

the **ACTIVIST**



35c

Editor: Jonathan Eisen
 Managing Editor: Carol Baggot
 Art Editor: Janet Smith
 Review Editor: Michael Nelsen
 Business: Craigen Wall,
 David Elkinton
 Editorial Advisor:

W. Carey McWilliams

Contributing Editors: Tracy Thompson, David Finke, Rennard Davis, Jerry Berman, Ethan Geto, Tom Hayden...

Advisory Board: Norman Thomas,
 Harold Taylor, Jack Sessions,
 Phil Altbach, Robert Zellner,
 Tom Kahn, Jim Monsonis

NOTES ON THE CONTRIBUTORS

Vladimir X is a pseudonym for a citizen of the Soviet Union. His article is translated from German...Harold Taylor is one of this country's foremost educators, and has served as President of Sarah Lawrence College. He is presently engaged in peace research, speaking, and writing. Paul Potter, a graduate student at the University of Michigan, is a former Vice-President of the National Student Association...Nina Chertoff is a student at Evander Childs Highschool in New York City...Paul Rahmeier is director of the Oberlin College YMCA...Don McKelvey is Assistant National Secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society...W. Carey McWilliams, instructor in Government at Oberlin College, is a graduate of the University of California at Berkeley. He is a frequent speaker and debater at many college campuses...Richard Lempert, a student at Oberlin, is debating champion (1962) of Ohio...Tracy Thompson is editor of SUN: A Monthly Poetry Journal and a regular contributor to The Nation, The Activist and less significant publications.

Copyright

Jonathan Eisen

1963

Vol. 3

No. 2

Whole No. 6

WINTER 1963
 THE ACTIVIST

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL.....page 3
 CONVERSATION IN LENINGRAD
 by Vladimir X.....page 4
 THE UNIVERSITY IN A NEW WORLD
 by Harold Taylor.....page 7
 LIFE AND CRISIS: thoughts of a
 young girl
 by Nina Chertoff.....page 15
 RANDOM THOUGHTS AFTER CUBA
 by Don McKelvey.....page 16
 REVOLUTION, DORMITORIES, and
 the STUDENT MOVEMENT
 by Paul Potter.....page 19
 THE DEVIL THEORY OF HISTORY
 by Paul Rahmeier.....page 25
 REVIEWS, POEMS, and TRIVIA
 page 29

cover photo by Phil Curry

Factual accuracy is the sole responsibility of the contributing writers....
 The ACTIVIST is a quarterly publication of the Students for a Democratic Society (112 East 19th Street, New York 3, New York) and is in no way affiliated with Oberlin College. Publication dates are seasonal; there is no summer issue. Subscriptions are \$1.00 per year, and single copies are \$.50. Back issues are \$.25 each. Subscriptions outside the US are \$1.50 per year....Unsolicited manuscripts are welcome; please include a stamped, self-addressed envelope if return is desired. All editorial and business correspondence should be addressed to: The ACTIVIST, 63 East Lorain Street, Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.A. Address lawsuits and all defamatory mail elsewhere.

EDITORIAL

The Activist is still a relatively new magazine (this is our sixth issue in present form, having formerly been a civil rights newsletter). Our editorial policy has always been open -- we have not espoused any line, nor have we been the cheering section of any political party. In speaking, in part, for the student movement, we have been speaking for a New Politics, a politics of concern, and one of deep questioning of basic assumptions. We have sought to be evocative, and at times controversial. In seeking to print material of student interest we have tried to explore some of the many areas of social change and political involvement. Our policy has not been merely to acknowledge and report a world in revolution, but to place perspective through interpretive essays, to point direction, and to indicate that we as students can help end the politics of drift and apathy.

A younger generation, as LIFE indicated recently, is indeed "taking over." But the pertinent questions of values remain: all generations were young once. But if the attitudes of the "take-over generation" reflect the society bequeathed it by a generation of devils and angels, overkill, mass-ness and mass violence, what kind of world and society will this generation bequeath the next?

* * *

We are honored to welcome to our Advisory Board Mr. Norman Thomas. Socialist candidate for President, author, debater of Barry Goldwater and other lesser figures, Norman Thomas remains the elder statesman of all who devote their lives to the attainment of peace, justice and reason. Recently instrumental in securing the release of Junius Scales from prison where he served for having once been a member of the Communist Party, Thomas has never stopped fighting. "Surely there is in him a reasoned fervor for liberty suggesting such spiritual forbearers as Roger Williams, Jefferson, and Wendell Phillips", was the way Scales put it...

* * *

Chairman Khrushchev's announcement of a limited Soviet willingness to accept on-site inspections has revived hopes for a nuclear test ban. We welcome Mr. Khrushchev's declaration, and hope that it is more than another gambit in the game played for propaganda advantage in which both East and West have discussed the control of nuclear arms. We cherish the perhaps more plausible hope that President Kennedy will respond with proposals which would open the door to a genuine agreement. Some trust of the Soviets is necessary. But it seems a minimal risk to put aside Dr. Teller's fears that the U.S.S.R. will be able to conduct secret tests by synchronizing them with earthquakes (!).

The Administration is accustomed to vaunt its "hard" realism; but both Kennedy and Khrushchev are realists enough to know there are no "propaganda advantages" any more. Even the Ghanians and possibly the Cubans, certainly the Russians and Americans, have learned to distrust words in a world where only positive actions toward peace constitute "realistic" statesmanship.

CONVERSATION IN LENINGRAD

by Vladamir X

Somehow it is the young ones who bother me most. It is not that they scrub themselves bright according to the cadet school directives. The young always do that; even I, a few years ago. Probably it is that they never grew up under the war and the Old Man. He, the great dim monster of our nightmares when we were in school, is for them a fable and an uninteresting one. We cannot refer to him without capitals, aspirate but real. To them he is the story of the torture techniques of the medieval church or the development of the double entry ledger in the stage of primitive accumulation. But the young ones must have bothered Zinoviev. My father, for example, who never wearied in his devotion and who takes the moving of statues as merely another stage in the inexorable blind man's bluff he would prefer to call History. And so a generation of others comes to plague me. A sign of senility, elder brother, and the slow creep of Doestoevskian death. But you always preferred Turgeniev. Probably I would too, if there were the chance to pull both of me together, einzumachen -- is that a word? If not, it probably ought to be. We have had two selves here for so long we have forgotten. Doestoevski and Lenin. The dialectic of history may be a myth to some. We know it; we are ourselves dialectic. A conjugation: I am, he is, you are, we are dialectic.

But I was to discuss a conversation with a young subordinate. He is back from Berlin, full of indignation at the wall. He tells me that the wall is not built to keep agent provocateurs out of the East. It is a discovery, another disenchantment. He is delighted to reveal the truth to me,

with the delight of those demystifiers who have not yet learned that mystery is truth and realism is the only illusion.

"Of course the wall is not built to keep Nazis out. Why should it be when there are just as many on our side as theirs? Of course the Germans would love to run wildly across to the other side. Especially now that we have built it; they have always had an urge to cross other people's frontiers. But please don't tell me that they feel an urge to "freedom." A German feels an urge to a place that is moving, where he can move and move upward and where the echt Deutsch--not our fellow Ulbricht--runs the show. But I have seen a few of your German freedom lovers. How old are they? What were they doing then...back in these days when you were born somewhere near Kubyshhev and your mother ran from their freedom-loving embrace? They love freedom just as much as we do. Enough to keep your mouth shut--as we did when the Old One was around, and will do again some day--and go on, grow fat, burst into procreation and die."

"Perhaps you are right, about the older ones. But there were young Germans too. Young ones who never came east and who want to go West. And we shoot them and let them bleed under the wall. I tell you, I have seen these things."

"I am quite sure you have. There were days in which it was not necessary to go to Germany to see them. How many of our loyal Jews would be delighted to go to Israel? We did not need a wall in the old days. We shot a few without such refinements and the new and younger Jews learned.

They mutter and they fear and they stay."

"But one can hardly excuse either case..."

"Yes, one can excuse both. The Jews are a tough folk. They can endure us and may outlast us. Our successive generations of bestiality to them have only brought Kaganovich back in again. Could they endure Israel? I doubt it. The stagnant cities and the ever fewer countrymen? The Americans, so patronizing, so certain in their mortgage? The stupid exports which are an excuse for the ausländer to make a contribution without feeling they are doing so? And the same incessant propaganda about noble missions and the joy of labor which they heard here? Zion? Isn't Zion better for them here? And your young, ever-so-idealistic Germans? Even death under the wall has its merits."

"I find that hard to believe. The West, of course, has its limitations; there is no doubt considerable exploitation left and freedom is often a sham. But we know how much of that is propaganda. They have not yet had the revolution, of course, but..."

"On the contrary, they have had it. Long ago. They do not delude themselves with silly notions like the idea that a "revolution" made by bourgeois intellectuals is somehow different from one made by bourgeois businessmen, following the doctrines of deceased bourgeois intellectuals. Nor do they follow Marx's notion that revolutions change history. They call it "progress" and we call it the "transition from socialism to communism." We say the state will wither away, and for them it has. So far

away that the average men no longer know that the state controls, structures their life; so far that one of their great corporations is not to be distinguished from the state or the state from a corporation. History may be inexorable; it is not welcome. You are always parading your poets and telling me that tomorrow will be better. Perhaps it will; it is better than it was yesterday; it is better in Poland than it is here; it may be better in the West. Such things may seem to make all the differences. But the "better" and "worse" are always within the idiot channels constructed by the mute God, History."

"I am hardly so pessimistic--or should I call it cynical--as you. After all, whatever we suffer from bureaucratic rot and stupidity we now are far better off than we were yesterday..."

"Better fed; better clothed. In all "objective" respects. But yesterday the fact is that a man--in all his misery--was closer to knowing that he was a man--one, not four or five. I don't mean Stalin's yesterday; or God knows, the Czar's. Perhaps we have never known a yesterday. But they did once; I have seen Prague and Florence. I am perhaps a little tired of cant; I am glad to see the young feel the same. But there is a louder cant: that utter nonsense about action and effectiveness and purpose that is almost as silly as being moonstruck by one's own tragedy, peering fascinated into the vastness of one's own eardrum. Perhaps it is too much to ask of any society. I appreciate what we have done; in a dim way, I am proud of it as only Muscovites can be proud--for it is ours as it is never

Leningrad's--and someday we shall probably both lay down our divergent dreams and our virtually identical lives for it. I recall once when a couple of Americans said the same thing to me. Yet how important it is to realize how foolish it is."

"Philosophy..."

"Bores you. It bored me. We do not teach it and neither do they. Have you read Wittgenstein? I had a copy of Camus once; a kind of warmed over Dostoevsky. Philosophy is dangerous and religion is moreso and neither side of the wall teaches it. Put them together and they spell politics; neither side of the wall wants that. But they dream better than we do. I have more hope for them."

"Dream better?"

"Because they are older in the revolution. Older and more successful, to us as we are to the imbeciles in China. Older and a bit more tired. But being tired is a first stage to sleep and sleep to wakefulness, just as the dreaming that they may do will precede their morning. Perhaps because they are getting a bit bored with the revolution and the capital accumulation and getting wealthier and stupider. Boredom I have little hope for. I have seen them discussing some incomprehensible poet of ours because he was new. In boredom they might even become fascinated with us--in all due respect--in your boredom you are fascinated with them. And in our mutual fascination we carry our folly and our boredom further and some day the Chinese and the Africans will come and eat us up and we will be so bored as to be diverted by it."

"But you had some hopes, I

thought, hidden in your despair somewhere?"

"Aside from you and a few others and a bottle or two. Yes. My hope is that there are enough of them who are tired. Tired of the nonsense that all of us have been diverting ourselves with for God knows how long. Tired of the low-comedy Gods like our History and their Freedom. They are tired, some of them. And they will be sleeping and dreaming now, I hope, that they will some day come bright awake with a new God who is grand because it is tragic and righteous because it is just. And then none of us will have to be ashamed because there is a Doestoevski in us; and none of their Doestoevskis will have to be ashamed of the Lenin in them. Perhaps then we can put the Old Man's statues back up, to remind us, instead of being frightened by them."

"As we do now with Ivan?"

"As with Ivan."

"You know, it's odd. You are attacking everything--of course, I'm not shocked by it; I've thought a lot of this myself. Everything, I meant to say, that Marx ever wrote. Yet you begin to sound like him."

"That sometimes frightens me. Because Marx, you know, was only an echo of Abraham. And it is Abraham we need."

THE UNIVERSITY IN A NEW WORLD by Harold Taylor

The new world in which we now live is a world which has a present which is not exactly real but is moving and changing so fast, and is changing in ways that are so fantastically complex, that we have to think of it as located in a swiftly moving point which connects the future with the past by the slenderest of threads. All we can now know is that the future will be radically different from the past and that we must do the utmost in our power to make certain that the future is one in which the human race can achieve its own fulfillment. The task of the university is to make this fulfillment more certain and less precarious.

The university as a social institution did not have a task of this size to carry out until these recent years. In fact, it is a recent institution and one which existed in former times as a servant of the Church, the state, and the elite. In the four hundred years of its existence in the Western world, it has been for collecting and transmitting the history, culture, and knowledge of the West and for acting as a stabilizing force in the development of civilization. The new circumstances of the present age have changed all that. Not only must the university transmit the culture, renew the heritage and civilize the new young, but it must act as the creative center for planning the future of the world in every dimension of human life.

We are without predecessors, we are, in this sense, traditionless, and we are but recent emigrants into life. That is, we are recent emigrants into the kind of life which is now actual, and into another kind of life which is now possible. There are no precedents for a world whose every part is connected by instant communication with

every other part, or one in which it is now possible to use the entire resources of scientific knowledge either to destroy what humanity has built or to create a better life for every person now alive.

What has happened is that the traditional ways of running the world's affairs are no longer adequate, and we have entered into a time when we have not been able to build new institutions quickly enough to cope with the explosion of new problems. We have invented the United Nations to cope with the problems of international order, and we find that there are too many such problems, of too fierce a kind to be handled easily by the instrument we have devised. We try to turn back to traditional ways of settling international disputes by threats of war and by war itself, and yet we find that nationalist wars and the threat of nuclear destruction do not remedy situations which can only be cured by social revolution. We build new school and university systems as fast and as well as we can, only to find that the demand for more education runs faster than our ability to keep up with it. In the distractions of the present moment, we feel an urgency that something must be done, immediately, about almost everything. But the clamor of advice and suggestion is so loud, and the fears and anxieties of insecurity are so great, that we turn in every direction at once for salvation -- to civil defense, nuclear arms, to disarmament, to science, to religion, to psychiatry tranquilizers, pep-pills, to anti-communism, to right-wing ideology, forgetting that the way to salvation lies in a steady search for a just and honorable world order rather than a frantic concern for personal security.

As a result of the size of our problems and the sheer numbers of the population itself, America has become a society in which we have lost touch with one another. Our lives are organized in such a way that the private and the personal element in them has shrunk to almost nothing, and the necessity for organizing ourselves to meet the necessities of the social order has flattened out the quality of personal relationships. We learn about each other by reading the newspapers, watching the television, hearing reports, and are prepared to accept what people tell us about ourselves without seeing it with our own eyes, or feeling it in our own hearts. In place of a sense of community and a love of the intimate, we have given ourselves an organization society of big government, big military, big labor, big business, big universities, big school systems, mass media, mass culture, and mass education. Truth, justice, and honor cannot be pumped through a social system by the mechanical means of the mass media. They cannot be created by press conferences. They must grow quietly within the consciousness of each person, and each person must care to seek them as instruments of understanding, for the enrichment of his life. Universities exist to challenge accepted truth and accepted values. They exist to nurture the private: hope, the personal insight, the affection for enlightened truth, to bring to a human scale whatever there may be of sensitivity, community, and love within the world at large.

In the present situation, the universities are operating as units in an organization society. They are seldom conceived as homes for the spirit of learning or as

intimate communities for the cultivation of personal values. They have, perhaps inadvertently, become bureaucracies for the dissemination of information and culture. They possess their own organization men who wish to move upwards in the bureaucracy by carrying on appropriate research in academic fields and engaging in endless committee meetings from which reports are issued. If successful, such men receive the ultimate reward of the modern university: not to have to teach.

We have a confusion in philosophy as to the true aim of the university. There are those who hold vigorously to the notion that only by reason of purity of the liberal arts can the modern student be truly educated, and that those institutions which try to do practical things with education are betraying the tradition of higher learning. One of the most vigorous spokesmen for the liberal arts has been Robert Hutchins, who, at frequent intervals over the past thirty years, has denounced the American universities for not teaching the liberal arts properly, and for teaching practical subjects like mortuary science and fly fishing instead. Over a considerable amount of this period some of us have tried — publicly and privately — to help Mr. Hutchins to a more enlightened view of education, even to the point of encouraging his inquiry by sending him happy examples of university absurdities, including a short course in Church Ushering (given at a university in Florida) which enables the student to learn how to pass the plate, and to show people to their seats with dignity. A publication entitled 'The University' has been issued revealing that Hutchins has collected another gem: a four year course with a major in mobile homes at Michigan State University. He has

now deplored the recent decision of Columbia University not to offer its course in contemporary civilization in the form for which Columbia has become famous, since contemporary civilization has apparently become too complex to deal with, and there were too few faculty members who wished to desert their introductory departmental courses in order to deal with the topic.

The world is not moving in the direction of supporting an education suited to an elite. A liberal education is one which brings meaning into the life of those who are liberally educated, and if one considers the liberal arts to be those which are devoid of practical relation to the society in which they are taught, they are not an appropriate way for the individual to find meaning in his life. The point at issue is not a curriculum of fly-fishing, which is an impractical art if ever there was one, and a curriculum of philosophy -- the most practical of subjects. There are varieties of education because there are varieties of personal and social needs in a democratic social order. The question is, what knowledge is of most worth, and what is it to be used for? When we consider the university from the viewpoint of the world's needs, we find, for example, that the world needs agricultural experts who possess a knowledge of foreign languages and foreign cultures, who at the same time have a sense of public service to which their knowledge can be put. We find a need for young men and women who can survey roads, teach school, handle juvenile delinquents, run tractors, dig ditches, minister to the sick, run governments, and who at the same time can look at themselves and the world with clarity and compassion.

In any case, those institutions

which argue for the purity of the liberal arts are most likely to be those which are most highly vocational -- in another sense. The institutions which have come to be referred to by journalists as 'the prestige colleges' are among the most vocational institutions of education in this country. Their conception of themselves is, in Reisman's phrase, that of a 'gatekeeper for the upper middle class.' They produce through their undergraduate programs young men prepared to become business executives, investment bankers, advertising men, as well as graduate students who enter the vocations of college teaching, law, medicing, architecture, forestry, government service, among other things. The study of the liberal arts in institutions which proclaim such purity quite often comes to consist in learning how to use the vocabulary, wear the clothes and adopt the intellectual posture of those who belong to a privileged economic and social class.

The danger is that this conception of the role of the university may in the long run corrupt the educational aims of the state universities which began with a more important purpose in mind, that of meeting the educational needs of the citizens and of the society they were founded to serve. The difference between a university supported by State funds or supported by private donors is not one of function and aim, in which the private university exists to select those who are considered to be most scholastically able as against those who are less able and without the funds to go anywhere else but to a lower priced institution. Nor in my judgment does the difference lie in a higher degree of freedom in the educational program and curriculum of the private institution, simply

because its funds are derived from endowments and student tuition.

The boards of trustees of private institutions are in some cases more conservative, more responsive to public pressures, and more concerned to control the educational program than those of the State institutions. The difference between one university and another lies in the quality and range of imagination in the leadership provided by its administrators and scholars, it lies in the variety of attitudes taken to the students and to the duties of the scholar. Most universities are organized according to the interests of the faculty members and the particular subject matter which they are concerned to impart. The academic structure is one created by those interests. In private and public institutions alike, there are variations in attitude and, whether it be Wayne State University, San Francisco State, or Michigan State, experiments in new forms of education adapted to the needs of a new student population are under way, with far more imagination and educational energy than most of the private institutions are now displaying. I am one of those few who believe that an educational institution has as its main function to deal directly with the liberal and practical education of the students. I join happily with Chancellor Beadle, of the University of Chicago, in his view that the scholar who has no students is an intellectual eunuch, being without progeny.

The danger is that in our concern to meet the public responsibilities of the university-- a set of responsibilities which

range from producing more scientists in order to compete with the Russians, carrying out scientific research for military defense, to staffing the executive leadership of business corporations --that we will dismiss the task of educating citizens in an understanding of themselves and of the world around them. I am also concerned that in the search for public esteem and by reason on institutional competition for such esteem, we may reach a point at which both public and private institutions will place such a heavy stress on academic preparation in their applicants and academic achievement in their graduates that there will be no joy in learning and no sense of responsibility for the use of learning in the public interest.

I would go farther and say that the University is responsible not only for the education of its students in the achievement of the intellectual and imaginative power, but in the achievement of an enlightened view of the responsibilities and aims of the educated citizen. At the present time there is little room in the university for the spiritual and moral education of the student, since the university structure is divided into three huge pieces of apparatus, none of which is designed to deal with such matters.

On the one hand there is the academic apparatus, with its over-organization, its accumulation of academic materials, collected in textbooks, condensed and distributed in lectures, recollected in examinations, graded like eggs and rewarded with something called academic credit at the rate of three credits a throw for sitting still, listening and making notes over a period of fifteen weeks. In order to standardize the ac-

ademic machinery so that teachers and students can be moved in and out like so many replaceable parts, curriculum committees of university faculties meet regularly and rearrange the subject-matter in new sets or requirements.

Next is the administrative structure, which consists of deans, departmental chairmen, vice-presidents, provosts, chancellors, and presidents who never see students and see faculty members only on business matters, like leaves of absence, salaries, housing, parking permits, football tickets, and research budgets.

Third is the student personnel section, devoted to the rest of the students not dealt with in any other way. This consists in part of counselling and psychological services designed to give therapy to those who are either sterilized or spiritually and emotionally exhausted by the academic apparatus. Under this section comes the student's social life, usually dominated by a fraternity and sorority system which encourages snobbish, segregationist and materialistic values, and the intercollegiate athletic complex, by which young men learn how to move from being low-paid amateurs to high-aid professionals while thousands cheer. In one university of 25,000 students I discovered a genuine intellectual center after several days of searching. It was in a small set of rooms at the Y.M.C.A. That is where the students came to talk about their lives and the things that genuinely mattered.

In this situation it is no wonder that the student culture creates its own values and its own standards, and that cheating on examinations, throwing basketball games, competing for grades,

and jostling for social position is condoned as the normal conduct of the American student. For this he can scarcely be blamed. In the absence of genuine intellectual and moral leadership from his university, he accepts the values of the society around him.

Nor is the answer to be found among those who argue for the necessity of bridging what have been persistently called the Two Cultures. There is in fact only one culture in the true university, the culture of those who care about the life of the mind and the pursuit of the honest truth.

The capacity to lose oneself in the pursuit of objectives is a virtue possessed by the fortunate and one seldom regarded by educators. Yet it is the first essential for the child and the young adult when he sets about learning what he needs to know. Without the absorption of the self in action which goes deeper than the immediate threshold of consciousness, the one who is learning cannot reach the deeper level where all his faculties are engaged. There are many who live through an entire life without ever having learned to lose themselves so completely in the enjoyment of an experience that the experience itself continues to exist as an unconscious element in the enrichment of all future experience. It is this element of involvement in the work itself which we recognize as the central fact about experience in the arts. The great ones who engage in the arts as performers, composers, dancers, architects, sculptors, writers, have the capacity for intensity of focus on the thing to be done, and the capacity to lose themselves in doing

it. Their art is a total expression of who they are.

So it is in learning. The student so often says, "I am unable to concentrate." What he means is that his efforts to focus attention on the task to be learned have failed, that he cannot get inside the ideas, they skitter across the surface of his mind like leaves in the wind. Often this is due to the character of the knowledge to be learned. It is presented as subject-matter, it makes no demands for involvement of the student. It demands only that he pay attention. As a result, too often the mind will not respond, and the student either gives up and satisfies himself with what he can make himself remember, or loses confidence in his own ability to learn.

This is particularly true where mass methods of instruction using the lecture and textbook methods give him no chance to ask questions about what he does not understand or appreciate, and he is taught not to ask questions, since any admission of ignorance might affect his grade adversely. Either that or the text and lecture are reduced to a level of understanding which automatically diminishes his interest and therefore his ability to respond.

We must rid ourselves of the notion that science is technique whereas the humanities contain the 'human values.' The fact is that everyone who tries to think with accuracy has to this degree become a scientist. "Science is a creative activity of human beings in representing experience precisely, and in the most general form," says Lloyd Berkner. In this it does not separate itself from philosophy, history, literature, except in the degree

and kind of its precision.

The mark of great poetry is in the precision of its imagery, the intensity and fullness of its truth, the degree to which it illuminates the reality we already know. The mark of great science is different from this only in the fact that at its higher levels of discourse it can be understood only by those who have themselves undergone the discipline of its language. But even here, a comparison of Finegan's Wake or with Wittgenstein's Tractatus Theologicus would indicate that this is not a final distinction between science and humanistic studies.

When we consider the social sciences in their turn, it is necessary to come to similar conclusions. The novel, the play, the work of literary criticism, the work of social philosophy, cannot be sharply set against the sociology of the South, the political science of a national election, the psychological analysis of moral behavior. For the student there is no need to separate philosophy from literature, biography from history, art from anthropology. They are all approaches to a common end-- a greater degree of understanding of man in his world. As we have seen in the case of Andre Malraux, work in archaeology may result in the development of theories of art, political action may result in creations of literature, concern for art may result in political administration. The student's mind is not built along departmental lines. He will easily make for himself the organic connection between a novel like Man's Fate and the history of 20th century Asia, provided he is not always forced to study them in separate survey courses

entitled Soc. Sci.102 and Hum. 104.

In a similar way, what are called the humanities cannot, without harm, be separated from a direct relation with the creations of art and the actions of human beings. Among the Balinese, children begin to dance and play music when they are three and four years old, and the men and women of the villages dance and act the whole of their lives. They are not professional dancers. They are fishermen, farmers, workers. Their enjoyment of the arts is part of their life in the community, and it is only the Americans and the Europeans who write about their art without creating it. The idea that only those of exceptional talent should be trained in the arts does not fit the Balinese culture. The Balinese are happy to recognize exceptional talent when they see it and to give it an honored place among them. But they recognize that talent and give it the honor it deserves because their knowledge is direct, and their critical faculties have developed from a basis in the creative act itself.

I suggest that this is the way in which the arts and sciences should be regarded in this country. It is natural to live with them and to learn what they have to teach. The boy or girl who enjoys learning in the sciences more than anything else should be given full rein to do so, at his own pace. This does not mean that he becomes a narrow specialist. It means that with enlightened teaching he will learn more, not only about science, but about related matters, in a world in which science already relates itself to society, to moral values, to politics, to art, by the very nature of its enquiry.

In the university it means that we think of the total lives of the students we are educating, and that we bring the teacher and the student into relations of mutual respect and mutual interest. The scholar who reveals what he knows and what he wants others to know in a way which deliberately takes his students into the intellectual life which he is living will find the means to remove the obstacles to understanding which may exist in the concepts and perceptions which he has gained for himself through his own endeavors. He will be concerned that each of his students may learn how to win his own intellectual victory. He will not consider it his task merely to weed out the unfit, to "raise standards" at the expense of those who have not yet learned a standard by which they may guide their intellectual lives. In doing so, the scholar will find himself enriched not merely by the generous companionship of the new generation of the young, but by the necessity of re-examination and recreation of what he already knows in order that others may know it in their own way.

The university will then organize itself, not around a body of subject-matter or a system of professional schools with their tributaries of pre-professional majors, minors, and other breeds of acolyte. It will organize itself around the communal existence of students and scholars who share an identity of purpose--that of extending the range of their minds and the richness of their lives.

It will think of technical education not as acquiring skills which are commercially valuable,

but as a way in which, by addressing the student to the practical problems of medicine, law, engineering, architecture, or forestry, he may learn how to use his mind and his energies in the service of others. Where else but in the actual context of technological education can we find a better place to investigate the social, moral, and political problems of a technological age? Where else but in the medical school can we learn better to understand the delicate relationships which exist between the diseases of the body and their social, psychological and economic origins? What better place to consider the aesthetic, political and moral implications of modern society than in the school of architecture where they are raised bluntly by the very na-

ture of the problems to be studied?

We who exist in the new world of America, where, four hundred years ago, Western civilization was given a new beginning, are now at the threshold of another world of those uncertain proportions referred to in the opening sentences of this essay. The university has within its power to influence directly the course of events which will determine the character of the world's future. It will do so when it takes as its task, the use of science and the arts to enhance the possibilities of mankind, when it takes as its means the development within the lives of the millions of young the capacity to go on creating themselves endlessly.

.....

The Activist is completely student operated. We need your subscriptions and patronage to continue. We are heavily in debt and would appreciate your support... if we stay in the red, we're dead.

subscriptions are only \$1.00 a year (4 issues). Clip & mail to:ACTIVIST
63 East Lorain
Oberlin, Ohio

I enclose \$ _____ above
the sub price to help defray debts.

Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

Address

.....
.....

LIFE AND CRISIS - thoughts of a young girl by Nina Chertoff

(Ed. Note: The following article was received with this note: "...This article was originally submitted to the EVANDER NEWS (the student newspaper of Evander Childs High School) during what has been termed "the height of the Cuban crisis." It was accented by the faculty advisor of the newspaper, but was rejected a day later by the principal...on the grounds that it went against President Kennedy's decision during a time of crisis. It was then submitted to THE SPECTRUM, the magazine of the History Honor Society. The principal again censored the article, this time on the grounds that an article criticizing President Kennedy's decision on Cuba would arouse controversy in the community to which the principal would be responsible." From Ethan Geto, student at Columbia University, and contributing Editor of The Activist -- see the Fall, 1962, issue for his article, "Academic Freedom and the New York City Schools -- came this information: "A history teacher at Evander Childs High (Bronx, N.Y.) is advisor to a History Honor Society (an active political and social action club) whose mag, THE SPECTRUM, is being edited to death. The teacher and the kids are being pushed around and pressured for their thoughts and words...The case simply involves the right of students to freely express themselves in publications of their own, and to hear controversial speakers if they desire to. The many overtones of this freedom of speech and expression argument need no further detail..." We might add that Miss Chertoff is 15 years of age; this is the first article by a highschool student that we have published to date. We feel that people like her deserve a hearing; we offer our pages in the absence of what has been reported as a censored highschool press.)

Have you never felt the warmth of the sun spread on and through your comfortable skin? Have you never lain in the cool spring grass and felt the moist, porous soil? Have you never contemplated the endless waters and floated a twig upon them and pondered upon where the feeble yet somehow very strong little branch was going and what it would see? Have you never had a moment of ecstasy, a moment of complete communication with another human being? I ask this of you who would kill me; you who would rather die than live in a totalitarian society; you who would rather be "dead than red." And I tell you that I have known, in certain beautiful moments of revelation, what life is and I am not prepared to give up that which I have lived and that which I have yet to live. I tell you that if you feel that life under a totalitarian system would be as death then you may commit suicide if that ever happens; but you may not take my life.

Also, if you feel that totalitarianism is slavery and living death then you might as well kill yourself right now because democracy is not when your parents vote for a man and then two years later have him propose to kill their children because of a majority vote; that this decision to possibly kill me to hang my life on the sharp hook of a calculated risk is a totalitarian decision. I cannot help but be emotional in this warlike atmosphere. I cannot offer a concrete suggestion to a few power hungry men. I cannot tell you whether the smog of deceit and hypocrisy which hangs heavily over the situation is the mist of the Soviet Union or of the United States.

I cannot tell you whether the United States should withdraw or carry through its "quarantine" of Cuba. But I can tell you that no ideal is greater than life. Men, living men think and dream; dead men rot.

RANDOM THOUGHTS AFTER CUBA

by Don McKelvey

What follows are thoughts which have come to mind during and since Deterrence 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 (was) 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. 1, 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 Back-

ground to Disarmament."

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 our insistence, since then, that the outmoded IL-28 bombers--see I.F. Stone's Weekly, Nov. 19, 1962--are "offensive" and the further insistence that all Soviet troops leave Cuba, as well as 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 on 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. 29, 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 nonexistent reporting of underdeveloped nations' peoples' reactions), it was--and remains--very difficult too 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 emplacement 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, Oct. 29, 1962, 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 Hanson Baldwin also points out (Times, 11-7-62, 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 "presence" would mean potential--and in some cases actual--neutralization of many of these allies. (By this analysis, then, the Turkish bases will not--as I have felt--be removed within a year as 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).

REVOLUTION, DORMITORIES AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT

by Paul Potter

The fact of revolution, the formation of an incipient student movement, and the presence of a dominant issue on college campuses--dormitories and the administrative environment--do have something to do with each other. Beginning with revolution, perhaps I can show you more of what I mean. I think that it is safe to make the categorical statement that revolution is the predominant fact of life today in the world. It's become almost cliché. I don't think that anyone would deny the importance of revolution or the presence of a worldwide upheaval. We can spell off Africa and Asia in the proper order and in the proper rhythm as it has been repeated and rehearsed to us in many ways. But if there is a fact of world-

wide revolution and social upheaval, then it is singularly amazing to consider how very little we know about what is happening or what has happened even in the last fifteen years or what is at stake in the various social movements which we read about in the newspapers or see analyzed in the journals or perhaps on occasion even have the opportunity to study in our academic pursuits. There is, I believe, a basic problem of comprehension of what is happening in the world for students who usually come from middle income families, who hold certain liberal persuasions and concepts for the most part, who come to a good institution of higher education, but who live in a society which has perhaps frustrated them and isolated them from the mainstream of what happens

in the world.

The Congo, for example, is a story which has been in the news for months and yet I think probably despite the very serious efforts many people have made to communicate that story and what is at stake there, we are ignorant, for the most part, of everything except some of the more obvious facts about the United Nations intervention, about the various disputing factions. I don't think that we know, I don't think we begin to know why Lumumba was so important to the Congo and why, when Lumumba was murdered, there were worldwide riots in protest. I don't think we understand the symbol of Lumumba or its importance to the kind of forces, the kinds of movements for change that are transpiring today in the Congo.

Viet Nam perhaps will be a ten-year involvement for the United States in para-military operations. We just don't know the first thing about Viet Nam, about the people, about the North Viet Nameese, about the kinds of changes that the Communist system has made in North Viet Nam or about the working social structure in South Viet Nam, Korea, Cuba, South Africa. You can, in fact, sweep into this kind of category, I think, practically all the events that have come to the fore in the last few years and those that will undoubtedly come to the fore in the next few years. I don't think it's something one can blame on the press and say that it has done an inadequate job of reporting because I believe that there are real blocks in our own society and in our own background of values which keep us from understanding these things.

In this sense then, I'd like to talk about the student move-

ment as an example, and go into it in some detail. The student movement in the South, I think today, is primarily viewed as it arose two years ago as a protest movement. We think of students as fed up and tired of the system, no longer willing to acquiesce. But here we miss what is central and most crucial in the South: that two years ago it may have been a protest movement (it was a spontaneous movement as I think we all know). Today it's a very conscious effort on the part of a few students to promote and lead a social revolution. They have accepted something that I think we, as people who subscribe to an integrated society, have not been willing to admit. They've realized the fact, in all its starkness, of the presence of two societies, a Negro society and a white society. There are two communities in the South and one can't talk about working in the South; one has to distinguish which community he is going to work with. It is interesting to note that we see and hear about the student movement in the South when it comes into conflict with the white community, but we don't hear about it when it comes into conflict with the Negro community as it does daily. The very real problem that the students face today is not so much one of obtaining the vote or of sharing the opportunities arising in inter-state commerce or of having the opportunity of sitting at lunch counters or attending theaters. The students face going to the Negro community and changing the way in which people perceive themselves, the way in which they view their roles in society, in order to make it possible for

people to go vote or to go to the polls to register to vote. To convince a man that he is able to vote and that he has the basic human qualities that qualify him to vote, that the franchise is important, is a tremendously painful, painstaking and slow process, and this is the process of revolution as it's taking place in the South. The fact that one hundred students walked out of a high school in McComb, Mississippi, was the result of a whole series of incidents from which they saw new ideas channeled into the community, and in which at a very crucial moment in their lives they were given the opportunity to make a choice. An opportunity was present which had not been there before, the opportunity to leave school rather than stay in school and acquiesce to the system. One can say in an academic sense that opportunity was always there--that of course an individual at any time has that opportunity to leave school and take the consequences. But in a social sense and in the sense of what was possible in their environment, they could not leave the school until after the new ideas had come--until after the society had begun to change. They left the society changed even more by bringing people into a whole new series of new relationships; people began to perceive themselves in whole new ways. It is very interesting to note at this moment, too, that the students who left the high school in Birklandtown in McComb didn't say that they were leaving because they were protesting for equal opportunity or civil rights. They said they were leaving because a friend of theirs, Brenda

Travis, had participated in a sit-in and hadn't been allowed to come back to school, and that was unfair. And they decided that they would not tolerate this kind of injustice. I think, too, that this was important because we tend to over-intellectualize the situation. We impute to it all sorts of motives and possibilities which are not presently there. What is there are very simple, day-to-day considerations about how people live and work, how they relate to one another, what they feel is important to themselves, their families, and their children. That is indicative of our basic lack of comprehension. This is what is happening within the United States. this is not ninety miles from home, this is right here in the southern USA. If we can't understand it here, I don't think we can understand it in its much more complicated and numerous aspects in other lands and in other cultures. And if we can't understand it, I don't know that we can deal with it adequately or accurately.

Beyond the question of comprehension of revolution, and the fact that revolution, the mainstream of events as I see it, is going on outside of our door, outside of our understanding and our ability to relate to it, is a question which I think is poignantly close to students in this country. The question, essentially, is what is relevant, what has meaning in the world? Were fourteen hundred students in Washington, D.C., demonstrating for peace of any significance whatever in changing the way in which the world is working today? Whom did they impress? What power structure did they influence? What analysis did they bring to

bear on the situation which could be seen as valid by other individuals? Is the whole civil liberties issue, which concerns students, really influencing the tenor or society in this country? Are the protests against the HUAC of significance? What will be changed by a few hundred students walking out of the city colleges in New York? The speaker's ban, it's true, was changed. But will the functional setting in which alternatives are given change as it changes in the South when the students of the Student Non-violent Co-ordinating Committee entered the community of McComb? Did that change in New York? Were there any more real alternatives to them because they could hear a Communist speaker than there had been before they went through all the rigamarole of a student strike and student protest? Was it a relevant act? Were the freedom rides for the participants, and I speak primarily now of the students of the North who participated in them, an act of real meaning? Did it bring them into a situation in which they were able to comprehend what was happening in the South? I think that in many cases one can demonstrate quite conclusively that simply from talking with the students who were on the rides that it did not. That as a matter of fact it heightened an acute frustration which in many cases led to their original participation in the rides. It made them, perhaps, understand their own inadequacy to effectively participate in the civil rights movement.

Does scholarship have relevance today to the really critical areas of world change? I talked the other day to a leader in the

civil rights movement who told me, as I was giving him an argument against what I saw to be certain negative tendencies, that I was over-intellectualizing the problem. That the problem was basically to incite people to move, to change position, physically almost--but in changing position physically to change position socially, psychologically. The law student said that it really doesn't make any difference what kinds of ideas you are interested in, because one of the things he had learned studying law was that he could find the ideas he needed at the proper time and the proper moment. The question that confronts him is the technique, the technique of getting people to move--to get them into a social movement which he, as an intellectual, could understand, but which they could never understand from reading a book. He had to move them physically, to force them in a way. The student was flirting with an authoritarian theology. Yet, he had touched on something very real. What will scholarship add in comparison to the demagogue--the demagogue who uses the techniques to exhort people to move?

What is relevant? The question is one which I think every student should face, which should frustrate him thoroughly, which should complicate his life and make it perhaps less pleasant (but surely more exciting). But given the difficulty of determining what is relevant, it would seem that certain things are clear. What could be less relevant than dormitories at Oberlin? I'll tell you what can be less relevant than the dormitories at Oberlin; the dress issue at Swarthmore. And beyond the dress issue at

Swarthmore is the question of whether diplomas at Harvard should be written in Latin. I think that you see the dilemma that I'm approaching, that as I travel and as I talk to students I feel that, in so many cases, these questions which I feel, these kinds of dilemmas, are not shared by them. That in fact they perceive something that is much more immediate, the environment in which they work, and they react to it and their reaction in many ways prevents them from coming to grips with more critical issues.

In a society which considers stringy hair and dress and liquor of primary importance in their influence on the university, I fear that there is very little opportunity for this same society to come to grips with the questions I posed earlier concerning revolution and student movement. Because what could be more peripheral to the concerns of these people outside the university than what the students wear when they go to their classes or the architecture of the hall; what could be more peripheral to what is going on within the educational community than these kinds of pressures? And this brings me, I suppose, to my real interest: education in relation to revolution, the student movement, and dormitories. People do respond to their environment, that the environment is the critical element in which an individual perceives not his relationships with other individuals but the various ideas which are presented to him; the environment itself is made up of some rather artificial and funny elements, it's made up in the situation of McComb of a student

who said "that's unjust." Over a minor thing, over one individual really, who had clearly broken the rules in which the society operated. It's an environment which so conditions an individual that he can't communicate with certain other individuals simply because of the color of their skin.

One can talk about Cuba and the environment there and the very interesting kinds of changes which have taken place in that so the Cuban peasant sees himself in a new light today. Now whether we like it or not, he sees himself as a part of something that's bigger, that is important, and something that is going to elevate him and his nation. And he feels a part of it, he feels a responsibility for it. Why? Because this madman has stood up and orated and whether he is a mad man or not, no matter how warped the particular values which he would attempt to impose on this society, he has done something which we couldn't--he has given people a sense of excitement which gives them a much greater mobility, than they had before, which makes many more alternatives real to them than they were before, through a process of participation and enjoining them to a kind of action that they could not experience. And I think that all of this has bearing on what we in an educational institution perceive as our environment, because it is made up of dormitories and classrooms and teachers and friends, and administrative people, and rules and regulations, and Tappan Square. The other elements which have very little to do, I suppose at least on the face of it, with this thing which we call intellectual process, which are really the screens through which I think we accept

or reject our views. And it is in this sense that I would like to stress what I mean when I refer to Cuba or the South or Oberlin. If we can talk about the functional meaning of an ideal or movement or concept, its importance is proportional to the extent in which an individual is challenged or is able to make that idea part of himself, internalize it--to fit it into an incoherent or coherent internal system, to work with it until he can either accept either all or part of it and reject the rest or hold some of it in lieu of final decision. So that, I guess perhaps I envy the high school students in McComb because they had an opportunity to come to a much more complete understanding or social justice through their simple act and experience than perhaps I have through a very long process of struggling with concepts in an abstract fashion and trying on occasion to relate myself, perhaps artificially, to these same ideas. The functional importance of an idea must be measured in its ability to create the environment in which people will accept or reject it. But the environment must also be measured according to those goals which you strive for--to a certain extent by its ability to create a situation in which ideas can be accepted or rejected.

Dormitories and dress should have little enough to do with what we are really concerned with. They do have something to do with it, in that they are the elements through which the students perceive their environment. And I think we ignore this fact. I think administrators ignore it as do students who protest against particular aspects of their environment which they don't appreciate.

The thing which distinguishes a liberal education is the desire to minimize indoctrination and maximize free inquiry. The free inquiry relates to action, it relates to all kinds of meaningless action. It relates to speakers and the ability to read books or the ability to engage in special protest.

To fulfill the free education I think we have to minimize the elements of indoctrination and authority as they extend throughout the educational system. I would see an educational community which is fluid, which is unstable, which has a multiplicity of diverse groups--a pluralistic society with various competing forces in which the student simply cannot remain stable, cannot set up screens through which he will proceed, but in fact finds screens eliminated by the environment in the institution itself.

The A CHALLENGING
Worker and

Midweek
EST. 1944

NEWSPAPER WITH CORRESPONDENTS IN ALL MAJOR CITIES OF THE WORLD... PUBLISHED BI-WEEKLY... YEARLY RATES: \$7.00... OUTSIDE U.S.A.: \$12.20

23 West 26th Street
New York 10, New York

THE DEVIL THEORY OF HISTORY

Rev. Paul Rahmeier

Although few people still believe in a personified devil, complete with tail and pitchfork, many now carry with them a revised standard version of the devil. Today's "devil," according to the political world view of such people, takes the form of the current political or national arch-enemy. To the man who holds such a world-view, properly called "the devil theory of history," all the troubles of this world are caused by the evil scheming and conspiracies of one villain and his accomplices.

This devil theory of history offers a delightful facility, for it enables the user to see all things clearly, to probe unerringly into the depths of the world's problems, and to propose the immediate and complete panacea for all existent problems. For instance, the devil theory of history informed us in 1916 that the Kaiser was the cause of World War I--kill the Kaiser and the world would be cured. Thus we knew (passionately, for one characteristic of this means of knowledge is that it always produces passionate convictions) that Hitler was responsible for World War II; thus the Prohibitionists sincerely believed that the demon rum was the source of humanity's ills. Vision after vision is revealed, and the enlightened devotee of the devil theory of history knows once and for all how to repair the world.

Curiously, the devil seems to exercise himself in multiple incarnations, and his various forms are revised regularly. Those of us who were growing up in the 1940's remember learning via our national communications media that Hitler was the arch-enemy, all Germans, Italians, and Japanese were only half-human,

and kindly old Joe Stalin and the Russian bear were the staunchest of true friends. But somehow, between 1945 and 1950, we managed to bury one devil and raise another, for suddenly we were talking of re-arming our ally West Germany in order to help protect us against the most fiendish of all devils, the Atheistic Communistic Conspiracy.

However, the "devil" identified by various adherents of this theory can be an individual, an idea, or a group, or sometimes a mixture of all three. The Prohibitionists hated alcoholic beverages, but never really focused their ire on one man. Socialism, in the minds of some Americans, has become a term of derogation (yet Norman Thomas is seldom despised and often is respected). Castro is a bearded satan in the eyes of many, but the people who support his government and compose his populace are more pitied than hated. This illustrates one of the minor ironies inherent in the devil theory: when one individual is truly the personification of evil, then those who work around him are excused of whatever anti-social traits they possess, because we see them as having been duped and misled by their leader. When evil can be located in one specific man, then everyone else is open to pardon.

Nevertheless, probably only a few people profess the extreme version of this devil theory of history and really believe that all of the world's troubles result from one cause. Most of us are a bit more broad-minded. We generously admit that "it's not all the other fellow's fault." Even so, ask the man in the street to name the outstanding source of evil in the world and most

responses, I suggest, would indict Khrushchev, or perhaps simply "the atheistic Communistic conspiracy." Indeed, I asked a group of about fifty high school seniors this sort of question last summer; and while four or five did think that the population explosion is the biggest problem confronting the world today, they went along with the rest of the group in pronouncing Communism the source of most of the evil in the world. While I do not intend to defend Khrushchev or the Communist party or any other individual or group, I do want to attempt to criticize that view of History which assumes that evil can be blamed on any one source.

We should recognize that the transference of guilt is a common psychological phenomenon. Rather than confront our own problems, shortcomings, or traces of evil, it is far more satisfying to whitewash our own image by thoroughly discrediting our chosen devil. The young boy who is caught in a juvenile misdemeanor is amazingly adept at purifying his own reputation by blaming everything on his accomplice. The political candidate who needs to blot out some marks on his own record does this most easily by besmirching the reputation of his opponent. The community that is having a hard time governing itself successfully accuses the state of unfair treatment. The nation that has a difficult time, psychologically, confessing its own apartheid changes the subject, so to speak, by denouncing South Africa. And so forth. Scapegoats are a popular and effective technique for hiding our own guilt by shining the Everready on the evil-other.

In a world where the old moral

absolutes are no longer as dynamic as they once were, where cynical characters are always telling us that "it isn't all so simple", where absolute right and wrong are no longer universally (if ever they were) recognizable, where moral decisions are confused because the alternatives seem gray rather than black and white, where contextual ethics and "relative goods" are the orders of the day, the somewhat confused, but sincere, person cannot be blamed for wishing that right and wrong were always obvious choices. To the man who senses his own indecision and the moral confusion of his society, any attempt to simplify his problems is a step in the right direction. When he feels the deep uncertainties of this age and knows what sham and hypocrisy are, he might be expected to approve of the theory that clarifies the picture for him. Though there may well be a healthy dissatisfaction with old legalisms still active, many persons seem to be so frustrated by the absence of clear-cut moralities that they are now ready for a revised and enforced Ten Commandments, or something similar. To such a person, a devil theory of history is indeed an attractive proposition.

The devil theory of history serves a distinctive and necessary political purpose today. The 1960 voter was not offered candidates who represented clearly defined ideological positions, but instead had to choose between two pragmatic politicians who tried to get as close to the middle of the ideological continuum as possible, knowing that the votes are to be found near the moderate middle. Now it's difficult to stir up public interest in political campaigns if

there are no true issues involved and if both candidates seem to have come out of the same type case. Consequently, the personal image of the candidate and the corporate image of the party become supremely important: our man must be made to look good by making the other man look bad. The television "debates" are an interesting point of reference here, for the conversations heard the next morning usually centered on "who looked good" and "who looked bad" the night before. If there is no significant difference in party ideology, the voters will remain apathetic and "stay at home in droves" unless a certain frenzy can be whipped up by using a form of the devil theory. "Let that rascal get elected and we'll all go straight to perdition!" Such a battle cry has an effect, no doubt, and without it contemporary politics might be tragically dead.

The theory seems to promote another pleasant psychological phenomenon. When we identify evil as being derived from one outside source, we are also inclined to set up our own leader as a hero figure who will lead us in conquering the enemy. During a presidential campaign, neither candidate looks quite like Jack Armstrong; the week after election (or perhaps inaugural) sees an interesting change in the public attitude towards the new president. He gradually becomes slightly superhuman, endowed with extraordinary wisdom and powers. Perhaps this is a form of a Messiah psychology, in which our leader takes on the image of an idealized hero with whom we can subconsciously identify. The presence of a devil calls for the presence of hero,

and we who inhabit a culture that has been shaped by the period of western expansion and a frontier mood are extremely susceptible to charismatic leadership. In many respects Mr. Eisenhower fitted the bill quite well; we felt secure when we saw his grinning face blessing us like the figure of a protective grandfather, and we thrilled to the sight of his stern military countenance as he confronted Khrushchev on our behalf.

The effects of the devil theory are far-reaching and subtle. The January 5 issue of Saturday Review includes a one-page piece that illustrates this magnificently. Psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner disclosed that he had been showing photographs he had taken in Russia to a class of fifth and sixth graders in an American school; many of the children came from middle class faculty and professional families. Some of the pictures were shots of roads in Russia, lined with young trees. A child asked "Why do they have trees along the road?" Bronfenbrenner turned the question back to the class: "Why do you suppose they have trees?" One child answered "So that people won't be able to see what's going on beyond the road"; another said "It's to make work for the prisoners." When Bronfenbrenner asked why some of our roads have trees along the side, the children replied "For shade; to keep the dust down". Where, asks Bronfenbrenner, did the children learn the idea that the Russians have different reasons than we do for planting trees along the road?

Finally, the devil theory of history seems to attract public support because it enables us to do fulfill what H. Richard Niebuhr

claimed as a basic human temptation, that of absolutizing the relative and relativizing the absolute. According to Professor Niebuhr, we are always trying to take something that is by nature relative and make it into something absolute. Capitalism as an economic system is a good, but a relative good; we try to insist that all emerging nations shall adopt the two-party system as an absolute good. Russia is our competitor, and, relatively speaking, an enemy; we attempt to absolutize her status as an enemy by denouncing her as "a godless conspiracy". Niebuhr, as a theologian, states that this temptation to confuse absolutes and relatives is tragic because there is but one absolute, God, and to relativize

the diety is to attain a confused perspective.

The devil theory of history, then, is not a viable option for the Christian, for if he is to take himself seriously he must take his own evil and his own love seriously, and if he is to take his neighbor seriously, he must take both his neighbor's evil and his neighbor's virtue seriously. If God is grander than modern man imagines, the devil is more ubiquitous than he prefers to believe. There is a satanic principle in each of us as well as the image of God. And men must learn to recognize the devil in themselves, if they are to truly recognize the commandment of God and the dignity of man.

the
CO-OP bookstore, Oberlin, Ohio
paid \$15.00 for this space ...

PRESS
OF THE
TIMES
774-2761
OBERLIN, OHIO

INVITATIONS
ANNOUNCEMENTS
LETTERHEADS
BROCHURES
PROGRAMS
POSTERS
HANDBILLS
BOOKS
CATALOGS
NEWSPAPERS
N.C.R. FORMS
4-COLOR PROCESS
FOLDING
DIECUTTING
LETTERPRESS
PHOTO OFFSET

SIXTY SOUTH PLEASANT STREET

KAHN AND HIS CRITICS... THINKING ABOUT THE UNTHINKABLE

by W. Carey McWilliams

Herman Kahn's latest book is a reply to his critics. Intended for a popular audience, his writing becomes immensely more readable, free from the technical language and in-group jargon that characterized On Thermonuclear War, his earlier work.

Kahn's style is not irrelevant to the substance of his argument. He is a very honest and a very frightened man, who sees the grim possibilities — or, indeed, probabilities — of the future with intense clarity and does not attempt to minimize them. The real dangers to the world come from the long-term tendencies of the arms race and the cold war; exaggerating the present dangers only makes us less capable of dealing with the ultimate apocalyptic menace.

It is hard not to believe that Kahn's critics are as much infuriated by his style as by his argument. There is a certain jauntiness of term, an insouciance of metaphor that is bound to infuriate those addicted to the more austere rhetoric of Puritan moralism. Drawing a comparison between international politics and the game of "chicken", or referring to a possible "Doomsday machine" may be based on sound understanding. Yet to many readers the terms, themselves, will sound irreverent.

Differences of rhetoric, however, are often prone to obscure the substance of a discussion. Kahn's title and his initial pages seem to suggest that his critics irrationally refuse to think or talk about the possibility of nuclear war. Yet it is an obvious fact that such is not the case: they are always talking about it, largely because they see less possibility of avoiding war than do Kahn and his own school. It may be that their constant viewing the issue in terms of 'universal destruction' raises public anxiety to such levels that the issue is simply repressed and thrust aside. But then, the charge against Kahn's critics would be that they are impolitic: they fail to realize the irrationality of the public, rather than that they, themselves are escapists or irrational.

It is equally unfortunate that Kahn chides his critics for a "warm error" and an "emotional mistake" in being unwilling to discuss the possibilities of saving 50 or 100 lives in a thermonuclear conflict. While it is true that Kahn's critics attack his willingness to consider the loss of 50 million lives as "inhuman", there is a certain icy rationality in their case. There is nothing inhuman about Kahn's aim: the saving of as many human beings as possible. When his critics suggest that the loss of so many makes survival "not worth it", their contention rests on an almost inhuman gamble: that the risk of destroying the entire race is to be run in the interest of avoiding massive losses. Kahn's pacifist and neo-pacifist have little chance of obtaining general consent for their program. Yet they oppose any effort to mitigate the possible effects of a nuclear conflict. They do so because they fear that any such mitigations may make the idea of

war more bearable for the mass of the population, and increase the risk of war. They contend that even a relatively undestructive war is unacceptable in an age of modern technology.

The argument seems based on the premise that the greater the public's fear, the more likely it will reject war altogether. The more that is risked, the less the chance of the risk being run. Yet such a presumption could lead to the building of a Domsday machine as a "cure" for war; it is, in fact, the principle of deterrence turned against one's own people, rather than the enemy.

The basis of such an argument may be an exceptionally dogmatic 18th Century rationalism, but no one can consider it warm or emotional. Machiavelli argued that total anxiety makes men virtuous, but he argued that it makes them bellicose, rather than peace-loving. Hobbes, while conceding the creative quality of the fear of death, hoped that it might produce peace. If the critics of Kahn take the side of Hobbes, modern psychology is inclined to side with Machiavelli (though not with his estimate of virtue). Men are able to endure the state of total terror only for so long; anxiety and frustration tend to generate aggression. Hermann Goering put it succinctly: "Better a terrible end than an endless terror." The other side of the absolutist demand for total peace is a demand for total war.

Kahn is no less inclined than his critics to see the logic of history as leading to the failure of deterrence. On the whole, Kahn is certainly a rationalist. But he is less inclined to gamble the future on the basis of a theory of human nature or an absolutist morality. One even suspects that he doubts the old liberal premise that conflict and competition are "creative" and that fear is the mother of virtue. His insouciant or ironic language suggests a broader humanity and sympathy than his opponents possess: the willingness to tolerate mankind with all its folly, its irrationality, and its emotion. The old religious messianists with their demand for regenerated man had at least the realism to recognize that an apocalyptic destruction must precede it, and entrusted the fulfillment of their moral passions to an inscrutable Providence. The secular messianists like Marx believed they had discerned the laws of Providential history, but they saw that change involved the necessity of violence and revolution. The new messianist has neither the realism of his secular, nor the moral humility of his religious predecessors.

Kahn, no less than they, senses that the world order must change, but believes that there is still time for the quest for a new order. Meanwhile, he is less inclined than the critics to tell mankind that it must change or perish. Possibly this reluctance arises from his awareness that the only total peace and total brotherhood are the peace of the grave and the brotherhood of Bryant's *Thanatopsis*, when men became brothers to the "insensible rock" in a universe of ultimate and cosmic stillness.

Mike Harrington: THE OTHER AMERICA by Richard Lempert

There are in this country two separate cultures. There is the culture of middle-class America, the affluent society, the beneficiaries of the welfare state. And there is another culture, the culture of the other America, a culture of poverty, ill-housing, and of perpetual undernourishment. There are between forty and fifty million occupants of this second culture and something must be done about them. Thus runs the main theses of Michael Harrington's new book, The Other America, a study of poverty in the United States. It is with the second culture he deals.

It seems strange that a quarter of the people in a nation this size could keep themselves hidden, yet this is one of the main problems with which Mr. Harrington must deal. Most people are not aware of the existence of this vast inner culture, for the poor keep themselves out of the way and the wealthier don't go out of their way to find them. The middle class goes to the city to see shows, not slums; and they travel through the mountains to see leaves turning, not towns decaying. Mr. Harrington has seen this and more. He has worked for The Catholic Worker in the slums of New York and has worked to help the migrant workers in the fields of California. He has visited the forlorn mountain towns of Pennsylvania and West Virginia as well as the hovels of the Negro sharecroppers in Mississippi. And he tells about all of them, and he tells about them in a way which puts faces on the fifty million people whom the federal government labels as indigent. At times in fact he almost is too interesting and the reader gets lost in the story, forgetting that what he is reading about constitutes

a real and severe problem.

In writing The Other America Harrington ranges in style from a story-teller to a muck-raking journalist, but the unifying thesis is always that of a sociologist. Namely that there exists a culture of poverty in this country and that the roots of that culture must be broken before anything meaningful can be accomplished. This culture of poverty is composed of four main sub-cultures--the aged, the minorities (mostly Negroes and to a lesser extent other non-whites), the agricultural poor, and the industrial rejects. They differ in certain particulars but they all have much in common. They all are out of the mainstream of progress; their lot does not improve when that of the average worker does. They miss out on almost all the benefits of the welfare state which many consider to be aimed at them. (The best example here is the agricultural poor who get virtually no benefits out of the price support and other rural improvement programs which enables his wealthier counterparts to remain on the farm.) This is largely because as a group their political power is virtually nil. Most important and most discouraging of all is the fact that they seem to be caught in the vicious cycle of feeding their own poverty and passing it on to their descendants. This was not always so. Once the poor in this country were composed largely of immigrant groups with high aspirations of being assimilated into the American Way of Life. Now the poor seem to be resigned to being forever exiles from this way of life. The poorer they are, the greater the amount of

sickness, and the less likely they are to find and keep working at a job. The poorer they are the less the premium they put on education, and thus they lose out on this method of rising in society. The poorer they are the less political power, the more prejudices to be overcome, the more psychiatric problems, and so on.

Mr. Harrington admits that if he errs, it is on the side of pessimism, but even so he doesn't find the situation without hope. Now, as in the past, the main champions of the poor are the labor unions, yet this is more and more taking the shape of an anachronistic bit of charity on the parts of the unions. For the poor are no longer union members; if they were they would not be the poor. The key to the problem of the indigent must be found, according to Mr. Harrington, with the federal government, this is the only agency big enough to deal with such problems. However, the main problem with this solution is that the poor lack the political power needed to spur Congress on. When it passes labor legislation it is the garment

workers and the migrant laborers who are ignored, and when it passes social security measures, those who are out of work are out of luck. The only solution is for the people in general--the members of the affluent society--to demand action. And Mr. Harrington feels that this can only happen when they are convinced that the existence of the other America is dragging America down. The first step toward this and the step which Mr. Harrington takes is the vivid portrayal of the existence of this sub-culture of poverty in terms Mr. Average American will comprehend.

Whether anything will be done, however, remains to be seen. It is interesting to note that the hottest piece of non-fiction to hit the best seller list in recent weeks has been Ruth Carson's book Silent Spring. This deals with the often devastating results which the overuse and abuse of pesticides and fungicides etc, has been having on our birds and wildlife; and it has raised many people up in arms. Somehow Americans often seem readier to fight for their feathered friends than to work for their fellow human beings.

CENTRAL

Hopgold; difference between a frog and toad.
Love will anger you but this remains.
Ride not the rails of death's low Trains.
Follow the signposts on the Boston Road.
The sun is our salvation, on days like these;
Well-meaners all, I hope, plenty of chaos
And love the old struggler, come to me
Before the bums come pouring out of Taos.
Three ribbons, blue, on a pink background;
Suicides not honored; Spring arriving slowly,
And we remember now our dancing in a round.
Let us overproudly listen, nor too low.

- Tracy Thompson

ACTIVIST
63 E. Lorain
Oberlin, OHIO