

Trinity College

## Trinity College Digital Repository

---

Resist Newsletters

Resist Collection

---

6-10-1968

### Resist Newsletter, June 10, 1968

Resist

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/resistnewsletter>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Resist, "Resist Newsletter, June 10, 1968" (1968). *Resist Newsletters*. 8.  
<https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/resistnewsletter/8>

# RESIST

*a call to resist  
illegitimate authority*

10 June 1968 - 763 Massachusetts Avenue, #4, Cambridge, Mass. 02139 Newsletter # 12

## LETTERS THE NY TIMES WON'T PRINT

On April 21, Paul Lauter sent this letter to the NY Times. The Times never ran it, so it is printed in its entirety here:

Sirs:

In an April 18 editorial you criticize those who ask the government to drop the prosecution of Spock, Coffin and the others. However, the editorial makes two fundamental assumptions that bring into question the applicability of the generally accepted principle that those who commit civil disobedience ought to be ready to accept the legal consequences of their act.

First, you assume that the men are guilty, that "they broke the law." It has been the defendants' position, and that of all of us who signed the "Call to Resist Illegitimate Authority," that it is in fact the Vietnam war that is illegal, carried on in violation of American treaty obligations and Constitutional limitations on the President's war powers, among other things. Beyond that, there is serious question whether, as a matter of fact, the defendants broke any law whatsoever. American law assumes men to be innocent until they are proved guilty, and it cannot but prejudice the trial of these men when even the most responsible public voices casually judge their guilt in advance.

But the editorial's more fundamental assumption is that the law exists somehow independent of political processes and that courts are rather like umpires who must simply decide whether the pitch is a ball or a strike. If this were the case, we would be

(Cont. on p. 2)

## IN MEMORIAM

During the week of 5 June 1968 four or five hundred American servicemen, several thousand Vietnamese soldiers and civilians, and one United States Senator lost their lives by violence with malice aforethought. In recent months, three black students in Spartanburg, S.C., Bobby Hutton of the Black Panthers, and Martin Luther King were assassinated. All these deaths were equally senseless (unnecessary). We mourn the dead and offer condolences to their survivors with equal outrage and grief.

For many reasons, however, the murder of Robert Kennedy seems the most important among these thousands. Some of the reasons are spurious and cynical. We are used to the sight of crocodiles in high places with wet eyes. But in carrying on the war in Vietnam, the government has created the chief model for the use of violence. Those who arm half a million American youths in Vietnam cannot tell us anything about gun control; those who butcher the children cannot condemn violence.

However, millions of sober and honest Americans do feel a special loss. To many, Robert Kennedy seemed a great and admirable and even a good man. To those who really mourn, his loss seems great because he seemed a man--the man-- who might stop all the other killing, the murder in Vietnam and the brutality of the ghettos.

The death of an irreplaceable leader, like the death of Martin Luther King, is a disaster, indeed.

(Cont. on p. 2)

hard pressed to criticize the Soviet Union for prosecuting dissenting Russian writers, or South Africa for threatening to imprison those who participate in multi-racial political parties. These governments have vague and sweeping "laws" on their books forbidding such actions; such laws are designed to prevent citizens from interfering with the political decisions made by the state. The draft is not an elaborate ball-game whose rules are sacrosanct; it is an instrument of political purpose--the prosecution of war--and its criminal penalties are designed to defend those political purposes against opposition.

The case of those who sat in at segregated southern lunch counters helps clarify this situation. The sit-ins were illegal, judged by the laws of the states in which they were held, and indeed by the standard of "separate but equal" previously accepted by the Supreme Court. But political conditions had changed: lunch counter segregation was no longer an acceptable policy to the nation as a whole, which was stronger than the south, and thus the Constitution could be reinterpreted to override self-serving local laws. International law is not yet strong enough to override self-serving national regulations, but the principle still holds that conflicts between laws are settled on political bases.

In this sense, the Spock-Coffin trial is a political trial. The request that the government quash the indictments is a request, like that for an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, that the Administration give up the political objectives that the prosecution, no less than the bombing, is meant to serve.

Yours truly,  
Paul Lauter

In Memoriam, cont. from p. 1

We are respectful of the anguish of all who hoped that Robert Kennedy was such a man. We are now only more sure than ever that, if anyone can spike our country's official violence, it will be those who resist the illegitimate authorities of our national institutions.

POSTSCRIPT TO THE TIMES LETTER

I would add a brief personal postscript to the foregoing letter, which the Times did not, of course, print. I hope the trial and sentencing of H. Rap Brown to five years, and the Boston trial (whatever its state when you read this), will lead people to reassess the notion that we can find in the courts a favorable ground for fighting our cause. After all, the courts are an integral part of the system we are challenging. Decisions of the courts seldom do more than ratify changes in the political consensus (although courts will sometimes uphold traditional values against temporary political vagaries). Rap was found guilty of violating an obscure federal statute against carrying a weapon across state lines while under indictment for a felony. The original Maryland indictment was strongly questioned in the Kerner Report, and Rap's reason for travelling armed, whatever one thinks of it, hardly needs an explanation. It is clear that no matter of justice is served by prosecuting him for hauling a gun to New Orleans and back; but the government's desire to have him off the streets is well served. And what is served by the Boston prosecution is simply the policy of making war on Vietnam.

Our job is not, therefore, "defensive." It is, rather, to push the political offensive against the war and against racism. It is only so long as the courts provide grounds favorable to our work that we should concentrate our efforts in or around them. And we must better learn how to use the courts instead of simply permitting--or even enabling--the government to use them against us.

Our ability to carry forward a political offensive depends right now upon our will, on our energy, as brother Thoreau put it, to "clog" with our whole weight. To that end, we may very well persist in tactics we have used before. If it is right and effective to turn in draft cards, we shall. And if it is to burn draft files, we shall. And it is to aid,

---

 TRIAL OF THE BOSTON FIVE
 

---

The trial in Boston of Dr. Benjamin Spock, Rev. William Sloan Coffin, Michael Ferber, Mitchell Goodman, and Marcus Raskin, has clearly not been the "legal and moral confrontation" which the defendants sought when they gathered at the steps of the Justice Department on October 20. All evidence of the unconstitutionality of the war, the illegality of the conduct of the war, or the illegality of the Selective Service Act has been ruled "irrelevant" by 85 year old Judge Francis J. W. Ford.

The government's case has centered around three events -- the October 2 press conference at which the "Call to Resist Illegitimate Authority" was released, the October 16 draft card turn-in at Boston's Arlington Street church, and the October 20 demonstration in Washington at which the draft cards collected across the country on October 16 were presented to the Justice Department. The government contends that these events stem from a conspiracy to counsel, aid, and abet young men to resist the draft, and to obstruct the workings of the Selective Service System. So far the government's case has been sketched in only the flimsiest of terms. The law on conspiracy, however, is extremely loose, and open to varying interpretations. With the aid of Judge Ford's quite one-sided instructions to the all-white, all-male jury (which has but one college graduate), the government will most likely win its case.

Whether or not a government victory will lead to further indictments is difficult to assess. A Democratic administration seeking to woo liberal voters back into the fold before November may decide that little purpose would be served by further indictments. Character witnesses for the defendants have already included such distinguished liberals as Senator Stephen Young of Ohio; Congressman William F. Ryan of New York; former presidential science advisor Jerome Wiesner; former New Deal brain-truster Benjamin Cohen; President Johnson's chief trade negotiator William Roth; and former deputy assistant Secretary of State, Philip Stern.

(Cont. top of next column)

On the other hand, once the machinery to prosecute individuals for support of anti-draft activities has been set in motion, it may not be easy to stop. Many names have been mentioned in the course of the trial. Only a few days ago, government prosecutor John E. Wall stated flatly, "I suggest there is a prima facie case for naming Professor Chomsky as a co-conspirator."

Yet the government still has a long way to go before winning this, the original case. The trial in Boston may end in convictions. But the outcome in the appeals courts, where broader constitutional issues may be allowed, just might be quite different.

---

 Postscript, cont. from p. 2
 

---

abet and defend resisters, we shall. We do these things knowing that the government will bring against us whatever power it can, including that of the courts. For my own part, I do not seek jail--however right it may be for just men to be in jail in a time of national injustice. But I think all of us understand that in resisting we risk jail, all the more so as our efforts to prevent the war policy begin to succeed. We risk jail not because we are committing crimes or performing illegal acts, but because the U.S. Government is.

And these acts are continuing. Over 1100 Americans and who knows how many Vietnamese died these last two weeks. Negotiations and candidates may putter along, but the war takes no vacations. Neither can we. We will defend the men in Boston and Oakland and elsewhere with all the resources we can. But the best defense of them, and of thousands of others, remains organizing resistance among larger and larger numbers of men. It is possible to multiply resistance TENFOLD this summer. This is no exaggeration: see the figures on potential draft resistance on page 9. I hope we will all be at that work, wherever we are.

-Paul Lauter-

---

PUNITIVE RECLASSIFICATION CASE GOES  
TO THE SUPREME COURT

---

The Supreme Court agreed May 30th to decide if draft boards can punish Vietnam war protestors who are exempt from service. James J. Oestereich, a divinity student who lost his draft exemption after turning in his draft card last October, brought the issue to the Supreme Court. Oestereich was reclassified by his draft board in Cheyenne, Wyoming, and ordered inducted into the Army in February. Oestereich, who is 22 years old and a student at Andover-Newton Theological School, was one of the war protestors who turned in draft cards at the Justice Department last fall. The ACLU is defending him.

The case has brought the Solicitor General Erwin N. Griswald of the Justice Department and Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey into open conflict over the use of induction to punish protestors, since the Justice Department represents the Selective Service in court. Griswald says that ministerial students are entitled to exemptions under law, but Hershey issued a secret memorandum to the court claiming that the Justice Dep't failed to afford him adequate legal representation in draft cases.

The feud between the two began last October when Hershey recommended to local draft boards that the induction of war protestors be speeded up. Later, Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Hershey agreed that Hershey would leave punishment of dissenters and demonstrators up to the Department's prosecutors, and that Clark would prosecute actual law violations. Now the Supreme Court has decided to rule upon the Oestereich case next term.

---

ORGANIZING IN AUBURN, NEW YORK

---

May 27, 1968

John Clayton  
Resist

Dear John:

I'm writing this just to thank you for your contact during the year, and

indicate briefly what's happened here this past year. Wells is an extraordinarily isolated (nearest public transportation is 25 miles away) girls school of 600 students. The nearest town is Auburn with 35,000 people, a harsh, industrial, ethnic city, reminiscent in many ways of the deep South.

Isolation is a key to political attitudes around here. That's why contact from you (et al) has been so important. In the past year we have been able to hold a substantial teach-in, a very successful academic day of conscience, a dozen or so speeches and films, Auburn's first peace march--perhaps 100 or so marchers--and frequent leafletting with enclosed leaflet at High Schools, downtown stores and factory gates. You must understand that until this past year, this area has had just about NO peace activity. Now, of course, I think it is crucial that a draft resistance program begin. I however, will not be here this summer. I suggest you send some literature to Jim Greenwald, 162 South Street, Auburn, a high school senior.

I think one reason a draft resistance program is so important here is that it builds something, a group of committed people, at best. This is its crucial difference from the kind of "organizing" we've done this year. With the close of the college this will fold. With very few exceptions all the "peace" oriented people around here have opposed a draft resistance program (not in principle, they've just opposed putting their energies into it) and this is almost entirely because of the McCarthy and Kennedy candidacies. The biggest step people took here lay in (finally) deciding not to turn their group and energies to either McCarthy or Kennedy but to continue educational, etc., peace activity irrespective of the campaigns. For middle class, isolated peace groups, yearning for relevance, this is a big and important lesson.

(Cont. top of p.5)

Auburn letter, cont. from p 4

Another lesson you might impress on people operating in areas similar to mine is, don't despair. These tough little towns are the Northern equivalent of Mississippi (truly). Start your organizing wherever the people are politically and psychologically, but keep escalating it. Keep forcing people to choose, No matter how minor your actions are, they count. A leaflet handed out in New York is nothing. A leaflet here is a real confrontation. Many, perhaps most, people won't even take it. A peace march in towns like this affects the existential reality of nearly everyone who lives in the town. A slow accretion of such shocks will bring change. Speak in language people understand, but NEVER water down what you have to say. This last is the inevitable drive of the middle class liberals you are certain to attract in these areas. But they are often amenable to change, too.

The two problems we haven't touched: how middle class, part-time organizers can reach the white working classes, huge masses of factory people who resent the very leisure which allows you to pass out leaflets. Must be done. 2) Continuity to preserve momentum. Which means commitment. Potentially, I hope, draft resistance is a way to that.

I hadn't meant to turn this into a "What we've learned" but if these notes can benefit other people in analogous areas to mine (and I'm sure there are many) then pass them on. Anyway, thanks for your help.

One last thing. I'll be in Washington DC this summer. I'll get in touch with the Resist office there, but if anyone is organizing among whites, I'd appreciate a contact. Also, two friends: Dick Ochs and Bob Levine, presumably with Institute Policy Studies help (along with me) are interested in organizing professionals, intellectuals, teachers, scientists, and technicians somewhat along RESIST lines. The idea is to have everyone subscribe to some

statement committing themselves to withhold their brains, expertise, knowledge, etc. from any work whose ultimate use is war. Also, to broaden it, alongside the pledge, an attempt (especially for scientists, engineers) to develop the kind of projects they want to work on (peaceful, human-centered) and fight for a diversion of war-industrial spending to that. Anyway, very tentative. What do you think? Who do you know in Washington this summer that might be interested? Does such have national potential?

Eli Zaretsky  
Department of  
History and Government  
Wells College  
Aurora, New York

---

#### HOW DRAFT COUNSELING CAN BE USED

---

"Every movement must attempt to deal with individual problems, particularly when it is engaged in building a mass political base for resistance. Aside from the purposes of 'good will,' 'reaching people,' and 'providing a community service,' draft counseling has two major purposes.

"The first aim of counseling ought to be to turn people to resistance, i.e., to political action and to connect the issue of the war with the draft and with domestic problems. Secondly, expert draft counseling can help keep movement organizers and persons who can become politically active out of the army, or those in the army out of jail. These must be our main purposes."

The foregoing paragraphs are excerpts from Chapter 2 of a fine new pamphlet called "A Pocket Manual on Draft Resistance," by Ken Cloke. Available from the Guardian, 197 East 4th Street, New York, NY 10009, for 40¢ a copy.

---

 BERRIGAN SENTENCED
 

---

"The six-year sentence imposed on Father Berrigan is one of the most severe given an American clergyman for protest activity in this century," church officials said when Federal Judge Edward S. Northrop passed sentence, May 24th, on the Reverend Philip F. Berrigan, the Baltimore priest who poured blood on Selective Service files. A six-year sentence was also passed on Baltimore artist Tom Lewis and a three year term was given to David Eberhardt, a former school teacher and social worker.

Before receiving sentence, Father Berrigan said, "These are not times for building justice-- these are times for confronting injustice. This we feel, is the number one item of national business-- to confront the entrenched, massive and complex injustice of our country. And to confront it justly, non-violently, and with maximum exposure of oneself and one's future.

"America can at this point, treat us as it wills. If it can find justice for us and for the growing millions of citizens who refuse complicity in its crimes, then it will display a stamina of reform in full accordance with its national creed. If it cannot find justice for us, then its cup of violence will fill up and up, finally to brim over." Each of the defendants gave a statement, and, according to the NY Resistance, "the trial was beautiful."

An editorial in the Boston Globe commented on the severity of the sentence. "Father Berrigan is no mortal threat to society. The threat to society comes from the opposite direction. . . His crime is hardly so heinous (if pacifism is a crime at all) to warrant the casual lopping off of six years of a man's life. Convicted thugs and murderers have been treated more gently." The editorial expressed fear of injustice in the courts. ". . . relentless repression most surely is taking root again as it always has in periods of unrest. . .

This is the latest in a great string of bad omens," it concluded.

The case is being appealed. Contributions toward court costs may be sent c/o the RESIST office, 763 Mass. Ave. Cambridge, Mass. 02139.

---

 WAR RESISTERS SUPPORTED IN OTHER COUNTRIES
 

---

The growing numbers of Americans who dissociate themselves from the American war in Vietnam are receiving asylum and assistance in Sweden and other countries overseas. The Stockholm Conference office has received signed appeals from 25 countries in Africa, America, Asia, Europe, and the Pacific, as well as from nine international organizations.

In Oxford, England, a group of American graduate students have organized a Council for Democratic Alternatives whose constituency is over 12,000 expatriate American students in England alone. With others, they have formed an International Communications Network with other British universities and their counterparts in Germany and France. Working groups help those who need lodging and those who need to find work, as well as providing moral, political, and legal support.

To carry on the work, the two offices listed below have sent an appeal to organizations and private persons to contribute support with knowledge, funds, or both.

Swedish Committee for Vietnam  
Jungfrugatan 30  
S-114 44 Stockholm, Sweden

Council for Democratic Alternatives  
46 Leckfor Road, Oxford, England

The escalation of the Vietnam war will lead to an increasing number of American refugees as well as soldiers who refuse to do military service in a war which is illegal on international and Constitutional grounds, and which is directed against the Vietnamese people in their struggle for peace, freedom and national independence.

with America's grave error in Vietnam.

---

RESPONSE TO THE TRIAL OF THE  
BOSTON FIVE

---

The trial of the Boston five has brought much response. At Ohio State University in Columbus, COLDRU (Columbus Draft Resistance Union) hwd a demonstration on May 21. "The demonstration took the form of a sit-in against military recruiters, but the form of the demonstration was, in a way, incidental. For the importance of this demonstration lay both in the issues which were presented and the new people who were drawn into the movement here on campus."

In Corvallis, Oregon, there was a public demonstration May 20th. On the same day in Lewisburg, Pa., Resist held a vigil. The New England Office of the American Friends Service Committee on May 20th released the following statement: "We herewith convey our support for the five men whose pursuit of their consciences in opposition to the war in Vietnam has brought indictment for violation of the law. We believe it is wrong to coerce individuals to enter into the mass destruction of a nation."

From all over the country have come similar expressions of support.

---

SUPPORT TO RESIST

---

Nonetheless, the "peace talks" and support for the McCarthy campaign have taken their toll on the contributions to RESIST. These contributions are urgently needed to support many local groups, as well as to aid in the legal defense of men and women who, like the Boston five, have challenged the legality of the war and the draft.

Here is a letter from a supporter:  
I'm sorry and terrified to hear that contributions to RESIST have fallen off. I am one of those who dropped in level of contributing because of financial difficulties. Now for a moment can the ruse of peace talks be seen as the proper, moral, politically reasonable and effective confrontation

I agree with Senator Fulbright that Johnson is merely manipulating toward another term in office and attempting to silence the heretofore vociferous climate of dissenting voices. No real confrontation of the U.S.'s imperialistic foreign policy under present circumstances and contending candidates is promising.

I hope RESIST will live and grow. All the ideals of civilization are at stake.

Sylvia Lyman

---

PARENTS' DRAFT RESISTANCE

---

A new approach to non-cooperation with the draft: A Maryland mother of a young man approaching his 18th birthday has declared that she will not permit the SS to induct her son. She says, "Selective Service will have to deal with me, not my son, who is a minor. . . He has committed no crime which allows him to be taken away. He will not register when he is 18 because I will not allow him to do so. He is not only under my charge but my protection. If I do not stand for him, who will?"

Mrs. Helen G. Alexander has opened up this potentially powerful way of opposing compulsory military conscription. She seeks help in making Mothers' Draft Resistance and Parents' Draft Resistance a national movement. She quotes Daniel Webster, speaking on the draft in Congress, 14 Jan. 1814:

"Where is it written in the Constitution, . . . that you may take children from their parents, and parents from their children, and compel them to fight the battle of any way in which the folly or wickedness of the government may engage itself? . . . A free government with an uncontrolled power of military conscription is the most ridiculous and abominable contradiction and nonsense that ever entered into the head of man."

Write Mrs. Helen G. Alexander,  
Box 14 - Route 6, Frederick, Maryland  
21701. Phone: 301 662 4445.



NEWS IN GENERAL

Advice to the Wartorn: From the NY Resistance, 5 Beekman St. Room 1025, New York, Ny 10038: There is considerable evidence that those who emigrate to Canada after defying the draft make it rougher on those who stay. Bails skyrocket and judges seem to think they should punish those who stay and increase the length of their prison sentences. If you decide to go, NY Resistance suggest that you leave before breaking the law.

The Peacemaker Orientation Program in Non-Violence will be held August 17 into Spetember at the Heathcote School of Living, Freedland, Maryland. For more information write Wally Nelson, 3810 Hamilton Street, Philadelphia, Pa., 19104.

Now Available: GI's ACT -- written in English for servicemen in Western Europe. Write Jean-Paul Sartre, B.P. 130, Paris France. Information to servicemen on counseling and help available in Europe: Washington Draft Resistance Union Newsletter, 3 Thomas Circle N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

News of Punitive Actions: Air Force Sgt. Richard M. Jones, of Oregon City, Oregon was sentenced to dishonorable discharge after pleading guilty to disobeying an order to go to Korea.

Pfc. Daniel Amick and Pfc. Kenneth Stolte were sentenced to four years of hard labor and dishonorable discharge for violating Article of War 134, by distributing pamphlets urging organization of a soldier's war union at Fort Ord, California.

Rev. David W. Connor, a 31 yearold Roman Catholic chaplain at Cornell was reclassified 1-A after turning in his draft card last October. He refused induction May 28th.

Sanctuary: The old tradition that the church should be a sanctuary was revived in Resistance by Robert Talmanson and William Chase in Boston. The tradition is based on the position that civil law has physical as well as mental and moral boundaries. Resisters tried it again in Providence, R.I. in early June. Thus far, it has not

proven effective as a defense against arrest, but it may turn out to be a dramatic way of rallying support for Resisters.

Recently, SS Director Lewis B. Hershey tangled with the Senate Judiciary Committee about whether draft registrants amy appear with their local boards. At present, the registrant is denied the right of private counsel during appearances before the board. Sen. Edward Kennedy argued that the legal counsel supplied by the board itself really does not protect the registrant. The local board's appeal agent, whom the registrant is invited to contact, is not a confidential attorney, but merely a source of legal information.

Staughton Lynd has been denied a full-time post at Roosevelt University by the University's trustees. Last year he was denied appointments at the University of Illinois, at Northern Illinois University, at the University of Chicago and Chicago State College. Ultimately, Chicago State was forced by a legal suit and a national campaign among academics, to hire Lynd for the year. Once again, the administration at Roosevelt overruled the Department of History's appointment, declaring that it had the right to reject an appointment on any grounds for someone who was not tenured.

Readers are asked to send letters of protest, or simply their names, to the New Univerisyt Conference, c/o Chapel House, 5810 Woodlawn Ave., Chicago, Illinois.

GOOD ARTICLES: Ronald Dworkin, "Civil Disobedience: The Case Against the Prosecution," in The New York Review of Books, June 6, 1968, pp. 14-21. It opens with this question: "How should the government deal with those who disobey the draft laws out of conscience?" Paul Lauter and Florence Howe, "The Draft and Its Opposition," in the New York Review of Books, June 20, 1968, pp. 25-31. Includes reviews of ten books on the draft.

More on Vietnam Commencements:

In describing the Vietnam Commencement at the University of California in Berkeley, Frederick Crews writes: "The biggest crowd since the December 3, '64 sit-in, a tremendously moving program, and total approval and enthusiasm for our position. Newspaper reporters came up afterwards to sign the support pledge. We must have about 1000 We-Won't-Go pledges by now." At the University of Pennsylvania, a Vietnam Commencement was held April 25. Rev. William Sloan Coffin spoke to the 1200 participants, 242 students and faculty signed the pledge to refuse induction, and 345 signed a pledge to support. 30 medical students also signed a pledge to "refuse induction." The New School held its Vietnam Commencement June 3 in support of 21 seniors and graduate students who won't go. Noam Chomsky was chief speaker at the special Vietnam Convocation at the University of Chicago on June 7, and he reports that Rockefeller Chapel overflowed with supporters, including more faculty members than attended the regular commencement exercises.

In order to make this a truly national newsletter, we need local groups to send us clippings and reports. We can't know what's happening in your area, or tell other people about it, unless you keep us informed.

SUMMER PLANS

Please let the RESIST office know what you are doing this summer. Send your name, address, summer address, and answer these questions:  
Will you be working on a summer project?  
Can you travel?  
Are you trained as a draft counselor?  
What kind of work do you want to do?  
What kind of movement experience have you had?  
We will try to get individuals and groups together.

"THE COLLEGIATE DRAFTEE": Excerpts from column by Louis Harris, NY Post, May 16, 1968.

As a result of the end of deferments for graduate students and a tightening of student exemptions, a heavy proportion of the young men called to military service this summer and fall will be college-educated. Up to now, the draft has tapped college men much less than other sectors of the population.

With over 150,000 former graduate students alone becoming eligible for the draft, an acid test of the draft system is likely to be in the offing. For while a majority of young people generally go along with the prevailing support for the draft in the country, a high number of college students show opposition to the draft, even to the point of refusing to go.

. . .  
Respect for the principle of resistance to military service runs highest among college seniors in the West; where 51% expressed respect for those who refuse to server; among students in private nondenominational colleges where the number rises to 42%; and among those studying in the humanities and social sciences, where 41% sympathize with resisters to the draft.

. . .  
In terms of their numbers, [the] activists do not represent anything approaching a majority of students in college today. But in the aggregate they come to well over 100,000, or a potential of over 70,000 draft resisters

It is likely that many of them when faced with an actual call-up to service will not be pleased but will serve. But even if as many as 25,000 choose to go to prison or one of the other courses of refusing to serve, the size of the crisis surely will exceed any this nation has ever faced in terms of resistance to the draft.

# RESIST

Room 4, 763 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Mass. 02139 Phone: 617-491-8076

To: Academics  
Subject: A CALL FOR A RESISTERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

## TEMPORARY STEERING COMMITTEE

NOAM CHOMSKY  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

FREDERICK CREWS  
*University of California Berkeley*

WILLIAM DAVIDON  
*Haverford College*

RICHARD FLACKS  
*University of Chicago*

MITCHELL GOODMAN  
*Temple, Maine*

PAUL GOODMAN  
*New York City*

DONALD KALISH  
*University of California Los Angeles*

LOUIS KAMPF  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*  
Associate National Director

HANS KONINGSBERGER  
*New York City*

PAUL LAUTER  
*Antioch-Putney Graduate School*  
National Director

REV. RICHARD MUMMA  
*Presbyterian Ministry at Harvard*

GRACE PALEY  
*New York City*

RICHARD OHMANN  
*Wesleyan University*

MARCUS RASKIN  
*Institute for Policy Studies*

SONDRA SILVERMAN  
*Brooklyn College*

DAN STERN  
*Chicago Area Draft Resistance*

ROBERT ZEVIN  
*Columbia University*

We believe the young men who have conscientiously resisted the draft must be supported in their stand against a war they see as both immoral and illegal. We therefore call upon our colleagues and upon our universities and colleges to give aid and assistance to draft resisters similar to that provided for veterans of the Second World War. Toward that end, we call for the Establishment of a RESISTERS' BILL OF RIGHTS.

To those whose educational or vocational opportunities have been interrupted or impeded because they have tried to serve their country and mankind by opposing the war in Vietnam, we pledge:

I. To offer opportunities for them to continue or complete their educational or vocational training by:

- A. Arranging for correspondence courses to be offered on a credit basis to men in jail or exile through the University Extension sections of various colleges, or otherwise;
- B. Agreeing to serve as their tutors through such courses;
- C. Arranging for them to receive books, journals, and newspapers of relevance.

II. To demand of our universities that:

- A. They accept resisters without prejudice to their continuation in school or with such resistance counted in their favor toward admission; and,
- B. They help establish and finance a Resisters' Education and Training Program to provide for readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities by supplying counselling and scholarship allowances to meet the expenses of subsistence, tuition, fees, books, and equipment.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. \_\_\_\_\_

Courses I would be willing to teach \_\_\_\_\_

University or college \_\_\_\_\_

My university/college will \_\_\_\_\_ will not \_\_\_\_\_ provide credit.

I would help plan the program and undertake some of the administrative work if necessary \_\_\_\_\_