

Students for a  
Democratic Society

Issue # 2  
December 1965

In Loco Deus

The questions "What are we?" and "Why are we here?" do, indeed, sound like a high school student's attempt to philosophize on the world in general. What a pity, then, that a university community should be compelled to ask itself these same questions.

A not irrelevant anecdote, if I may. When I was twenty-three years old, a bizzare thing happened. I had traveled two continents (without benefit of any guardian), voted in a presidential election, and served honorably for a full hitch in the army. After my discharge I came to the University of Kansas, where, according to the attractive-but-serious looking catalogue I had received, I would be able to cultivate my mind and develop my self as a person. I was then given a sheet of paper informing me that I could be expelled from this modern, sophisticated institution for having either alcohol or women (unless, presumably, my mother was present) in my quarters. Bizzare, indeed!

But these rules are not the real substance of this article, for I suspect that with a little ingenuity, one could succeed in ruining himself quite nicely outside his own quarters.

Nor is my main objective to point out that a high school dropout selling cabbage in a supermarket has rights that we, who have chosen to try to equip ourselves for somewhat more complex roles, do not have.

(continued on page 2)

Agentis WASPentis Kansiensis

In loco parentis is more than University Administration (Deans of Men, Women, Students; Provost; Chancellor) acting in lieu of parents. The phrase in loco parentis is used to designate a body of beliefs and practices, some codified in University Regulations and some embodied in tradition, which justify and give direction to a certain group's efforts to inculcate their conceptions of acceptable behavior into the student body. This "certain group" I am going to call the Decision Makers. The DMs are the Governor, members of the Board of Regents, University Administration, State Legislature, Council for Progress, other assorted Republicans, businessmen and what-have-you. This group of people, the DMs, have certain ideas about what is proper behavior, what is acceptable conduct, and what is not.

Most DMs, and unfortunately many educators, think that a school is a school; that Universities, like high schools, are supposed to be in the business of sulture transmission. The DMs are training their replacements at the University, and they want their plebes to know what it stands for. Offenses against their University are ipso facto offenses against them and are not to be condoned.

People in the University Administration are perhaps somewhat less dogmatic than most of the other people in their DM peer group. Nevertheless it is the administrator's responsibility

(continued on page 7)

I do not even want to raise the rather vital question of constitutional rights when we are penalized for simply being students. Double jeopardy is the name of that institution, and it occurs when a person is punished twice for the same offense. Not only may a student face action from both civil and school authorities for the same act, but he can be punished by the school before his guilt is ever proven in any legitimate court.

The fallacy lies not with any one of these rules, per se, but with the whole atmosphere they create.

Ours is a complex world, fraught with dangers and inconsistencies. It has its Vietnam (all, regardless of their beliefs and proposed solutions, must concede that it is a tragedy), its Budapest, its Algeria. Churches are bombed and mothers assassinated in the night in freedom's name. Forty million in the world's richest nation are impoverished. The majority of the world's population, having in the past been deprived by others, and now left deprived-but-free, are determined to join the society of man by whatever means seem most likely to them.

To cope in any way with these problems, the universities must produce independent, responsible human beings. If an individual entering a university is socially a fetus, another four years in an incubator will not help him. If he is not a fetus, incubator life will only stifle him. He will be no more than a senseless automaton, fit only for use on a sterily conveyor-belt-society that goes nowhere. There are numerous institutions to care for the socially, physically, and mentally retarded -- the university, I hope, has a different job to do, and it only defeats itself when it attempts to incubate its students. Both our society and we, ourselves, sell ourselves cheaply when we allow it to do so. If we do not act soon, and constructively, to remedy this situation, we can pass into history confident that our children and our children's children will be set upon by our very same problem.

In some form. At some time. With progressively more horrible implications.

John Garlinghouse (KU-SDS)

The KU-SDS Journal will appear periodically throughout the school year. Signed articles appearing in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of KU-SDS, or of the editorial staff. Unsigned articles and "tidbits" are the responsibility of the editorial staff.

KU-SDS . . . . . Publisher  
Jim Masters. . . . . Editor  
Rich Hill. . . . . Asst. Editor

For further information about KU-SDS, contact John Garlinghouse (847½ Mass. St., #8, Lawrence, Kansas 66044). Those wishing further information about this journal contact Jim Masters (656 West 23rd Street, Lawrence, Kansas 66044).

The Kansas University Students for a Democratic Society is a local affiliate of Students for a Democratic Society:  
1103 East 63rd Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60637  
(312) 667-6050

Printed by the KFP Publishing House.

Person of the Month: U Thant, for his continuing efforts to pound some sense into everybody's heads.

Book of the Month: A Critique of Pure Tolerance, three essays by R. Wolff, Barrington Moore, and Herbert Marcuse. Beacon Press.

Slogan of the Month: There's a Change Gonna Come.

## Student Responsibility

At the very core of becoming a human being is assuming the role of moral agent. This entails decision making in relation to consequences. If a person is to be a responsible citizen, he must try to imagine the consequences of his actions. His actions should be those he believes will bring about desired consequences.

To do this a person must see himself in the world; in relation to others, and with the power to choose the sort of world it will be. He must also see that refusing to recognize this power is also choosing, and that this choice, if multiplied by others, creates a solipsistic wilderness in which we all must wander. How can the person who wishes to establish an identity (unity and persistence or personality) do so if there are no other such unities of personality through which he might know himself? If there is nothing firm to encounter, no other identities to which to relate, then the world becomes a Kafka-esque nightmare. There are only "images" -- no persons. Such a world can offer nothing but despair and momentary sensual pleasures.

This may all seem very abstract, but it is what is at stake when we consider whether those people coming to adulthood are to be isolated from the realities of existence or given a sympathetic environment in which to create a genuine independence.

It seems to me that the university over any other institution should not hand down a questionable (judging from the condition in which we find ourselves) set of values. It should rather provide an atmosphere in which the student may come in from his Archemedian point and develop his moral, aesthetic and logical capacities. "Image" has become a ubiquitous term in our society. It implies superficiality -- how one looks. As long as one is concerned with it, one cannot be anything. It is tragic when anyone's existence is so trivialized -- dehumanized.

I am particularly concerned with the position of women in the university, since they are most especially smothered in a "benevolent" environment. The university is, to be sure, reflecting prevalent middle class attitudes. But one would expect it to lead -- at least slightly -- rather than reflect the most prosaic views. It is not a secret to psychologists that a person is not self-actualizing until he has a sense of his aloneness -- that he must decide for and take care of himself. Women are not encouraged to think of themselves as persons with lives to choose. They are regulated in the most minute aspects of everyday existence -- a method well used in Nazi concentration camps to disintegrate the personality. The hours that women are required to keep are certainly generous. I should think that most could not keep them and stay in school. The thing that is wrong with them is that they are imposed. It sets up a "we" - "they" situation, and therefore "we" try to get all "we" can out of the ever-present "they". The proper sphere of the university is academic. It should not be a country club, nursery school or other type of social club. The proper place to exercise controls is in the area of admissions standards. Kansas is one of the three states in the Union which has none; the others being equally non-populous. If the university experience is to be meaningful, girls as well as boys ought to decide that they are here for something -- that no one is requiring their presence and that such limits and goals as they are to have must be conceived of and imposed by them.

I can say from my personal experience that such realizations are painful and that action which may follow is threatening. But the results are the beginnings of a sense of meaning.

I am deeply moved by a sense of pity when I see girls playing the role -- cute, flighty, warm -- to be fondled and patted on the head like a cocker spaniel. Now another day may be anticipated because it may bring an adventure, a date, an encounter, pinning, marriage may be looked forward to. But what of "happily ever

A question has been raised in the New Republic of Oct. 30 which I think it most appropriate for me to take up here. The question is a familiar one, an old companion of American radicals.

The editors criticize Students for a Democratic Society for being too casual about the prospect of communist infiltration. Our members, they say, "do themselves and their aims a disservice by welcoming communists in their ranks, and by making a virtue out of indifference to the possibility of communists becoming the dominant voice in their organization."

Presidents of SDS -- I am the fifth -- don't really preside over much. They don't make policy. Least of all do they speak final words in the organization's name. So my attempt to reach into the heart of this concern is my own. And on a matter as perplexing to Americans as communism is, I'm of course doubly cautious. And cautious a third time because the problem is a very hard one.

I will cavil a bit to begin with, for the editorial in question has somewhat misconstrued us. So we "welcome" communists, do we? "Welcome" is of course the loaded word, automatic on these occasions. We welcome small-d democrats and converts to radical democracy, not totalitarians in cloaks -- neither red-cloaks nor fed cloaks. And the editors surely have an odd view of our simple human pride in values if they think we'd be "indifferent" to the loss of the organization that embodies and sustains those values.

Still, their question is real, even piercing. SDS does not screen, purge, or use loyalty pledges. So along with Senator Dodd, the New Republic editors narrow

Curiosities of the Month: Reluctance of the faculty in the East Asian Dept. to debate or engage in a dialogue critics of the war in Vietnam.

Last year Lt. Gov. William Crutcher spoke before the K. U. CYRs and was rather critical of the U. S. role in the war in Vietnam. Immediately after he finished speaking the CYRs passed a strong resolution favoring the Johnson Administration's position on the war. This year the CYRs did not rebuke their guest as they did last year. They cleverly passed their strong endorsement of the Administration's position before Senator Frank Carlson spoke.

#### Student Responsibility (continued)

after"? Ever after is a very long time -- even babies don't fill it. And how sustaining a relationship may one have with a cocker spaniel?

If these insights do not take place in college, for many it is too late. To be sure it is harder as time goes by. Some choices may forever be excluded. The university should not make the mistake of sheltering its students from these crucial truths with a haze of parties, collegiate rah-rah, and successful conformity. If a student is not ready for these responsibilities when he comes to college he will not be more ready when he leaves after four years under an authoritarian system. The only difference is that at 22 he will be in a position to make more important decisions with the same equipment he had four years prior.

Even a university free from "in loco parentis" is a controlled environment. The student has only to see to his own development and is free from many of the responsibilities of a person of similar age in the world at large. A student is defined as a neophyte, a learner, and he has set tasks to perform. He has in addition, hundreds of scholars and administrators who in large part are devoted to helping him in these pursuits. It is an excellent place to learn a process -- to learn to think, rather than learn a set of rules which in any case have little to do with reality.

Mrs. Donald Emmons (KU-SDS)

their eyes at us. We are not confused, however. We can perceive the differences between Sen. Dodd and (the New Republic's editor Gilbert) Harrison. We understand about the strange bedfellows that politics makes. Indeed, this is the whole question, isn't it?

So what answers do we have? What about the problem of "infiltration"?

And just what are we expected to do, anyway? We say we are democrats and are told that's not enough, for a man may smile and smile, and be a villain. Certainly. He may also be a happy democrat. Our critics must show us the perceptible telltale clues that divide pretense from belief, or how to find the twisting motive in the straight-seeming act. Motives are invisible. And it is so obvious one nearly weeps to say it that to judge the invisible -- even, alas, in politics -- is a type of sorcery. We judge behavior. Those whose behavior runs athwart the deep SDS commitment to democracy just have no leverage over the democrats of SDS. And in any case, SDS retains no detectives.

Further it is hard to see how a group can be "taken over" unless it has handles of power that can be seized, some "central apparatus" that can enforce orders. SDS has no such apparatus -- only a beleaguered hotspot in Chicago -- and it is a main hard point with us that it never shall. In all our organizing work, in slums and on campuses, we aim to involve everyone equally and openly in the making of decisions, to break down social machines that bestow power undemocratically and withhold it in the same sorry way. Bureaucracies concentrate and conceal power. We avoid them. Anyone who tries to invade us therefore invades only himself; for the only power available to any of us is the power of good sense and humanity.

But the criticism has entirely missed the real point: "infiltration" is not nearly the problem that "association" is.

What should we do when we find ourselves agreeing on a special issue with "out-caste" groups that we may strongly disagree with generally? Mao Tse-tung wants the U. S. out of Vietnam. And according to the official sources, so does President Johnson. Ho Chi Minh would doubtless like to retire (Defense) Secretary (Robert) McNamara, whom (Barry) Goldwater the other day suggested should go back to making Edsels. How may Mr. Goldwater and President Johnson cleanse themselves?

The manual of American realpolitik recommends dissociation, exclusion. We are pure, they are not. Our motives are good, theirs ulterior. We pluck out this offending eye, cut off this hand. We march alone.

But that would hardly be SDS. Radical democracy, we believe, is exactly that social freedom that can reflect critically upon its own foundations. It exposes itself on purpose in order to be itself. It insists on the equal thinkability of all thoughts. Whoever gives himself to real democracy thereby gives himself to a most demanding experiment -- one that never closes except in the defeat one form of which is called "consensus." It is not clear on the face of the matter that democracy exists so that struggle can exist without death? That it responds to the problems of variousness in fact by requiring variousness?

Of course there is peril for SDS in the democratic commitment -- two kinds, in fact. First, the danger that our democratic faith might be out-argued from within. I cannot describe the remoteness of that danger. It seems to me galactic. But the other danger is more intense. Our acceptance and trust of others opens up the possibility of short-term cooperation with what the great world condemns as untouch-

(concluded on following page)

\* \* \* \* \*

Censure of the Month Award goes to the governments in Saigon, Hanoi, Washington, Moscow, Peking, Salisbury, Johannesburg, Bonn, Khartum, etc., etc., for their continuing lack of effort to bring peace and freedom to the peoples of the world.

ables. This can lead to our prejudgment, thence to our political ostracism, and thence to defeat.

Then how do we justify taking such a stand?

Morally, there is just no choice. Our vulnerability must be total. Is that naive? Yes, I think it is naive. Innocent? To be sure -- from love. Is it also fatal? Only if America so decides.

But there is also, I think, a quite practical wisdom in our stand. I doubt it, but perhaps we'd be more tempted if we were shown how exclusion leads to a more democratic distribution of political power. Clearly, it leads to greater acceptance. But acceptance by what but the prevailing power champions whom we should be striving to unseat? Acceptance to what use but the license to survive without sway in an unchanged society? It is not the aim of the New Left to become the love child of the wretched and the Bank of America. The aim is to change society. We choose to remain unacceptable to those who would not have it changed. And we already know that if they cannot red-bait us -- and they can do that, as you know, at whim and with no proof -- then they will be beard-bait, beatnik-bait, now this new depravity, Vietnik-bait; and when all else fails, idealist-bait -- as if when it is once shown that you have ideals, your arguments stand refuted in advance.

Compromising to meet the guilt-by-association attack is thus not only unethical, it is also -- naive, innocent, and fatal. But from fear this time, not love. And among political deaths, too, there are the quick and the slow, the better and the worse.

There is maybe still a richer reason for our not saying no to anybody.

I see SNCC as the Nile Valley of the New Left. And I honor SDS to call it part of the delta that SNCC created. We are other things too. But at our best, I think, we are SNCC translated on a somewhat different and broader set of issues. Our best concern comes from SNCC. Some find that concern a bit shocking, but I'll name it anyway. It is to make love more possible. We work to remove from society what threatens and prevents it -- the inequity that coordinates with injustice to create plain suffering and to make custom of distrust. Poverty. Racism. The assembly-line universities of this Pepsi Generation. The ulcerating drive for affluence. And the ideology of anti-communism, too, because it smothers my curiosity and bribes my compassion. This ideology decrees for me that I may not love Castro, however shining-bright his anguish, or Gus Hall, however long his sorrow. And I quite likely speak for most all of us in SDS when I refuse that ideology on plain and self-evident principle.

Finally, I would be so bold as to lecture our liberal critics a bit on the subject of democracy.

Even as they counsel us on this matter, we stare their failures in the face. What, after all, is the idea of "political democracy" which they claim to be jeopardized by our radical trust? Is it this quadrennial spasm of the body politic that puts purchasable men in the low places and purchasers in the high? Do they see the fruit of their own generation's political wisdom in this recently paroled Congress, which met with such amazing silence what may be the major crisis of American character, the Vietnam war? SDS, believe me, is by no means smug or even so very hopeful about what it has been able to do so far. But still we are puzzled that they should play schoolmaster on this question. Better for them, perhaps, to observe more and admonish less their sons and daughters. All the old good hopes rest now with them, the young, whose risks are obligatory.

It simply must have been heard in this country, sometime, that democracy is nothing if it is not dangerous.

Speech given by Carl Oglesby, President of SDS, at the National Guardian's annual dinner. Reprinted from the National Guardian, 20 November 1965.

to enforce, inculcate, and perpetuate the DM's notions about propriety. The administrator acts as an agent of, and is responsible to, the DMs. The administrator is responsible for the student.

Your behavior may have consequences for nobody but yourself; your actions may infringe upon nobody else's rights; your actions may be perfectly legal according to city, state, and national law; but your posterior, dear student, still belongs to the administration, and to the administration junior grade -- the A S C (Social Committee), the All Women Students (Board of Standards) and the Senior Key Board.

"Students who involve themselves with infractions of the generally accepted code of conduct and morals are subject to disciplinary action by the personnel deans." (pp. 77-78 -- all citations from K. U. Student Handbook, 1965-66.)

"Students should recognize that mere presence in the vicinity of an unlawful assembly may be cause for disciplinary action which could involve suspension or dismissal from the University." (p. 77)

"The University of Kansas does not permit the consumption or possession of alcoholic beverages . . . by students in their rooms in private residences." (p. 78) This is still a University regulation.

"Willful destruction or defacement of property is considered clear evidence of immaturity unbecoming a University student. Participation in such an activity either in this community or elsewhere will be considered sufficient ground for dismissal." (p. 78)

"Above all, the University expects its students to abide by accepted standards of social conduct. Evidence of intoxication will be considered a serious offense." (p. 78)

"In all disciplinary situations at the University of Kansas every effort is made to preserve the principles of 'due process of law.' Any student is entitled to a thorough hearing on specific charges before an unbiased tribunal." (p. 86) Kaff-kaff.

"College judiciary bodies, however, are not courts of law. Emphasis is on the welfare of the student and of the campus as a whole, rather than upon technicalities. A University student assumes some special responsibilities, since his actions reflect not only upon his own reputation, but indirectly upon any group with which he is associated and upon the University itself. Correspondingly, some of the corrective measures employed by college judiciaries are peculiar to the campus."

"As a general policy of the University of Kansas, in those rare cases when a student is charged with a felony in a court of law and the facts seem to justify the charge, the student may be suspended without prejudice until the court action is resolved." (p. 86)

"Penalties. Those normally enforced by University disciplinary bodies include: 1) Reprimand; 2) Failure and withdrawal from a course; 3) Probation; 4) Restrictive probation -- probation and withdrawal of some privileges; 5) Withdrawal of privileges: a. social, b. activity participation, c. automobile; 6) Suspension; 7) Expulsion." (p. 87) You can also be fined.

Here comes the AWS. "A woman student at the University of Kansas is expected to conduct herself in a manner which would at all times reflect honor to her University, her living group, and herself. This implies adherence to the generally accepted standards of propriety and thoughtful consideration to the welfare and reputation of the University."

"Any woman student whose conduct is unsatisfactory, or who violates the regulations of the University, may be requested to withdraw at any time, or may be denied readmission at the end of any term.

"Every freshman woman at the University of Kansas lives in a freshman hall or in a scholarship hall during both semesters of her freshman year, unless she is living with her parents in Lawrence or is personally excused by the Dean of Women. Every upperclass woman at the University is expected to live in a university residence hall, in a scholarship hall, in a sorority house, or in a room in Lawrence approved in advance by the Dean of Women. Information on out-of-town housing is available in the Office of the Dean of Women. Apartments with private entrances are not approved for undergraduate women." (p. 79)

"Entire groups are held responsible for participating in or encouraging violations of regulations or standards of acceptable conduct." (p. 81)

And so it goes. If you want to explore further than the sample given here look at the Student Handbook (University Regulations, AWS Regulations) or at the ASC Social Regulations and Constitution. What do these regulations and practices mean? What happens when you enroll at the University of Kansas? We kid you not. It's goodbye to freedom.

It's hello to unnecessary, unjust, vague, ambiguous in loco parentis rules and traditions. These bonus features come in addition to city, state and national laws that you, just as any other citizen, must obey. You immediately have another group of people who have the "right" to poke around in your private life, and punish you if they don't approve of what they find.

It's hello to arbitrary enforcement of the rules, as the bureaucrats make judgments in terms of their DM-defined concepts of good and bad. For example, some student groups are allowed to use University facilities for presenting fund-raising programs or revues. Other "less responsible" groups are denied use of these facilities. Some student groups, if adjudged pure, are allowed to solicit funds on campus; other student groups are denied this right. I call this unequal treatment under the law. The University Administration calls it "Good Housekeeping." By sweeping under the rug what they consider to be the dirt, they keep their peers happy.

It's goodbye to freedom of association, movement, and assembly for those students that get locked up at night, or are required to live in certain places.

It's hello double jeopardy when one state agency, the University, punishes you (suspension "without prejudice") for allegedly having committed a crime, then further punishes you (expulsion) if the court finds you guilty, and another state agency, the court, also punishes you if they find you guilty.

It's goodbye due process when you are not allowed a trial by jury of your peers; when you are told at the trial that there is "no need for legal counsel because this is not a trial"; when you are tried by "impartial" bureaucrats (a contradiction in terms) who by virtue of their position are subject to immediate direct pressure from the other DMs; when the same people who make the rules accuse you, determine guilt, and pass sentence.

It's goodbye to democracy when elites deny you the right to participate in making the decisions that affect your life.

In loco parentis regulations and traditions are not necessary to the education process -- they hinder it (see Emmons and Garlinghouse articles). They are a means by which one group of people, the DMs, force their personal tastes and private misconceptions off onto another group of people -- the students. These regulations and traditions infringe your right to privacy; they are clearly inconsistent with guarantees found in the Bill of Rights -- in the law of the land.

You are denied exercise of many of your rights, hence denied those rights, as a student at what should be a refuge from the quest for conformity, the University. You did not voluntarily give up your rights; you never had them -- they were denied to you. When will you be free from agencies which unjustly restrict and curb your actions, and by so doing render meaningless your prerogatives? When is it your turn? Will it be different at General Motors or A T & T?

Jim Masters (KU-SDS)