

1st Edition
So. Coast
March 27, 1967
Amsterville, C.

COLORADO CONFERENCE

Tom Cleaver
CSC SDS

On Sunday, February 5, representatives of the five SDS chapters in Colorado met for a regional conference at the Colorado State College Student Union; this was the first time since SDS had been organized in the state that all five groups had been together at the same time in the same place, and was to primarily provide everyone with the opportunity to find out just who the other SDS people in the state were. The conference was attended by representatives of the CU SPU, CSC SPU, and the Denver Stop the War Committee (which is run by the local Trots). Carl Davidson and Barbara Pappish of Missouri U. SDS also were at the meeting. About 20 SDS members from the Denver University, Colorado University, Colorado State College, and Metropolitan State College groups were in attendance.

The first part of the meeting was relatively unstructured, with representatives telling about what their chapters had been doing, what they had and hadn't accomplished, and some of their future plans. Davidson spoke about the SDS Draft Resistance Resolution, and about some of the more recent developments in thinking towards campus organizing in other parts of the country. After discussing what could be done in conjunction with the UCM groups now being organized on the CU, CSU, and CSC campuses, the meeting was adjourned for supper, which gave the various groups the opportunity to get together and talk about the proposals up before the conference which would be discussed

in the evening.

The evening session was devoted to a discussion of whether a regional newsletter and regional coordinating committee should be set up; Davidson commented that it would not be too cool an idea, as the people who got on the newsletter would tend to dominate its contents with their own particular interests. He suggested instead that a mailing list be made up of the people present, and that each chapter start a newsletter, to be mailed to those people telling of any forthcoming activities on their campuses; this was accepted by the meeting.

Discussion of the April Mobilization devolved to a debate between Howard Wallace of the SWP Stop the War Committee, and the chapter presidents over whether or not to get people to go with the Committee to San Francisco, or to organize local solidarity actions for the mobilization; it was decided that if anyone could get up the money who wanted to go, that they should, and a definite decision on whether or not to hold local actions was put off to the next state conference - to be held at the CU campus the first weekend in March - when the local chapters would have had time to assess their strength and capabilities and come up with some formal proposals. The Conference of Unrepresented People to be held in Denver on February 18 was also discussed, and the chapter presidents decided to act as sponsors for it, along with the Crusade for Justice, Denver SNCC, the New Hispano Movement, and the Stop the War Committee.

Davidson stayed in Greeley thru the next day, and spoke in a Sociology of Social Movements class on the development of ideology and identification with 3rd World Revolutions in SNCC. Monday night, representatives of CSC SDS - with Davidson - went over to CU to discuss plans for a joint conference with the CU Independent Socialist Club (not a part of Draper's group); after a long night of discussion - which showed in its factionalization why the American left is not in control here in this country - it was decided that the conference would be held in Greeley on February 16, on the topic, "The Student Dilemma: Tune In, Turn On, Cop Out?"; this topic was chosen due to the fact that most people on Colorado campuses who might have been interested in the movement have turned on and dropped out of society, and ways must be found to interest them in working for change, rather than deciding to hell with the whole thing.

With the conference just held, and the plan for monthly state conferences, in addition to the joint discussion meetings to be held with the various groups in the region, it is hoped that SDS will be able to develop a resurgence of interest in the already-established chapters at CU and CSU, and that the newly-established chapters at DU, CSC and Metro will feel justified in seeking national recognition at the April NC.

OGLESBY

CARL OGLESBY TO SPEAK AT COLORADO STATE COLLEGE

Carl Oglesby, former nat'l president of SDS, will debate the chairman of the Political Science Department of the U. of Illinois, on the topic "The Ethics of Corporate Liberalism and Vietnam". The debate is sponsored by the CSC Lecture Series Committee (which was captured by the campus radicals in last year's elections).

The speech and debate will take place on Wednesday, February 22, in the CSC College Center Ballroom at 8 P.M.; admission is free, and no self-respecting radical in the region should miss the opportunity to hear Carl and meet him for a party after the debate. It is also an opportunity for Colorado State College SDS to "get on the map" with some fund-raising from the party.

SNCC & MPI

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE STUDENT NON-VIOLENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE AND THE MOVEMENT FOR PUERTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE (MOVIMIENTO PRO INDEPENDENCIA, M.P.I.), N.Y. Branch

January 26th, in San Juan, Puerto Rico, a joint statement was signed by representatives of SNCC, M.P.I., and the University Federation for Independence (Federacion de Universitarios Pro Independencia F.U.P.I.). In this statement, the three organizations affirmed the need for a joint struggle against the political, economic, social and cultural oppression inflicted upon the Afro-American and Puerto Rican peoples by the United States. Just as black power signifies the struggle for liberation and the control of Afro-American communities by black people, the independence struggle in Puerto Rico aims for control by Puerto Ricans of their own lives and the wealth of their country. Black people constitute a colony within the United States; Puerto Rico is a colony outside the United States.

In that statement and during subsequent meetings in New York, the three organizations have agreed to work together on the domestic and international levels in the following ways:

- 1) Joint action against the draft in part-

(Continued on page 2)

SUNYARMK Strikes Again

Pete Henig
REP

A brochure that the Placement Services Bureau of the State University of New York at Armonk (SUNYARMK) blithely hands to all comers reads:

Placement Services personnel at SUNY-ARMK expend a great deal of time and effort not only to make certain that corporate recruiters are provided with an adequate knowledge of the individual student, but also to make it possible for the student job applicant to obtain an accurate and realistic picture of his prospective employer. This effort to inform the applicant has been hailed as "one of the most important innovations in the personnel counseling field" by PLACES AND PERSONNEL, the official publication of the American Society for Personnel Placement Systems.

Needless to say, the Placement Bureau is something of a joke on campus because of its general incompetence and disregard

for the feelings of students. Nevertheless, it was the stage for hot controversy when SUNYARMK SDS began the new semester with an "information" campaign aimed at providing graduating engineers with an "accurate and realistic picture" of at least one of the employers who had sent a recruiter to campus.

The recruiter in this case was from the Research Division of Bell Aerosystems. Bell ranks eighth among the top 100 defense contractors and 34th among the top 500 largest defense research and development contractors. Bell's biggest contract is for the HU-1 helicopters used in Vietnam.

The theme of the SUNYARMK SDS educational drive was "Would you work for this man." The man was Walter Dornberger, now Director of Research for Bell but also one of the pioneers in aerospace research. Dornberger was commandant of Peenemunde - the secret Nazi rocket base where the V-1 flying bomb and the V-2 rocket terror weapons were developed. The man who is now developing better helicopters to zap Victor

(Continued on page 11)

new left notes

sds

1608 w. madison, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

Vol. 2, No. 6 let the people decide February 13, 1967

CHICAGO

Sits on Apartheid

TCF

U. of Chicago

The University of Chicago SDS chapter has just completed the first stage of what has been to date a rather successful program on South Africa. Successful not only in the fact that we were able to mass people for an excellent demonstration at Continental Illinois Bank and Trust Co., but successful also in that the program has aroused a greater interest and respect for SDS on campus, and has led to a second stage that is less dramatic but more far reaching than the first.

Continental bank is one of ten banks involved in a consortium which maintains a 40-million dollar revolving-credit loan to the government of the Union of South Africa. While this loan in and of itself is not upholding the South African economy, it does have a very important role in doing so. First, it gives the assurance to American investors in South Africa that an American bank is helping to insure their credit. It also gives confidence to South Africans, one of whom said "so long as United States banks and business back us, we can go ahead."

The reason for the protest at Continental was twofold. First, since the SDS-sponsored demonstration at Chase Manhattan (one of the leaders in the consortium), there has been a national program aimed at consortium banks. Thus the demonstration here fits into a national political program.

The second reason why the issue was especially suited to this campus is that the university banks at Continental and thus is indirectly supporting the loan. On the Board of Trustees of the University is the president of Continental and ten other members of boards of directors of consortium banks.

The Program

The program, as originally conceived and presented to the chapter, was fairly short-range. As an educational effort and in order to arouse interest, Mr. Richard Thomas of the American Committee on Africa, was invited to speak at an informal meeting. Also, Lionel Rogosin's film *Come Back Africa* was shown about a week before the demonstration was scheduled.

The culminating effort was seen to be a demonstration accompanied by a sit-in fol-

lowed two days later by a rally on campus at which an appeal to the Board of Trustees was to have been presented. The timing was arranged so as to get the best possible coverage in the campus press.

Implementation and Evaluation

An eight-page leaflet entitled "The University, Continental Bank, and Apartheid" was prepared and distributed by intensive use of literature tables placed in various campus buildings. The leaflet was taken mainly from *Christianity and Crisis* and "A Web of Power" with several additional specifically relevant paragraphs added. This proved to be the most successful of the educational efforts.

At the same time as these other events, a letter was drawn up and sent to each of the trustees. A special letter was sent to those trustees who were members of the board of directors of a consortium bank. Many responding took the position that although they were personally against apar-

(Continued on page 3)

in this
issue

PRAXIS

p. 5--9

PRESIDENT'S
REPORT p. 3

p. 10 Middle
class organizing

Nat'l Sec'y
Report p. 2

Forebodings

p. 3

National Secretary's Report

THE MODERATION OF COOPTATION — DOUBLE-THINK AND STUDENT DISSENT

by Greg Calvert

Around the table in a conference room of the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel in Washington sat representatives of 18 national student organizations, four Peace Corps bureaucrats, and members of the staff of "Moderator" magazine. At the head of the table, Sherman Chickering, smooth young editor of "the national magazine for leading students". Chickering was explaining that "Moderator" had called this "conference on voluntary national service" in order to bring together student leaders united in their opposition to the draft and in their concern for the positive involvement of young Americans in service to society.

(The National Administrative Committee had approved my request to go to the meeting to present our viewpoint on the draft and to oppose what seemed to me a major attempt on the part of the government to coopt student dissent on the draft and to channel social concern into forms acceptable to the establishment. I still know little of "Moderator's" ties to officialdom. I asked the staff how much money they received from the State Department: they denied any ties. It later emerged that "Moderator" is working closely with the National Service Secretariat which, under the direction of Donald J. Eberly, prepared a study for the Marshall Commission and is holding a conference on National Service April 2-4. Whatever its direct connections, it is clear that "Moderator" is involved in the attempt to create the new image—"beyond the organization man"—of the top level technocrats who will run the bureaucracies of the neo-capitalist corporate-liberal state of the near future. The pages of "Moderator" are full of information on the careers open to "leading students" in the bureaucracies of the military-industrial complex.)

Before us was a statement which "Moderator" had sent to participants beforehand and which sought "to represent the common thrust in as aspirational terms as possible, with the central core of common ground as its base." The document read:

MODERATOR CONFERENCE ON VOLUNTARY NATIONAL SERVICE

WE BELIEVE...

That young Americans have a right to serve their society.

That the free exercise of this right is more important to the national health, security and interest than a government law which enforces service.

That the nation will be best served on the battlefield by men who serve willingly, and who choose to do so as soldiers.

That service on the fronts of poverty, ignorance, disease and urban squalor is as necessary and honorable as service on the battlefield.

That voluntary service is a principal and imperative national requirement, and should be instituted with all deliberate speed.

I, the undersigned, signing as an individual, agree in principle with this statement.

The social-fascistic language had sent my head reeling and I was deeply relieved to discover that none of the participants had been convinced to sign before the conference began.

The tone of the meeting was to be set by the lead-off speaker, Bob Greenway, Deputy Director, Institutional Relations, the Salvation Army of American Imperialism-Peace Corps. He was slick, collegiate, and dripping with earnest openness. He wanted to speak about five things: brain damage, innocence, Athens, Norman Vincent Peale, and sensuality.

First, brain damage meant the "unfortunate tendency" of certain kinds of young people to flip out into irrelevant areas of concern: viz., those kooks who immediately want to talk about Vietnam when the question of military conscription is raised. These unfortunate souls seem to feel that you cannot talk about details of the national

policy without talking about national goals. Their minds, Greenway informed us, are damaged in a way which makes it impossible for them to concentrate on issues at hand.

Second, innocence. Greenway explained that American students were often well-intentioned but stupidly naive. Their actions often seemed designed to avoid having any impact on policy. "Serious" people must shed their innocence and concentrate on results.

Third, Athens. He quoted some politician or other from classical Greece: "What we need is a good war." What America needs is a good definition of "commitment" in terms of "voluntarism".

Fourth, Norman Vincent Peale. We needed to stop being "negative" and start being "positive". Greenway told a story: "Every morning President Johnson gets up and looks out the window of the White House. If the pickets are wearing beards, he feels good about life. If the pickets are beardless and dressed in suits and ties, he's worried." The moral of the story was: we need to stop expressing our personal hang-ups and deal with the real world in a positive way. "There's a hospital down the street with a full staff of psychiatrists for hung-up people with a negative approach."

Fifth, sensuality. Greenway drew three intersecting circles on the blackboard. He explained that the intersection of the circles represented the "Sensuous center" of agreement which existed in the meeting: our opposition to coercion and conscription. If we were to minimize our brain-damage, throw off our innocence, emulate the Athenian politician, and be as "positive" in our thinking of Normy Peale, we would concentrate on our "sensuous center."

During the ten minutes of Greenway's presentation, I experienced the whole gamut of passionate angry emotions which constitute my gut-level reactions to the inhuman-manipulative-life-hating American prison in which I live. My blood pressure jumped so high that I thought I would pop a blood vessel. I wasn't sure whether throwing a bomb, screaming, or walking out would best relieve my outrage. ("Cool it, Baby," I kept repeating to myself. "If you blow your cool now, they've got you by your balls and you won't get anything across to anyone.")

Fortunately, the presentation of individual position statements on the draft and national service placed one speaker between Greenway and myself. I cooled it. I brought the blood pressure down slowly, told the adrenalin to shut off, swallowed deeply, and then spoke. I explained that I was sent under specific mandate from the National Administrative Committee of the most militantly democratic organization in the country—that our National Council had a democratically arrived at position of draft resistance. I told Greenway (and elaborated to him later) that his presentation was an insult to any politically aware American. I said that he spoke as the voice of cooptative corporate liberal society. I argued that representatives present should not be taken in by an attempt to render their discussions trivial and meaningless by restricting issues debated to details which had to be understood in the largest context—that the essence of the radicalism which I was sent to represent was an insistence that all the issues are related and that the fundamental questions must always be kept in the forefront. I explained that the draft in itself was not the problem, but that it was the whole problem of American aggressive expansionism which must be considered.

During the remainder of our meetings together, I concentrated on two points: the exposure of "double-think" and the encouragement of dissenting caucuses.

DOUBLETHINK AND COOPTATION

The underlying strategy of the "Moderator" conference was "cooptation through double-think." This strategy addressed itself to two realities of current American history: widespread student opposition to the present system of coercive selective military conscription and the increasing involvement of students in activities growing out of a concern with problems of social change in America and the larger human community.

Radicals like ourselves argue that dissent and the new forms of social commitment are

expressions of the alienation of students from the meaningless alternatives of this society and that this alienation can only find meaningful expression through involvement in activities which will build a movement for revolutionary change in this society and which will re-orient America towards a creative interaction with revolutionary movements in the Western-dominated Third World.

The strategy of the corporate-liberal establishment (as evidenced in this case by "Moderator") faced with student alienation and dissent is cooptation through double-think. Given that students are alienated from the meaninglessness of American society and find the coercive system of military conscription to be the clearest violation of the principle of individual freedom, let us rally students around the concept of "voluntarism." Dissent and alienation can be neutralized by rechanneling into "positive" action—without raising basic questions about America. Conscription is coercive and should be abolished: students are concerned about social change and their service to society should be "voluntary;" let us establish a "volunteer" army and "voluntary national service."

George Orwell would have been amazed by his own prophetic powers: doublethink is here in full force. "Voluntary armies" used to be called "professional armies" (a characteristic of aristocratic or totalitarian societies) and "voluntary national service"

(continued on page 11)

SNCC & MPI

(Continued from page 1)

cular and the American war in Vietnam in general, to be carried out by Afro-Americans and Puerto Ricans in the urban ghettos of this country;

- 2) Joint action for better housing, education and living conditions generally, as well as against police brutality, in the urban ghettos;
- 3) Joint action to bring international focus to the problems of Afro-Americans and to the Puerto Rican struggle for independence. SNCC has agreed to offer its assistance in M.P.I.'s efforts to raise the colonial case of Puerto Rico at the United Nations during its current session. M.P.I. and F.U.P.I. will offer their assistance in bringing international attention to the case of Afro-Americans, particularly in the United Nations. The question will be raised there not as a domestic issue but a matter of concern to all humanity, i.e., not as a question of civil rights but human rights.

In the immediate future, the organizations hope to conduct joint demonstrations during the visit to New York of Brazilian President-Elect Arturo Costa e Silva. De Silva, who is scheduled to take power on March 15th, represents the forces of military dictatorship, supported by the United States; continuation of Brazil's economic policy which has maintained the poverty of millions; and support for Portuguese colonial domination in Africa. De Silva has, in a series of statements, indicated that he will seek American military support to suppress so-called "external subversion" in Brazil—in effect, movements for basic change to benefit the impoverished of Brazil.

N. B. — FROM THE EDITOR

The article, "No Hunters" in last week's issue of NLN was written by STEVE JOHNSON, ANN ARBOR, REP.

NEW LEFT NOTES will be printed on Mondays from now on, instead of on Friday.

go up, and since the poor have not got any of the money it leaves them worse off than before.

You must see Thousands of poor children in the streets, everywhere you go, why not find out if they are getting the Medical care that they should have? And why not photograph these cases for your paper? I can't see how you can miss these things since there are millions of them; or maybe you don't want to associate with this "trash" since they would be to ignorant to belong to the SDS, and would not be able to understand the ways of the SDS. So it is better not to have anything to do with the poor except, maybe to collect money from them, to fight poverty with, let them get back part of their own money, at least.

Sincerely yours,

Gaster Vaughn
Bean Station, Tenn.

To The Editor of NLN,

I wish that you would print NLN on better paper, because after my friends get through reading it, it looks like a ball of left-over toilet paper. Believe it or not like any efficient prison they have toilet paper galore; here for free.

In peace,

Mark M. Orton
Lawrence U., Wisc.

(Ed. Note: Any donations for the cause would be welcome. Otherwise there is little prospect of improvement, in that respect.)

NEW LEFT NOTES

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 W. Madison, Chicago, Ill. 60612. Phone (312) 666-3874. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Illinois. Subscriptions: \$1 a year for members, \$5 a year for non-members. Signed articles and letters are the responsibility of the writer. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of the editor, Cathy Wilkerson.

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Nick Egleson, president; Carl Davidson, vice-president; and Greg Calvert, national secretary.
National Office: 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312) 666-3874
New York City: 49 West 27th St., NYC, NY 1001; (212) 889-5793
Niagra Region: 107 Dryden Rd., Ithaca, NY
Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif; (415) 362-7922
Southern California: 4319 Melrose, Los Angeles, California, 90019
New England: 138 River St., Cambridge, Mass., 02139
Radical Education Project: 510 East William, Ann Arbor, Mich.

FOREBODINGS in the Dominican Republic

David Gelber
New York

SANTO DOMINGO, REPUBLICA DOMINICANA--The yankee planes and tanks which sprayed the sedate parks and narrow streets of Santo Domingo with bullets and bombs set the stage for the election six months ago of Joaquin Balaguer. He owed his victory to his insurance value against another U.S. military intervention rather than to any promise of national reconstruction.

Now the dead weight of the Trujillista military and civil bureaucracy, rescued by the U.S. intervention, threatens to foil the foremost goal of the U.S. planners here--to manipulate events here so that another intervention, with its disastrous consequences for the U.S. position in Latin America, won't be necessary.

After speaking with American officials and representatives of various shades of Dominican political thinking, I believe the Balaguer-U.S. axis has far less than complete control of the situation here. This is the story ignored by the American press, which, characteristically, has lost interest in the Dominican Republic after the right wing triumph last June. In particular:

—Anti-interventionist Dominicans increasingly are intimidated by a mix of terror and tyranny reflecting the persistent autonomy of extreme rightist military-police elements.

—The sugar economy continues to stagnate in spite of the efforts of U.S.A.I.D. men to "bootstrap it up," as one official put it.

Balaguer has appointed fanatical rightists to high government posts. His apparent aim is to propitiate those who would be most likely to conspire against him. Owing to the administrative incompetence of his ministers, more and more decisions are made by Balaguer himself. He is rapidly becoming an "indispensable man."

His alliance with the extreme right has produced legislation which mocks the constitutional facade of his regime. Political parties are forbidden by law to hold rallies until three months before elections.

Policemen are being installed in every secondary and primary school to "encourage respect for authority." Legislation will be passed to permit the government to open all international mail. Finally, funds for the University of Santo Domingo, whose student body is overwhelmingly controlled by Marxists and militant Social Christians, have been cut drastically, and the government is now subsidizing a new university founded by ex-Trujillista professors.

American police and military experts are here to share what they have learned about containing insurgency. "We want to show them they don't have to be bloody to be effective," a U.S. man said. Nevertheless, bodies of anti-interventionists are disgorged from passing cars at a rate of about 250 a year, according to the most reliable sources available. (Some people regard this as a great improvement over the bloody Trujillo years.)

Although there have been no investigations of the political assassinations, the chief of police was quoted as saying, "Due to the rate of illiteracy in the police force, many acts are committed which shouldn't be."

The rag-tag army is the largest per capita in this hemisphere. It consumes 40 per cent of the national budget. The army is not likely to be reduced until something is done about unemployment, which is about 45 per cent (taking the government figure, multiplying by two and subtracting 5 per cent to avoid overstatement). Even then, pruning the army would affront the military elite.

Adding the unemployed to the parasitic military class leaves relatively few people to produce the country's wealth. The "productive economy" is dominated by the national sugar consortium, a major political asset of the ruling party. Packed with no-show jobs for ex-Trujillistas whose support Balaguer depends on, it is widely inefficient. The country loses five cents on every pound of sugar sold on the world market.

Further evidence of the lack of economic planning is the agreement recently concluded with the government of Haiti to import 30,000 Haitian sugar cane cutters. (Dominicans won't do this type of work because of low wages and slavish connotations.) The plantation owners have been served at the cost of glutting the labor supply and perpetuating the monoculture.

The left here is recovering from the re-crematory atmosphere which followed the Bosch defeat. Bosch himself has left the country on the grounds that Balaguer's repressive measures have rendered meaningful opposition impossible. His departure and the anti-democratic laws will do much

to unify the left, according to a leader of the Social Christian party.

Students are now the most organized leftist group in the Republic. The "school police" plan has precipitated a call for a general strike by the high school students affiliated with Marxist and Social Christian movements. They are demanding the ouster of the education minister, elimination of the school guards, curriculum reform (sociology instead of religion) and better laboratories and libraries. In return, the kids will acknowledge the government's right to exclude from classrooms all students carrying pistols and grenades.

The intervention indisputably succeeded in "radicalizing" sectors of the working class as well as the students. Labor unions increasingly relate low wages and unemployment to U.S. political and economic hegemony. It is extremely doubtful that the moderate leftist Partido Revolucionario Dominicano, the party of Juan Bosch, still commands the loyalty of a majority of the Dominican left.

The favorite betting game in Santo Domingo is whether Balaguer will live out his term. One persuasive view is that the military will blame Balaguer for the recrudescence of the left and demand even more repressive measures. Unable to destroy the left, Balaguer, according to this viewpoint, will be deposed. The U.S. will lose its foothold from which to push moderate reforms, thereby increasing the likelihood of another nationalist revolution and/or U.S. military intervention.

Another line is that Dominicans are convinced of nothing so much as the "irrelevance" of politics and political change to real improvement in their lives. They are resigned and apolitical. An esteemed European ambassador takes this view but adds contradictorily, "The dominicanos will accept Balaguer if he improves things just a little. So far, with all the American aid, he has produced nothing."

Chicago and Apartheid

(Continued from page 1)

theid they were corporately for a good bank (and since SA is a good investment . . .) etc. The letters often ended with what can only be interpreted as a browning comment.

Several meetings were held with bank officials during the interim. One of the chapter members who has made Africa his field of study was present at every one of these meetings; the other committee members changed. The last of these meetings was held during the demonstration itself and served as an immediate prelude to the sit-in.

The demonstration itself was quite successful. We managed to present a very respectable picket in front of the bank, filling up a double column the entire length of the block. We were aided at this by several organizations other than SDS. The largest of these contingents came from JOIN and marked the first joint action we have taken with them.

A single page leaflet entitled "The Big Bank With Apartheid Inside" (the bank's slogan is "The Big Bank With the Little Bank Inside") was distributed at the demonstration. One of the greater mistakes made was in only printing 3,000 of these. Due to the nature of the protest as well as the hour and cite of the demonstration this proved to be far too small a number.

Another error we made was neglecting to hold a press conference either before or after the action. Although a press packet had been prepared it proved almost impossible to distribute it at the scene.

After the campus rally which was held two days later as scheduled we asked the Board of Trustees to permit us to present the appeal in person at their next meeting. So far we have not received a definite

I thought it would be good to try to get people writing less formal things for NLN. So I have put together a collection of excerpts from letters I have written over the last few months.

Ingrid and I didn't stay around SF, but went up to Marysville to see Judy Graham. She was working with NFWA there. In spite of my often repeated intention to do nothing this summer we stayed, helped to organize the shed workers on two DiGiorgio ranches there, and, when the arbitrator failed to allow us to hold elections, went further north to the very end of the Sacramento Valley (Redding, 110° every day) to raise money and set up a food drive for Delano.

Most of the people in Redding were extraordinarily friendly. A union town good enough to restore just a little of our faith in union people. They weren't too good on foreign policy, its true, but they were very sympathetic to the plight of the farmworkers, and of poor people (as opposed to rich people) in general. Even the conservatives there seemed easier to talk to, but perhaps that is just because we are learning how to do it. Ingrid got in a conversation with one, a doctor, and he made a comment which, if I remember correctly, fits in exactly with a discussion we were having when we stopped by at your house. This fellow couldn't understand why Ingrid wanted to help those farmworkers, who, he said, wouldn't even help themselves. He concluded, and the words are his, that Ingrid did it because she felt people were basically good, while he didn't because he felt people were basically bad. Wasn't that what we decided was the basic difference between left and right?

I got an idea about why the good, union people are conservative on issues like the war. The three people we got closest to there: an assistant business agent, union organizer, and a mechanic who did some work on one of the cars we used, all of them had sons in Vietnam. When I compare that to the number of people I know, or even know of, from my circles who are there (I know only one) it begins to look like a clear case of class difference. Upper Middle Class kids can get out, in one way or another, from the army -- or put it another way, they don't need the army to give them the training to make a living (All three of the business agent's sons were in the service picking up vocational training). UMC people

don't have sons in the army, and didn't have to use it to help their kids. They can afford to criticize it. Not the union people . . . I would like to do a quick study of the backgrounds of the members of one platoon -- any platoon -- to see where the army comes from.

We have both enjoyed working for the farmworkers. Part of the joy, other than working with nice people both in the NFWA and in the supporting unions, has been that we could put away, for a brief while, long term worries. We didn't have to think about whether we were doing the strategically right thing. It was only for a month, the farmworkers clearly needed help, and the NFWA seemed to talk at least to their immediate needs. And we weren't running the show. The problems with the farmworkers movement -- and we didn't block them out entirely -- are many. In spite of the impression, generated I think by our own desire to see our hopes realized, that the NFWA is a people's union, many decisions still get made at the top. We woke up one morning and found out that NFWA had merged with the AFL-CIO (AWOC). Cesar had promised again and again that he would never take that step without the explicit consent of the membership. The consent wasn't even sought, so far as we can find out, until after the event.

I was recently at a meeting of a high school chapter. I wish I had known in high school what they know. A ROTC man was going to come speak at the school. They asked the school whether someone from SDS could come to give the opposing point of view. Refused. They threatened, and the principal gave in. In my conversations with them they were jokingly disappointed that he had, because if he hadn't they would have had an issue. Their sophistication in that direction was exciting, but they were also surprisingly naive in another way. All they would talk about was having a part in the decisions which affected their lives. Part of that was good, as it meant that they were concerned with their immediate surroundings -- what could be done at their own high school. They were the opposite of the stereotype liberal who gets more and more concerned about a problem the farther it gets from his neighborhood. But the kids had little, I thought, to back up their faith in participation other than sentiment. I asked them for instance, why it was important for them to participate in the functioning of their high school. I said suppose I was the principal asking you that, how would you answer? Suppose I said "Look, the decisions get made well without you, or by your elders." And they did not know how to respond. They could have said that the decisions did not get made well. They had, in fact, been telling me all evening in their complaints about the lunch menu, the dress rules, and even the style of teaching. So I think if they had thought harder that is what they would have said. But I would argue in situations like that that the reason for participation in the decisions in high school is that participation there is a vital part of education in a democracy -- in a society in which people are supposed to control their environment, they ought to be taught the techniques of that as a vital part of their formal education. And that teaching could best be done by participating in decisions at the school. I think they listened to my reasoning with a quiet tolerance.

Other strange things about them -- a directness, a presumption of equality -- that or could either be the honesty of the new society or the manifestation of urbane, upper middle class a self assurance and arrogance.

I realize the problem about finding time to get anything written down. Maybe next

(Continued on page 4)

answer, but have agreed to attempt to attend the meeting even if no invitation is forthcoming.

The Response

Outside the university, the best coverage we received came from television reports. In one case we were given the first local spot and in all cases the report on the late evening news was accompanied by photos.

In the daily press the coverage was spotty. In no case, however, was there a definitely negative article.

On campus the entire action has been generally well received. A certain faculty member here wrote an article that appeared in the campus paper (one of our best supporters in this case) attacking us for involving the rest of the university in what was a matter solely for the trustees. The response that has come as a result has been almost entirely in our favor.

Unquestionably, the action had the effect of greatly improving the campus image of SDS. As one faculty supporter wrote: "Congratulations, SDS has finally lost its negativism." Whether this negativism existed at all may be open to question. That there was widespread feeling towards SDS on this is not. The project has done much to dispell that attitude.

Sit-in Post Script

The Chicago courts have been extremely hard on those who sat in. Although all pleaded guilty, the fine leveled was 50 dollars per person. This is twice what had been expected and has forced us to intensify our fund raising efforts. (It had been assumed before that each person would pay his expected 25 dollar fine).

There is at present a group of people

working on further action. If the proper response is found in other groups, there is a possibility of attempt a large scale withdrawal of funds from Continental and the other Chicago consortium bank.

President's Report

(Continued from page 3)

time I can come - sometime in February - I'll bring a tape recorder or a notebook and try to get some of it down. The reason I think it important is because campuses are starved for information. My travels as campus - I have been to about twenty five so far - have left me struck again with a sense of how easily one projects one's immediate experience onto the rest of the world. In this case I had projected Swarthmore onto College, USA. At Northern Illinois a student I was arguing with, not a right winger, broke down the religions of Vietnam to me thus: a forty per cent Catholic, forty per cent Buddhist, and twenty per cent Viet Cong. One chapter, under red-baiting attack in the grand style phones us to say: "We've told them we are not on the attorney General's list, what else can we do?" I could think of no way to straighten out the facts about religion in Vietnam except by offering a pamphlet. I was able, by talking with the chapter, to offer some alternative, offensive ways to fight red-baiting: Who made that decision? Who are you letting decide what is dangerous for you to here? In the latter case the chapter was very receptive to those ideas. It wasn't that they did not have intelligence; they had just never been exposed to those ideas.

In the same way people have no conception of the other subjects are they might be studying, or ways they may go about it. And so, whenever you or someone else can get around to it, something on the kind of study program you are running would be a good thing.

LETTER TO CAMPUS ORGANIZERS -

When I speak on campuses there are certain questions that I get asked again and again. My guess is that anyone who does any organizing at all on the campus meets many of the same questions. I think that we could all benefit from knowing how other organizers have dealt with them. I know I have learned much from the times I have teamed up with another organizer on a campus. This exchange of answers is no substitute for that kind of teamwork. But it can be the start of a dialogue which will lead, I hope, to a meeting of campus organizers sometime in March.

So suppose you are at a meeting and you get asked the questions listed below. You don't have time to write a speech; you have to respond right away: 1) What answers have you given? 2) With what anecdotes have you illustrated your points? What questions have you thrown back? It took me about an hour to note down brief answers to these questions. If you send yours to me at the N.O. I will assemble the various responses and send them out. Examples of responses:

What kind of education do you want to see on the campus? 1) In theory we live in a democratic society. That ought to mean, by definition, that the people who live in this society shape it. People ought to learn that in school. People would learn that process by shaping their environment - by shaping their school. True student government (not mickey-mouse student councils) would then change from an extra-curricular activity to a fundamental part of education. 2) Courses should deal with the big questions, not just atomize the world and study the pieces. Courses must confront: How does an understanding of history help me understand the world I live in? or What does this poem say about the way we should or do live? rather than examining only: The impact of the western frontier on 19th Century American political theory, or only This poet's use of assonance. 3) Education should concentrate on communicating the process of thought - not on transmitting a body of facts. I have a story I tell about a primary school teacher who, to teach her kids about

(Continued on page 12)

Bill Hartzog

Bill Hartzog, SDS field secretary from Topeka, Kansas, was arraigned for resisting the draft. His hearing will be Thursday, Feb. 16, in Cincinnati, Ohio. Bill refused induction twice last summer. He is currently organizing a draft resister's union in Kansas City, Missouri.

CADA: Urged to RESIST

Dear Friends:

On December 12, 1966, the National Board of Americans for Democratic Action voted to move the national office of CADA to Washington, D.C. Four of the delegates to the ADA National Board from Campus ADA spoke vehemently against this move. The fifth CADA delegate, from Washington, D.C., voted with the majority. The four delegates urged the Board to keep CADA in New York for the following reasons:

1. ADA should have acted with greater consideration for the constitution of the student group. CADA's constitution states, "The National Headquarters of CADA shall be at such a place as the Convention or the Board may decide."

2. Although the primary purpose of the move was economy and efficiency, the net effect is to destroy the autonomy of Campus ADA.

3. ADA offered, as a palliative to the move to Washington, to hire a fulltime staff person. At present there is a staff in New York including the national chairman and volunteers from many of the local chapters. A move to Washington would remove the day to day conduct of the organization from the hands of the elected officers and would place it in the hands of a single hired staff person. Furthermore, it would reduce the office of national chairman to a mere figurehead who in reality would not be able to carry out the mandate for which she was elected.

4. National ADA claimed that the move to Washington was an economic one. At present, National ADA provides CADA with a budget of \$400.00 a month. After moving to Washington, costs would have to increase tremendously over this present allotment. The salary alone of a hired staff person would exceed \$400.00. Postage, office supplies, telephone bills, and travel would, at least, maintain their present level of expense. There is no savings for national ADA.

5. Such a move would hamper any future growth of Campus ADA because of the aura of paternalism it entails.

6. It was argued that Washington was an exceedingly poor town to be based in as it has few schools, most of which have southern conservative orientation and are thus highly unlikely targets for mass organizing by us. New York, on the other hand, has a student population approaching the size of the TOTAL population of the city of Washington, D. C. New York is also strategically near the large university centers of New England and upstate New York. A poor but growing organization with little money for travel must be near its greatest area of potential growth.

No matter what the arguments were, pro and con, the principles that Campus ADA should make its own decisions must be respected.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS!!!!

While key people in ADA had told us that the move would not have to be immediate, our funds were immediately cut off. After a good deal of pleading, ADA agreed to send us the usual allotment if we agreed to move right after the CADA National Board meeting and if our checks for the two month period would include all debts incurred by CADA. A requested accounting was sent last week, and we are hoping that ADA will send us our check for the last month and the month coming up.

When the College Young Democrats were booted out of their quarters by the Democratic National Committee for opposing the war in Vietnam, National ADA offered the CYD's space and facilities in the Washington office.

While this move seems fraternal and noble at first glance, to many CADA'ers the extreme courtesy being shown to the CYD's matched with the rather shabby treatment ADA is giving to its own student group can only be viewed as highly suspicious. Perhaps National ADA wishes to cast its own child aside and adopt the CYD's?

New York State ADA has informed CADA that they will have no facilities available for local chapters to set up a regional office in. The result will mean a tremendous weakening of chapters in the area of our greatest strength. The chapters need an organizational base to work from. They have this with the National Office in New York. Once the National Office moves, they will have nothing.

In peace and freedom,
(Signed)

Claudia Dreifus
National Chairman
Campus ADA

Anthony Fainberg
Chairman, CADA
Berkeley, Calif.

Donald Hillegas
CADA Program Vice-President
Chairman, CADA Fredonia, N.Y.

Jay Mazur
CADA Convention
Staff, Long Island
University Campus ADA

Charles Klien
National Affairs
Vice Chairman,
Campus ADA

Paul Madnick
Queens College CADA
Campus ADA Executive
Board

Arthur Kanegis
Coordinator
CADA Affiliate
Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana

David Schwartz
Member
National Executive
Committee

William Simon
CADA Yale University
CADA delegate to the Nat'l
ADA Board

January 27, 1967

Claudia Dreifus
National Chairman
Campus Americans for Democratic Action

Dear Claudia:

I have read the account of the recent paternalistic attitude adopted by the ADA toward your organization and deeply regret the loss of independence and freedom implied in the decision to move your offices from New York to Washington. This latest example of *in loco parentis*-following, as it does, the "disciplinary" action taken by the Democratic National Committee regarding the College Young Democrats-reveals once again the profound gap existing between a generation of young Americans whose personal sensitivities and political outlook have been radically altered by the experience of "the movement" and an older generation which has failed to respond to the new demands and the new possibilities of American society.

Both the Democratic National Committee and the ADA refuse to accept one of the fundamental political realities of our time: that young Americans are on the move morally, politically, and socially and that they are determined to create the new politics of the future. This willful blindness to the new political reality of our generation is certainly distressing; it should not, however, discourage us nor should it deter us from the task we have set for ourselves: the building of a movement which will create a radically new America embodying the values and the vision which we have rediscovered in the process of confrontation and struggle.

As for coercion and paternalism-whether their origin be in the Selective Service System or in "parent organizations"-there is only one possible response: RESIST!

In Peace and Freedom,

Greg Calvert
National Secretary
Students for a Democratic Society

Port Chicago Vigil

During the spring and summer of 1966 several war protest vigils were staged by CNVA West and by the Contra Costa Citizens Against the War in Vietnam, Port Chicago, site of the U. S. Naval Weapons Station, was a natural target for these demonstrations. Ninety per cent of the napalm and munitions for the war in Vietnam are stored and shipped from this base.

On August 7, 1966, the Contra Costa Citizens sponsored a peace rally at a Concord park, followed by a six mile march to Port Chicago by some 300 people. After reaching the waterfront entrance to the base, some of this group took up a vigil to await the first truckload of munitions which several persons had announced their intention to stop in acts of civil disobedience. The first truck approached at 3 A.M. the next morning and a group of vigilers moved to block it. Another truck appeared about daybreak and some of those who were still waiting stood in its path. Twenty-seven persons were arrested during the first two days. Now those arrested number over sixty persons.

Others came to take their places, individuals from varied backgrounds, individuals moved by conscience to join the protest. The vigil was soon initiated at a second location, the storage entrance, termed the "main gate", about two miles from the waterfront area. Food appeared as did blankets and sleeping bags, coming at first from local sympathizers and then from many parts of the Bay Area. The Contra Costa Citizens as host organization continued to support the vigil and to exert a guiding influence through the forum of its weekly meetings. The council for Justice provided bail and volunteer legal aid during the early weeks before its resources were exhausted. Support soon came from many other organizations including the Women for Peace, S.D.S., Palo Alto Concerned Citizens and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

The vigil persisted. Through afternoon heat and early morning chill, it persisted. Often with a dozen demonstrators, at each gate, sometimes with only two, reaching a peak on week ends, it persisted. At times as a line of silent and meditative protesters, at times as informal conversation groupings, it persisted. Twenty-four hours a day, holding anti-war signs, talking with those who happened by, involving the drivers of the military vehicles in a dialogue, the war protesters have stayed at the roadside vigil, confronted by the military apparatus, and by their presence confronting those who implement the steady flow of munitions to the waiting ships.

The vigil is also a learning experience. We observe the apparatus of the military machine, the loads of crated napalm, large trucks marked "explosives", security areas and Marine guards, ships loading day and night. The war is seen to be close by. We see civilians enter the base to go about their jobs, to "earn a living." We begin to realize that the problems which produced the Vietnam war are related to other foreign problems and to domestic problems. We are led to conclude that wars and riots represent a failure to solve these problems.

The war fever is manifested in hecklers who come to abuse the vigilers with words, douse them with paint, pelt them with bottles, rocks, eggs and fruit. It is present, too, in the behavior of Marines who have sometimes come onto the roadway to club and manhandle those who would stop trucks. It is seen at nearby Clyde village in the armed vigilantes who for a time stationed themselves around a rest and food preparation house rented there. At first they stopped and intimidated demonstrators en route to it and later they ransacked the house, eventually burning it after the demonstrators had turned it back to the realtors.

If you have time, money, food, clothes or ideas to offer - contact us either at the vigil line, or write:

PORT CHICAGO VIGIL
Post Office Box 811
Port Chicago, Calif.

PRAXIS

Vol. 1, No. 1 PRAXIS February 13, 1967

WHY THE NEW PRAXIS SUPPLEMENT?

THE WRITTEN COGITATIONS of SDS members and others in the new left are endless. This indication of a general will to "figure out by writing down" is a healthy sign of foment and growth, both in the field of action and of thought. However, these cogitations, once written down, become positive as contributions only if they can serve as catalysts to further foment. This dynamic seems most likely to occur if the various cogitations relate to each other in a coherent fashion and in a context which sets up a specific confrontation of viewpoints and analysis.

The primary place where this sort of positive interaction can take place is of course at the local level where on-going dialogue allows individuals to criticize and build upon the evaluations and criticisms of others in a face-to-face situation. There is also value in a national dialogue in that the ideas presented can be seeds of discussions at local and regional levels. The value of dialogue at the national level, however, exists only to the extent to which the dynamics of the interchange are capable of sparking a reaction in

those who read it, which turns them on to their own potentials for creative thinking and acting.

The nature of the collective contributions received in the NEW LEFT NOTES office implies that the readers of the paper consider it to be many things, all of which are by no means reconcilable. The conflict has been that with the current staff of NLN (1 person) it has been impossible to do justice to the large number of longer, more "theoretical" articles which come in; these articles speak to many of the questions and needs of SDS chapters and members, but are not so helpful as unedited contributions in an isolated context. PRAXIS has been created in order to give more attention and consideration to these pieces. They will be read by several people and discussed and edited by them.

An additional incentive for the creation of PRAXIS is the wide-felt need for a more current analysis which gets down on paper. Hopefully, PRAXIS will serve as a forum where parts of a new document or new documents can be hashed out.

The first article in this issue of PRAXIS is the first part of a new paper called The Port Authority Statement, soon to be completed. In it is a discussion of the concept of PRAXIS, from which the supplement has been named.

HOW WILL IT WORK?

One of the things which the National Secretary had on the agenda which was discarded was a supplement to NLN. Because it was never discussed and yet the need is great, we have started PRAXIS now on an experimental basis so that SDS members will have some experience by which to judge and discuss the supplement at the next N.C. We hope that this sort of presentation will enable readers and chapters to deal in a more coherent manner with this material.

A number of people in New York volunteered to be on an editorial board. As they all live in the same area, and many of them have worked together before on criticizing and reading papers, the arrangement seemed the most feasible. The NAC approved the following people, therefore, to be on the board:

John Fuerst, Bob Gottlieb, Gerry Tenney, David Gilbert, Steve Halliwell, Laurie Mamet and Beth Gottlieb.

PRAXIS will come out about once a month. All copy, except that written explicitly for PRAXIS, should still be sent to the NLN office in Chicago. Those pieces which are potentially appropriate for PRAXIS will be forwarded to N.Y. PLEASE DO NOT SEND ARTICLES TO N.Y. C W

PRAXIS AND THE NEW LEFT

Bob Gottlieb
Gerry Tenney
Dave Gilbert
New York

the rate of growth in this direction is rapidly increasing. Students, in that they will by and large constitute this new working class, are becoming the most structurally relevant and necessary components of the productive processes of modern American capitalism. This indicates one of the reasons for the seeming disproportionate amount of attention given to the small student new left.

Locating this new structural relation to production on the part of students leads to the question of whether the new left can develop a level of praxis that confronts society in its root operations; or whether, in fact, the new left is one more epiphenomena of protest movements that can be absorbed by the economic growth of American society. In terms of this problem, there has been a notable lack of discussion within the new left of the nature and relevance of praxis and of its revolutionary implication.

PRAXIS

Praxis can first be defined as the development of consciousness through men's relations to production. Through that process, theories of society, of class, and of man's relations to man and nature gradually develop and then reflect back on men's human practical activity. Knowledge comes from activity and in turn affects and shapes that activity. This knowledge becomes political consciousness when it develops out of the class relations of production. Therefore, class consciousness is the highest form of political consciousness. Class-in-itself (in terms of its relation to the means of production) becomes class-for-itself (consciousness of its political and historical role). In Marx's conceptualization the industrial working class contains the seed of the final expression of praxis (class consciousness).

Praxis is usually defined as the unity of theory and practice. All too often the use of this definition leads to a static formulation of praxis and a static strategy for social change. What is absent is both historical understanding and an understanding of emerging and potential contradictions in society. "The unity of theory and practice is also not a given mechanical fact but an historical process of becoming."⁹ This implies critical analysis of the social situation concomitant with social activity. Briefly, praxis is "practical-critical activity."¹⁰

Central to understanding praxis is the concept of the different levels of praxis as well as understanding praxis in its totality, that is, total revolutionary praxis.¹¹ All too often this isolation of one level of praxis leads to an undue emphasis on the economic level of production, with a purely mechanical understanding of the relation of base and superstructure. Therefore, this relation is translated as a one-to-one relation, inhibiting understanding of the subtle and significant changes in the superstructure (political, cultural, and social developments), which in turn reflect on the development of the base (economic structure). This is an historically important form of partial praxis. In the Soviet Union, there was an undue reliance on developing heavy industry as the means whereby socialism would be created. In the United States, the American Communist Party and other elements of the old left relied on the Soviet model which obscured important specific features of American society, and they refused to recognize the flexibility of American capitalism.

The form of partial praxis more relevant to the new left is its inability to develop

1 Percentages computed from the figures of U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the U. S.* 1966.

2 *Time*, January 6, 1967.

3 *op. cit.* *Statistical Abstract*, p. 107.

4 *op. cit.*, *Time*, p. 19.

5 Kenneth Keniston, "Social Change and Youth in America", in Erik Erikson, ed., *The Challenge of Youth*, p. 197.

6 Rockefeller Panel Report, *Prospects for America*, pp. 346-9.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 347.

8 Manuel Bridar, "New Working Class or New Bourgeoisie", *International Socialist Journal*, Jan.-Feb. 1966, p. 8.

9 Antonio Gramsci, "The Formation of the Intellectuals," in *The Modern Prince and Other Writings*, p. 67.

10 Karl Marx, *Theses on Feuerbach*, #1.

This paper is a joint effort to try to inject further development of radical socialist theory for the new left. We are discussing praxis because we feel the need to develop theory out of our political and social activity and then to use that theory as a guide to our future practice. The concept of the new working class has yet to be either concretized or fully developed, especially in the American context. For this reason we're writing and expanded version as a document entailing a critique of American corporate capitalism, its trends and potentiality for change, which will be completed sometime in early February. Please send any comments or criticisms to Dave Gilbert, 523 E. 13th St., N.Y.C. 10009.

Circumstances are changed precisely by men and the educator must himself be educated . . . The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity can only be conceived and rationally understood as revolutionizing practice. Marx - 3rd Thesis on Feuerbach

There can be no revolutionary practice, without revolutionary theory. Lenin

In the last six years there has emerged, in the United States, a new student left. This paper is an attempt to describe and analyse the conditions that led to this development. We will try to situate these conditions within the context of the concept of praxis, and analyze the ability (or inability) of the New Left to develop a relevant praxis that will lead it to a structural critique and potential force for transforming society.

This discussion must be seen in terms of the growing importance of students for the maintenance and stability of American society. Simply on a statistical level, youth constitute an increasingly important sector of the population. In 1950, people under 25 made up ca. 41.5% of the population; in 1960, ca. 44.5%.¹ Estimates for 1966 indicate that citizens 25 and under constitute very nearly 50% of the population.² Furthermore, a larger percentage of this growing sector of youth is attending school, especially at the university level: in 1950, 44.2% of Americans between the ages of 5 and 34 attended school; in 1965, 59.7% attended school. The most significant areas of growth have been in the college-age group: the change from 1950 to 1960 in the percentage of 18- and 19-year-olds attending school is from 29.4% to 46.3%; the percentage of 20-24-year-olds, from 9.0% to 19.0%.³ *Time Magazine* states that now "nearly 40% of American youth goes on to higher education, and more will soon follow."⁴

The social importance of students is increasing at a much greater rate than indicated simply by their numerical growth. In our highly industrialized society, the rate of scientific knowledge and technological innovation is growing at a logarithmic rate.⁵ With this development, technical, clerical and professional jobs that require educational backgrounds, also rapidly increase. As stated in the Rockefeller Panel Report, *Prospects for America*: "Not only are the tasks that must be performed to keep our society functioning ever more intricate and demanding, they are constantly changing. As a result, we are experiencing a great variety of shortages of human resources in fields requiring high competence and extended training . . . We have become more conscious of the strategic importance of education in our society . . . (including) of course, the imperative need to meet the Soviet military threat."⁶

The report cites the growth of professional and technical workers from 1910 to 1957 from 4.4% of the labor force to 9.9%; clerical workers from 11.7% to 14.1%; total jobs demanding highly developed skills and considerable educational background from 32.8% to 47.6%.⁷ More recent estimates indicate that technicians, white collar, and skilled workers constitute ca. 58% of the working force.⁸

These statistics not only demonstrate the present (absolute) growth of the new working class (the new, highly-educated, technical state) but also demonstrates that

(Continued on page 6)

praxis and the new left

(Continued from page 5)

a social praxis that comes out of their class relations to production. These relations are perceived as ambiguous by students who are not yet integral components of the new working class as formulated in the previous section. This situation implies a lack of definition of their own class role. This lack can first be seen as the new left's inability to develop a total revolutionary critique of American society, which is also intimately related to the inability of the new working class to develop consciousness as a class-for-itself. The failure to perceive their class relations inhibits the development of total revolutionary theory, which in turn inhibits the development of total revolutionary praxis. However, the protest movement led to a gradual recognition of the nature of powerlessness, and produced that oft-quoted ideal: People should make the decisions of class consciousness. In this light, total revolutionary praxis involves recognition of their structural, technical role in maintaining, developing and rationalizing American capitalism, and therefore of their own power as a force for social change.

PRAXIS AND THE NEW LEFT

The new left's inability to understand its potential class role comes partly from the fact that students qua students do not constitute a class-in-itself. The university experience does not describe, by itself, class relations of production. It has primarily two functions: first, as a socializing mechanism that is used to integrate and stabilize various social groups into society; secondly, as an apprenticeship for the new technically-specialized economic functions of the society. The apprenticeship also includes liberal arts studies, since, as the Rockefeller Reports implied, the rapidly changing nature of economic tasks requires a more flexible training program. Liberal arts education is also part of the requirements caused by the proliferation of social and administrative tasks, a result of the process of the new technology.¹² The protest at the university level relates primarily to the first function of education (socializing mechanisms) instead of the class related function of apprenticeship. However, the new left's origins do not rest simply with its present social condition but go back to the protests concerning civil rights and peace.

The origins of the new left are not based on an ideological (class) confrontation but on the contrary emanate from a serious commitment to certain features of the dominant American ideology, (although, in the 1950's, there was a latent rejection of the ideology, as was typified by forms of a social behavior, of which the "beatnik generation" was of the most pronounced expression). The denial of civil rights to the black population was the first issue that led to the emergence of the new left. The exposure of this denial directly contradicted the dominant rhetoric of equal opportunity and democratic rights. The movement that resulted was oriented toward ameliorating these specific evils rather than developing programs that included a structural critique of the whole society. The call for integration was the call for the elimination of some apparently irrational features of American capitalism. What followed was the growing realization of the inadequacy and irrationality of other features of American capitalism: namely, the arms race and the existence of poverty amid affluence. Again, the critique and program were oriented toward the elimination of specific problems within the context of a class society.

that affect their lives. This pervasive state of powerlessness enabled some to grasp the correlation between activity in the rural South or the urban North, and relations of this country to the underdeveloped nations. The protest movement could then move on to a higher level of critique, in particular concerning the two specific problems of the university and the war in Vietnam.

In the winter of 1959, the Berkeley revolt occurred. The studies on the nature of this revolt point to and give evidence to the thesis that the protest movement developed in response to the contradiction between the American ideology and its reality rather than as a rejection of this ideology. Glen Lyonn's study shows that a large plurality of students participating in demonstrations for the first time considered themselves Liberal Democrats, whose position represents the idealized formulation of American ideology. However, this plurality was sharply reduced among students who had previously participated in demonstrations.¹³ Participation in the protest movements did result in a partial radicalization.

Involvement in the Vietnam protest has furthered that process in several different ways. First, the very centers of power are clearly implicated in waging this war. This implies a qualitative difference from the civil rights situation, where, in fact, President Johnson could say "we shall overcome" and where the Federal Government was not recognized as directly obstructing civil rights. Secondly, Vietnam and the Dominican Republic led to a consideration of the nature and structure of U. S. world relations and a development of theories of U. S. imperialism. Thirdly, Vietnam has raised the question of priorities in the allocation of resources, especially affecting poverty and education. Fourthly, Vietnam clearly revealed the processes of manipulation and consensus instrumental to maintaining the dominant ideology. However, Vietnam, in itself, has not clearly demonstrated the nature of class society, regarding in particular the new working class. The war protest has not brought forth the specific structural programs for social transformation.

The protest on the university level has further developed student consciousness to the point where the new left began to formulate a partial praxis. Instead of simply responding to specific irrationalities, the new left began to construct a social-political

11 Henri Lefebvre, *La Vie Cotidienne*, chapter on praxis.

12 Certain bureaucratic positions have political rather than purely technical causes; e.g., the War on Poverty program does not allow for democratic control by the poor of the funds available; therefore, bureaucratic jobs of a political origin (social workers, War on Poverty administrators, etc.) are open to the middle sector.

13 Lyonn's survey showed that 48% of first-time demonstrators considered themselves Liberal Democrats. The next largest group was Democratic Socialist, 17%. Conservative Democrat and Liberal Republican each constituted 10% while Conservative Republicans and Revolutionary Socialist were only 3% each. On the other hand, among previous demonstrators, 39% were Liberal Democrats, 35% Democratic Socialist and 18% Revolutionary Socialist. c.f., Glen Lyonn's "The Police Car Demonstration: A survey of Participants", in Seymour Lipset and Sheldon Wolin, eds., *The Berkeley Revolt*, p. 524.

(Continued on page 9)

THE RIGHT OF REVOLUTION

Staughton Lynd

"The Right of Revolution" is the draft introduction to a book which will be published by Little Brown in 1968 under the tentative title *Freedom Now: The American Revolutionary Tradition, 1760-1860*. Staughton Lynd would like very much to have NLN readers send any reactions and suggestions they might have.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: *The Right of Revolution*
 Chapter 1. *Nature And Nature's God*
 Chapter 2. *Certain Inalienable Rights*
 Chapter 3. *Freedom Now*
 Chapter 4. *My Country Is The World*
 Chapter 5. *The Earth Belongs To The Living*
 Conclusion: *Bicameralism From Below*

For by natural birth, all men are equally and alike borne to like propriety, liberty and freedom, and as we are delivered of God by the hand of nature into this world, everyone with a natural, innate, freedom and propriety (as it were writ in the table of every mans heart, never to be obliterated) even so are we to live, everyone equally and alike to enjoy his Birthright and privilege; even all whereof God by nature hath made him free.

Stokely Carmichael, UPI dispatch datelined New York, *New Haven Journal-Courier*, Oct. 29, 1966.

There is a higher law than the law of government. That's the law of conscience.

Richard Overton, *An Arrow Against All Tyrants And Tyranny, Shot From The Prison Of New-Gate Into The Prerogative Bowels Of The Arbitrary House Of Lords* (1646)

Americans have made two revolutions: the first in '776, the second in '86'. To energize and explain these revolutions, the men who made them created a revolutionary intellectual tradition. Among the tenets of this tradition by 1776 were: 1. All men can intuitively distinguish right from wrong; 2. No man, however oppressive his circumstances, is without some freedom to decide how he should act; 3. Every man is born with certain natural liberties which, if taken away at all, cannot be justly taken without his consent. After the revolution of '776, the fact of slavery—property in man sanctioned by the highest legal authorities of the American nation state—drove abolitionists to the further affirmation that: 4. Not only do oppressed majorities have the right to revolt, but that individuals have the right and duty to resist oppressive laws; 5. We owe our ultimate allegiance, not to a particular nation state, but to a higher law which governs the whole family of man; and

(sometimes) 6. The earth belongs to mankind in common.

Those recent historians who hold that the American revolution had no "ideology . . . capable of being made universal" are quite wrong. They simply ignore the fact that the Revolution addressed to the "opinion of mankind" a dramatic insistence on the natural rights of "all men" which has been echoed by revolutionaries the world over from that day to this (most recently by the Vietnamese, whose 1945 declaration of independence begins with the words "all men are created equal"). They blantly forget Tom Paine's assertion that the American Revolution was unique precisely in being "a revolution in the principles and practice of governments" and not "merely a separation from England."

Above all, the revolutionaries of 1776 and 1861 defended the right of revolution. During the century 1760-1860 the right of revolution was justified by Presidents as well as by prophets, by politicians in power

as well as by radicals out of it. "Revolutionary ground should be occupied," stated the Address of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society in '844, which concluded: "Up, then, with the banner of revolution!" But this was only to rephrase more flamboyantly what the Declaration of Independence termed the people's right "to alter or to abolish" the governments that they created. The Revolutionary constitutions of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Maryland and Massachusetts called the right of revolution inalienable. And Abraham Lincoln's first Inaugural Address asserted:

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it.

The preamble to the Declaration of Independence is the single most concentrated expression of the revolutionary intellectual tradition. Without significant exception, subsequent variants of American radicalism have taken the Declaration as their point of departure and claimed to be true heirs of the spirit of '76. Jefferson developed the philosophy of the document he had drafted in the direction of states' rights and the defense of Southern sectionalism. But in doing so Jefferson continued to invoke the Declaration of Independence, as did the very language of the South Carolina Declaration of the Causes of Secession in 1860. Northern radicalism also traced its lineage to Carpenters' Hall. On July 4, 1826, the day Jefferson and John Adams died, Robert Owen delivered a declaration of "mental independence" comprising secularism, equality of the sexes, and common ownership. These ideas inspired one current of Jacksonian dissent. But William Lloyd Garrison, anything but secular and intensely anti-Jackson, also adopted the rhetoric of the Declaration in drafting the manifestoes of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1833 and the New England Non-Resistance Society in '838. Lincoln referred to the Declaration of Independence as the "standard

maxim for a free society" and compared its role as a spiritual regulator to that of the Biblical injunction, "Be ye perfect." All the Radical Republicans, Charles Sumner for example, maintained that the Declaration was part of the United States Constitution, or if it was not should at once be made so.

After the Civil War the glittering generalities of the Declaration retained their potency, and American radicalism continued to present itself as their fulfillment. "The reform I have proposed," wrote Henry George in *Progress and Poverty*,

"... is but the carrying out in letter and spirit of the truth enunciated in the Declaration of Independence... They who look upon Liberty as having accomplished her mission when she has abolished hereditary privileges and given men the ballot, ... have not seen her real grandeur... We cannot go on prating of the inalienable rights of man and then denying the inalienable right to the bounty of the Creator."

When Julian West awoke in Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, Doctor Leete's explanation of the new society ran in similar terms. "In a word," he said, "the people of the United States concluded to assume the conduct of their own business, just as one hundred odd years before they had assumed the conduct of their own government, organizing now for industrial purposes on precisely the same grounds that they had then organized for political purposes." Henry Demarest Lloyd invoked the analogy of the American Revolution in *Wealth Against Commonwealth*, declaring:

Myriads of experiments to get the substance of liberty out of the forms of tyranny, to believe in princes, to trust good men to do good as kings, have taught the inexorable lesson that, in the economy of nature, form and substance must move together... Identical is the lesson we are learning with regard to industrial power and property...

"Liberty recast the old forms of government into the Republic," Lloyd concluded, "and it must remould our institutions of wealth into the Commonwealth."

In the twentieth century it has been no

(Continued on page 7)

the right of revolution

(Continued from page 6)

different. Both the NAACP and SNCC derive from W.E.B. DuBois' seminal essay "Of Booker T. Washington and Others," that ended with an appeal to "those great words which the Sons of the Fathers would fain forget": the preamble to the Declaration of Independence. For Eugene Debs, similarly, Patrick Henry "was one of my first heroes; and my passion for his eloquent and burning defiance of King George inspired the first speech I ever attempted in public." Among the French and American revolutionaries who inspired Debs, Tom Paine "towered above them all."

During the New Deal and World War II, it was vogueish among radicals to identify their various causes with the alleged tradition of "Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln." The New Left of the 1950's and 1960's, despite its oft-described sense of alienation and its quarrel with the intellectual habits of the previous generation, also uses the Revolution as a touchstone. Thus in November 1965 Carl Oglesby, president of Students for a Democratic Society, asked an antiwar demonstration gathered at the Washington Monument to imagine what Thomas Jefferson or Thomas Paine would say to President Johnson and McGeorge Bundy about the war in Vietnam. Thus in August 1966, when the House Un-American Activities Committee, subpoenaed antiwar activists, the head of the Free University of New York issued a statement invoking the Green Mountain Boys and the chairman of the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee appeared in the hearing chamber in the uniform of an officer of George Washington's army.

For almost two hundred years American radicals have traced their intellectual origins to the Declaration of Independence and the revolution it justified. Much as, with or without the help of therapists, all of us occasionally look back to our individual pasts to find strength for new beginnings, so with or without the help of historians Americans who wish to change their society in the present have used the past as a source for forgotten alternatives. The Revolution-cum-Declaration serves them as a means toward that "frequent recurrence to fundamental principles" which the leaders of the American Revolution advised.

II

This process of looking backward has its perils. One of them is to identify with the past too strongly. William A. Williams rightly remarks: "The real point about radicalism is to create and act upon it in the here and now rather than to invest so much energy and talent in finding its roots in the American past... An emphasis on finding roots is very apt to distract one from the labor of evolving new ideas."

The Old Left exemplifies this fallacy in its uncritical attitude toward past political leaders, the historiographical reflection of its over-identification in the present with President Franklin Roosevelt. The revolutionary tradition in America is not simply a Jeffersonian tradition, or the tradition of Lincoln, or some common-sense synthesis of the two. Jefferson, as noted earlier, used the words he wrote in 1776 to defend states' rights, Southern sectional interests, and (by implication) slavery. Long before Lincoln quoted the Declaration of Independence to attack slavery, abolitionists rough-hewed a revolutionary theory from the Declaration and the Bible. It would be more accurate to say that at certain periods of their lives Jefferson and Lincoln expressed the American revolutionary tradition, than to say that they created it. The characteristic exponents of the revolutionary tradition were urban artisans, poor workingmen who did not go to college and rarely held public office, such as Paine, Garrison, George and Debs.

But if there is danger in romanticizing the past by fabricating a radicalism which was not there, it is equally misleading to suppose that prior to the formation of an industrial proletariat, or the advent of Marxist theory, all groups in American society shared a consensus as to the goodness of private property and republican government. Williams comes close to suggesting this when he says: "the roots of American radicalism may in fact be rather young shoots... It may be more helpful, then, to look for the roots of an American radicalism within the confines of the 20th century—beginning, say, with William E. B. DuBois, Eugene Debs, and the Wobblies."

Now if, in fact, there was no American

radicalism before Debs, if the American Revolution was nothing more than an independence movement of rum smugglers and impoverished planters, if the abolitionists (to quote Williams) were only "the moral and ideological shock troops of *laissez-faire*," then we would have to face up to it and cherish as best we could the heroism of the American Indian and the Latin American guerrilla. The truth is, however, that while the American revolutionary tradition was "bourgeois" as well as "democratic," there is an unbroken continuity between the revolutionaries of 1776 and the radicals of the twentieth century. Thus, for example, the early nineteenth century American socialists built on Jefferson's dictum that "the earth belongs to the living"; a son of Utopian socialist Robert Dale Owen was the principal



FREEDOM—NOW

draughtsman of the Fourteenth Amendment; and a son of John Brown sent grapes to the Haymarket anarchists as they awaited execution. The very men whom Williams mentions as creators of a new, twentieth century American radicalism saw themselves as executors of a tradition they were proud to inherit.

BuBois revered John Brown, both for his understanding of what it meant to be a Negro in the United States and for his "inchoate but growing belief in a more just and a more equal distribution of property." So did Debs, who called Brown "History's Greatest Hero." Debs' best-remembered speech, his remarks to the jury on the occasion of his conviction for sedition in World War I, was a miniature history of the United States for radicals. He reminded his listeners that Samuel Adams had been condemned as an incendiary and Patrick Henry as a traitor, that Washington, Adams and Paine "were the rebels of their day." Then the abolitionists began "another mighty agitation." Elijah Lovejoy, "opposed to chattel slavery — just as I am opposed to wage slavery" was "despised in his day as are the leaders of the I.W.W. in our day." It was my good fortune, Debs continued, to know Wendell Phillips personally; Garrison, Garrett Smith, Thaddeus Stevens were once "regarded as monsters of depravity" but "you are teaching your children to revere their memories."

Then Debs turned to the theme of internationalism, quoting Paine's and Garrison's words, "My country is the world." He referred to Lincoln's opposition to the war with Mexico, maintained that he did not go so far as Phillips who had said that "the glory of free men is that they trample unjust laws under their feet." And he ended, as his biographer Ray Ginger notes, by unconsciously paraphrasing John Brown's words to the jury in 1860.

There is, then, in reality as well as in rhetoric, what past SDS national secretary Paul Booth has called a "lineage of radicalism" in American history which runs back to the "revolutionary spirit" of the eighteenth century, "a vital tradition of radicals and radical movements... resumed in our time."

III

The vocabulary of the Declaration of Independence may seem a little distant and archaic to us. We find the scenario of social contract unusable. Insistence on natural "rights" suggests all too strongly the vision of an atomistic rather than a communal society.

But what eighteenth and nineteenth century radicals meant by these old words has much in common with what the modern radical movement means by "Freedom Now." Men should have freedom now, according to the revolutionary tradition, because on joining society they did not surrender their essential natural powers. If existing society abused those powers, men should demand their restoration at once: "Immediate emancipation," after all, is simply

He exaggerated his own intellectual distance from the French and American manifestoes, for he too built his intellectual system on the concept of "alienation" (*Entfremdung*) which he took from Hegel. Alienated man, as Marx portrayed him, was man "corrupted, lost to himself, . . . subjected to the rule of inhuman conditions": one who had transformed his own energies into things and institutions outside himself which returned to oppress him. Alienation as described by Marx has a good deal in common with the Declaration's description of government as a creation of men designed to secure their inalienable rights, which on occasion becomes destructive of the ends for which it was designed.

The thesis of this book is that the political philosophy of the Declaration of Independence derived not only from the bourgeois worldly wisdom of Locke and Harrington but from an essentially religious vision of the good society as a covenanted community under the law of God. Originating in the Radical Reformation, translated into eighteenth-century terms by English Protestant Dissenters and American Quakers, this element in the ideology of the rights of man was developed by nineteenth-century abolitionists in the direction of civil disobedience and confiscation without compensation of private property; and by the early Marx, in the direction of Communist revolution.

The ambiguity of the philosophy of the American Revolution lay in affirming the concept of personal liberty while at the same time linking it to private property and economic self-interest. The result, paradoxically, was in significant respects a closed society: a society which held the meagerest hopes for human nature, which foreclosed significant alternatives before they had been tried. Abolitionists could transcend the results of the American Revolution only by discarding the cool deistic temper for which the leaders of the Revolution have been so much praised. To carry freedom forward they had first to quarry back to its intellectual origins in Christian liberty. No less than their Anabaptist forbears, abolitionists felt themselves in the presence of the coming of the Lord. And so they sang: Be swift my soul to answer Him, be jubilant my feet.

IV

What if anything does the American revolutionary tradition, as it culminated in abolitionism, have to add to the insights of Marx?

The revolutionary tradition built on the experienced reality of conscience, and sought to reconstruct society as a voluntary association of free moral agents. Marxism, too, speaks of the good society as an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all. Marx derived his critique of capitalism from the critique of Christianity by Feuerbach and other German Young Hegelians. Some Americans (such as Theodore Parker) read the same books that Marx did (such as Strauss' *Leben Jesu*) and drew from them the same analytical tools (such as "fetishism"). Henry Thoreau might speak of pushing down the road of life a barn seventy by forty and Marx of the fetishism of commodities, but they meant very much the same thing; and in the same years (1845-1846) that Marx described in *The German Ideology* a Utopia in which men would work in the morning and write literary criticism after lunch, Thoreau was living it at Walden Pond.

Despite these similarities between the American revolutionary tradition and Marxism, even the thought of the young Marx leaves little place for spontaneous initiatives — improvised revolutions — by individuals and small groups. To Marx, as to the American Founding Fathers, responsible social action presupposed a rational survey of the economic situation in which one planned to act. Inevitably, the required analysis fell to an elite which had the leisure and training to make it. For all his talk of the dependence of theory upon practice, Marx like Madison was condescending toward the felt experience of common men. His scorn for individuals and small groups — often groups of working men — who sought to change society on the basis of their own perceptions had a good deal in common with the hostility of John Adams toward "self-constituted" abolitionist societies.

Abolitionist activism therefore has some-

a latinate rendering of "freedom now."

Existential radicals of the mid-twentieth century have rediscovered the central affirmations of the older tradition. We learned in the concentration camp or the American South that no external circumstances can deprive man of his capacity to be a free moral agent. At the Nuremberg Tribunal and elsewhere, we began to talk once more about the attributes of man as man: to use Jefferson's language, about "the common rights of mankind," "the rights of human nature," the "sacred" laws of nations "which even savage nations observe."

For us, then, it is no longer satisfactory to dismiss the eighteenth century rhetoric as mere myth. Even Carl Becker, author of a brilliant study on the Declaration, discounted its philosophy as "a humane and engaging faith" which, however, was founded not on fact but on "a superficial knowledge of history" and a "naive faith in the instinctive virtues of human kind." The young Karl Marx found the meaning of the Declaration equally transparent. The liberty protected by the French and American bills and declarations of rights was, for Marx, "the right to do everything which does not harm others." It rested, not on a communal relation between men, "but rather upon the separation of man from man." It was "the right of the circumscribed individual, withdrawn into himself," "the right of self-interest." Citing the bills of rights of revolutionary Pennsylvania and New Hampshire (the texts of which he found in Beaumont's *Marie*), Marx analyzed the "imprescriptible" and "inalienable" right of religious liberty as simply the reflection in the superstructure of bourgeois society of the absolute right of private property which was its economic foundation. Marx said that religion in capitalist society "is no longer the essence of community, but . . . an expression of the fact that man is separated from community." Like the economy, bourgeois religion is fragmented, privatized: "only the abstract avowal of an individual folly, a private whim or caprice."

Marx's analysis of the eighteenth century's "rights of man" was brilliant but one-sided.

(Continued from p. 8)

THE WHITES

The following article is the third chapter of a thesis on the subject of the feasibility of an interracial movement of the poor. The author interviewed residents of two poor neighborhoods, one Negro and one White. (The sample size was 250.) Three SNCC members did the interviewing in the Negro slum. The questionnaire contained questions dealing with various sorts of reactions to figures, events and directions of the civil rights movement and anti-poverty activities. (The interviewing was mostly done in the summer of 1966.) This part of the paper deals with the White community.

Question: Whom do you like better: Roy Wilkins or Malcolm X?

Answer: Malcolm X.

Question: Why?

Answer: Cause he's dead.

Racial segregation does not appear to be a dominant fact of life in this 100 block square South Philadelphia area if one takes the census as authoritative guide. Indeed, the census tells us that the racial mix in this area is 60% white - 40% black. It is not until one walks down any of the main streets, Dickinson, Morris, Tasker, 25th, 28th, Moore, that one can appreciate how gross statistics can distort the truth. black by blacks, the next by whites, or maybe the next two or three, and so on. There is black by blacks, the next by whites, or maybe the next two or three, and so on.

There is little variation. Either a block is entirely white, or its composition is neither an off-white or gray, but wholly black. Only the Tasker Project, a public housing installation of about 500 units, appears integrated, and this is probably not due to free choice.

Most of the houses in the "white" blocks seem in good repair. They are all row houses, stretching in endless procession as far as the next bar or church. Their shades are drawn to keep out the sun, and here or there a second hand air conditioner rattles and drips water from the second floor. There is no grass and trees stand only in the few vest pocket parks populated, even on hot summer days, by several small children and a caretaker.

The streets are narrow. Some are filled with glass, others pock-marked with abandoned cars, and almost all have a bar. These, as one might suspect, are also divided up between the races and business is usually good at any hour, for all are air conditioned, have a TV, a talkative bartender, and 15¢ beer. Other institutions abound. There are many churches (mostly Catholic) and almost as many schools. Although the area has no chain super markets, there are a multiplicity of corner "one stop" grocery stores. Beauty parlors, some with pictures of Negro models, some with whites, exist in profusion, as do luncheonettes, drug stores, and "hoogie shops". There is one factory.

Even during the summer, most whites in this area, populated largely by second and third generation Irish and Italians, stay indoors. It is possible to see a few women having morning coffee on the stoop, men in the bar or washing their cars, and children playing stickball. But, more often than not, each doorbell rung will evoke some response, though not often cordial, from within the house or apartment. And, in the great majority of those instances, more than one member of the family is at home.

It was apparent, from the beginning, that few people wanted to discuss their feelings and reactions to the civil rights movement. A man or woman (the response was the same), upon hearing the doorbell, would turn down the television, come over to the door, open it a crack, peer out, and ask what was wanted. If the researcher introduced himself as interested in sampling opinions on civil rights, or Negro-white relations, the door was 50% certain to close with polite disclaimers from the inhabitant that he wasn't "interested in that stuff", or that "they treat me right and that's all I ask". Many said they couldn't get "involved". When the researcher's self-introduction changed to "sampling opinions about governmental policies toward poor people" the refusal rate dropped to approximately 20%.

The intensity of feelings of hostility, and fear, to all Negroes was overwhelming and was uniformly high among all sub-groupings of the whites. Coexisting with this hostility were the rhetorical trappings of tolerance. One 40 year old white man beamed with pride:

I like them, get along with them. But I'd never go into one's home. They're busting my block now. That's okay; let them buy all the homes they can, but I'd never go into one's home. They're busting my block now. That's okay; let them buy all the homes they can, but when I get a chance I'm moving out. We just ignore them. That makes them feel worse than if we move out. They got some smart cookies, but the young

ones are just a bunch of rape artists. We should have educated them a long time ago.

Another man, 52 years old and unemployed, became more and more heated as he said:

We drove the Indians out and the Negroes will drive us out. They were held down in the South so long, then they come up here, get a little freedom, and it goes over their heads. They're getting overbearing. I'm not prejudiced, but they're taking over all the cities. They breed like rabbits.

The propensity, as in the above, to claim no bias and to blame any racial trouble on the South was quite common. We "should blow the South up" was a sentiment shared by many whites, most of whom then went on to suggest that those Negroes who now lived in the North "shouldn't try to move so fast".

One indicator of the perceived differences between North and South was the virtual identity among those who wanted "to blow up the South" and those who thought integration "has been accomplished in the North". 55 out of 106 respondents thought that it had been fully accomplished in the North. This statistic, however, blurs the full reality. Among the 40 who thought that integration was not complete, there were some who thought it never would be and many who thought it never should be, given prevailing attitudes.

There seems a fairly even dichotomy in this poor white community between those who say "we've always had integration", and those who say "we never want it". Whether implicit, as in the first position, or explicit, as in the latter, the warning is identical: "We will move no further toward integration". If Negroes "have all the rights they need", indeed, "have too many rights - because 80% of them haven't shown they're human", then it is ludicrous in the extreme to expect any impetus for integration, "freedom now", or "black power" to come out of this depressed white area.

Many whites were able to produce no justification for the existence of a civil rights struggle or, in some instances, for Negroes themselves, e.g., liking Malcolm X "cause he's dead" (The similarity here to the old frontier maxim, "The only good Indian is a dead Indian", seems pronounced). The questionnaire presented the respondent with four forced choices, each involving two Negro "leaders", and with five civil rights groups which the respondent could grade: either excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor. The results of these questions lend credence to the proposition that the whites, by and large, were unable or unwilling to make distinctions between "moderate" and "militant" alternatives.

When asked to choose between Cecil Moore, militant and outspoken head of Philadelphia's NAACP, and Martin Luther King, 64 out of 103 respondents like neither. Between Adam Clayton Powell (before his Congressional troubles) and James Meredith 50 out of 84 likes neither. When the choice was between Roy Wilkins and Malcolm X 38 out of 81 respondents could not pick, so equally reprehensible were the alternatives. Only when the option was either Cassius Clay or Floyd Patterson were the whites willing to distinguish between the two, 24 picking Clay ("a better fighter", "not ashamed of being colored"), 56 choosing

Patterson ("not a regular nigger", "not a loudmouth"), and 19 disliking both.

Most of these "leaders", from Wilkins to Meredith to Malcolm, were seen as "trouble-makers" and "agitators". The consensus not only was that "I don't like any of them niggers", but that it is impossible "to civilize them bastards". One young woman, a high school graduate whose husband "drives a '53 Chevy while those niggers have Cadillacs" said:

What do they want? We were 800 years getting civilized. They've only been out of the jungles 200 years. They should learn to creep before they walk.

Similarly, all civil rights groups were seen by the majority as without merit, although more distinctions were made:

	excellent and pretty good	only fair and poor
NAACP	37	53
Deacons for Defence	1*	25
Black Muslims	1	83
Urban League	23	27
Philadelphia Anti-Poverty Action Committee	26	53

*The one excellent ranking for the Deacons for Defense came from a 70 year old American Legion member who sputtered excitedly, "Oh, defense? Yes, I'm for anything for defense."

Adamant in their steadfast refusal to grant the propriety of Negro demands, much less the demands themselves, the whites, not surprisingly, do not see violence as a viable tool for the attainment of Negro ends. 106 out of 114 think that violence is not the way to gain desired goals. To say that violence is anathema to poor whites because it is the method which most directly threatens them seems obvious. What is not apparent is what political apparatus, what kind of activity, Negroes should employ to ameliorate perceived injustices. If violence is odious to these whites, so is non-violence (64 people liked neither King nor Moore, 35 liked King), and so are any demonstrations:

Only the radical bastards who won't work are causing all the commotion. You don't see any respected smokes carrying signs. None of them Hollywood entertainers do it. (55 year old union member);

They can even win without demonstrating. They should educate themselves. Some elements want to get things by rioting, killing, and raping. (23 year old fireman);

They should go slower and use different methods, although I don't know what they'd be. (18 year old girl)

It is not, then, a question of means by which to achieve certain just ends. The ends themselves are scored, and Negroes are advised that they either already have too many rights or have no chance of receiving any more. In such a situation a coalition of the poor of both races is irrelevant, for not only are there no common "interests" (inter-subjectively defined), but insofar as status "interests" tend to dominate economic ones, the "interests" of the two groups are close to polar opposites. There seems only one way that the Negro might achieve his ends. A 33 year old woman hinted:

I'm not prejudiced. I don't care if a colored person lives next door to me, so long as he keeps his house clean, and he conducts himself like a white person.

II

If whites' feelings about civil rights and Negroes are uncomplicated, their perceptions about themselves, with regard to poverty, are at least complex, and probably somewhat paradoxical. Although there is no identification with Negroes, there seems to be much identification with the poor. That is, these whites carefully delineate between two "classes" of the poor, Negroes (being helped beyond their needs), and whites (made to carry an undue tax burden and otherwise left to the caprice of laissez-faire). 85 out of 123 white respondents identified themselves as either lower or working class. This is at least *prima facie*

evidence that the subjective class polarization necessary (but not sufficient) for a political movement of the poor is present in these whites. There was no aversion to calling Negroes poor, either. However, perceived similarity ended there, for both Negro culture and political "interests" were seen to be sufficiently alien as to warrant antipathy.

There was little cynicism, although one might have expected it in a sub-population where the gap between promise and achievement on the vertical mobility scale is so great. Nevertheless, the great majority of the respondents (81 out of 98) gave the government a "yes" when asked if they thought the government was trying to help the poor. Additionally, most people thought that the government had changed its policies toward poor people in the last several years (72 out of 111), and were at least familiar, if not overjoyed, with some of the new programs e.g., OEO and Medicare.

Criticism of governmental response to the poor took both a quantitative and qualitative jump when respondents considered how the governmental policy mix had changed and whether it was succeeding in its stated purpose of helping the poor. One 20 year old IBM worker said he was sure that the government had changed, but that he hadn't seen anything happen yet. Similar sentiments were expressed by a 43 year old woman:

I think they're succeeding but I haven't heard of anybody who's been affected yet.

One airline serviceman thought that the government wasn't succeeding because federal monies were being syphoned off by heads of communities. Others, of course, blamed this simply on fiscal irresponsibility and corruption. This sort of response is fairly sophisticated, for it entails making distinctions of intent between two governmental levels.

Other respondents, as well, showed both an intimate feel for the political process and a strong distaste for programs ostensibly aimed at them. One 30 year old woman commented:

The poverty program is supposed to be trying but it's not accomplishing much. The only reason it's around at all is because it's being pushed by groups into trying to help.

A 19 year old boy thought most of the poverty programs didn't really accomplish much, because "all they do is hire a few big names". Many people thought Medicare

(Continued on page 9)

ON revolution

(Continued from page 7)

thing to say to the Marxism which came after it just as it spoke potently to the Harringtonian materialism of the Founding Fathers. One cannot entrust the mass of men with a collective right of revolution unless one is prepared for small groups and individuals to revolutionize their lives from day to day. One should not invoke the ultimate reconstructive act of revolution without willingness to see new institutions perpetually improved from below. The alternative is revolutions made in the name of the equality of "all men" which perpetuate chattel slavery, or in the name of a classless society which perpetuate dictatorship. The withering away of the state must begin in the process of changing the state. Freedom must mean freedom now.

The Marxist who endorses this perspective has fundamental principles to which he can recur. Early Marxism shared with the American revolutionary tradition the concern that ideas be acted on. Revolutionaries, whether in the Marxist or native American traditions, stand on common ground in affirming: The philosophers have only interpreted the world; the thing, however, is to change it.

the whites

(Continued from page 8)

a fine idea, "but too expensive to buy".

In all, while 81 out of 98 respondents thought that the "government" (this was widely understood to be the federal government) was sincere in its desire to aid the poor, only 16 out of 66 thought that it was succeeding. Some, to be sure, of the majority saw the prime flaw in government programs as the propensity to help only "one class of the poor", the blacks. One old gentleman thought the logical panacea to be "painting my face black; then I'd have it made". Generally speaking, however, criticism was directed at the lack of effect anti-poverty forays had had in this community; moreover, most of the perceived reasons for governmental failure were not related to Negroes.

Thus far, this chapter has touched on two of the salient variables which must be considered in any evaluation of the possibilities for an interracial movement of the poor: 1) the feelings of whites toward the other race with which, in some ideal formulation, they are to join and; 2) the perceptions of poor whites vis-a-vis poverty, both their own relationship to it and their feelings about existing efforts to eradicate it. There is a third important determinant: the predisposition to join or not to join groups.

One housewife in her middle thirties told the researcher that "the poverty program is a high priced sham". She then went on to say how much she disapproved of unions "because people should work individually" to achieve their ends. Thus, the individual was seen as pure, the group (unions in this instance) as a corrupting influence. If the feelings of most poor whites tend in this direction, i.e., that individuals should remain atomized, then no matter how strong the identification with poverty, or how intense the feelings against existing governmental efforts, a movement, which requires wholesale group membership and identification, is probably an impossibility. In a "pluralist" society which is vulnerable only to group pressures, individual disaffection is insufficient to effect change.

The questionnaire measured tendencies toward "belongingness" in two ways: 1) whether the respondent approved or disapproved of unions and; 2) whether, in fact, he belonged to any groups (religious affiliation excepted). The results were fairly conclusive. 48 out of 90 respondents thought unions a "good". Of these 48, 28 belonged to groups, e.g., athletic clubs, sororities, VFW. Of the 42 respondents who saw unions as either bad or "part good, part bad", only 11 belonged to other groups. In addition, both the union approvers and those respondents who were themselves in groups were stronger working class identifiers than either those who disapproved of unions or were not in groups. These tended more toward identification with the middle class.

Overall, there were 43 out of 125 who belonged to non-religious groups. These 43 saw existing governmental efforts toward the extinction of poverty as no better or no worse than the remaining 82. In any event, whatever the attitudes of group members regarding poverty, the basis for group membership has to be present for a movement to have a chance. In this sample, with 53% of its number union sympathizers, and 34% actual group members, the foundation seems present.

III

Statistical Variations on a Theme

Although hostility to the Negro and skepticism toward existing governmental programs appeared fairly widespread throughout the white community, some interesting patterns are visible, especially with regard to income, age, and educational level. Income, less a factor in this study than in others due to the uniformly low socio-economic status of the respondents, still played a definite role in opinion formation.

As a general proposition, both tolerance (such as it was) of Negroes and civil rights groups and approval of existing anti-poverty efforts were direct functions of income. Most of the approval for Clay, Patterson, Meredith, and Wilkins came from those making between \$4,000-10,000 a year. Below \$4,000 the respondents were much more likely to disapprove of any of the "leaders".

Similarly, with regard to civil rights groups, the NAACP and the Urban League scored much better with upper income groups than with those of lower income. When it be-

came a question of whether the poor are being helped by existing programs, no single income category voted "yes". However, what pattern there is indicates that at higher level of income a respondent is more likely to approve of existing governmental efforts than is a respondent who makes less than \$4,000:

	Income	
	\$0-4,000	\$4-10,000
Yes. The government is succeeding	0	74
No. The government is not succeeding	78	29
Don't Know	17	26

With regard to age, the pattern was somewhat different. There was little variation in the opprobrium with which any age category of the whites saw Negroes and civil rights groups. However, approval of governmental anti-poverty efforts proved a direct function of age, as it did with income:

	Age	
	20-40	over 40
Yes. Govt. succeeding	5	6
No. Govt. not succeeding	31	12
Don't know	74	22

Related to education, this trend remains unchanged. The more education a person had received, the more likely he was to be tolerant of civil rights activity, and the more likely he was to be a believer in the efficacy of present governmental efforts:

	Educational level	
	0-10 years	over 10 years
Yes: Govt. succeeding	0	16
No. Govt. not succeeding	10	40
Don't know.	14	29

Sketchy and inconclusive as these "trends" are, they do offer some limited proof that civil rights sympathizers and supporters of present governmental programs tend to have relatively high incomes and high educational levels. In addition, government supporters tend to be older than those who think present efforts to erase poverty are insufficient.

The only one of the three variables, income, age, and education, which seems to relate at all to union approval and group membership is income. As income increases (and this tendency has been cited in many studies), the respondent is more likely to belong to some organized group:

	Income	
	under \$7,000	over \$7,000
In a group	24	19
Not in a group	67	15

The implications of all this are, of course, not clear. Several things, however, do seem apparent. Given the prevailing attitudes in this poor white area, the point to be made about an interracial movement of the poor is that it cannot happen. The white's animosities, hostilities, and fears of the Negro, all Negroes, are manifested in almost everything he says. Integration, blacknationalism, violence, non-violence, ends, means: all are suspect. Coalition with blacks is not thought of in pejorative terms. It is not thought of. Even though these whites are perfectly willing to identify blacks as poor, as they are themselves, the economic cleavage in the society, which separates "poor people" from others, is not seen as dominant. Rather the cleavage of crucial import, and one which is central to the vision of an interracial movement, is color.

However, opposition to existing governmental programs is also widespread among these ghetto whites. Government is not perceived as beneficent big brother, but rather as a power system, which operates "to keep the poor where we are". The options these respective positions open to the "movement"

PRAXIS

(Continued from page 6)

theory out of its every-day practical experiences; i.e., a praxis. Significantly, the new left started talking about control and manipulation. This new emphasis was a response to the socializing mechanisms of the university, which involve such things as *in loco parentis*, objectification and quantification of the learning experience (also part of the apprenticeship function) and the pervasiveness of the "legitimate" institutions of authority. These mechanisms were related to the manipulations that occur in the society at large, such as paternalism in the poor communities and expertise in foreign policy. Although these issues did, in part, spring from the civil rights movement, they were now more refined and recognizable within the context of the university, both to the new left and to a greater number of students.

Another aspect of the developing social theory was the concept of decentralization. The new left, itself a product of post scarcity economy¹⁴ with its potentials, began to articulate the need and new possibilities of real democratic control through the processes of decentralized decision-making. The new student left's awareness of a post-scarcity situation comes from a lack of economic compulsion. Their own leisure enabled them to conceptualize men freed from centralized organizational imperatives, which in turn would allow men to deal with the processes and decisions that shape their lives.

The new left, then, has moved from single-issue protest to an embryonic political theory whose two new features are the concepts of control and decentralization. These concepts are directly tied to recent developments in American capitalism: 1) The creation of a new working class whose formulation occurs within the university, meets the needs of the skilled positions created by technology. The new working class lies at the very nub of production, and yet fragmentation of their role caused by technology demonstrates their lack of control over the total processes to which they are essential but whose operations in their totality they have the potential to comprehend. The demand for control can then become crucial to their very self-conception, at work and in their life-style. 2) The development of the conditions allowing for a post-scarcity economy provides the potential for decentralization. The new student left, however, has not yet experienced these demands in class terms, i.e., in terms of their relationship (as student trainees) to the new working class.

PROSPECTS FOR THE NEW LEFT, THE NEW WORKING CLASS AND AMERICA

The prospects for the new left revolve around its distinction between class and status, in the ways the new left defines both itself and the possibility for change. The present theory for social change, implicit in new left activity, is that groups (staff) outside society, because of their role as outcasts not central to the mechanisms of production, have least to lose and most to gain in changing society. They, therefore, are invulnerable to co-optation. In fact, this position is most vulnerable to co-optation.

First, the student sense of alienation results from the social organization in the application of the new technology. Under capitalism, these increasing productive powers lead to growing waste production and, at the same time, develop mechanisms of control which leave the individual (student) with less control over the now more complicated processes of production. Students find themselves in a situation where they have become socially necessary for the functioning of the economic system, but their economic functions have little or no real social value. Added to this are the cultural and social manipulations they experience which have been made more remote by the development of technology.

Secondly, for the black population the converse holds true. Their economic functions, or non-functions, involve real work related to a subsistence economy, but are being made socially unnecessary by technological advances. They share with students the sense of powerlessness that arises in part from cultural and social manipulations.

These forms of alienation are insufficient by themselves to form the basis of a viable radical movement. Both groups, though not necessarily, can be co-opted or relegated to irrelevancy. The underclass can be rendered ineffective either through a process of sharing economic gains (greater expansion of social welfare measures) or through their gradual absorption by the ever-increasing growth of the middle sector.¹⁵ Although this co-optation might not necessarily occur, given a certain rationalization of American capitalism and its continued ability to expand, this tendency becomes a real possibility.

The potentiality for new developments in American capitalism (economic planning, rationalization, greater equalization of income, full-employment practice - the Welfare State model),¹⁶ is directly tied to the potential of co-opting students, alienated by waste production and powerlessness, by enabling them to become the future rational technocrats. This role provides for a greater sense of power, specifically in dealing with the surface dislocations in American capitalism. Clark Kerr, one of the prime advocates of the new technocracy, was, after all, a member of student L.I.D. Bobby Kennedy, the symbol of rational capitalism, has remarked that S.D.S. types will make the imaginative administrators for future governmental posts.

The other side of co-optation is the indigenous aspects of romanticism and reformism (the politics of protest) within the new left. The politics of protest derives

14 The concept of post-scarcity economy describes the conditions of economic growth and affluence that can eliminate all vestiges of scarcity and subsistence. Although the model differs from the current reality, this allows for a critique that includes the current economic (technological) potential of society. The language of post-scarcity is the language of the fulfillment of all social needs and non-compulsive labor. Only in a post-scarcity situation is it possible to eliminate the social division of labor and thereby social stratification, allow for the withering away of the state therefore achieving decentralization.

15 This assumption blurs certain areas of the civil-rights movement and its recent radical turn. It also makes assumptions about the flexibility of capitalism. Nevertheless we must recognize this potential even in its most extreme form.

16 cf. The discussion concerning the growth of the planned economy in Western Europe in Andrew Shonfield's *Modern Capitalism* and George Lichtheim's *The New Europe*.

(Continued on page 10)

support
PRAXIS:
resist

are as interesting as they are challenging to traditional movement values: Is an interracial movement still to be sought? If not, what is to take its place? Should whites organize in Negro ghettos? Should they try to organize in white ghettos? Around what issues should whites be organized? These questions, as well as some other speculations, will be treated at some length in the last chapter of this paper.

PRAXIS

(Continued from page 9)

from the lack of class politics and the tendency for the new left to look at itself as a status group outside of a class position and role. Romanticism comes from certain material comforts as students. The revolt involves deciding to give up material comforts, which are potentially always available, as opposed to a situation where one's livelihood is at stake. However, it is their very livelihood (the future technical positions) that can provide the basis for class politics based on the programs of control and participation. Therefore, the very forces for co-optation also provide for the development of a new class consciousness with a power to make structural changes in society. This power can only develop through a new and higher level of praxis; one which recognizes the possibility of class consciousness in the new working class.

The concept of the new working class can first be found in the works of Antonio Gramsci. His emphasis on the growing number of technical jobs and the functions of the University in training students for these jobs, led him to a formulation of this group as the possible vanguard of the working class movement. Serge Mallet, in his book *La Nouvelle Classe Ouvriere* and Andre Gorz, in his *Neo-Capitalisme et la Strategie Ouvriere*, extended Gramsci's arguments by analyzing certain working class groups, such as the metallurgical workers, who, through their technical functions and by beginning to raise demands of control and participation, have started to develop a structural critique of capitalism.¹⁷

Students do not constitute a class-in-itself. However, through their University experience they can begin to articulate demands of control and participation, and this can help form the vanguard of this new emerging class. These types of demands have the potential for including other elements of the working class, such as the traditional blue-collar industrial workers, whose problems increasingly revolve around questions of automation (the rate of introduction and the nature of the new working conditions) and technology, rather than pure wage demands. The underclass is also concerned with issues of control, and in fact has been the vanguard in raising these types of demands. What is implied is an alliance between the new working class (including students), the traditional industrial workers, and the underclass, in a movement for real social change. This alliance implies the need for a revolutionary social theory, which can develop out of a more total praxis for the new left. It also implies intermediate strategies and goals which have not at all been touched on.

Any revolutionary theory based on the strategic importance of the new working class must also recognize the dangers of reformism inherent in this class's economic well-being. Lucien Goldmann has pointed out that demands of control and participation can be neutralized so that a revolutionary theory must always contain the cultural and social critique of societal manipulations, as, for example, those contained in the works of Herbert Marcuse. Further, this critique must always rely on a structural analysis of capitalism, including a critique of imperialism. Finally, this critique must include an international perspective; with the problems of world capitalism, and the development of socialist activity throughout the world.

The New Left, in its development of a partial praxis, has within itself the possibility of co-optation or absorption through the developing aspects of American Capitalism; however, it also contains the seeds of a total revolutionary praxis with the potential for transforming American society from top to bottom; a society where "the free development of each, is the condition for the free development of all." (Marx, *The Communist Manifesto*)

¹⁷ See the debates and articles in the April, May, June, and August issues of the *International Socialist Journal*, cf. in particular the debate between Herbert Marcuse and Serge Mallet concerning socialism in the developed countries and the new working class.

the need for middle class organizing

Donald McKelvey
Toronto

Donald McKelvey is on the staff of the *Research, Information, and Publications Project of SUPA*, Student Union for Peace Action. He was Assistant National Secretary of Students for a Democratic Society from 1962 to 1964. The following is the first part of a pamphlet written for SUPA in Dec. 1966. Copies may be obtained from SUPA.

The New Left in North America has concentrated in its analysis and activity on organizing two groups of people — youth, and the poor. I think this represents an organizational short-sightedness and lack of political analysis which can be fatal to our efforts for fundamental long-term social change.

The poor, or the dispossessed, have been a main focus of organizing for the New Left — SUPA in Canada, SDS in the States — for the past three years. I think there are psychological reasons for this emphasis on the part of middle class young people — especially their desire to get as far as possible away from suburbia and the suburban style of life, and their desire to do something immediate and concrete about gross physical deprivation. These feelings are understandable, and right — and I share them — but they are not a political analysis. My analysis is that the major physical deprivations, which are so ugly and so dehumanizing, will be sufficiently ameliorated by the government and 'the Establishment' to prevent the dispossessed from becoming a force for basic social change on this continent. And perhaps I should state how strongly I feel that it is fundamental social change to which we should always be looking — a completely different way of living lives and of relating to people and of using the tremendous power for human development which technological advancement has placed in our hands. It is precisely because I feel so strongly the poverty of the quality of

life in our society that I urge people to commit themselves to work where they will be most effective and strategic in accomplishing long-term, basic change.

Let me be clear, especially to comrades doing community organizing — it is important work, valid in itself because it is dealing with important human problems, important strategically because it has the potential to develop part of a coalition for social change and to do radical educational work. But where given the opportunity, I would encourage middle class youth — almost all of whom will spend their lives in the middle class — to prepare themselves to organize that class.

MIDDLE CLASS LIFE-STYLE

When we talk about long-term organizing for social change in Canada — say, over the next 30 or 40 years — we are talking about confronting the pattern of life-styles, values, and alienation symptomatic of the middle class. To be sure, the term 'middle class' is a very loose one: it includes everyone, really, between the poor, and the rich and powerful. But that's all right; at this point in the strategic thinking and action of the New Left, an emphasis on even that vague classification would be a significant change. What distinguishes this 'class' is that the problems they face are not those of physical deprivation — as has been true of virtually all classes organized by the Left throughout the world and throughout history. The problems the middle class faces are distinguished by alienation, powerlessness, psychological repression, and their being manipulated by forces which too often seem (but never really are) impersonal. The key concept here, I think, is powerlessness and the lack of a feeling of integrity of one's self.

Our task is to organize these people around these issues, for two reasons. First, because

Spring Mobilization

Marjorie Kinsella
Chicago

The article in January 13, "New Left Notes" by Vic Berkey is both timely and outdated. A contradictory observation? No, it just needs explanation. It was outdated in so far as it suggests that students should be talking about something other than National Students Strikes. This had been the conclusion of no small number of people months prior to the National Student Strike Conference in December. The Conference itself discussed the feasibility of strikes only in so far as it recommended that the Continuations Committee investigate the possibility of holding strikes on four or five major campuses. The rest of the Conference dealt with (parliamentary procedures! and) other types of campus activities around which the unorganized students opposed to the war could be organized. Vic Berkey's suggestion for "across the country referendums" is exactly the kind of suggestions which the Conference discussed and which the Student Mobilization Committee (c/o Linda Dannenberg, 29 Park Row, 5th Floor New York, N. Y. 10038) is so anxious to receive . . . and for this reason I say his article is 'timely'.

There are many universities across the country where government war-research is taking place. Where this is known, (for listings see Vietnam News Service Bulletin No. 17 & 18 or write me for a copy) investigation and exposure by the students is a most appropriate activity for organizing. At Med. schools, it seems one logical issue by which to arouse anti-war sentiment is the "Children of Vietnam" (See Ramparts Jan., 1967). Doctors across the country are being organized to give medical and financial help to the victims of our insanity. Catholic and other denominational schools and seminaries (I wonder how many "New Left Notes" readers see their way into these corridors) do well to publicize the "Clergy & Laymen Concerned about the War" Conference held in Washington, D. C. as a means to letting their fellow students know that "It isn't just the ultra left opposing the war". (Information on the results of this conference: Room 560, 475 Riverside Drive, N.Y., 10027)

Law students, given their 'legal bend' would do well to make issue of the Fort Hood Three Defense Case. Columbia Law students researched interesting material on the legal aspects of this case. Also of interest is the statement of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam.

And of course there is the draft issue. U. of Chicago students are going full force on this aspect of anti-war organizing. For myself, as student at Roosevelt University, I found Vic Berkey's suggestion most appealing and am anxious to see copies of suggested referendum.

Other suggestions discussed at the Chicago Conference were setting up War Crimes Tribunals; Civil Disobedience, as the Port Chicago actions; Opposing Recruitment for the War Machine along with numerous other anti-draft activities; Student Refusal to do Research (As part of the general exposure of the war-oriented research on campus, students should make clear their

refusal to participate in physics, chemistry, or other research where this research lends itself to war purposes.); aid to victims of napalm; Boycott War-Related Companies; and Tax Refusal, to mention a few.

We do not lack the issues. The problem admittedly is which one to choose for a particular campus to concentrate on. April 8-14 has been set as 'Vietnam Week'. The week when across the nation is hoped anti-war activity will take place on every campus. Upon setting this date, we did not expect that no anti-war activity would take place before or after that time. Especially 'before' calling for protest, much educating and organizing needs to be done.

The Spring Mobilization Committee has set April 15 for its massive demonstrations in New York and San Francisco. It seems to me that some SDSers have consistently objected to "National Demonstrations", not meaning an objections to local actions held nationally on one day, and therefore not opposing April 8-14 Vietnam Week, but objecting to national demonstrations which mean transporting people to one or two places for expressing their protest. Well, I'm inclined to agree (and disagree) with this objection. (Contradiction again?) Agree, it's a shame to send half a million people to New York when it will certainly help the hotel and restaurant business and it won't harm the transportation industry either! and agree, if in the process of trying to send a few to N. Y. and S.F., the rest of the folks back home are not organized to express their opposition to the war.

However, I disagree that this latter objection can be applied to the Spring Mobilization . . . at least it does not have to be applied if organizers keep in mind that we are trying to rouse anti-war sentiment AROUND THE WORLD, and if it is kept in

(Continued on page 12)

CUNY

On February 11, 7 SDS chapters of the City University of N. Y. (CUNY) held an anti-ranking conference at the Free School of N. Y. The 60 members met to plan the strategy and tactics of the united fight against the Board of Higher Education's resolution to continue ranking. The BHE decision overruled all votes, referendums, petitions and protests, whether by faculty or students, on any city or community college campus in N. Y. The following resolution passed: 1) That a central feature of the fight to make the BHE abolish ranking be as follows: No BHE collaboration with the unjust war in Vietnam; NOBODY should be drafted.

2) That one goal of campus educational and organizational tactics be demonstrations at the B.H.E. scheduled for the fourth week of March.

to a great extent they are the future society — the wave of the future, if you will — and we believe in changing the lives of everyone, and in participatory democracy for everyone. Second, because that is the social class or psychological pattern from which we come and which we best understand. To be sure, before we can effectively work there, we will have to, as individuals, overcome our emotional overreactions and our abhorrence of that life style — a feat of self-discipline which is most unlike the New Left precisely because it is unlike the middle class. (This, by the way, is another psychological basis for the New Left rush to organize the dispossessed — our unwillingness to face directly the middle class from which we come and whose values and life style we so abhor.) And we must recognize the fact that psychological repression is not only one of the problems of the middle class, but is itself an important form of social control of the middle class, and makes organizing more difficult.

YOUTH A TIME OF LIFE

I can't see youth as a social class — that is, as a group of people who, when organized, would be the centre of a coalition for social

change.

Youth can more usefully be viewed as a time of life than as a social class. The time of adolescence and late adolescence is the period of what Jim Harding has called the second socialization period. It is a time when identity is more or less consciously being sought; the young person asks him/herself, "Who am I?", and "What is the basis of my worth and existence?" This is closely connected, as Jim has pointed out, with the child's effort to wean him/herself from parents' emotional and psychological influence, part of which process is the physical leaving of the parents' home (which is one of the reasons why university organizing has more promise than high school organizing).

In our society, of course, there is no humanly satisfying answer to these questions, but the questions are asked nonetheless. Society's inability to give people a satisfactory sense of their identity leads to insecurity and alienation, all sorts of personal hangups, and also to an openness to political expressions of discontent.

Usually, a person learns from society that these personal hangups are personal inadequacies and faults, unconnected to political and social conditions and therefore not

(continued on page 12)

NAT'L SECRETARY

(continued from page 2)

used to be called 'universal national service'. That was the combination of the Prussian military establishment with the *Hitlerjugend*. But the concepts of 'voluntarism' subsumes all under the banner of individual freedom and, hopefully, coopts all dissent.

"Moderator" and the "corporate-liberal" establishment are, it must be admitted, amazingly more subtle than Nazi totalitarianism. They have to be. Numerous voices were raised at the conference against any notion of any national "system" of "voluntary" service. There was a strong majority voice raised at the conference against coercion in any form. Unfortunately, apart from a staunch minority of representatives with radical sympathies, there was a frightening blindness to the relatedness of issues, to the links between any military establishment in America and its use in implementing America's imperialist foreign policy, between student alienation and social concern and the need for radical social change in America, between opposition to coercion at home and American coercion abroad.

Doublethink was powerful. "Voluntarism" seemed an umbrella under which a variety of fundamentally irreconcilable concerns could be grouped.

RESULTS

Due mainly to the concerted insistence of the minority of radicals present (SDS, University Christian Movement, American Friends Service Committee, Federation of Newman Clubs) the consensus statement of the conference was limited to two brief points: united opposition to the draft and common concern for involvement in relevant social action.

Despite "Moderator's" attempt to give the impression of a broader consensus, the fundamental differences came across. Two important "minority" statements were issued. Both embodied the fundamental concept that I felt was important: that it was impossible to discuss the draft without discussing the war in Vietnam and the direction of American society.

THE PRESS

After the "Moderator" conference, we held a press conference which included both representatives of the United States Student Press Association (USSPA), which had just completed its national conference, and the professional press. Sherman Chickering began by reading the consensus statement, the "minimum program", which had been hammered out by the 18 representatives:

We approach the problem of the draft from various perspectives and find two major points of agreement:

1. That the present draft system with its inherent injustices is incompatible with traditional American principles of individual freedom within a democratic society, and that for this reason the draft should be eliminated.
2. That an urgent need exists within our society for young people to become involved in the elimination of such social ills as ignorance, poverty, racial discrimination and war.

Then minority reports were presented. I read the statement of the radical caucus signed by five representatives (SDS, AFSC, Union Theological Seminary, National Newman Student Federation, and College Young Democratic Clubs of America). That statement actually advocates draft refusal and non-cooperation with the Selective Service System:

MODERATOR CONFERENCE ON VOLUNTARY SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 5, 1967

STATEMENT PREPARED BY GREGORY CALVERT (STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY), HOWARD EVANS (AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE), AND PETER JOHNSON (UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY). THE STATEMENT REPRESENTS THE INDIVIDUALS' VIEWS AND NOT THOSE OF THEIR ORGANIZATIONS.

No attempt to reform the present system of conscription can come to terms with the basic issues raised by the draft. No discussion of the military can be divorced from questions concerning national goals

and foreign policy. We decry current attempts to mask conscription under the rhetoric of national service and we seek, rather, true volunteerism in humanitarian service. The threat posed by the American military establishment to democracy at home and to the self-determination of other peoples is the real question which must be faced. The draft is the single greatest violation of individual freedom in our society. It is a threat to the operation of democratic institutions because it encourages the growth of militarism and concentrates power in the hands of a few men.

We believe that conscription should be abolished and that aggressive American policies towards underdeveloped countries should be changed. Young Americans, dedicated to individual freedom, should:

- (1) seek ways to abolish conscription and involuntary servitude
- (2) consider refusing to serve in Vietnam
- (3) consider taking the CO position and encouraging others to take it
- (4) consider non-cooperation with the entire draft system
- (5) work instead for the abolition of poverty, ignorance, racial discrimination and war.

John J. Wituk, National Newman Student Federation
Joseph T. Berlart, Policy Committee Chairman, College Young Democratic Clubs of America
(for identification purposes only)

I then read the following personal statement addressed to my draft board:

Selective Service System
Local Board No. 23
1516 Hudson Street
Longview, Washington 98632

Dear Selective Service System:

Your recent communication regarding the possibility of a change in my draft status reminds me of my failure to answer similar requests for information over the past year. The sense of urgency which you attempt to impress on my reluctant consciousness leads me to assume that you have some new and unfortunate intentions regarding my future.

I appreciate your concern about my present situation. At my advanced age (I am now twenty-nine years old), I have lived for some time under the illusion that my life was no longer of interest to you - that perhaps you would quietly forget about me. I am one of those who was given special privileges over the years, first in the form of a student deferment (II-S) and then with a job deferment as a college instructor (II-A). In brief, I was party to the undemocratic and inequitable game you play with the young men of the United States. I did not, of course, escape from the sinister influence which you exercise over all of us: by threatening us with military service and by offering us carefully selected alternatives to the killing business, you direct our lives in a way which is designed to fill the manpower needs of the military-industrial complex by maintaining high profits at home and aggressive imperialism abroad.

I am grateful for your continued efforts to influence my life simply because you force me to make a decision. You oblige me to stop dodging the draft and to confront it. As a result of your helpful prodding, I have reached a decision and wish to inform you that I will no longer play your game. I have simply decided to resign from your system and am returning those cards which you used to send me.

I am presently working as National Secretary for Students for a Democratic Society - an organization which is working to build a movement for radical social change in America. In twenty years, when radicals have succeeded in building a new America, there will be no need for a Selective Service System because that new America will devote its energies to creative efforts both at home and abroad: it will be, it must be, an America which produces for democratically determined social need rather than private profit and which encourages much needed social revolution abroad rather than launching aggressive wars to pro-

mote economic imperialism.

Since I am actively engaged in implementing the draft resistance program of SDS, it would be a bit ridiculous for me to continue the pretense of cooperation. I am enclosing a copy of the SDS draft resistance program together with those cards of yours.

For love, peace, and freedom,
Gregory Calvert - National Secretary
SDS

I understand that the "Moderator" staff was more than a little unhappy: the assembled press applauded.

BOOTH-MACNAMARA RIDES AGAIN

What seemed to me a pretty decent presentation was suddenly interrupted by a moment of despair when Chickering pulled out of his pocket a telegram which he read to the press, from "Paul Booth, past president of SDS":

Regret unable to attend. Believe Left can work with voluntarist position on service. Urge you call, with cooperation of appropriate groups, nationwide open student convocation for Spring to adopt resolution on draft and related questions.

Fraternally,
Paul Booth

I swore to myself and smiled idiotically to hide my embarrassment. There it was all over again: "Build Not Burn." The Booth-MacNamara Proposal, as we call it in the National Office. The greatest formula ever devised for selling out the radical movement and playing into the cooptative hands of the establishment.

"Moderator" closed the presentation with its proposal for a new SSS: the STUDENTS SERVING SOCIETY Registry. The plan is to sign up 500,000 young Americans who would rather build than burn and to link them up with the National Service Secretariat so that the scheme of cooptation through moderation will have an impressive list of endorsers.

I left grumbling to myself about "idiot coalitionists" and just angry enough to relish that other slogan: Build Not - Burn!

SUNYARMK

(Continued from page 1)

Charlie" testified at Nuremberg to the fact that Peenemunde used slave labor to speed its work of "zapping" Londoners.

The SDSers prepared leaflets and posters warning those appearing for an interview with the Bell Research Division representative that if they take the job they'd find their boss is "a real slavedriver" who "summarily bounces anyone who does not share his enthusiasm for developing hardware for genocide, terror, and aggression." SUNYARMK administrators looked the other way until the SDS people showed up in the lobby of the building in which interviews were being held with a 6 by 8 foot blowup of a picture of Dornberger in his Nazi regalia - swastikas, crosses, peaked cap, jackboots . . . The picture was taken out of the book V-2 in which Dornberger relates the story of the good old Peenemunde days - leaving out the part about the slaves.

It was at this point in the demonstration that SUNYARMK Dean of Student Affairs Cyrus Pitch waved the flag on the proceedings by suspending the SDS charter and threatening chapter officers Ken Greene and Sarah Warner with unspecified "disciplinary action." The chapter has secured legal assistance.

In an interview for the SUNYARMK campus paper Ken Green observed that:

Dean Pitch gave us the old line about administration non-interference with student rights except when the actions of students are "irresponsible and in poor taste." We told him that we'd thought a lot about Dornberger's slaves, rocket bombs, and helicopters but try as we might, we couldn't improve the taste. We thought SUNYARMK students should be warned before they hire out to an outfit that does what Bell hires Dornberger to do.

SUPA

(Continued from page 10)

solvable or translatable in political terms. This notion is one of the most fundamental forms of social control of individuals: once an individual has learned that discontents he or she feels are personal problems, his or her ability to be an effective society-changer is severely circumscribed. But if, at this crucial time, the process of socialization is directed differently, a totally different conception of oneself and the world can result.

In any case, an individual cannot remain for too long in the state of psychological tension involved in this identity crisis. In the absence of a strong political education, sooner or later he or she must make peace with him/herself. Too often, that peace is made of psychological repression and basic political acceptance of the status quo. Most people, in addition, will be forced by economic and social exigency into social roles - 'breadwinner' or 'loyal housewife' - which will require them to fundamentally accept 'the system', and which will punish them (subtly but well) for stepping outside accepted limits of political and social behavior. Slowly but surely, because thoughts must be in consonance with one's life-activity, they will be psychologically forced to give up whatever intellectual desire they once had for basic social change, in favour of a more acceptable 'liberal' approach - or perhaps they will simply cease to care.

I think this scenario - in its major aspects - is all too true for the majority of New Leftists, including undoubtedly most of us gathered here. The question, then, is, How can this socialization process be prevented, and effective commitment to social change made deep enough to sustain socially concerned people throughout their lives?

My first answer to that question is that I don't really know, and we don't really know. We haven't studied ourselves sufficiently to answer the question - nor will we be able to do so until we as individuals are capable of looking at ourselves pretty objectively, which in turn depends on having reached a certain level of personal security.

But I think that if we think in organizational terms - i.e. about what SUPA can do as an organization - we have one important answer: radical education. One of SUPA's most important tasks - I think its most important - is to impell its members towards an integrated political understanding of the world, and a conception of themselves as committed organizers - to sustain them in their future political activity by giving them the self-assurance to carry on in the face of majority disapproval and general frustration. What radical education means to me is constantly impelling people to think in terms of basic causes, the integratedness of issues, a long-term strategic and political approach, and a deep integration of values, analysis, and strategy. The constantly asked question, "Why?", is a very ideological question - always ask yourself why something happens, why a person acts a certain way, why institutions have developed and work as they do. I am convinced from my contact with New Leftists in SUPA and SDS that people want this kind of what I call ideological understanding - indeed, I think there is a fundamental human drive for integratedness and integrated understanding (the denial of which by capitalist society Marx called alienation).

COMMITMENT

But this can have only limited effect . . . I think. (I'm not really sure.) What is commitment made of? Or, put another way: Why should people care? When, in the course of organizing, you talk to someone

(Continued on page 12)

WORKERS LEAGUE

Send 25¢ for 10 issue sub to the BULLETIN OF INTL. SOCIALISM.

British socialist youth paper
KEEP LEFT 10¢ a copy

French socialist youth paper
REVOLTES 20¢ a copy

Box 1663 San Francisco, Calif. 94101
Box 14002 Minneapolis, Minn. 55414
243 E. 10th St. New York City 10003

NAC Minutes

January 31

Members present: Berkowitz, Jacobson, Adams, Goldsmith, Tepperman, Calvert, Wilkerson, Silbar.

Members absent: none.

Others present: Davidson, Pardun, Venenziale, Schuman, Iskran, Hartzog, Rosenblum, Draznin, Kushner, Knitmeyer, James.

Agenda:

1. Washington draft proposal
2. Draft program
3. National Council meeting
4. South Africa program
5. Praxis
6. Staff
7. Literature
8. Fundraising
9. Report from Carl Davidson

Finances. We have \$750 in the bank, but we owe T.W.O. over \$1,000 for printing NLN. Fundraising mailings to Midwest Faculty Committee to End the War, and to clergy will be done, with a system for checking their effectiveness. Also special fundraising mailing in New York. The need for a full time fundraising coordinator was again brought up.

Washington Draft proposal. There will be a meeting of student groups against the draft this weekend in Washington, called by the Moderator magazine. The NAC mandated Greg Calvert to go to the meeting to represent the sds position as laid out in the draft program. A NIC ballot will be taken to determine SDS strategy for the meeting. (See current Nat'l Sec'y Report for results.)

Draft program. 1. Levi Kingston was hired to do national traveling on the draft, at \$30/wk, with travel expenses to be worked out. Levi is an ex-SNCC staff member who has been organizing black guys against the draft in Los Angeles, and will work on campuses and in ghettos, setting up similar programs. 2. Mark Kleinman requested that he be hired tentatively to do draft work in Northern California until the San Francisco regional council makes a decision on draft program. The NAC voted 5 to 3 not to send him money until we have a clear mandate from the San Francisco regional council.

Staff. Staff situation is 15 people on national staff, 9 in the NO and the rest traveling. The desirability of regions hiring their own staff was discussed, as against the NO's responsibility to provide staff for the draft program, which is national.

Morty Miller was hired to do draft traveling in New England (he has been organizing against the draft in New Haven). He is hired provisionally for three months in the hope that after that he will be able to raise his own salary in New England.

Bill Hartzog asked that a national meeting be called of SDS draft resistance staff, plus resource people who have been doing similar work, to work out guidelines for draft organizing work. The NAC approved calling the meeting. Hartzog clarified his situation as field secretary in the Great Plains. He will concentrate on organizing against the draft on Kansas City, with some traveling to existing campuses to do work on internal education.

National Council Meeting. The Tufts chapter will not be able to arrange for the NC. Harvard has been asked to do it, but has not yet replied.

South Africa. Nancy Bancroft wants to organize a national protest against the US role in S. Africa on March 21, under the slogan "de-Mobil-ize". The NAC asked her to write it up as a program proposal for NLN.

Praxis. The NAC mandated seven people in New York to begin editing a monthly theoretical supplement to NLN, to be entitled Praxis, which they have volunteered to do. (See intro to supplement in this issue for more details.)

Staff again. Bob Pardun was hired to do regional organizing in Texas and Oklahoma, with the provision that he try to be self supporting as soon as possible. Dick Schuman was hired as financial secretary in the NO. Dan Tylke is now membership secretary.

Student Power. The Guardian is printing a pamphlet to consist of Jack Smith's two articles on student power, to retail at 10¢ each. The NAC decided to order 2,000 copies, presumably at a big discount.

Jean Tepperman

President's Report

(Continued from page 4)
horses, gets them in the car and asks them where to go to find a horse. She goes everywhere they suggest until she finds one (down town, the country, a barn). Her alternative was to tell the children that a horse was a four-legged animal that ate hay, and give them a book. 4) People should learn to take themselves as data, to trust their own reactions or their own ideas. At present, with teachers handing down the word to students, students in fact learn to distrust their own ideas.

How can you get anywhere when people are so apathetic? We agree that people are apathetic when they are not involved in the regular political process - elections, voting, PTA's, etc. You imply it is a fault of the people; I hold it is wisdom: they know that no real change comes from those puppet shows. When we find real avenues of change we will not have to worry about apathy.

If you don't fight the commies in Vietnam you will have to fight them here. Why do you want to fight them? OR How do you know they are such a threat?

QUESTIONS

Many questions are missing, so ADD. AGAIN, I'M NOT AFTER TREATISES AND NEW ANSWERS * JUST NOTES ON WHAT YOU HAVE DONE IN THE PAST.

MIDDLE CLASS

(Continued from page 11)
about powerlessness, alienation, and the rest, how do you try to convince that person that he or she should care? Commitment is not a rational phenomenon - i.e. only rarely, if ever, can a person be argued rationally into committing an important part of his or her life-activity to work for social change. Commitment is a state of mind resulting from a lifetime of experience. The real questions, then, are: (1) What experiences enhance commitment? (2) What is the likelihood that in the future society people will have such experiences?

In answering the first question, the general answer I can give - and this is really biographical - is that people become committed by, first, getting screwed by the world, and second, objectifying themselves and society sufficiently to understand how and why they have been hurt so deeply. If this is right - and as I write I am thinking out loud - then the process of politicization during the susceptible period of adolescence and young adulthood is crucial, and in fact SUPA's work can be crucial, if done right. Let me leave it at that tentative suggestion for now; I hope others will be able to add their biographies and analysis to it.

nac minutes II

Feb. 8:

Members Present: Greg Calvert, Dee Jacobson, Jane Adams, Steve Goldsmith, Jean Tepperman, Cathy Wilkerson, Richard Berkowitz, Earl Silbar.

Others Present: Dick Schumann, John Venenziale, Henry Ilian, Sue Eanet, Wayne Draznin, Don Tylke.

- Agenda:** I. National Secretary Reports
II. Staff
III. Finances
IV. Membership Drive

I. National Secretary's report on Moderator Conference:

Greg reported to the NAC the frightening details of a weekend conference in the realm of the foggy bottom. For an exciting account of Un-American activities in Washington, please see the National Secretary's report in this issue.

II. STAFF:

A. National Fund Raiser Wherefor Art Thou? This question was bantered about until the NAC once again concluded that a National full-time fund raiser should be hired (the hottest prospect for the position has fallen through in the interim - foiled again?).

B. Greg informed the NAC that Richard Thomas, the well known and popular with

letter to Mr. Black

Associate Justice Hugo Black
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Black,

You will soon be asked to sit in judgment on some brave young Americans who refuse for various reasons, including the Nuernberg Convention, to fight an illegal and immoral war in Vietnam. They include David J. Miller, David Henry Mitchell, Howard Katz, David A. Baumann and will probably also include the world's heavyweight boxing champion, Muhammad Ali. I wish to call your attention to these facts:

1) While the Constitution does not include "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor" it does protect decent people who challenge the loud-mouthed liars who claim we have been attacked by a tiny agricultural nation 10,000 miles away.

2) We are still legally at war with Nazi Germany.

3) We are not at war with Ho Chi Min who was our ally in W. W. II.

4) Making war on women and children is by nature illegal. Such conduct in a global war with the weapons available would end the race.

5) The people who bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki and propose to use such weapons in the future cannot plead that civilian deaths are accidental.

6) It is contrary to public interest to legalize the use of atomic weapons, napalm, biological, chemical and gas weapons, defoliation etc. Such weapons can also be used against us.

7) Use of such weapons makes it impossible "to provide for the common defense", one of the primary aims of the Constitution.

Sincerely,
Paul Burke

Penn. Convention

Registration for the convention will be held on the 24th of February in the lobby of the Penn. State University, Hetzel Union Bldg. (U.B.) which is located on Pollock Road near the center of the Penn. State Campus. Come directly to the HUB when you arrive at Penn. State College.

If you need directions call 237-4455 or 238-4647. Please note: all the national officers will attend the convention.

mobilization

(Continued from p. 10)

mind that the point of having the American people see such a massive number of people express opposition to the war, they will be encouraged to do likewise. As Reverend James Bevel who is now working full time on this Mobilization has said, this is but the beginning of an expression of opposition to the Mass Murder in Vietnam which will grow until it is heard and heeded.

The American Peace Movement is not working in isolation. The Conference in Chicago received encouragement and support from Canada, Puerto Rico, the All-India Union of Students, The Arab Socialist Union, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the World Peace Council and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam besides students and faculty from England, France, East and West Germany and Chili. Whether it be on one specific day or during a specific week, people in America and around the world are waiting to see, and identify themselves with, the anti-war sentiment which exists in this country. As I said in my address to the Chicago Conference, Students began the present-day peace movement and it was only after their example and inspiration that professors, church leaders and unions began their involvement. SDS played no small role in the original beginning. They likewise played no small role at the Chicago Conference for they out-numbered any other single organization present.

We look forward to seeing again the impact of SDS on the student body during "Vietnam Week" and consequently their impact on changing the course of the war.

NEW LEFT NOTES
Room 206
1608 W. Madison
Chicago, Ill. 60612
Return Requested

Second-Class postage rates paid in Chicago, Illinois. Entered at Chicago and other points.

Helen Garvey
710 Willow
Apt. 12
Hoboken, N.J. 07030

the people South African scholar, has dropped his course at Eton, and has for several months been doing sds oriented research on U.S. investments in South Africa. Richard's application for the position of sds South African Research and Program Director was reviewed, and the NAC unanimously approved such an appointment pending the formal dissolution of the standing but inactive committee on South African affairs.

C. Sue Eanet (New York Regional Coordinator) reviewed with a tone of desperation, the staff and financial crises in the New York region. She referred to the difficulties involved in financing a regional office, and she applied for a small but predictable income which would enable her to thwart the grim spectre of starvation. At this point the NAC embroiled itself in a lengthy discussion of a formula which would permit the funding of regional staff operations by the National Office while encouraging continued regional autonomy. The decision was made to hire Sue as N.Y.R.O. Internal Education Field Secretary (pending approval of the Regional Council). The need for developing and debating an administrative program which would finally bring some discernable order into the relationship between

the NO and the Regional Offices was agreed upon. The National Secretary agreed to advance such a proposal well in advance of the Spring NC.

III. FINANCES

The NAC received a report on the current state of insolvency that prevails in the NO. It seems that the NO, according to Walter Hallerjuggle (financial secretary), is in the midst of one of those unpredictable slumps suffered by any firm functioning in a vagarious macroeconomic world. Fund raising mailings, Brinks robberies and other fund raising schemes were discussed.

IV. MEMBERSHIP DRIVE

Greg reported that his trip to Washington had brought to his attention the interest of other national student groups in sds. The possibility of increasing sds membership by large numbers through mailings and other forms of appeals was discussed. Developing a national membership of between 25,000 and 100,000 would not be difficult - the only thing you have to lose is your elitism.

Submitted by: THE NO GADflew - d.j.