Space is significant only in relation to the earth, which is and will remain our home. Major Titov confessed to some homesickness, though he was away from earth only 25 hours and never more than 160 miles distant. We cannot, even if we would, shed the genes and environmental heritage of a million years. We cannot exchange our life on this green planet for an airless, dangerous and expensive environment If a thousand men reach the moon and the nearer planets in the remainder of this century, it will be a remarkable enough achievement. Yet for every space traveler there will still be three million who will stay where they were born. If we keep our sense of proportion and recognize that the joys and agonies of humanity will still be of this earth, the achievements of the space explorers will not be the less glorious.

STUDENT LEADERS and CAMPUS APATHY

by Steven Roberts and Carey McWilliams, Jr.

Madison, Wis.

MONTHS before the annual Congress of the United States National Student Association began here August 20, journals eager to foster the supposed rise of collegiate conservatism carried dire threats that 1961 was the year of reckoning for the liberal leadership of the nation-wide confederation of student governments. The stories warned that "busloads" of disciples of a prominent Arizona merchant would descend upon the Congress at the University of Wisconsin, and establish the rise of the youthful right-wing as a political reality.

Representatives of Young Americans for Freedom, the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists, and a brand-new front group called the Committee for a Responsible National Student Organization, arrived here early and set up shop in a motel near the campus. Their numbers did not fill a bus. In fact, they could fit quite easily in a Cadillac, with enough room in the trunk for a mimeograph machine, several prints of *Operation Abolition* and a complete file of back issues of the *National Review*.

The youthful conservatives, and especially the Young Americans for Freedom, are a group almost devoid of articulate spokesmen in their collegiate ranks. YAF, which claims a membership of 30,000, was born out of a conference on the Sharon, Connecticut, estate of Bill Buckley, and still receives a good deal of its nourishment, both financial and philosophical, from him. If it is a significant movement, and that is still a debatable question, it is a movement almost wholly directed from above. Even its membership rolls seem to have been fattened by judicious reporting in some of the more widely read weekly news magazines. As one critic of YAF put it, "They built their organization out of press clippings, and now are trying to fill it with people." But if they have to leave the public defense of their cause to such venerable young Americans as Buckley and M. Stanton Evans, editor of the Indianapolis *News*, the young conservatives are masters at the fine art of issuing press releases. The barrage of paper they unleashed on the Congress from the very start hammered at one theme—that NSA is not representative of the American student, and cannot presume to speak as his voice.

Only 388 of more than 2,000 institutions of higher learning in the country are NSA members, so their argument went; few delegates (usually about 500 attend the annual ten-day meetings on a Midwest campus) are chosen in college-wide elections, the rest being selected by the student government. This is true, and nobody really disputes it. NSA is a confederation of student governments, not individual students; the figure of 1.3 million student members usually given by NSA apologists is specious. That number of students attend schools belonging to NSA, but a majority of them have no idea what the organization is, and probably could not care less. The people who come to the Congresses, where NSA policy is formed, are not representatives of their student bodies, nor are the five national officers and about ten staff men who "execute" policy from a rickety four-story building in Philadelphia.

The reason for all this is simple. Galloping apathy still dominates most American college students.

NSA IS NOT typical. It is an elite of interested students, awakening to a world they did not make, but a world they want to change. This has not always been so For most of its fourteen-year history, NSA devoted itself to the issues which concerned its member student governments: college parking, home-coming dances, women's hours, etc. It did so largely from necessity, because its claims to legitimacy rested on these student governments, which had virtually complete freedom to withdraw their colleges from NSA when dissatisfied with its policies. Contemporary collegiate student governments are, to put it mildly, a poor vehicle for transmitting political awareness. They reflect the desire of the college administrator to "avoid difficulties" at all costs by eliminating the student from all areas of controversy which might "reflect on the university."

There is a close interaction between student government under these conditions and student apathy. The banality of student politics repels the student; the absence of student criticism and interest leaves student governments in the hands of those who find playtime bureaucracy and hom-

STEVEN ROBERTS is an editor of the Harvard Crimson; *CAREY McWILLIAMS, Jr., teaches government at Oberlin College.*

iletics about alma mater to be congenial pursuits.

It was these governments that sent delegates to the NSA Congress; and the delegates annually rose in revolt against whatever broader policies had been pursued by national officers, threatening to withdraw or to form rival associations. Under such circumstances, even the most far-sighted national officer was likely to develop an ethic of cautious prudence and "responsibility." This led to endless compromises, and a pandering to the uninspired interests of campus political regimes.

The top staff of NSA realized that it was not truly representative. Consequently, it tried even harder to please, and largely submerged any trace of boldness or imagination it had in the silence of the times—a silence punctuated only occasionally by a boisterous football cheer or a shrill female scream.

THE LAST two years have seen an already much-discussed "awakening" of the silent generation. The sit-ins in the South, sympathy pickets and selective buying in the North, protests against the House Committee on Un-American Activities and compulsory ROTC, the campaign for repeal of the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education Act, and enthusiastic support for the Peace Corps all came in a rush.

There was definitely a stirring, a reawakened interest. In addition to the protest, a rash of campus political parties such as VOICE at Michigan, SLATE at California, and PILOT at Chicago sprang up. So did a number of new magazines devoted to political thought, such as *Albatross* at Swarthmore, *Advance* at Harvard, and *New University Thought* at Chicago.

NSA mirrored the change, but not because it had become representative of the American student (the large majority of American students remains unaware and unconcerned). There was, however, a growing interest among the leaders who actually *are* NSA and form its policy at the annual Congress. For the first time, the association took stands on such issues as the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Peace Corps, Algeria, Cuba and nuclear testing.

The stimulation of the unique student protests aroused NSA to take positive stands on important questions, but in doing so it was acting not as the National Student Association, but as a conscious group of student leaders, far removed from the sentiments of their campuses and constituency. The value to those who have participated has been immense, but they are few. NSA has almost completely failed to transport the initial enthusiasm of the "movement" back to the campus, largely because of the understandable concern of idealists for the moral content of issues rather than the structure of social and educational power or the day-to-day realities of student life.

THIS IS where NSA stood as the fourteenth National Student Congress began here. The difference this year was the conservative "challenge," which forced NSA leaders to take a long look at the association.

YAF leaders like "Howie" Phillips of Harvard (scholastically ineligible for delegate status) preached that the liberal NSA was not representative, and should be reformed. The conservatives would like to change the structure so that more "indifferents," responsive to conservative influence, would come to the Congresses.

But structural issues aside, the rightist groups were almost wholly devoid of the ability to articulate their "resurgent ideology." The expected intellectual offensive of the Right materialized only in the person of William F. Buckley, who spoke outside the official program of the Congress at the motel headquarters of his minions and attracted practically all the delegates. Emotion ran high in the crowd, packed tightly into a parking lot. On one hand was a hostile silence, on the other, an almost frenzied enthusiasm. The formal speech passed with little controversy, but the questioning period was different. Time and again Buckley parried questions with rhetorical ripostes, and the crowd grew restive. In answer to a question about colonialism from a Ceylonese exchange student, Buckley asked if he could quote Jefferson, Washington and other Founding Fathers with "Mobutu, Lumumba, Kasavubu, and the other semi-savages in the Congo." It was a fatal concession to flippancy, and his value to the right-wing cause was destroyed in the ensuing chorus of jeers and hisses. National Affairs Vice President Jenking typified the sentiment of the crowd when he said in an impromptu speech, "We have unmasked the final reality that exists behind the façade of the conservative image."

Though their prophet had fallen, the conservatives did mount an attack on a resolution advocating abolition of the HUAC. Basing their position on the argument that abolition would be directly against the Supreme Court majority and the 412 Congressmen who had recently supported the committee, the conservatives appealed to the moderate bloc of delegates. They said that such a vote would be "irresponsible" and might jeopardize all NSA influence, and tried to substitute a resolution that strongly condemned HUAC but stopped just short of calling for abolition. They appealed, in other words, to precisely those values of bureaucratic caution which had characterized the prior history of NSA.

THE CHALLENGE forced a novel degree of courage and clarity upon the liberal wing of NSA. With emotion and sincerity, Ken Cloke of the University of California asked, in the words of Justice Black, for "the courage to be free." Barney Frank of Harvard lashed out in hard pragmatic terms against those lacking the courage to pursue their ideals of academic freedom in the face of such opposition as Congress and the Court. The resolution calling for abolition carried 236 to 216.

The debate proved that NSA vitally needs a vocal opposition, and will suffer if the conservative withdrawal threatened by Fulton "Buddy" Lewis III ever materializes.

But conservative criticism of structure, while failing in its objectives, produced the most significant changes in the traditional outlook of NSA. Outgoing President Richard Rettig

said in his report to the National Executive Committee, "The gap that exists between the local campus activity and the activity of NSA has widened because of the expressed concern by the Association with the new developments on the domestic scene and the continuing commitments of the Association on the international scene, and the neglect in relating these events with clarity to the local campus. Many campuses feel alienated and distant and unrelated to the activity of the Association." The new officers of the Association are about evenly divided between the moderate and more extreme liberal factions, but the tone for the administration was set by President Ed Garvey, a former student-body president at the University of Wisconsin.

While recognizing that "NSA must continue to respond to the sit-ins and HUAC," he emphasized the need for bringing the experience of a Congress — the deliberations and, most important, the defense of an ideal in the face of strong opposition — to all students. This can only be done, he said, "by structuring the Congress so that delegates won't leave and forget what has happened, but will go back to their campuses, fight for the stands they have taken, and translate policy into specific programs."

Symbolic of NSA's renewed interest in educational problems was a resolution condemning the theory of *in loco parentis* as restrictive to the full intellectual and social growth of the student. This doctrine, which gives the college legal authority to act as a "parent," forces the student into a dependent relationship with the school, rather than the beneficial mutual give and take of an intellectual community.

NSA, after years of frustration, has finally emerged as a voice, if not of the American student, then of the American student leader. The question is now whether it can translate the enthusiasm of a few into a device for awakening the still "silent" American college community.

WELFARE à la NEWBURGH

by William B. Rollins and Bernard Lefkowitz

ON JULY 10, *The Wall Street Journal* said in an editorial:

> It's a fine commentary on public morality in this country when a local community's effort to correct flagrant welfare abuses is declared illegal under both state and federal law. That is exactly where the matter rests in the case of Newburgh. The small New York city has announced a 13-point program to reduce the burden caused by its bums, cheats and loafers, many of whom came to the town and remained for the deliberate purpose of living on relief—which is to say, on the hard-earned tax money of honest residents.

On the same day, a motorist was told by Thomas Chalmers, gas-station attendant at the Newburgh city line: "You know, there's a sign in a railroad station in Durham, North Carolina, or Montgomery, Alabama, that says, 'Come to Newburgh and live off relief. You'll never have to work again.' That Mr. Mitchell's a brilliant man. He's going to make them take that sign down."

No doubt Mr. Chalmers is telling his customers the same thing today.

Far down Newburgh's main street, Joseph McDowell Mitchell, City Manager, leads a welfare reform movement before the television cameras: "The bleeding hearts and welfarists are enraged. . . . They apparently will go to any lengths to prevent Newburgh from joining the growing number of communities which have already taken steps to tighten relief operations." And in a nearby office, Newburgh Mayor William D. Ryan tells whoever will listen, "This man Mitchell has fooled us all."

Joseph McDowell Mitchell has always managed to stay one step ahead of the cynics during his relatively brief career as a city administrator. The balding, thirty-nine-year-old City Manager, who had held six "hateful"—his term—minor federal jobs in ten years, plunged into the maelstrom of municipal government about five years ago. The city manager profession hardly felt the shock, but in his first two municipal jobs, Mitchell managed to shatter the calm of Marple Township, Pa., and Culver City, Calif. in rapid succession. It took Mitchell's bosses in Culver City, where he had served as Assistant City Manager, only a year to get rid of him (his job was abolished). They were slower in Marple. There, the Board of Supervisors waited two years before pressures gathered sufficient to force Mitchell to resign as township manager. Both communities are still feeling the after-effects of his administration.

THE TAXPAYERS of Culver City may remember Mitchell for a fanciful garbage pick-up proposal which he insisted would cost the community only $2 per day per truck ("Why, $2 wouldn't pay for the gas for one truck," commented a Culver City newspaper editor). But his colleagues on the municipal payroll are inclined to remember him more for his political belligerence. Mitchell eschewed the anonymity that is the trademark of the professional city manager. He was brought to Culver City by its then manager, Dean Seeger, who found the young man in an American University classroom. Seeger now says the disenchantment with Mitchell began four months after his arrival. "Our relationship started to deteriorate very rapidly," Seeger said. "Joe was more interested in political power than anything else.

WILLIAM B. ROLLINS and BERNARD LEFKOWITZ are on the staff of the Middletown Times Herald-Record.