

The College of Wooster

Open Works

Alternative Voices

Special Collections

12-1967

Che

Follow this and additional works at: https://openworks.wooster.edu/alternative_voices

Recommended Citation

"Che" (1967). *Alternative Voices*. 3.

https://openworks.wooster.edu/alternative_voices/3

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Collections at Open Works, a service of The College of Wooster Libraries. It has been accepted for inclusion in Alternative Voices by an authorized administrator of Open Works. For more information, please contact openworks@wooster.edu.

ENÉ

December 1967



EULOGY TO ERNESTO GUEVARA

This the first edition of Che is dedicated to the memory of Major Ernesto Guevara. He lived and died in an attempt to bring about political, social and economic reform to a desperate Latin America. The communist doctrine which he advocated, is at worst utopian; there is no evil in its anticipation of a world of content and high minded workers-- which is a good if not enticing vision. It is time that in many cases the beauty of this doctrine is marred by dogmatic leaders, but it cannot be denied that communism has in many cases proven an effective means of liberating a people from oppressive oligarchies with no interest in social reform.

Che desired to introduce a type of communism modified by the needs of Latin America. He was a revolutionary first and a communist second; the two do not necessarily go hand in hand. Che at the Punta del Este Conference said, "Killing is evil. . . . All countries are different and progress should be achieved by peaceful means wherever possible. The members of this government (Uruguay) do not agree with our ideas yet they allow us to express such ideas. This is something you should cherish."

Che was not the tool of "treacherous" communists in Russia; he was born, raised and educated in Latin America. He saw the United States ineffectively attempt to initiate some social reforms in South America, but realized that however sincere the attempts were that the roots of U.S. economic prosperity would allow only superficial change. Thus Che realized the need for a revolutionary doctrine that promoted change for the hungry and desolate.

Major Ernesto "Che" Guevara was an idealist and he lived for no other purpose than these ideals. Even though he is physically dead, his idealism will live on in the hearts of the oppressed and in their darkest moments of despair offer them some hope that future generations will not suffer the agony they must.

Whether we agree with what Che lived for or not, let us

all know that he was a man that not only lived for his ideals but died for them, and that this is what makes a truly great man. For my part I can only say, "Viva Che." For so long as men walk the earth we will need to be reminded that ideals can and have been reached.

"Viva Major Ernesto Che Guevara!"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>A View From Harlem</u> by John Saunders.....	7
<u>Peace and Power</u> by Joseph J. Lawrence.....	9
<u>Detroit Cops: Brutal Or Stupid</u> by Luis Cassels.....	14
<u>Reflections On A Riot</u> by Mr. Ray Swartzback.....	17
<u>A Modest Proposal Revisited</u> by Phil Pink.....	21
<u>Build Up to a Revolution</u> by Mark McColloch.....	25
<u>Cuba: Fidelistas Vs. Communists</u> by Bill Barrie.....	27

We will publish all letters to the editor that are considered pertinent. We ask that letters be confined to 400 words and we reserve the right to shorten them if necessary. Please mail letters to Box 544, Hoover Cottage, College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

THE FUNCTION OF THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

To the editor:

I am pleased that the "Bird" has been purchased, not so much because I happen to like it nor because I think the Center especially needs it, but rather because I think the whole endeavor exhibited the best kind of Student/Faculty cooperation: practical, not theoretical; positive, not negative. I shall be even more pleased if it has demonstrated to some students that they do have a personal stake in that building on Beall. Indeed, it is not a question of "What We Want for Them" but, as Dr. Baird ably points out in his letter (Voice Nov.3), a question of what we all want for ourselves. However, what Dr. Baird fails to appreciate, it seems to me, is the simple fact that every four years we have a complete new student body. For this reason I would be more than pleased if my letter had stimulated no more than the needed redissemination of the information his letter provides. But I would restate my contention that we are not now concerned with the past as much as with the present and future. Those who understood me as proposing a negative and sarcastic criticism of campus architecture and a derogatory slur on the integrity and good intentions of the planners are missing the wood for the trees: I refer them back to my original letter in the Voice and especially the paragraph which begins "So it's up to you." I was, and still am, mainly concerned with the attitudes of everyone at Wooster now to what has been done, and is still being done, on his behalf.

Two specific cavils before I leave Dr. Baird's letter:

(1) I am sorry to have to point out to a committee entrusted with the responsibility of creating a permanent and important feature of our physical environment that the conception of fitting a "skin" around an "interior layout" is, architecturally speaking, nonsense.

(2) Dr. Baird puts himself on record as claiming that "the volume of traffic" on Beall can "be handled by normal procedures": I would suggest he now check with Dean King

what the motorists of the Town think about the status quo.

May I return to the major point of my letter which seems to have been missed, for it is a question which in its widest implications raises the whole question of the function and *raison d'etre* of a Liberal Arts College. If Wooster exists to train certain defined skills (academic or otherwise) a State University does the job better because it has the size and it has the money. If it is to provide a "family" as Dr. Baird suggests, undergraduates might as well stay at home. (Let's not misuse that word: to apply it to a community of 1700-odd people united by a place and a common interest of which a large proportion is renewed every four years is to devalue that institution to which the word properly refers.) What Wooster should and could provide (and, in my opinion, must provide if it is to survive) is a context within which formal structure students have the best chance of growing into informed independent, thinking adults. Within the academic structure this is the avowed intention of everything from Liberal Studies to I.S., despite the terminology of all official publications of the College which refer cosily to students as "the boys and girls" which even freshmen, mentally and physically, manifestly are not.

The teacher's function in this structure is simple: to render himself unnecessary; to phase himself quietly out. On the general social level (Wooster as a community of the more and the less experienced) the function of those on the payroll is to turn out on each Commencement Day a body of unique individuals who are on the way to knowing who they are and what they believe, and who have the courage to preserve this integrity when it conflicts with the pressures of majority opinion or tradition; who, while related as a corporate experience of four years' duration, are not factory moulded products all bearing the "Wooster stamp" and thus indistinguishable from each other. (None of this is new, but it will be new to some of us, and therefore needs to be re-examined.)

I might add that, as a product of the Old World's system of Liberal Education, I have been disconcerted by the pervasiveness amongst both old and young on the campus (on both administrative and student levels) of the ideal of the "instant community." I am dismayed by the extent to which Sections create a divided community when they attempt to bestow an artificial sense of social "belonging" based, as I see it, less on the ideal of choosing one's friends according to an identity of interests and desires than along the lines of a primitive banding together for security in the face of a hostile environment. I am depressed when societies in a modern state are still established by processes more akin to tests of virility than to the ideals of civilized adults. I am perturbed when social pressures are thus exerted by organized majority groups to the prejudice of the free-choice of a minority of the community who might otherwise prefer to remain independent. And I am concerned about the effect on the maturing individual within these identifying organizations of the potential limitations to an experience of the widest possible variety of attitudes, disciplines and values which such formal social structures encourage.

Indeed, such practices, when encouraged by all sections of the community, suggest to me a general lack of conviction in the ideals to which the college pays unanimous lip-service. Such determination on the part of many students to act like "boys and girls" more than justifies any administration's alleged "paternalistic attitude and makes nonsense of any conception of a college functioning socially as a controlled dummy-run for the real world.

All this is relevant to the Lowry Center which should act at once as a unifying agent and as an individualizing agent. In the first place it should combat the simple-minded distinction which conceives of play as no more than relief from work: it should answer the needs of the whole man, not just function as an entertainment center for an hour to be off-duty. This is the attitude which recognizes no carry-over from work into play (and vice-versa), which recognizes not people but categories of people (Administration, Faculty, Students, Negroes, Bums). It is the same attitude as that which distinguishes between Faulkner in a Modern Lit. course

and William Styron in a week-end cottage, between reading about McCarthy in Lib. Studies and voting in the upcoming election, between studying Anouilh in Drama App. and watching Michael Caine in an SGA Movie, or between praising God in church and having a Negro live next door all equally artificial and false distinctions.

It should also work against that compartmentalism which puts work in Kauke or the Science Labs., food in the dining halls, sleep in the dormitories, books in the Library and sex in Crandall House. If for this reason only, removing the word student from the name of the building is misguided and inaccurate because only students need a place on campus in which they are not forced into one category as opposed to another (i.e. the student v. the complete person; the student at play; the student at work; the student at waste). Faculty members can evade categories at home (and thus bring a whole person to bear in their work): where do students retreat to be only themselves?

And finally, it should house a congregation of people all traveling different routes to the same end (individuality), not in competition with each other as single units or as mutually hostile bands creating for their members a stereotyped "identity," but working together in a purposeful united adventure.

It is with this larger context that my concern with the new physical plant on campus should be understood, for that is achieved within buildings is greatly determined by the nature of the new environment the buildings themselves create. When are we to think about the value of our buildings as seriously and in the same terms as we already do about the value of our trees? I am not only concerned that our buildings adequately fulfill the functions for which they were specifically built, but also that they create a stimulating, relaxing and elastic environment within and around which may be allowed to occur the kind of complete growth I have been advocating. Which building on campus inspires? Is there anywhere on campus (papers written for courses can achieve this) where a student may plaster himself on

the wall, step back, and see who he really is? If we are truly devoted to the ideals of Liberal Education, let's at least get Thoreau and Eudora Welty out of the classroom and be honest with them and with ourselves on a campus honestly devoted to finding out who we are and what we want to be.

By
Roger Nicholls

A VIEW FROM HARLEM

Hell! Life is a waste and these damn honkies are on my back. I am going to sell my pot, junk (narcotics) and get rich from Whitey's money! Living is Vietnam in Harlem and only the strong make it though. Each day I never know if someone is going to cut off my leg or my arm because he is bored to death and wants a change. I walk down the west side along 127th Street and hear some fool preaching peace, while a white landlord does nothing about the rats eating on a Negro woman's child. I say to hell with peace and Dr. King's policy because I know he is damn wrong. I look up the block and a bull (police) is beating some brother (Negro) on his head because he did not make payment (on his narcotic sales) this week. Also, I see bulls treating Negro women worse than I treat my dog. I walk to the employment agency at 128th and Lenox Avenue and a white man calls me, "Hey, boy," as if he is my old man. I come home and my father is drinking himself to death because he cannot get a job because he is a Negro or does not have the money to buy a job. I turn on the television and some white fool is debating about those poor Negroes in Harlem who need help. He keeps asking, "Why don't we send them some money?" Money, I guess, is supposed to fix everything in the white American's eyes. Buying people off has always been a policy directly or indirectly of the United States.

When I see things happening, as I have indicated, how can I help but have any feeling except hate and rebellion? I go to school, P.S.76, where classes are on three sessions a day because there are too many students. The teachers do

not give a damn if a Negro or Puerto Rican kid acquires a decent education as long as the teacher gets his salary. A fat chance many other Negro kids like myself will make it! What is a proper place in society according to white Americans? If teachers don't give a damn about my having an education, I can only take to the streets and live the best way I can. Nobody will give me a job because whites are afraid and have a stereotype image of the Negro, who sits under a tree and eats watermelon. This is why I am a rebel and why I hate! Whitey has forced me into a corner and will destroy me if I let him; so I riot, fight and burn, because I am not going to take anymore crap!

I am almost ready to join the completely radical minded groups and fight to gain freedom their way, but I have a small hope that life is better than what Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael and white extremists indicate it is. I know that there are some good people left because I have lived with both sides confronting me and I see little circles of life here and there. I know if the United States is going to survive it can only do so by its people working together. Both races must have people willing to go half way in working out their problems. Negro and white should be able to look upon each other with human respect and selfpride. If and only if personal pride and respect are developed can America take its place as a nation. The damn, bitching, narrow mindedness that is confronting me now will become a part of me completely if Americans are not willing to listen and to help each other. I see no reason why freedom of the mind does not ring from each person., then I, a proud Negro, could agree!

By John Saunders

SAC NEWS NOTE

There will be a meeting of the executive committee every Tuesday at Four Fifteen in the afternoon. All interested are invited to attend and offer ideas concerning present and future plans.

PEACE AND POWER

The Case Of The Negro Revolution

In the summer of 1966, the call to Black Power signaled the beginning of the militant Negro Revolution and the demise of the nonviolent Civil Rights Movement. In retrospect, an assessment of the structure, goals and accomplishments of the Civil Rights Movement produces four basic propositions concerning the Movement itself, and its relationship to the new Negro Revolution. First, the structure of the Civil Rights Movement precluded the possibility that it could have succeeded in its stated objectives. Second, its most important function was its changing of the value consensus among Americans, especially among Negro Americans. Third, the value change which it precipitated led directly to the Negro Revolution and its dominant theme of Black Power. Fourth, the American society is not likely to achieve inter-racial peace unless the Negro minority is accorded its proportionate share of the power within the total society, and unless a new value consensus is developed.

An understanding of the failure of the Civil Rights Movement in achieving its goals requires comprehension of the fact that Negro-white relationships in the United States have always been, at the core, a power relationship. The configuration of power has been such that not only has the dominant white majority been able to control the social, economic and political opportunities of American Negroes, but it has been able to demand and enforce certain lines of personal conduct of Negroes. It would be difficult to exaggerate either the pervasiveness or the effectiveness of the power which white America has exercised over the black minority.

The Civil Rights Movement which entered into the midst of this power relationship was, in effect, a coalition of three parties--Negroes, white liberals and the federal government. The broad goals of the Movement involved the achievement of equality through the process of cultural assimilation and social integration. The immediate methods employ-

ed to obtain these goals were seemingly diverse but in the final analysis, most efforts were directed at securing equality through legal sanctions, especially those applied by the federal government.

There is little need to recount each specific achievement of the Civil Rights Movement. But an evaluation of its overall accomplishments must take note of two major limitations. First, some of the problems which its programs were supposed to solve grew more rapidly than the solutions. For example, the increase of population density in urban areas, rapid technological developments, and gains made by the white majority in technological sophistication, all worked simultaneously to offset the minimal gains which benefited a few Negroes in the areas of residential desegregation, integration of schools, and the development of job training centers. The second major limitation was that once the legal basis for civil rights had been firmly established and the federal government was fixed with the responsibility for intervention the execution of the Movement's goals on the local level failed to command the wholehearted support of all parties of the coalition.

Why did the Civil Rights coalition leave all further responsibility for its goals in the hands of the federal government, and why could the Movement not keep pace with the growth of the problems it attended to solve? The answers lie mainly in the interaction between two factors: peace and power.

The superordinate value of the Civil Rights Movement was the maintenance of racial peace. That is, although the Movement had developed specific goals, its objectives were to be accomplished only through means which were not designed to precipitate violence or disrupt law and order. Throughout the brief history of the Movement, Negro leaders, white liberals and spokesmen for the federal government urged nonviolence and deplored that violence which did occur. Peace was a superordinate value for two reasons: the avoidance of unregulated conflict is a fundamental goal of all societies; and the whites and federal government in their coalition with moderate Negro organizations, could not take a militant,

revolutionary stand against themselves.

The significance of the value given to peace becomes clear when one remembers that at the core of the civil rights problem lay a power relationship between an extremely dominant majority and a subjugated minority. Men in power are not generally prone to relinquishing a major portion of that power unless they are threatened. The magnitude and the urgency of change in the power configuration was such that nothing short of overt threats to racial peace could have ensured the success of the Civil Rights Movement. The large masses of Negroes whose hopes had been raised by the activity of the Movement cared little for the minimal gains of a few of their members, or for the niceties of the legalistic re-definition of civil rights on the part of the federal government. Consequently, not only did the Civil Rights Movement fall short of reaching effective goals, but also white liberals could no longer maintain a working coalition with Negro leaders who found themselves unable to control large masses of people without advocating more direct and aggressive action. Thus, white liberals deferred to the federal government and new Negro leaders emerged to go their own militant and separatist ways.

The structure of the Civil Rights coalition led directly to its own failure, for the parties to the coalition could not advocate any action which would jeopardize law and order in the society.

Turning now to the second proposition in the assessment of the Civil Rights Movement, it is asserted that the Movement's most significant function was the change in the value consensus among Americans. This proposition is based upon the generalization that stable power relationships rest not only upon the resources of the dominant power, but also upon the justification of the power configuration as it is linked to the accepted values of the society. Stated somewhat differently, a power relationship cannot peacefully endure for long unless it is regarded as being legitimate

Traditionally, white America has held a set of beliefs by which it justifies its dominance over the Negro minority. These beliefs may be condensed into one term--racial superiority. There is little reason to doubt that a large proportion of white Americans accept the racist theme. In addition many of those Americans who have been conciously sympathetic with the old Civil Rights Movement, are largely unaware of the extent to which the order of American society rests on this assumption. Given the doctrine of racism, it becomes wholly logical as well as perfectly moral to continue to control both the opportunities as well as the behavior patterns of Negroes. In short, racism, whether explicitly or implicitly affirmed, has served to legitimize the power differential between Negroes and whites in America.

Although it is true that Negro Americans have not shared the same racial beliefs as whites, many have until recently found it virtually impossible to articulate a counter ideology. But in a sense, an "ideology" of acceptance of the power relationship did exist among Negroes--an ideology of despair, of inevitability, of powerlessness to change the system. Historically, the Negro American has been preoccupied with a goal which has precluded the development of a counter ideology--the goal of survival in a hostile society. In pursuing this goal, many Negroes learned to play, and even to accept, the obsequious role so clearly defined for them by dominant whites.

Within the context of these orientations toward legitimacy, the Civil Rights Movement effected definite, and in some cases, largely unplanned changes. First, the federal government rendered illegitimate through judicial, legislative and executive action, some of the patterns of dominance exercised by the white majority. Second, although a small minority of American whites came to understand and reject the legitimacy of the interracial arrangements of power, many more whites, challenged by the Movement, came to reaffirm more strongly than ever the racist dogmas. Finally, and this leads us into the third proposition of this analysis, the mass of Negro Americans had not only been given some reason for hope, but had also been able to articulate an

ideology which could effectively counter the creed of legitimacy offered by the white majority.

The new Negro creed, the new challenge to the old legitimacy, was summed up in the now familiar words of "Black Power." Although the interpretations of the "real" meaning of the term are quite diverse, there appears to be agreement on its containing the following doctrines. First, Negroes are at least the equals of whites in every way, and blackness is to be affirmed as a positive value. Second, the Negro Revolution will be led by Negroes and the old coalition is defunct. Third, at least a proportionate share of power--political, economic and social--rightfully belongs to the Negro minority, and the Revolution will gain this power by whatever means necessary. And finally, although the use of naked force is not necessarily an end in itself, it will be used when (not if) required.

"Black Power," then, is more than a slogan and less than a program. It is a set of values which not only challenges the white basis for legitimacy, but functions to legitimize the new Negro Revolution. Born of the Civil Rights Movement, it nevertheless rejects racial peace as a superordinate value and focuses entirely upon the acquisition of power.

The final proposition of this analysis is that the American society, is not likely to achieve interracial peace unless the Negro minority is accorded its proportionate share of the power in the total society, and unless a new legitimacy can be developed.

It is all too clear that a condition of continuous interracial violence is imminent. Battle lines for the Revolution have been drawn. On the one side stand the bulk of American whites--militant in their determination to retain power. On the other stands the growing majority of Negro Americans--equally militant and possibly more committed to their goal of power. Between these polarized groups stand the parties to the old coalition: the federal government which cannot support the militancy of the Negro Revolution for to do so would jeopardize its basic stability; the white liberals

who cannot abide with the potential for violence even though they may accept the power goals of the Revolution; and many middle class Negroes who risk losing much through the new militancy but cannot fully deny their sense of identity with the Negro community.

It is impossible to prevent the violence of the Negro Revolution, for the basis of the existing configuration of power is gone. The creed of Negro pride, power, separatism and militancy has totally disrupted the effectiveness of the old legitimacy. Racial peace requires a new legitimacy, but its birth and development are wholly contingent upon a new power arrangement. The restructuring of power so that it is shared and not monopolized, will in large part be effected through the struggle of the Negro Revolution. The factors which ensure that the Revolution will not be able to reconstruct a new and stable social order.

The conservation of the new distribution of power will rest upon the emergence of a new legitimacy acceptable to all people--both black and white. The only groups which will be able to develop this new legitimacy will be the very groups which were formerly parties to the old Civil Rights coalition--the federal government, liberal whites and moderate Negroes. And here, I suggest, lie the future roles of many who read this paper. For if the parties of the old coalition are not prepared to regroup when power has been redistributed, then the American society, shattered by the violence of interracial conflict, may well fall under the control of those who would establish order based on naked force and who would offer an ideology acceptable to no one.

By

Joseph J. Lawrence

"Detroit Cops: Brutal Or Stupid"

The following is directly quoted from Luis Cassels article for U.P.I.

"I've learned what Negroes mean when they complain about police brutality.

"Police stupidity might be a better term.

"U.P.I. reporter Mike Conlon and I were walking through the heart of the Detroit riot zone on 12th Street and Clairmount yesterday in early afternoon. You could sense the lessening of tensions where angry mobs had run amok with molotov cocktails since Sunday morning.

"Sightseers in automobiles roamed. Two Negro girls in mini-skirts walked past the still smoldering ruins of a furniture store, listening to soul music on a transistor radio. The biggest crowd we encountered was lined up outside an ice cream parlor which had just recieved a fresh shipment of butter pecan.

"Things have calmed down a lot; I think the worst is over," said a worried looking, middle-aged Negro man to whom we talked.

"At this point, a Negro man who had evidently been drinking heavily began haranguing the crowd near the ice cream parlor. We didn't get there in time to hear what he was saying, but spectators told us he was trying to stir up trouble.

"He was arrested immediately by police from one of the numerous blue squad cars patrolling the area. He was shoved roughly into the back seat and handcuffed to the door post.

"The mood of the crowd changed like a cloud passing over the sun. Knots of grim faced Negroes gathered on nearby street corners. An apprehensive father hustled his children away from the ice cream parlor and off to a side street.

"For inexplicable reasons, the squad car did not move away. It just remained parked in the middle of the street while other police rushed in answer to a radio call. Soon there were seven scout cars and about fifteen rifle-wielding police facing a solid but sullen crowd of about 100 persons.

"In heaven's name why don't they get him out of here before they provoke another riot," Colon said. But the police

just stood there bellowing at the crowd over bull horns, 'Get out of here. Move on.'

Shouting In Car

"The arrested drunk was still shouting curses and threats from the back seat of the scout car.

"A short, thicknecked white city policeman in riot helmet yelled back at the drunk to shut up. Apparently the prisoner made some obscene reference to the policeman's ancestry.

"You can't call my mother that. I won't kill you in front of these newspaper reporters' -the latter remarked with an angry glance in our direction- 'but I'll shut your mouth.' With that he thrust the butt of his rifle into the car and smashed the hand-cuffed Negro prisoner in the face again and again and again.

"The prisoner collapsed and rolled to the floor of the car. Just then another policeman came toward us with his rifle and suggested very forcibly that we move on.

"As we walked away I looked into the eyes of a Negro man who had watched the episode from the front steps of a nearby home. What I saw in his eyes went a long way towards explaining how a black ghetto can explode."

EAST HARLEM: POLICE REPORT

"One of the two deaths in East Harlem during its uneasy days came when, according to the police, a young man was found with a broken neck, 'probably from a fall.' Halpern, city coroner, examined the man and found he had been shot in the ribs with a 38 caliber bullet. 'I don't know how they missed it,' he said. 'It was very obvious.'"

"REFLECTIONS ON A RIOT"

The Civil Rights Movement as we knew it before the Watts Riot is no longer in existence. In the early sixties, the black man made his bid. "Assimilate us," he said. "We're willing to lose our identity in the name of integration. Take us in." That bid was rejected by the white community.

The older Civil Rights leaders like Row Wilkins, Martin Luther King Jr., and Whitney Young no longer have the influence in the black community that they had when we stood at the March on Washington, arms entwined, singing, "Black and White Together--We Shall Overcome." Their leadership in the ghetto has been successfully challenged by young militants; and although these young militants may themselves have no real following, they speak and act in the mood of the people.

The white community spelled the death of non-violence when it failed to respond to the sit-ins and marches, to the voter registration drives and the demands for equal protection under the law. The white community spelled the death of non-violence when it responded to peaceful demonstrations with fire-hoses, police dogs, and cattle prods. The white community's failure to hear the anguished cry from the ghetto has produced violence.

Despite the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Bill, despite the various Supreme Court decisions, the gap between white and black has widened. The unemployment rate and the underemployment rate of black people today is twice that of whites--in 1950, it was close to equal. For youth, the unemployment gap between white and black is close to five to one. The white exodus to the suburbs has caused housing segregation to increase throughout the country. Housing conditions within the ghetto have become increasingly intolerable. Little or no low-income housing, public or private, has been built to replace housing destroyed by Urban Renewal and Expressway construction. Today, more black people attend segregated schools than in 1950. White students are still denied access to Afro-American history. Most significantly,

the income gap between white and black has widened. One authority has indicated that at the present rate, the income gap, presently higher than 40% as measured by the ratio of non-white median family income, will not close until the year 2,410.

What I am saying is that in many ways the black man finds that his position today is worse than it was before the great Civil Rights explosion of the early sixties. For generations black people have worked, bled, and died for this country, waiting patiently for their share of the goodies. Now the waiting period is over.

In the face of the colonialism and paternalism of the urban ghetto, violence seems to many black people the only possible means of gaining redress from their legitimate grievances. Violence is a terrifying message. It is an angry message from the poor and oppressed that they do not have unlimited patience.

The riots we have witnessed are but an articulate form of social protest. It is a gross misunderstanding of the present crisis which faces our nation to characterize these eruptions with words like "hoodlumism." What we are experiencing today is essentially a revolution against a form of colonialism which has become unbearable. We are experiencing a revolution against a system of institutionalized racism.

"The riots make it unmistakably clear that passive, non-violent struggle against the violence of discrimination and poverty has been eclipsed by a spontaneous back-lash of pent up violence that answers with a force equal to that which contained it-- just as a mousetrap springs back with the same amount of force that set it. And woe to him whose fingers get in the way."*

The mood of the ghetto in places like Detroit is one of anger and hate. It makes no careful considered "demands." It is rationalized in no specific "programs." The "honkie" is the target--white people in general.

The mood of the suburbs in places like Detroit is one of anger and hate. Two and three times each week, meetings which draw between 800 and 2,000 angry whites are being held in the suburbs. At these meetings, spewers of hate tell their audiences to get their guns ready for the incoming hordes from the "inner-city." Words like murder and rape are commonplace.

You can cut the hostility with a knife. In the words of one black leader: The question is not, "Will there be another riot?" It is, "Will there be race war and genocide?" The lines are drawn that sharply. The polarization is that extreme.

The covert violence which, for generations, black people have suffered is no less violent than an overt punch in the nose. This is why the people indigenous to the ghetto show no great concern about the violence of the summer. Urban poverty does violence to people. It was interesting that reporters noted the "carnival atmosphere" in Detroit. Don't me misled. "Paying back" those unseen white gougers is cause for celebration.

"What the young black leaders are doing in the riots is systematically destroying every possibility that the old kind of integration will ever become as normative for their lives as it was for their fathers. The old kind of integration permitted black people to come in out of the cold if they weren't too noisy, left the seats closest to the fireplace to whites, and didn't all come in at the same time. Those who came in carefully watched over their shoulders to see that they weren't followed. They rubbed their hands, grinned, said, "Sir," and shuffled their feet.

"That kind of integration is now being rejected. The only kind of integration that will be acceptable to the new leaders is integration as a concession to equal rights and equal power.

"All of the talk about power that is coming out of the black community today means simply that from now on people

of that community want to initiate, control, dispose of and reap the benefits from every program, project, commercial enterprize, political machine and public authority that comes into their neighborhoods. It means that black people now prefer an unsuccessful community run by black people to a successful community run by whites."*

It would be a tragic mistake to respond to these eruptions with new measures of suppression, but apparently this is the spirit abroad in the white community; to punish the poor rather than to eliminate the intolerable conditions under which they live. Already it is becoming obvious that the white community is going back to business as usual. He has systematically excluded the young militants and the desperately poor from the blue-ribbon study commissions. He has captured the news media with his references to "out-side agitators." He has enlisted his "exhibit" black people. He is proposing adjustments in welfare legislation. But he has failed to see that the militant leadership, however raucous and offensive, is expressing the mood of that large segment of our large population which is "visible."

Until these leaders are heard, until people in the colony are given a voice, until men and women of color are granted their rightful place in the decision making process, this caldron will continue to boil. I am convinced that H. Rap Brown is right when he says that unless the poor are heard, it will take concentration camps to quell this revolution. I am convinced that the black man will not go back to "things as they were" -not with headlines about democracy for Vietnam screaming from every newspaper.

*Dr. Gayraud Wilmore, Executive Director of the United Presbyterian Church's Commission on Religion and Race, made a report to the Commission on September 21, 1967. I am a member of that Commission. The quotes are taken from Dr. Wilmore's report which has since been published.

By

Mr. Ray Swartzback

A MODEST PROPOSAL REVISITED

For

Aiding the backward nation of South Vietnam become a civilized country based on a Christian social and economic structure equivalent to the United States.

It is a sad and unfortunate object to those who have visited South Vietnam to walk through the streets of Saigon or travel in the countryside, when they see streets, roads and village huts doors crowded with beggars and prostitutes. These unfortunate wretches are the victims of unhappy circumstances, and while many of them are scarred, desolate and hungry they nevertheless retain their fecundity. These mothers with their children close at hand are forced to spend their time strolling to beg sustenance for their helpless infants, who as they mature, either become spies for the Viet Cong or join the South Vietnamese Army and participate in the destruction of their country for democracy.

I think it is agreed upon by all that this horrendous number of children in the arms, or on the backs of their parents is in the present deplorable condition of South Vietnam a very great additional grievance. And whoever could find a just, cheap and expedient method of making these children good and useful members of the nation would be so deserving of this world as to have his statue set as a preserver of humanity.

Having turned my thoughts to this subject, and maturely weighed the existing schemes of other projectors, I have always found them grossly mistaken in their calculations.

I propose to deal with the children of South Vietnam one year after they are dropped from their dam. This span represents the time least costly in the maintenance of the child. I hope to deal with them in such a way that they are no longer a burden to their parents or parish or state in their need for nourishment and clothing; they shall, instead, contribute to the feeding and to the clothing of many thousands.

There are approximately one million of these infants in Vietnam that must be supported, but with the destruction of farm land and population displacement this is impossible. I am assured by our merchants that the sale of a boy or a girl before twelve years of age is impractical, that the life expectancy of the average Vietnamese is twenty-five; furthermore, that humanitarian societies frown upon this type of barter. I shall now therefore propose my own theory which I hope will not be liable to the least objection.

I have been assured by a very knowing Texan in Washington D.C. that a young healthy child well nursed is at a year old a most delicious, nourishing and wholesome food, whether stewed, roasted, baked, boiled or Southern Fried.

I do then humbly submit to public consideration, that of the one million children, aged one year, 600,000 be reserved for breed, where of only one part be male, which is more than we allow to sheep, cattle or pigs. A further benefit offered by this would be to boost morale among lonely troops. Excursions might be offered to these breeding grounds and our troops could amuse themselves for a while, without being endangered by syphilis. The breeders would necessarily be inspected by government agents, and also our troops could relax with little fear of inhuman Charlie attacking. That the remaining 400,000 may at a year old be offered in sale to persons of quality and high rank throughout the nation. The mothers should be advised to allow the infants to suck plentifully the last month, so as to render them plump and juicy for a good table. A child will make two dishes at a reception for dignitaries (this is dependant upon their gluttony) and when the family dines alone the fore or hind quarters will serve marvelously. On the fourth day if seasoned with a bit of salt and pepper it will be very good especially in monsoon time.

I grant this food will be somewhat dear, and therefore proper for generals and high ranking officials, who, as they have already devoured the parents have best rights to the children.

I computed the cost of nursing a beggar's child to be about two dollars per annum, rags included. I believe that no gentleman would pay less than twenty-five dollars for a good fat child. Thus the generals and politicians will learn to be good hosts, the mother will be twenty-three dollars richer, and certainly not to exclude the entrance of a new dish.

Those who are more thrifty (as I confess conditions demand) may flay the carcass; the skin of which artificially dressed will make luxurious gloves and summer boots. The fat that is not edible could be used to begin a soap industry. This would be very good for as the saying goes "cleanliness is next to Godliness."

Some persons of desponding spirit are concerned with the vast number of poor peasants who are diseased, maimed or senseless. I am sure there is little to worry about in this respect for the average life expectancy of a Vietnamese is twenty-five. They are dying every day of famine, filth, napalm and fragmentation bombs. The younger laborers are in similar circumstances, consequently they degenerate from starvation to a degree that when called for military service they have not the strength to perform this noble duty. Thus the country's populace is at the mercy of cruel Viet Cong communists, except for the graciousness of American intervention. She has promised to destroy this threat of communist revolution no matter what the cost, so Vietnamese politicians may continue with their fundamental tasks.

I have too long digressed from my subject. I think the advantages of my proposal are evident and plenty as well as of the highest importance.

For first, it would greatly lessen the population of Vietnam, and thus facilitate the pacification program. It would end the continual harassment of generals by silly emotional pleas, not to waste life with no point. The peasants will have something of their own to covet, and will be harder to induce towards communism.

Secondly, the national stock would rise, due to the found-

ing of a new profitable industry that needed no outside help to flourish. A new dish would be introduced and it would probably meet with so much enthusiasm that South Vietnam might well begin to export them, thus creating an incoming flow of currency. Families in need could contract with large corporations and pre-sell four or five children, thus, solving their problem.

Thirdly, the parents would be rid of the constant burden of four or five children, and would have twenty-three dollars extra to live on.

Fourthly, it would increase the care and tenderness of mothers toward their children. Husbands would be more affectionate to wives during pregnancy and not beat them for fear of miscarriage. We should soon see competition among mothers to see which could bring the fattest babe to market.

I wish to make clear that I calculate this remedy for the individual nation of Vietnam. This is only pragmatic, consider if you will the flooding of the market with this commodity. It would lose its significance for Vietnam, because countries with great technology would find some manner to mass produce them and the Vietnamese would be back where they began.

I profess in the sincerity of all my heart that I expect no benefit for this proposal for I am not married and have no children. I suggest this only in the best interest of my country for I know that America sincerely attempts to aspire to the acme of benevolence and humanitarianism. And for Vietnam, desperately in need of a viable solution if it is to thwart communist aggression. Thus it is my hope that if the free nation of South Vietnam adopts this policy it will greatly aid in the defeat of communism, militarily economically and socially. Vietnam will then be able to take a seat in the world as a nation par excelant in all that Christianity and democracy imply.

By
Phil Pink

BUILD UP TO A REVOLUTION

Independence was achieved by most of the nations of the Latin American World by the middle of the nineteenth century. The island of Cuba was an exception. After Simon Bolivar liberated the South American Continent, Cuban Nationalists invited him to come to their country and assist in Cuba's struggle for sovereignty. Bolivar, "The Liberator," occupied with crises on the continent was forced to decline this offer.

The Creole Nationalists comprised the majority of Cubans determined to gain independence, and Bolivar's rejection did not deter them. In 1868 Creoles, Negroes and students began the Ten Year War. After many initial successes the revolutionaries were suppressed by the Spaniards, and in February 1878 the Pact of Zajon was signed granting the Cubans only token benefits.

Jose Marti, a poet and Cuba's greatest national hero, led his country in its revolutionary bid for independence. The struggle began in 1895 and this time it was successful; however, it cost the life of Marti. By 1898 the Cubans were close to victory and at this time the United States entered and the combined forces were able to quickly defeat the Spanish.

The United States refused to grant immediate independence to Cuba and it was not until 1902 that this country was allowed autonomous rule. However, there were stipulations imposed by the U.S. in the form of the Platt Amendment. This act guaranteed America its permanent base at Guantanamo, imposed financial restrictions on Cuban commerce and gave the U.S. power to intervene in the internal affairs of Cuba. The Platt Amendment caused humiliation to the Cuban Nationalists. Then in 1906 the United States occupied Cuba for a period of two years, under the auspices of "restoration of order." During the next decade American intervention continued sporadically, but gradually these interferences became less frequent.

In 1924 Gerardo Machado was elected president of the Republic. Gradually Machado established a dictatorship that lasted until 1933. At this time he was overthrown by a broad coalition which was eventually taken over by Fulgencio Batista a mulatto sergeant. The "Sergeant Revolt" was led by him, and Batista became the fairly benevolent dictator of Cuba. By 1940 Batista had proclaimed a constitution and was elected the first president. In 1944 he was succeeded by Ramon Grau San Martin and then by Carlos Soccarras Prio. Both these regimes were characterized by corruption, but a strong drive for social reform and a structuring of democracy.

Batista returned from voluntary exile in 1948 and ran for president in 1952. As it became obvious that he would finish a poor third; Batista over-threw the democratic regime using the excuse of "preserving order." He then established a military dictatorship. This regime steadily grew more oppressive under the constant pressure of revolutionary action from men like Castro.

Castro and a group of exiles landed in Oriente, the easternmost province of Cuba on December 2, 1956. Batista's troops were unable to cope with the revolutionaries. The extremely oppressive measures adopted by Batista such as suspension of freedom of press and speech and his mass arrests and torture only strengthened opposition. In mid 1958 Batista launched his vaunted "final offensive" against Castro which was a total failure.

It was at this time that the United States realized that Batista was doomed and began to enforce the arms embargo it had imposed several months earlier. In late 1958 Castro sent his troops down from the hills in three columns under the command of his brother Raul, Camillo Cienfuegas, and Ernesto Che Guevara. In late December while the battle of Santa Clara was being fought, Batista realized that his troops would not fight for him and that he was destined to fall from power. Accordingly on December 31, 1958 Batista, taking a fortune out of the country, fled Cuba into exile. The Revolution had triumphed.

By
Mark McColloch

The following obituary appeared in the New York Times on October 12, 1967:

GUEVARA--Ernesto "Che," Humanitarian and liberation leader lived for freedom, died for freedom.

Stonybrook Students for Democratic Society
Spencer Black, Chairman

CUBA: FIDELISTAS Vs. COMMUNISTS

When Castro and his guerrillas marched through the streets of Havana on New Years Day 1959 Americans cheered. A ruthless dictator had been toppled and a democratic revolution had succeeded. Now the Americans believed, violence would cease and Cuba would have a stable government modeled after our own with protections for free enterprise. This attitude showed a serious ignorance, on the part of the American people, concerning the situation in Cuba and the problems by the victorious guerrillas.

Senator Fulbright, in his "Old Myths and New Realities" speech said: "At the same time we must be under no illusions as to the extreme difficulty of uprooting long established ruling oligarchies without disruptions involving lesser or greater degrees of violence. The historical odds are probably against the prospect for peaceful social revolutions... In the other Latin American countries, this power of ruling oligarchies is so solidly established and their ignorance so great that there seems little prospect of accomplishing economic growth or social reform by means short of forcible overthrow of established authorities."

During the early months of 1959 the men in the Cuban government were definitely not communist and many were not even socialists. But the social revolution was far from over. Under Batista more than 60% of the entire economy was United States owned. U.S. owned sugar companies kept more land uncultivated, and rented, than cultivated. The American indus-

tries were in the practice of paying minimal official taxes but hefty bribes. The government was heavily indebted and the peasants were poor, shoeless, and homeless. The Cuban Revolutionaries faced a bankrupt, corrupt government and a one sided economy heavily dependant on the United States. Cuba had always sold her sugar and tobacco to the U.S. in return for American oil. The oil was then refined in Cuba by U.S. owned oil refineries, dependant on U.S. loans for budgetary health. Finding it economically advantageous to Cuba, Castro traded Cuban sugar and tobacco for Russian oil. The United States refineries, however, which were under contract to refine all Cuban oil refused to do so. In retaliation Castro nationalized the oil refineries and other U.S. companies. Unable to pay for these companies in cash he offered to pay in bonds what the companies estimated their wealth to be in their own tax statements. But this did not satisfy American interest and the U.S. government demanded "prompt and effective" compensation for all expropriated property.

At the same time that Castro was struggling against U.S. domination conservative opposition to the Revolution was mounting in Cuba. Almost all of the reforms enacted by the new government were vigorously opposed by Cuban property owners. An investment boycott was launched by wealthy Cubans, and by March 1959 private investment had virtually ceased. Foreign capital declined by \$25 million the first year and this was further complicated by a drop in the price of sugar. By June counter-revolutionary violence had begun.

The business and conservative groups in Cuba and the United States would not allow Castro to conduct a meaningful social revolution within a democratic framework. While in the Sierra Maestra he had dreamed of combining the individual freedoms of western democratic liberalism with the social justice of communism. But when he actually attempted to do so he met with failure and disillusionment. He was left with three choices: he could return to orthodox economics; he could be overthrown by a counter revolution; or he could plunge into outright communism. Given the choice between losing the revolution after years of struggle or embarking on a radical path, the Cuban leaders understandably choes the

latter. By declaring himself a Marxist-Leninist Castro put the Soviet Union in an uncomfortable situation. Krushchev was forced to either pour economic aid into Cuba and promise to defend her from U.S. aggression or lose an enormous amount of prestige in both communist and capitalist countries. Castro did not turn to the Soviet Union because he was a communist, he may or may not have been, but because it was politically expedient. The world was polarized by the United States and the Soviet Union; and after having been found incompatible with U.S. interests, Castro had no other alternative but to appeal to Russia.

Soon after he declared himself a Marxist-Leninist Castro called for the formation of a truly unified revolutionary party which would be the central organ of the Cuban Socialist Revolution. The Integrated Revolutionary Organization (ORI by Spanish initials), which was formed, however, was merely a pseudonym for the Communist Party. The highly organized apparatus of the Communist Party had no difficulty in swallowing up the relatively inexperienced and unstructured organizations with which it merged. Anabel Escalante, Organizational Secretary of the old communist party, was chosen to head the ORI. Old line communists then proceeded to take over the management of farms, factories, and government offices. Within a short span of time the ORI had become Cuba's shadow government, and Escalante revealed Castro himself in day to day political power.

Gradually the Communists began to strengthen their hold on Cuba by taking complete control of the Cubans and removing Fidelistas from posts of influence. Unlike the idealistic Fidelistas the ORI officials were concerned primarily with maintaining their own power. The welfare of the Social Revolution was of only secondary importance to them. Through criminal mismanagement and greed for personal power the communists brought the Social Revolution to a stand still. After protecting herself from Yankee imperialism Cuba had fallen to another wolf.

By 1962 Castro had become alarmed at the action of the ORI communists, and the subsequent conditions these actions had created in Cuba. He, Guevara and the Fidelistas planned

a counter offensive and in March 1962 they launched an open attack on the ORI, accusing Escalante of creating a state within a state, paralyzing all administrative activities, and imposing sectarianism, favoritism, and nepotism with special privileges for the old line communists. Castro accused the ORI officials of creating conditions of social injustice and pointed out they had not supported the Revolution until it appeared as it would win. It was made clear that Escalante alone was not responsible but that the entire ORI apparatus was guilty. Castro demanded that the Revolution be purified and purged of undesirable elements; and returned to the control of sincere revolutionaries.

After the Fidelista offensive the communist newspaper, Hoy, had no choice but to endorse Castro's new position. They obviously could not afford a complete break with him and unfortunately he still needed their organizational talents. The Soviet Union was somewhat more tardy in praising Castro's actions but they also realized that a complete and open break would not be to their advantage.

Since the Escalante affair the split between the old line communists and the newer revolutionaries has constantly been widening. The Cuban missile crisis was another indication of this schism. At the Organization of Latin American Solidarity Conference in Havana this August it was made even more obvious. The communist parties of Brazil, Argentina, Ecuador and Venezuela refused to attend, and on the eve of the Conference Russia devoted a full page of Pravda to an attack on Castro. Castro condemned the Soviet Union for making trade agreements with Brazil and Colombia; "If internationalism exists," he said, "if solidarity is not just a word, the least we can expect of any state of the socialist camp is that it will lend no financial or technical assistance of any type to those (oligarchic) governments." The speakers podium was back dropped not by posters of Marx and Lenin but one huge portrait of Che Guevara and the words, "THE DUTY OF EVERY REVOLUTIONARY IS TO MAKE THE REVOLUTION."

On August 12, 1967 Castro summed up the situation quite adequately:

"We don't talk very much of Marxism anymore. Our goal is a free society, a genuine democracy in which all the people are integrated through their own constant, active participation in the continuing struggle required for a man to feel free and be free. To achieve the basis of that kind of society, man must first defeat his exploiter. To do so, in view of the reality that the exploiter is always richer, stronger, bigger, each man must particularize the struggle into his personal life and generalize his personal commitment. If he can, he can defeat any exploiter whose motivation is greed and possession. That is why the Vietnamese cannot be defeated by the armed technological might of the United States. Each Vietnamese fights for his Revolution. His own and all of theirs. He fights for himself, for his country, and for his vision of a just world. That combination is undefeatable. We, too, in the Americas, are gaining such a combination."

By
Bill Barrie

FIFTH SECTION ADOPTS TWO ORPHANS

Since 1938 the Christian Childrens' Fund, Inc. has been has been sponsoring orphan children in Korea, Taiwan, India and Brazil. They have attempted to help children who are desperately in need of food and clothing. This organization solicits funds for this project by asking people or organizations to accept the care of a child or children by promising twelve dollars a month for his support. This type of action represents those characteristics in men that are most significant and distinguishes men from other animals that are more base in nature. Unfortunately many people fail to realize the importance of this type of action and commitment.

Forty-six members of Fifth Section heard of this organization and decided that they would like to participate. They are in the process of adopting two orphan children as a

section project. They deserve the commendation of the entire campus. This is the type of action that a church-related college should encourage: it should not waste the campus' time or its own in creating trivial and ineffective rules like church attendance. But even more important than praising the delts would be for other groups to follow their example and make a similar commitment. This would be the best type of compliment that the Wooster community could give.

A S.A.C. PUBLICATION

Co-Chairmen of S.A.C.	John Dineen Bill Barrie
Vietnam Coordinator	Greg Moore
Civil Rights & Poverty Coordinator	Diane Bradford
Chairman of Communications	Deb Burnham
Chairman of Finance	Al Easley
Program Chairman	Mark McColloch

CHé is published under the direction of the
Chairman of Communications Deb Burnham
Editor Phil Pink
Associate Editor Al Easley

