

Jan
82-
2083

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

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



S.D.S. BULLETIN

NO. 3, 1962-63

JANUARY-FEBRUARY

COUNCIL MEETS IN ANN ARBOR

During the Christmas holidays in Ann Arbor, SDS took a good look at itself and made several steps forward in its two-year old trek toward maturity. The meeting of the National Council, which is composed of NEC members plus representatives of chapters and associated groups, was attended by about 35 people from various points around the na-
(cont. on page 2)

The Bulletin is prepared by National Secretary Jim Monsonis and Assistant National Secretary Don McKelvey, except in the case of signed or quoted articles. Articles about local situations are usually derived from letters and other materials sent to the National Office by local groups and individuals. Any responsibility for inaccuracies, distortions, misstatements, etc., are usually the staff's, for which we apologize.

This issue of the Bulletin is divided into three parts: the Membership Bulletin (MB), containing news of SDS activities and other campus happenings; the Correspondence section (CORR), including primarily (this month) an interchange among a good number of people about the New York City newspaper strike; and the Discussion Bulletin (DB), containing substantive political articles by SDS members.

Needless to say, we urge all members to contribute to all three sections of the Bulletin.

Dues Are Due!!

AN OPEN LETTER TO SDS MEMBERS

Dear SDS Member,

This Membership Bulletin is quite long: eighteen pages not counting the Correspondence and Discussion Bulletin sections. It contains, we believe, much information of interest and importance to socially concerned students and others. But there are too few reports of activity by SDS groups and individuals, and this is the concern of this letter.

SDS members are not organizing. If we are to have a campus base it must consist of local chapters who engage in continual activity inter-relating the theoretical and action aspects of our program. Without such a base of chapters we are nothing more than a collection of like-minded individuals scattered at random through the American college scene.

Too often national officers and national meetings blame lack of financial stability for our inability to organize. Rather, the opposite is true, we suspect: we cannot raise money because we do not have chapters doing things. Chapters can be started with little or no local money and a minimum of resource help from the national office—mostly literature. What is needed is an investment of time and effort on the part of individual SDS members. We must get into our communities—whether these be the student bodies, particular areas of cities, work groups, or whatever—to promulgate ideas and stimulate action.

Until this effort and activity is
(cont. p. 2, right-hand column)

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING cont.

tion, including nine NEC members and five chapter representatives. Four days of intensive meetings on organizational plans, programming, and review of where we stand, left us rather exhausted but feeling more confident about the future.

It is hard to summarize the content of the meeting. How does one capture the sense of direction and purpose that emerged gradually; or the growing frustration attendant upon the realization that we simply do not have the resources to do what we wish to? Nevertheless certain programmatic and directional summaries can be made which can give some indication.

1. The National Council made the formal decision that top priority (with fund-raising) over the coming Spring is to be organizing chapters. We have the skeleton of a structure and some idea of an integrated philosophy of social change embodied in the Port Huron Statement; now we must fill in the skeleton and expand the PHS's constituency--which are essentially the same thing. At present we have only a few functioning chapters, some of which were organized during the Fall. But until there are many more chapters, comprising a co-ordinated body of students and young adults who are agents of social change and who identify themselves as SDS members, we will not be fulfilling our function. In the light of these long-range needs, the following organizational tasks are of primary importance over the Spring:

- a. paying expenses for Field Secretary Steve Max, so he can spend most of the Spring on the road and at campuses.
- b. a series of regional conferences dealing with the range of SDS views and

"Even to maintain the misery of Asia today at a constant level will require a rate of growth tripling the national income and the aggregate production in Asian countries by the end of the century. For Asians to have the (unacceptable) 150 standard of Europeans, less than \$2000 per year for a family, national production must increase 21-fold by the end of the century, and that monstrous feat only to reach a level that Europeans find intolerable."
---from the PHS

OPEN LETTER cont.

forthcoming, chapter reports will continue to be few and fund-raising an insuperable problem. A "movement" means local activity, and only the membership can build a movement.

THE NATIONAL STAFF

focusing on student involvement in social change; conferences are planned or hoped for in Ohio, Washington/Baltimore, New York State, possibly Illinois.

c. mailings which go out of the national office: an expanded Bulletin (this is the first); a bi-weekly key list mailing to key people on campuses; other things as they seem relevant. More concentration of national office on local groups and chapter building.

2. In the area of national program, the emphasis is to be on action that will assist local groups. The following were reviewed:

- a. a conference on university reform at Brandeis (see p. 5)
- b. a pamphlet on voter registration and the student's role, to educate and direct students interested in civil rights (see pp. 8 and 9)
- c. a mailing (about to be sent) including "Peace, Power, and the University" and a suggestions for local programming and organizing in the area of peace;
- d. a collection of documents to fill in the gap of material on university reform.

Some of the workings of the National Council are discussed elsewhere in this Bulletin, some will come in future Bulletins. In one sense it does not seem to be a very exciting result: the traditional areas of peace, civil rights, and university reform were discussed, along with the need for organization. It is more and more clear, though, that these are the frontiers of social change in America, and that students cannot and will not exercise their proper influence toward social change until they organize themselves into a self-directed, visionary community. It is the communication of this understanding to the people assembled that was most important--and the National Council meeting will be judged a success or failure by the extent to which these urgent tasks are carried forward over the Spring.

Mina Felshin reports from the BRANDEIS U. chapter (Waltham, Mass.) a number of activities. Besides the forthcoming University Reform conference being sponsored by the chapter on March 1-3 (see p. 5 story), SDS members are active in local disputes over NDEA and the campus newspaper, and plan to publish a Newsletter.

Though lack of an available mimeo machine thwarted plans to publish the first issue of "University Liberal Thought and Action" in early January, that problem has been solved and the Newsletter's prospects are bright. An all-campus referendum on participation in the revised NDEA is planned for the first post-intersession week. The chapter plans to get out a statement prior to the vote and are considering a debate between the Brandeis debate team and SDS Vice-President Paul Booth. An editorial on NDEA which could not appear in the proposed Newsletter was reprinted in the Justice (the campus paper).

Long-standing hostility between the school administration and the editorial staff of the Justice has resulted in the possibility of the college's withdrawing its support for the Justice, thereby causing its demise. The proposed administration solution--a Publications Board of primarily faculty membership whose function it would be to keep a week-to-week eye on the Justice's operations--is considered unsatisfactory by the students. An SDS-suggested compromise is being discussed now; both administration and Justice staff seem receptive. More news of developments in the next Bulletin.

At GEORGIA STATE COLLEGE (Atlanta), there are problems of administrative arbitrariness. Dayton Pruitt was told by the Dean of Men that there is a college rule prohibiting a campus group from affiliating with a national organization until one year after its formation on campus. No one else around the school, including the Student Activities Committee members, has heard of this regulation; aside from this, there appears to be no trouble, as Student Council approval seems assured. Plans for the first quarter are to concentrate mostly on the issue of student and faculty freedoms in the college.

From SWARTHMORE C., Paul Booth reports:

"As of now, we plan to set up an extra-curriculum of three seminars for the coming semester. It would include an American Society Seminar, a peace course, and a seminar on Student Affairs in co-operation with the NSA Committee and involving Bryn Mawr and Haverford /sister small Quaker schools/ people." (Last minute word is that SDSers are signing students up for SDS I, SDS II, and SDS III seminars at Spring registration.)

"We are also in the talking stages with County SANE people about peace politics. A joint meeting of all County peace groups will be held in March, at which I will give a presentation on peace politics.

"We are also discussing the possibility of stronger organic connections with the Swarthmore Political Action Club, a large group concentrating its efforts this year in Chester, a neighboring city, with a Negro Tutorial program and some direct action."

From NORTH TEXAS STATE C. (Denton), Bill Jamison reports that the chapter is having trouble becoming an official school club; "the administration, which completely controls decisions of this nature, is opposed to anything on the left of Goldwater.." SDS members there have been active in the officially recognized Political Economy Club, hoping thereby to introduce controversial subjects and viewpoints. They plan to be active contributors also to A Priori, a small literary journal.

"The FDR FOUR FREEDOMS CLUB, New York City SDS Associate, is holding a fund-raising drive for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee on the lower east side of Manhattan during the month of February. Participants will invade the housing projects in these areas in groups of four per building, ringing doorbells and collecting money for SNCC. The group is using as its headquarters for the drive a local Reform Democratic clubhouse. Many other groups are participating in the drive including Reform Democratic youth groups, NSA committees, and various independent campus groups. The drive will begin on February 10."

by Danny Hillstone
(more chapter news on page 4)

At HUNTER COLLEGE (Bronx Division) in NYC, the SDS chapter expects formal school recognition at the beginning of the semester, reports Mark Scher. Formal programming has been hampered by the lack of such recognition, though recruitment efforts have been quite successful over the Fall semester. Proposed for the coming semester are selective patronage efforts, weekly discussion of the Port Huron Statement, and a newsletter to the student body (the only political publications extant are the campus paper and an occasional YAF sheet). Also, SDS members will be involved in the planning of a proposed right-left debate over HUAC (to be sponsored by YAF and the campus civil liberties group), which will include showings of "Operation Abolition" and "Operation Correction", and a debate between outside speakers.

NSA REFORM PLAN AHEAD

In a draft outline which was considered extensively by the NSA NEC over Christmas, SDS NEC member Al Haber (U. of Michigan) has suggested problems and principles for reform of the National Student Association. The outline is summarized briefly here; copies may be obtained from Al at 510 E. William, Ann Arbor, Mich. In the next Bulletin, we expect a story indicating the reaction of the NSA NEC to the proposals.

The main thrust of the problems and reforms discussed centers around: (1) the relative lack of substantive political discussion of many of the issues dealt with by NSA; (2) the considerable lack of participation on the part of member schools and their delegates to the National Student Congress; and (3) the overabundance of resolutions at the NSC and the resultant diffusion of energies and lack of focus.

The suggested reforms include: (1) the institutionalization of ideologically oriented caucuses (liberal and conservative or radical, liberal, moderate, and conservative) at the NSC and provision that they meet daily to develop partisan arguments on issues and priorities and that candidates for major NSA offices debate before them; (2) the setting up of a Resolutions Committee (to be elected by the NSA NEC) whose specific function would be to gather proposed

resolutions and to solicit counter-resolutions and arguments for all sides; members of each caucus would be ex officio on the Resolutions Comm.; (3) the replacement of outside speakers at the NSC by student debates on issues; (4) distribution well in advance of the NSC of a resolutions booklet containing resolutions and counter-resolutions proposed for the NSC and background material prepared by the NSA National Office and by interested schools and individuals; (5) the institutionalization of NSA responsiveness to member schools and their student governments, including encouraging them to prepare materials on resolutions suggested by them and to suggest topics and resource personnel for the NSC; (6) cutting the number of resolutions to be considered by the NSC to ten (2 from each of the five standing committees, which would have the responsibility of holding seminars on the various proposed resolutions and of weeding out all but two), thus pinpointing issues and encouraging individuals and student governments to involve themselves more in issues of concern to them; (7) discontinuation of the referral of policy questions to the post-NSA NEC meeting; that body would be mandated only to consider questions of program and administration; (8) giving to the officers the prerogative to speak for the Association within the scope of the Basic Policy Declarations.

While discussing proposed reforms of the NSA, it is interesting to note a CPS release of December 14, 1962, noting a Daily Californian (U of Cal-Berkeley) editorial calling for making the compulsory campus-wide election of all NSC delegates a criterion for membership in NSA. Many schools' delegates are now selected by appointment by the student government. The editorial argued that inasmuch as the NSA was perceived as speaking for "the American student", it should be more directly responsive to its constituents' wishes. (It should be noted that the Haber proposals would facilitate such a procedure by getting the issues out to student governments--and assumedly thereby to the student bodies--as well in advance of the NSC as possible, and through greater responsiveness to students, creating greater involvement in NSA's workings.)

CUBA DEMONSTRATION IN ATLANTA

Although the following story was received from Atlanta prior to the publication of the last Membership Bulletin, it was not included then due to an oversight. Because of the importance of the Atlanta demonstrations, we are including the story now.

"Demonstrations against Kennedy's position on Cuba were held in Atlanta the Thursday and Friday following his Monday television announcement of the blockade. Because Atlanta's only "peace" organization, the Peace Council, is not action-oriented, the demonstrations were spontaneously planned and publicized by several individuals who shared the same point of view on the crisis. This was an inspiring aspect of the demonstrations, for no one would have predicted such a response in a city which has heard almost nothing about peace issues.

"Numerically the group was quite small--about 30 the first day, 20 the second--not worth mentioning in comparison with Washington, New York, and other places. However, this small number was quite significant from another perspective, in that they were the first demonstration for peace in the Deep South, an area considered more militaristic by nature than the North and without the tempering influence of newspapers with a moderate or liberal position on Cuba.

"The demonstrations received enormous publicity. Representatives from the NY Times (Claude Sitton), UPI, AP, Newsweek, TV stations, radiostations, and the local papers covered the peace picketing, as well as the two separate counter-pickets--one initiated by the National States Rights Party (affiliated with the American Nazi Party) and one started by students from Georgia State U. The demonstrations were also well covered by the city police and plainclothesmen from the FBI and Georgia Bureau of Investigation, who questioned and took pictures of each person in the anti-blockade line, though not the others. This served as a restraining factor upon people who otherwise would have joined the group.

"The angle taken by the local press was that the peace demonstration was composed primarily of members of the civil rights movement. (In fact, it was

UNIVERSITY REFORM CONFERENCE PLANS

MB/5

Plans are going well for the conference on University Reform announced in the last Membership Bulletin. It will be held the weekend of March 1-3 at Brandeis University, and over 100 students from New England and the Middle Atlantic area are expected to attend.

Aimed at exploring the present nature of the university and the necessary revisions and reforms necessary in order for that institution to play a socially responsible role in the society, the conference key-note address will be given by Paul Goodman, author of Growing Up Absurd, Community of Scholars, and many other works. Other speakers include SDS President Tom Hayden, NEC member Bob Ross, Brandeis U. Dean Milton Sachs, and local faculty members.

For information on the conference before its formal announcement, contact: Ann Cooper, 561 South St., Waltham, Mass.

THE COLLEGIATE PRESS SERVICE

Membership Bulletin readers will notice a number of stories credited to "CPS". This stands for the Collegiate Press Service, which was set up last Fall as a news service for campus newspapers. Owned and sponsored by the newspapers themselves--at present about 100 papers belong--it came into being under the auspices of the NSA though it is organizationally separate. It gathers news of student interest and activity from around the country and transmits it to member papers and groups. Your campus newspaper should be participating; for more information write: Mark Acuff, CPS, 3457 Chestnut St., Phila. 4, Pa. (Bad writing, by the way, in CPS stories in the Bulletin is due to our editing, not to Mark's original releases; don't blame him.)

about 1/3 or 1/2.) Moreover, the papers singled out one girl and tried to associate her with the Communist Party, thereby implicating the demonstration for peace as well as the civil rights groups represented there. An editorial written by Atlanta Constitution Editor Eugene Patterson criticized three professors who took part, two of whom had written a "letter to the editor" which was printed on the handbill used at the demonstration."

BOB ZELLNER HARASSED

Those who know of civil rights activities in the South know that Bob Zellner, SDS NEC member and SNCC staff member, has become rather notorious among the forces for the status quo. As a Southern white person working in the most militant force for change in the South, he has become particularly conspicuous and has undergone regular harassment. The story below, sent to us on January 31 from the South, tells something of the latest troubles--and incidentally something of the South:

A serious situation has arisen in Alabama, and we need your help. Bob Zellner has been harassed to the point where state agents created a state of terror at the funeral of his grandmother last weekend.

His grandmother was Mrs. J.J. Hardy of Mobile, Ala., widow of a Methodist minister who served many churches throughout Alabama. Bob's father is the Rev. James Zellner, who has also pastored a number of Methodist churches in Alabama and Florida.

Bob has been arrested several times because of his activities, once on a charge of criminal anarchy in Louisiana. He was arrested again Jan. 8 as he walked with some students on the campus of his alma mater, Huntingdon College in Montgomery, Ala. This time the charge was vagrancy, for which he was sentenced to 60 days in jail. He was freed under bond pending appeal.

Just before he was arrested, Bob had given a pawnbroker a check for \$85 for a camera he wanted to use in his work. He issued the check with the understanding that money to cover it had been deposited in his account in Atlanta. Through a clerical slip, the deposit was not made on schedule.

When the pawnbroker read of Zellner's arrest for vagrancy, he called the bank and was told there was not enough money in Bob's account to cover the check. Police then filed a charge of false pretense against Bob, although money to cover the check was deposited in the Atlanta bank within three hours after the pawnbroker made his complaint. If the pawnbroker had sent the check to the bank in the normal manner, the money would have been there when it reached

Atlanta. State authorities plan to present the false pretense charge to the county grand jury in Montgomery on Feb. 12. The charge carries a possible 10-year sentence.

"After Bob was released on bond, five men in automobiles and on foot followed him wherever he went in Montgomery, including to the home of his lawyer. They trailed him when he went to Mobile, where his grandmother was near death.

"Mrs. Hardy died last week and relatives gathered at the home of one of Bob's aunts in Mobile to pay their last respects. The agents trailing Bob set up a watch outside his home. It was learned by checking car licenses and credentials that they were from the office of Al Lingo, the new State Safety Director in Alabama.

"The presence of the agents caused so much distress among Mrs. Hardy's relatives that a state of terror resulted. Bob and his father made a personal appeal to the men to go away. Bob's mother, Mrs. Ruby H. Zellner, wrote a personal note to the agents in which she said:

"My mother was the widow of a Methodist minister. Both my mother and father were known and loved in many communities throughout Alabama. I am asking that this desecration of their memory be stopped at once."

"The pleas were ignored. Instead, the agents followed when Mrs. Hardy's body was removed to Loxley, Ala., for the wake. They hung around the funeral home, followed the family to church on Sunday morning, and then trailed the funeral procession on Sunday afternoon, January 27.

"Bob's father made a new appeal to the agents to leave them in peace--but this appeal was ignored. Instead, after the funeral, the agents followed Bob across the state line to Panama City, about 100 miles from Atlanta.

"Officials of the State Department, the State Educational Department, and various public officials are aware of the harassment of Bob Zellner, which results from his work for the benefit of all people. We ask you to support the protest by wiring, writing, or calling one or all of the following:

"1. Maury Smith, Assistant Circuit Solicitor, Montgomery, Ala., regarding the charges against Bob.

(continued bottom page 7)

(CPS): During the Fall semester, the question of discrimination in fraternities and sororities came up a number of times at various colleges and universities. What follow are brief accounts of some of the cases which have come to our attention.

The Stanford U. chapter of Sigma Nu voted unanimously to go local over the issue of discrimination in the national. President Thomas Grey of the local said the action came because the national convention of Sigma Nu last summer failed to respond to the Stanford chapter's request to eliminate the bias clause against Negroes and Orientals. Grey said the action was a matter of principle, not a result of a desire to pledge a particular individual. University President J.E. Wallace Sterling, citing a resolution passed by the Stanford trustees committing the University to "work actively" with student groups attempting to end discrimination and bias clauses, issued a statement supporting the chapter's decision.

At Brown U. also the Sigma Nu chapter is considering the possibility of withdrawing from the national because of discriminatory clauses in the national constitution. The Brown local attempted to have the constitution changed at last summer's convention.

The Swarthmore chapter of Kappa Sigma was suspended from the national in early November for "attempting to involve other chapters in organizing to defy the national's basic principles, and failure to maintain standards of scholarship" (according to the national). The local attributed the suspension to

(ZELLNER, cont.)

"2. Richmond Flowers, Attorney General of Alabama, Montgomery, Ala.; Gov. George C. Wallace, Montgomery; and Al Lingo, Director of Public Safety, Montgomery, regarding the charges and the harassments by state agents.

"B. Attorney-General Robert Kennedy and the US Commission of Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., about the arrest and harassment. Stress that state agents followed the Zellners across state lines, putting the case within federal jurisdiction."

its recent efforts "to change the unwritten discriminatory policy of the national", which involved soliciting support from other chapters for removal of the "gentlemen's agreement" barring non-whites from membership. At a regional conclave, the national's treasurer is reported to have said that Jewish members were "frowned upon" and "any chapter which bid a Negro would be expelled". (Another chapter had been expelled previously for pledging an Oriental.) The Swarthmore local has since decided not to attempt to gain readmission to the national.

At the U. of Wisconsin, faculty members passed a resolution requiring that all fraternities and sororities on campus demonstrate autonomy from nationals (in matters of race, national origin, and creed) in selecting members. The resolution grew out of a controversy over discrimination in Greek groups on campus. Specifically, the Delta Gamma sorority has come under fire as a result of the national's alleged policy of discrimination. (Last year the Beloit [Wis] C. chapter was suspended after pledging a Negro, allegedly for ten different infractions of national rules.) However, the DG local claims autonomy and says it is working to improve the national in this regard; and the faculty has postponed the institution of a measure banning them from the campus. Also coming under scrutiny due to national policy has been the Kappa Sigma local (see preceding paragraph). And at the U. of Minnesota, the Delta Gamma local has also been investigated.

Iowa State U. has asked three unidentified national fraternities to remove discriminatory clauses from the constitutions of the local chapters. The Dean of Student Affairs said that the three were the only ones with such clauses at I.S.U.

The Intrafraternity Council of Union College of Schenectady, N.Y., has adopted a resolution offered by Phi Delta Theta recommending that the school prohibit further initiations by social groups with written discrimination clauses, after December 1964. Phi Delta Theta is the only group on campus with such a clause.

BOWDOIN POLITICAL ISSUES COMM: A REPORT
 Dick Hathaway, faculty co-ch, SDS member

The Bowdoin Political Issues Committee, whose primary purpose was to inject a political hypodermic needle into a partly comatose campus community, was established in March 1962. Including both faculty and students, it was very much an ad hoc entity which attempted to meet the specific needs of a men's school of 900 students and faculty. The campus had not, during the previous decade, demonstrated any notable sympathy for the peace and social justice concerns which are at least more evident, if not dominant, at such institutions as Oberlin, Swarthmore, Antioch, Earlham, and Reed. The school has prided itself on being a happy amalgam of both "conservative" and "dynamic" ingredients. But the upshot in terms of atmosphere and intellectual climate has sometimes seemed that of genteel apathy and cosmopolitan privatism than that of any vigorous political ideology whatever.

The structure of BPIC, which is formally non-partisan and open-ended in membership and whose budget is drawn from the student activities fee, comprises several levels of personnel and activities. The Executive Comm. has six co-chairmen (3 students, 3 faculty) and two other student officers. Some twenty to thirty participants attend most of the BPIC-sponsored events--notably the bi-weekly seminar/discussions which probe such themes as "The Power Elite Reconsidered" and "Unilateral Initiatives and Disarmament". In addition, there are perhaps 200 students who might attend back-to-back showings of "Operation Abolition" and ACLU's "Operation Correction", or receive literature on the politics of peace. One of BPIC's major projects is the annual BPIC Commentary, a magazine addressed to all who wish to participate in reasoned discussion and debate over the major issues of our decade--the questions of war and peace, the nature and goals of government and its proper relation to the citizens, the problems of revitalizing the democratic ideology and process, etc.--and open to all.

Thus, the focus of BPIC has been to abandon the spectator-oriented activities of traditional campus "political forums", or the intermittent, election-oriented framework of the Young Democrats and

SDS TO PRODUCE VOTER REGISTRATION PAMPHLET

One of the most important "events" taking place in the South is the extensive voter registration activity of the past two years, especially student activity. Yet nothing has been written on this which highlights the students' role and is readily available to students. SDS will attempt to fill this vacuum with the publication, hopefully by the beginning of March, of a pamphlet on Voter Registration and the Student's Role. It will be a series of essays and reports by SDS members and others directed toward stimulating interest and participation in the voter registration drive. About 36 pages in length and photo-offset, the pamphlet will sell for 25¢ per copy, or \$20 per 100. On the next page you will find the pamphlet's content outline.

The pamphlet should be distributed as widely as possible this Spring, both for educational purposes and in order to help efforts in the South this summer. Let us hear from you with orders (and advance payments) for single copies or bulk orders to sell on campus.

Young GOP groups. Instead, the committee has formulated a series of participatory, action-oriented programs which will enable the alert and the concerned to "grab hold" at a point where it makes sense to him.

While scarcely the most numerous or most opulent campus organization, and still dependent upon a tiny group of activists, BPIC has added another dimension to the process of discovery at Bowdoin. It hopes to continue stimulating "perpetual insurrection" against the corruptions and inadequacies of contemporary society. It hopes to mobilize a sense of urgency and to focus upon the vital rather than those ephemeral issues too often dominant in a private, distracted undergraduate world. For if the intellectuals are not the actual agency of change, they are at least a crucial element among the preparators. Groups such as BPIC can confront the inarticulate student feelings of anxiety and discomfort over the status quo, and assist in the transformation of these vague perceptions into a matured and persuasive critique of their imperfect world. Should this emergent critique prove relevant, then the very validity of its message would achieve that momentous response which awaits "an idea whose time has come".

VOTER REGISTRATION IN THE SOUTH: THE STUDENT'S ROLE

Edited by Sandra Hayden

I. INTRODUCTION TO A PROBLEM

Timothy Jenkins places the problem of political change in the South in the context of the international revolution of rising expectations and the pervasiveness of racism in American life.

II. A POLITICAL ANALYSIS

Thomas Hayden discusses the shift of the civil rights movement in the South to voter registration as a method of achieving basic change; the problems faced, the conservative coalition in Congress as a block to social legislation, the possible effects nationally and regionally of increased Negro registration.

III. FACTORS INFLUENCING REGISTRATION

A summary of a study by James Prothro and Donald Mathews of the University of North Carolina on the relative influence of socio-economic and political factors in determining the number of Negroes registered.

IV. CONCLUSIONS OF THE U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

A summary of the findings of the Commission on problems of registrants in the Deep South states and legal progress to date.

V. TWO SOUTHWIDE EFFORTS

Jack Minnis, Research Director of the Voter Education Project of the Southern Regional Council, and Andrew Young, Director of the Citizenship Education Program of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference discuss these two projects as stimulants for grass-roots activity.

VI. CASE STUDIES IN STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

1. Raleigh, N.C.: What Can Be Done, by Dorothy Dawson
2. Baltimore, Maryland: Lessons Learned, by Kimberly Moody
3. Mississippi: A Report, by Robert Moses
4. Jackson, Tennessee: A Summary, by Richard Ramsey
5. Albany, Georgia: What Happened Here, by Charles Sherrod

Each of the studies analyses how the group was organized, composition of the group, significant aspects of the project, problems encountered, future needs.

6. The South: Why Act?

- A Story About a Lady, by Robert Moses
- Letter to a Northern Friend, by Jack Ghatfield
- Two vignettes on work in the Deep South

VII. IF YOU WANT TO KNOW MORE: A CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

An annotated bibliography of periodicals, books, and articles, prepared by Robb Burlage

VIII. IF YOU WANT TO ACT

A list of agencies through which students can work.

IX. STATISTICS

On the South, voting and registration, and the Negro in the U.S.

SOME SUGGESTED READINGS FROM PERIODICALS

Appearing briefly in the last Membership Bulletin and more extensively in this one and in the future is a regular "column" or "feature" containing a synopsis of articles of importance and interest to SDS members. We urge you both to read the suggested articles and to let the National Office know (preferably in a form directly insertable into the Bulletin) about any articles you have come across which you feel other SDSers should know about. If a bias toward international affairs and peace concerns is noticed and an insufficient breadth of reading is criticized, it is because one person did most of the preparation for this month's column. It is thus doubly important that many people write in with suggested readings.

Also, this is a good time to remind SDS members that any Discussion Bulletin articles of less than one page in length go automatically into the Membership Bulletin, and that longer articles either go into a separate Discussion Bulletin or are also included in the Bulletin, depending on the amount of such material available.

CUBA AND THE CRISIS: Two recent visitors to Cuba, upon returning, report that material conditions are quite good (certainly better than elsewhere in Latin America) and that Fidel Castro still retains very substantial support from the Cuban people. I. E. Stone, in his Weeklys of Jan. 7, 14, and 21, reports on his Christmastime trip to Cuba. Though unhappy about the government's complete control of all sources of information and propaganda, he clearly feels that the Revolution has not ossified and is still free-wheeling and relatively free from bureaucratization (though he does have some caustic things to say about Cuban bureaucrats)--he calls it nearly anarchist. He (assumedly approvingly) quotes a Le Monde reporter who said that "in no country have I seen such intimacy between a leader and his people", and notes approvingly that in the intra-Communist bloc Cold War, Cuba alone stands in the Third Camp. Fidel is, says IFS, clearly in political control of the regime and the Revolution--in fact, the Cuban CP is actually declining in power. Cuba, says Stone, is a "Popular Democ-

racy, a kind of continuous town meeting under a popular dictator".

Dorothy Day's conclusions and style of work are extremely difficult to describe. I urge strongly that Bulletin readers obtain copies of the (monthly) Catholic Worker (175 Christie St., NYC 2; 5¢/issue) for the months of September through December 1962 in order to catch the flavor of her rambling and highly personal and human style. Though a Catholic pacifist, she has consistently supported the Revolution, which has become anti-clerical and which has not always been particularly gentle with its enemies. Her support for the regime clearly is based on her belief that the vast majority of Cubans have been given the opportunity to realize human dignity by the Revolution. Her four-part Pilgrimage to Cuba presents a viewpoint and perspective found nowhere else.

Many analyses of Cuban, American, and Soviet policies and strategies have been generated by the blockade crisis of October 1962. To this reviewer the most interesting--and very possibly the most valid, especially in the light of recent developments on a test ban treaty--analysis is to be found in the December 1962 issue of Liberation (5 Beekman St, NYC 38; 40¢) in an article by Leslie Dewart entitled "The Prospects for Peace". Dewart's basic thesis is that the U.S. response to the never concealed emplacement of missiles in Cuba was precisely the response which the Kremlin anticipated and desired, and the result of the crisis--which, due to Soviet calculations, never really had us on the brink of war--were those desired by Khrushchev et al. These results included two of especial import: a considerable loosening of American inflexibility on Cuba itself (he quotes Stevenson's Oct. 23 UN statement that the U.S. was unconcerned with Cuba's socialist and dictatorial system as long as it did not present an offensive nuclear threat to the Western Hemisphere--at least, one might add editorially, for the time being), and greater U.S. willingness to negotiate differences in negotiable areas such as a test ban treaty.

A series of nine articles on Cuba and the crisis is to be found in New Politics of Fall 1962 (vol. 2, #1). The

views range from opposition to support of the blockade and of the Cuban regime. The contributors include Norman Thomas, Victor Alba, Hal Draper, Robert H. Alexander, Boris Goldenberg, Dave Dellinger (an especially good article), Roy Finch, Samuel Shapiro, and Antonio de la Carrera. (N.P., 507 5 Ave, NYC 17; 90¢)

PEACE CAMPAIGNS: '62: Council of Correspondence Editor Roger Hagan, in an article entitled "Peace at the Polls: '62 Lessons for '64" in The Nation of Feb. 2, 1963 (333 6 Ave, NYC 14; 25¢), contrasts peace-concerned people working in electoral campaigns in '62 with the "old" peace movement. The former, he says, are mostly liberals alienated from the Kennedy administration only by its unwillingness to stop the drift of militarism. They are quite "moderate", they support the ACDA and studies on the economics of disarmament but feel that a minimum deterrence force is necessary, for now at least. They are not inured to constant defeat and long struggle, as are the "old" peace movement. In this context, the already extremely sticky question of how "radical" to be in opposing the Kennedy administration's foreign and military policies becomes even more difficult. Hagan's article devotes itself primarily to a discussion of this problem and how various peace candidates reacted to it.

Pete Irons, Ed Knappman, and Dawn Lander of the Washington Office of the Student Peace Union, have compiled a factual study of the campaigns of 35 peace candidates, based on experience in some campaigns, campaign literature, and responses to a questionnaire on candidates' stands on some specific issues. The document, which also contains information on organizations working in or created by campaigns, will be enlarged in a future edition. (SPU, Box 3031, Washington 10, D.C.; 25¢)

ILGWU/NAACP DISPUTE: Over the past months there has been debate and friction between two natural allies--the civil rights and labor movements--over the question of discrimination within the labor unions themselves. The debate particularly rages over the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; in the last two issues of New Politics (Fall and Winter; 507 5 Ave, NYC 17; 90¢) readers can peruse the first parts

of the dispute over that union. The Fall issue includes testimony to a government investigation committed by NAACP Labor Secretary Herbert Hill; the Winter issue the reply by Gus Tyler of the ILG and some correspondence in response to the Hill article. Coming in the future are further replies by Hill, Tyler, and undoubtedly others.

INDIA/CHINA: As ever, I.F. Stone sheds some light on the Sino-Indian border dispute; his articles in the Dec. 3 and 10 Weeklys provide, in his words, "an antidote to the exaggerations in the American press", as well as some good background material.

In New America (the weekly organ of the Socialist Party) of Jan. 15, 1963, is a debate between Mike Harrington and Hal Draper on the India-China dispute. Harrington favors the extension of all possible aid to India (including military aid), as does a statement of the SP's National Council, on the grounds of helping a democratic (though not socialist) India against a totalitarian China bent upon destroying India, economically and militarily and thereby removing a competitor. Harrington's article, in fact, is a polemic against China. Draper, on the other hand, views the conflict as a border dispute over control of (a) territory and (b) peoples neither Indian nor Chinese ethnically, and advises against sending military aid and thereby exacerbating the conflict. (Room 402, 1182 Broadway, NYC 1; 15¢)

AMERICAN NUCLEAR POLICY: A factual and analytical article of great importance is to be found in the October 1962 issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists--Michael Brower's "Nuclear Strategy of the Kennedy Administration". Relying on primary source materials (speeches and military data), Brower reveals a considerable degree of contradiction between Kennedy Administration statements and what one could logically infer from actual present and proposed military strength levels. This is a must. (935 E. 60, Chicago 37; 75¢)

CIVIL DEFENSE: Not among those who believe that C.D. is pretty much dead is Dawn Lander of the Washington Office of the SPU. After attending Congressional hearings on civil defense last spring, and noting the government-inspired "sec-

and rise of the shelter fable" during the Cuban crisis, she has written "Civil Defense--Le Grand Illusion" in the Southern Atlantic Region SPU Newsletter of early January 1963 (vol. II, #8). The author notes the relationship of CD to the counterforce military doctrine (McNamara considers it an integral part thereof), discusses many of the illusory aspects of civil defense, notes how the instigation of a really potentially effective fallout shelter would be both expensive (c. \$275 billion to protect 120 million) and provocative, and includes a brief bibliography. We have not, she feels, seen the end of civil defense. (SPU, Box 3031, Washington 10, D.C.; 5¢)

A DEBATE ON GENERAL COLD WAR ISSUES:

A very interesting debate will be found in the November 1962 issues of The Minority of One (Box 544, Passaic, N.J.; 35¢) between Dave McReynolds of the War Resisters League and TMO Editor N.S. Arnoni. In "Dissenting from Dissenters", McReynolds accuses TMO of seeing the world in blacks and whites rather than in greys (more specifically of being at best pro-Soviet and at worst Soviet-apologist), of advocating too broad a peace movement (i.e. including Communists) while at the same time attacking much of what is considered the "respectable" peace movement (e.g. SANE, TTP, Norman Thomas, et al), and of violating the George Orwell dictum which appears in every TMO ("there was truth and there was untruth, and if you clung to the truth even against the whole world you were not mad") by not printing anti-Soviet truths. Arnoni, in his reply, entitled "When Dissenters Conform", answers McReynolds's substantive political points (of which there are quite a few; the debate encompasses a range of Cold War issues) tellingly but at times is too extreme in drawing illogical and tenuous analogies between McReynolds's statements and those of some unusually disagreeable fascist. Arnoni delineates his political viewpoint (that the balance of blame--to use C. Wright Mills's phrase--lies to a very great extent with the U.S.); states why he favors a "broad" peace movement and goes into an extensive criticism of Hower Jack; and indicates his feeling that although

KENNEDYS WIELD McCARREN ACT

Recently Attorney-General Robert Kennedy requested that the Subversive Activities Control Board cite Advance Youth Organization of New York City as a Communist Front Organization under the terms of the 1950 Internal Security (McCarran) Act. The Advance hearing before the SACB will come in a couple of months. If found "guilty", it must appeal to a court to prove its innocence.

The reader will find, in the Discussion Bulletin section of this Bulletin, the text of a draft resolution which is to be voted upon by the National Council. In co-sponsorship with the Campus Americans for Democratic Action, SDS plans to circulate this statement to other student organizations for support and further co-sponsorship as a joint statement opposing both the McCarran Act itself and its application in this situation. Through the widespread use of this statement, or one drawn up by local campus activists, it will hopefully be possible to help provide the educational basis which must exist if there is to be an intelligent, articulate, and effective movement against the formal and informal denial of civil liberties.

In addition, SDS members and friends are urged to contribute critiques and additional comments on the statement and the whole civil liberties question much as occurred with the newspaper strike (see Correspondence section). Let us have your comments and send us word of your activities.

he has no desire to let Soviet aberrations go unnoticed and uncomented upon, he has even less desire to give ammunition to Cold Warriors who are unconcerned with the well-being of Soviet citizens but rather desire only to use such statements for prosecuting the Cold War. ("It is one thing to tell or withhold the truth for pragmatic considerations, and another to refuse to pour truth into a liar's mixing bowl.") This debate is most interesting, to say the least; and it brings up many, and many types of, issues very vital to the peace movement.

PROFESSOR FIRED FOR PRO-CUBA VIEWS

The following is reprinted from I.F. Stone's Weekly of Dec. 17, 1962.

"We urge a maximum effort to protest the action taken by Michigan State University-Oakland in dropping Samuel Shapiro as assistant professor and its senior American historian. Dr. Shapiro made himself "controversial" by articles he wrote for The New Republic and The Nation in the wake of three visits to Castro's Cuba, the first in August, 1960; the second in January, 1961 and the most recent in August 1962. Though critical of certain aspects, particularly the loss of civil liberties, Dr. Shapiro praised the constructive achievements of the revolution and opposed the U.S. policy of strangulation. The article let loose a flood of hostile publicity, and Dr. Shapiro has pending a suit for slander against a Lansing, Mich. TV commentator who called him a Communist.

"A New Yorker who went to City College and took his Ph.D. at Columbia, Dr. Shapiro has taught at Brandeis and Oberlin and was a Fulbright professor in Argentina. He will finish his third year at Michigan State in April. He has been informed that the board of trustees voted not to renew his contract. As usual in such cases, the university sought to create the impression that they were acting only because Dr. Shapiro was not meeting academic standards, that he was getting too interested in journalism, was not producing scholarly work, etc. They also complained that he was spending too much time on Latin American affairs and Cuba, as if these were somehow too distant from U.S. history--though the problem of Cuba only a few weeks ago threatened to write our final chapter.

"On the score of scholarship, Dr. Shapiro seems to be outstanding on his campus. Since Michigan State's establishment at Oakland in 1959, the whole faculty of some 60 teachers has produced only five books. The Michigan State press published Dr. Shapiro's doctoral, a biography of Richard Henry Dana, Jr. A second book of his, "Invisible Latin America", will be published next year [1963] by Beacon Press. Only a few months ago Michigan State granted him \$700 to buy microfilms for

NEWSPAPER SUES FOR ITS FREEDOM

(CPS): In what could be an historic case, nine students at Flint Community College (Flint, Mich.), including student government officials, editors, and interested students, have filed a brief in U.S. District Court of Flint bringing suit against the Flint Board of Education for the freedom of their campus newspaper, the "College Glamor". The chairman of the Michigan region of NSA has retained the services of two lawyers to assist the students. The object of the suit, according to the students, is to ascertain whether the editorial board of the student paper or the college administration is ultimately responsible for what is printed in the paper. If the court holds with the students--that the students are responsible--the decision would have wide implications, as administrative control over the campus press is currently (formally) based on administrative responsibility for its content. We will do our best to keep up with this story.

ONE FOURTH OF FACULTY RESIGNS IN PROTEST

(CPS): Of the 26-man faculty at Lincoln College (Lincoln, Ill.), four have already resigned over the dismissal of another professor for his anti-Cuba blockade picketing, and two more have announced pending resignations unless their picketing colleague is reinstated. The professor, Joseph Lester, was informed recently by the trustees of the private college that his contract would not be renewed because he had not exercised "appropriate restraint" in expressing his opinions. "Appropriate restraint" is one of the guidelines for academic freedom subscribed to by the American Association of University Professors. Lester, however, contended that the phrase means "staying within the law", which he did while picketing the Lincoln Post Office.

a third book, on Daniel Webster.

"Dr. Shapiro has been one of the few American scholars courageous enough to deviate from U.S. "party line" and to write sympathetically of Cuba. His dismissal will bring derisive echoes from Latin America. At home it will frighten others into silence or conformity. We urge a strong kick-back."

COLUMBIA U. PRESIDENT HITS REVISED NDEA

(CPS): President Grayson Kirk of Columbia (one of the first major institutions to refuse to participate in the original National Defense Education Act), has expressed disapproval of the new provisions in the revised Act. Of the new provisions, Kirk said, "There are not things we would want to settle down and live with." Though the disclaimer signing provision has been dropped from the Act, the amendments recently signed into law declare it a crime for a member of a Communist organization, as defined by the Subversive Activities Control Board, even to apply for or to use an NDEA scholarship. A number of organizations have been formed at Columbia and other New York City schools to express continued opposition to the revised NDEA.

The Columbia Spectator, student newspaper, has called the provisions "a sinister attempt to clothe reactionary measures in seemingly liberal garb". The Michigan Daily editorialized "the [now] amendments will solve nothing and will only cause further aggravation". The North Carolina Daily Tar Heel said, "The debate essentially narrows down to the question of whether the government should set political qualifications for its scholarship aid. The eliminating of the disclaimer affidavit does little to end this debate." The Barnard Bulletin termed the revised NDEA a "wolf in sheep's clothing".

We concur.

This controversy takes on important ramifications in the light of the application of the McCarren Act to Advance Youth Organization (see story on page 12).

CLARK KERR AS JANUS

(CPS): President Clark Kerr of the University of California reaffirmed last week that he would not allow outside forces to restrict freedom of speech and inquiry at the University. Speaking to 3000 students at an outdoor meeting, Kerr said, "The right to free inquiry is an integral of the American society. The non-conformist, as contrasted with the conspirator, today as in ages past, serves humanity, and the university is one of his havens. When freedom of thought and expression has died on a university campus, it will be dead everywhere."

NSA TO HOLD CONFERENCE ON SERVICE CORPS

The proposed Domestic Peace Corps (formally known as the National Service Corps to avoid confusion with the overseas Peace Corps) will be the subject of a national conference on March 1-3 being sponsored by the National Student Association with Federal government cooperation. (For more information on the conference, contact NSA, 3457 Chestnut St., Phila. 4, Pa.) The NSA, as it did with the foreign Peace Corps, has urged the creation of such a force.

In a letter to Jed Johnson, National Chairman of the Young Adult Council, SDS National Secretary observed: "...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 document (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 or some other local political force, 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."

(CPS): Four students at the University of California's Riverside campus have filed for a writ of mandamus against the Regents of the University, President Clark Kerr, and their chancellor at Riverside. The suit is a result of the banning of a Communist speaker by Chancellor Speth last year. The students base their case solely on a freedom of speech basis.

(Noted here should be the famous "Kerr directives" not to permit student governments to speak on any "off-campus" issues.)

A REPORT FROM LOUISVILLE

From Louisville, Ky., comes news of efforts to provide food and clothing for wildcat strikers in southeastern Kentucky, and copies of a new student magazine hoping to fill the "large geographical gap between Oberlin's ACTIVIST and Jackson, Miss.'s MISSISSIPPI FREE PRESS."

For a full story of the bitter and violent dispute between 10,000 striking coal miners on the one hand and mine operators and the United Mine Workers on the other, we suggest you read the Jan. 17 issue of the National Guardian (197 E 4, NYC 9; 20¢) and the current issue of Common Sense (out around Feb. 10 or so). Briefly, the situation is this: In the midst of constantly worsening economic conditions in coal mining generally, brought on partly by automation, the mine owners cut back on welfare and benefit payments, undercut union contract wages, and in some cases even halted social security payments for unemployment. The UMW advised that workers continue at their jobs and then opposed the strike when it was called six months ago. The workers are in danger of having the four (UMW-owned) hospitals in the area closed down, as owners have refused to pay the 40¢/ton bonus specified in the contract which was used to keep the hospitals running. In addition, the Union has refused to honor the welfare cards of miners whose bosses have not paid the bonus. The situation has steadily deteriorated; the strikers are well-armed and well-organized, and violence threatens.

In the midst of this situation, efforts have been made at a number of places around the country to collect food and clothing for the miners and their families, and have met with considerable success: by December 24, \$15,000 cash and several tons of clothing had been collected from all sources. These efforts, however, have only partially met a continuing need; further contributions are urgently needed. Food, clothing, and/or money should be sent to: Hazard Needy Fund, c/o The Hazard Herald, Hazard, Ky.

At the U. of Louisville (a quite conservative campus), SDS member Jim Williams and others have been very active in gathering material and moral support for the miners. An "Are You Having a Merry Christmas?" leaflet and other in-

tensive efforts have gained support from campus Greek groups, professors, and religious organizations. In addition, Jim has been interviewed on WBAI (the Pacifica network subsidiary in NYC) on the strike, relief efforts, and the long-range economic implications of the affair.

The "New South Review" has published three issues thusfar. The first was devoted almost exclusively to the first of a series (the completion of which has been delayed) on "The Roots of Fascism: A Study of the Origins and Causes of State-Monopoly Capitalism" by co-editor Ed Clark (the other co-editor is Jim Williams). The second issue contained a number of documents and commentary on the Cuban crisis, including the texts of Premier Khrushchev's replies to Lord Russell and President Kennedy; statements by Women Strike for Peace, Turn Toward Peace, Gus Hall of the Communist Party, and the National Steering Committee of the Student Peace Union; and a Yevtushenkp poem, "Cuban Mother". The third issue included stories on the Hazard situation, End the Draft, aid for Mississippi voters who have suffered economic reprisal for attempting to register to vote, sympathetic reviews of Robert F. Williams's Negroes with Guns and William Appleton Williams's The United States, Cuba, and Castro; and laudatory letters (the editors say that critics apparently don't send letters). Subscriptions are \$2/year (at least 9 issues); write to MSR, PO Box 8344, Station E, Louisville 8, Ky. Contributions are also solicited, both monetary and literary/political. MSR declares itself open to all opinions from the Left, and hopes that as many viewpoints as possible will contribute.

international peace/disarmament directory is the title of a 96-page, pocket sized booklet which will be available March 1. This second edition pamphlet contains about 1400 organizational addresses as well as the titles, addresses and subscription data for more than 350 periodicals in nearly 80 countries around the world (Albania to Zanzibar). The cost will be \$1.00 per copy. For information contact: Lloyd Wilkie, 327 Dayton St., Yellow Springs, Ohio.

The Activist: Notes and Prospectus

by Jon Eisen (Oberlin College Chapter, ed., The Activist)

The current issue (Winter, 1963), now at the printer, is Vol.3, No. 2, Whole Number 6. The articles, mostly introspective and interpretative, include an anonymous (uncensored) letter from a Soviet citizen, an article by Harold Taylor called "The University in a New World", one by Paul Potter on "Revolution, Dormitories and the Student Movement", and "The Devil Theory of History" by Rev. Paul Rahmeier. Other pieces include McKelvey's "Random Thoughts after Cuba", and "Life and Crisis: Thought of a Young Girl." The latter, written by a highschool student, was censored by her principal and refused publication in the school paper and History Club magazine because "it went against President Kennedy's decision on Cuba." We are printing the article in the cause of a free school press. Books reviewed are Herman Kahn's Thinking about the Unthinkable (Carey McWilliams) and Harrington's The Other America (by Richard Lempert of Oberlin). This issue (the year's second to date) will run to 32 pages and will run us further into debt.

For the Spring Issue (we exude self confidence), in the works are: Students and the Democratic Party in California by Congressman Sisk, hopefully something about the HUAC mess by Congressman Ryan, the State of the Liberal Democrats in Ohio, by David Neuberger, The Church and Social Change by Honsonis, A Critical View of Voter Registration by Gordon Carey of CORE, Comic Books and the Changing American Hero, by Jerry Berman (Berkeley), How to Deal with the FBI: A Learner's Manual, by Walter South, plus longer stuff like Camus, Existentialism and Political Involvement by Julie Loud, and my piece on A View of Student Government. These, for the most part are indefinite. What is necessary, though, is some greater involvement on the choice and content of the material by SDS people. We invite you to submit manuscripts, critiques of present issues, and money, which leads us to the third paragraph...

Financing is achieved mostly through 1) subscriptions, 2) small donations, and 3) the private resources of the staff. We still owe upwards of \$120 to the last printer and will owe more than that to the present one. Rather than fund-raising -- staying in school requires time for study et al -- we have begun to concentrate on increasing subscriptions substantially: the free mailing to SDS members and friends is one example. Lack of capital has precluded advertising in other journals (and has about precluded publishing another issue). Ideally much more could be done in the way of exchange ads, free mailing, advertising, promotional blurbs, but of the present run of 2,000, only about 250 are paid subscribers. Oberlin sales will account for another 200-300, and book stores account for another 150 or so. There will be no more free mailing to SDS people. It is imperative that you subscribe now!

clip and mail with \$1.00 (3 issues)
to

The ACTIVIST
63 East Lorain Street
Oberlin, Ohio

-
- name -
-
- address -
-
- -
-
- I include \$1 for each year -

(CPS): A combination of state and national politics, a number of debunking articles and letters in the Colorado U. student newspaper, and a boisterous reception for Senator Goldwater at the campus last spring have resulted in the firing of the campus newspaper editor and the resignation of the CU President, and may well bring more ramifications throughout the entire southwest.

The immediate crisis (which was reported briefly in last month's Bulletin) arose over the publication of an article of national political commentary by Carl Mitcham derogating, among other politicians, Senator Goldwater, calling him "a montebank, no better than a common criminal". The Senator, hearing about this and undoubtedly remembering the tough time given him last spring at a speech by Young Socialists and liberals (he charged having been insulted by socialists and "other un-American elements" then), demanded apologies from all concerned on the campus--and got them from CU President Quigg Newton and Colorado Daily editor Gary Althen, but not from Mitcham, who wrote the Senator demanding that he take the issue up with the writer of the article directly. Unsatisfied with the apologies received, Senator Goldwater wrote Newton demanding Mitcham's expulsion and Althen's firing and questioning Newton's abilities as a college president.

Newton, elected CU President in 1956 by a 4-2 vote of the popularly-elected State Board of Regents and well-known (infamous to some) as a liberal and civil libertarian, answered Goldwater with, "Senator, I shall not silence them", defending students' rights to hold and advocate any non-violent political viewpoint. He was supported by the Denver Post, largest newspaper in the state, and attacked by right-wingers. In separate meetings, the student government, the Board of Student Publications, and the faculty senate all backed up Newton's stand. Mitcham then wrote a letter to the editor explaining his previous article and in it called former President Eisenhower an "old futzler"; understandably, this renewed the furor.

Apparently, it was too much. About a week later, editor Althen was called out of class by Newton and fired, "in-

suant to presidential final authority". As a result, students held a spontaneous demonstration in front of the president's official residence and a number of the other members of the Daily staff resigned. The remaining staff members published an editorial (signed "staff") charging that Newton had succumbed to political pressure and that it was the staff's duty to remain as "guardians of the public trust" and to carry on the paper's work, especially its critical voice: "The removal of one shall not silence us, senator".

Since then a new editor, Tom Parmeter, has been appointed by the Board of Publications; he has declared that the Daily would continue to take strong editorial stands on controversial issues, but "we will do it in better taste than before".

The issue is closely tied up not only with national politics (Sen. Goldwater needs no introduction) but especially with state politics in Colorado and also in neighboring New Mexico, where similar conditions exist. Both states' legislatures are rural-dominated and susceptible to right-wing pressures to "investigate" and otherwise pressure the respective universities, both of whose campus papers have been under liberal editorship for the past few years. It was undoubtedly such pressures which caused the ultimate outcome of the affair. The situation was exacerbated by the imminent state elections and by the fact that Colorado is one of the few states whose Boards of Regents is elected by popular vote. Thus, the "anti-Goldwater" article precipitated a state-wide political affair, as a Republican regent candidate called for an investigation of the Colorado Daily and other "subversive" elements at the University and pledged himself to work for Newton's removal. As reported above, Newton at first withstood the pressure but finally cracked. Some weeks after the firing of Althen and in the wake of right-wing election victories (including the Republican Regent candidate), Quigg Newton resigned from the presidency of the University. His role in the crisis had succeeded at best only in alienating liberals but not placating or satisfying his right-wing critics of the past six years.

Faculty members generally praised Newton's term of office, in which UC grew greatly in academic stature, but saw his resignation as a "natural consequence" of the Republican election victories.

Two post-scripts seem worth mentioning:

In a regular signed political column in the Daily Illini (the paper at the U. of Illinois), SDS member Roger Ebert had some derogatory things to say about Senator Goldwater, in relation to the UC affair and generally. He questioned whether Goldwater was true to the conservative principle of individual liberty. The Senator fired back, accusing Ebert of incompetence, lack of knowledge, and being anti-civil libertarian. Nothing more seems to be coming of this dispute.

In an interview in the Arizona State Co. Lumberjack, Senator Goldwater declared himself in favor of allowing Communist speakers to speak on college campuses; only thus, he maintained, could students obtain the full story of communism.

PROFS. BACK STUDENTS DEFYING SPEAKER RULES

(CPS): The Michigan State University chapter of the American Association of University Professors overwhelmingly passed a resolution urging the reinstatement of students disciplined for violation of the MSU speaker rules last month. The students, including the president of the student government and the presidents of six other campus organizations, were disciplined for refusing to co-operate with a university board designated to pass on all speakers for university appearances. The student body president refused to sit on the board, charging that it was necessarily an organ of censorship. He and the presidents of the six groups also invited speakers without clearing them through the board. A number of professors at the AAUP meeting reportedly praised the student leaders concerned for being "far ahead of us in the fight for academic freedom". The AAUP also appointed a committee to investigate the affair.

** SECOND SEMESTER DUES ARE DUE! PAY NOW! **

Clip and send to: Students for a Democratic Society, 112 E. 19 St., NYC 3, NY

NameSchool & Yr.

Mailing Address

Permanent address

- ___ I wish to join (see below) and enclose (\$1 initiation + (\$1/semester dues.
- ___ I am a member. Enclosed are () last semester's dues, \$1 () this semester's dues, \$1
- ___ I wish to contribute to SDS: \$ enclosed; \$ pledged _____ (date).
- ___ Send me information on SDS and mailings for two months.
- ___ Send me the 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 ()

* * * * *

"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.

--SDS Constitution, Article III, Sections 1 and 2

"...neither has our experience in the universities brought us moral enlightenment. Our professors and administrators sacrifice controversy to public relations; their curriculums change more slowly than the living events of the world; their skills and silence are purchased by investors in the arms race; passion is called unscholastic. The questions we might want raised--what is really important? can we live in a different and better way? if we wanted to change society, how would we do it? --are not thought to be questions of a "fruitful, empirical nature", and thus are brushed aside."

--from the Port Huron Statement of the SDS

CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING THE NEWSPAPER STRIKE

This letter is from Kim Moody and Ed Shiller of the Baltimore SDS.

January 10, 1963

Dear Jim,

At this time, when the Labor Movement is undergoing a crisis in relation to its position and direction in the American social structure, it is important that its nature and its need be fully understood and supported. The right to strike under any circumstances whatsoever and against any employer whatsoever is one of the most vital necessities of the Labor Movement. This right has come under attack by some who say that striking against the national or public interest is irresponsible. As long as American society is characterized by social and economic inequity labor's first responsibility is to itself.

The New York City newspaper strike is an important manifestation of the right of labor to continually advance its position in society. Opponents of the strike, such as the Publishers' Association and even many liberals, criticize the Typographers' demands as excessive. It must be recognized, however, that labor, and only labor, has a right to determine the extent of its demands. Those who support labor in principle must support it in actuality.

We therefore urge SDS to actively support the Typographers in their strike. We propose that SDS do the following:

- 1) Issue a public statement in full support of the strike.
- 2) Establish extensive and effective liason with the Typographers' Union.
- 3) Offer any assistance to the strikers that may be needed. This might include picketeers, office workers, canvassers, or leafleters.
- 4) Encourage the strikers to set up a newspaper.
- 5) Publicize SDS involvement to all chapters and to whatever other organizations that might be interested.

We would appreciate replies and commentaries from all those who read this.

Kim Moody

Ed Shiller

The following is Jim Monsenis' reply to Kim Moody.

January 13, 1963

Dear Kim,

There are two issues involved in such a decision of support. The first is the right of labor to strike at any time and determine its own demands; the second is whether in this particular instance we feel that the union's demands are justified.

It seems to me that our response to the first must be unequivocal support of the union. To take union's side in a management-union dispute ought to be an automatic reflex for the radical community, quite apart from the issues involved. I myself would take such a stand, I believe that the majority of SDS would take such a stand, and that it would be good for us to do so.

The second issue is more problematic, however. I gather in reading your letter that it deals with the first point almost entirely. Was this deliberate? What is your feeling on the actual issues involved? Before SDS is prepared to make a statement on the matter of the strike we ought to think through whether such a statement should support the right of the unions to make such demands, or the demands themselves.

corr/2

The member of SDS who is probably most in contact with the whole matter, Jack Newfield, editor of the West Side News, has come out in an editorial opposed to the strike and the demands. We have talked at length with Jack, some of us; and while I am no expert on the strike, the general position I would take would support him mostly.

To summarize the situation, as I see it:

1) The Typographers are asking both for an \$18/week increase over two years, on top of their present base pay of \$141 for a 36 $\frac{1}{2}$ -hour week; and airtight guarantees against loss of jobs by automation. The total effect of these two demands, if met, would be to put out of business all of the ~~less well-financed papers~~: The Mirror, The Post, possibly The Herald Tribune, The Journal-American, The Long Island Star-Journal. Or else these would have to boost the price quite a notch. This is not just "crying wolf": these papers actually are in financial difficulty. In view of the potential loss of the Post, the left-wing here will have lost its only major public voice.

2) It seems fairly clear that a good deal of the reason for a strike--if not the major reason--is a matter of union rivalry. The Newspapermen's Guild settled for an \$8 increase over two years, not too long ago, and has probably taken the lead away from the Typographers as the more militant union. There are unofficial indications that the decision to strike was made long before there was any effort to negotiate, and that the strike is a prestige one as well as--if not actually in place of--one to benefit the workers. They are sitting quite comfortably with a \$4 million strike fund, and the union men are taking home \$98/week per family while the strike gets settled.

3) Either of the two demands, by themselves, may be feasible; together, they will lose jobs for union men because of the loss of several newspapers. My own feeling is that they should have made a big issue of automation and left wages alone.

4) On the other hand, the newspaper publishers are no heroes either. Only four papers were struck--the News, Times, World-Telegram, and Long Island Press. The others are lock-out situations; the rationale being to keep one paper from profiting at the expense of another but more importantly by the total news black-out shifting public opinion against the strikers, and using up their striking fund in support of these printers also.

5) Outside of the newspapers themselves, the persons most hurt by the strike are the reporters, copy editors, copy boys, etc. who are in the Guild; while out of work, they are getting some \$35/week in support, hardly enough to live on. Yet they have no part in the decision on when the newspapers will resume publishing. By the end of the strike the Guild will be financially in very bad shape.

Jimmy Wechsler summed it up the other day: "there are no heroes on either side." And I understand Murray Kempton, who is not the most conservative guy around, has a long article in the New Republic blasting the union, but I haven't read it.

So I am left personally in the position of supporting totally the right of the union to strike, opposing totally any imposed arbitration or legislation through Congress (which I hear is in the offing), but not supporting the union demands. On the other hand, support of unionism means that I would not want to declare my disagreement publicly.

The involvement of SDS in the strike is primarily a New York affair, of course, and since there is no formal organization here other than the National Administrative Committee, I am going to raise the issue with that body. Frankly, there isn't much else we can do except publish a statement. Token picketing is in progress and no help is needed there; the union is affluent, needs no more volunteer help than it already has; it has a newspaper for its members but has decided that it does not want to take its case to the larger public; and I am not clear on what extended relations would mean or consist of.

Sincerely yours,
Jim

Reply from Kim and Ed.

January 16, 1963

Dear Jim,

We are aware of Jack Newfield's position on the strike. It was, in fact, our knowledge of this that prompted us to send such a letter. That radicals could be found in the position of opposing labor was of great concern to us. Like yourself we believe that, "To take the union's side in a management-union dispute ought to be an automatic reflex for the radical community, quite apart from the issues involved." Furthermore, we do not believe that this reflex is irrational but based upon the fact that the progress we desire is dependent upon the labor movement and the direction of its activities. As you are doubtless aware, the NYC newspaper strike is not taking place in a vacuum, but in the midst of a national strike wave of considerable intensity. It is in the context of this national struggle that we view the NYC strike. We see this as the first in a long series of labor crises that will lead to the long awaited liberalization and politicization of the labor movement. Certainly the predicted recession in 1963 will deepen this labor crisis--unless the tax-cut actually alleviates the situation, which we doubt. It is just at such times that labor is most open to help and cooperation from students and radicals in general. Let us not cut ourselves off before that time comes. Though the demonstration by 5,000 workers in Times Square would indicate that the Typographers are not as isolated as we had thought, their isolation is enough so that this would be an excellent time to establish contact.

Before we deal with the five issues that you have outlined, we should like to make a distinction that seems to us important. Opposition and support with criticism are two different things. One criticizes the Trade Union movement for its beurocratic structure and its conservative leadership; one does not oppose it or suggest its dissolution. SDS criticizes the red-baiting of the YPSL, but does not suggest destroying the YPSL as an organization--we are in fact fraternal groups. At the same time, one may say of a union that its demands are mis-oriented, but one does not oppose its strike. If you defend labor's right to strike it is rather contradictory to oppose a strike when it comes--especially because these days this means supporting the right of the government to stop that strike.

1) Granted that \$159 a week seems like a lot - \$8,168 a year if they work full time. Nevertheless, who are we to say that he can't have the living of a begining advertizing copy writer. Isn't social equality our goal? Once again we would say that "labor, and only labor has the right to determine the extent of its demands." We certainly wouldn't give that right to management. We hardly need to dwell on the necessity and relevance of anti-automation clauses. The fact that labor's demands threaten to put certain to the papers out of business only points up what radicals have always maintained: that the interests of labor and the corporation, whatever form that corporation may take, are basically opposed. If this actually happened, it would further demonstrate the inherent paradoxes of our economy. It might help regain for labor its lost sense of power, which is one of the things that maintains a conservative leadership. As for the Post, we are reminded of the situation that the publisher of the socialist Appeal to Reason (popular in the western states before WWI) found himself in. This "unqualified" defender of labor found that his printers wanted a union. He refused, they struck. He held out for some time until Gene Debs reminded him that he was a socialist; then, of course, he granted the workers the right to organize. Jimmy Wechsler, of course, is not a socialist, nor does he pose as a defender of labor; nonetheless, you will be more likely to find him at the pub-

lishers association than at strike headquarters. Poor Jimmy is on the wrong side, even if his stance is not a heroic one. As for Murray Kempton, we would simply suggest that he is out of touch or to be less kind, that he will miss his column in the Post and the salary connected with it--even though it may have been less than the printers will make. That may sound crass, but it should be realized that these are the times that divide the radicals from the well-wishers.

2) We are sure that at least part of the motivation of the Typographers' strike is competition. It is unfortunate that unions are forced to compete and we would recommend deep reforms in the structure of the American Trade Union movement, but this is not the issue at this time. In this particular case, we see the competition as healthy, since it is well known that the AFL-CIO Printers' Guild in NYC has for a long time been signing "Honeymoon" contracts with the publishers. It is important to keep in mind another of the demands that the strikers are making: to get the publishers' agreement to having both the Guild and Typographers' contracts signed at the same time. This demand is an attempt to eliminate both the "Honeymoon" contracts signed by the Guild and the company, not the Typographers. We believe that it is natural for a more militant union to compete with its weak sister in the interests of the workers.

3) We would agree with your criticism of the union's not placing the issue of automation in the foreground, but we do not see this as grounds for opposing the strike.

4) Of course. Are we to assume from the fact that the Post was not originally struck that it has locked-out its printers, or is it still being printed? If it is anti-labor enough to lock-out its workers, one can hardly admire the depth of its liberalism.

5) We deplore the situation of the reporters, copy-boys, etc., but again we see this as a result of economic and structural paradoxes. Are the printers never to strike because owners will be hurt, and vice-versa, are the reporters never to strike because the printers would be hurt? This paradox is quite insoluble and cannot be the criterion for not striking.

Before I go on, I would just like to point out that the newspaper strikers in Cleveland have begun to publish a newspaper for city-wide distribution--40,000 a day, at 10¢ a copy. We view this as a bold and somewhat important step for labor to take.

While we wrote to the NO with the intention of involving them in the strike, and this intention has not changed, there was another reason for so doing. When we heard about Jack Newfield's position we were, as mentioned above, concerned. We were not only concerned that Newfield and other liberals took this position, but afraid that the NO might do the same. For us this is not a question of personalism in the NO, but rather of the general atmosphere of 1963 radical politics. We feel that a strong labor orientation is the basis of any radical program. In the new left jargon that means that we accept what C. Wright Mills called the "labor metaphysic." We will leave our reasons for accepting this until a later date. We also believe, hence our connection with SDS, that the student has a role in progress. This role is, of course, educational. At this time, our educational role, in relation to labor, is largely one of example. These unionists do not read us, but they do read about us. For this reason it is important that they know that the radical movement stands with them. If they do not know this they will hardly be inclined to join with us or follow us in our struggle for a better society. The radical movement of the 30's was able to lead, or mislead depending on how you view it, the labor movement because it gained its trust. It gained the trust of labor by demonstrating its unqualified support of that

movement. Whatever that particular group of radicals did that was wrong, the fact remains that they did build the CIO. If we are to build a new political movement with labor, we too must win their trust. Is there really even a choice between the trust of labor and an occasional editorial in the Post? Labor today, no matter how friendly to LID, does not know what to make of the student movement. The hospital strike was a good first step toward clearing up their impression of us; the newspaper strike could be another such step.

This letter, like the first one, expresses the opinion of only we two. We have had no opportunity to speak to the others as a result of term papers and exams. We really can't say what the reaction to the strike is.

Fraternally,

Kin Moody
Ed Shiller

The following is further comment on the Newspaper Strike in New York as seen by Mike Vozick of Berkeley.

January 21, 1963

Dear Jim,

The Baltimore correspondence seems to point to a revived interest in the class struggle as such, at least in some circles. The YSA is reported to have a new and sweeter personality on that scene, and I wonder whether anyone is arguing with his position.

In general, in holding the radical torch aloft, must we also close our eyes? Is our response to James Hoffa "unequivocal support of the union?" When, if ever, will we learn to be chary of any "automatic reflexes...apart from the issues involved?"

The kind of radicalism which says "Labor, and only Labor has the right to determine the extent of its demands" ignores that we no longer live in the age of proletarian slavery. Such is a sleazy sort of radicalism. Labor has accepted the collective bargaining process, and that would seem to settle the issue: there must be some external limit to its demands. Recognitions of this sort do not solve the problems, but at least they put us in the problems.

I grant the need for fundamentally new approaches to many of the old issues, but I submit that this requires new reflexes on our part. There are people on the other side of our society saying "the military and only the military has the right to determine the extent of its demands." The great bulk of responsibility in this inadequate democracy will reject both views, and for the same reason: they ignore realities.

The sadness is that there are good ideas on both sides of the correspondence, and that in the case of this strike there is not much that we can do. We would increase the relevance of our thinking by admitting that the right to strike is not the right to strike forever, and ceasing to wave dogmas of thirty and fifty year old flags.

The labor movement can be a tremendous force for social change, and we in SDS have a unique opportunity to point the way. But first we must speak to the real issue; what do we want labor to do?

Best personally,

Mike Vozick

The following is a letter from Barbara Jacobs of Ann Arbor SDS.

January 21, 1963

Dear Jim,

...On the newspaper strike: I wholeheartedly endorse the position taken by Kim and Ed, and particularly urge that SDS make a public statement of endorsement, and let the union know that we are doing so. We might also make an offer of aid, though I agree with you that there may be little we can do for them concretely.

One point of the Moody-Shiller letter with which I find myself in vehement disagreement (actually they quote it from your letter, so I disagree with you too) is the statement that "To take the union's side in a management-union dispute ought to be an automatic reflex for the radical community, quite apart from the issues involved."

My objections are as follows:

1) The job of thinking people is to stop having automatic reflexes and to consider the issues. True, I consider the issues of a particular strike in the context of my ideological commitments, but that does not mean that anything called a "strike" I should automatically take to be something in the interest of economic and social equality, workers' control of the economy, humanization of employment, and other things which I believe in.

2) On the contrary, because I have these goals I must evaluate the actions and statements of labor in terms of whether they aid or hinder my long range social and political goals. A bad strike, one asking for unjust things, one totally unresponsive to the needs of the community to whom it must turn for support, such a strike I would not support.

Some strikes, as you imply this one is, not only against management, but against another union. In the newspaper strike it is true that there is competition between the Guild and the Typographers. It is also true that, in a larger sense, the competition is between the craft union idea, which is divisive and weakening of the power of unions to bargain, and the industrial union idea, which presents a united front to management, and which increases the potential gains for labor. In the NYC strike, the Typographers have taken a hard stand on this very issue by insisting that the contract expiration dates be made uniform, so that the more militant Typographer's union can participate in the bargaining before the Newspaper Guild signs compromise contracts that affect all the workers in the industry. I maintain that this claim is just, that the publishers have adamantly refused to give in on this point, and that therefore the strike is to be supported.

To quote from the Nation, January 10, "One observer said that there would have been no strike at all, and that even now it would end almost immediately on that single point. Certainly, from almost any viewpoint--except possibly that of the publishers--it would seem to be a happy solution of the present mess, and give the union the much-needed face saver (which they) must be desperately, though silently, praying for."

One other statement in your letter with which I take issue: "Support of unionism means that I would not want to declare my disagreement publicly." I think that support of unionism means that we maintain an attitude of critical support. That means an overall support of labor's aims, help on specific projects when possible (this we have done too little on), setting up a working liaison with the labor movement, and voicing our opinions. This takes place in two ways: In

groups where we have a part in the decision-making process, we proceed as insiders, making our criticisms first to the group, in hopes of bringing about change. Later we may decide that the issue should be laid before the public, in which case we begin to function as an outsider, reporting on the group to society (the largest group of which we are members, and to which we owe allegiance).

The second way in which we exercise our responsibility to criticize is as a sector of the public. This pertains to criticisms of groups in which we do not have a direct voice within our political community as well as of the Kennedy Administration. In terms of the labor movement, as in terms of all other groups (including civil rights groups) with which we have sympathies, we retain the duty to be open in our criticism of them, as we ought to be open in our support of them. It is not to the organization but to the idea, that I at least hold by allegiance. The organizations are deserving of support in so far as they work toward the worthwhile goals, and are deserving of criticism when their actions work against their purported goals.

That is all for now. If I have other thoughts relevant to SDS I will send them along in equally disorganized form....

Drop a line.

Barbara (Jacobs)

And MORE news and views about the newspaper strike...this time from Brewster Kneen, student secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

January 23, 1963

Dear Jim:

There are a number of points which I would like to discuss with you that are brought up in your January 17 Bulletin...The real instigation of this letter, however, is the correspondence about the New York newspaper strike.

To put it bluntly, I was startled by some of the premises and discussion in both your letter and that from Kim Moody and Ed Shiller. I guess my major point of disagreement centers on the conception of The Divine Right of Labor, i.e., "The right to strike over any circumstances whatever and against any employer whatever is one of the most vital necessities of the labor movement," "labor's chief responsibility is to itself," "labor and only labor has the right to determine the extent of its demands." This sort of talk utterly amazes me in this latter half of the 20th century! The theory that is here being advanced is that Labor, which curiously enough is nowhere defined, has an inherent right to determine the values and policies of the total society. What is really being said, I think, in the statement "the right of labor to continually advance its position in society" is that Labor by definition exists over against society and is not to be regarded as one element of society. It seems to me that this sort of thinking leads inevitably to a totalitarian conclusion and I think there are enough examples of this that I need not elaborate.

I am surprised at your statement, Jim, that "to take union's side in a management-union dispute ought to be an automatic reflex for the radical community, quite apart from the issues involved." What this seems to be saying is that when the subject of this undefined "Labor" comes up, the intellect must perforce be laid aside and an emotional reaction, totally uncritical, be relied upon. Needless to say as a professed intellectual, I find this idea both inconsistent and disturbing.

In reference to the second letter of Moody and Shiller, I certainly hope that the radical community in this country is not dependent upon Labor and I hope that we can leave behind the mystique of "Labor" which belongs to the last century.

I am certainly not an anti-Marxist, but to force the sort of dialectic between labor and management that the writers do seems false indeed and in addition, a manifestation of utter contempt of public responsibility or service. I might describe this sort of thinking as that of a closed circuit with no room for the increasing number of people such as ourselves who cannot identify with either "management" or "labor".

Of course I have my own theories about the newspaper strike and perhaps with tongue-in-cheek I could say that this whole business is being perpetrated by the Establishment to put an end to Freedom of the Press and the Press itself as one more step towards the development of the Corporate State.

I am grateful for the work that went into the newsletter and look forward to more of these. As always, your friend,

Brewster Kneen

Response to Kneen's letter, written by Steve Max of the National Office of SDS

First to provide the definition of Labor which is called for. I would suppose that in the Moody-Shiller letter "Labor" refers to organized labor in general and to the AFL-CIO in particular. For the sake of the argument which Kneen raises, though, "Labor" might just as well refer to any who work for others and are engaged in production or service for a market.

The problem, it seems to me, is not to pose the question: should labor be thought of as something which exists over and against society, or should it be regarded as one element in society. The problem rather is to examine the position which labor actually occupies in society and from there, on the basis of values, determine whether a particular action of labor is "justified" or "not justified".

A discussion of labor as one element of society puts me in mind of the high school civics book in which there inevitably appears a drawing of the personifications of "labor," "management," and "the consumer" all sitting around a table working things out to everyone's mutual satisfaction.

We may at the start eliminate the consumer, as he is either labor or management under a different hat, unless he is one of that small group known as professional people. This leaves management and labor, or to put it in other terms, labor and capital. That is to say labor and capital comprise the two elements in the sphere of basic production. It is of course true that the number of people who are "professionals" and service industry workers is rapidly increasing in America. However, political and economic power remain polarized at the labor and capital ends of the spectrum, and the fundamental relationship between the two (labor and Capital) is the basic determining factor in shaping the rest of society. I would submit, although I will not argue it here, that the interests of the "middle sector" i.e., white collar and service workers, coincide with those of labor and with the labor movement when that movement acts in the true long-range interest of labor (as opposed to those times when the labor movement supports measures such as arms spending as a stop-gap measure to prevent unemployment).

Now it is no secret that there are some people in our society who own or manage the means of production, and that there are others who own little or nothing

but their ability to work. From this perspective, of course, labor is one element in society and not something over against society.

It is also true, however, that those who sell their labor power never receive in return the full value of what they produce. While a lengthy discussion may be embarked to illustrate this point, it is sufficient to say that if labor did receive the full value of what it produced then there would be no profit. Indeed, it is precisely the portion of unpaid labor time which constitutes profit. Therefore, to the extent that unpaid labor can be increased either by lowering wages or by automation, to that extent profit increases. To the extent that wages are increased, to that extent profits decrease.

Viewed from this perspective, in a society where profit rather than need is the basic motive for production, then labor indeed exists over and against society, in that the basis of social production is the exploitation of labor.

In addition it should be pointed out that throughout American history all attempts to raise wages have met with bitter resistance not only from capital, but with the exception of a brief period during the New Deal, from the federal government as well, not to mention local and state governments. A list of particulars starting with the Hay Market Riot and ending with Hazard, Kentucky, in 1963, could be given to illustrate this point, but this information should be readily available to anyone interested in matters concerning the labor movement. Suffice it to say that however one cares to characterize the role of labor vis a vis "society," the fact remains that labor was placed in this role by economic and political conditions which existed before the start of the labor movement and continue to this day. Organized labor did not create these conditions, they created organized labor.

It is true of course that the Labor movement is itself a major political and economic factor in America today. But it is also true that Labor is a responsive movement rather than an aggressive one and has been thus since the organization of the mass production industries in the 30's. I would consider this to be precisely the weakness of the labor movement, but the point here is that labor primarily reacts to the pressures applied to it by "society" as an agent -- "over and against society," if you will; and secondarily it shapes "society" as one element of it.

If this is true, it ill behooves us to criticize an action of the labor movement without making mention of the socio-economic conditions which inspired that action.

I will grant that the above makes somewhat of an over-simplification of a much more extensive viewpoint; but if it does not convince, it should at least indicate why I support the statement that "to take union's side in a Management-union dispute ought to be an automatic reflex for the radical community, quite apart from the issues involved."

This is not to say that the Trade Union Movement should not be criticized by the radical movement from a fraternal point of view, or criticized strongly when labor fails to act in the best interest of those it represents. But if one accepts as a value proposition that exploitation is wrong, and if one accepts that the basis of profit is exploitation, then one cannot escape taking labor's side in a union-management dispute as an automatic reflex.

Kneen says "I am certainly not an anti-Marxist, but to force this sort of dialectic between labor and management that the writers seem to do seems false and, in addition, a manifestation of utter contempt of public responsibility or service."

Now neither Moody nor Shiller--nor Marx, for that matter--have any need to "force" such a dialectic. It was brought into being historically at the point where an economic surplus was first expropriated by an individual instead of being distributed socially.

In the current newspaper strike the ITU hit only those four papers which were in the best financial position to survive the strike; whereupon the rest of the daily papers promptly locked out their employees, indicating that the "dialectic" exists as much today as ever. In view of this, the question of who is concerned with "public responsibility" and "service" might well be re-examined.

I would commend to the attention of all concerned with the ITU strike the article appearing in the current issue of Common Sense by Paul DuBrul, the educational director of the United Furniture Workers' AFL-CIO.

Steve Max

The following is from Mary Varela, Field Secretary of the Young Christian Students, in response to the original three letters:

...I don't intend to discuss the New York Strike in specifics--but more the problem of labor-management. Please see these remarks in the framework of a student's questioning (even though they sound quite definitive--that's just my way of expressing myself).

What prompts the response, "To take union's side in a management-union dispute ought to be an automatic reflex for the radical community, quite apart from the issues involved"? Is it because this is the tact necessary to gain strength for unionism and then to secure industrial harmony? I can't see giving unequivocal support of anything "quite apart from the issues involved"--in any type of struggle--labor-management, student-university, black-white, US-USSR if you will. Perhaps the basic question to consider is how do we want to reconstruct society? Democratically, of course--where the decisions are initiated, controlled and resolved by those who are affected by those decisions. But from what vantage point: from the vantage point of force or from the point of community (this may be a poor term but the only one I can think of at the moment). A dialectic of force may achieve bit by bit substantial material concessions but I can hardly see this procedure as bringing union and management/industry into societal harmony. I can only foresee industry/business being brought around to serve society, instead of vice versa, by a co-creative venture of all involved--even the consumer and I can't see this kind of a possibility without community. (By this I mean groupings of men bonded in trust towards common ends.) Perhaps it's possible to have a society organize and progress without community--but I wouldn't want to live in it. That notwithstanding--I question the ability of the human values we give credence to, to exist, much less flourish, without community.

All this by way of saying that ~~that~~ in working for harmony in any stratum--university, politics, or economic life--the reforms, the changes, the new contracts would seem to have to be in terms of organizing the university or corporation into a democratic community. This seems to me where labor is operating with no vision--much like what Fidel once remarked to striking workers--"All you want is your plate of beans". We support entirely labor's right to strike, but this does not require our taking labor's side in the strike. I think we must speak out when the issues involved in the strike--the demands of management and/or the demands of labor--are a strictly profit-seeking venture not mindful of the welfare of the whole industry and those in society who depend on this industry.

You say that "labor and only labor has the right to determine the extent of its demands". Does this mean labor can act unilaterally--against the Commonweal and we still unequivocally support it? I think it's time we understand that the profit motive is not restricted to management. I think we can see the utter dependence/relatedness of one sector in economic life to all other strata in society. Are all other strata to be helpless without recourse while one sector goes on unilaterally for its own profit? What's good for G.E. is good for the country!; what's good for labor is good for the country? Kind of reminds me of Orwell's Animal Farm.

It seems to me that just as we defend the right of free speech for all men of any political leanings--left of right-wing, if we want industrial/big business control and harmony we must support those efforts which bring it about--whether they be from management or labor; and likewise we must speak out against those efforts which bring about discord--again whether they be from management or labor.

And finally--I can't see where the automation problem will be affected in the least constructively by contracting for airtight guarantees against loss of jobs. If this doesn't show a self-interested lack of vision I don't know what would.

The following is from the report/letter of Robb Burlage (NEC member; New England organizer) to the National Council, which he was unable to attend:

This fall has seen SDS get something of a foothold in New England, especially in the Boston area, where we were hardly known before. But it is still unclear exactly what role SDS can and should play. Our organizing conference was a good advertisement for the "SDS approach" but intensive contact work must follow and it is not entirely clear just what we have to offer...local groups. The Brandeis chapter is autonomously doing very well but this is to the credit of Ann Cooper with much Nina Felshin and neophytes like Pete Rothstein, not to me, the national office, or SDS nationally, although Steve Max's timely visit did help get things accelerated out there. They deserve much national help and encouragement on the University Reform conference. It seems a bit odd to me that these relative moppets (in age, not organizational orppolitical sophistication) are the whole cutting edge of our University Reform program thus far and yet they have had little "intellectual experience" with the problem compared to our elder statesmen across the country. This is an example of the localites running off and leaving the intellectual elite but the general problem of not hitching intellectual activity to local impact is here exemplified.

There seems to be some demand for SDS people to serve as "effective educators" in the Boston and New England area. Peter Countryman voiced the hope at our Cambridge conference that SDS would help supply more intellectual leadership for his front-line people but it was agreed that that unless there is a solidarity and absolute connection between reflection and "local action" there will be a breakdown at both ends. Fred Bird of the Boston NS Coordinating Comm. wants SDS people to help at the NSM workshop in early February and to help with other "educational" activities such as publicizing summer opportunities to work in civil rights. During the Women Strike-HUAC scrap, SDS people (me, Suzie Hyman, Todd Gitlin) were the cadre who called together the Boston Peace Coordinating Comm. to talk about the civil liberties problem: a larger discussion on this is set for January-February. The study group on Social Movements and Social Change Through History (Fabians, Bolsheviks, British Labor Movement, American Labor Movement, Violence, and Non-Violence in India and America, the Abolitionists, the Chinese Communists, etc.) is drawing upwards of two dozen people from about six different schools in the Boston area (Har-

vard, Brandeis, Boston U., Wheaton, Emmanuel, Simmons, MIT, etc.) and should have some seminal impact on the group leaders represented. But how do we translate this into "SDS local activity"? I think the problem I face in Boston is similar to the problem the other graduate students on the NEC face at other schools. Since I am not "down in the context" of the schools, I must depend on the present outcroppings in a symbiotic way. We are most effective when we have people like Ann Cooper and Mina Felshin with a prior orientation to SDS cropping up in the ranks on campuses and organizing from within the undergraduate student bodies. At Harvard SDS lives in varying shades of friendly relations with the three most visible liberal action groups: Tocsin, Harvard-Radcliffe Liberal Union, and the Harvard civil rights group (HRLU). The first and third have taken most of the leadership of the HRLU and it is not clear just where, if anywhere, it is going as a result. I cannot find the freshmen and sophomores at Harvard except through these organizations, especially Tocsin. It may be that Tocsin and, less likely, HRLU, will affiliate with SDS in the future but meanwhile we work with these groups in a friendly way and have gotten some of their individuals to join SDS. I am unclear about what else we could do here at present. I also suspect that the problem here is as everywhere else: we do not have as many people as we think we have--that is, people really committed to giving hours a week for SDS. Ann is doing a magnificent job at Brandeis. Todd, of course, has his duties with Tocsin itself. Richard Rothstein is active ~~ix~~ with the civil rights group, HRLU, and his thesis. Ann Cook will be leaving Fletcher in January. So most of the basic organizing of anything SDS-like I must do. And, alas, there are general exams.

Let us view a couple more "case studies" of campuses and what SDS might do in and around them. We are getting some of the top leadership from the Boston U. peace group coming to our study group (Lee Webb, Nick Morris--president and veep--and others) and they also came to our organizing conference. We might be able to get an SDS study group going at BU but this is a commuter campus par excellence and it would be hard to do more than wastefully duplicate the peace group's orbit there now--perhaps we could get them to affiliate but this has not been explored too much yet because they are primarily locally-oriented. There has also been talk with some BU people and Ben Page of Turn Toward Peace about organizing a "socialist study club" built around Harvard and BU radicals and emphasizing foreign students of radical persuasion in the area who are at present not communicating with American students very much.

Wheaton College has an excellent cluster of girls who want to break out of their school's provincialism and apoliticalness--but they wonder if starting with SDS is the wisest move--whether they should be ~~a~~ liberal local group unaffiliated at first.

Thanks particularly to the work of Mary Varela for YCS at Emmanuel College, there are a number of little peace and civil rights clusters of people--some of whom attend our study group and attended the conference--but they mainly want to concentrate on local activities and are cautious about identifying with something big to swallow politically on the national level.

Perhaps some of the problems of "local organization" begin to become clear: we don't have the "sold" people to start with at the persuasive undergraduate level; it is not clear what SDS offers the locally oriented group or whether it would be wise for SDS to "compete" to any extent with current peace and civil rights groups on these campuses; we are still learning in what ways our "education" can be most effective...and mainly we are learning that we have a helluva lot to learn.

The following letter to Tom Hayden comes from Joe Love, Special Assistant in Latin American Affairs in the International Affairs Section of NSA

Dear Tom,

During the past few months I have established contact with several groups in Latin America--specifically, the Arevalista Youth (Juventud Arevalista) in Guatemala; the Christian Socialist Party (Parti Chretien-Socialiste) in Haiti; and the Democratic Socialist Party (Partido Socialista Democratico) in Argentina. The three groups have quite different orientations ideologically, and I did not feel that ideology was the criterion for establishing contact with a given group; program seemed to me a more critical aspect of an organization's political posture.

The Arevalistas are followers of Juan Jose Arevalo, whose book The Shark and the Sardines you are probably familiar with. Since Arevalo has been in exile during the whole period since the Arbenz crisis, his party (which was dominant in Guatemala during Arevalo's presidency) has disintegrated into several factions. However, during the last few months Arevalo's major rivals for control of what formerly was the (Arevalista) Revolutionary Party have suffered major defeats at the polls, and Arevalo's star is rapidly rising. My contacts in Guatemala say that he could now be elected president of Guatemala, despite total opposition from the right. The ideology of the Arevalistas is a Marxist one, although Arevalo has in the last couple of years taken a very strong stand against any form of collaboration with the Communists. This posture may change, however, with the development of events in Guatemala. In any case contact with the Arevalista Youth is important, for in my opinion this group has the strongest appeal among youth sections of national political parties to Guatemalan students. The Juventud Arevalista should play an important role in the presidential elections in Guatemala in 1963. Currently Ernesto Ramirez is president of the organization; perhaps you remember his speech at the last HSC, when he was also president of the Guatemalan NUS.

The Christian Socialists, like all political parties in Haiti, is small. Its membership seems to be mostly students and young intellectuals, though they have apparently made some inroads into the labor movement--such as exists in the country. This group is still pretty fuzzy in their ideology, in that they don't know whether they are closer to the Christian Democrats or the "popular" (AFRA-type) parties. In any case they are to the left of the Christian Democratic parties of Central America; their orientation is similar to that of the Chilean CDs, which fersees a Latin American revolution and some sort of Christian socialist form of economic organization.

The Democratic Socialist Party of Argentina is probably the most conservative of the three groups so far contacted; at least it is the group most opposed to popular frontism. As you may know, the Argentine Socialist Party in Argentina has suffered internal divisions, like almost every other party in that country; and the PSD (or DSP) was formed as a distinct entity in 1958, when questions of personal rivalries and the issue of the united front split the old Socialist Party. The PSD is largely urban based, having its greatest strength in Buenos Aires. Its ideology is eclectic, accepting some ideas of Marx, with modifications by Lenin (theory of imperialism), Haya de la Torre, and Americo Ghioldi (the party's president).

The initial response of these groups to my initiatives has been good. I would like to have a number of copies of the Port Huron Statement made available for distribution to political groups abroad. A distribution of the PHS to certain groups would be effective even where the rank and file cannot get past the language barrier.

THE NATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT
by Brewster Kneen

There may have been times when many of us thought we knew what was going on in the realm of a student peace movement, but I think this is not one of those times. The phenomena which one encounters on the campus are puzzling indeed, at least superficially. But if one goes deeper, I think there are clues that can be found.

A year or two ago it appeared as if there would really be a national student peace movement, and that it was just a matter of time and organization. Succeeding months have, however, shattered this expectation, I think. In fact, one could say that there is today less of a student peace movement nationally than there was a year ago--certainly less of a national student peace organization--even apart from the Washington Action Project of last February and the ~~continuing growth of membership~~ in the Student Peace Union.

But rather than despair and hand-wringing, however, I am led to think that this lack of a student peace movement is a good thing, or a healthy sign, at this time. It may well be an indication that students understand our society and its ills better than many of us suspect or hope. My point is that the apparent, and I hope real, rejection of organization--at this time--is a manifestation of the realization that a peace movement which is established on the premises of our society and patterns itself after the fashion of a protest movement within society is doomed to the role of functionary in the society. By this I mean that the forces of the status quo, at their most intelligent, should be well aware that some outlet of protest is essential if they are to remain in control of the Machine. Therefore they can and will make a place for a reformist or liberal peace movement safe in the knowledge that such a movement will not be radical enough to threaten the Establishment but will soften criticism and pull the fangs of the potential revolutionaries, if they can be sucked into the movement and then have their energies expended fighting such monstrosities as the HUAC, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the draft which are not at the core of society but peripheral manifestations of its basic nature and malaise. A peace movement, in this context, is then just another functionary of the Establishment, of the War Machine.

Students, then, reject all this, probably un- or sub-consciously, and this is a healthy sign that they have understood. And I am one who tends to think that there is considerable truth in this analysis.

What does this mean, then, if there is only a dying student peace movement, at least on a national scale, and if it is dying for the reason outlined above, coupled with a deep sense of frustration, resignation and despair? It means that we do not try to keep any such movement alive, nor attempt to revive the corpse, but rather seek to develop the ground for a truly radical and significant revolutionary movement, operating on the premise suggested by A. J. Muste: any revolution that is truly revolutionary today must be nonviolent, and only nonviolence is truly revolutionary.

I think that there are still many people who sincerely feel that the real question is one of the right kind of organization sufficiently developed, and that peace lies essentially in the proper organization. This is analogous to the liberal concept that the answer to every problem lies in "Power" as an abstraction undefined but usually meaning the power to destroy, without any consideration of the uses or aims of "Power". In other words, the question of "What for?" is left largely unanswered, and even avoided, perhaps because it is difficult to answer and purveyors of violence are inclined to take the short cut every time, even if it does not solve the problem or address the situation. But I would say here that such a concept of peace and the peace movement will never bring about peace because the concept rests on precisely those attitudes and structures which have gotten us where we are today. Therefore I can be glad when such a "movement" is rejected by

all those who are tired of being used, manipulated, regarded as potential converts, and who simply want to live a legitimate life but don't know where to begin. This rejection means that the ground is fertile for the right word. (To illustrate: A few weeks ago I was having dinner at a university conference. I got into conversation with a student who did not know who I was. I asked a number of questions and got a lot of conformist, impersonal and non-committal answers. The conversation continued and about a half an hour later I again asked the same questions. This time I got answers in almost total disagreement with the first ones, and this time they were personal, troubled and honest answers. I could have drawn my conclusions about that girl on the basis of the first set of answers, or the second. I am afraid that we usually base our judgments and actions on the first set of answers.)

If this analysis contains any truth, then it should be clear where the answer to our concern lies. It does not lie in a matter of organization, though this must certainly come in time as the logical expression of a corporate concern. It does not lie in manipulation or fear. There is too much of both already. This then leaves Community, Personalism, Integrity, Universalism, Nonviolence, Faith, Hope, and Joy.

Let me now try to incarnate some of these words.

Community. A world-wide phenomenon today is the increasing tendency towards centralism. Community is the converse of this, based as it is not on Power or Authority, but on persons and their natural associations which strengthen them as persons and at the same time draw them into an organic phenomenon which they can serve and which they can exercise responsibility for and control over. In community there are no middle-men. Persons live for the community and the community exists solely for the persons, and not for any exclusive or external individual or groups of individuals. Community is the natural expression of the corporate life of persons living together. Community cannot be imposed.

Personalism. With centralism, a major characteristic of the modern world is the drive towards impersonalism. A counterpart to this is individualism, that is, the concept of the person existing over against everybody else. This is a key concept in "free enterprise". In such an impersonal society we regard people as functionaries, i.e., students, owners, soldiers, workers, but seldom as persons. We regard people mainly as statistics (war-games, advertising) to be manipulated to serve our private purposes or potential converts to be won over to our religion or ideology. This must be said of the peace movement when it is trying only to win people over rather than working for reconciliation and a human society. Personalism, then, is inherent in community, in regarding the person as a member of the community and a being in his own right whom we may challenge and love, but whom we must respect and serve. It is not individualism, but the regarding of personhood as the state of living with others and on their behalf. It means upholding human or personal values as supreme, people as persons and not things.

Universalism. This follows naturally, since the community we participate in is the human community from which no one can be excluded, but from which man may exclude himself. Universalism calls for the constant task of constructing and extending the community because in fact, as human beings all men are already in it potentially. The task is to break down the walls that divide.

Integrity. In a centralist impersonal society integrity and the determination to maintain it must be paramount in any creative movement. Persons must refuse to prostitute themselves and the community must give every assistance to enable persons to maintain integrity personally and the community itself must maintain its integrity. Like community, integrity cannot be imposed, but must be carved out by persons.

Nonviolence. If the task is to break down the dividing walls and to build community, then nonviolence is perhaps the single most important element. There can be no peace movement which does not adhere fully to the concept of nonviolence as a way of life and as the way of life alone capable of achieving a peaceful society. This means that each person has to struggle with his understanding of himself and the way of love. This is not a position to be taken but a life to be lived. It involves gentleness and strength, the acceptance of abuse and courage. It means accepting suffering rather than inflicting it, compromise and not conquest. It means the overcoming of evil with good.

Faith. The trials are and will be severe. The temporal order cannot be counted as sufficient and an awareness and intimacy with the eternal, the truth, the transcendent, is the only reason for continuing for those of us who cannot believe in "progress" or man's goodness, but who can believe in man's possibility and who must believe in the possibility of history.

Hope. This is the consequence of faith, that which moves when reason says it is impossible, there is not time.

Joy. Leon Bloy has said, "Joy is the most infallible sign of the presence of God." Joy is essential and without it there is not life. Beware of one who is without joy. To be able to see the good, to be able to laugh and rejoice because there is one other, because there is one friend, there are others who can see what we see and see us as we like not to see ourselves but who can make us laugh...Joy is the sign of humanity.

These are some of the elements of a peace movement. A community of friends who share a vision and trust one another...may, love one another--not to be confused with liking. So we begin by becoming acquainted and ever widening the circle, establishing the community of trust and affection, non-violence and joy, which can sorely tempt those who fear and would hate. The movement shows another way, it wins the hearts and lives of men because it becomes a way of life and not another manipulator. It cannot threaten because it has nothing with which to threaten. It cannot be violent because it knows itself in every other. It frees those caught in the machine. It is radical because it establishes its own terms and does not live on the sufferance of the Establishment. It seeks to overthrow the Establishment, to undermine it and overcome it with personalism, community, nonviolence. It is the greatest threat to the present society which will not tolerate it but cannot kill it and which must be won over if only we can grow and love and persevere through the upholding and criticism and affection of one another.

RANDOM THOUGHTS AFTER CUBA
by Donald McKelvey

What follows are mostly just thoughts which have come to mind during and since Detorrence Week, Oct. 22-28. It is not particularly well-organized and is not meant to encompass any definitive analysis of Cuba or the Cuban crisis; I do think, however, that it brings up important questions for people working for peace.

When I originally decided to write these "random thoughts", I was most impressed by the implication of the Cuban crisis for analysis of Soviet military strength. For, if one was to believe Administration statements and press accounts, the emplacement of Soviet missiles in Cuba resulted in a significant and strategic increase in Soviet military power. (This was the basic reason given by the Administration for getting the Soviet missiles out of Cuba.) If this was true, then Soviet military power must be extremely limited, and nowhere near American military power. Clearly this would have extraordinary implications for the respective nuclear strategies of the respective countries. Then the government, through Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric (on TV show "Issues and Answers", quoted in I.F. Stone's Weekly of November 19), declared that in fact "there was (not) any major change in the over-all military equation as a result of this particular deployment (of missiles in Cuba)." All that had happened was that "an element of flexibility (for us) introduced into the power equation that the Soviets had not heretofore possessed." The above brings up two questions: first, what is the actual state of Soviet (and American) military strength?; second, why did the Administration feel it had to tell such a blatant lie?, and what implications does this hold for the future?

The government's original position on Soviet military strength and Cuban bases prompted Hanson Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, to do an analysis of comparative Soviet and American power and of the function of overseas bases (Times, Nov. 7, 1962, p.6). The figures are most revealing, for they show clearly that the Soviet Union does not have the power necessary both to carry out a first strike on military targets and to have enough weapons in reserve to carry out a second strike on cities. (Clearly, it would be suicidal to carry out a first strike on cities, for the automatic response would be retaliation on one's own cities.) This policy of minimum deterrence on the part of the Soviet Union (i.e. retaining only enough nuclear weapons and delivery systems to destroy U.S. cities after an American first strike, and keeping those weapons either sufficiently secret, sufficiently mobile, or sufficiently rapid-firing to save them from an American first strike) and the contrasting policy of counter-force held by the U.S. (i.e. retaining enough weapons to launch a "pre-emptive" first strike on Soviet military targets and to hold in abeyance enough weapons to threaten bombing of Soviet cities--holding them in "hostage"--and even devastation of a third power--China) are most clearly spelled out in an article by Prof. P.M.S. Blackett in The New Statesman of March 2, 1962 (reprinted by Marzani and Munsell, 100 W 23 St., NYC 11; 25¢) entitled "The Military Background to Disarmament". This analysis by Prof. Blackett, a British military strategist of considerable stature, is most important and should be read, I believe, by every peace-concerned individual--as should an article in the October 1962 "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" (935 E 60 St.,

Chicago 37) by Michael Brower entitled "Nuclear Strategy of the Kennedy Administration" dealing also with the comparative nuclear policies and strengths of the two countries. Perhaps it is fortunate that the Cuban crisis threw into clear relief this whole question of nuclear strength and policy, for the tendency of much of the "peace movement" to equate Soviet and American military policy and threat is clearly erroneous; much more sophisticated analysis and understanding is needed.

Second, what were the Administration's additional reasons for its extreme reaction to Soviet missiles in Cuba, in addition to the stated one of the enhancement (though only tactical, not strategic) of Soviet military power? I suspect at least two such reasons--first, a paranoia about having missiles 90 miles away (especially if potentially available to "that crazy bearded beatnik"); second, a desire to deprive the Castro regime of all possible means of defending itself (note the insistence, since then, that the outmoded--see I.F. Stone's Weekly, Nov. 19, 1962--IL-28 bombers are "offensive" and the further insistence that all Soviet troops leave Cuba, as well as the insistence that the "no-invasion" pledge will not be issued until inspection is accepted by Cuba--though not with counter-inspection of U.S.-sponsored counter-revolutionary plotters throughout the Caribbean). Also, this particular episode reminds us that our government is willing to deceive us in order to justify its aggressive policies; and we should, henceforth, be considerably less than trustful of the government's statements in a future Cuban "crisis" (e.g. the undoubtedly forthcoming invasion).

Without contributing to Cold War-oriented debate, it is relevant to examine "who won". According to the U.S. press, the U.S. won, making Khrushchev back down in the face of our superior might (and right?) and making Castro look ridiculous and insignificant. Furthermore, there was virtually unanimous agreement throughout the world--including Latin America--that the U.S. had acted justly, and U.S. actions had the support of most regimes and peoples. This general analysis must be dealt with on two levels:

First, is it true that the U.S. had the support of the peoples (never mind the reactionary regimes in U.S.-tied underdeveloped countries, especially Latin America) of the world? I really have inadequate information on this, but I do know that even in London there was grave doubt about U.S. actions (see I.F. Stone's Weekly, Oct. 24, 1962); and I suspect that those actions had very little support indeed from peoples--or even from most governments--in the underdeveloped world. In the atmosphere of national support for Kennedy and psychological self-censorship of the press (as well as the usually poor or non-existent reporting of underdeveloped nations' peoples' reactions), it was--and remains--very difficult to tell just how the world's peoples felt during that week. It is important to note, by the way, the condemnatory-of-the-Soviet-Union-and-disappointed-with-Castro statement of important leftist Brazilian leader Leonel Brizola.

If the administration actually believes that it had the support of the world's peoples in this act of power/deterrence, it makes the Administration even more dangerous (it is perhaps even worse if that evaluation is incorrect, for it will show the U.S. government to be out of touch with reality).

Second, did the U.S. "win"? Before the emplacement of missiles in Cuba, it appeared that an invasion was, if not imminent, soon to come. (Why else, for instance, would the government reverse its policy-- this was in summer 1962--and accept into the U.S. Army refugees who did not know any English, train them in Spanish-speaking outfits, and hold the option to release them after five months if they still didn't know English?) Now the Castro regime has been given what may very well prove to be a vital breathing spell in which to consolidate its defenses and, more important, build its economy in preparation for the undoubtedly forthcoming invasion. Rather than give its no-invasion pledge (as I naively believed it would as a result of its deal with the Soviets during the crisis), the U.S. has found every way to squirm out of doing so (and successfully), from calling outmoded bombers "offensive" weapons to insisting that even Soviet troops leave Cuba to insisting on "inspection" in Cuba despite the U.S. government's own admission that all the "offensive" weapons have left or will soon leave the island. Although the U.S. has not carried out its end of the bargain, nonetheless the emplacement of the missiles did serve the purpose of giving the Cuban regime valuable time. (In any case, the U.S. will have to be even more careful about its invasion, now that it has made an implicit no-invasion pledge.) Also it should be noted that the official government objective is the overthrow of the Castro regime.

An analysis of "who won" must delve into the question of why the crisis came about. What motives did the Soviets have in placing missiles in Cuba? (Clearly this started the immediate crisis, though it must be recognized that in the total situation of U.S.-Cuba relations from which the specific crisis arose, the U.S. should be almost completely blamed for its still-continuing policy of "unremitting hostility" which put Cuba in a situation in which it had to ask for the missiles or die; thus the Soviet implacement must be seen as a response to U.S. actions, not as an independent action.) Accepting the idea that the missiles did not strategically enhance the Soviet military position, and recognizing that the existence of a Socialist/Communist Cuba (which could be cultivated and turned into a "socialist showcase" with little trouble, as well as used for the spread of revolutionary and anti-American propaganda) is highly significant in terms of North American hegemony in Latin America, I think there are two other reasons of more or less relevance. One was the hope for a softer American position on Berlin, or perhaps simply an attempt to precipitate negotiations on Berlin; I suspect that this probably failed, though we may never know (cf. James Reston's analysis that the outcome of the Cuban crisis did not necessarily mean that the U.S. would be "tough" and belligerent in future crises--N.Y. Times, 10-29-62, p. 1). Also, the Soviets wanted to bring up the matter of foreign bases. Not only would the Soviets like to get rid of the encircling U.S. bases (it is very instructive to look at a map of the Soviet Union ringed with American missile and bomber bases, and then to remember American counterforce strategy) and specifically in the case of Turkey to neutralize the only country with a warm water port potentially available to the Soviet Union, but the Soviets would like also to bring pressure upon the U.S. on the question of (soon to be--or already--militarily obsolete) overseas bases. As Hansen Baldwin also points out (Times, 11-11-62, p. 6), increasingly the overseas bases serve the main function of proving that the U.S. is sincere in its commitments to its alliance allies (especially in NATO); removal of this American "pres-

ence" would mean potential--and in some cases actual--neutralization if many of these allies. (By this analysis, then, the Turkish bases will not--as I have felt--be removed within a year on part of an unreported agreement between Kennedy and Khrushchev--though much depends on the stability of the Turkish regime and Turkish-American relations.)

I would like especially to challenge the notion that the Soviet Union has "lost face" in international opinion by backing down before U.S. might; rather, I suspect that many people and peoples share Bertrand Russell's appreciation of Soviet calmness in the face of incredible U.S. belligerence.

On the balance of "victory", then, Cuba "won" most, having been given at least a lease on life; the Soviets "won" next most; and the U.S. came out least ahead, if at all (except in the reinforcement of a whole host of prevailing attitudes on the part of the American people and governments friendly to the U.S.--which is scarcely much of a victory).

Perhaps most of all I wonder about the responses and actions of the "peace movement". Almost exclusively, the method of confrontation with the public was the traditional "public witness" one--demonstrations, walks, rallies, etc. (None of us thought we could do the first thing about the Government's crisis actions, though I.F. Stone's articulation of this feeling drew cries of indignation and "No!" from some of the participants at the Washington rally on Saturday.) To the extent that we were noticed by the public, I think that we exacerbated the general crisis effect of polarization of "public opinion"--or rather we narrowed, rather than widening, the portion of individual citizens' minds that doubted the correctness of the Administration's actions. I think this was due, in good part, to the psychological effect on individuals of seeing "those unpatriotic crackpots" from a physical distance and being able easily and satisfyingly to categorize indirect confronters as a group rather than dealing with us as individuals. (In part, this is the old problem of not articulating our position clearly enough so that a passer-by can understand at a relatively short glance what it's all about and not be alienated from it; only rarely has this been done. But this is not the central problem.) It should be noted that the public demonstrations served the very important purpose of keeping open the channels of dissent and making it clear that there were those who opposed brinkmanship policies.

Second, some of the signs we used called for the parties to the conflict to do things which the other party had asked; thus, we were asking them to take "unilateral initiatives" which would look like appeasement of the aggressors.

Taking the second problem first, one must remember the general theory of unilateral initiatives, which says that it is possible to take initiatives when tempers are collected--i.e. between crises, not during crises. Thus crisis situations are not the time for unilateral initiatives; rather, I feel, crises should be used to explain the background of the conflict and to call for actions which cannot be interpreted as asking for "giving in" to the opponent--e.g. negotiations or going to the U.N.

In general, I believe, the method of confrontation of the public-- at all times, whether or not during a crisis--should be as direct, and educational as possible, while retaining the features of dissent-channel unclogging and whatever mass media publicity value mass demonstrations have. A couple of possible ways of achieving this triple aim come to mind. One, used by the General Strike for Peace in New York City for months prior to the week of the General Strike itself, would be to send relatively small contingents through a city's streets talking with individuals, passing out multilanguage leaflets if appropriate, in general, decentralizing control and execution of the protest. A second way would be for individuals to go, in tandem, door-to-door talking to other individuals (imagine the impact if each of the 10,000 of so who showed up at the Sunday walk/rally in New York City had spent that time talking with friends, acquaintances, or just anyone who might listen--or even if half of them, or a third, had done so). I use the word "demonstrative" here most advisedly; for such people would be involved in a highly important, effective, and significant form of demonstrating their beliefs. And I should like strongly to emphasize the revolutionary and educational effect on peace workers of such a mode of action, which would require their learning and knowing about issues and then articulating their positions.

I fully recognize, first, that participation in such demonstration would require a number of things the "peace movement" does not have: highly skilled mass media liaison people, who could make such demonstrations sufficiently imaginative-sounding (after all, they would be imaginative; we would only have to tell the truth, which is not always the case now) to catch the interest of the general public; second, "peace movement" leaders willing strongly to urge their followers to take a psychologically and intellectually very difficult course of action and able to turn those followers out for such demonstrations; third, a willingness to be highly permissive and non-insistent on a particular political "line" for a demonstration (this follows naturally from decentralisation); and fourth, a group of intelligent, articulate, educated, confident peace-niks who would be willing and able to walk up to a door or a person on the street and start talking about peace effectively (of course, the best and only way of learning how to do this is to do it.) These are problems; but is there any alternative?

 "Many pacifists and socialists argue that it is intolerable for the government to police the peace movement but that the peace movement does have an obligation to police itself, carefully screening its membership so as to eliminate Communists. In some organizations this is attempted directly by purges and loyalty oaths, and in others it is approached indirectly by what Paul Goodman calls the "Byzantine symmetry" with which they strain never to criticize the United States without being sure to lambaste the Soviet Union. I should like to offer three comments [only one is quoted here] on this preoccupation with purging Communists from the peace movement.

"Strange as it may seem, those most concerned to keep Communists out of peace organizations are often those who, in one respect, are most like them--leaders who are more interested in selling a line to the public than stimulating individuals to develop their own independent thoughts and actions in the interests of peace. Communist infiltration is chiefly a threat to those who are themselves trying to develop and control a rather pliable membership..."

--Dave Dellinger, editorial in January 1963 Liberation

the least dishonorable failure
by Lynn Pfuhl

The creation of a new Left, such as is proposed in the Port Huron Statement of the SDS, is both imperative and impossible; imperative in terms of need and impossible in terms of success.

Unascertainable Values

That absolute values are impossible of attainment and that as a consequence relative values are arbitrary is a fact. Humanistic values, conceptions of human beings, of human relationships, and of social systems are most directly in accord with the subjective nature of any system of values, but even Humanism assigns a value to an object which is ultimately devoid of any such characteristic. Such a Humanism further fails by assuring that man may change independently of his environment and by declaring that majority participation in decision making is desirable or even feasible, a declaration easily invalidated by the facility with which the ruling class inculcated in the American public a frenzied desire to obliterate themselves and the rest of the world in a war over Berlin or Cuba.

Any new Left therefore fails, though unavoidably, in the postulation of values upon which the philosophical foundation of such a Left may be laid.

Neglected Facts

But however valid may be the contentions of Humanism, the realization of these contentions is unattainable. That this is true is easily proved by acknowledging a few easily demonstrable facts, facts admitted by the Port Huron Statement itself.

The Statement says, "Economic minorities not responsible to the public in any democratic fashion make decisions of a more profound importance than even those made by Congress." To change this situation, it would be necessary for any new Left to become more powerful than these economic minorities. To believe that this will occur is unjustifiably optimistic. The Left must accept the unpleasant fact of Charles E. Wilson's "permanent war economy".

It is also a fact that the United States defense budget alone is over \$160 billion, and that this is only a small part of the total financial aspect of the whole military industrial alliance.

Perhaps it is the very desperation created by these facts which causes a question such as, "How long will it take to establish a relation of trust between America and the newly developing societies?" The mentality of any leader of a "newly developed society" which trusts the United States is not newly developed; it is under developed.

Capitalism in short is stagnant, but the motivating assumption of the Port Huron Statement is that it can be reformed.

Unattainable Expectations

Neglected facts are conducive to unattainable expectations. Consideration of the expectations & the goals of the new Left ~~are~~ is in this context relevant.

First, the means of attaining these goals. The various conditions of the civil rights movement, the peace movement, labor, and liberalism are in themselves justification for despair.

Consideration of two facts in pertinent to a discussion. Repression and violence

increase in direct proportion to the amount of dedication and courage shown by the few actual activists, and the number of half-committed and pseudo-committed is legion. The number of incompetents and status seekers who inject themselves into positions of leadership, particularly in such totally ineffective organizations as the NAACP, is staggering, and accelerated movement through the courts an impossibility. Aside from the fact that the tremendous energy now being directed toward voter registration is being wasted because of the continued impossibility of working within the system which is the agent of oppression, the final end of the integration movement is, with the significant exception of organizations like the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, entrance into bourgeois society.

The peace movement is similarly confused and disoriented. The war mongers are successful in engendering intra-group and inter-group conflict by red-baiting, and the groups themselves have evolved no really effective technique of combatting war or the warfare state. Rather they persist in hopeless competition with that state with inadequate attempts to educate a public already thoroughly inculcated with the virtues, pleasures, and profits, of war.

The labor movement is in an even more hopeless situation. Increasingly restricted by big business government, it is nevertheless viewed, and to a great extent views itself, as another division of the Cold War Complex. The unions also aid management by maintaining segregation in their southern and in many of their norther locals.

Finally the liberal segment of leftwing opinion, represented by organizations and publications such as Americans for Democratic Action, the New Republic, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and rather unbelievably Senator Eastland's Democratic Party, is in reality the segment of the apologists for the status quo and as such is fundamentally opposed to basic, radical change in the American economic structure.

In essence, despair is admirably justified.

Second, the goals themselves. Some are undesirable and unattainable, others merely unattainable.

"Concern with the challenge to the American economic system" indicates a basic misunderstanding of the necessary goals of a radical left and is a phrase which might as easily come from Goldwater's Conscience of a Conservative as from the Port Huron Statement. One wonders at such concern when it is precisely the American economic system which is the cause of war, hunger, and segregation.

Or again, such a question as, "How long will it take to create a relationship of trust between America and the newly developed societies?" is indicative of a basic flaw in the purposes of any Left which would pose it. When it is manifestly obvious that America's only interest in any of these societies is annexation for military purposes in the Cold War and thus a domination possibly more terrible than that from which they have freed themselves.

The previous points have fallen into the undesirable and unattainable category. The rest are merely unattainable.

For instance, such a question as, "How may democracy be ~~achieved~~ achieved in America?" is indicative either of a complete lack of information concerning American social and economic reality or of complete idiocy on the part of the questioner, and the contention that "universal controlled disarmament must replace deterrence

and arms control as the national defense goal" gives strong evidence of an inability to distinguish between desirability and reality.

This inability is evident throughout. A statement such as, "The United States' principal goal should be the creation of a world where hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance, and exploitation are replaced as central features by abundance, reason, love, and international cooperation." or a recommendation for a fifty-year program of industrialization of the underdeveloped countries are only further retreats from reality.

And the proposition that America should show its commitment to democratic institutions not by withdrawing support from undemocratic regimes but by making domestic democracy exemplary is not only unrealistic in that this proposition incorrectly assumes that America has such a commitment, but evil in that it advocates continued support of undemocratic institutions.

It is this underlying illusion of the existence of American democracy which will prove fatal to all radical action. Rather any action of whatever nature must be grounded on the unpleasant realization that America is not a democracy but a military industrial complex existing for the temporary benefit of the few and the eventual destruction of all. Thus recommendations that corporations be made publicly responsible, aside from ignoring the fact that "corporation" and "publicly responsible" are mutually exclusive terms, ignores the basic nature of corporations and of capitalism itself.

The foregoing considerations must not, however, be interpreted as an excuse for inaction; for to remain silent is to give consent in an era which demands dissent. Rather they are a call to action motivated by a new courage founded on the realization that such action will not succeed. The radical of a new Left must not realize that the least dishonorable failure is the only honorable goal.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHINA'S NUCLEAR CAPABILITY
by Mark Scher

One of the main points of discussion involving world peace today is the so-called threat of a China with nuclear capability. China's economy, it has been asserted, is being sapped to finance an aggressive nuclear arms development program. Those who make these allegations should inspect the facts more closely.

It seems unlikely that China has made a concerted effort toward the construction of a nuclear device; and it is not already an accomplished fact. On the contrary, in all probability the manufacture of such a weapon will in any event be distilled out of China's scientific progress in related areas. Such a device in all likelihood would employ plutonium as the fissionable material, plutonium being quite easily manufactured in a breeder reactor, as compared with the costly uranium isotope separation process necessary for the manufacture of a uranium fission bomb.

Although it would be speculative to fix a date, it appears that China will not be able to produce any sort of nuclear capability reaching even a token amount of the present nuclear powers as far as tactical ability and sophistication within ten years.

In view of China's forbearance in her foreign policy, it is highly unlikely that she will assume the form of an all-devouring Ogre once it achieves nuclear capability. The record shows considerable thought and deliberation about self-protective moves on her part and action only after provocation. Examples include: (1) The Korean War, which she entered five months after its inception, when the U.S. had advanced upon her borders, when MacArthur threatened to bomb Manchuria; carried on private talks with Chiang Kai-shek planning an invasion of the mainland. Only then did China act to repulse these forces with only a mild defense in a limited area at first. Then followed three weeks of non-intercourse. Only MacArthur's "Home by Christmas" offensive brought full involvement of Chinese power. (2) The recent Sino-Indian border conflict, where Indian troops had infiltrated areas of Chinese territory through the subterfuge of occupying territory which colonialist Britain had attempted to occupy through economic expansionism in the beginning of the century. (3) Other restraints such as the Quenoy-Watou harassments, and the buildup of military forces on Taiwan.

The Western countries and the Soviet Union have tried to foster ill will between China and her neighbors, by sending outstanding amounts of military supplies and aircraft to India and SEATO countries, and have made concerted efforts to wreck a peaceful solution to the Sino-Indian boundary dispute-- which involved less serious complications than has been true between countries where amicable solutions have been found in the past. By using the remaining elements of colonialist thought still extant in some countries, they have made attempts to sabotage China's efforts to implement the Five Points agreement of Bandung and to block negotiations aimed at resolving conflict in the Far East.

The following is a draft National Council resolution on the McCarran Act, on the occasion of its application to Advance Youth Organization:

It [the McCarran Act] would put the government of the United States in the thought-control business. It would give government officials vast powers to harass all of our citizens in the exercise of their right of free speech... [These provisions] represent a clear and present danger to our institutions... the application of the registration requirements to so-called "Communist Front" organizations can be the greatest danger to freedom of speech, press, and assembly since the Alien and Sedition laws of 1798.

--President Truman, from his 1950 message vetoing the McCarran Act

Attorney-General Robert Kennedy has petitioned the Subversive Activities Control Board to order ADVANCE, a small youth organization in New York City, to register as a "Communist Front Organization" under the requirements of the Internal Security (McCarran) Act of 1950.

We condemn the McCarran Act on principle as obnoxious to the entire American tradition expressed in the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution, the right to trial by jury, the principle of innocence until proven guilty, and the illegality of bills of attainder. We condemn the continued use of the McCarran Act by the Administration on the grounds that its use--and even its very existence--only strengthens those who threaten democracy and peace in the United States: the Ultra-Right and the conservative forces who stand in the forefront of the military-industrial complex and their representatives in Congress and in the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition.

Our concern in this statement is not primarily with ADVANCE. Bespite our constant opposition on political grounds to that organization, we feel that defense of their right to hold whatever political ideas they choose is the duty of every democrat. Our concern is with the McCarran Act itself, with the right of all people to organize and to advocate political ideas, and with the record of the Kennedy Administration with respect to civil liberties.

In citing ADVANCE as a Communist Front organization, Attorney-General Kennedy noted that ADVANCE took several positions which were "parallel" to those of the Communist Party; advocacy of a four-power ban on nuclear testing; non-intervention in Cuban affairs, restoration of diplomatic relations with Cuba, and protesting the blockade in October of 1962; negotiations for a peaceful settlement to the Berlin question and withdrawal of foreign troops from the city.

Since every peace and civil rights organization in the country takes some positions more or less similar or "parallel" to those of the Communists, all are more or less vulnerable to inclusion under the provisions of the McCarran Act. Even the 35-hour work week, advocated by George Heany, is a position which the Communists hold.

The Internal Security Act was passed over President Truman's veto in 1950. It provides that organizations which the Subversive Activities Control Board--appointed by the President--finds to be "Communist Action", "Communist Front", or "Communist Infiltrated", shall register with the Attorney-General's Office. It defines the three in the following manner:

Communist Action Organization: "one substantially directed, dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization, controlling the world Communist movement..."

Communist Front Organization: "Any organization in the United States which is substantially directed, dominated or controlled by a Communist Action Organ-

from those of any Communist Action Organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement."

Communist Infiltrated Organization: "one substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by an individual or individuals who are, or who within three years have been actively engaged in giving aid or support to a Communist action organization, a Communist foreign government or the world Communist movement."

In 1961 the Supreme Court upheld by a five-to-four decision the requirement for a Communist Action Organization to register. To date the other provisions have not been tested; however, the Attorney-General has moved to enforce registration orders against eleven "Communist Front Organizations". ADVANCE is the twelfth organization to be cited.

The order to register as a Communist Action Organization is more than a formality. Such registration subjects the organization to certain appalling consequences: (1) the organization is branded as a treasonous conspiracy loyal to a single foreign power bent upon destroying the United States; (2) notice of this political character must be labelled on all mailings and publications to any persons or other organizations; (3) it becomes a criminal offense for members of such an organization, or officers of a "Communist Front Organization", to apply for certain government jobs, or to apply for or use a passport, or to apply for a National Defense Education Act scholarship; (4) officers and members may be subject to criminal prosecution under the "conspiracy to teach and advocate the overthrow of the government" section of the Smith Act, as well as under the "membership clause" of the Smith Act which makes it a crime to be a member of the Communist Party, thus subjecting registrars to double jeopardy and forcing them to bear witness against themselves; (5) in states of national emergency, members of such an organization may be subject to imprisonment in detention camps without trial; (6) failure to register entails enormous jail sentences and fines (\$5,000 and five years in jail for each day of failure to register); (7) the McCarran Act makes it illegal for a member of a registered organization to work in a "defense establishment". It also provides for the registration of all printing and mailing equipment in possession of the organization, as well as the registration of membership and mailing lists, if the group has been ordered to register as a "Communist Action Organization".

To determine whether a group is due to register under the McCarran Act, a hearing is held by the Subversive Activities Control Board. The function of prosecutor, judge and jury are all combined in the same body. Once a decision is made, the organization has recourse to the courts to defend itself. The legal assumption is that it is already proven guilty and is appealing.

We support the views of Justice Black in his dissent to the 1961 ruling that (1) the registration procedure violates the Fifth Amendment, which guarantees protection against self-incrimination; (2) the Act is a Bill of Attainder since it inflicts punishment without judicial trial; (3) the Act violates the First Amendment by in fact outlawing the Communist Party and destroying other organizations ordered to register. "When the practice of outlawing parties and various public groups begins, no one can say where it will end."—Justice Black. And we agree with President Truman's veto message given at the beginning of this statement. It is on these grounds that we stand in opposition to the McCarran Act.

Beyond that, we particularly object to its application against a youth organization, whatever its nature. Thought control laws such as the McCarran and Smith

Acts are especially injurious to youth. Hundreds of thousands of young people will think twice before they study any writings of the past and present which are partial to Communism, if they feel that this may be construed in such a way as to brand them in the public eye. With that system holding sway in one-third of the world, and a major force elsewhere, it is the sheerest folly for a nation to try to outlaw ideas and the study of ideas.

Let us not forget that in several states in the South, the NAACP and CORE are already labeled "Communist organizations" by legislative means. Let us also bear in mind that those who staff the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee, the Dodds, Judds, Eastlands and Walters, would like to label all active liberal and progressive groups as "Communist", "Communist Front", or "Communist infiltrated". As long as such men and their protectors, such as Senator Goldwater, remain a real force in our country, the loss of one or another constitutional liberty is not just a question of the loss of rights for Communists and their immediate friends. With such Right Wing political forces waiting in the wings all liberals are potential victims of the fear machine. Those who could accuse the National Council of Churches of being Communist infiltrated can stop at no rational boundaries.

Men must be free to organize around their ideas. This freedom does not exist if, in fact, the state intervenes to label, punish or attempt to destroy political organizations. Such state intervention is a characteristic of totalitarianism, as is an attempt to justify such actions by arguments which "balance" state security against human rights. If the organization being prosecuted under the McCarran Act constitutes a clear and present danger, there are democratic methods of dealing with them. The government has full power to prosecute acts of violence, espionage, or treason, but "dangerous ideas" can only be defeated by the participation of all contending views in a free political process.

This is particularly important with regard to the development of young people. The problems of all mankind must be included in the curriculum of all youth. It is equally important that ideas of all kinds be tested in action against other ideas. A nation must trust its youth as they experiment and develop, or the youth will have no trust in their nations.

We fear that the Administration believes that the Cold War can be waged effectively only if political life is shaped bureaucratically from above. The enforcement of the McCarran Act is thus consistent with attempts to impose "self-censorship" on the press, to channel and blunt the activities of the civil rights movement, and to intervene in the process of collective bargaining and the internal life of the trade union movement.

What is the strategy of the Administration in using the McCarran Act? So far the Administration has been careful to use the Act only against plainly Communist or Communist-controlled organizations, or those which are organizationally useful to the Communist Party. Thus it becomes difficult for some liberals to protest such undemocratic acts, since their fear of the "Red Snear" hinders their freedom to act in support of their belief in the principles of the Constitution.

The pattern of persecution of the Communist movement indicates that the Administration is attempting to outlaw, step-by-step, the public functions of the Communist Party. However, the history of such persecution here and abroad indicates that this will not destroy the Communist Party but merely drive it underground. Nonetheless, the removal of the "visible Communist Party" will allow the Administration to claim victory on the home front and thus placate the ultra-right. That the ultra-right would in fact be placated is dubious, to say the least.

With the Communist Party in existence, fire is drawn to it like unto a lightning rod; but with the Communist Party out of public ken, any group which makes a radical or left analysis of society and which becomes a thorn in the side of the powers-that-be becomes the prime target of the Red-baiters. This state of affairs would in turn give the Administration more control over the very diverse forces which make up the left-liberal wing of the Democratic coalition, including groups from the labor movement to the civil rights movement to some parts of the peace movement. The administration would be in a position where it could at will agree or not agree with the Ultra-right that any segment of the coalition has "gone too far" and with the use of "secret information" from the FBI, CIA, Army or Navy intelligence, T-men, etc., drive it out of existence.

A liberal administration ought to urge Congress to repeal the McCarran Act and other undemocratic laws which give the foes of full civil liberties room in which to act, rather than attempting to outflank the right-wing by persecuting allegedly un-American political organizations. This Administration should trust the creativity and intelligence of its citizens more, and its unconstitutional devices less, in the development of democracy.

We would suggest that if the administration is to accomplish the goals of the Kennedy program, it would be wiser to take another course. The Kennedy Administration is not itself a monolith, but a complex series of alliances and regional interests which clothes itself under a cover of "liberalism". In fact, parts of the Administration do come from the liberal community (Schlessinger, Stevenson, Bowles); other parts are more to the right and represent clearly reactionary interests (Allan Dulles, J. Edgar Hoover, Earl Russell). The ultra-right has always used the issue of anti-communism to discredit the proponents of liberal and welfare legislation. This tactic was first made an institution by Nixon in the 1946 election, and by McCarthy beginning in 1949. Since the Right need not be troubled by facts and is not encumbered by the responsibilities of political power, it can usually outmaneuver the Administration on its chosen field of battle: anti-Communism and super-patriotism. The hunt for Reds, especially when the Communist Party is not, in fact, a danger to anyone but other equally insignificant sects, can only sidetrack the American people from the fight for peace, the fight for New Frontiers legislation, for social welfare and civil rights. The first two years of the New Frontier indicates that more, not less, of such legislation is needed if the American people are to move dynamically to solve the ills of our challenged democracy. If the Administration is to be successful in accomplishing its stated goals, it needs to bloc with the liberal forces against the Right, not to appease the Right at the expense of the liberals. The attacks of the civil liberties of the Communist Party create a situation which seriously endangers the rights and ultimately the existence of the very liberal forces whose strength must be interposed between the Administration and the Right. Let the Administration worry less about Communists, and more about the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition which cripples every piece of liberal legislation. The American enemy at home is prejudice and egotism, inertia and vested interest. Let us move quickly before we find avenues of change closed.

A BRIEF RESPONSE TO THE MCCARRAN ACT DRAFT
by Donald McKelvey

I have two main criticisms of the draft document on Advance and the McCarran Act. First, I am opposed to the disclaimer which says, in effect, that we recognize what Advance is (even if we don't say what Advance is) and we're not like that. In relation to the civil liberties issue, with which the document purports to deal, there is no question of Advance's political beliefs; it seems to me that that question is irrelevant, as we are supporting the right of any group to hold any political beliefs and to organize to promulgate them.

We should, I think, specifically eschew any disclaimer, saying that the use of such devices only intensifies the anti-communist paranoia which is so rife. To go out of our way to say that we are not communists (or sympathetic to communists or fellow travellers or whatever) only serves to focus attention further on communism as a special thing to be wary of and exacerbates the tendency to see so many questions of communist/anti-communist.

Secondly, I am more concerned with the very existence of the McCarran Act and, more important, of the societal atmosphere which lies behind and beyond it than I am with the use of the Act in this specific situation or its ostensible potential use against organizations to the "right" of the CP (I don't think formal sanctions will be used against organizations without definite CP connections). This aspect of the whole affair (and, incidentally, of the Women Strike/HUAC set-to) should be emphasized much more than it is in the document (which is meant to perform primarily an educational function). Namely--that the dominant societal atmosphere in this country is such as to make an individual unlikely or wary even of considering "unorthodox" ideas; and if he considers them, wary of believing them--not because they're wrong but because they're unorthodox--; and if he believes them, wary of espousing them to others even privately and of following them to their conclusions; and if they are logically followed and privately espoused, wary of taking a public stand and of attempting to promulgate them. The informal sanctions and tools which the society wields are much more powerful than the formal ones, and much more efficacious in deadening individuals' ability to think; thus, the informal societal phenomena should be highlighted, not just mentioned. The running of this societal gambit is something rarely done indeed; too many go through life "conforming" out of a psychological inability to do otherwise.

Brewster Kneen is Youth Secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and an SDS member.

Donald McKelvey is Assistant National Secretary of the SDS and a member of the Student Peace Union National Council.

Lynn Pfuhl is an SDS member and a student at the University of Louisville.

Mark Scher is chairman and National Council delegate from the Hunter (Bronx) chapter of SDS.