dispute with management they are more likely to act in the workers' interests than at other times, even if due to nothing more than objective circumstances.

Second, I would very strongly criticize the leaders of Big Six for their clear lack of class-consciousness (i.e. for not looking out for laborers as a class) in accepting the terms they did on automation--to do no more than assure that current workers would be protected against lay-offs but to do nothing about assuring work for future laborers not now on the job. I would tend to emphasize the automation question much more than the various correspondents did; it can usher in a Brave New World (my guess) or a human society. That labor leaders (and management, also, of course) see the question in terms of economic things like jobs and hours and not in human terms is a most unfortunate comment upon their lack of vision and concern and upon our society.

But I am more concerned with the question of "identifying" with one side or the other in what is admittedly a class struggle. It is true that workers are oppressed economically--but in the only--or even the worst--form of oppression in this

society? I would say, No, that the dehumanization and alienation of all men (regardless of class) is the most important problem, and that we must--while recognizing the existence of economic (and thereby social and political) class conflict--identify with all humanity. (Here i would refer readers to pp. 11 & 29 of the MB section of this Bulletin, to Noel Day's and Robert Scheer's comments respectively; they are most apropos.) Fortunately, as we know, we have, for the first time in history, the material and technical base to do away with the material basis for classes, while i firmly believe that the existence of an atmosphere of love and human-ness in society will do away with the psychological need for classes. (I'm sorry i can't go into this more extensively here.)

I think this is the sort of thing Mary Varela means by emphasizing community-- that the class conflict has, in reality, only psychological and social bases, not a material one. Thus (and this will perhaps reply somewhat to some of Todd's penetrating questions) what is necessary is to change the society's atmosphere, its mode of having people relate to each other. In short, the way to realize (not create but realize what is already there objectively) community-- i.e. a certain way of relating to people, lovingly, humanly--is to act that way.

Don McKelvey

\* \* \* \* \*

McCARRAN ACT

The following is a brief comment by Hannah Frank of Boston U on the McCarran Act statement included in the last Discussion Bulletin.

I agree in principle with the statement on the McCarran Act; however, I'd like to know more about Advance. Whether it is communist or not is not the point; whether we agree or disagree politically is not the point (all the parallel positions cited in the statement are positions which I personally hold). Still that is not the point. The point is that the government is trying through this act to censor the free development of ideas, and it is the free development of ideas that is the foundation of a liberal democracy. Since that is the case, I would eliminate the paragraph beginning with "Our concern in this statement is not primarily with ADVANCE." That paragraph in this particular statement puts us in the position of trying to protect ourselves from prosecution. Beside being irrelevant to the cause, it is the very trap the law tries to maintain. In order to protect ourselves we must make it clear that we don't agree with Advance. It doesn't say what we agree with or disagree with, but comes out as a nice statement of self protection.

Hannah Frank

\* \* \* \* \*

The following article was left out of the Membership Bulletin by mistake.

## SPECULATIONS ON THE PLACE OF THE PEACE ISSUE IN POLITICS

by Steve Johnson, Harvard; Chairman, TORFIN

At the outset, let me mention the perspective on politics circumstances have given me. The perspective is largely my father's. I've had a son's-eye view of his five campaigns, beginning in 1952 and continuing uninterrupted through 1960. The comments which follow probably represent a good deal of what Byron Johnson would say if asked to remark on the place of the peace issue in politics.

The few paragraphs written here hardly pretend to do a thorough job on this problem. They are meant to raise most of the important questions which as students and as people worried for the future we should want to consider. These questions include philosophical, historical, and practical issues of the recent past and of the months ahead.

By philosophical issue is meant the question many people have of whether or not any political activity is possible without engaging in some forms of moral dishonesty. The question is sharper if, like my father, one is a Christian pacifist and belongs to the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Two conflicting sets of commandments then seem to be involved. On the one hand, religious and ethical principles say to one that his first duty is to love God and to obey Him in all things. This ought to include obeying the injunctions to love one's enemies and to accept suffering rather than to inflict it.

On the other hand, the first commandment of politics is to win elections. The worst political fate is not to be labeled dishonest, incompetent, or pigheaded. The worst fate is to be known as a "can't win" candidate. And some of the lowest means imaginable have been used to score the largest victories.

If it is extreme dishonesty that is meant, the answer is simple. Very few campaigns ever really descend into the muck. It is frequently possible to win elections at no special cost in self-respect. Furthermore, the more significant rejoinder is that you can do much more to achieve the social good you believe in if you hold office, and much less if you do not.

This does not silence doubts about subtle dishonesty, though. Many candidates and many campaigns contain the truth and nothing but the truth—at least within the limits of honest differences of opinion. They probably never contain what the candidate feels to be the whole truth. So this is the first question. In a campaign is a candidate to keep silent about the whole truth if he feels it will cost him the election?

To some extent, each answer to that question must be personal. You might say of my father that he felt politics was an extension of religion by other means. He clearly was not stopped by any feeling that a basic gulf divided political activity from religious or ethical loyalties.

A brief review of his background and political experience will make this more clear. In college during the depression, he was shaken enough by the shack housing and the penny wages and the rag clothing that were everywhere to make economics his undergraduate and graduate specialty. He worked for the State of Wisconsin part-time during his graduate years '39-'42, then moved to Washington, D.C., where the Budget Bureau and the Social Security administration subsequently employed him. After finishing his thesis and receiving his Ph.D. in 1947 he took a teaching job in economics and public administration at the University of Denver. This was until 1956 when he resigned to run for Congress.

In 1950 he began to get seriously involved in political activity, and then began the long process of working way up in the party. In 1952 the Stevensonites began to throw out the old guard, and that year he ran for the state legislature, finishing first in the primary but running third in the election for two seats. In 1954 he was elected to the legislature, one of two Democrats to carry our home county that year. For the next two years he was both a professor and a legislator.

Then he resigned from the University of Denver to run for Congress. Victory in the Democratic primary was his by a three-to-one margin. In the general election Ike carried the state and the eight-term Republican incumbent won his ninth victory, 107,000 to 93,000.

For the next two years Johnson served as an administrative assistant to Democratic Governor Steve McNichols. In this position Johnson was constantly called upon to represent the governor in speaking engagements before any number of civic groups throughout the state. This frequent speaking had the advantage of keeping him very alive politically in the Second District.

In May, 1958, the Republican Congressman announced his retirement plans. In June, Johnson announced for Congress. In July the nominating convention made him the only candidate of the Democratic Party. In September a bitter primary fight left Republican ranks split. In November Johnson defeated State Representative John Mackie by a vote of 95,000 to 80,000.

The chief issues in Colorado that year were domestic. The third of the Eisenhower recessions had brought Republican popularity to a new low. A Republican-Dixiecrat coalition in the House defeated the Kennedy-Ives bill and left the Democrats in the admirable position of being both the labor party and the labor reform party.

Within the state, GOP chieftains led a campaign for a constitutional referendum on a compulsory open shop proposal, otherwise known as "the Right to Work" proposal. Union opposition to it was extremely energetic, and almost all Right-to-Work cleavage in the state followed party lines. When the "Right-to-Work" amendment was defeated three hundred thousand to two hundred thousand, dozens of Democrats were swept into office and dozens of Republicans swept out.

Foreign policy issues were not absent from the campaign, but did not dominate it. Johnson ran not as a peace candidate but as the Democratic Party candidate. In fact, an independent candidate named Isely got on the ballot, was quoted during the last week of the campaign saying "Johnson is too warlike", and drew 1100 votes.

However, the last ten days of the campaign did see a shift. In public debate at Ft. Collins, Colo., John Mackie attacked Johnson for his pacifist views and affiliation with the Fellowship of Reconciliation. The Republican wondered if Johnson's pacifism wouldn't affect his ability to swear to defend the Constitution of the United States.

Such a man was unfit to be a Congressman, he said. Johnson replied by charging that "any man with less than a passion for peace is unworthy of being a Congressman".

The initial reaction was one of strong nervousness about Johnson. Within three days it shifted to a feeling that Mackie was making an unfair attack upon Johnson's religious beliefs. Insofar as it affected the election, the attack probably helped Johnson. But the dubious barometers available do not indicate that a Republican would have won under any circumstances.

During the next two years, Johnson hit the headlines a number of times, for many different actions. He attacked the Army Chemical Corps for carelessly allowing its plants to seep into the underground water table near Brighton, Colorado. Some tests showed water so polluted that no plants would grow within fifty feet of them.

Johnson attacked Denver food chains for starting a milk price war designed to drive small dairies out of business. A Congressional investigating subcommittee held hearings in Denver about the attempts of Bordens Milk and others to destroy competition. Through these actions and others similar he won the respect of great numbers of Second District voters. Polls taken early in 1960 showed that almost all voters believed Johnson had been doing a good job. Many registered Republicans were not even aware that Johnson was not a Republican congressman.

Those were not his only headlines, though. Johnson voted against the renewal of the draft, against two successive defense appropriations bills, against a Congressional resolution unequivocally opposing China's admission to the UN, and against a bill requiring the post office to label certain foreign mail as propaganda. On the first of these votes he was one of twenty voting "no"; on all the rest he was one of only three who stood in opposition (and a changing three they were, at that.)

And so there came a time of reckoning. In the 1960 campaign Johnson's opponent, Peter H. Dominick, used these votes to his own advantage as often as he could. There were really two features to his attack. He made the usual orthodox arguments about the United States' need to be strong and build up its defenses. Such arguments may be dangerously shortsighted, but they are acceptable political discourse.

Less pleasant was Dominick's steady use of the ad hominem argument throughout the campaign. He accused Johnson of "softness" on defense and of "softness" on Red China. Johnson's retired predecessor was quoted as saying the 2nd District was being represented by a vacancy in Washington. This form of total denunciation extended to other areas. Johnson was called a man whose "economic ideas are all wrong".

It can be quite effective to tell a voter he is being embarrassed by the actions of his representative in Washington, to hint that his pride is at stake, to call into question his common sense if he continues to support such a lemon. If a candidate can scare people into believing somebody is making them look foolish, he won't even need to discuss real issues. His opponent, if not fully prepared, stands in real danger. It raises a good question: How does a candidate escape or overcome such attacks?

Came the election. Heavy Republican sentiment engulfed Colorado in 1960, running in reaction to the stiff tax raises voted by the Democratic legislature. An ugly undercurrent of anticatholicism brought an undetermined number of normally apathetic bigots to the polls, to nobody's special benefit.

Yet all this was not the half of it. Johnson's campaign cost about \$22,000. But Dominick's is estimated to have cost anywhere from sixty to eighty thousand dollars. A host of Dominick billboards appeared. The newspapers crisscrossed with advertisements. There was an endless hammering of Dominick commercials on radio and television, and lavish use of television time for five minute spot programs and larger extravaganzas.

Voters who in August had never heard of Dominick and thought Johnson was maybe a Republican knew very well by November which man was on their side of the party fence. For Dominick the value of his clever strategy may have been that it gave him a margin of an extra few thousand votes. But the election wasn't even close. Dominick carried the district 151,000 to 111,000. John Kennedy and Bob Knous, the Democrat running for Senate, did similarly poorly in the district.

Any Republican could have beaten any Democrat on any issue in that district in 1960. And 1962 was worse. Republican Brotzman 138,000, Democrat McBride 87,000.

Even this brief chronology and biography suggests several things for us to consider. Here is a man who has been publicly identified as one of the best congressmen on the peace issue that we have had. Two years after his defeat Colorado Republicans still feared him enough to attack him for being a sponsor of the Liberal Papers.

Yet Johnson is quite far from being a one-issue Congressman. His background, training, and interests have equipped him to deal intelligently with a wide range of important issues. When a political party chooses its candidates, it wants men who can represent most of the people at least most of the time. The responsibilities of public office demand this. One-issue candidates on any issue do not often enjoy success, regardless of the issue. Part of the explanation for this is voter apathy. Voters have their own narrow problems, and will vote for the candidate who appeals best to their special interests. If a candidate can appeal to the largest number of special interests, he obviously has the best chance of winning. But the other part of the reason for the failure of one-issue candidates could well be their inability to fill the whole job.

Being qualified for the whole job, Johnson ran to win. He gave discussion of peace issues a certain share of his campaign, but nothing like a full share. This creates the problem of whether he was missing or avoiding chances to educate the voters about the dangers of several current policies. As an integrationist campaigning for office in the South might be frightened into an unwholesome silence, so are politicians everywhere deterred from speaking what they inwardly know to be the truth about some other touchy subject. Johnson did get involved in some possible compromises of belief. He was undoubtedly less than 99 44/100% pure.

Turning this discussion to practical problems affecting 1964 campaigns, I would like to suggest a number of reasons why students don't need to demand complete purity of opinion from the candidates they support. These reasons are personal, impressionistic, and offered mainly to evoke discussion.

As I see it, the value of even a quiet victory can be inestimable. Frank Kowalski of Connecticut was elected twice not because he stood foursquare for peace but because he was Democratic, Polish, Catholic, and pro-labor. Yet his was the only skeptic's voice in the House Armed Services Committee, and he was able to ask questions in hearings that no other other congressman cared enough to ask.

A student may support even a mediocre candidate if he wants badly to see some terrible incumbent defeated and removed. He may feel that the best he can get is a silent congressman who votes right. Such men as this would be healthy alternatives to the war-criers holding office today.

Further, Congressman Kastenmeier is teaching the lesson now that an incumbent Congressman can use the tools of voter education over a much more sustained period of time than a candidate who says much but is cast to the winds in November. Congressmen make news more readily than mere candidates; what they say is respected more. Kastenmeier is not only able to make news. He keeps an active organization in touch with the voters and maintains a steady flow of newsletters home.

Kastenmeier has been re-elected twice now, even after undergoing the heaviest of attacks. He provides an object lesson for congressmen who sympathize but never dare say so on the floor of the House. If more men like Kastenmeier could be elected, it would be a terribly significant thing. The fangs of the "invade Cuba" speeches would be dulled. The venom that paralyzes Congress on foreign aid appropriations would lose its power.

Men like Kastenmeier, Kowalski, Ryan, or Johnson are rare. What distinguishes men like these is not that they stand outside of politics. They are very much a part of it, and are very thoroughly orthodox politicians. In fact, this is not of itself a bad thing. Kastenmeier and the rest are distinguished because they are orthodox politicians who have shown the courage to rise above the common level of debate. They are not standing aloof from the normal life of politics. I would suggest that

they are taking part in it and simply expanding upon it from time to time when the issue is urgent.

How can students help more such men get elected to office? One of the first steps is to understand the way in which such men think and work. If favoring medicare and being opposed to right to work are going to elect a good man to Congress, his workers should be pulling together as a team to get him elected on these issues.

One natural alternative might not be too pretty. Picture a situation where a good candidate campaigns primarily on peace issues and ignores other issues of importance to his district. Because he is a "peace candidate" he attracts hundreds of enthusiastic workers, but still he fails to make himself entirely relevant to his constituency. He loses. It would leave a taste of ashes in my mouth, I know, if I thought I had lost a peace congressman because I had been unwilling to talk about anything else besides peace—or because I had been willing to speak, but had argued without conviction.

"Politics" is often called a dirty word. Some of the world's worst bums are found in it, fouling up everything they meet. But more to the point, many of the world's greatest unsung heroes are the workers in long and agonizing political campaigns. These are people with extraordinary vision, able to see beyond the months of drudgery to the years ahead when the dividends of their struggle will be paid and become visible. If maturity of purpose, dedication, and perseverance are the marks of a hero, then the heroism of campaign workers is beyond question.

One final comment, much more subjective than even the foregoing. We are working for the greatest of rewards—the day when men can at last destroy their missiles while they sit on the launching pads, because missiles are no longer needed. The day will not just come. But I think it will be brought about—the vision that calls is real.

There is, I believe, an important intellectual failing in the discussion of party politics in the Manifesto, in which the distinctions between party discipline and party realignment are not drawn, and consequently, the democratic "model" of party structure is made quite ambiguous.

Political realignment consists at the very minimum of a shift in the interests and allegiances of voter groups around party structures. In the literature of the left,<sup>1</sup> including the Manifesto, realignment carries an ideological content. Parallel to the discussion of the groups with which we (as liberals) would like to align in party politics, is the discussion of the means by which the joining of forces is to be carried out. The outstanding characteristic of the literature of party discipline<sup>2</sup> is the assumption (perhaps stemming from the political scientist's attraction to the aesthetically pleasing British parliamentary two-party system) that democracy and efficiency can be increased by the imposition of political conformity on representatives.

Political realignment in the national parties is only as important (relative to state--and local--level realignment) as the parties have meaningful national functions. The national functions of nomination of Presidential candidates and organization of the House of Congress are the two arenas in which the parties, as parties, have power. If we understand our goal as ousting Dixiecrats from the bodies which select the nominee and the committee chairmen, I suggest that we first pause briefly at the suggestion that we combine to oust J. William Fulbright from the Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and then consult historical precedent to see if a more public means of ousting Conservatives from the Democratic Party can be attempted.

The realignment of the thirties and forties displaced the conservative Democratic Party bosses from control of the political organizations of the northern industrial states. Two characteristics of this realignment are important--the first that it was carried out from the bottom up, with Union people displacing party hacks at the ward level, and with liberal-labor candidates receiving nominations for higher office as the party organization took into account the political power of organized labor. The second characteristic is that the political power devolved from mass organization, rather than from political alliances in Convention and caucus. The realignment of the sixties and seventies will displace Dixiecrats from political control of their political fiefs through militant organization, registration, and the use of political power of the organized vote. The civil rights movement will, with other liberal forces in the South, force the Dixiecrats into the national conservative (Republican) party, and the force of the organized vote (the political scientists will call the civil rights movement a "pressure group") will be the mechanism.

The phrase in our "democratic model" which reads: "demanding allegiance to party principles" (p. 46, Manifesto), leaves us open to charges of both elitism and political romanticism. Party discipline, in its extreme, suggests a "line". And, unless it is imposed from above, the adoption of a line implies unwillingness to co-exist with those who disagree on certain grounds. It is politically romantic to assume that seventy million Americans can reach consensus on more than tendencies in public policy. At most, in a two-party system<sup>3</sup>, we can attempt to expand the area of public mandate by forcing issues into politics, and it is certainly not suggested that a divisive issue like civil rights should be suppressed because of the nature of the party coalition. It is in order to be able to bring up divisive issues that we maintain political independence; when our concerns have a voter base which can make them meaningful political issues, it is then that we should operate in two-party politics, gaining legitimacy for our position. It is idyllic to demand that the differences among the parties be less than those between the parties; it is, however, the responsibility of the radical

DB#7

to expand the difference between the parties, and this is done through independent political organization, and the power of the independent vote.

The element of elitism enters the discussion of realignment-by-party-discipline in the question: by what set of values could we justify throwing out Fulbright along with Eastland? This approach is heresy to the "practical politicians", who would only deny credentials to racists if, in the calculations, the credentials action won more support than it lost. If the denial is advocated in a vacuum, it should be heresy to us, too; if the civil rights movement builds political by registration and maintenance of independence, then we will have the political power to effect our moral position. By any objective standard, Fulbright is a racist, in defiance of the Supreme Court. And party discipline inevitably invokes objective standards of "how did you vote?" Yet Fulbright's signature on the Southern Manifesto is clearly the price he must pay to maintain the possibility of voicing a liberal foreign-policy position among the closed minds of the Senate. If political realignment comes about from below, it is likely that place for men of the stature and politics of Fulbright can be found in a new Democratic Party.

Finally, in regard to the hypothetical model of a "real two-party system" (p. 46) let me comment that this smacks of a mistaken identification with the British party system. In Britain, the Party to enforce conformity on candidates (most recently for the Gaitskell H-Bomb position), and to deny legitimacy to radical politics. The absence of discipline in this country allows relatively easier entry for radical positions into party politics; this condition alone speaks well for the undisciplined system we have. The mavericks in American politics are too many to name; the centripetal force of disciplined parties in Britain is too great for almost any innovator to withstand.

We are seeing political reform in many states this fall. In Texas, the one-party system is evolving into a two-party system; temporarily both parties are controlled by conservatives. In the Deep South, the reform is still in the stages of voter registration. In California and New York, organization politics is being systematically challenged by reform-club movements at every level. In many states, peace candidates are injecting debate about deterrence into politics. There is political ferment, and it challenges us to develop a national perspective for "the movement". It is my suggestion that we avoid permanent reform in the mechanics of the system, and concentrate on development of permanent citizen participation in the body politic as the only sure means of counteracting "practical politicians". For our purposes, realignment is not a good slogan; it is muddled by its juxtaposition with party discipline. Political Reform should mean reform clubs, and not the House Democratic Caucus.

\*\*\*\*\*

Harold Lewack, a member of the LID Board of Directors, wrote the following as a response to the Port Huron Statement last summer; immediately following is a response to Mr. Lewack's argument's by Ass't National Secretary Don McKelvey.

There are minor inaccuracies (such as the discarding of useful labels like "Stalinist" which describes an actual CP member; the call for unilateral disarmament as a means of inducing Russia to follow our example; or the assertion that Russia is not really interested in Central Europe). Indeed, these are points that LID members might argue about themselves.

I find myself disagreeing with the major premise of this document and agreeing with its minor premise. I disagree that it will be possible to slow down the arms race to an appreciable degree (even if Russia were so inclined, China would not be). On the other hand, I find merit in the argument that we have allowed ourselves to become prisoners of the arms race. For the sake of our NATO bases

(now facing ICBM obsolescence), we remained silent in the UN when we should have spoken up. For the sake of a bi-partisan foreign policy, we tolerate the Dixiecrats in the Democratic Party. I think this aspect should have been explored more fully. For instance, it may be that liberals should now pay less attention to the Presidency and more to the Congress where dollars are appropriated. The Congress has more to say about certain aspects of foreign policy that really matter than does the President. Former President Truman may yet go down in history as a greater President than Kennedy because he used the office of the presidency chiefly as a platform to educate the American people (on the twin themes of a "do-nothing Congress" and Soviet expansionism).

It seems to me that in its analysis of the problems, the document decries the tired slogans of the liberals and socialists, but only succumbs to the equally tired slogans of the pacifists. It ignores the more sordid aspects of nationalism (India vs. Pakistan or Israel vs. Egypt) and the alliances that the Communists make with national dictators (Sukarno, Peron, Batista). In both instances it offers no guide or lesson. While I think this is unfortunate, it is not a fatal error.

The most disturbing aspect of the document is its overall tone and lack of organizational approach as to how to implement its program. It talks of man's great potential and then goes on to prescribe a very exacting diet that must be maintained at all costs. The implication is left that if all of these recommendations are not carried out immediately, man's mind faces certain disaster. Isn't this like the Jehovah's Witnesses who equate salvation only with total commitment? There is no room here for lesser evil choices. He who is not with us (like the liberals) is against us. This smacks of religion rather than politics. But, unlike religion, there is no appeal to join SDS before it is too late! Why shouldn't there be some kind words for less ambitious steps in the right direction? And, why not an emphasis on the role of SDS--not just universities--in all of this?

Dear Harold Lewack,

I would like to comment on a number of the specific points you made with which I personally disagree. Under your point (2), you mention "minor inaccuracies", including: (a) "The discarding of useful labels like 'Stalinist' which describes an actual CP member." I have had considerable personal experience with people who use that label extensively; it is used so indiscriminately and in such a "baiting" fashion that it is clear to me that it does no good at all. I have asked a number of these people what their definition of "Stalinist" is, and each gives a different definition (only one--of which I've heard--defines it as an actual CP member). But this does not prevent them from applying the epithet to practically anyone--from someone interested in folk singing (no other information on him) to a "hard pro-Soviet". The use of single terms like that does not help to categorize what are usually complex political viewpoints; it does help to drive away people who are at least potential converts and who should, in any case, be talked to. (b) "The call for unilateral disarmament as a means of inducing Russia to follow our example". May I refer you to the last paragraph of page 37, in which we suggest a policy of unilateral initiatives, which are, by what is not conventional peace movement theory, a series of moves which would (1) be taken at a time of little tension, since greater tension means less ability of both parties to respond peacefully; (2) not weaken the U. S.'s ability to defend herself in the event of Soviet attack; (3) prove to the Soviets that we were sincere about wanting disarmament, thereby inducing them to follow suit with similar steps; and (4) would result eventually in clearing the air so that negotiation could take place. This is certainly not unilateral disarmament...You might be interested in reading the classic statement of unilateral initiatives by Charles Osgood, "Suggestions on Winning the Real War with Communism", which appeared in the Journal on Conflict Resolution two or three years ago. (c) "Russia is not really interested in Central Europe." This question's answer comes from one's view of the Soviets' aim in

world affairs--are the Soviets attempting to build an empire through the taking of other territories and actually ruling them or installing puppets, thereby gaining material profits for the home-land? or are they interested in helping to install in other countries leaders and elites favorably inclined toward their (the Soviets') ideological point of view? or are they in an essentially defensive posture vis-a-vis the U.S., and seeking buffer areas such as Eastern Europe? In viewing the Soviets' relations with its two principal bloc allies--Eastern Europe and China--as well as with "the underdeveloped world", including Cuba, one certainly finds no evidence supporting the first or third alternative i posed above. While it was true that after the second world war the Soviets acted as the grossest imperialists, especially in Eastern Europe but also in China somewhat, it seems no longer to be true, certainly not in relation to China (whose unfavorable terms of trade with the Soviets has been due to her--China's--need for exactly the same products of which the Soviets have need, thus forcing the Soviets to charge more for them) and probably not in relation to Eastern Europe (though i have heard of at least one person who, having done a study of Soviet-Eastern Europe relations, concludes that the Soviets are still being economic imperialists there--though this may be due to the same factors as with China and be therefore a misinterpretation). I ought to say that i am far from an expert on Soviet-East Europe relations, and my remarks here are quite uninformed. And i have seen no evidence of Soviet attempts to install puppets in the highly nationalistic underdeveloped countries--if for no other reason than that to do so would provoke instant anti-Soviet feelings. Even in Cuba the Soviets, for all their ascendance and indispensability, have been unable to "run" Castro; i'm sure they're much happier with a pro-Soviet country 90 from the U.S. serving as the focus of anti-American nationalism throughout Latin America. From this point of view, the recent Soviet placing of missiles in Cuba worked against basic Soviet policy (cf. Leonel Brizola's denunciation of the act a couple of weeks ago, which was directed mainly at the Soviets, also at the Cubans); thus, we must wonder whether the missiles mightn't have been militarily significant to the Soviets...but that is another question. But to return somewhat abruptly to the central question--that of Soviet interest in Central Europe--i would say that they are interested in getting some benefit from the tremendous industrial potential in Europe, not simply gaining territory. There must be a balancing, in their minds, between obtaining those benefits (this is assuming already "occupying" the territory, either by force or by the installation, one way or another, of a "friendly" government) and obtaining the support of the population of the respective countries, so as to avoid constant use of force to keep the regime in power. I suspect that just such a balance has been made in Eastern Europe--i understand that most of the satellite governments enjoy at least a measure of popular support. In sum, i think that the Soviets are more interested in Central Europe (i.e. Germany and Austria) than the Manifesto might lead one to believe; maybe one of the main problems is of clarity of presentation in the document.

Under point (3), quite apart from the contention on your part that the "major premise" of the document is that the arms race can be slowed down (which i would doubt to be the major premise), you seem to be saying that it is not in the interests of either the Soviets or--especially--the Chinese to end the arms race, or slow it down. The only reason it would not be in the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy to slow down the arms race would be that they use that conflict to justify oppressing people both at home and abroad (Eastern Europe). This may be true about Eastern Europe; i have stated that i am no expert about these countries, though i do get the impression that they--or many of them--no longer need the Soviet Army to prop up their regimes, having developed both sufficient internal coercion and/or persuasion to do so. I would say that it is pretty definitely true about the Soviet regime internally; the Soviet people are much better off economically, politically, and personally than they were ten years ago, under Stalin. Their standard of living, albeit poor, is rising; they have pride in their country; they have some measure of freedom from arbitrary oppression. This is not to say that the Soviet people would necessarily choose the same leaders as those who rule them now. But

the advent of disarmament--or at least a lightening of the military load on the Soviet economy--would give to the current rulers an even better chance to win over the Soviet people to the "Communist way of life"; and i think that those leaders would like that opportunity. "...even if Russia were so inclined, China would not be." I have done considerable research on China, and i think that the points made about Soviet acceptance of some measure of disarmament hold even more true for the Chinese elite, with greater support of their people and more need for turning their resources to economic development. That Chinese foreign policy is not as belligerent as Western reporters report Chinese expostulations to be is indicated in an excellent article in the Yale Review of Fall 1960 (v. 50, p.1) by Allan Whiting, in which he examines Chinese actions during the Korean War and the two offshore islands crises and finds it quite cautious. I am afraid i don't have the time to go into the whole question of the Chinese regime--and it may be that the continually hostile attitude of the U.S. toward Red China would mean the necessity of many years' repairing before they would be willing to trust us and enter into disarmament agreement with us--but i tend to believe that the Chinese would welcome real disarmament, since they would gain from it in a number of ways. On the question of left/liberals' concentrating on the Congress more than on the Presidency in attempting to "take over" the running of foreign affairs, there are points either way. In the specific conduct of foreign affairs, at least in the more important decisions, the President operates with an almost free hand; the only real locus of Congressional power in foreign affairs is money, specifically foreign aid. And i quite agree that part of the left's efforts should go toward a more liberal attitude among Congressmen's constituents about foreign aid--a more principled attitude, perhaps one might put it. Also, Presidential power is so inaccessible and unaccountable in many ways; it is much easier to elect one of 500+ men from a small district than to elect one from the country at large. However, the important thing for us to be doing is educating the American people as a whole, then to suggest ways in which they can apply this new point of view electorally, in their votes for Congressmen, Presidents, mayors, PTA officers--in fact, in any election involving social responsibility (and which don't?), and also at every opportunity they get to exercise their own social responsibility, in just talking to people and acting.

Under point (4), i think i have already indicated that the document is not a pacifist one; in any case, i know of very few, if any, pacifists who are mouthing "tired slogans". On the contrary, pacifists, virtually without exception, are people of unusually high social consciousness and social conscience most of whom peg their theories to a conception of reality that should, i suspect, receive more consideration from the "realistic". Also, i don't think the Port Huron Statement is or has in it pacans to nationalism; it discusses neither the sordid nor the progressive features of nationalism. I would call your attention to the final paragraph on p. 45, however, for a description of the kind of nationalism--or, rather, national systems--which the Statement believes that U.S. actions should help to foster; i don't think that description is an apology for existing nations' actions.

Under point (5), i would tend to agree with you that the current leadership of SDS has much to learn about developing organizations such as SDS--and i suspect that they would agree also. In fact, as you inferentially point out, the last section of the Statement--that dealing on the specifics of how to get there from here--is the weakest; i should hope that much experience will be gained over the coming year by SDSers throughout the country on that question--which is probably the most difficult we have to face--how to be effective and true to our ideals at the same time.

Ed. Note: The following was originally to have been a Bulletin story, but we decided that rather than cutting it (which we'd have had to) we'd put it in the DB verbatim. It is by Warren Brodhead, a student at Williams C.

Williams College, heretofore known as a typical "preppy", small liberal arts school, one dominated by a fraternity system which attracts and "educates" businessmen-to-be, is a changing institution. In June, 1962, a specially-appointed committee of alumni investigated what is now called the "fraternity situation", and recommended that the College take over eating and housing facilities from the fraternities. The "Angevine Report" (named after the chairman of the committee, Jay Angevine '61) cited that fraternities at Williams are "exercising a disproportionate role" in undergraduate life; and they proposed that the College replace them with "social units", which, while retaining the advantages of small-group living, would facilitate the promotion of educational and cultural activities to an extent barely possible under the present system. Already two such social units are planned for next year, student and administration committees have formulated basic policy for them, and a sizable number of students have expressed interest in complying with the new system.

While the change is a dramatic one, it is a natural outgrowth of attempts of the last ten years to liberalize the fraternity system. In that time the more obvious and objectionable attributes of Williams fraternities were modified or done away with. Rushing was deferred to the beginning of sophomore year; Hell Week was made less barbaric; racial and religious discrimination was prohibited; a student union was constructed to serve as a social center for "non-affiliates;" and the system of "total opportunity" was instituted, whereby any rushee rejected by all his fraternity choices would have to be granted membership by at least one house. But even though fraternities, by 1962, were not as exclusive and restrictive as before, they still concentrated their activities around social events and tended to stifle, by and large, the intellectual and cultural environment which any good college should afford.

Such a decision, to be sure, smacks of institutionalization and paternalism at first glance, especially to SDS readers who are preoccupied with the problems of university reform. Although the majority of undergraduates are opposed to the Angevine Report's recommendations, and although Williams does not pretend to be a democratic institution in the first place, nonetheless it must be made clear that students have and will exercise a great deal of autonomy and responsibility in the implementation of the new system. Five student planning committees have met frequently since the beginning of the school year, and their recommendations have almost unanimously been incorporated into the official plans for next year's social units.

Of special interest to SDS readers, the members of each unit will elect their own officers--President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer, Social Committee Chairman, and Cultural Committee Chairman--who will direct the activities of the unit. The students will be fully responsible for disciplinary matters, for planning and organizing all cultural and social activities, and for managing finances. In short, students will be given the opportunity to run the units as they desire, without the burden of either oppressive college regulations or the policies of national fraternity organizations.

Each unit will maintain a "discretionary fund", a sum derived from a collective social tax. The amount of per capita contributions will be decided by the students themselves; and the students will likewise direct and control the use of the discretionary fund. This money will be used to pay for guest speakers and visitors, for cultural activities, and for normal weekend parties.

Close student-faculty relationships will be fostered by the students' choice of fac-

ulty associates, who will dine regularly in the units and attend as many unit activities as possible. Moreover, a guest suite will be maintained in each unit for alumni and visitors.

A student steering committee has recently been appointed to direct the final implementation of the recommendations of the planning committees. The members of this committee will serve as interim officers for the fall term next year, and as advisors to the Administration's Standing Committee.

Two units are definitely going to function next year; two existing dormitories are to be renovated for this purpose, and a new dining hall is to be constructed shortly. Facilities will include a snack bar and social center, libraries, studies, and lounges, as well as student bedrooms and living rooms. Already a number of undergraduates have applied for membership in the social units, and April 15 has been set as the deadline for further applications. Although rushing will take place next fall and fraternities will continue to exist for the time being, the social unit system will be extended eventually to the entire campus.

Williams, like many other colleges of the same design, size, and organization, seems to contain a vast number of undergraduates who are preoccupied with "having a good time" and are relatively unexcited by the prospect of a challenging intellectual and cultural environment. But a goodly number of students are willing to accept the challenge of such an environment, as embodied in the social unit plan, and indeed have taken the lead in the new system's conception and implementation. These are, for the most part, the students whom Toynbee might call the "creative minority". If Williams were to neglect her creative minority and accept the opinions of the majority of her students, Williams would not be an exciting place to learn and grow. If the Trustees of the College were guided solely by students' fear of paternalism, and thereby retained the present system, Williams would forever remain a party school. This college is too far on the verge of precipitating a revolution in education to be anchored to an anachronistic social system, and, led by a solid nucleus of concerned students, this college will take a notable step toward the ideal of a "community of scholars".

\* + \* + \* + \* +

#### NOTES ON THE PORT HURON STATEMENT

--by Jim Williams

In a recent mailing, Jim Monsonis raised some very pertinent questions about the PHS --namely, why isn't there any mention of such things as classes and class struggles, role of the University as an agent of social change, the Church, and conflict in general. The following then, will be a number of random comments and speculations of a rather casual nature, on these problems with a sort of suggestion as to what the SDS position might be on these, although I wouldn't presume to have a "final word" on these subjects in any sense, but rather hope that they will encourage further discussion among SDSers.

**ON CLASSES AND CLASS STRUGGLES:** We are often told these days by the Luce publications and, sometimes, by prominent union officials that there is no such animal as the class struggle in America anymore--that such thoughts are properly belonging to a forgotten age. And, in a sense, this is true. Class struggles as we knew them in the early 1900's and in the '30s are pretty much things of the past. But, I would be tempted to suggest that perhaps these struggles have been diverted into new, unexplored channels, with completely new forms and effects. I think we would all be agreed that there exist large numbers of Americans who are, properly speaking, in "dispossessed economic groups". These are the persons whom Mike Harrington spoke about in his The Other America. These are largely composed of minority groups, and the technological unemployed. Both are different problems and will require some separate treatment.

Certainly anyone who has travelled in the South is aware of the desperate conditions of most of our Negro citizens. Many still live by sharecropping and other primitive means. Those who work in other jobs are well aware of the "last hired, first fired" pattern of Negro Employment.

Off-hand, most southern Negroes live in rural areas and are engaged in some manner of farming, generally sharecropping or tenant farming. Yet this is an area which is rapidly being closed out for small farmers. Jack McKart of Operation Freedom reports that some 80% of cotton is now being picked by mechanical pickers rather than by manual labor--thus causing untold hardship among rural Negro populations dependent upon this type of employment. (This is particularly true of Mississippi.) As a side-effect of the Freedom struggle, many more Negroes are suffering economic reprisals, also. According to the study by the Conference on Economic Progress, "Poverty and Deprivation in the U.S.," about 78% of the southern non-white population lives on an income of \$3,999 or less, for a family of four. Another 13.6% is said to be in "deprivation, having an income of \$4000-\$5999. This is compared to white poverty index of 39.5%, itself appalling but small in comparison.

This pattern of Negro economic deprivation is continued in most northern areas, and assumes a number of forms. Recently, some AFL-CIO unions have been severely criticized for discrimination against Negro and Puerto Rican members. In Louisville, at this writing, roughly 40% of the Negro labor force is unemployed--in comparison to 10% unemployment for white workers.

Immediately, we can point out that discrimination and racial segregation are to blame for much of the problem among minority groups. If discrimination can be eliminated, non-white workers will stand a better chance for employment--at least a 50% better chance, other factors still being inhibitive, such as low educational levels, etc., plus a general worker surplus.

The second section of workers who are properly classed as "dispossessed" are the victims of technological unemployment, or automation. This tends to cut across racial lines and involves many Negro and white workers. At the writing, we have a nationwide unemployment of roughly 5.8% of the total labor force, including some one million young persons who have never had jobs. Probably the actual unemployment figure is higher--due to the Labor Department's "seasonal adjustments".

Generally speaking, persons who are "technologically unemployed" have little chance of finding new, gainful employment. The reasons for this are complex. We are in a situation where the number of jobs are decreasing while the work force is increasing. Workers, while perfectly willing to work, are nonetheless unable to qualify for newer jobs which require special skills--which may actually go begging for someone to fill them! The striking miners in Hazard, Kentucky, are good examples of this paradox. Although one would want to avoid generalities, the Hazard miners are incapable of anything but mining. This is all they know--it is all they care to know, really. Yet, these men can't be allowed to starve. Certainly they are not going to stand by peacefully and starve, as their recent strike activity has proven! Some type of work must be found for these men. We would certainly hate to place them on the dole--which is corrosive of certain human values if used over a long stretch of time, and is no answer to anything.

So, here, we have two dispossessed groups which feel their inferior class position bitterly. What's more, they are beginning to obtain a certain new class consciousness, at least with regard to their immediate surroundings, if not with the working class "in general".

These persons are certainly not going to remain content in inferior economic

positions while the rest of America gorges itself in affluence. They will demand their fair share of this wealth in due time.

This is certainly a class struggle. Persons are being exploited, by a system. Yet, they are not in a really strategic position to protest through "regular channels"--and, even if they could, those channels seem somewhat deaf to these demands nowadays. For us, as students and generally middle-class persons, the task is to take the grievances of these people before the public as a whole and to the government and to industry, etc., and demand a redress of these grievances--knowing full well that some rather drastic changes may have to be made in our economy to achieve this.

**ON THE CHURCH:** Certainly important segments of the integration struggle and the peace movement are composed of church-oriented people. The number of ministers involved in the integration movement will readily prove this. The numbers of dedicated, professed Christians also point of this fact. Many ministers are right in the thick of these struggles. Fred Shuttlesworth, Martin King, Maurice McCrackin are only a few of the more wellknown who participate very actively and at great sacrifice.

For the most part, the Church is divided into two parts: Talkers and Doers. Most ministers now will certainly sanction integration--yet, how many make a special effort to aid the battle for equality? How many churches are being integrated? The proportion of active ministers is certainly a minor ones in comparison to the inactive ones. Peace is certainly a cause worthy of ministers of the Prince of Peace--yet this is the hardest field to work in'. Only a very small minority have made serious commitments to the peace movement. Those who have, have paid costly prices. Maurice McCrackin, for example, was defrocked by the United Presbyterian Church for his refusal to pay taxes. The strength of ministerial participation is generally based on the development of their respective congregations. Most congregations now wouldn't think twice about firing peace-mongering ministers.

Yet, those who can participate and who do participate are ever so valuable to the movement. And their courage is to be admired. In Louisville, a seminary professor came under community fire for participating in an anti-war demonstration during the Cuba crisis, yet he participated gladly under very difficult circumstances and great physical danger.

But the ministry is only one part of that amalgamation we call the Church. The activities of laymen and laywomen are even more numerous and as effective and dedicated. Yet, problems are just as difficult for most of them. Many fear loss of jobs along with the outrage of their fellow-Churchmen. Needless to say, many ministers also block some lay activities.

For some laymen, work inside the Church is impossible and some leave the Church for that reason. It is written that when the apostles fail to speak, the very stones will be raised up to preach the word. We have seen the development of these stones. SDS is one of these stones which has been so raised. When older organizations and channels become clogged, new arise to take their place. This is our function from a Christian point of view. Yet, the very diversity of these organizations--"stones" is depressing. One new concerned layman was openly distressed after joining the NAACP, CORE, SFU and FOR. "Why all these cards?" he asked. "Why can't the label 'Christian' suffice for all these?" His point is well made and lays bare the failures of the Church as a whole to assume its duties and obligations. For many now, the Church means Billy James Hargis and the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade or some other Right-Wing conglomeration. Certainly, their use of the term and trappings "Christian" makes one think twice before proclaiming that label.

Yet, we must. We must be prepared to be unpopular within our respective congregations--for a while. Like Jeremiah, we must proclaim the grim prophecies of doom unless our paths are set aright. We must change our congregations--not be isolated from them. This doesn't necessarily mean that we should "dilute" our message in any sense--a moral message can not be overstated.

The Church lacks an eschatology in questions of social justice. It is that eschatology which we, as Christians, must supply.

Conflict in itself is something that we shall be stuck with in one form or another. Yet, this is no cause for alarm--since conflict is really the basis for change and growth and development.

The purpose of democracy is not to eliminate conflict, even if it could, but rather to smooth off some of the bumps which conflict always causes. Democracy provides a peaceful means for social change and development and for that reason, is a fluid and dynamic medium.

A problem arises when the democratic processes harden into something less than democracy. Then, conflicts can erupt into real causes of danger to all mankind. Thus, the task of keeping democracy alive and virile is foremost in our objectives.

CHANCES FOR SUCCESS: Generally I must admit to a certain optimism. I know it is popular among some sections to beat one's breast and wax pessimistic (see Lynn Pfuhl's article in the last DB), yet I am in the movement because I feel it will succeed, that progress will be made, that peace and freedom can be achieved. If I didn't feel so--I wouldn't waste my time. I'd be out making a buck and being an average, everyday hedonist. I see no sense in knocking oneself out for a lost cause--and anyone who feels that he is in a lost cause should get out. I believe, though, that we will win, that Good will triumph over Evil, someday. One observer once commented that the working class loses every battle but the last. If so, we can continue to work, confident in our victory.

\* + \* + \* + \* +

Editor's note: The following, untitled, is from Tom Hayden.

Some of the ideas and even the language of SDS literature, especially the Port Huron Statement, have had sizeable innovating effects--in organizations, such as USNSA, and in action politics, such as "university reform". From an informal beginning 14 months ago, we also have gone far towards building organizational structure and program. We have a larger staff, more able officers, and the NC meeting in December certainly committed us to even greater attention to chapter growth. Peace-centered study, community electoral politics, university reform conferences--these are some of the specific areas in which we can make unique programmatic contributions. As for money, of course we're starving--but at least survival seems possible for the visible future. The Ann Arbor meeting (the NC) was fruitful because its participants confronted these facts with some realism; the \$500 raised on the spot for our field organizer is concrete evidence.

On the other hand, it is plainly true that (1) SDS is not growing locally with enough speed to be a major social movement in the near future; (2) SDS is not thinking radically, and with a consciousness of the organization as weapon, about political objectives; (3) SDS does not have the money or staff to meet the burgeoning needs we see everywhere. Why not, then, withdraw to a more modest operation, e.g. a small, geographically-centralized, adequately financed "think center"? In melancholy times this is tempting. But it is inadequate for two

reasons. First, strategically relevant theory is in part an outcome of experiencing political action. Second, and more important, we need more than a "think center" because of the apparent thirst of American politics. By now any liberal should be aware that the New Frontier is not coping with problems in ways that will guarantee acceptable levels of democracy and peace. Behind the President's and the Attorney-General's buoyant sanguinity, we are witnessing an attempt to manage the structure and content of human activity nearly everywhere. Using the mask of "public interest", the government is regulating labor-management disputes, and a compulsory arbitration bill is not unlikely by 1965. In the 63rd month of gross unemployment and underemployment, the New Frontier tax cut proposal seems more likely to give the Democrats a political issue than the nation a new economic life. The Justice Department has stepped up the pace of attack on dissident political organizations so effectively that there are no substantially visible spokesmen for anti-Western politics on the American opinion spectrum. Through foundations and pro-Kennedy civil rights leaders, the Administration is trying to manipulate the focus and timing of civil rights action so that the Democratic Party (with the Dixiecrats) receives "the Negro vote" and the image of American life suggests the orderly attainment of racial justice. Internationally, even rebuffs by France and Canada have not yet deterred our pursuit of political-military-economic superiority with a wide range of options as to the way of implementing our advantages.

These changes are impressionistic, but easily substantiated by anyone. Most disturbing, however, is the inability of a critical movement to receive expression. The liberal bureaucracies are not moving against the Administration consensus in many instances. The people working in liberal causes at the grass-roots, however, are distinguishable from the Establishment--by at least their discontent, albeit their political outlook is still maturing. Perhaps these nearly invisible actors, existing in every community, are the points of energy to which we should look--rather than to Geneva negotiators, or the heads of the labor movement, or the other entrenched liberal organizations.

What we may need is a way to transform these invisible rebellions into a politics of responsible insurgence rooted in community after community, speaking in comprehensible terms to the felt needs of their locales, offering specific alternatives to specific problems of inequality, industrial stagnation, inadequate schools, civil defense, and so on. The most alarming activity of the new Administration is its rapid and successful building of a loyal political base for the future--in New York City, Texas, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts. We have no more difficult and more necessary task today than a race to create genuinely independent political constituencies who will not be satisfied with the New Frontier. Can the methods of SNCC be applied to the North?

This does not mean the university and educational orientations of SDS should cease at all--but that they should be focussed on the task of developing a broad, independent consciousness among individuals, one that can find its expression in concrete action. Can we spread our organizational power as far as our ideological influence, or are we inevitably assigned to a vague educational role in a society that increasingly is built deaf to the sounds of protest?

## SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR PEACE WORK --by Dave Russell

This is a list of a number of ideas that I have had, or have been suggested to me, as to possible activity for a group interested in promoting peace. They deal with matters aside from the emotional displays (peace walks, demonstrations, etc.) not because they are not important but because most people in the group are already familiar with these and other types of action are needed as supplements to them. The suggestions are intended simply as a jumping-off point for program development.

1. Speaker program--a number of students who are versed in one or more areas relating to peace to be available for civic groups, high schools, etc. Compile a list of as many school and civic groups in the area as possible, develop an introductory letter listing topics and send it out periodically. Also, notifying these groups of speaker services of national organizations might be included in this sort of program.

2. Make offers to local newspaper columnists or editors to write articles on student opinion and analysis of various issues. This might be done for local high school newspapers as well as your own.

3. Conduct a limited door-to-door campaign in town canvassing on issues that directly affect the community (fallout shelters). This is a good firsthand method of finding out just what sort of opposition we face.

4. Develop a small group of letter writers who can continually bring subjects to the attention of local leaders, state and national representatives, newspapers, etc. This sort of activity should be spontaneous but it usually isn't.

5. Get in touch with similar groups in schools such as Cornell, Hamilton, Alfred, etc. and attempt to establish a reciprocal speaker program--i.e. if they or we get a speaker from outside, 4 or 5 schools could share the costs and gain the benefits.

6. Reproduce any research papers that are done by students as material for students here at school and basis for speaker program (#1 above). Summaries might be used as articles, letters, etc.

7. Get in touch with local Democratic and Republican parties and find out what programs they have in this area. The least we can do is supplement their junk mail pile. There may be a chance in the future of working with a Democrat committed to peace issues. At least the groundwork could be done now.

8. Campaign in the community for grants, money or services to be devoted to peace research. Perhaps we could stimulate the establishment of a foundation for teachers or graduate students working in the area of peace. And/or compose a letter to local business heads soliciting money for sending students around the country on projects (for instance, this summer there will be a research project on peace conducted in Colorado).

9. Organize and propose to the faculty that a day be set aside for nothing but discussion of questions related to peace and war. Provide seminars, lectures, et al. If this can not be arranged, perhaps we could call for a day of absence for all students to emphasize the importance of the issue.

10. Push for the adoption into the curriculum of courses dealing with peace. Law course on world peace through world law, conflict resolution (sociology or psychology) are some suggestions.

11. Check the school library for material and suggest additions.

12. Contact community groups for mutual discussion on the problems in this area and possible programs. (Committee of Concern).

13. Develop a program of peace action for freshman orientation program.

FROM THE PEACE RESEARCH & POLITICS OFFICE: Discussion Points and Action Suggestions  
 --by Dick Flacks

What follows is a series of notes, thoughts and proposals for people to ponder, talk about and argue with. They are, for the most part, offered tentatively and without being worked out in any detail. A paper which Tom Hayden and I have been working on will deal with many of the following points in a more substantial way, and will be available in several weeks.

It seems clear, at this point, that the Administration genuinely desires a test-ban treaty--in part, to maintain present US nuclear superiority, in part, to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and, in part, to further reduce tensions with the Soviets. The major barrier to an agreement now is the US Senate--the propaganda barrage of the military and congressional hawks seems likely to prevent any further reduction of US inspection requirements. Meanwhile, the Russians undoubtedly are ambivalent about where their own interests lie with respect to a test-ban; moreover they are unlikely to immediately concede when they know that we know that our inspection demands are unnecessary.

The Russians, I am sure, do not understand that a test-ban treaty would be a major historical event. The necessity for Senate ratification of the treaty would require that the Administration literally stake its political life on proving the desirability of negotiation, accommodation and arms control. We would then have, for the first time in fifteen years, a wide-ranging national debate on Cold War policy.

Present Administration moderation toward the Soviets is a symptom of a significant shift in policy. Policy-makers are increasingly of the belief that the arms race as such has ceased to pay off--that it constitutes a major barrier to effective foreign policy, and its burdens may outweigh its benefits domestically. Some kind of detente and arms agreement with the Soviets is necessary, in the Administration's view, in order to cope with the following problems:

1. The problem of revolution in Latin America and Asia. This is the major foreign policy preoccupation of the Administration, and the lesson of Vietnam and Cuba for the Administration has been that counter-insurgency wars cannot be effectively waged so long as the danger of escalation to nuclear wars is great. A detente with the Soviets might free us, especially in Latin America, to prevent, forestall, or suppress revolution.
2. The problem of economic competition within the Western Alliance--the American economy falters in comparison with the European economy--in large part because we are over-committed to military research and production while the Europeans act as if the Cold War did not exist.

The shape of foreign policy and domestic politics from now on is going to be defined by the stagnation of the American economy. The Administration, after two years, has begun to see that this stagnation is profound and not peripheral. But it has apparently decided to hold on to the classic American view that the solution to our domestic difficulties lies in overseas expansion and trade. Thus, the "turning down" of the arms race with the Russians, while happily reducing the danger of imminent nuclear war, may be but a prelude to ever-increasing US involvement in "limited" wars throughout the underdeveloped world--wars fought to preserve and enhance American economic interests wherever they are seriously threatened.

The emerging debate over foreign policy is between corporate reaction--committed to hard anti-Soviet policies and the concept of victory over "communism"--and corporate liberalism--committed to a somewhat less ideological view of the Soviet Union, but equally committed to the preservation and growth of the American corporate system.

It is, however, already apparent that corporate liberalism, despite the greater "rationality" of its policies, is intellectually incapable and politically unable to cope with the foreign and domestic problems it now has begun to perceive. The

Alliance for Progress is a silly--even pathetic--response to the chaos of Latin America. The tax cut and other Presidential domestic programs will have little effect on poverty, unemployment, or the rate of growth. And South Vietnam, where the rebels now control 90% of the country, suggests that counter-insurgency techniques, no matter how "sophisticated" (read "brutal"), will not prevent the overthrow of regimes of corruption and tyranny.

The fundamental debate of the coming years ought, then, to be between established liberalism and a new radicalism. The defining characteristic of the latter position will be the demand that immediate attention and full energy and resources be devoted to the problems of this society--that poverty be abolished, full employment be established and racial equality be guaranteed; this, in contrast to official liberalism's commitment to "aggressive tokenism" and the "long, twilight struggle" to preserve American power.

Such an opposition movement would be a "peace movement"--even if advocacy of foreign policy alternatives were not a major feature of its program. For the creation of powerful demand for major reform in domestic economic and social life would require a fundamental reordering of priorities for our society--major internal reform is incompatible with the "long twilight struggle"; major internal conflict would disrupt the national consensus which would be necessary for effective prosecution of that struggle.

What is needed now? The requirements of the movement are perhaps somewhat contradictory. In my opinion, these include:

1. Intensified efforts both locally and nationally to build popular support for reduced tension, disarmament agreements, and alternative foreign policies. In particular, we should support and participate in the educational and lobbying projects of groups now attempting to demonstrate support for the test-ban, such as Women's Strike for Peace. Perhaps the outstanding action project for campus groups would be a continuing effort to speak to a wide range of community and student groups about various issues. This has been one of the major efforts of Toxin, at Harvard; a variant of this is now being tried by Voice, at Michigan--which is sending speakers into fraternities and dormitories to lead discussions about the draft--as a way of focussing attention on the way the cold war affects individual lives. The best place to reach people is in the context of their own groups and organizations; the purpose of such activity is not so much to build a peace movement through recruitment, but to develop a constituency of support for particular policies.
2. Organization for peace politics: In most college towns or districts, it ought to be possible to develop strong ties between the local peace people and local political organizations. Where, for example, the Democratic Party is a minority party--there ought to be opportunities for peace concerned students and faculty to actively and effectively influence the choice of candidates and the policies of the local Party. In other districts, a caucus of peace people within the Party can raise issues for debate, frame resolutions, run candidates in primaries. Peace people who are not tied into a political party directly, can influence parties and candidates and congressmen by forming non-partisan citizens groups whose function is to endorse candidates, lobby for specific proposals, etc. Note that the citizens group plays less of an educational role within the community and more of a lobbying function. An effective local peace politics effort requires peace education--to develop a constituency; a non-partisan group--to exert pressure; and, ideally, a caucus of concerned people within one of both of the parties--to directly influence the party organization. Peace politics is likely to be meaningful mainly in districts which contain a high proportion of middle class intellectuals or professional people--for it is here where the peace movement is likely to have a base, and where foreign policy is a salient issue.

db/20

The function of peace politics, wherever possible, is to elect to Congress men who are democratically responsive on foreign policy, and to create within the district a body of politically effective people who are independent of established liberalism--and conscious of the need for radical reform. In most areas, the main focus of such an effort may not be foreign policy, but rather the more immediate and pressing problems of race, employment, poverty, etc. Thus, "peace politics" becomes one of several kinds of possible "insurgent politics" that seem to be developing in many parts of the country.

3. There is an immediate need for serious research, analysis and writing pointed toward: first, the development of alternative programs for dealing with our problems, and second, the development of strategy for the new politics of reform. Examples of the first would be programs for eradicating poverty, and technological unemployment, focussed on particular locales and conditions and relating these problems to defense production. Examples of the second might include--what particular congressional districts are potentially open for effective peace politics, what is the demographic, sociological, and political structure of one's district, what political issues are of central importance in the district and what kinds of organization, argument, and appeal might be effective in building constituencies around particular issues.

There is little doubt that students can play an active part in developing this kind of research. For example, the March 1963 issue of the Council of Correspondence Newsletter contains four studies of public opinion in foreign policy done in various locales. Three of the four studies were either performed entirely by undergraduates or centrally involved undergraduates as interviewers, data analysts, etc.

\* + \* + \* + \* + \*

Three brief thoughts stimulated by Dick Flack's article:

1. I don't think we should concern ourselves centrally with mounting a massive campaign of support for the test ban treaty in order to assure its getting through the Senate. Quite apart from the fact that we're not capable of doing so--the reason I say this is not that its passage is assured, but because I don't think that Kennedy will risk his political neck on anything he doesn't have to. Thus, I am convinced that if Kennedy signs that treaty, he will do so in the knowledge that it will be ratified by the Senate, for which ratification he will not count on popular pressure and other at least somewhat democratic methods, but rather on political arm-twisting and back-scratching, in which he may well go all out--but not publicly; I don't think he wants a public debate. Thus, I think we should view the test ban fight (of course there will be public manifestations--speeches, etc., and JFK's opponents may well want to take it to the public) as a major education opportunity, rather than a time to put pressure on Senators. The difference is that in the former effort, more concentration can (and should) be put on historical developments and issues peripheral to the test ban itself.
2. We shouldn't think that the Kennedy administration is getting peaceful. Examination of even Humphrey's arguments shows them to be Cold War arguments exclusively; as Dick says, the US view is of freezing things before we start losing. We must remember that the Soviet test series in September '61 was to develop a lighter warhead to go with more mobile missiles, which were/are necessitated by US knowledge of the location of soft sites in the Soviet Union. Maybe the Soviets haven't developed these warheads yet, and the Administration; then it would be very advantageous to the U.S. and very disadvantageous to the Soviets to freeze development of weapons now; this may well be the reason for any Soviet hesitation about a treaty now.
3. Without real disarmament (not arms control), the problem of escalation of limited wars (insurgency/counter-insurgency) is not relieved one iota--even if the Soviets were willing to accept a moratorium on support of indigenous insurgents (which they couldn't because of the intra-bloc conflict), the Chinese--and the insurgents--wouldn't. We mustn't fall--however slightly--into acceptance of the myth that the Soviets cause--or even substantially help--such insurgencies. --Donald McKelvey

I was so caught up with Brewster Kneen's letter in the last issue of the Bulletin that we devoted all our attention to answering the proposition that a statement such as "The right to strike over any circumstances whatever and against any employer whatever is one of the vital necessities of the Labor Movement" is the "sort of thinking" which "leads inevitably to a totalitarian conclusion". While we were so occupied we allowed another missive of Kneen's entitled "The Nature of the Peace Movement" to go by unanswered. We should like to deal with it now and ask our readers to refer back to the article to save the space it would take to synopsis it here

Kneen contends that even considering the continued growth of the Student Peace Union there is less of a student peace movement today than there was a year ago, and hopes for a national student peace movement have been shattered. If we understand correctly what Kneen means by national peace movement, we have little disagreement with him here. However, he continues to say that "...this lack of a student peace movement is a good thing, a healthy sign, at this time". This is because, Kneen contends, students have somehow realized that a peace movement which functions as a reformist group within society will "pull the fangs of potential revolutionaries if they can be sucked into the movement and then have their energies expended fighting such monstrosities as HJAC, SISS, and the draft". These, he maintains, are merely symptoms of the malaise of society and are not at the core of the problem.

Now as to the central point which Kneen raises, that in reality the peace movement is part of the establishment, that it is reformist, liberal, and non-revolutionary.

There is no doubt that the peace movement is reformist, liberal, and within the establishment. There is also no doubt that the movement is subjectively non-revolutionary. This is due to one rather simple reason--that is, because it is a peace movement and not a revolutionary movement.

If Kneen means to say that revolutionary movement on a non-violent basis is called for, we may well agree with him. This does not necessarily mean that the peace movement should be transformed into such a revolutionary movement, nor does it mean that there is not a valuable role for the peace movement as it now stands.

We must make a distinction between being objectively revolutionary and subjectively revolutionary. An organization which carries out a program of major transformation and which is aware of the social consequences of what it proposes may be considered objectively revolutionary, and may refer to itself as such. It turns out, however, that in our country such organizations when viewed in terms of accomplishment and productivity are quite non-revolutionary and amount to little more than gum-beating

A movement such as the civil rights movement, on the other hand, seems to be aimed at a set of single issues. There is a great deal of material issued by SDS and others, however, which indicate that the consequences of civil rights for Negroes will bring about major economic and political changes in the country. Thus, while members of the civil rights movement may or may not be aware of the revolutionary nature of the movement, it is nonetheless objectively revolutionary.

We consider that the peace movement falls within this category also. The changes which must be made to successfully operate an automated industrial system without a war economy are revolutionary changes. The political changes needed to allow the USA to compete with the Russians (and Chinese) peacefully are revolutionary political changes.

The peace movement does not need to proclaim itself as revolutionary in order to be so, and the actions being demanded by the peace movement as it is now constituted lead in the directions we have measured.

db/22

Kneen asserts that "...forces of the status quo...will make a place for a reformist or liberal peace movement". We wish that Mr. Kneen would say this a bit louder so that Senator Dodd and HUAC might hear him. Apparently they haven't gotten the line yet. The peace movement, far from being "another functionary of the Establishment, of the war machine", is actually quite a radicalizing phenomenon. A student may become interested in a peace group for no deeper reason than the fact that he doesn't like the taste of radioactive milk. He is therefore concerned with the question of testing, which leads to the question of a test ban treaty. This leads to the question of who did what at Geneva and why. This leads to a discussion of the possibility that a treaty which may be in the offing would have a most difficult time getting a 2/3 Senate ratification. This in turn leads to the question of in whose interest does the Senate act and why?, what is the role of the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition in the Senate?, how is the coalition affected by the lack of Negro voting rights in the South?, what is the relationship between peace and civil rights?, what is the relationship between hostility to disarmament and the need for arms spending?, what steps must be taken before the labor movement can support disarmament without facing unemployment?, who would profit from these steps?, who would not?, how much of the "Cold War" is being fought over colonial areas?, what is the effect of the colonial revolution on American Economic Relations? We might go further, much further in fact, but the point is made. It is the great weakness of the student peace movement that it often fails to show these connections, but the framework is there, or as it is put, "He who says A, must say B". Far more students will start out with a proposition A, the taste of radioactive milk, than will start out with a proposition Z, "imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism!"

We must now ask if the student peace movement doesn't have a real function apart from the above which justifies its existence at this time. The answer is an unqualified yes. Who, if not the student peace movement, is best equipped to carry the scientific data on the effects of radiation to the campus? Who is best equipped to bring to light the data which make any shelter program ludicrous? Who has the forces to go out into the community and explain that to accept a test ban treaty is not treason? Who has the manpower and the facilities to carry on research on disarmament and reconversion? Granted that the student peace movement as it now stands, does the above imperfectly, but does that mean that we agree with Kneen that "...we do not seek to keep such a movement alive, nor attempt to revive the corpse..." Not at all. (It must be stated that the reports of the death of the student peace movement have been greatly exaggerated.) If anything, with a test ban treaty in sight, renewed efforts are called for.

Now it might be suggested that a more effective way to carry out this activity would be to work through a multi-issue student organization which is in a better position to follow through on the chain of questions that the issue of peace raises, and if this suggestion were made we would be the first to agree.

Let us look at the second proposition which Kneen raises, that students are not flocking into the peace movement because they somehow realize that it is "...just another functionary of the establishment, of the war Machine." We would suggest that the only students who have stayed away for this reason are those who have given their ears to one of several extreme left splinter groups, or perhaps to Brewster Kneen. Even the purest of the pure, the Trotskyite Young Socialist Alliance (youth group of the Socialist Workers Party, fourth International and direct descendant of the Bolshevik Party, self-proclaimed) so loves the Student Peace Union that they will not part with one of their meagre positions in it.

The bulk of American students, at least from my experience, will not support the student peace movement because it is closer to A. J. Muste than it is to John Kennedy. Those organizations which were in the streets during "Cuba Week" discovered this rather rudely.

It is of course true that there are a number of young radicals who are not in the

peace movement, who do hold Kneen's sincere position, and many more who have left the movement because of such things as inefficiency, factionalism, etc., but this is not "The American Student".

Now what of the proposition that the answer to the problem of the student peace movement "...does not lie in organization though this must come in time", but rather we must devote our energies to spreading the "right word", or words, "Community, Personalism, Integrity, Universalism, Non-violence, Faith, Hope, and Joy." OK. We are for these, but, it seems to us that man's philosophical perspective develops out of his interaction with other men and with his environment, and that such a perspective does not burst full blown in the midst of the bundle of matter that thinks, the brain. Nor is simple advocacy sufficient, for such philosophy if not combined with regular practice is hollow, ephemeral, and a best a three-week fad. We would contend, then, that what Kneen proposes to do is start with what for him is point Z and then work his way back to A. We believe in involving ourselves today in practical political activity which is understandable and supportable by large numbers, and which meets immediate needs and situations of people and nations. Only by so doing will the process be started whereby people may as a result of their own experience and perceptions in bucking the system eventually arrive at Kneen's point Z. Kneen's people are not real people, they do not exist, and will not until the physical (social) conditions which produce such people exist. We feel, then, that to start at the end and work toward the beginning is not itself a realistic approach. Kneen has not suggested a tactical way to do this. If he can, let us hear it.

For we know only too well;  
 even the hatred of squalor  
 makes the brow stern.  
 Even the anger against injustice  
 makes the voice grow harsh. Alas, we  
 who wished to lay the foundations of kindness  
 could not ourselves be kind.

But you, when at last it comes to pass  
 that man can help his fellow man,  
 do not judge us  
 too harshly.

--Bertolt Brecht

\*\*\*\*\*  
 CONTRIBUTORS TO THE DISCUSSION BULLETIN:

STEVE JOHNSON, a junior at Harvard, is an SDS member and chairman of TOCSIN, the Harvard/Radcliffe peace group.

PAUL BOOTH, a junior at Swarthmore C., is SDS Vice-President.

HAROLD LEWACK is a member of the LID Board of Directors.

DONALD MC KELVEY is Assistant National Secretary of SDS.

WARREN BRODHEAD is an SDS member at Williams C.

JIM WILLIAMS is an SDS member at the U. of Louisville.

TOM HAYDEN is SDS President.

DAVE RUSSELL is an SDS member at Harpur C. (Binghamton, N.Y.)

DICK FLACKS is a member of the SDS NEC and Director of the SDS Peace Research & Edu

STEVE MAX is a member of the SDS NEC and SDS Field Secretary. Project.