

OPEN SHEET ROOM

OPEN SHEET ROOM

OPEN SHEET ROOM

*The*

V. 2 no. 3

# ACTIVIST



C.M.G.P.

*Spring 1962*

354

The function of the intellect is...to present things not that we may most thoroughly understand them, but that we may successfully act on them. Everything in man is dominated by his necessity of action.

T. E. Hulme, Speculations

# The Activist

Volume 2  
Number 3

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: Jon Eisen  
MANAGING EDITOR: Carol Baggot  
BUSINESS MANAGER: Chris Williams  
STAFF: Linda Coram, Lee Goldblatt, Pat Hornaday, Janet Wilson

## ADVISORY BOARD:

M.S. Arnoni  
Rennard Davis  
David Finke  
Al Haber  
Tom Hayden  
Tom Kahn  
W. Carey McWilliams  
Paul Potter  
Dick Roman  
Robert Ross  
Jack Sessions  
Dr. Harold Taylor  
Robert Walters  
Robert Zellner

## CONTENTS

Theodicy of 1984 by B. Payne, J. Berman, D. Walls...page 4
Report from Jackson, Miss. by David Campbell...page 12
Feiffer...page 14
Review-essay: The Souls of Black Folk by W.C. McWilliams Jr. ...page 18
Decomposition of Democracy: Excerpts from a speech by Tom Hayden ... page 22

*the woodcut on the cover is from ISIS, Oxford, England*

Factual accuracy is the sole responsibility of the contributing authors -- The Activist is a quarterly publication of the Students for a Democratic Society, 112 East 19th Street, New York 3, New York, and is in no way affiliated with Oberlin College. Subscription price is \$1.00 per year. Address all correspondence and unsolicited manuscripts to: The Activist, 63 East Lorain Street, Oberlin, Ohio.

## IN MEMORIAM: C. WRIGHT MILLS

With profound shock and deepest sorrow the Editors acknowledge the passing of C. Wright Mills. His death is especially poignant to those of us who are engaged in intently viewing the slowly emerging rebirth of student concern with the social and political problems which Mills spent most of his time bringing to our attention. For more than to anyone else, the Student Movement -- such as it is -- owes much of its existence and impetus to this man.

Mills taught that our actions do in fact matter, and that we -- all of us -- have choices presented to us every day -- important choices -- and we must accept their challenge and act accordingly. Mills the sociologist was profoundly anti-sociological in that he cut through the barriers and theories of "process" and "pluralism" substituting the intense belief that man was more than a niche, a cog, but was relevant to his environment and was directly responsible for its drift or mastery.

Battling against the false dictums of "individuality," he substituted the idea that we can realize ourselves most fully only through personal conviction and commitment to and participation in a democratic society. "Duty" and "loyalty" meant little lest they attended "other people" and "freedom."

More than what Mills actually said or wrote, the spirit he engendered is perhaps what we shall remember him for. For he was a prophet, and like prophets he pointed, impassioned, at the disasterous direction we were pursuing, and standing in the midst of society, importuned us to reverse and revolt. Like the prophets he harkened back to a tradition and belief, and cautioned us about ourselves, telling us, warning that we have forsaken all in the name of Baal. Even our inaction and apathy were powerful forces in determining our fate. Everything will not rectify itself; society is not an abstraction. We must and can change our course, for society is nothing more than all of us.

If we don't protest injustice, be it inflicted on Cuba by a vengeful and inhuman giant run amok, or on ourselves by a heady and emergent elite, no one will. Sovereignty and decision-making power is out of our control, and unless we persevere, none will remain to collect the fragments and potsherds of our civilization, dead before the Bomb.

Keenly he felt the agony of our time, and became embattled against the inflictors of pain. And in a real sense he was a "voice crying in the wilderness."

# Theodicy of 1984 by B. Payne, J. Walls, J. B.

Today there are two words that describe and characterize the common bond among the majority of American intellectuals; those words are confusion and concern. As truly political men, we are concerned about our common life, with respect to both its meaning and purpose. We desire to act and yet we cannot seem to answer the question "For what?" Purposes do not appear as "self-evident" in the age of impersonal government and mass organizations. The meaning of the American political consensus seems to blur. For instance, we rightly insist on protecting liberty, and yet the meaning of liberty seems interchangeable with the meaning of alienation and loneliness. Americans have always pursued "prosperity", but today they find that prosperity is not necessarily interchangeable with happiness. In the end we often find ourselves unable to act or to read meaning into life. With Paul Goodman, we find more and more that we are "growing up absurd."

Few men in American life are more concerned with the present and future of American society than Clark Kerr, President of the University of California (past Chairman of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the Berkeley campus.) Not only has he given much time to research the present trends of the American community, but he has set down his ideas and findings in several pamphlets, articles, and his most recent book, Industrialism and Industrial Man. (Besides these important contributions, Clark Kerr has served the public as a labor-management arbitrator.)

Whereas most of us are confused and concerned about the prospects for America, Clark Kerr claims to know this future in many of its more important aspects.<sup>1</sup> More importantly he believes this future is "necessary" and "logical", and more profoundly, an improvement over the present state of American life. Since it is a better future for Americans, we are encouraged at least explicitly to act in accordance with the prophetic vision and help make it a reality. Not the vision of the philosopher or moralist, but the vision of the social scientist - making predictions and calculations on the basis of known facts - is the presumed meaning of Clark Kerr's future society.

History, says Kerr, reveals "a pattern to all the apparent chaos" about us. It is the "process of industrialization." Once a country begins to industrialize, its history can follow only the logic of industrialism, which is "designed to be the ever-lasting thread of the future." In Kerr's opinion there is no turning back and there is no alternative to industrialism once a country has chosen to industrialize.

We become suspicious of this interpretation of history when we discover that the end of industrialization is "pluralistic industrialism" for all countries. The nature of this "good industrial society" happens to be the American answer to the questions of industrialization and the basis

of decisions by the American industrial elite. Pluralistic industrialism turns out to be the result of American culture, ideology, and organization.

In America the cause and legitimacy of industrialization can only be ascribed to "liberty." Time and again Kerr defines liberty as "the absence of restraint" and the right "to act as you please", which are our common notions of liberty. America in the Declaration of Independence happened to desire "happiness." Happiness, declares Kerr, is prosperity. Prosperity is the promised land for which we make sacrifices. From this seed industrialism begins and continues to be the essence of American history. From this viewpoint Americans did not contract for an equal opportunity to live and develop their potentials, but rather their agreement was based on a desire to gain "satisfactions" from "wealth." Upon this desire, rational or irrational, there has been built the industrial complex we know today. For Kerr there is no use being concerned for what we have given up in exchange for this age of large, impersonal organizations and mass society. There is no escaping the logic of industrialization.

Although the general trend toward industrial society is clear and seemingly irresistible, Kerr argues, the exact characteristics of the new order are not inevitable. To predict, one must first choose. What is chosen and what is required by the "logic of industrialism" is often unclear, but it is certainly clear that Kerr prescribes the kind of society that he predicts.

This new society is to be a society of the "managers and the managed." "Everywhere there develops a complex web of rules binding the worker into the industrial process, to his job, to his community to patterns of behavior." 3

These rules cover every aspect of economic life. They are to be devised by the managers, who are the leaders of the "new society, the vanguard of the future." Interestingly enough, the managers are also to perform the "role of protest," though it is to be a "more restricted and passive role." 4

Some of the specific features of this society might be pointed out. Religion, custom, and tradition, Kerr and his associates argue, will be eventually destroyed by industrialism. Some traditional institutions will be preserved, but most of them will not. Agriculture, for instance, is not a way of life to be preserved, 5 but will become rather an industry with a single purpose of the production of food in the most efficient possible manner. This stands in striking contrast to the words emblazoned over the doors of the Agricultural Hall on the Berkeley campus. Only a few hundred yards from Kerr's office in the modern University Hall, these words state the historic aim of the School of Agriculture:

The family, too, is to change in character. The destruction of the institution of the extended family seems already to have taken place in advanced industrial societies like our own. "There is no place for the extended family in the industrial society; it is on balance an impediment to requisite mobility."<sup>6</sup> The function of the nuclear family is constricted. It is to be "largely a source of labor supply a unit of decision - making for household expenditures, and a unit of cultural activity."

This sort of family is necessary to provide the society with the mobility required by constantly changing occupations and places of work. Certain jobs become obsolete in industrial society, and retraining will be necessary.

The point of this argument is that Kerr intends to argue quite seriously that the "web of rules" is the only force holding society together. These rules of the game determine the division of labor and the power relationships in the society, and for Kerr, these are the primary factors in the society.

What this society means to individuals is broadly defined in the four-man study. Regarding the worker, they state that "in his working life he will be subject to great conformity imposed not only by the enterprise manager but also by the state and by his own occupational association. For most people any true scope for the independent spirit on the job will be missing."<sup>7</sup>

There is to be little danger of strife between the managers and the managed, for most of the members of society will have both types of roles. Moreover, there will be little cause for strife. The economic wants of the people will be more and more satisfied, though never fully, since aspirations will rise proportionally.

More importantly, there will be little conflict because all the basic questions have been answered. A consensus will have been developed around the goals of production efficiency and individual self-interest that will allow conflict only at lower levels. Society has achieved consensus and it is perhaps less necessary for Big Brother to exercise political control. Nor in the Brave New World need genetic and chemical means be employed to avoid revolt. There will not be any revolt anyway, except little bureaucratic revolts that can be handled piecemeal.<sup>8</sup>

Under this system, ideology and politics (and Kerr seems characteristically to make little distinction) become "bureaucratic gamesmanship." Politics is seen as conflict still, but that conflict will be over narrower issues. "It will be less between the broad programs of capital and labor and of agriculture and industry; and more over budgets, rates of compensation, work norms, job assignments."<sup>9</sup>

Nineteenth century Utopians would have found little which is original in Kerr's new society. It is fundamentally identical with the managerialism of St. Simon, the militarized capitalism of Bellamy, and even, perhaps surprisingly, with the old Marxian dream of a society where "the government of persons is replaced by the administration

of things" is enabled to replace the "government of persons" because under its beneficent aegis persons have been reduced to things.....

Students will be particularly interested in the position of education in the new society. Even after accepting industrialism's goal of prosperity, one might well feel there is a certain inconsistency in having a leading theoretician of industrial organization as the President of one of the nation's leading universities. It is disconcerting to realize that these two roles are not seen as contradictory in the least by Kerr. As the "handmaiden of industrialism," education has itself become a leading industry. Kerr considers education to be a functional imperative to an order based on technology. As there is a "relatively smaller place for the humanities and the arts," the system of higher education becomes keyed to the production of specialized careers - professionals, technicians, and managers.

The principal functions of education are to train the bulk of the population to "receive instructions, follow instructions, keep records," and train the managers, engineers and civil servants to operate this system. The increasing importance of the funds obtained for research activities adds to the need for patterning the university more along the lines of the industrial organization. Each participant has his carefully delineated role within the "great web of rules," the authority allotted out to each person is carefully subordinated to the principle of efficient productions and control.

Kerr is well aware that intellectuals and students can often be most disruptive to the carefully laid plans the managerial bureaucracy has for the new society. Since Kerr assumes the goals of society are already embodied in the things that be, students and intellectuals "are by nature irresponsible...not fully answerable for consequences. They are as a result never fully trusted by anybody, including themselves."10 Especially Clark Kerr, we are tempted to add. At the same time the conflict within societies takes place increasingly in the realm of ideas. Thus the student can be a "tool as well as a source of danger," in these intellectual skirmishes. Even so Kerr also remarks that "in some cases students may be taught things they must 'unlearn' if they are to make good production workers."11

Kerr's history as President of the University of California suggests how he proposes to control this apparently natural tendency of some students to refuse to see education as merely another technical procedure designed to fit them to a specialized niche in the process of production. In October, 1959, the "Kerr directives" were first promulgated under the guise of being a liberalization of University policy toward political activity. A quick series of "clarifications" removed certain of the more objectionable provisions - such as restrictions on the power of the academic senate and such obviously unconstitutional provisions as

qualifications on the freedom of students to lobby in the legislature on matters concerning the University. While the directive did certainly liberalize certain rules on political speakers and the distribution of literature, the attempt to codify the regulations on the student government amounted to a severe reduction in the actual scope of its traditional authority. The old restrictions had originated in the political stress of the thirties and the later period of McCarthyism. Under a principle of "salutary neglect" they had been enforced only intermittently.

By the fall of 1961 the major points of the clarified directives seemed to establish two general policies: (1) an "open forum" for discussion of public issues, and (2) "limited purpose" student government. The open forum was tested at the UCLA campus by an invitation to Dorothy Healy, former chairman of the Communist Party of Southern California, to speak on the campus. At this time an old graduate of the Berkeley campus promised the University a million dollar trust fund on the condition that no members of the Communist Party be allowed to use University facilities. President Kerr immediately stated that it had been the policy of the Board of Regents since 1944 to prohibit Communists from speaking on the campus on the grounds of "incompatibility with the educational ends of the University." This line of reasoning becomes more comprehensible if one assumes the end of the university education to be the production of individuals with the particular skills required by the existing industrial order more than the preparation for citizenship and training in distinguishing truth from error.

The "limited purpose" nature of the student government revolves around the "on campus--off campus" distinction and the question of the right of student government to represent the interests of the students whenever this may be opposed to the interest of the administration. The National Student Association has held that these distinctions indicate a grave misunderstanding of the student community. To limit student government to "on campus" issues, narrowly defined, is to deny that students have any common interests whatsoever outside the price of cheeseburgers in the cafeteria and the type of background music to be played in the student union. This reasoning parallels Kerr's concern for protecting the individual from the associations to which he belongs - be they labor unions, professional societies or student bodies. 12)

At the bottom of Kerr's theoretical concern for restricting the scope of student government is his concept of the "absolutism of the group," the strangely vague process through which the individual is tyrannized over by these intermediary organizations between himself and the state. There seems to be a definite, if curious, relation between Kerr and defenders of the "Beat Generation" who maintain that man can gain some portion of freedom and attain a certain measure of human virtue only in isolation, never through acting in concert with other men.

The most recent addition to the Kerr directives was announced to the students this past year. Student political groups (YD's, YR's, YPSL, YAF, SLATE, etc.) are forbidden to use the campus for their business meetings on the grounds that the University's charter states that the University must be kept free of "political and sectarian influence." The Kerr administration does not recognize the argument that it is precisely when they yield to the pressure of small but vocal elements in the state--as by exiling campus politics--that they place themselves subject to political influence. But it is not to be expected that the University would recognize any obligation to encourage student participation in politics. Kerr believes it is sufficient to allow these groups to sponsor speakers on campus. In a manner very consistent with the rest of his system of "liberal pluralism" Kerr refuses to admit the necessity of connecting thought with political action.

The new society of industrial pluralism, while requiring a great degree of conformity in the work individuals do, is designed to increase their degree of individual freedom. "The great new freedom, it is argued, may come in the leisure of individuals. Higher standards of living, more leisure, more education, make this not only possible but almost inevitable. This will be the happy hunting ground for the independent spirit. Along with the bureaucratic conservatism of economic and political life may well go a New Bohemianism in the other aspects of life."13)

This is not an unusual sort of argument, particularly in America. One assumption behind it is that men are primarily motivated by self-interest, and that freedom is the ability to do as one likes. It is an argument in the Madisonian tradition, and a number of fairly standard criticisms may be applied to it. With many others, we would challenge this idea of irresponsible freedom. The freedom to do what one feels he ought to do, the freedom to do one's duty, are concepts which argue against the one-sided view that man is no more than a self-interested beast. And certainly freedom for economic self-interest can hardly hold much meaning for individuals in an economy of abundance.

Further comments at the end of Industrialism and Industrial Man remind us that the argument made by Kerr and his associates go far beyond the arguments of the eighteenth century liberals. "The new slavery and the new freedom go hand in hand. Utopia never arrives, but men may well settle for the benefits of a greater scope for freedom in their personal lives at the cost of considerable conformity in their working lives. If pluralistic industrialism can be said to have a split personality, then the individual in this society will lead a split life too; he will be a pluralistic individual with more than one pattern of behavior and one dominant allegiance."14

The new system, then, involves not only a division of the society, but the division of the individual. The separation of the parts of an individual's life prevents any one

part from having overriding importance. Kerr has argued in the past that groups are dangerous because they tend to interfere with individual freedom. The aim, therefore, is to prevent any one group or institution from having any great part of the loyalty of an individual. It may be worth noting that loyalty is not a word that one finds often in the works of President Kerr. When it does appear, in fact, it is usually found to be "loyalty to the plant," or something similar.

Kerr rejects, notably, any idea of civic or political loyalty. His citizen is a "private citizen" and not a public one. For civic or political loyalty demands that the individual integrate his diverse roles into a whole personality, just as it demands that he accept responsibility for the whole political society.<sup>15</sup> This fact lies behind Aristotle's dictum that man is a "political animal," one who discovers himself and his being only through political society. Loyalties, in Kerr's argument, are specialized, fragmented into "roles;" they reflect Kerr's complacency regarding the individual of split or multiple personalities. A man is, Josiah Royce argued, what he is loyal to, and he urged nineteenth century Americans to "be loyal to loyalty," and to the idea of the whole man. Kerr rejects politics and civic loyalty because he rejects man as such. He accepts a "system" in which men are only parts, and schizophrenic parts at that.

Challenging this system, we would argue that it carries with it a great potential for destroying itself, and with terrible results for the citizens who make it up. We are convinced that at least for most people, this system would not create "the Happy Hunting Ground of the independent spirit." It would rather lead to a heightened sense of alienation, both from the society itself and other individuals. It is that very lack of a sense of control over one's own environment that has produced such feelings in America. It seems, moreover, that the closer we move toward the industrial society, the more we find ourselves faced with boredom and apathy and alienation.

A little reflection reminds us that these feelings are dangerous. Bored and alienated people do surprising and destructive things to escape their sense of boredom. They are seldom moved, but when they are, the bitterness produced by years of unsatisfied needs may vent itself in reckless fury.<sup>16</sup>

Whether such destruction results or not, however, makes little difference if the feelings of the individuals in the system are as we have argued. Kerr's system throws the individual back completely on himself, with no serious support or loyalty from any group or idea except the "web of rules." Intermediate loyalties between those to family and to nation are destroyed or rationalized in the terms of self-interest. Kerr argues that his "system" makes "Big Brother" unnecessary. It is too efficient to need him, a kind of rationalized 1984. Yet when the groups between the individual and the state become so specialized and remote as to lose all meaning, when the individual loses all sense of a "public," Big Brother is not far off. For the isolated individual is unable to act with his fellows to control the system. Convinced of his own isolation, he can acquire the sense that the "system" is concerned for him and for his welfare at all only by a fevered personal identification with an "ego-ideal," with the Messianic chieftain who is at once "one" with the citizen and elevated far above him. "Big Brother"

10

arises when man can no longer find brothers of his own.17

It should not be thought that the basic themes in the predictions and prescriptions for the new society are the creations of President Kerr and his associates. The basic choices have been made and are being made by the populace, even in Kerr's eyes.18 We dislike President Kerr's picture of education and the new society intensely, but we are forced to admit that this picture is true to the standard of American fears of loyalty and prejudice against politics. The American people have believed in self-interest, and many of them sense that this ethic has cheated them. As yet, however, they have been unable, in all but a few instances, to substitute a new one.

There is at least one ideal that still survives in our society, although it has been a part of our civilization for more than 800 years. That ideal is a university, a community of scholars bound together by the search for knowledge and truth, and feeling a responsibility to their society. That ideal declares that teaching and learning are more important than economic self-interest, and where that ideal has been a reality, some men have been able to face the future with self-confidence and hope.

We believe the defense of that vision and the attempt to make it a reality are profoundly important. For in fact, the vision is losing to Kerr's adherents, and not only losing in California. The defeat of the vision of the University is, of course, only part of the general social process of which Kerr is both analyst and advocate. But students have a special duty to combat that process on their own part of the battlefield: the university campus. "History" may be moving in the way Kerr believes it to be. "Brave New World" or 1984 may be the destiny of man in some ultimate sense. We do not believe that his must be the case. But in any event there is all the difference in the world between resisting any such trend and advocating it, between hoping to postpone 1984 to 2025 and hoping to establish it, as Kerr seems to, in 1975.

#### Notes

1. Clark Kerr, Dunlop, Harbison, and Meyers: Industrial Man (Harvard U. Press, 1960). The authors state their agreement on essential points (p.5); it is fair to associate any views expressed with Kerr himself.
2. ibid., p.288
3. ibid., p.8
4. ibid., p.311
5. ibid., p.39
6. ibid., p.35
7. ibid., p.294
8. ibid., p.295
9. ibid., p.293
10. ibid., p.72
11. ibid., p.179
12. "Unions and Union Leaders of their Own Choosing," Fund for the Republic publication
13. ibid., p.295
14. ibid., p.295-296
15. J.H. Schaar and W. C. McWilliams, "Uncle Sam Vanishes," New University Thought, vol.1, no.4, 1961
16. Glenn Tinder, "Human Estrangement and the Failure of Political Imagination," Review of Politics, vol.21, no.4, October 1959, pp. 611-630; Sigmund Freud, "Thoughts for the Times on War and Death" in B. Nelson, ed. On Creativity and the Unconscious, New York: Harper Torchbook, 1958, pp. 206-235
17. Vladimir C. Nahirny, "Some Observations on Ideological Groups," American Journal of Sociology, vol. LXVII, no.4, January 1962, pp. 397-405
18. Kerr et. al., op. cit., p.288

# REPORT from JACKSON

*by Dave Campbell*

Jackson is the capital of the state that has the highest ratio of Negro to white population and the lowest number of registered Negro voters. It is the capital of the poorest state (in per capita income) which spends more money than any other in propagandizing its way of life and in devising ways to legally squirm out of court integration orders.

However, Jackson today is the scene of three crucial developments in the integration struggle. Robert Smith has become the first non-white in the Twentieth Century to run for a national office. An independent integrationist newspaper, The Mississippi Free Press, was launched with its first edition December 16. Lastly, Southern treasuries continue to be filled by court expenses from the Freedom Rider Trials.

Robert Smith will not be elected to Congress this fall. The incumbent, John Williams, is too deeply entrenched in the Southern system of one-party politics and Negro disenfranchisement to be defeated. But the importance and significance of Smith's campaign is not bound up with victory or defeat. By gaining time on radio and television he can actively publicize the harsh facts that Negro Mississippi residents are not receiving their full rights as American citizens. He will be able to bring to many the knowledge of existing injustices, and to others, the realization that there are men pursuing the hope of change.

Above all the campaign will demonstrate the importance of the vote in the struggle for equal societal rights and liberties. The voter registration drive, conducted by the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, is based on many of the same premises. Realizing the limited scope of their efforts, the SNCC staff is at least as equally concerned with informing and providing a focus for future action as with gaining voters. But they too, direct their drive at that mystical power: the vote.

But their goal, and Smith's, is neither "the vote" nor a hamburger nor a cup of coffee, but the transformation of the Negro's self image by means of a structural revolution in Southern society. (And this, perhaps, is what they mean by "Integration" as opposed to "Desegregation.")

Smith's campaign is not one of revenge, as he often points out to integrationists. Revenge would necessarily mean the seeking of power to return a wrong or injustice, to inflict similar harm. The very acknowledgement by Smith's opponents that revenge would not be at all unnatural is indication of their consciousness of the evil that is the "Southern Way of Life." What Smith's campaign could do would be to bring this consciousness into open awareness through publicizing the situation and offering a settlement of equality, not a counter-imposition.

To demand the ballot truly comes to the heart of the matter. For, as stated in the 1961 Report of the US Civil Rights Commission on Voting, "If the disenfranchised can never speak with the same force as those who are able to

vote, it follows that they are apt to suffer in other ways. As a Negro witness put it at the Commission's Louisiana hearing: 'So you see, we have nobody to represent us, on the jury, school board, office, the state Legislature, nowhere. All the laws are passed, we have no voice in, whether it is for us or against us, and I don't think there is many for us.'

(A bill is pending at the time of this writing in the Senate --S2750-- introduced by Mike Mansfield which would eliminate the restricting literacy tests. It has been the arbitrary and discriminatory voting "requirements" which have greatly served the cause of the Negro disenfranchisement. The new Mansfield Bill can only be lauded, and hopefully passed through Congressional reaction to popular liberal support and encouragement.)

The Freedom Rider Trials continue monotonously, painfully. The legal defense of the riders has claimed \$325,000 in legal fees and bail money with the aim of appealing until justice is reached -- in a Federal Court. At that time, some of its money will be returned, though much of it will have been forfeited to the state coffers. That the White Citizen's Council is financed largely from those coffers, presents a note of irony to the fracas.

Nevertheless, direct action such as the sit-ins and the Freedom Riders are still essential to the Southern revolution, posing a poignant human confrontation of freedom and a desire to resolve conflict nonviolently to a decadent system of rigidity, oppression. Such protests in themselves provide for fundamental change in the Negro's personal self outlook in establishing a framework for a "way out." And in a larger context, through the sensation-loving mass media, they spew forth the hate and vulgarity of the white-southerner's response and increase the imperative for change.

But Negro leaders are becoming more aware of the limitations of direct action and are beginning to settle on the efficacy of the ballot. of making their people a people with a voice, that can meaningfully challenge the System. The Kennedy Administration seems to know that with its help the Negro voice will be heard, and that the time has come for governmental action, if only to insure that if the Negro votes in 1964 he will vote Democrat. And assuming the current trends for realignment continue in the national parties, the Justice Department's assistance in the voter registration seems shrewd, but laudable.

The Mississippi Free Press has been conceived as a result of the convulsion that is Jackson. It is born because the only "free people" of Jackson know that there can be no revolution without a newspaper. The purpose of the paper is essentially the same as that of the Riders and the Voter Registration Drive: to critically confront Mississippi with its own anomaly and fallacies; to disrupt the way of life that means suffering and degradation, to interrupt the pattern of warped social thought and offer the only

solution that is concomitant with the American way of life.

The idea of the Free Press is great in its implication and so is the Movement. And both have shaken segregation to its roots.

There has been progress in Jackson, and it doesn't seem to be slowing. The struggle will continue until a truly democratic social and political structure is effected. Americans "want their freedom," to quote Tom Kahn, "and to want in this context does not mean having a pale wish for freedom, but a hunger which can no longer be denied."

## JULES FEIFFER

GENTLEMEN, IF YOU WILL, PLEASE TURN TO PP.42 OF THE APPENDIX WHITE PAPER NUMBER 6521, PAR.14. DO YOU ALL HAVE IT?



RE RIVALRY - CIA VS. STATE? IS THAT IT, CHIEF?

YES, NOW PIERRE. IF YOU WILL SUMMARIZE -



EXCUSE IT, CHIEF. HERE'S CHESTER

SORRY I'M LATE, CHIEF I WAS FINISHING UP A BOOK REVIEW.

TRY TO BE PROMPT, CHESTER. THE REST OF US MANAGE TO GET OUR BOOK REVIEWS DONE ON OUR OWN TIME.



POST, ARTUR. WHAT'S THE PAGE?

PP.42, PAR.14

©1961 Jules Feiffer

3-18

NOW THEN, THE PROBLEM IS THE IMPROVEMENT OF INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS BETWEEN OURSELVES AND RUSSIER, OURSELVES AND ASIER, AND (MORE DIFFICULT BECAUSE IT'S A CLOSED SOCIETY) OURSELVES AND CIA. YES, ED -



WELL, WEVE HAD SOME SUCCESS IN TRACKING CIA'S ACTIVITIES BY MONITORING THE ENEMY'S RADIO ACCUSATIONS, CHIEF.

TRUE. HOWEVER, STATE TELLS ME IT FINDS IT INCREASINGLY FRUSTRATING TO RECOGNIZE A NEW GOVERNMENT IN THE MORNING ONLY TO HAVE CIA TRY TO OVERTHROW IT IN THE AFTERNOON. NOW, THAT'S SLOPPY



IN TERMS OF LONG RANGE PLANNING CIA SHOULD, ON OCCASION, HAVE THE SAME FOREIGN POLICY AS STATE, WOULDN'T YOU SAY, CHIEF?

I'LL BUY THAT, WALT. TYPE UP A CLASSIFIED MEMO AND LEAK IT TO THE PRESS. NOW AFTER LUNCH. I WANT TO DISCUSS POSSIBLE SITES FOR A FUTURE SERIES OF ATMOSPHERIC TESTS. I UNDERSTAND THAT SOMEBODY SUGGESTED HAVANA.



BON APPETIT, CHIEF

The Hall Syndicate, Inc.

# The hollow men

by Roger Leeds

The generation of the fifties was called the silent generation. It probably earned that label. The student voice, if raised, was seldom enough listened to in this country; it was nearly the end of this decade before the country's professional auditors realized the students weren't saying anything. Then began a parade of articles in the great family magazines. A concern developed because the campuses weren't living up to the role they had been allotted -- furnishing restless, impractically idealistic background music to the undulations of history, indicative of healthy young minds coming to grips with monster problems, expecting ( like Joshua before the walls ) these problems to diminish from the outcry.

There were some ( students of students ) who suspected well enough the reasons for the silence. Like Phillip Jacob, they guessed that students were preoccupied with the "real" world and had rejected the role society had come to expect of them. And like Jacob, they conducted surveys that confirmed their suspicions with sociology's claim to scientific objectivity, the opinion survey (properly coded on punch cards). They lamented then: the American student had become, suddenly and quite without advance notice materialistic and security-conscious. College was merely vocational training to the Orwellian denizens of the old campus. Who killed idealism?

The answers were forthcoming. There was war (Second and Korean), the new prosperity, installment buying, the new organization mentality, suburbia, and even the end of ideology. And, of course, the veterans had no time for role-playing what with wives, children, and a late start in life. The answers seemed pretty satisfactory. They all pointed to the fact that students were intimidated by the whiplash of circumstance.

The only disturbing thing about the answers was that they were wrong. It is true that the post-war student was and is a great deal more literal than students have been in this country. There is a disinclination to suffer rhetoric, pretense, and the singularly American preoccupation, self-delusion. The romantic image of the thirties failed to interest the liberal silent generation. Few commentators realized how much they were judging the fifties by the standards of the thirties. The post-war campus appeared lifeless in this comparison.

But the truth was that the silent generation was not silent. The student of the fifties was busy adjusting to the new world that Americans had thrust into their care. The new world of nationalism, Cold War, European recovery, the United Nations, and the Bomb. The post-war world was not a world for ideology. Events compounded with realignments of economic, military, and political power, were moving beyond theory and too fast for considered examin-



ation. Too fast, that is, for response. The silent generation may have been bewildered - but equally, it was too intent on absorbing the import of the course of events to think of influencing that course. The generation of the fifties had to raise its eyes from America to take in a perspective of the world. The concern with the domestic society was lost in the concern for world society and ancillary subjects of student interest were likewise universalized-human rights, civil liberties, and politics. So the silent generation was not really silent; it was attentive to the tasks at hand, attentive to the spectacle being played, attentive to the demands for new attitudes and insights into fresh problems.

The distinction between a "silent" generation and an attentive one is important. Silence implies lack of interest and ignorance. An attentive generation is one that is interested and knowledgeable. The students of the fifties were trying to visualize this post-war world they had reason to believe was a new world, and maybe the old responses were inadequate. Unfortunately, in most respects the world has managed to right itself in the past fifteen years. Most of the pre-war problems have survived, and are now in company of the new ones we are compelled to face. The new world of peace and justice and progress proved to be a typical human optimistic extension. And so, what of this college generation?

This is the empty generation. Nationalism, communism, and nuclear war are familiar companions - we can lie with them. The vision of the new world is destroyed, and we can be literal as the fifties never could. No longer are students optimistic realists. We are realists, period. We know the precise dollar evaluation of our education, down to the penny - thanks to Seymour Harris. Our certainties are few but definite. We have confidence in ourselves, the dollar, the destructive capabilities of the Bomb, and the continuing imperfection of man and his societies. Also we continue to believe in science, although it, too, has become commonplace. Withall, some of us are a bit fearful. Look magazine reports a rise in church attendance. It is most probable that this is due more to the felt need for sanctuary than to a rediscovery of faith. The plain fact is that we have ceased to be attentive; we have lost interest in the spectacle. We have ceased to relate to the world, or even to our own society. We are more silent than the generation of the fifties - we are empty.

This is not to say that we are pessimistic. We are merely literal and confined. We deliberately confine ourselves, out of self-defense. Hope is not abandoned, it is ignored. We pride ourselves on having no illusions. We are distressingly successful in that endeavor. Perhaps our elders do not realize it, but we are the only ones adapted, to living in this age.

In the last issue, Tom Hayden railed against the pessimism of the adult liberals. What he said was only too accurate. The same men who excited the fever of the

thirties have betrayed their trust. They have allowed liberalism to die. With it died the enthusiasm and idealism we might have inherited. The inheritance they leave is disillusionment and disengagement. We rejected this in favor of emptiness. It bears emphasis that emptiness is not negative--it is non-emotional. It involves no shattered hopes. It is safe.

We aren't "beat." Beats are no more than people who care about not caring. Nor are we angry. How can we be indignant? We have accepted the world on its own terms, we don't seek to impose our terms upon the world.

The idea abounds, even on the campus, that the right has risen, and that students are coming to be concerned about civil rights and peace. But the confluence of all the movements now stirring would hardly make a fair-sized rivulet compared to the number of students who remain inert. It may be that civil rights and peace will engender, in time, an attitude to replace the emptiness. On the other hand, the conservative wave demonstrates just how empty we have become.

The new conservatives deal in irrationality and absurd rantings. They are against the UN, the income tax, and government. YAF is virtually maniacal, and the posturings and belligerency it manifests confirm that it is mainly an unthinking response to the not considerable pressures of the Space Age. This is not to depreciate conservatism, but merely to call attention to the fact that the YAF itself is an unintelligent response -- attributable to the breakdown of ideology and the depressing sense of frustration we have acquired as the price of technological progress. To a certain extent, the peace movement also deals in irrationality. It too, cannot define a proximate series of goals. YAF aspires to individual freedom; the peace movement to peace. Neither is very sure of the waystations. The civil rights activists must count themselves fortunate to be exempt from this particular pitfall.

The left is still aimless. Even if it were not, it could not penetrate the insularity of the campus. Both the left and the right must perpetrate themselves, if they can, so that they be available when the student becomes once more receptive. But let them mark well the failures of the former students who allowed both traditions to wither.

We are empty because we are insulated. We are insulated by our geography, by our society, and by our occupation. We cannot appreciate poverty, disease nor hunger, because we have not experienced them either. We are not desperate, though we may be frustrated. We are not restless or uncertain because we are prosperous and we know, barring the unforeseen, we will continue to be. We are not impassioned or idealistic or committed - we are empty.

---

*the Souls of Black Folk - a review-essay*  
by *Wilson Carey McWilliams*

W.E.B. Du Bois has finally become an official member of the Communist Party. That fact makes reading the new paperback edition of The Souls of Black Folk doubly painful, (the book itself is a painful book to read in any case) because Du Bois' incredible intelligence, his lucid, almost Gallic, style, and his sensitivity and perceptiveness are all somehow circumscribed by the great wall labelled "Negro." Du Bois will always be the tragic symbol of American racial politics; in some ways, the tragic symbol of America (Dreiser's American Tragedy is almost opera - bouffé in comparison; it can never really be tragic because Griffiths never had the essential trait of the tragic hero, greatness of soul). Du Bois lived and lives at an entirely different level of human experience and imagination than the average American. Yet the works and attainments of his life never transcend "negritude;" a great man was limited to being a great Negro and has now ended by becoming an insignificant Communist, in perhaps his last effort to escape from the prison of identity fixed by race. Tragedy is always ambiguous. If Du Bois is the fallen hero, the drama itself is peculiarly the American tragedy, in which Du Bois' ignominy results from the poverty of the American imagination, of our failure to reach beyond pettiness. If the hero falls from pride, from believing himself able to be more than man, society is judged more severely for the lack of pride, for being less than man, the unter-opposite, the ubermensch.

Du Bois' great insight is contained in his first chapter, where he discusses his initial contacts with discrimination, and his discovery that, though like his fellow students in "heart and life and longing" he was shut off yet from them by a "vast veil," which he ceased to desire to tear down. Du Bois' pride is that he resolved to treat that veil with "common contempt", to live beyond--or above--it in a "region of blue sky and great wandering shadows." But the veil remained a reality for American Negroes and, willy-nilly, for Du Bois as well. The world, Du Bois noted, allowed the Negro to see himself only through the "revelation of the other." Refusing to regard him as a person, the world, that is the white world, judged the Negro by what it saw. And the Negro, hence, was dominated by two selves, the one unwanted self seen and the self within. Yet the whole man has one soul and not two.

"The history of the American Negro is the history of this strife --this longing to attain self - conscious manhood, to merge his double self into a better and truer self ... he wishes neither of the older selves to be lost...He simply wishes to make it possible for a man to be both a Negro and an American."

Du Bois' contemptuous rejection of the veil of skin is his refusal to hate his "outer self," his insistence on just that unified self that he sees the American Negro striving to attain. But what Du Bois did not see--what reveals that de-

spite his pride and his greatness he was imprisoned by the race question after all -- is that he has described not the Negro American, but the American per se. Change the word Negro in the paragraph above to "Jew" or "Catholic" or "German - American" and the result is not at all incongruous: it is a statement of historical fact. The "double self" of Americans, the public and the private face, was noted by de Toqueville long ago. All equal, and all equally weak, the white American was forced to dissemble in public, to conceal his weakness and his inner self, and ultimately to strive to lose his inner-self as it menaced the security built so laboriously by the public conformity of the "outer-self." Oddly enough, only in Paris did James Baldwin note the same fact: that hybridness and alienation from self, tensions, and terror and tenderness, are American and not "Negro" traits. Why has it been impossible to learn that lesson in America?

The American Negro does differ from the American white. Both have two selves but where the Caucasian strives to lose or destroy his inner self, the Negro strives to lose the outer. It may be, as Du Bois and Baldwin have both felt, that either policy was wrong. But the Negro has nonetheless menaced the white American by that fact. The "mysterious" Negro world, unknown to whites, and feared by them, which Baldwin and Du Bois note, arises from that fact. For the white world recognizes the "nigger" as its own creation, and knows as well that the whole visual world of white America is known to him. But it cannot ever know his inner world without admitting an inner world of its own, a world which it has been desperately seeking to conceal, deny, or escape. The feverish effort of American Caucasians to make the Negro see himself as a Negro, to force him to surrender his inner self, is part of an effort to force him to become what white America has become by choice.

This has old roots. The Negro, after all, was forced to come to America; the whites chose to come. That simple truism conceals a vital fact. White America deserted its homeland, its skin, and its co-religionists. It left the struggles of the old world to them and sought to escape the burdens of struggle to build a refuge: it sought to flee from responsibility and from political and human duty. White America has been dedicated to the proposition "henceforth be masterless" as Lawrence knew. But to refuse responsibility, the burdens of obligation and duty, to refuse guilt, is to refuse the inner self, as Lawrence was well aware. The American "soul," he told us, can only be discovered when men learn to be "mastered" by something worth being mastered by. And that lament echoes in American history through our thought and literature; think only of Royce's great appeal to Americans to be "loyal to loyalty." The American white has never been an American: he has been the non-European. He may have regarded Europe with romanticism and nostalgia, the compulsive "cosmopolitanism" at once of American intellectuals and the robber barons who married their daughters

19

to dukes and built replicas of Versailles. Or, he may have regarded it with an equally compulsive loathing, which need scarcely be described in historical detail. Those Negroes who have sought to be "masterless" have been different, demanding the right to assume responsibility, to be treated as worthy to bear burdens and to have high duties, just as Du Bois sought to rise above the petty world of race. Forced to leave his homeland, the Negro American has few nostrums or compulsions about it. Garvey-ism appealed not because of its "back to Africa" movement but in spite of it, like the Communists own "black nationalism." Even in the 1830's, the African Colonization Society had its heaviest opposition from American Negroes. And even Du Bois' devotion to Pan-Africanism had the usual Du Bois component of paternalistic contempt, a counterpart of his famous commencement address on Jefferson Davis. "The land was ours before we were the land's," Frost said; one wonders if white America is the land's even today. But to become "the land's," was the Negro's only escape from being, like the land itself, "ours." In a very real sense, the Negro is America's first "native son," the only American born without an animus against his inner soul. Du Bois knew as much:

"We, the darker ones, come even now not altogether empty-handed: there are no truer exponents of the Declaration of Independence...no true American music but the wild, sweet melodies of the Negro slave...American folk-tales are Indian and African..we black men seem the sole oasis of simple faith and reverence in a dusty desert of dollars and smartness."

John Winthrop lectured the Puritans on their perils before they landed: having fled from Europe they could only be justified by an absolute adherence to the dream of Christian perfection. "That which others do in their churches by profession only" must become, he said, the rule of life here: God will not bear from Americans, iniquities even as minor as he bears "from those among whom we have lived." America, he argued, is a "city on the hill." judged by the whole of humanity. Yet Winthrop's ideal, howevermuch it constitutes the "promise" of American life, finds few echoes: a paragraph in Croly, an essay or two of Randolph Bourne or Thoreau the analysis of a Swedish economist or a French Aristocrat. Yet the "vast ideal that swims before the Negro people" which Du Bois saw was just that ancient American ideal, a dream which dominated Du Bois and perhaps the majority of American Negroes not because they were Negroes but because they were Americans. Du Bois called it "in conformity with the greater ideals of the American republic." Even here, the old "racialism" deluded him: The Negro dream did not "conform" to the American dream: it is the dream itself, perhaps its only genuine social expression.

And Du Bois ends in the embrace of American Communism:

the least distinguished of the Communist parties, without intellectual attainments, political influence, or independence of movement. But even such an ending is true to Du Bois' life. Marxism is an analysis which denies that racial politics are real: it regards them as a "superstructure," or an opiate meant to delude workers. In its fundamental meaning for Du Bois, Marxism denies that Americans are so foolish or so petty as to take the absurdity of racism seriously, to allow it to dominate their conscious or their subconscious minds. Du Bois' Marxism suggests he would rather regard us as misled by capitalist propaganda at best, or even as crafty purveyors of that propaganda at worst, than see us simply as foolish, superficial, and hollow. For Marxism holds out for Du Bois the faint, desperate hope that the dream can still be real, and the second alternative--to see us as we are -- would be to deny it. Baldwin sees us better, but Baldwin is no tragic hero. He lacks the dream. He assimilates himself to white America with his references to "our" feelings about Blackness or how "we" regard Harlem or the world of the Negro. His success is that of a vision too limited, just as the success of Black Islam would be one of a base dream; the success of either is as irrelevant as its failure would be. And Du Bois' failure is the failure of a vision too high for us, of a soul too much for the world we have built. If it is Du Bois' tragedy, it may be the supreme irony of American history that perhaps the last American should end in the embrace of Moscow as a price of maintaining his Americanism pure.

---

SUBSCRIPTIONS ARE \$1.00 A YEAR

THIS IS RIDICULOUSLY CHEAP. WE ALSO NEED YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO SUBSIST. AND SUBSISTING IS THE VERY LEAST WE WANT TO DO.

The Activist is a student publication dedicated to the evolution of dialogue on matters concerning current problems of democracy.

That the democratic society is contingent on the active, intelligent social and political participation of its citizens is our credo. That the task of the student community is to help bring about such a society is implicit.

---

name

address

city

state

ENCLOSED IS MY \$1.00 FOR 1 YEAR'S SUBSCRIPTION. IN ADDITION I ENCLOSE \$ AS A FRIEND OF THE ACTIVIST

clip and mail to: THE ACTIVIST  
63 EAST LORAIN

UNCENSORED, UNADULTERATED TRUTH  
is very likely to be found in the  
books sold and serviced at the  
CO-OP BOOK STORE  
OBERLIN, OHIO

# decomposition of democracy excerpts from a speech Tom Hayden

Several influential studies in recent years suggest rather alarming facts about the nature of today's student weltanschauung. In his book, Changing Values in College, Phillip Jacob found three percent of the students interviewed "gave top priority to being active in national affairs or being a useful citizen." Seventeen percent expected that participating as a citizen in the affairs of the community would be one of the three activities giving the most satisfaction in life." Asked what was the University's most important function, the goal of "getting along with other people" received five times as much support as the goal of "citizenship participation."

A second study, done by Dr. Edward Eddy at the University of New Hampshire, concluded that most students perceive college life as a "parenthesis" enclosing something neither related nor relevant to the rest of life, except as it assures a better job.

Another more recent study is contained in a 1,000 page collection of essays by social scientists, edited by Nevitt Sanford and titled "The American College." One of the author's major concerns is the university's failure to challenge and truly educate a huge block of students who are fair achievers, but without strong goals or commitments.

One of the most astonishing surveys was reported by Dr. Hermann H. Remmers just a few years ago: "They play it so safe," he said, "that they've lost their feelings for the basic tenets of American democracy." He found that three out of every four students believe "that what the nation needs is a strong fearless leader in whom we can have faith," fifty percent were willing to compromise freedom of the press, eighty-three percent saw nothing wrong with wire-tapping, and fifty-eight percent thought it all right for the police to use third degree tactics.

What are we witnessing here? Surely it is the decomposition of democracy, if ever we had genuine democracy in this country. People are becoming more remote from the possibility of a civic life that maximizes personal influence over public affairs. There is a deep alienation of the student from the decision-making institutions of society. C. Wright Mills suggests a widening separation between "social structure" and personal "milieu." As our major institutions expand, and science and technology generate an increasing need for division of labor, expertise and specialization, and the life of nations becomes more interconnected, fewer and fewer individuals are able to perceive truly beyond their immediate and limited circles, their milieu. An even smaller number have even the semblance of an integrated understanding of social realities and social change. Take the University of Michigan: who here has any conception of authority formal and informal, the role of the faculty in policy-making, the impact of federal research funds on the education of the in-

Less and less do we transform private troubles to public issues; for instance, the man who is sick with the commercials he sees on television tends to disconnect the set instead of complaining about a capitalist system that creates pseudo-needs in people so as to continue profit in time of over-production. Similarly, the freshman in the quadrangle does not connect the fact that he can see his girlfriend in the quad but not in the apartment with the fact that the State of Michigan is politically gerrymandered so as to entrench 19th Century Americans like Senator Elmer Porter in the Senate and House of Representatives. The student who is upset by the idiosyncracies of the Negro cleaning lady in his corridor does not connect his upset with the fact that more than one-third of all Negro women in America are compelled to be domestics, or the fact that salary rates for Negroes have been, on the average, one-half of the rates for white men for the past twenty years.

As the perimeter of personal vision becomes closer, a sense of powerlessness evolves with regard to changing the state of affairs, evoking the ideology of "complexity" often hidden behind joviality and complacency. To the students, things seem to happen because of a mixture of drift and manipulation by an unseen "them", the modern equivalent of "fate." To the extent that these "powerless" participate in public affairs, they participate with impotency, adapting themselves to the myriad of rules, initiated and imposed from without, that constitute the university game (after all, who wants to be a martyr over dress regulation?). They seek to conform their actions to what the Top People like; they just try to get by, feeling content most of the time, enjoying the university's benevolent laxity about drinking regulations, building up their exam files, and "playing it cool."

A recent Gallup of youth concluded, among other things that youth will "settle for low success (and) won't risk high failure." There is no willingness to tak risks and to set dangerous goals, no real conception of personal identity, except one made in the image of others, no real urge for personal fulfillment except to be almost as successful as the very successful people. Much attention is paid to the social status (meeting people, getting a wife or husband, making good solid business contacts); increasingly more attention is paid to academic status (grades, honors, admittance to mad school). Still neglected is the intellectual status, the personal cultivation of excellence of the mind. Nevitt Sanford writes, "To develop a skill in selling one's personality may appear far more important than to develop any personality worth selling." That the universities should encourage social acceptance is only natural; they are, of course, only acting in loco middle class parentis.

The university and society are not just impersonal to the student. Where members of an institution are linked by a functional bond of being students, not the fraternal bond of being people, there develops a terrible isolation of man from man, dimly disguised in the intensity of twist parties, or the frightening riots of Fort Lauderdale. Albert Camus' novel, The

Stranger, creates a paradigm of the man lacking relatedness to anything at all. In one part of the novel the stranger's mother has died, and he, himself, goes swimming and to the movies with his girlfriend. That evening she asks him to marry her to which he nonchalantly consents. Next she asks if he loves her, and with the same detachment he replies that he does not think so. In this perhaps extreme case, don't we see the contours of a generation consciously drifting, but not even prepared to commit itself to drifting. A teacher in Austin, Texas, made this point plain to me when he joked: Students do not even give a damn about apathy." Can we call this attitude human? Doesn't it involve a perception of life that is unreal as articulated by one co-ed who stated: "For the most of us war is a great big fairy tale told by our parents. We don't believe it can happen to us."

If war is a great big fairy tale, what meaning have life and death?

---

## CONTRIBUTORS

Bruce Payne, David Walls, and J. Berman are students at the University of California, Berkeley. All are former candidates of SLATE Political Party, and Payne is now the National Student Association Coordinator --

Roger Leed is a student at Harvard College, and Chairman of the Harvard USNSA --

W. Carey McWilliams, Jr. is an instructor of government at Oberlin College, and is a well-known speaker and writer --

David Campbell is a student at Oberlin College, and has travelled extensively throughout the South --

Jules Feiffer is far too popular to get another blurb. If in need of further reference, however, please see The Activist, Winter, 1961 --

Tom Hayden is Field Secretary for the Students for a Democratic Society and a free-lance writer. His latest pamphlet is Revolution in Mississippi available from The Activist @ 25¢ per copy.

---

THE ACTIVIST  
63 EAST LORAIN STREET  
OBERLIN, OHIO

Non-Profit Org  
Permit #1626  
Postage PAID at  
New York, N.Y.