

# south africa demonstration

Minneapolis, Minn.

On May 27, J. C. Van Rooy, the "cultural attache" of the South African embassy spoke to about 300 to 400 students at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis. Mr. Rooy had been invited by the "liberal" student government to participate in a symposium on "Emerging Africa." The University chapter of the SDS helped initiate a protest demonstration. The SDS was joined by the African Student Association and the campus Students for Integration (SFI).

A few days before the speech and protest, 200 printed posters reading "Don't Always Leave the Protest of Injustice to Someone Else . . ." were placed in strategic points of the campus. Attempts were made to get a counter-speaker but there wasn't enough time. Complaints about Mr. Rooy's credentials as "an educational speaker" were also directed toward the student sponsors through the campus newspaper. The campus was fairly aware of the controversy surrounding Apartheid's practices because a few weeks before the *Daily* ran various SDS columns on the subject and letters-to-the-editor from the six or so white

South Africans on campus.

The demonstration took the form of a picket in front of the meeting hall. The 50 to 60 people who participated in the demonstration represented a broad cross-section of the campus. (The fact that one participant was wearing a fraternity jacket testifies to the legitimacy of the Apartheid issue). Both American and African Negroes were represented and several African students wore their colorful native dress. The clearly lettered signs read: "Apartheid Denies the Brotherhood of Man," "The West Profits From Black Misery," and so on. The African issue was linked with domestic protest through such slogans as "We Shall Overcome Apartheid." The picket line participants spontaneously decided to risk arrest and enter the speaking hall with their signs and leaflets. Throughout Mr. Rooy's entire speech, demonstrators lined the back wall of the auditorium. The audience asked very embarrassing questions of the speaker and when he finished his apology for Apartheid's racist policies many members of the audience joined the demonstrators in singing the international verses of "We Shall Over-

come!" One thousand printed leaflets on Apartheid's crimes against humanity and corporate capitalism's role in the South African economy were distributed inside and outside of the auditorium. The material was taken from C. E. Wilson's article on "American Interests in South Africa" in the February issue of *Liberation*.

The participants generally agreed that the

demonstration, though small, was one of the better protests held on this campus. Our success at getting our side of the issue to the campus seemed, in part, dependent on the quality of our protest. Specifically, the professionally printed handbill was accepted more readily than previously used mimeographed leaflets.

Brian Coyle



VOL. 1, NO. 21

let the people decide

JUNE 10, 1966

## discussion on students and draft

Chicago, Ill.

I was very surprised to see that some SDS members were taken in by McNamara's proposed "universal service" plan. This is not "a draft program that SDS has been recommending." And rather than have a "nationwide massive letter-writing campaign" in favor of it, I would hope that we could issue a statement unequivocally denouncing it, for the following reasons:

1. The fact that it still would not allow the individual to choose. The government would still decide how many people they could afford to have in the Peace Corps or Vista, and if the quota was filled, one of draft age would have no choice other than entering the army or going to jail.

2. That we find extremely repugnant the idea of up to 20 million young Americans being under government discipline. This would very clearly act to stifle dissent.

3. That SDS's "build not burn" proposal involved the right of the individual to involve himself in activities contributing to building a democratic America. That SDS is not interested in serving the needs of American foreign policy abroad by encouraging people to enter the Peace Corps as an alternative to the army, since the Peace Corps presently helps put a liberal facade over the objectively counterrevolutionary

role of America in the underdeveloped world. Neither, I would hope, are large numbers of us willing to enter government projects such as VISTA, helping to make enough token concessions to make the world think that America is truly engaged in a "war on poverty" when in fact this is a deception and any meaningful gains will have to come from organizing outside the framework of the government's "war." Both the Peace Corps and Vista project nice public images for America and help to build American prestige. Personally, I'm not interested in helping America regain the prestige she rightfully lost for her actions both here and abroad. I'm interested in changing the conditions which allowed these actions in the first place.

4. That the coercive nature of the draft cannot be nullified by making that coercion apply to everyone. We shouldn't be interested in making the undemocratic aspects of our society apply more equally to everyone.

5. That we are not interested in making it easier and more efficient for America to pursue its war against the people of Vietnam.

6. And lastly, that since we believe that people have a right to make the decisions vitally effecting their own lives, that we call for no draft at all, believing that the state has no right to force individuals to fight and die and kill against their will. If America wants to fight a war in Vietnam, let her try and get volunteers for it. (Ha!) The "build not burn" statement said that we felt that our generation could perform more useful tasks than burning villages. But I don't think we should place ourselves in the position of constantly having to justify ourselves by saying "Well, what we're doing is more useful," escaping the fact that anything is more useful than fighting in a counterrevolutionary war, that individuals have the right of just simply living their daily lives uninterrupted, without doing anything "useful". And we should assuredly

denounce the concept that we owe two years of our life to the American government.

The difference, in my mind, between the liberal and the radical is that the liberal essentially accepts as legitimate both the assumptions and the needs of the established power structure, while the radical advances proposals based upon his own assumptions and values. That is why I'm not interested in telling Mr. McNamara how to achieve a more democratic and equitable draft because I don't want a draft at all. That's why I'm not interested in Senator Gaylord Nelson's proposal for a highly paid professional army, eliminating the "need" for a draft -- because I'm not interested in an army at all. Enough of the lesser evil, enough of apologizing that "we appear perhaps too often to have only positions against" and must now show that "we are not exclusively protesters," for in the midst of a relativist America the most valuable function we can perform is to carefully delineate our values and assumptions, making them explicit without regard for how "we appear." In the words of a sign carried in Brooklyn, friends, NO TEST, NO RANK, NO DEFEREMENT, NO DRAFT, NO ARMY, NO WAR.

Bernard Farber

### anti-mcnamara

### moral stand

The following article was taken from the discussion papers written for the Queens College Chapter of SDS when they held a conference recently. I felt that it is representative of a viewpoint which I have heard within SDS about the draft and therefore included it in this issue.

Eliot Linzer

On the issue of the draft, it is possible to take any of a number of positions, all "against the draft."

The position of most SDS members, and the SDS leadership has been to "dodge" or "evade" the draft. The position I, most pacifists, and many non-pacifists, have taken is one of "confronting" the draft. Most SDS people want to keep their student deferments at whatever the cost. If they lose their II-S, or if they leave school, they will engage in various means of deception to get a IV-F or I-Y.

Most SDS members look upon the draft as an elitist system, especially the student deferment, and justly so. But how many are willing to make a definite break with the system they look upon as being so obnoxious? It's easy to oppose a system when it works against you (it's easy to oppose grades when you're a poor student), but it's another thing to oppose it when it puts you in an advantageous position. How many SDS members are giving up their student deferments voluntarily?

We're all against picking and choosing among students. We're all against the draft exams, and the giving of grades and class standings to draft boards. We're all against the University cooperating with the Selective Service System. Now what are we for? The Du Bois Clubs has come out in favor of preserving II-S. Most SDS members, by

their actions, if not by their words, have indicated that they want II-S, or at least their II-S retained. A more logical position would be that the draft itself ought to be done away with, or, if the draft is to be preserved, II-S, and all other deferments should be eliminated. If you already believe this, then the only consistent action the individual can take would be either to stop cooperating with the draft entirely, or at least give up one's own advantage.

Some SDS members have applied for Conscientious Objector status simply for the purpose of "screwing up the system." Some have stated privately that if they're turned down, which they expect, they would accept induction into the armed forces. They're applying for C.O. status just to delay by one year the time when they actually have to make the choice between army and prison.

I'm not advocating that we should all try to get ourselves put behind bars. In certain situations it might work, but the draft is not one of them. Certainly nobody wants to go to prison. The time one might spend in prison is just as wasted as the time one might spend in the army. What I'm saying is this: be consistent, and make your actions reflect your beliefs. If one supports this war, or if one feels that a military institution is necessary to defend democracy, then one should certainly enlist. But if one has serious doubts about this war, and about the very usefulness of any international war; if one feels that war can no longer be used as an instrument of foreign policy, then one should engage in as dramatic a break with the military as one feels capable of doing.

I am giving up my student deferment, and I'm a step closer to prison because of it. I urge all other SDS members to do the same, or commit themselves in a similar manner.

### hard line

Recent discussions of the draft have emphasized the discrimination against the poor and the poorly educated which is built into the current system. But almost wholly overlooked has been the basic fact that the draft--any draft--is inherently unfair and undemocratic. Not even the currently advanced program of a national lottery which presumably eliminates the privileges which now accompany wealth and/or education confronts the reality that a draft compels some people to perform military service whether or not they want to. Consequently while a national lottery may make the current practice of the draft less unfair to the poor in our country, all that really will have happened if it is adopted is that the effects of this undemocratic institution will have been more evenly distributed--not eliminated.

Even the principle of "build not burn" in governing the type of service to be performed begs this question. It is fine for us as members of the New Left to search for an alternative form of service and find one existing precisely in the type of activity in which we are interested. But do we really want to concede that the government has a legitimate claim to two or three years of our lives? Do we want to concede that everyone at a specified age must commit him-

self to an acceptable means of "building" or "burning"? Do we want to argue that there really is no legitimacy to a person's "building" in his own way, whether or not the government approves or sponsors.

It may well be as Paul Lauder argues that "...a simple 'end the draft' campaign is neither practical nor very useful from the point of view of SDS." But this tactical consideration should not obscure the fact that no means of appropriating the services of individuals for any kind of activity should be acceptable. In particular we should not forget that the real meaning of a military draft is that the leadership of a society has undertaken foreign policy commitments which it believes requires an army larger than volunteers would provide. The draft means that such a foreign policy has been chosen over the democratic practice of a wholly voluntary force. What we should argue for is first a commitment to democracy and then a foreign policy which limits itself to the resources thus provided. This basic principle of foreign policy having priority over democracy will have been accepted if we advocate tacking on to the draft a mechanism of alternative service or of wider dispersion of compulsory service.

--Joan D. Mandel

--Jay R. Mandel

### nac minutes

The NAC met and had three or four members present. Attending were Bob Speck, Paul Booth, Lee Webb, and sometime later -- Arlyn Weissman.

STAFF - Walt Kelly is leaving us and going back to school. We need a replacement for him. The job includes doing all the dirty work of mailing NLN, sending out the literature, and filling information requests. Tom Condit

was hired for two weeks to work on changing addresses for the membership file and NLN for the summer. Nick Jones is going to California.

FINANCES -- As usual we are broke and in debt. Booth, Weissman, and Le Blanc are working on fund-raising. The lack of funds hampers any attempt to publish literature.

# national council working papers

## on convention document

by C. Clark Kissinger, member at-large, SDS NC

At the Spring meeting of the National Council in Yellow Springs, Ohio, there was a discussion of preparations for the annual National Convention of SDS. The only substantive point of contention was whether or not the convention should undertake the production of a major organizational statement. The *Port Huron Statement* was produced in 1962 and *America and the New Era* was produced in 1963. Since that time, SDS as an organization has produced no substantive statement of its thought, analysis, or program, and has consciously avoided doing so since the abject failure of the 1964 Convention to agree on a programmatic document.

I argued at the Spring National Council meeting and argue again now that it is imperative that SDS lift its de facto ban on the written word. We no longer constitute the children of apathy — we are in fact the children of activism. The task now is not the motivation of young people to act, but rather posing rational analyses and programs for the thousands motivated already. In the short period of its existence, the most striking failure of the new left has been its failure to politically educate the thousands of activists which its moral power and activities have created. And many of the political and organizational problems which we currently face stem directly from our failure to disseminate the enormous reservoir of political knowledge which exists compartmentalized in the minds of the hundreds of young scholars, organizers, and activists who constitute the core of our movement.

Political knowledge in SDS is simply not shared. In the school year 63-64, most of us were convinced of the urgency and possibility of organizing an inter-racial movement

of the poor of political significance. To that end hundreds of young SDS's went to work in community organizing projects in the urban North. What has become of the ERAP program? What have we learned? How do those who conceived the program now evaluate its future? If you are a new member of SDS in a typical campus chapter, you may never know.

In 1962 there was a wave of "peace candidates" in congressional and senatorial races across the country. Paul Booth wrote an exhaustive study of the effectiveness of the peace candidate strategy. 99% of SDS's members have never seen it, and will have to repeat yesterday's mistakes anew.

SDS's March on Washington, April 17, 1965, represented a major turning point in the history of the American peace movement. It provoked a bitter debate and schism in the peace movement similar to the effect of the MFDP challenge at Atlantic City on the civil rights movement. Yet, to this day the majority of SDS's membership remain ignorant of issues in that debate.

A dozen more examples could be cited. And the cumulative effect is roughly analogous to the workings of capitalism: Those who have been around a long time, who travel, and who direct programs and projects become the entrenched monopolistic owners of analysis and know-how. Simultaneously, the increasing membership becomes increasing intellectually pauperized. In the long run the Radical Education Project is designed to meet just this problem, but in the short run a hell of a lot of people (including myself) could benefit from a concise statement of values, analysis, and programmatic thought of SDS. An awful lot of people are frankly looking for direction and program. For example, one reason why it is so difficult to formulate general programs for the anti-war movement is because there is no generally accepted analysis of the war or analysis of how domestic social change is to be accomplished.

Both because of the prestige of SDS and because of the simple fact that we have a

lot of good things to say, a statement by SDS at this time could go a long way towards bringing coherence to the American left. Such a statement would not be intended to replace the PHS, which now belongs to history anyhow, but rather would attempt to summarize what we have learned in the intervening years. Like all SDS statements it would be neither a manifesto nor a binding creed. It would attempt to summarize that which we hold in common and it would attempt to point to the new directions which we see from the vantage point of the present.

While I would attempt neither an outline nor a draft of such a statement, I can list the things I think it should emphasize. I would see the bulk of the statement explicating the three corner stones of the new left: our analysis of who controls America and how, our analysis of the international situation and role played in it by America, and our analysis of the dynamics of a healthy movement for basic social change in America.

Collectively, the young scholar-organizers of the new left possess the most penetrating analysis available of the operations of power in America. The mosaic of power taking in the great corporations, the ward heeler, the news media, the labor unions, the Justice Department, the state legislators, the Hubert Humphreys, the war, and war on poverty operating within the framework of the Johnson consensus unfolds itself every day. The analysis begun in *America and New Era*, where the term "liberal corporatism" was coined, has been highly justified and now deserves a basic restatement. It is imperative that we understand not only in whose interests the establishment governments, but also the world view and ideology held by those who exercise power in America.

While we have recognized from the beginning the essentially self-interest nature of American foreign policy and its frequent subservience to the interests of private corporations, the logical extension of that kind of foreign policy never really flowered until the present war in Vietnam. The resulting and seemingly endless human misery caused by our own government now forces us to re-evaluate our own rather academic attitudes toward the cold war and our attitudes towards the revolutions that are (as opposed to the revolutions we might like to see). We need to state clearly the basically counter-revolutionary role played by our country in an impoverished world, and the way in which that role grows directly from the attitudes and interests of those who exercise power in America.

And we need to say a lot about organization and movements. Perhaps no subject has been more discussed and less written about than our ideas on the internal life and character of social movements. We have debated about democracy, bureau-

cracy, salaries, women, voting, privacy, parliamentary procedure, work, elitism, discipline, vocations, sitting in circles, sex, offices, communes, leadership, race, love, and pot — to name a few. But the basic theme is the same: the character of the future society is determined by the character of the movement which forges it, and it doesn't make any difference how good your analysis and program are if you have a movement that alienates people. It is in this area that I think the new left has made its greatest contributions.

But beyond these three corner stones I think some new departures are in order. First, I think we ought to be a lot more explicit about the kind of society we are working for. And in recognizing that the implementation of our values can only be accomplished over the dead body of the private corporate economy we ought to acknowledge that our program is basically socialist. Second, I think we ought to acknowledge the fact that we aren't the first Americans to ever pose the idea of a better and radically different society. That we stand in the tradition of the Populist, Wobbly, Socialist, Progressive and Communist movements, and our task is to succeed where they failed. Third, for the first time we ought to talk about the necessity for discipline. We ought to describe the kind of self-discipline and commitment that our values and analysis dictate. For when we act irresponsibly, it is not we who pay the price — it is the child in Vietnam, the peasant in Latin America, the teenager in the urban ghetto.

And for the record we should make a basic restatement of our values and our commitment to a democracy of participation. We should restate what we have learned from history about the inherent dangers in massive centralized planning and control — be it capitalist or socialist. What we have learned from the failures of democracy in trade unions and Communist movements. And what we have learned about the positive values of intellectual freedom, pluralism, and a libertarian approach to structure.

Finally we have to say something specific about immediate program. SDS ought to come out and say just who it thinks can at this time be organized to do what around which issues. Some rational judgement should be made about where we think it is important for people to be working. (Or do we think all programs for social change are equally valid?) We ought to state specific criteria for the kind of community organizing, anti-war, and electoral activity we would like to see. And finally we ought to state just what role we see for SDS as an organization in the movement for basic social change in America.

I hope this spelling out of one person's ideas will provoke others to do the same, and in particular I hope the June meeting of the National Council will take seriously the commitment of the last meeting to see the National Convention produce a new statement.

## on labor project

The SDS Labor Project

by Stanley Arnowitz

The past six months have been fruitful for raising the question of the relationship between students and labor in a new way. No longer merely a subject for an SDS workshop at convention or NC meetings, the problem is being worked out on the picket line—in the New York and Chicago welfare strikes, the California (and now Texas) agricultural workers strikes, hospital and cafeteria organizing campaigns in many campus communities and others largely unknown (at least to me). The UE wants students to go into shops in the New York and Mass. area, other unions are picking up various young radicals and putting them on the staff (Williams for the IUE, Brandon for AFSCME, young Prosten in the IUD); district 65 courts the students for inside organizing work in department stores and a whole new area of "career" opportunities in the labor movement seems to be opening up.

The time is here for those attracted by the idea of entering the labor movement either as organizers, staff people, in research and education, or as shop workers to examine their objectives carefully lest the experience result either in dissolution because too much is expected from the labor movement (an ironic twist from recent times when the militancy of the civil rights movement confronted a conservative trade union leadership which failed to measure up and was written off by large sections of young radicals), or the possibility that finding the unions less bureaucratic than expected and sometimes even engaged in serious and worthwhile struggles for workers gains, students become completely absorbed in the problems of actually building the union and forget their radical purposes for being there.

I am mindful of the fact that the study of history often appears the least relevant of all the intellectual pursuits for new left radicals. Nevertheless, I am constrained by the sudden increase of interest in labor by many students to attempt some extrapolation from the experiences of previous generations of radicals in order to better elucidate some principles relating to the radical's role in the labor movement. The most instructive period when large numbers of radicals en-

tered the labor movement was the late thirties and early forties.

During this period, Communists and Socialists alike became stalwart organizers of the burgeoning industrial Union movement led by John L. Lewis in the CIO. They accepted the concept that the Wagner Act under which labor was "given" the right to organize according to specified government supervised procedures was beneficent and in the interest of the workers. They perceived that the role of the radicals had to be to aid the liberal trade union leadership of the CIO to build its base, since these leaders armed with a mass constituency would now become a valuable ally of the forces of light against the Hitlerite forces of darkness and despair. Moreover, anybody could justify building the unions on the grounds that the workers would actually be "better off" within the CIO, if measured by present economic standards. The CIO was "militant", i. e. it organized all the workers within a given industry and did not hesitate in most cases to strike for union recognition. Many of these strike battles were dramatic and excited the romantic idealism of young radicals looking to fight the class war on a simulated barricade.

Yet in a few short years after the initial organizing upsurge, most left wingers had, by 1948, been extirpated from labor's ranks, or had completely surrendered their radicalism (even in its distorted CP form) in order to remain on the Union's staff or as a rank and file leader within the shop. The CIO literally used the energies of young radicals to build their power within the Roosevelt New Deal coalition (which was converted intact to the Truman anti-communist cold war coalition, including liberals). When the job was done the radicals were given few choices—surrender your beliefs or get out. However, the left had already put up a last ditch battle and finally got out.

Most of those whose stomachs were not yet hardened to the requirements of militant anti-communism put up a last ditch battle and finally got out. However, the left had already laid the basis for its own destruction during that great period of the emergence of labor's new millions. How?

The first error of the radicals was their failure to build an independent base for their own ideas. Even more basic, most of them did not have ideas which could be distinguished from those of Lewis and Hillman as far as trade union practice was concerned. In other words to be a radical in the years under review the major requirement was an abstract belief in socialism, an anti-war position, an anti-fascist viewpoint and a fervent faith in the efficacy of industrial unionism as the workers salvation. Rarely, if ever was the question of worker's control raised as a major objective of trade union struggles. Only the Trotskyists and a few radicals on the periphery of the left even discussed this issue in practical terms. The objective or trade union organizing was seen most within the traditional framework: strike for union recognition in order to get a contract which set forth certain wages, benefits and conditions of work. The problem of control of capitalism's institutions was looked upon as a long range question almost out of sight. Even granting the fact that the establishment of unions bargaining rights within the plant constituted the first practical task, radical responsibility for raising transcendent perspectives was never met. Everybody was always too busy with grinding out the next plant gate leaflet, or conducting the strike, or negotiating the contract.

Anyone asking the question about what the role of the union could be in terms of modifying the operations of the economic system so as to provide for a greater voice for the workers, examining the role of the federal government in strengthening the

power of the large corporations (or conversely in limiting their power), the problems associated with the internal structure of the unions themselves, especially their democratic forms, the content of workers educational programs, whether the unions should support the New Deal and the Democratic party, and other issues of similar importance, was looked upon as a strident, disruptive force.

During World War II, these issues faded away into the background because everybody was straining to deliver the goods to our "brave fighting men" engaged in the holy war against the Nazis and the "yellow peril," Japan. Even more important, the left, which supported the war wholeheartedly used their still potent influence in the CIO to argue hotly that labor should honor a no strike pledge in order to guarantee full production for victory.

Meanwhile, back in the shops, the bosses were using this cooperative attitude by left and liberal union leaders to speed production, cut free time during working hours and hold the lid on wages. Profits soared but the leadership stood pat, limiting their fight against the glaring inequities to mild protests on government boards supervising production, prices and wages, where the "labor representative" would issue empty warnings about labor's thinning patience. Wildcat strikes which broke out in many defense industries were quickly broken by the combination of government and Union pressure except in a few cases, notably the strike of the Coal miners in 1943.

(Continued on page 3)

# letter to sncc

ED. NOTE: The following letter was sent to Stokely Carmichael, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and should be self-explanatory. We are printing it in line with our new policy of printing letters to and from the NO which we think the SDS membership should be aware of.

June 2, 1966

Stokely Carmichael  
Chairman, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee  
360 Nelson St.  
Atlanta, Georgia

Dear Stokely,

The current criticism of SNCC's assertion of a strategy of Black power is reminiscent of liberal criticisms of Populism; SNCC is portrayed as reverse racists, just as, in the 1950's liberal intellectuals saw Populism and McCarthyism as connected by "a straight line". This kind of misrepresentation reflects a deep problem -- the relation of the liberal community to movements for social change.

We have followed SNCC's evolution for years, learning from it, adapting its approaches in our own organizing efforts, and acting as allies when called upon to assist the struggle in the South. And as SNCC and the movements in which you work have taken more explicitly political approaches to organizing, we have welcomed this as a sign of the strength of those movements, and as evidence of real possibilities for social change. Black people organizing for political power in the Black Belt poses those possibilities on a level of seriousness that no legislation or lobbying drive could ever presume to match.

We are somewhat surprised to see liberal journals taken aback at talk of Black Power. But SDS has never gotten its politics from the New York Times. We know that if there wasn't a radical Negro movement around, then a community movement like JOIN in Chicago would be branded "a hillbilly mob" for saying that "poor folks gotta get power for their own kind" if they are going to end their poverty. I'm sure something similar was said of Mexican-Americans who took control of Crystal City in Texas.

The moral of all this is that the movement should continue to set its own priorities and timetable and style of work, and that its allies, those who say "we agree with your aims, but..." should take heed of C. Vann Woodward's advice on the subject of "The Populist Heritage and the Intellectual" -- "One must expect and even hope that there will be future upheavals to shock the seats of power and privilege and furnish the periodic therapy that seems necessary to the health of our democracy. But one cannot expect them to be any more decorous or seemly or rational than their predecessors..."

"For the tradition to endure, for the way to remain open, however, the intellectual must not be alienated from the sources of revolt... The intellectual must resist the impulse to identify all the irrational and evil forces he detests with such movements... He will learn all he can from the new criticism about the irrational and illiberal side of Populism and other reform movements, but he cannot afford to repudiate the heritage."

The heritage, at its best, embodied the understanding that oppressed people must organize for the power to determine the conditions of their lives. SNCC revived that heritage in the '60s, and the movements it brought into being best embody that heritage and its hopes in America today. SDS will continue to be an ally of SNCC by organizing to make our period the time when that vision of ordinary people determining their own destiny finally prevails.

Fraternally yours,  
Paul R. Booth  
National Secretary

## NEW LEFT NOTES

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1103 E. 63rd St., Chicago, Ill. 60637. Phone (312) 667-6050. Application to mail at second-class postage rates is pending at Chicago, Ill. Subscriptions: \$1 a year for members; \$5 a year for nonmembers. Signed articles and letters are the responsibility of the writer. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of the editor.

Editor, Speck

### STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Carl Oglesby, president; Jeffrey Shero, vice-president; and Paul Booth, national secretary.

National Office: 1103 E. 63rd St., Chicago, Ill. 60637; (312) 667-6050

New York City: 49 West 27th St., New York, N. Y. 10001;

(212) 889-5793

New England: 839 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.; (617) 547-5457

Southern California: 1132 Miramar, Los Angeles, Calif.; (213) 629-8218

Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif.; (415) 362-7922

VOL. 1, NO. 21 let the people decide JUNE 10, 1966

## free university of berkeley

Berkeley, Calif.

Throughout the country, today, students are engaged in projects striking at the heart of "Establishment" styles of education. Their creations, for the most part, are taking the form of "Free Universities," novel attempts at implementing new and vital forms of educational experience. The Free Universities, above all, are a hope -- demanding that the gap between education and life, thought and action be obliterated.

I believe SDS was lead to create the Radical Education Program out of the same needs and desires and to accomplish the same ends of unity in intellectual and political life. It is to coordinate these small independent educational reforms so that all may grow and share to form a real, counter, radical educational opportunity.

Berkeley now possesses a challenge to the Leviathan knowledge factory haunting this city. The Free University of Berkeley sits like a mighty David facing the huge, amorphous and deadly Goliath at its front. Of course, we do recognize that the "David" of modern education has a long road to travel; yet, its sting is already being felt. And the "authorities" have reacted in their predictable manner. Overzealous city inspectors have thrown innumerable obstacles in the path of this little giant. But even with all the harassment, inconvenience, and attacks, FUB represents a principle, a conceptual alternative to the impersonal, sterile, and fragmented knowledge doled out by the administrators of the modern University-corporation.

As you know these same Overzealous City Inspectors (or their brothers across the Bay)

treat the New School in San Francisco in the same manner. As a matter of coincidence (?) the Free University of New York and that of Palo Alto are rewarded by super-law-enforcement from the Fire Department also.

The indignation and frustration has been vitalized into a spreading sense of educational revolt; and, even more important, this enthusiasm in order to persist, and precipitate significant change, must be given a continuing physical reality. Currently, FUB is scouring the Berkeley country-side in search of a new home. However, while contending with the problem of being homeless, the people of the FUB community are preparing a summer session of classes, a program of interesting forums, and a Free University Journal and are trying to work with the SDS San Francisco RO to cooperate in formalizing the Bay Area educational summer project.

FUB welcomes anyone who plans to be in the Bay Area to enroll as a student and/or to teach a course in a topic of his own choosing. Also, of course, contributions of time or money are always needed and appreciated in a community of this nature.

I would like to see FUB and its counterparts succeed and flourish because in order to have a general overall revolution in education, we must nurture our small settlements of reform and grasp a handhold wherever possible. Then we can unite our resources and... And it is necessary to develop an understanding and framework for our political action if there is to be any action and if we are ever to attain the World we seek.

Gloria Polanski

## on labor project

(Continued from page 2)

Is it any wonder that when the left finally decided to make its fight after the war, they found few sympathizers among the rank and file, and, with some exceptions were effectively squelched in three or four years? They functioned as skilled organizers within the established trade union framework set by the liberals, reinforced the policies of that leadership and the federal government during the war, and failed to build a core of radical sympathy, on radical issues among the rank and file strong enough to resist the crackdown.

Now a new generation smelling the chance to be relevant and to be organizers too, are inspired not by the idea of industrial unionism but by the chance to organize the poor. They look to the labor movement as one vehicle in advancing their goal. I agree.

All I am saying is that the crucial thing about the unions is the same as the political action arena: it is one more place to build a radical constituency. But to achieve this goal,

one must examine the history and social role of the labor movement within corporate society and be prepared to fashion an alternative role. Our vision, a society based upon popular control of economic social and political institutions and against the cooptative function played by central bureaucracies within federal, and local governments in order to safeguard the rule of elites extends to what we do within the trade unions.

In order to function as a radical within any institution, one should see the task in primarily educational terms. The primary work is among ordinary people--the rank and file. Each individual will decide where best he can do the job, whether it be on a union's staff or in the shop, office or profession. But the crucial thing is to remember what Santayana said, "Those who do not know history are doomed to relive it." There is nothing sacred about organizing. The question is always "organizing for what and for whom."

# regional conferences announced

## great plains:

ED. NOTE: The following plan (proposal) was sent in by Jane Adams, regional traveller in the Midwest Regional Organizing Committee, otherwise known as the Great Plains Region (includes Kansas, Mo., Nebr., and Iowa).

### PROPOSAL FOR INSTITUTE

There's been a good bit of talk about the need for internal education, with perhaps an institute/conference site set up. At this time, such a center is unfeasible due to lack of funds and full time personnel. However, the need for intensive education is pressing. Therefore, the following proposal:

1. That people from all the sds chapters in the region draw up a curriculum of weekend sessions, to cover relevant areas of ignorance.
  2. That each chapter volunteer to organize one session a school term. This would be a bi-weekly institute which would draw from all over the region, mostly from those chapters close by.
  3. That resource people be recruited during the summer for fall term; during fall term for winter, etc. In this way we can begin to get some semblance of planning ahead and get people we want.
  4. That the host chapter draw up bibliography and gather reading materials to be distributed to participants before the session, and to others who want them. Also, summary and papers distributed afterwards. One session each month could include MROC meeting.
  5. That there be fees and pre-registration by participants.
- Model:

### ASPECTS OF BUILDING A MOVEMENT FIRST SESSION

#### I. INSTITUTIONS AND THE MOVEMENT

- \*Wk. 1 -- Labor (at Columbia)
- Wk. 2 -- Churches (at Kansas City)
- Wk. 3 -- Community organizing (at Drake)

#### II. INDIVIDUALS AND THE MOVEMENT

- \*Wk. 4 -- Negroes, Women, and other minorities (at KU)
- Wk. 5 -- Artists (Iowa City)
- Wk. 6 -- Journalists (at Lincoln)
- Wk. 7 -- Scientists (at Ames)
- Wk. 8 -- Movement vocations (at Grinnell)
- Wk. 9 -- Evaluation (at St. Louis)

\* denotes MROC meeting

Other possible topics:  
Utopian models (containing sessions on group interaction, education, participatory democracy, decentralization, etc.)

Analysis of society (power structure, international politics, man and machine, the city, the south, etc.)

History (farm-labor movements, philosophical bases, revolutions, etc.)

Third World (revolutions in, U.S. and, theory of development, etc.)

## chicago:

The Chicago region will have a membership conference on the weekend of June 25-26. The agenda is: Sat. 9:00-12:00, Power in America and Power in Chicago; 12:00-1:00, lunch; 1:00-4:00, Chicago Movement (SCLC, SNCC, WSO, etc.); 4:00-6:00, informal discussion groups. Sunday, 10:30-12:00, The University and the Anti-War movement; 12:00-1:00, lunch; 1:00-5:00, Plenary session to discuss the business of the region.

For more information or specifics, call or otherwise get in touch with Steve Baum, Chicago Regional Coordinator. Steve can be reached at (Phone number) 944-3624, or by going or writing to 2059 North Larrabee.

# nic&nac

## Kansas, Iowa, Nebr. Mo. Report

The regional meeting in Kansas City, Mo. this last weekend was poorly attended, as expected - everyone in finals. 4 people from Lincoln, 2 from KU, 3 from Topeka, none from Iowa, none from Columbia or St. Louis, and of course most of the KU chapter and some people from Wichita. A good solid discussion on what a movement is all about, what the functions of a chapter are, what a region should be, a feeling of frustration on the part of most of the people there about the inability to reach the hangers-on (which the majority of members are) in depth, etc. I thought it was healthy because we've been in that first flush of enthusiasm when everything's easy and you're going to change the world overnight, and now at least a good number of people are realizing that this just ain't so and it requires hard work and just what the hell are we about anyway? Out of which comes a level of commitment, which doesn't turn off when you get out of college. So some people are getting there, anyway. People really serious about internal education, turned on to the institute proposal, so I think that will really happen, and maybe even in a coordinated, pre-planned way.

Now, let me make some critical comments about the functioning of the NO, from feedback from people in the region:

1. The people in the NO are very unfriendly to strangers. A number of kids who have made special trips to Chicago to visit you have been turned off completely due to the cold reception given them. I can explain the way you're overworked, etc., but that is little more than a poor apology, cause I and others who know you are treated warmly and there is time found to talk. The feeling is that you all think you're too good for just a member who isn't in the inner sanctum.

2. Use of WATS line. Due to a confusion, the region has 7000 extra Vietnam tests, which somehow have to be paid for. Don Olson was told by someone in the NO that Iowa wanted 10,000 tests. No one in Iowa was told that Don would print them, since my understanding was that the printing would be divided between Pam and Don and the chapters would be informed as to who would print them - that the NO would coordinate that with the WATS line. Due partly to the fact that it was almost impossible to get the NO to return a collect call, and that people knew Pam's phone number, they called her and she sent tests up. So Don had those tests left over. I was kind of pissed, cause we don't have the money to pay for that. Also, it seems that the WATS line was inefficiently used. Let me suggest a logical system if you ever get one again: That 2 or 3 contacts be gotten from each chapter. These would be written up and pasted to the wall above the phone. A schedule would be made whereby each chapter would be called at a given time say once every three days (we used to call each of 36 projects 5 times a day in Miss., on schedule, so it is possible to do that). Free time would be allowed for emergency and non-scheduled calls. The schedule would be mimeographed and sent to the contact people so they would be at their phone when you called. That way you wouldn't have to ask me three times for the contacts in this region and wouldn't have to run the risks that collect calls entail and eliminate expensive errors in printing, etc.

3. The formation of the bureaucratic mind: I was told by a member that someone called him up on the phone and said "Hello this is SDS give me the contacts you had got from distributing the test" turned him off.

Members tend to feel themselves part of a joint effort and really resent being treated as digits. I think the hostility to the NO (and there is a good bit of it here) comes out of those kinds of reactions on the part of the people in the NO.

4. The physical state of the NO: Everyone I've talked with who's been to visit the NO has commented on how cruddy it is. Most of them feel that part of the quality of living is reflected in the environments people create around them. So the dirt and physical disorganization of the office reflects the unfriendliness and seeming uncaring the encounter in the people who work in the office. Get a good mop, some spik and span, some paint, some rags, brushes, etc., and clean the damned place up! Some kids here at Iowa City said if they ever went back to the office it would be with cleaning equipment and a contingent of people, that they

would throw everybody out, throw out half the paper in the place, and clean it. I mean, people feel strongly about that. Things like having phone numbers of frequently called people easily accessible, membership files where they can be used, etc. Several comments on how inefficiently the office is set up so that you have to spend half your time looking for things under piles of paper.

Anyway, people want a national office which they can feel a part of, which is a good place to work in for the people who work there, which reflects in some way the spirit of movement comradeship, etc. The WATS line could have been a great thing for building a sense of a national movement; instead, it made members feel even more that the NO is unresponsive to them, more isolated from the central office, etc. Very very bad. Take the criticisms and apply personally where needed.

So enough criticising. Will see you all probably either June 2 or the last week of June. Would be good if you paid Don for the paper for the extra tests printed. I'm so flat it's not funny, and just can't afford to do that, but he needs the money, and since it seems to be your muck-up, seems that's where financial responsibility ought to lie. Will try to round up some money to pay you our lit. debts.

Jane Adams

Dear Jane:

Thanks for the letter. I hope you folks make some contact with our brothers down there.

You raise some important points about the functioning of the national office; I hope that my comments here go some way to meeting your points.

Your point about the National Office being unfriendly to strangers is a telling one. I'm sure that it must seem so. The fellows from Nebraska were the only ones to get much attention at all of the people who have come in from far out of town. In part we aren't very well equipped to deal with outsiders because of small staff and heavy burden; we never do very well even dealing with local people who come in. Do you think we'd be better off with a Chicago area organizer operating out of the National Office (assuming that the political problems could be solved, and some arrangement could be made about mimeo equipment, etc.) and giving that person reception responsibility? The feeling about us feeling that there's no time for a member who isn't in the inner sanctum is, of course, unfortunate and misplaced; hell, the staff here isn't in the so-called inner sanctum group either with the exception of me and Speck. It's Nick Jones just down from N. Dakota and leaving soon; Paul Le Blanc fresh in from Pittsburgh, Art Rosenblum the printer, Aerlin Weissman who you know, Walt Kelly from U.C., and Bob and I.

About it being messy is a good point too . . . we do our best on that with an every couple of weeks blitz, but it just accumulates. Of course you were never on the staff during New Left Notes, so you don't have any first-hand experience with the physical effort involved every week in getting that thing out. In fact, there is every reason to believe that the messiness will increase considerably this summer because of the presence of a real live full time printer and four offset presses going all the time turning out a literature program (a real large quantity program, unlike anything you've ever seen). You needn't believe it until it comes into being. But the national office isn't run for the esthetic satisfaction of the rank-and-file, and I doubt that they would want it to be.

I think on the WATS line (which we don't have any more) we had a lot of problems that would be worked out and smoothed out once we had it for a while and didn't have to try to call the whole organization every couple days. People were treated brusquely because of the heavy burden on that little instrument; I'm sure Eric Chester and Sue Robbin - the WATS operators - had no intention to be brusque, but if you sit there 8 hours or 10 hours straight making phone calls it starts to get a little wearing . . . I'm sure you can understand that.

Your suggestion about regular phoning of chapters at fixed times is an excellent one; if we put WATS back in next fall I'm sure we'll adopt it.

Paul

New York, N.Y.

CHALK CIRCLE is a new radical magazine of the arts. Some of its main goals are to analyze the nature of American "culture" today and its repressive function in the corporate system, to begin defining the nature, aims and potentials of radical art within that culture, to establish and solidify connections between radical art and the movement, and to present artistic visions of meaningful reactions and alternatives to the present system. Both through analysis and art-work CHALK CIRCLE aims at becoming a forum in which radical consciousness in this country can express itself, understand itself and proselytize.

The first issue, which appeared in April, contained an essay by Peter Weiss, author of *Marat/Sade*, a new translation of a poem by Brecht, an essay by John Berger, author of the recently published *The Success and Failure of Picasso*, a play by Lee Baxandall, an editor of *Studies on the Left*, a translation of a poem by Andrei Voznesensky, and poetry by Martin Glass, of the West Side Committee for Independent Political Action. There were also drawings, woodcuts and photographs.

The second issue is nearly ready to go to press. We welcome poems, plays, short stories, parts of novels, articles relating to art and culture, critical essays, photographs and drawings. Those interested in contributing should send in their material immediately, to CHALK CIRCLE, Post Office Box 2859, Grand Central Station, New York 10017. Those in the NYC area who would like to help out on the production end should get in touch.

-Martin Glass

Just out, *Our Generation*, journal of the Canadian New Left and anti-war movement. Includes "Youth in Quebec" by Marcel, "A Short History of ERAP" by Richard Rothstein, "The Sociology of Participatory Democracy" by Martin Oppenheimer, "The British Left" by Raymond Williams, more. Available for \$1.25 from 3837 Boulevard St. Laurent, Montreal 18, Quebec, Canada.

Ida Brown, Newark mother, was acquitted last week by the County Court. The charge was assaulting a policeman, originating in a NCUP rent strike in the winter of 1964-5. Her case came during a concerted attempt of the Newark machine to break NCUP. NCUP now stands a good chance of unseating South Ward City Councilman Lee Bernstein in the June 10th runoff election.

All those friends of SDS who contributed to Ida Brown's legal defense and bail fund deserve our thanks. NCUP wishes it could write them personally, but their names were lost in the fire at the Chicago JOIN office this winter.

Do you think things are rough at your school? If so, you don't know what the word means. Jeff Shero, SDS vice-president, reports from Utah State, where he spoke recently, that "At Utah State I was in a public program in the Student Union talking about the issues of the war, civil-rights, and university freedoms. Tremendous ingrained resistance to thinking. Example - a person should not smoke or drink because it is against the holy 'word of wisdom'. The local liberal group did have a smoke-in that involved a couple of hundred people for three days. They won their demand; a smoking room in the student union. Smoking is banned elsewhere." ". . . loco . . ."

## SPECIAL TO NEW LEFT NOTES

The monthly campus magazine of the University of Wisconsin, "Quixote," will feature poetry, fiction, and art related to the theme of peace in its June issue. Barbara Gibson, faculty sponsor of SDS at UW-Milwaukee, and Henry Haslach, SDS president at UW, assisted in gathering peace literature from authors like Ramon Guthrie, Paul Goodman, George Starbuck, William Hunt, as well as Wisconsin faculty and students. The issue will be published June 25th and may be ordered for .50 from the editor at 505 North Carroll in Madison.

The magazine is interested in receiving manuscripts from radical authors, especially SDS members, and is interested especially in short stories, poetry, and literary-social commentary essays. It is published monthly, and authors submitting work can expect replies within two weeks. ("Quixote" hopes to furnish an example-possibly a negative one - of what form a magazine like that described in the Radical Education Project would take.)

Wilmington, Ohio

Although we have no SDS chapter on this campus and I am the only SDS member on campus, the draft exam was passed out here.

Rather than pass them out at the exam center on campus when the tests were given, we simply distributed them in each dormitory. In this manner we achieved maximum distribution and even the girls received copies. Reaction ranged from burning the test to real enthusiasm.

I am sure that there will be more testing by the SSS. I hope we can continue to counter the testing by good anti-war material. May I suggest dorm distribution as another way to get exams, etc. to as many people as possible? Don't leave out the girls.

Will Powers, Jr.

Ed Note: I am including the following announcement, but I am unsure that I should have. In the phone call which I received from Mike he said, "This is a campaign which is being run to put Adams into the Senate, not to build a grass-roots constituency. However, due to the participation of SDS members in the election we may be able to start the process of grass-roots organizing." In light of the April NC resolution on electoral politics - that we do not support such attempts as Mike describes - I will let people draw their own conclusions.

Bob Speck

Tom Adams, great-grandson of a past U.S. President, is running for the U. S. Senate in the Democratic Primary in Massachusetts on a platform of Peace and Freedom. He wants 10,000 volunteer organizers by August. There are unlimited openings for SDS members at subsistence wages, and a few openings at better than subsistence wages. For more information or applications write or call collect: Mike Ansara, 387 Washington, Boston, Mass., (617) 482-2025.

I was supposed to write (and I did so) a proposal for the National Council dealing with publications. Because of space limitations this week I did not include it as I had planned and said in NLN last week. It will be in next week's NLN.

POSTAGE DUE  
 RETURN TO: NEW LEFT NOTES  
 1103 E. 63rd  
 Chicago, Ill 60637  
 Return to: Jim Anderson  
 88 1/2 Edwards Street  
 New Haven, Connecticut 06511  
 9476 Louboch  
 1843 Vernon N.W.  
 Washington, D.C.  
 Application to mail at Second Class postage rates pending in Chicago, Ill.  
 49345