

stand still, maintaining an uneasy status quo in their totally inadequate standards of living.

has no more than thirty years millions upon millions of people would be starving, with some

could only do it by quantum changes in their foreign policies, permitting them the closest co-

Letters to the Editor of The Times

Charter of Status Quo To the Editor:

Whatever Senator Everett Dirksen's motives may be in quietly organizing a constitutional convention, they hardly justify the central (and revealing) assertion of your April 6 editorial that "the nation has too many problems as it is without trying to rewrite the Constitution."

The fact is that increasing numbers of Americans are beginning to realize that this country's problems are inextricably bound up with its constitutional framework which may have served an eighteenth-century Arcadian society, has little or no bearing on twentieth-century political and economic realities. The sooner that the great majority of Americans begin to question the archaic constitutional framework that is victimizing them in one way or another, the sooner they will be equipping themselves to solve America's problems.

Therefore we should welcome Mr. Dirksen's attempt. If successful, it is likely to have effects that reactionaries like himself can conceive of only in their nightmares. Just as Louis XVI's convocation of the Estates General in 1789 led to the overthrow of the monarchy it was supposed to buttress, so Mr. Dirksen's staging of a constitutional convention—unprecedented, as you pointed out, and with the potential of making last summer's Chicago seem like a picnic—could be an important step toward the overthrow of the status quo it is designed to reinforce.

It really would be nothing new; history is full of such ironies, to which doomed social orders—Mr. Dirksen's no less than Louis XVI's—seem particularly susceptible.

TIMOTHY YOHN
New York, April 14, 1969

Communist Conference To the Editor:

As the Soviets doggedly continue trying to convene a world Communist conference against Chinese opposition, it is interesting to recall that six years ago the Chinese were pressing for a world conference and the Soviets were backing away.

In January 1963, the Chinese wanted a world meeting at which to air their charges that the Soviets were committing "modern revisionism" and other sins. The Soviets agreed in principle to a world conference, but insisted that "proper preparation" was needed.

On Feb. 21, 1963, they wrote to the Chinese to suggest that a bilateral meeting be held to iron out their differences. Such a meeting, they said, could prepare for a larger conference of Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Chinese replied on March 9, welcoming the Soviet letter and the "definite approval" by the Soviets of a world conference of Communist parties. The Soviet answer, on March 30, expressed gratification at the Chinese acceptance of a bilateral meeting.

Arrangements for the meeting went forward through diplomatic channels, and in May the Chinese agreed to come to Moscow on July 5. Meanwhile, on June 14, they continued the correspondence with a letter that laid down the law to the Soviets so offensively that it has been called "a declaration of political war."

The letter set off a major public brawl: the Soviets refused to publish it, the Chinese sent five members of their Moscow embassy staff to distribute copies around town, and the Soviets expelled the five.

After that it was small-won-

der that the July meeting accomplished nothing, except that both sides reversed their strategy: The Soviets, having seen that they could do nothing with the Chinese on a head-to-head basis, changed in September 1963 into a meeting to calling for one meeting to outlaw "facionalism," and to quarantine, if not excommunicate, the Chinese unless they mended their ways.

This posed a risk the Chinese didn't feel like taking, and they went all-out to oppose the conference.

After several ill-tempered letters had gone back and forth on the above positions, the Chinese ended the correspondence on May 7, 1964. They were entirely willing to have an international meeting for "unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism," but "ample preparations" were necessary. "Judging by present circumstances, it may require perhaps four or five years, or even longer, to complete these preparations."

As it turned out, they were right. David C. LEVINE
Washington, April 14, 1969
The writer is author of "The Rift," an analysis of the Sino-Soviet dispute.

Inequities of Draft

To the Editor:
The present Selective Service System is grossly inequitable. A system of universal military training for every young man would eliminate these inequities, and would provide the nation with adequate reserves of trained manpower at a minimum of cost financially, and a minimum of interference in the life of the individual.

The shocking number of desertions from the armed services is just another manifestation of the failure of the current system. [Editorial May 2.]

Were each youth required to serve for a period of eighteen months to two years immediately upon completion of high school (or at the equivalent age), the cost to the Government in allowances for dependents would be minimal since few would be married.

The colleges and industry would be assured (barring on all-out war) that there would be no interruption of scholastic study or of regular employment. This would be highly beneficial to the economy of the nation. But, above all, it would be a truly democratic means of providing the necessary manpower for our defense structure.

It is time that the Congress enacted the legislation necessary to give this nation a truly democratic system of universal military training.
J. GARDNER CROWELL
Riverton, N. J., April 17, 1969

U.S. on Pacific Island

To the Editor:
In 1947 the United States granted the United States Trusteehip Agreement, a group of islands in the South Pacific, and granted a free hand in directing Micronesian affairs. For nearly twenty years the United States governed without establishing much in the way of long- or short-range programs. A \$7-million budget was consumed mainly by salaries of American administrators. A few years ago the budget ceiling began to rise. It has reached nearly \$40 million. Why the sudden change?

In an article in the April Foreign Affairs Quarterly, Philip W. Quigg states, "By coincidence" which does not escape the notice of Micronesians, a change in this philosophy occurred as the war in Vietnam began to escalate and as the Japanese heightened the pres-

sure to force us out of Okinawa." Under Article 5 of the U.S. Trusteehip Agreement the administering authority (U.S.) is entitled "1) to establish naval, military and air bases and to erect fortifications; 2) to station and employ armed forces in the territory." This for the sake of "international peace and security."

On March 31, Lieut. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, requested the use of land in Palau (the southwesternmost island chain in Micronesia), explaining that a training base for marines might be needed. In private conversation he confided that Palau's proximity to Vietnam made its swamps greener.

As the United States begins losing its military foothold in the Pacific (Okinawa and the Philippines), it must examine the necessity for widespread control there. Assuming that peace and withdrawal are the objectives in Vietnam, why does the military insist on training its men as close to the action as possible? There is no dense jungle in Palau, certainly nothing more similar to Vietnamese terrain than a Florida swamp. The answer most likely is the military establishment's desire to maintain a force base in the Pacific, even after the war's termination. Surely Guam is firmly ours (at present many people there are aiming at statehood), and would seem to fit the bill. But the military insists on a wider scale of operation.

In Micronesia the United States plays its standard world dual role, and suffers accordingly. On one hand we offer aid in economic progress and aid in the military establishment's desire to maintain a force base in the Pacific, until we stand to make substantial, practical gain, to implement that aid. The Department of Defense may be somewhat surprised to find out that the Palau Legislature has recently voted to reject the planned marine base. Although the Legislature has no power over the Defense Department, it may put a damper on the project.
CHARLES FARNSWORTH
Peace Corps Volunteer
Koror, Palau, April 16, 1969

Role for Foundations

To the Editor:
An editorial appearing in the April 27 Times charges that the Center for Community Change is a political creature of the Kennedy family and therefore unworthy of foundation support.

It also refers to the directors of the Center personally in a way that I can only read as challenging my independence and integrity as chairman of the board, and that of eighteen other directors who serve for public reasons without political motive.

I believe that the references to the Center and its directors in the editorial are both unfair and inaccurate.

The Center was put together after months of hard work as a means of achieving stronger administrative controls over a number of existing and contemplated projects. These include a Citizens' Advocate Center in Washington; a New York technical assistance program under Mrs. Hortense Gabel; leadership training, manpower and economic development programs in six poverty areas; and a community press which has already published a highly regarded report on hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

These programs should be judged on their own merits, and the Center will be glad to cooperate with any research The Times wishes to do concerning

them. None of the projects is in any way engaged in partisan politics, as suggested by the editorial; unless it is partisan politics to try to meet effectively the problems of poverty and despair.

The Center shares a common purpose with the Robert Kennedy Memorial to help create institutions through which people can deal with their own problems—but the two organizations are entirely separate and independent of each other. There is no truth to the assertion that the "research findings are funneled into the statements of Senator Edward M. Kennedy," although, of course, all of the Center's findings are as available to Senators as to other members of the public.

I am proud of my own past work for President Kennedy, and the glorious opportunity it gave me to share the friendship of Robert Kennedy and other members of the Kennedy family. But your editorial necessarily suggests that that kind of past either disqualifies someone like myself from serving on the board of a private charitable agency, or makes the agency ineligible for foundation support.

I think that that suggestion not only does a disservice to the Center and to the trustees of the Ford Foundation who approved the grant to the Center, but also leads inevitably to the conclusion that foundations should stop the creative role they have recently undertaken, and return to the safety and comfort of unrestricted grants to major established universities and other institutions that will not contribute to change.

BURKE MARSHALL
Armonk, N. Y., April 28, 1969
The writer is a former Assistant Attorney General in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

The Case for DDT

To the Editor:
Your April 20 editorial "Twilight for DDT" repeats the arguments the Times has previously voiced against it. While acknowledging that DDT has been "spectacularly effective" you add that "for some of the purposes for which DDT has been used, safer substitutes are available" and conclude that DDT should be banned.

What your editorial did not say is that for DDT's principal use as a weapon in the world-wide malaria eradication campaign there is no available substitute which would permit the continuation of these programs of the U.S. Public Health Service and the World Health Organization.

These programs not only have resulted in saving millions of lives each year, but have contributed to a rising standard of human and economic health in countries where populations, once too debilitated by disease to more than subsist, now can lead useful, productive lives.

The proponents of DDT are just now presenting their case in Wisconsin. We would hope that The Times would wait until all the evidence is in.

SAMUEL ROTROSEN
Chairman, Industry Task Force for DDT
Newark, May 1, 1969

Issue at Cornell

To the Editor:
With reference to Tom Wicker's Sunday column [April 27], may I reply to his endorsement of the "official" Cornell University explanation of the capitulation to the demands of black students. I would not have resigned my professorship and chairmanship had the issue been, as Wicker so simply poses, "humanity above principle."

President Perkins had viable options, also not leading to violence, other than complete capitulation. The official excuse for importation of firearms by black students in the seized buildings was their fear of an assault on them by white students. Any assault could have been rendered impossible by police cordoning off the building, leaving the black students in the building but requiring them to surrender their firearms.

The faculty reversal on Wednesday was not made in primary response to the peaceful sit-in of several thousands of students at Barton Hall, which would imply faculty willingness to go along with student opinion pure and simple. The real picture is rather different. The Afro-American Society leader had given the university "three hours to live," had threatened four administrators and three faculty by name

over the radio, and clearly intended to have his group engage in aggressive action on the campus if the faculty did not reverse itself. The S.D.S. left no doubt of its intention to occupy one or more buildings. More than a score of faculty had pledged themselves to occupy a building if the faculty vote did not nullify the judicial penalties.

Under these conditions, the presence of thousands of students in Barton Hall aggravated the coercion level decisively, since none could predict how many of them would join the other named groups in building seizures or worse. On Monday, recall, the faculty refused to call a Friday meeting in a "free and nonpressurized context"; it was the above context that massed coercion and certain force that compelled the faculty to meet on Wednesday instead and to reverse its Monday vote.

The events of this past week are but one part of a pattern over the past eighteen months of the incapacity of the Perkins administration to contain and resist coercion-based demands. Militant student groups have rightly concluded that this is the sure way to extract concessions. Given the ideology of these groups, and their insistence on "cleansing" the campus of all vestiges of what they call "institutional racism" and the "military-industrial complex," no academic freedom is maintainable. These are the issues, Mr. Wicker, and not "humanity above principle."

ALAN P. SINDLER
Professor and Chairman
Department of Government
Cornell, Resigned
Ithaca, N. Y., April 28, 1969

Student Militants

To the Editor:
It is becoming increasingly fashionable to compare our left-militant students with the militants of early Italian Fascism and early German National Socialism. This comparison is most unfortunate. Apart from being essentially inaccurate it seems calculated to frighten rather than to enlighten the public at large.

There is little, if any, similarity in the social origins of, on the one hand, the Students for a Democratic Society militants and on the other hand, the Italian squadristi and the German storm troopers. In their political organization, regimentation and style. The psychological motivations that trigger their behavior and actions are different. There is little similarity in the kinds of violence they advocate, prepare and practice; in the instruments of coercion to which they vent their wrath; in the protection and cooperation they receive from the police, the magistrates, and the Army; in the visions of the future society that they grope for; and in the books and pamphlets that feed their rebellious indignation and imagination.

Analogy is not identity. Sound analogic reflection requires attention to both similarities and differences. Especially those who are familiar with the paramilitarism of early Fascism and National Socialism; through either personal experience, observation, or study, have a solemn obligation to give as much attention to the fundamental dissimilarities as to the surface similarities between the organizations and consequences of first-hour Fascism and of today's New Left.

And if close examination reveals—as I believe it does—that the dissimilarities decisively outweigh the similarities,



Drawn in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat