

# McGovern to keynote international symposium

Senator George McGovern (D-SD) will keynote Macalester's fall symposium, **A Foreign Policy For The 70's**. The four day conference, October 18-21, is jointly sponsored by the Mac faculty and International Center.

Initially, the idea for the symposium came with the Cambodian crisis. As Mark Peacock, foreign student advisor for the college, stated, "Cambodia showed us, very much, that despite occasional academic input, there has been no systemized academic response to US foreign policy."

Out of this original concern over Cambodia, it was decided to enlarge upon the notion of an "academic meeting of the minds" to include the whole spectrum of US foreign policy. Peacock added, "This administration is likely to be in office for another four years. As we slide in and out of the far east and get mired down in the mid-east...you're talking about issues that will take up the good part of this decade." Consequently, questions will be all-inclusive: What should we be doing in the 70's in the area of foreign policy? What is the best way of doing this? What is the place for the academic community concerning the input into foreign policy decision making?

In addition to Senator McGovern, professor Charles Burton Marshall will also address the symposium. Marshall, professor of International Politics at Johns Hopkins University, is the author of **The Limits of Foreign Policy, The Exercise of Sovereignty, and The Cold War: A Concise History**. He has also served as a member of the State Department Policy Planning Staff, and research associate of the Washington Center for Foreign Policy Research.

This year there will be a new innovation to the symposium as professors will host dinners following the last seminar. At these get-togethers, faculty and students will try to arrive at a statement on Mac's role, and the role of colleges on the whole, in the formation of foreign policy. It is hoped that a written statement will urge other institutions into taking similar action.

Here is the complete agenda:

**Sunday evening, Oct. 18:** Keynote address, "Foreign Policy for the 70's." Senator George McGovern.

**Monday afternoon, Oct. 19:** Panel, "Indo-China." Professor Allan Spear, University of Minnesota; Professor Harold Chase, University of Minnesota; moderator, Professor Theofanis Stavrow, University of Minnesota.

**Tuesday afternoon, Oct. 20:** Panel, "Middle East." Professor Yaya Armajani, Macalester College; Professor Scott Johnston, Hamline University; moderator, Professor Theofanis Stavrow, University of Minnesota.

**Tuesday evening, Oct. 20:** Address, "Foreign Policy for the 70's." Professor Charles Burton Marshall, Johns Hopkins University.

**Wednesday afternoon, Oct. 21:** Panel, "Responsibility of the Academic Community in the Formulation of Foreign Policy." Professor Thomas Grissom, Macalester College; David Bobrow, Director, International Studies Program, University of Minnesota; Jim Powell, Macalester senior; John Law, Macalester junior; moderator, G. Theodore Mitau, Chancellor of the Minnesota State College Board and also Macalester professor.

**Wednesday evening, Oct. 21:** Dinner at faculty members' homes.

## SMC says: don't be against the war--act against it

by Eric Pierson and Bill Binder of the Student Mobilization Committee

Everybody knows that Macalester is a politically active campus. Nothing explosive, of course; just a liberal place where they have coed dorms, almost no graduation requirements, an occasional demonstration, and where everyone automatically assumes everyone else is against the war. The anti-war events of last spring and summer seemed to back up that assumption.

Granted, we have our share of political liberals, radicals, and miscellaneous crazies, but the belief that we have any substantial number of activists is based on myth. We react strongly to emotional events like the Kent State massacre, but when the anti-war movement isn't making the front page, we demonstrate a remarkable lack of initiative. Normally apathy runs rampant, and Macalester's mythical activists, with great dedication, do nothing about the war except talk a lot and worry a little.

In this context, it is not surprising to find a Student Mobilization Committee (SMC) with a small (to be generous) membership. Anti-war sentiment is at a high level, which is fine, but anti-war action, which is more important, is hard to see.

The SMC is willing to take some of the responsibility for this state of affairs, and is trying to erase any negative impressions it may have made last year. We have been accused, sometimes justly, of being arrogant in expressing our opinions, appearing to be exclusive to anyone who is not a full-time revolutionary, and being too preoccupied with noble goals and lofty aspirations (ending the war just may turn out to be a big job) far above mundane reality and even farther above criticism. We're working on these.

We in SMC must of course keep in mind the primary purpose of the organization: working to end U.S. involvement in Vietnam immediately. But we don't think we are stepping out of bounds by diversifying and expanding our activities into local and campus issues as well. Therefore, we invite everyone who disagrees with the war to help us in our "traditional" activities: planning our own meetings (7:00 Thursday nights, U109), bringing in outside speakers, organizing state and regional anti-war conferences (there's one tomorrow afternoon at the University), working to hold anti-war, pro-peace rallies, marches, and parties (There's talk of rallies at the U. coming up October 3 and 9; more details about them some other time and place.) and, of the utmost importance this fall, building mass anti-war demonstrations on October 31, the Saturday before elections (and Halloween, too). But in our efforts to make more people want to be more active more of the time, we also invite anyone with a pet gripe or vested interest, as the case may be, to check out the SMC to see if we can help with money (?), people, or publicity.

Some areas of interest that we have discussed becoming involved in as an organization are: a discussion group of some kind that would bring together the handful of ex-GI's on campus, the people from the draft information center and anyone that would like to avoid any contact with the Army; the bookstore hassle; the Saga conspiracy (!); the connection of the war to inflation to tuition hikes (it's better to aim too high than too low); a series of educational, as opposed to emotional, seminars on the war and all things related (a bibliography has been compiled and a considerable number of people have signed up already).

Draft counseling will again be available to Mac students this year, according to Kent Allin, a Mac student who has worked with Mac's draft counselling program during the past two years.

A schedule for the program and plans to set up a booth in the Union were established during an organizational meeting of the Mac draft counselling service in Weyerhauser Chapel. Seven of the thirteen persons in attendance expressed an interest in counselling.

The service will be available to all Mac males from 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Tuesdays and from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. Thursdays in the basement of Weyerhauser Chapel. Persons interested in doing counselling, research, or otherwise helping out should contact one of the persons on duty during the day or Randy Cox, counsellor at large.

Veterans are especially requested for counselling or just to share their insights with the counsellors. Ex-GI Brian Roragen has already volunteered to work from 10:00 to 11:30 a.m. Tuesdays. In addition to seeking vets, the service would welcome anyone who might talk about his experience with the draft, particularly in securing conscientious objector classification.

The program lacks any formal structure or chairman and is open to suggestions as well as volunteers. "I feel obligated to keep our information up to date and continue counselling," explained Allin at the meeting. "We could also get into other things such as political activities, but that depends on whether or not people want to."

One possibility suggested was helping local high school students with the draft. Ideas discussed included providing speakers for assemblies, doing street corner counselling, and providing information to high school students who want to set up their own counselling. Volunteers decided to contact local students and see if they want any help.

Other work with off campus individuals might include consulting with other counselling services. In the past, the American Friends' Service Committee and the Twin Cities Draft Information Center have provided assistance. Both groups are being contacted again this year, although TCDIC is reported to have stopped counselling in favor of strictly political activities.

"The resources here at Mac are quite good, but there are occasions when it helps to get advice from other people," explained Tracy Baker, who has helped counsel in the past at Mac.

Materials passed out to new counsellors at the meeting included **The Conscientious Objector Handbook**, federal publications on the Selective Service System, and **Draft Facts for Macalester Students**. **Draft Facts** was published in June 1970, and contains new information on the Supreme Court's Welsh decision which broadened conscientious objector requirements to include non-religious moral objection to war. Counsellors say that about the only research needed at this point is some additional information on the Welsh decision.

## Mastering the draft The "stalling" trap and the I-S C

Copyright 1970 by John Striker and Andrew Shapiro

The last column explained how a student can gamble on his lottery number by staying 1-A through December 31. By that date, if the student's number has not been reached, he will descend to "second priority" in the lottery pool. Even if his number is reached before December 31, and he receives an induction order, his gamble will not prove a disaster. He will simply obtain a 1-S(C) deferment and have his induction order cancelled. (Remember, the 1-S(C) is available once to any fulltime college student who, while satisfactorily pursuing his studies, receives an induction order.)

Unfortunately the consequences of obtaining a 1-S(C) are dangerously misunderstood. Some draft board members regard the 1-S(C) as a "stalling" device that calls for prompt induction as soon as the student becomes 1-A again.

The source of this misunderstanding is an obscure proviso in the new lottery regulations. Although these regulations were promulgated by President Nixon last November, the impact of the proviso will be felt for the first time during the next six months.

The proviso warns: "... That any registrant classified ... 1-A or ... 1-A-O (i. e., a C. O. available for noncombatant serving) ... whose (lottery) number has been reached, and who would have been ordered to report for induction except for delays due to a pending personal appearance, appeal, preinduction physical examination, reclassification, or otherwise, shall if and when found acceptable and when such delay is concluded, be ordered to report for induction. ..." (32 C.F.R. S1631.7a, emphasis added).

This proviso is designed to trap the man whose lottery number was reached during his delay and who would have been sent an induction order except for the delay. While the delay persists, the man will be temporarily passed over. In effect, the issuance of his induction order is merely postponed.

That order will eventually fall like a Sword of Damocles. As soon as the delay ends, and the man is 1-A (or 1-A-O), the draft board will drop back to his lottery number. He will then be caught by the "stalling" trap and faced with belated "Greetings."

At first blush, the proviso seems to raise a serious question about the 1-S(C): Does a "delay due to a ... reclassification" occur whenever a student is reclassified from 1-A (or 1-A-O) to 1-S(C)? If so the student might justly fear an inevitable induction order soon after his 1-S(C) expires.

Some draft board members are under the impression that "reclassification" into 1-S(C) falls within the scope of the proviso. In other words, the "reclassification" has delayed the induction of a student that would otherwise have been accomplished.

This interpretation is dead wrong--although it probably will not be challenged in court until, at least, next summer (perhaps, by one of you). Even assuming a student's 1-S(C) is a "reclassification," no board member can correctly characterize the student as one "who would have been ordered to report for induction except for delays due to a ... reclassification. ..." This fact should be transparently clear from the very nature of the 1-S(C): A student cannot even qualify for the 1-S(C), unless he has actually received an induction order. Therefore, he could never be characterized as one who "would have been" ordered to report. By definition the student has, in fact, been ordered to report: and this definition excludes the student from the specific terms of the proviso.

If your board mistakenly springs the "stalling" trap on you next year after your 1-S(C) expires, consult a lawyer immediately. Your board will have acted in a "blatantly lawless" manner, and you should be able to get into court and enjoin your induction. (In future columns we will have much more to say about the availability of preinduction judicial relief.)

The next column will discuss one last handicap facing the student who gambles on the lottery. Even though he does not seek a II-S, his board may, nevertheless, classify him II-S. This potential difficulty requires special attention.

Must sell: '62 Mercury Meteor  
\$175. Phone 332-0561,  
after 8 p.m. or leave word.